

10-1-1955

Fray Marcos de Niza, Coronado and the Yavapai

Albert H. Schroeder

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

Recommended Citation

Schroeder, Albert H.. "Fray Marcos de Niza, Coronado and the Yavapai." *New Mexico Historical Review* 30, 4 (1955). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol30/iss4/2>

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.

NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. XXX

OCTOBER, 1955

No. 4

FRAY MARCOS DE NIZA, CORONADO AND THE YAVAPAI

By ALBERT H. SCHROEDER*

Historians in the past have suggested that Coronado went down the San Pedro River, in southeastern Arizona, and on the basis of Jaramillo's statement that the expedition turned right, they routed Fray Marcos and Coronado either up Aravaipa Creek or east from the Tres Alamos region.¹ If the latter route is accepted it automatically would place the four-day *despoblado* (uninhabited area) somewhere between northern Mexico and the middle San Pedro River. This would mean that the irrigating and cotton clothed Sobaipuri of the San Pedro River would have been on the north side of the four-day *despoblado* and they would have to be considered as the "barbarous" people, described by Castañeda, who lived by the hunt in pine and oak country and in impermanent settlements—an impossible comparison. If the former route is accepted it would imply that that portion of the middle San Pedro River, more than two days travel south of the junction with the Aravaipa, would not have been occupied, since it would then be the four-day *despoblado*. This is the very area in which DiPeso has suggested, on the basis of archeological evidence, that occupation may have been unbroken from late prehistoric into historic (1690's) times.² Thus, the old routes appear to be in error.

Undreiner's detailed restudy of Fray Marcos de Niza's *Relacion* led him to change not only the location of several

* National Park Service, Globe, Arizona.

1. Bandelier, 1881, p. 10 ff; 1892, pt. II, pp. 407 ff; Winship, 1896, p. 387 ff; Bolton, 1949, p. 105; Sauer, 1932, p. 36.

2. DiPeso, 1951, p. 259; 1953, p. 273 and fig. 1 (map).

formerly accepted stopping places of Fray Marcos' trip through Arizona, but a portion of the route as well.³ Whether or not the new route Undreiner proposes becomes generally accepted in its entirety remains to be seen. Basically I agree with Undreiner's route, though I take slight exception to minor points. This discussion is concerned mainly with that portion of his suggested route that passes through the territory known definitely to have been occupied in later historic times by the Southeastern Yavapai in Arizona. In addition, it presents ethnological evidence which tends to substantiate the new route through this particular region. Rather than attempting to recheck the entire route from Culiacán, Mexico, to Zuñi, as outlined by Undreiner, I am assuming his suggested distances and localities to be at least approximately correct since they are fairly close to former opinions. Moreover, the portion of the route with which this paper is primarily concerned, from the San Pedro River to the edge of the extensive *despoblado* below Zuñi, lies so close to the end of the trail that any slight errors in distance and in dates below the international border would be of little consequence. The internal evidence of the narratives referred to herein appears to restrict the route of travel in this area to a definite locale at the south end of the last *despoblado*.

I am cognizant of the fact that historians have long been at odds over Fray Marcos and his *Relacion*. It seems this plight stems from Coronado's disappointment resulting from his own interpretation of Fray Marcos' description of the people and country through which he traveled. Some historians have pointed to Coronado's reaction as an indication of the Friar's powers of exaggeration. Some state that he was a liar and never reached Arizona, much less the Zuñi country, and have ignored the fact that he *guided* Coronado to Cibola. Just before reaching Cibola, Coronado had an encounter with some Zuñis who retired to the pueblo, and it was then re-

3. Undreiner, 1947. Undreiner, in his discussions of the route he proposes, made comparisons with the routes previously suggested by others, especially when there was a major point of disagreement. In his study I believe he has successfully refuted Sauer's statement that Fray Marcos only reached the vicinity of the Arizona border. Since Undreiner made these comparisons, this paper will be concerned with other similar cross-checking only where it applies to the subject at hand.

ported that, "While this was taking place, Fray Marcos de Niza, a Franciscan friar, who was guiding the Spanish army, arrived."⁴ In short, many historians have failed to come to an agreement on the route of Fray Marcos.

The evidence presented herein not only indicates the good father was telling the truth, *but that Coronado and his chroniclers knowingly supported much of his relation pertaining to the trip through this area.* Surprisingly enough, if the historians had taken the narrative of Fray Marcos, and particularly those of Coronado's chroniclers, at face value, and traced the route accordingly, they would not have had Coronado turn east from the San Pedro River (when Jaramillo said they turned to the right, for example),⁵ since other sources also said Coronado went north up to 34½ degrees, or reached the Sierra where it turned west (points which are discussed below). All journals agree on details, so for this reason I believe Fray Marcos traveled as indicated in this paper.

