

## THE SITE OF CHIBCHA BOGOTA

Sylvia M. Broadbent

The Sabana de Bogotá is the southernmost and largest of a chain of high-level, flat bottomed valleys formed by Pleistocene lake beds in the Eastern Cordillera of the Colombian Andes. It is approximately 60 km. long and about 40 km. wide at its widest point; its floor lies at an altitude of a little under 2,600 m., and it is rimmed by mountains rising in some cases another 1,000 m., but generally less. This great valley is drained by the Río Bogotá or Funza and its tributaries, which trace meandering routes across its nearly level surface until the Bogotá enters a narrow gorge leading to the spectacular Tequendama Falls, where it begins a steep descent down the western slope of the Cordillera to join the Río Magdalena. In the central Sabana a noteworthy feature is the pantanos or ciénagas, which are not exactly the marshes or swamps that their names suggest but long, narrow, almost stagnant bodies of water resembling river lagoons which drain, albeit slowly, into the rivers, especially the Bogotá itself. The pantanos support a dense growth of reeds, and their fauna includes fish, water fowl, and guinea pigs. There is some historical basis for believing that these and other bodies of water were formerly more numerous, but many still exist. From the air and in aerial photographs one can often see traces of dried-up pantanos and ox-bow lakes, and also signs of what appear to be old drainage ditches that were made, perhaps in the historic period, to drain marshy areas. These ditch lines are especially numerous at certain points on both banks of the Río Bogotá, suggesting that these zones were formerly marshy. The Bogotá is now contained by levees; flooding of low-lying areas is common during period of heavy rain but seems to be due to slow run-off from the extremely flat terrain more often than to overflow from the river. In fact, these floods may be more persistent now than in former times; levees keep floodwaters from draining into the river as well as keeping the river from overflowing, and the water may have drained off faster via the vanished marshes.

At the time of the Spanish conquest the Sabana formed a major portion of the territory of the Chibcha. When the Spaniards first arrived they named this valley "el valle de los Alcázares," because the many Indian towns they saw there, with their palisades, masts, and banners, made them think of castles or fortresses. It was particularly the number of towns in this area that impressed the Spaniards, not their great size; Spanish writers speak of the towns as being "a league or less apart."<sup>1</sup> One of these towns was called Bogotá and was the capital of the southern Chibcha kingdom, a capital from which the Zipa ruled a loosely organized domain stretching from Chocontá to Fusagasugá.<sup>2</sup>

In spite of the historical indications of a reasonably dense Indian population in the Sabana, few archaeological sites are known there. In view of the scarcity of known sites and the marshiness and flooding to which much of it is subject, it has been denied that the Chibcha made much use of the valley floor.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, when landowners

in the region of Funza, in the very heart of the Sabana, reported archaeological finds on their property, I decided to investigate.<sup>4</sup> Pottery, burials, stone spindle whorls, and a few gold objects had been found in various locations over an area approximately two kilometers long, and local inhabitants say that potsherds appear wherever one digs in this area. Visual inspection of plowed fields, ditches, and other portions not obscured by vegetation showed that potsherds were continuously present over a width of nearly a kilometer at right angles to the extension suggested by local reports. Most of the artifacts seen in private collections and obtained by surface collection fit well into the types usually identified as "classic Chibcha:" Guatavita Sherd-tempered pottery,<sup>5</sup> incised stone spindle whorls, and the highly characteristic metal "tunjos" or anthropomorphic figures.

The site (see fig. 1) lies alongside a body of water known locally as "El Pantano del Gualí," although maps published by the Instituto Geográfico de Colombia ascribe this name to a connecting pantano lying somewhat to the north. The area where remains have been found appears to extend over almost the whole of at least three modern haciendas, known as "Los Henares," "San Carlos," and "La Ramada," which are now devoted primarily to dairy cattle; documentary sources suggest that pasturing livestock has been the principal economic use of the area throughout the historic period. Some portions of the site have not been plowed in living memory. The present vegetation consists of pasture grasses (mainly of introduced species); crops, such as potatoes and maize; gardens; and a few introduced trees, chiefly eucalyptus. The site is virtually level but is perceptibly higher than the surrounding land. Although the difference is no more than a meter or two, it is evidently enough to protect the area from flooding from the pantano or from the river, which passes within 500 m. of the site; fields nearby are said to be flooded on occasion, but an 18th century house on the site shows no sign of ever having been reached by flood waters. Otherwise there is little to say about the present physical appearance of the site; there are no visible ruins, no distinctive vegetation, no markings visible in aerial photographs. It looks like nothing but cattle pasture.

