

10-1-1926

The Six Cities of Cibola, 1581–1680

F. W. Hodge

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Hodge, F. W.. "The Six Cities of Cibola, 1581–1680." *New Mexico Historical Review* 1, 4 (1926).
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol1/iss4/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Historical Review* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sarahrk@unm.edu.

THE SIX CITIES OF CIBOLA—1581-1680

F. W. Hodge

In his excellent paper on the Second Spanish Expedition to New Mexico, which appears in the July issue of the *Review*, Mr. Mecham answers many questions respecting the habitat of the Pueblo Indians in the Rio Grande and tributary valleys at the time of the Chamuscado-Rodriguez expedition in 1581-1582. There are, however, a few points with which the student must contend in regard to the Zuñi villages of that period. It is the aim of this brief paper to shed light on them.

As is well known, only two of the pueblos composing the "Seven Cities of Cibola" of Coronado's time are mentioned by name. These are (1) Ahacus, of which Fray Marcos de Niza learned from his Piman Indian guides and which with every good reason is identified with Hawikuh, called Granada by Coronado in honor of the Viceroy Mendoza; and (2) Matsaki, recorded as Maçaque by Castañeda, who mentions it as the largest of all the towns of Cibola, its houses reaching a height of seven stories. The evidence of the identity of Ahacus, Hawikuh, and Granada is incontrovertible. We need mention here only the fact that it could have been the one Cibola-Zuñi pueblo that was first seen and reached by the explorers in ascending the Zuñi river.

Mr. Mecham has shown that Chamuscado proceeded westward from the Rio Grande to Zuñi by way of Acoma, Bandelier's statement to the contrary notwithstanding; and it may be assumed that the party pursued the route (only from the opposite direction) followed by Coronado's advance guard and his main force via El Morro or Inscription Rock, and Ojo del Pescado, one of the headwaters of the

Rio Zuñi, rather than by the difficult trail over the malpais which Alvarado took on his journey from Hawikuh to Acoma, which led him south of El Morro. There is no more truth, however, that "Chamuscado and seven soldiers inscribed their names" on Inscription Rock than there is that the Zuñi localize a native tradition that Estevanico, the so-called "Black Mexican," was murdered at Kiakima rather than at Hawikuh.¹ There is no question that the earliest inscription on El Morro is that of Oñate, whose name was carved in the rock, at which was the "Agua de la Peña," on his return from the Gulf of California in the spring of 1605. Absence of names at El Morro, of course, is only negative testimony that explorers did not follow that route in journeying between Acoma and Zuñi; yet it was and still is the most practicable line of travel, for its physiographic features offered little resistance to the explorers, while the immediate vicinity of the great rock afforded all the necessaries of a temporary camp—water, forage, and abundant fuel.

Leaving the discussion of the earlier "Seven Cities of Cibola" for another occasion, it has long been known that after the time of Coronado and until shortly before the Revolt of 1680, if not up to the very time of the uprising, the Zuñi inhabited only six villages. The native names and sites of all these are now well known, yet some of them have been the cause of almost as much confusion as any subject of Pueblo history by reason of the difficulty of harmonizing the array of recorded names, or rather the variations in the orthography of the names, with those by which the settlements were known to the native inhabitants. We will therefore endeavor to unravel the snarl by correlating the jumbled terminology of the six Zuñi villages occupied in the latter half of the sixteenth century, as made available to us by the Spanish chroniclers. The attempts to identify the seventh pueblo of the early Spanish period

1. See Hodge, *The First Discovered City of Cibola*, *American Anthropologist*, vol. VIII, no. 2, Washington, 1895.

have been based on little more than conjecture, since sufficient archaeological research has not yet been conducted in the Zuñi valley; therefore, if a seventh "city" really existed, we are as far from its true determination as in the day of Bandelier and Cushing.

1 — HAWIKUH

This pueblo, the largest of all, according to most of the Spanish narrators, was twelve miles southwest of the present Zuñi, on the point of a low mesa that projects southward into the valley. The topography accords with the "rounded height" on which stood the only pueblo of Cíbola which Fray Marcos de Niza says he viewed in 1539 from an elevation to the southward. It was this "City of Cíbola" of Fray Marcos of which Coronado and his companions complained so bitterly in the following year, the commander asserting that the entire group of pueblos was called "the kingdom of Cevola, and each has its own name and no single one is called Cevola, but all together are called Cevola. This one which I have called a city," he says, "I have named Granada, partly because it has some similarity to it, as well as out of regard for Your Lordship." It contained two hundred houses with five hundred families.