The following is a *summary of Undreiner's proposed route* and of pertinent data recorded by the Friar along this portion of the journey. Fray Marcos entered Arizona on April 13, 1539, traveling north along the Pima road about 15 miles east of Lochiel. The following day he reached what has been identified as the Sobaipuri village of Quiburi on the San Pedro River. On the 16th, Fray Marcos reached what has been identified as the village of Baicatcan, also on the San Pedro, which DiPeso dated pre-1698.⁶ Here messengers, residents of this village, returned from Estévan's advance party to report back to Fray Marcos, and here he also learned that two more days of travel would bring him to a *despoblado* which would take four days to cross. Two days later, April 18, he was near the edge of the *despoblado* at the northern-

4. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 345.

5. Oblasser, 1939, map p. 13. Oblasser was the first to route Fray Marcos and Coronado all the way down the San Pedro River. Bolton, 1949, p. 105, has Coronado turn east near Tres Alamos.

6. DiPeso, 1953, pp. 59-62, 136. DiPeso has dated Quiburi between 1692-1698 on the basis of his recent excavations, though he points out that there was an earlier occupation from 1100 to 1200 (?) A.D. on the same site. If his dating is correct Quiburi did not exist when Fray Marcos passed through. Perhaps the stopping place was the Boquillas Ruin across the river from Quiburi, or some other nearby site.

most Sobaipuri village on the San Pedro, according to Undreiner (probably near Aravaipa Creek).

Fray Marcos described this rancheria as being located in a green irrigated land and stated the people wore cotton garments, some wearing skins of cattle (buffalo). They were bedecked in turquoise, and brought him deer, rabbits, quail, maize and pinole and offered turquoise, skins of cattle, very fine vases and other things. At this rancheria he obtained specific information regarding Totontec (Hopi area) west of Zuñi.⁷

The next day, April 19, he entered the four-day *despoblado* and on the first day crossed an arroyo which Undreiner considers to be the Gila River. At the end of four days he came to a valley well settled with people. Undreiner charts this portion of the journey through present Feldman, Winkleman, and Christmas around the Mescal Mountains, then between the Pinal and Hays Mountains to Globe and Claypool reaching the Salt River in the vicinity of Tonto National Monument. Thus, in four days Fray Marcos covered almost 80 miles, reaching the Salt River April 22. Undreiner identifies the Tonto Cliff Dwellings as Chichilticalli.

Fray Marcos tells us that the natives of the first town in this valley exhibited a greater amount of turquoise than had any previous groups, and also had good blankets and skins of cattle. The women wore similar turquoise and fine skirts and shirts. These people were well informed about Cibola (Zuñi) and Totontec (Hopi).

It was here, on the Salt River, according to Undreiner, that he learned that the coast turned west, it having trended, Fray Marcos said, to the north up to the time of entering the four-day *despoblado* (at the Gila River). He said he went in search of it, as he was instructed by the Viceroy.

Undreiner then routes him down the Salt River to the Salt River Mountains near Phoenix. He suggests that from this point Fray Marcos deduced, by the general northwestern trend of the mountain ranges, that the coast turned west at

7. Hakluyt, 1928, p. 158 translates "Totantec lyeth toward the West." Those authorities who based their translations on the original documents state "west" rather than "east" of Cibola (Zuni).

35 degrees (actually completes curve to the west at $34\frac{1}{2}$ degrees). His five-day march through "that" valley Undreiner considers to be Fray Marcos' account of his trip down the Salt and not a leg of his approach to Cibola, and the following three-day trip he considers to be his return up the valley from his check on the turning of the coast. Hakluyt's translation regarding that portion of Fray Marcos' trip to search for the coast is slightly more specific—"Through the *foresayd* valley I travailed five days journey."⁸

This valley was described by Fray Marcos as being thickly settled with villages $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ league apart and so bountiful in food that it could provision 300 horses or horses and men.⁹ He said the valley was like a flower garden. Undreiner, who interprets this latter statement as probably meaning agriculture, refers to the closely situated extinct villages in the lower Salt River Valley around Phoenix as possible collaborating evidence, since these sites exhibit irrigation ditches of considerable extent. These sites, however, are prehistoric with an end date of 1400 A.D. or perhaps slightly later.¹⁰

Our first evidence of native occupation in this region, the lower Salt, during historic times is in 1873. Stout, in his letter of August 31, 1873, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated, "The reservation [Pima] does not afford a sufficient quantity of water for the support of all the Indians belonging to it, and some of them in consequence have left it in order to get a living . . . some three hundred have moved to the Salt River Valley."¹¹

According to the Pima calendar stick, Mormon settlers asked the Pima to come on the Salt, and their first year's crop of 1872-1873 was good.¹²

In 1878, Stout again wrote, "The Indians [Gila Pima] were therefore driven to the necessity of seeking other lands to cultivate, or to obtain employment elsewhere to save themselves. . . . Large numbers of them were compelled to cultivate

8. *Idem.*, p. 152. Italics are mine.