In view of the size of the site, its location, and the presence there of characteristic Chibcha materials, I decided to conduct excavations there. In March and April, 1965, approximately 40 two by two meter pits were dug on the property of the Hacienda La Ramada. A cultural deposit consisting of dark brown earth containing abundant potsherds and other artifacts was found to vary between 40 cm. and 1.50 m. in thickness, averaging a little less than a meter. Under it there was a layer of compact sticky clay, yellow ocher in color, in the surface of which were found numerous post holes and occasional large, irregular holes filled with cultural deposit; some of the latter went below the level of the water table, about 1.80 m. below the present surface. The yellow clay faded into a putty colored clay of much finer texture about 50 cm. below the bottom of the cultural deposit; it is possible that the large holes were dug to get at this finer clay, which would be more suitable for pottery manufacture than the yellow clay. Cultural materials were absent from both types of clay matrix. Objects found in the cultural deposit included, besides potsherds, many crudely

chipped stone implements, such as scrapers and choppers; fragments of rather large pillow-shaped manos; pieces of milling stones of approximately ovoid outline; a few fragments of polished stone axes; portions of three or four disk-shaped incised spindle whorls, also of stone; rare badly eroded scraps of animal bone; and one burial, flexed on its back in a simple, ovoid pit grave dug into the yellow clay and without associated artifacts. These materials are currently under study and will form the basis of an extensive report. The present paper is concerned with the identification of this site with a portion of Chibcha Bogotá.

It has always been perfectly clear from the published chronicles that the present city of Bogotá was not founded on the site of the Chibcha capital. Modern Bogotá has been called that only since 1819; before that date it was known by the name under which it was founded in 1538, Santa Fe de Bogotá, or more often simply Santa Fe or Santafé. The "Santafé" portion of the full name was eliminated, in an access of anti-hispanicism, by the Congress of Angostura.<sup>6</sup> However, santafereño, not bogotano, is still used with reference to customs considered traditionally typical of the capital; e.g., chocolate santafereño, hot chocolate served with cheese. The site of colonial Santafé, according to the chroniclers, was chosen by reconnoitering parties sent out from the Spanish camp at Indian Bogotá.<sup>7</sup> Piedrahita has the Spaniards camped at Bosa at this time but nonetheless cannot be interpreted as suggesting that the site chosen was anywhere near Indian Bogotá.<sup>8</sup> The accounts of the foundation show that the location of Santafé was that of modern central Bogotá, at the foot of the two mountains Guadalupe and Monserrate and between the rivers San Francisco and San Cristóbal. As late as 1668 Piedrahita specified that Santafé was still located where it had first been founded.<sup>9</sup> It has certainly not been moved since; most of the churches described by Piedrahita still exist.

Santafé was founded at or near a village the name of which has been published as Tensacá (Aguado), Teusaquillo (Simón), and Thybzaquillo (Piedrahita).<sup>10</sup> These must all be variant spellings of the same name and refer to the same place. Tensacá is probably a misreading of Teusacá, and Piedrahita's b would be equivalent to Simón's u, since b, v, and u were interchangeable in 17th century Spanish orthography. The longer (and later) versions of the name obviously end in the Spanish diminutive suffix -illo, probably used to distinguish this village from a town called Teusacá located somewhere between Usaquén and Guasca, presumably in the valley of the present Río Teusacá.<sup>11</sup> There is now a barrio of Bogotá called Teusaquillo, but it is of fairly recent development, since it is not included in barrio lists as late as 1928.<sup>12</sup> It may simply have been named in honor of the Indian village rather than representing its actual site. At all events, Teusaquillo seems to have had no direct connection with Indian Bogotá. It is true that late writers have described it as a pleasure resort of the Zipa, but this story seems to have been started by Juan Rodríguez Freire (1636) whose writings are entertaining but notoriously unreliable.<sup>13</sup> None of the earlier chroniclers mentions it. In the published versions of the earlier chronicles Teusaquillo is said to have been subject to Tunja (Aguado) or Funza (Simón).<sup>14</sup> The form "Funza" in the published text of Simón is a misreading of what appears in the manuscript from which the publication was made. The manuscript has "Tuna," not "Funza."<sup>15</sup> It

seems likely that the form "Tunja" which appears in the published text of Aguado is also a mistake for "Tuna." Tuna was a Chibcha town closely associated with, and presumably close to, Suba; the two are often mentioned together. <sup>16</sup> A rural district of the municipality of Suba is now named Tuna. As will be seen later, the error in the published text of Simón is of some significance, since it provides the only known appearance of "Funza" as a town name in the colonial literature.