The Gallegos report records Hawikuh as "Allico." From the narration of Espejo we gain little information on the subject aside from the fact that he gives the name Aquico (which in pronunciation closely approximates Hawikuh) and affords positive proof of the identity of Cíbola and Zuñi. For the first time Espejo presented

2. Coronado to Mendoza, in Winship, *Coronado Expedition*, p. 558, Washington, 1896.

3. Mr. Mecham (p. 286) gives the names of only five of the six pueblos discovered by Chamuscado, as recorded by Gallegos, followed by the number of inhabitants of each of the six, consequently (with the exception of Hawikuh) one cannot correlate Gallegos' villages with his population figures. This may be due to one of the typographical blunders with which Mr. Mecham's paper unfortunately is replete. The missing pueblo is Kwakina - the Quaquina of Luxán and the Coaquera of Oñate.

the name by which the Zuñi are known to the Keres and which has clung to this day. Luxán is more explicit, for, like Gallegos, he notes the names of the six inhabited villages, among which is "aguico".⁴

Before proceeding to later sources we must endeavor to untangle the knots found in the work of Baltasar de Obregón, which is accessible to me only in its printed form.⁵ In a marginal note (p. 19) and in the text (p. 293) of this work the pueblos of Cibola are recorded, but so confused are their names that we list them in order to show the difficulties with which students have been obliged to contend in endeavoring to harmonize the vagaries in orthography, due largely to typographical errors. In the first Obregón list we find "Macaque, Macilona Quequina, Acin [or Quequinaacin], Cocana", and, in the second, "Masaque, Caquema, Alona, Quequina, Acincocana."⁶ The intended application of these names must be determined at this point, because Hawikuh is involved with the rest, and nothing short of the dissection which follows seems so well to serve the purpose.

4. Both Mr. Meham (p. 286) and Dr. Bolton (*Spanish Explorations in the Southwest*, p. 184, New York, 1916) give "Agrisco," with what justification I do not know, as the Luxán manuscript, of which the present writer has a photostat copy, records "aguico" very plainly both in the text and in a marginal note.

5. *Historia de los descubrimientos antiguos y modernos de la Nueva España escrita por el conquistador Baltasar de Obregon año de 1584, Mexico, 1924.*

6. Evidently the scribe who noted the names of the towns on the margin of the manuscript (p. 19 of the published work) became confused in his attempt to record the first two names, with the result that the equivalent of Kiakima appears to be missing from the first list. As a matter of fact, however, *caque* of "Macaque" and *ma* of "Macilona" should have been combined to form "Caquema," but as this leaves Matsaki pueblo represented by *Ma* alone, we assume that the error was one of omission by reason of the identity in the spelling of the latter part of *Macaque* and the first part of *Caquema*. Incidentally it may be said that in the second, less garbled, list, the pueblos occur in the exact order in which they would have been visited by a party coming from the east (i. e. from Acoma), while Luxán gives the same order except that Aguico (Hawikuh) is placed before Alona (Halona) instead of after Cuaquina (Kwakina). If we may assume that "Coaguima" (Kwakina) was unintentionally omitted from Gallegos' list as given by Mr. Meham, and that it should have appeared between Aconagua (Halona) and Allico (Hawikuh), then the order of the pueblos is identical with that of Obregón, except that Matsaki and Kiakima, the two pueblos at the base of Tawayalane, are reversed. Evidently stationed at Hawikuh, the principal pueblo, when he recorded the village names, Oñate listed them in exactly the reverse order to that given by Gallegos, save that the Oñate list naturally names Hawikuh first.

<i>Matsaki</i>	<i>Kiakima</i>	<i>Kwakina</i>	<i>Hawikuh</i>	<i>Kyanawa</i>	<i>Halona</i>
Macaque	[see note 6]	Quequina	Acin,Co	canaMa	cilona
Masaque	Caquema	Quequina	Acinco	cana	Alona

The Oñate scribes, or more likely the copyists or the printers of the documents referring to the colonization in 1598, are among those who garbled Pueblo names practically beyond recognition. Hawikuh becomes Aguicobi and Aguscobi, but in these particular forms the name of the pueblo is not difficult to recognize, the suffix *bi* probably being intended to represent the Zuñi locative *wa* or *wan*, as in Oñate's "Canabi" for Kyanawa.