Chibcha Bogotá was therefore not the place where Santafé was founded but must have been located elsewhere. As Friede has noted, an encomienda of Bogotá and an Indian town of the same name persisted for some time after the conquest. <sup>17</sup> Friede believed that Indian Bogotá disappeared soon after 1626, but Piedrahita says that it still existed in 1668, Oviedo refers to it in the mid 18th century, and in 1781, during the Comunero uprising, there was still a cacicazgo of Bogotá for Ambrosio Pisco to claim. <sup>18</sup> Friede was unable to establish the precise location of Indian Bogotá; a 16th century map shows Bogotá on the opposite side of the river from Santafé but is too sketchy to indicate its exact position. <sup>19</sup>

The information given by the chroniclers as to the location of the Zipa's capital is rather vague: in the middle of the Sabana; close to the Río Bogotá but on the other side of it from Suba; nearly surrounded by pantanos; five leagues from Santafé. <sup>20</sup> After first visiting the site under discussion here it occurred to me that its position coincided approximately to this description, since it lies only a few hundred meters from the river and is on the appropriate bank, while a pantano runs all the way along one side of it. Moreover, aerial photographs suggest that there was once another smaller pantano just south of the site also, and this, with the surviving one, would indeed leave the site nearly surrounded by water. However, there are many similar locations on both sides of the river.

The highway on the south side of the site probably lies close to, if not actually on, the route of the Camino Real of Colonial times that formed the normal route of travel from Honda on the Magdalena de Bogotá; it still passes through towns mentioned by 19th century travelers. <sup>21</sup> This was the first macadamized road in Colombia. <sup>22</sup> Aerial photographs show no traces of any other road, except for one minor deviation where the route has been changed in very recent years. Archive documents indicate that Indian Bogotá was close to the Camino Real. <sup>23</sup>

The site, it will be remembered, lies in the municipality of Funza. A location of the Zipa's capital in the vicinity of this town has considerable traditional support. Funza has been identified (without documentation) with Indian and colonial Bogotá by many historians and geographers. <sup>24</sup> An exception is Vergara y Velasco, who regarded Fontibón as a more likely site. <sup>25</sup> Pérez de Barradas accepts this interpretation. <sup>26</sup> The reasons given for it are, however, easily refuted. A supposed lack of archaeological finds in Funza (always a risky argument) is now contradicted by the discovery there of one of the largest sites known in Chibcha territory. Vergara y Velasco's claim that the chroniclers "afirman perentoriamente" that the Zipa's capital was on the left bank of the river could not be further from the truth, since in fact

the chroniclers say that the Spaniards had to cross the river to get there from Suba. The ease with which the crossing was made, at the height of the rainy season and in the face of Indian opposition, refutes the suggestions that the river was unfordable and would have been an obstacle to trade with Guatavita, Chocontá and Tunja if Bogotá were on the Funza side, and a defense against the Panche were it on the other. Moreover, Fontibón was itself an important Chibcha town, and after the conquest it formed a separate encomienda, distinct from that of Bogotá.<sup>27</sup>

The fact that during the Colonial Period Funza was called Bogotá has now been conclusively proved by an examination of the parish archives in Funza. Except for the first book of the baptisms, all the colonial records there, which start in 1652, refer to "este pueblo de Bogotá." The exception involves the complicating factor that other towns in the vicinity have had their names changed since Independence; Cuatro-esquinas became Mosquera, while what is now Madrid was formerly called Serrezuela.<sup>28</sup> The first book of baptisms in Funza is titled "Bautismos de este Pueblo de la Serrezuela" and therefore belongs properly to Madrid; possibly it was lent at some time to the doctrinero of Bogotá and was never returned, so that it later got bound in with the Bogotá books. That Serrezuela was not an earlier name for Bogotá but a separate contemporary town is shown by entries referring to both towns and naming different doctrineros for them. Apart from this book, all references to "este pueblo" are to Bogotá, not Funza, until February 13, 1825, when a baptismal entry was made by a priest named Benedicto Salgar "en esta Villa de Funza."<sup>29</sup> Salgar had previously signed entries referring to "esta villa de Bogotá," and he continued to sign thereafter, varying between "esta villa de Funza" and "esta villa (or "esta parroquia") de Bogotá." Not infrequently one finds some entries referring to Bogotá and others to Funza on the same page; it would be difficult to find clearer proof that they were one and the same town. The last dated mention of Bogotá in these documents is a title page dated August 28, 1832, "...baptismos de Yndios de este pueblo de Bogotá..." although all entries following this title mention Funza.<sup>30</sup> Evidently, after Santafé became Bogotá in 1819 it proved inconvenient to have a small town nearby with the same name, so the town was renamed. The name chosen is one that has long been applied to the Río Bogotá, as for example by Piedrahita.<sup>31</sup> In fact, there are still areas, such as Chocontá, where the river is normally called the Río Funza. As noted earlier, the only known occurrence of Funza as a town name in the colonial literature is an erroneous reading of a manuscript.

It is, then, perfectly clear that the "pueblo de indios" called Bogotá did not die out in the early 17th century, as Friede has suggested. Like other such Colonial Period settlements in the area, such as Facatativá, Zipaquirá, and Guatavita, it has remained in existence to the present day; it is only unusual in that its name has been changed. It is curious that this fact should have been so quickly forgotten that only seventy years later Vergara y Velasco could suggest that Fontibón, not Funza, was the location of Indian Bogotá. Other changes of town names in Cundinamarca are amply documented, for example Madrid, Mosquera, and Villapinzón.<sup>32</sup> No source examined so far, however, says when or why Bogotá became Funza. Perhaps the fact that

the new name of Indian origin rather than Spanish led people to forget that Funza was ever called anything else.

There is little reason to believe that the modern town is on the exact site of the Zipa's palace. In Chibcha territory, towns bearing Indian names are usually Colonial Period foundations, new towns founded by the Spanish authorities near but not in the same place as the Indian towns for which they were named. The site chosen and the layout of the new town were in accordance with Spanish ideas of town planning, and the objective was to concentrate the Indians from a number of scattered aboriginal settlements into one center where they could be more easily controlled and indoctrinated in the Christian faith. The success of this program, which continued throughout the Colonial Period, was usually rather limited.<sup>33</sup> Modern Funza, with its square blocks arranged around a central plaza, is typical of such new towns, and in fact documents exist that refer to the establishment of a "reduction" of this type for Bogotá and efforts to persuade the Indians to settle there.<sup>34</sup> It is therefore reasonable to expect that the site of Indian Bogotá would lie a few kilometers from the present town of Funza. The site under discussion here is only 3 km. from Funza and within its present jurisdiction. These facts, together with the large size of the site, led me to suppose that it probably represented the Indian town from which the colonial foundation took its name.

There is some additional evidence from documentary sources which strengthens and somewhat modifies this interpretation. Bogotá, like other Chibcha towns, was divided into matrilineal social units which did not obligatorily involve either exogamy or endogamy and which I have chosen to call "parts."<sup>35</sup> From the parish records Bogotá appears to have had 13 such units, named as follows: del Cacique, Say, Canro, Chinsa, Tauta, Catama, Neuque, Busia, Sosatama, Gacha Grande, Gacha Chiquito, Tibaque and Chicaque. A document in the National Archives clearly identifies one of these parts with the very hacienda where my excavations were carried out.<sup>36</sup> "La Ramada" or "La Ramada de Antonio Olalla" is mentioned frequently in the document, which concerns claims for damages by the Indians of Bogotá against the Spanish owners of cattle that had broken into the Indians' cultivated fields in 1609. At one point the location of La Ramada is described so clearly that if one followed the instructions today one would arrive at that hacienda and nowhere else.<sup>37</sup> Elsewhere in the same document a witness speaks of "el sitio que llaman la rramada que los y[ndi]os dicen aquel sitio catama."<sup>38</sup> La Ramada is thus identified with Catama, one of the thirteen divisions of Indian Bogotá.