Gallegos reported "Allico" as having one hundred and eighteen houses in 1581, and Oñate one hundred and ten houses in 1598, a considerable reduction from the two hundred noted by Coronado nearly half a century earlier, although Hawikuh now had the distinction of being the chief Zuñi town. At the time of its abandonment it was mentioned by Vetancurt "*con otros pueblos pequeños donde había mas de mil personas.*"

The mission of Concepción was established at Hawikuh in 1629 during the custodianship of Fray Estevan de Perea.⁷ The evidence respecting the date of the abandonment of the pueblo is not conclusive, for, although it was raided by the Apache about 1670 and abandoned, it seems not to have been forsaken permanently until the Revolt of 1680 resulted in the flight of the Zuñi tribesmen to Tawayālanē, or Corn Mountain, where they remained until Vargas appeared on the scene in 1692.

The following synonymy includes only names derived from the earlier original sources. There are hundreds of variations in orthography, many of them due to typographical errors, with which we need not cumber the lists.

Ceuola (city and province). - Fray Marcos de Niza, *Relation* (1539), in *The Journey of Alvar Nuñez Cabeza*

7. See Hodge in *The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides*, 1630, Ayer trans., Chicago, 1916; Hodge, *Bibliography of Fray Alonso de Benavides*, *Indian Notes and Monographs*, III, no. 1. New York, 1919.

- de Vaca*, Translated from his own Narrative by Fanny Bandelier, New York, 1905, p. 211 et seq.
- Ceula*. - Ibid., p. 217.
- Ceulo*. - Ibid., p. 214.
- Ahacus*. - Ibid. p. 219.
- Granada*. - Coronado (1540) in Winship, *Coronado Expedition*, Washington, 1896, p. 558.
- Cibola*. - Castañeda (1540-96), *ibid.*, *passim*.
- Sivola*. - *Relación Postrera de Sivola* (ca. 1542) in Winship, *ibid.*, p. 566.
- Allico*. - Gallegos (1582) quoted by Meham, *op. cit.*, p. 286. (An evident miscopying or misprinting of Auico.)
- Aquico*. - Espejo (1583) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, XV, p. 133, 1871. (Probably a misprint of Aguico.)
- Aguico*. - Luxán (1582) *Entrada que hizo en el Nuevo Mejico Anton de Espejo en el año de [15]82*, folio 83, MS. in Archivo General de Indias, Sevilla.
- Agrisco*. - Luxán (1582) as cited by Bolton, *op. cit.*, and by Meham, *op. cit.* (The letters *ris* are an obvious miscopying of *ui*.)
- Acinco*. - Obregón (1584), *Historia*, p. 293. (Erroneously combined with Cana [see Kechipauan], thus forming "Acincocana.")
- Acin,Cocana*. - Ibid., p. 19. (Erroneous separation of *Acin*, for *Acui*, from *co* (*Acuico*), and fusion of *co* with *Cana*, i. e., *Kechipauan*.)
- Aguicobi*. - Oñate (1598) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, XVI, 133, 1871.
- Aguscobi*. - Oñate (1598), *ibid.*, 132.
- Cuni*. - Oñate, *Account of the Discovery of the Mines* (1599), in Bolton, *Spanish Exploration*, 239, 1916.
- Havico*. - Zárata Salmerón, *Relación* (ca. 1629), in *Land of Sunshine*, p. 44, Dec. 1899. (Refers to the Oñate expedition.)
- Zibola*. - Perea, *Verdadera Relación*, Madrid, 1632, p. 4.
- La Concepcion de Aguico*. - Vetancurt (1697), *Crónica*, 320, repr. 1871.

Tzibola. - Mota-Padilla (1742), *Hist. Nueva España*, 111, ed. 1871. (From documents of the Coronado period.)

2 — MATSAKI

The importance of Matsaki was set forth by Castañeda, who described it, in the form Maçaque, as "the best, largest, and finest village of that [Cíbola] province" and "the only one that has houses with seven stories."⁸ The area of the ruins, however, in comparison with that of Hawikuh, does not support Castañeda's assertion. As before mentioned, aside from the "Ahacus" (Hawikuh) of Fray Marcos, Matsaki was the only Zuñi pueblo mentioned by name before Chamuscado's time. It was situated about three miles east-southeast of present Zuñi, a short distance from the northwestern talus slope of the great mesa of Tâwayãlanẽ, or Corn mountain, popularly but improperly called "Thunder mountain" from Cushing's misinterpretation.

Maçaque. - Castañeda (1540-1596), op. cit. ("Muzaque" in the narrative translated by Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages*, IX, 163, 1838.)

Maca. - Gallegos (1582) quoted by Mecham, op. cit., p. 286.

Mazaque. - Luxán *Entrada* (1582), op. cit., f. 83.

Malaque. - Luxán as quoted by Bolton, op. cit., p. 184.

Maleque. - Luxán as quoted by Mecham, op. cit., p. 286.

Masaque. - Obregón (1584), *Historia*, p. 293.

Macaque. - *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Macaqui. - Oñate (1598) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, XVI, 133, 1871.

Mazaquia. - Vetancurt (1697), *Crónica*, 320, repr. 1871.

3 — KIAKIMA

This pueblo, about four miles southeast of Zuñi, was at the southwestern base of Corn mountain, which towers

8. Castañeda, in Winship, *Coronado Expedition*, op. cit., pp. 493, 517.

nine hundred feet, for which reason the great mesa was called the Peñol de Caquima by Vargas in 1692.

Aquima. - Gallegos (1582) cited by Mecham, op. cit., p. 286. (The name appears as "Aquiman" on Mecham's map.)

Quaquema. - Luxán, *Entrada* (1582), op. cit., f. 83.

Cuaquema. - Ibid.

Caquema. - Obregón (1584), *Historia*, p. 293.

MACAQUE, *MACILONA*. - Ibid., p. 19. (An erroneous fusion of names in which *Caquema* is hidden. See note 6.)

Aquinsa. - Oñate (1598) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, op. cit. (Cf. *Aquima* of Gallegos above, and note the frequent difficulty in transcribing initial C of unfamiliar proper names, of which the printed "Amé" for the *Cuni* of Espejo is an instance. In "Aquinsa," *ns* is no doubt a misprint of *m*.)

Caquima. - Sigüenza y Góngora, *Mercurio Volante*, 1693, repr. Mexico, 1900, p. 17 (" . . . *Peñol no menos inexpugnable de Caquima*"); Vetancurt (1697), *Crónica*, 320, repr. 1871.

Caquimay. - Doc. of 1635 quoted by Bandelier in *Papers Archaeol. Inst. Amer.*, V, 165, 1890.

Every student of the subject has been confused by "Aquinsa," which seems to be no more than the result of mistranscribing a name which both Gallegos and Oñate doubtless wrote *Caquima*. I am convinced that the identification of Oñate's *Aquinsa* is thus determined, and that his *Coaqueria* was not *Kiakima*, but *Kwakina*.'

9. Dr. A. L. Kroeber has suggested (*Anthr. Papers Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.*, XVIII, pt. III, p. 273, New York, 1917) "that the 'Aquinsa' of Oñate's list is the native name 'Akinnsa' or 'Appkinnsa' (*awa*, rocks; *kinnsa*, black) for Black Rock or Rocks" where the Zuñi school and agency are situated. Aside from the fact that no considerable ruins are to be found in that vicinity to account for the presence of a pueblo within the historic period, the etymology is unsound, for the Zuñi call Black Rocks *Akwinkwin* (a for *áalē*, pl. *áwē*, stone, rock; *kwin*, black; *kwin*, the locative), not *Akinnsa* or *Appkinnsa*. See note 10.

4 — HALONA

On the south bank of the Zuñi river directly opposite the present Zuñi; indeed it is said that Halona stood on both sides of the stream, a belief made plausible because extensive excavations at the site by Cushing in 1888 revealed no evidences of the Franciscan church on the south side. Much of the site is now covered by buildings of a trading-store and several Zuñi dwellings. At the time of its abandonment in 1680 the population of Halona was 1500, according to Vetancurt, but this probably included Matsaki and Kiakima, which were *aldeas de visita* of the Halona mission.

Aconagua. - Gallegos (1582) quoted by Mecham, op. cit., p. 287. (An evident attempt to record the Zuñi form Halonawa. The *c* is doubtless a miscopying of *l*.)

Alona. - Luxán (1582), *Entrada*, f. 83.

Olona - Luxán as quoted by Bolton, op. cit., p. 184.

Olona. - Luxán as quoted by Mecham, op. cit., p. 286.