This document, in combination with other evidence, leads me to think that the parts were territorial as well as social divisions, and that each part had its own more or less nucleated settlement. A Chibcha town would thus consist, not of one single aggregation of houses, but rather of a constellation of separate villages which may have been scattered over quite a large area. If La Ramada was the site of Catama, it would thus represent only one out of probably thirteen separate settlements that together formed Chibcha Bogotá. In view of the size of the site, this conclusion is somewhat surprising. If a site 2 km. long and 1 km. wide is only one of 13 parts of Indian Bogotá, Piedrahita's statement that it had 20,000 houses or families ceases to sound

unreasonable. At all events, it is evident that the Chibcha capital was an entity of considerable size. Somewhere in the vicinity of Funza there may be as many as twelve more sites comparable to the one discussed here. One at least may prove easy to locate, that of the part called Say. Documents sometimes mention "el rincón de Say." In the municipality of Mosquera, maps show a place called "Sai" located in a very marked loop of the Río Bogotá that encloses what could very well be described as a "rincón." 39

The La Ramada site is important for other reasons, apart from its identification with at least one section of Chibcha Bogotá. Its existence establishes the fact that the Chibcha not only used the valley floor but actually lived there, in spite of the excess of water. Many bodies of water still exist but do not prevent intensive agriculture and livestock raising. If there was more water on the Sabana at the time of the conquest it did not prevent the pasturing of thousands of head of cattle, sheep, horses and pigs in the vicinity of Indian Bogotá in the early Colonial Period, as is proved by the above mentioned document. In fact, it seems likely that the vicinity of pantanos was a preferred place to live, and that we can expect to find more sites in such areas. The rural district of Tuna, mentioned above, borders one of these features, and documentary evidence suggests that fishing, perhaps even fish farming, in the pantanos was an important food source. 40

The La Ramada site is the first that can be securely identified by documentary evidence with any Chibcha settlement mentioned in historical sources and known to have been occupied by Indians at the time of the conquest. Moreover, this settlement was part of the very capital of the larger and more centralized of the two Chibcha kingdoms. Its excavation and study will enable us to define archaeological materials pertaining to the historic Chibcha with much greater assurance than heretofore. We can hope to distinguish historic Chibcha materials from those of different age and thus start to build up the sort of chronological sequence which is at present the greatest need of Chibcha archaeology.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Aguado [1581], 1956-57, vol. 1, p. 271; Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. 1, pp. 193, 243.

<sup>2</sup> A curious tradition has developed to the effect that the Chibcha capital was properly called Bacatá. This form, however, has not been found in the literature before the 19th century. The 16th century chronicles and all early documents examined to date use only the form Bogotá (with such spelling variants as Vogotá and Uogotá). Divergent forms do appear in the 17th century, but not Bacatá. Castellanos says that the original form was Bocatá, and that it meant "end of the fields" (Castellanos [1601], 1955, vol. IV, p. 142). Simón says that Bogotá was

a corruption of Bogote, and that this word was part of the Zipa's title (Simón [1626], 1882-92, vol. II, pp. 114-115; ms., pp. 166-167). He adds that the capital was called either Bogote or Muequetá by the Indians, but he implies that Muequetá (which he translates as "field of flat land") was the commoner form which the Indians continued to use to his own day. The earliest use of Bacatá I have discovered to date is in a translation of a work by Humboldt (Humboldt, 1876, p. 578). It has not yet been possible to check the German original, *Ansichten der Natur*, 1808. Acosta follows Simón and calls the Chibcha capital Muequetá (Acosta, 1848, pp. 188, 201). Uricoechea, in a very confused statement, seems to imply that Muequetá and Bogotá were different places. He etymologizes the former as muyquyta, "cultivated field or plain of the field, literally 'field-field'" and the latter as fac-a-ta, "end of cultivated land, literally 'outside his field'" (Uricoechea, 1871, pp. LVI-LVII). With Restrepo the form Bacatá appears again (Restrepo, 1895, pp. 2, 45, 89, 195). Since Restrepo repeats Uricoechea's strained etymology, one is tempted to suspect that he has somehow fused Castellanos' Bocatá and Uricoechea's Facatá. However, in view of the occurrence in Humboldt it is also possible to suspect the confusing influence of José Domingo Duquesne (the inventor of a "Chibcha calendar") somewhere along the line. After Restrepo Bacatá is almost standard (Triana, 1922, pp. 66, 67; Pérez de Barradas, 1950, vol. I, p. 405). Of the early versions, Simon's story sounds the most authoritative and the most likely. If the Chibcha really said anything like Bocatá or Bacatá it is hard to understand why the earliest sources so consistently give Bogotá, a form which is perfectly easy for a Spanish speaker to distinguish from the other two and no easier to pronounce.

<sup>3</sup>Haury and Cubillos, 1953, pp. 83, 92.

<sup>4</sup>I am deeply grateful to Sr. Joaquín Macallister and family for their kind cooperation and gracious hospitality in the course of these investigations, which were financed by research funds of the Universidad de los Andes. My thanks also go to Kathleen Romoli, Gerardo Reichel Dolmatoff, and Alicia Dussán de Reichel for many useful suggestions, and to the directors and staff of the Instituto Colombiano de Antropología and the Archivo Nacional de Colombia, whose unfailing helpfulness makes it a pleasure to do research in Colombia.

<sup>5</sup>Broadbent, 1965, pp. 99-100.

<sup>6</sup>Henao and Arrubla, 1952, p. 498.

<sup>7</sup>Aguado [1581], 1956-57, vol. I, p. 316; Castellanos [1601], 1955, vol. IV, p. 276; Simón [1626], 1882-92, vol. II, p. 228.

<sup>8</sup>Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. II, pp. 74, 104.

<sup>9</sup>Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. II, p. 105.

<sup>10</sup>Aguado [1581], 1956-57, vol. I, p. 316; Simón [1626], 1882-92, vol. II, p. 228; Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. II, p. 104.



- <sup>11</sup> Simón [1626], 1882-92, vol. II, p. 166.
- <sup>12</sup> Arenas Paz, 1928, p. 34.
- <sup>13</sup> Rodríguez Freire [1636], 1963, p. 87; Oviedo [1761], 1930, p. 82; Vergara y Velasco, 1901, p. 662; Pérez de Barradas, 1950, vol. I, p. 309.
- <sup>14</sup> Aguado [1581], 1956-57, vol. I, p. 316; Simón [1626], 1882-92, vol. II, p. 228.
- <sup>15</sup> Simón, ms., p. 313.
- <sup>16</sup> Castellanos [1601], 1955, vol. IV, p. 194.
- <sup>17</sup> Friede, 1960, pp. 107-115.
- <sup>18</sup> Friede, 1960, p. 115; Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. I, p. 9; Oviedo [1761], 1930, p. 98; Gutierrez, 1939, pp. 221, 398.
- <sup>19</sup> Friede, 1960, pp. 309, 330-332.
- <sup>20</sup> Aguado [1581], 1956-57, vol. I, pp. 271, 273; Castellanos [1601], 1955, vol. IV, p. 197; Simón [1626], 1882-92, vol. II, pp. 115, 149-150, 207; Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. I, pp. 9, 47, 253, 255.
- <sup>21</sup> Reclus, 1893, p. 250; Mollien, 1944, pp. 56-57; Le Moyne, 1945, pp. 110-111; Pérez, 1946, pp. 6-8.
- <sup>22</sup> Camacho Roldán, 1897, pp. 21-23.
- <sup>23</sup> Archivo Nacional de Colombia, Caciques e Indios, tomo 55, f. 713r.
- <sup>24</sup> Acosta, 1848, p. 188; Uricoechea, 1854, p. 11; 1871, pp. xiv, xvii; Humboldt, 1876, p. 579; Reclus, 1893, p. 250; Restrepo, 1895, p. 89; Gutiérrez, 1939, p. 188; Hernández de Alba, 1948, p. 219.
- <sup>25</sup> Vergara y Velasco, 1901, p. 662.
- <sup>26</sup> Pérez de Barradas, 1950, vol. I, pp. 309, 405.
- <sup>27</sup> Bogotá and Fontibón (or Hontibón) were two of the numerous important Indian towns that Alonso Luís de Lugo saw fit to grant in encomienda to himself while serving as Gobernador of the Nuevo Reino de Granada in 1543 (Friede, 1955-63, vol. VII, pp. 102-103). When the New Laws forbade such practices, the encomenderos petitioned to have Lugo's encomiendas returned to those from whom he had appropriated them instead of reverting to the Crown. They specified that if the Crown were to take over any of them it should be Fontibón, since this encomienda had no legal claimant (Friede, 1955-63, vol. VIII, pp. 243-244). In fact, Fontibón appears in later documents as a Crown encomienda (Archivo Nacional de Colombia, Caciques e Indios, tomo 55, f. 717v). Bogotá was returned to its original grantee, Antonio de Olalla, and remained in