Alona. - Obregón (1584), op. cit., p. 293.

Macilona. - Ibid., p. 19. (An erroneous fusion of *ma*, belonging to the preceding name (Caquema for Kiakima) and *cilona*, misprint of Alona. See Note 6.)

Cilona. - See Macilona, next preceding.

Halonagu. - Oñate (1598) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, XVI, 133, 1871. (An attempt to record Halonawa or Halonawan.)

Aloná - Sigüenza y Góngora (1693), *Mercurio Volante*, p. 18, repr. Mexico, 1900.

Concepcion de Alona. - Vetancurt (1697), *Menologia*, 275 repr. Mexico, 1871. (In his *Crónica* Vetancurt mentions La Concepcion de Aguico and refers to the Halona church as dedicated to la Purificación de la Virgen.)

Purísima Concepción de Alona. - Sariñana y Cuenca, Oración Funebre, Mexico, 1681, repr. *Hist. Soc. New Mexico*, Bull. 7, 1906.

It will be noted that in recording the names of Halona and Hawikuh the Spaniards generally disregarded the faintly aspirated initial.

5 — KWAKINA

This pueblo was situated six or seven miles down the Zuñi river from the present Zuñi, on its northern side. The natives assert that it was of comparatively recent occupancy, but no archaeological research has been conducted at the site. Kwakina is not mentioned by Gallegos, unless inadvertently omitted from the list in Mr. Mecham's paper;¹⁰ but Luxán records its name, as likewise does Oñate a few years later.

Coaguima. - Gallegos (?) quoted by Mecham, op. cit., p. 287.

Quaquina. - Luxán (1582), *Entrada*, f. 83.

Cuaquina. - Luxán as quoted by Bolton, op. cit.

Cuaguima. - Luxán as quoted by Mecham, op. cit. (Misprint.)

Quequina. - Obregón (1584), *Historia*, pp. 19, 293.

Coaqueria. - Oñate (1598) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, XVI, 133, 1871. (The letters *eri* are doubtless a misprint of *in*.)

6 — KECHIPAUAN

This is the name applied by the Zuñi to a ruined pueblo on a mesa forming the northern wall of the little Ojo Caliente valley in which is the farming village of K'yápkwainakwin, commonly known as Ojo Caliente. It was situated about three miles in an air-line eastward from Hawikuh. The site is a very ancient one, but excavations have shown

10. Judging by Mr. Mecham's endeavor to identify and locate all the pueblos mentioned by Gallegos, this village was omitted by mistake, as he refers to Coaguima both in the text (p. 287) and on his map, regarding it to be the same as Kiakima. To the Spaniards Kiakima and Kwakina sounded much alike, yet it will be noted that they distinguished the determining *m* and *n* respectively in the last syllable of the names.

that a later and much smaller pueblo was built on the remains of the older town; moreover, the walls of a well-built stone church are still standing several feet in height. This fact, together with the character of the native earthenware and the finding of objects of European provenience in the later houses and graves, prove its recency beyond question. The term *kéchipa* signifies gypsum, and the village was so named because of the gypsum-like appearance of the sandstone eminence on which the ruins lie. The name of the *locality*, Kyanawe or Kyanawa, which has allusion to its water supply, was applied by the Spaniards to the pueblo which the Zuñi invariably call Kechipauan, whence Cana, Canabi, etc., of the chroniclers.¹¹

Acana. - Gallegos (1582) quoted by Mecham, op cit., p. 286.

Cana. - Luxán (1582), *Entrada*, f. 83. (This spelling is followed by Bolton and Mecham.)

Cocana. - Obregón (1584), *Historia*, p. 19. (Erroneous fusion of *Co*, belonging to the preceding name *Acin*, for *Acui* [See Hawikuh], plus *Cana*.)

Canabi. - Oñate (1598) in *Doc. Inéd. de Indias*, XVI, 133, 1871.

Acincocana. - Obregón, op. cit., p. 293. (*Acinco*, for *Acuico*, plus *Cana*.)

Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation,
Broadway at 155th St.,
New York, N. Y.

11. See Hodge, *The Age of the Zuñi Pueblo of Kechipauan*, *Indian Notes and Monographs*, III, no. 2, New York, 1920. Note the omission by the Spaniards of the affix *wa*, often used by the Zuñi in place-names. Another instance is Halona, Halonawa, both of which forms are employed.