the hands of his descendants for several generations (Friede, 1960, pp. 109-110).

<sup>28</sup>Esguerra Ortíz, 1879, pp. 133, 149.

<sup>29</sup>Archivo Parroquial, Funza, Bautismos, tomo 5, f. 157r.

<sup>30</sup>Archivo Parroquial, Funza, Bautismos, tomo 6, f. 163r.

<sup>31</sup>Piedrahita [1668], 1942, vol. I, p. 10.

<sup>32</sup>Esguerra Ortíz, 1879, pp. 133, 149; Zamora, 1907, pp. 199, 234-235, 262; Cárdenas and others, 1954, pp. 198, 207, 273.

<sup>33</sup>Fals Borda, 1957, pp. 47-50; Broadbent, 1964, pp. 20-21.

<sup>34</sup>Archivo Nacional de Colombia, Caciques e Indios, tomo 20, ff. 132v-135r; tomo 12, ff. 286r-295v.

<sup>35</sup>Broadbent, 1964, pp. 24-40.

<sup>36</sup>Archivo Nacional de Colombia, Caciques e Indios, tomo 20, ff. 10r-169v.

<sup>37</sup>f. 53r.

<sup>38</sup>f. 86r.

<sup>39</sup>A further clarification of the confusion over the name of the Zipa's capital can now be offered (cf. note 2). Simón's "Muequetá" may simply have been the Indian name of the place where the colonial foundation was made, this settlement being in existence by Simón's time. It would thus be the name, not of the whole capital, but of a particular piece of land, presumably within the territory of Indian Bogotá. Since one of the parts of Bogotá was called Neuque, it is tempting to suggest the possibility that the form was Neuquetá, "fields of Neuque," and that Simón has garbled it into something he could more easily etymologize.

<sup>40</sup>Archivo Nacional de Colombia, Caciques e Indios, tomo 55, f. 717v.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acosta, Joaquín

1848 Compendio histórico del descubrimiento y colonización de la Nueva Granada en el siglo décimo sexto. Imprenta de Beau, Paris.

- Aguado, Pedro de  
1956-57 Recopilación historial [1581]. Biblioteca de la Presidencia de Colombia, vols. 31-34. Bogotá. 4 vols.
- Arenas Paz, Belisario  
1928 Guía geográfica de Colombia. Segunda edición. Imprenta de la Luz, Bogotá.
- Broadbent, Sylvia Marguerite  
1964 Los Chibchas; organización socio-política. Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Sociología, Serie Latino-americana no. 5. Bogotá.  
1965 Stone-roofed chambers in Chibcha territory, Colombia. *Nawpa Pacha* 3, pp. 93-106. Berkeley.
- Camacho Roldán, Salvador  
1897 Notas de viaje (Colombia y Estados Unidos de América). Tercera edición. Garnier Hermanos, Paris; Librería Colombiana, Bogotá.
- Cárdenas, Manuel José, and others  
1954 Monografías de los municipios de Cundinamarca. República de Colombia, Contraloría General de Cundinamarca, Dirección Departamental de Estadística, Bogotá.
- Castellanos, Joan de  
1955 Elegías de varones ilustres de Indias [1601]. Biblioteca de la Presidencia de Colombia, vols. 9-12. Bogotá. 4 vols.
- Esguerra Ortiz, Joaquín  
1879 Diccionario jeográfico de los Estados Unidos de Colombia. J. B. Gaitán, Editor, Bogotá.
- Fals Borda, Orlando  
1957 El hombre y la tierra en Boyacá; bases sociológicas e históricas para una reforma agraria. Ediciones Documentos Colombianos, Bogotá.
- Friede, Juan  
1955-63 Documentos inéditos para la historia de Colombia, coleccionados en el Archivo General de Indias de Sevilla.... Academia Colombiana de Historia, Bogotá. 9 vols. (title pages dated 1955-60)  
1960 Descubrimiento del Nuevo Reino de Granada y fundación de Bogotá (1536-1539), según documentos del Archivo General de Indias, Sevilla (revelaciones y rectificaciones). Banco de la República, Bogotá.
- Gutiérrez, José Fulgencio  
1939 Galán y los Comuneros. Imprenta del Departamento, Bucaramanga.

- Haury, Emil Walter, and Cubillos, Julio César  
1953 Investigaciones arqueológicas en la sabana de Bogotá,  
Colombia (cultura Chibcha). University of Arizona Bulletin,  
vol. XXIV, no. 2, April; Social Science Bulletin no. 22.  
Tucson.
- Henao, Jesús María, and Arrubla, Gerardo  
1952 Historia de Colombia para la enseñanza secundaria....  
Séptima edición, corregida y aumentada. Librería Voluntad,  
Bogotá.
- Hernández de Alba, Gregorio  
1948 Guía de Bogotá; arte y tradición. Librería Voluntad,  
Bogotá.
- Humboldt, Alexander von  
1876 Cuadros de la naturaleza.... Traducción de Bernardo  
Giner. Imprenta y Librería de Gaspar, Editores, Madrid.
- Le Moyne, Auguste  
1945 Viajes y estancias en América del Sur.... Biblioteca  
Popular de Cultura Colombiana, vol. 59. Bogotá.
- Mollien, Gaspard Théodore  
1944 Viaje por la República de Colombia en 1823. Biblioteca  
Popular de Cultura Colombiana, vol. 46. Bogotá.
- Oviedo, Basilio Vicente de  
1930 Cualidades y riquezas del Nuevo Reino de Granada [1761].  
Biblioteca de Historia Nacional, vol. XLV. Imprenta  
Nacional, Bogotá.
- Pérez, Felipe  
1946 Episodios de un viaje. Biblioteca Popular de Cultura  
Colombiana, vol. 91. Bogotá.
- Pérez de Barradas, José  
1950 Los muiscas antes de la conquista. Consejo Superior de  
Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Bernardino de  
Sahagún, Madrid.
- Piedrahita, Lucas Fernández de  
1942 Historia de las conquistas del Nuevo Reino de Granada  
[1668]. Biblioteca Popular de Cultura Colombiana, vols.  
12-15. Bogotá. 4 vols.
- Reclus, Elisée  
1893 Colombia; traducida y anotada...por F. J. Vergara y  
Velasco. Papelería de Samper Matíz, Bogotá.
- Restrepo, Vicente  
1895 Los Chibchas antes de la conquista española. Imprenta  
de la Luz, Bogotá.

- Rodríguez Freire, Juan  
 1963 El carnero [1636], con notas explicativas del doctor Miguel Aguilera. Biblioteca de Cultura Colombiana, no. 3. Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Bogotá.
- Simón, Pedro  
 ms. Noticias históricas de las conquistas de Tierra Firme en las Indias Occidentales. Segunda parte. Bogotá, Biblioteca Nacional de Colombia, Sala de Libros Raros y Curiosos, vol. no. 175.
- 1882-92 Noticias históricas de las conquistas de Tierra Firme en las Indias Occidentales [1626]. Imprenta de Medardo Rivas, Bogotá. 5 vols.
- Triana, Miguel  
 1922 La civilización chibcha. Escuela Tipográfica Salesiana, Bogotá.
- Uricoechea, Ezequiel  
 1854 Memoria sobre las antigüedades neo-granadinas. F. Schneider i Cia., Berlin.
- 1871 Gramática, vocabulario, catecismo i confesionario de lengua chibcha según manuscritos anónimos e inéditos, aumentados i corregidos. Colección Lingüística Americana, tomo 1. Maisonneuve i Cia., Paris.
- Vergara y Velasco, Francisco Javier  
 1901 Nueva geografía de Colombia, escrita por regiones naturales. Tomo I. República de Colombia, Administración Marroquín, Bogotá.
- Zamora, Manuel M.  
 1907 Guía de la República de Colombia. Imprenta Eléctrica, Bogotá.