9. The word "de caballo" is translated as "horsemen" in some texts and "horses" in others, a point that is discussed farther on.

10. Schroeder, 1952b, p. 137; 1953a, pp. 189, 192.

11. Report of the Secretary of Interior for 1873-1874, Vol. I, p. 649.

12. Russell, 1908, p. 54.

lands on the Salt River and in other portions of the Territory,"¹³ (because of a shortage of water).

According to a newspaper article in 1878, "Nearly a year ago" it had been called to the attention of the Indian Department that a large number of Pima under old Chief Chin-chir-a-cum abandoned the reservation on the Gila and settled on land north of the Salt River running parallel with and opposite Tempe.¹⁴

As a result of the above move over to the Salt, the President issued an Executive Order, June 14, 1879, setting aside the land occupied by the Pima on the Salt River as the Salt River Reservation.¹⁵

Between 1540 and 1873, there is no mention of occupation on the lower Salt River below its junction with the Verde River. In 1699, Kino and Mange traveled east from the Gila-Salt junction and stated they saw the Rio Azul (Verde River), but they mentioned no observation of any Indians on the Salt.¹⁶ In 1746, Sedelmayr reported on Keler's trip from the mouth of the Verde River down to the Gila-Salt junction and beyond, as well as his own trip down the Asuncion (Salt). In neither case did he mention any Indians along this stretch, until the Cocomaricopa were encountered *below* the Gila-Salt junction.¹⁷

In view of the evidence above, it is doubtful that Fray Marcos went as far west as the Phoenix area to encounter any Pima on the Salt River as Undreiner proposes. Moreover, one cannot use the "De Niza" inscription near Phoenix as evidence of his having been in the area, as Bartlett and Colton already have indicated the fraudulent nature of the "inscription."¹⁸ If we reconsider the evidence pertaining to this route, it still remains valid, but the natives Fray Marcos met on the Salt River near the mouth of Tonto Creek apparently were Southeastern Yavapai rather than Pima.

13. Stout in Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1878, p. 3 and Indian Commissioner to the Secretary, p. xxxiv.

14. *Weekly Arizona Miner*, September 6, 1878, p. 2, col. 1.

15. Russell, 1908, p. 54 fn.

16. Kino in Bolton, 1948, Vol. I, pp. 93, 97, 199.

17. Sedelmayr in Ives, 1939, p. 104.

18. Bartlett and Colton, 1940.

All sources indicate that Chichilticalli was on the north side of the four-day *despoblado*, and that an extensive *despoblado* was situated between Chichilticalli and Zuñi. Mendoza wrote to the King that he had sent Melchior Díaz to check on Fray Marcos' story, and referred to a letter received from Díaz on March 20, 1540, in which it was stated "and since it is impossible for me to cross the despoblado extending between here and Cíbola on account of the snow and intense cold. . . ." ¹⁹ According to this statement, Díaz was at the edge of the extensive *despoblado* below Cíbola. In other words he was at or near what was later called Chichilticalli (a general area along the Salt River from Pinal Creek west to the Four Peaks, which extended northeast to about the north end of the Sierra Anchas, as will be shown below). Castañeda was more explicit regarding this journey of Díaz, stating he "went as far as Chichilticale." ²⁰ When we refer to Coronado's journey through this region in 1540 we find, in a letter he wrote to the Viceroy, that he was informed by the natives that the sea was 10 days distant from this place, *Chichilticalli, the point from where (Coronado said) Fray Marcos turned in search of the coast.* ²¹

Regarding agriculture, it will be noted that nowhere, according to Undreiner's account, does Fray Marcos specifically mention agriculture or irrigation from the time he reaches the river on the north end of the four-day *despoblado* to the time he leaves it to go to Zuñi; *only before*. Undreiner does not translate or use the word "irrigation" in regard to activities on this river, but interpolates agriculture. ²² Hakluyt's and Baldwin's translations (like Undreiner's) state "it is all well watered and [is] like a garden." However, Hammond and Rey state "all is irrigated; it is like a garden." Bandelier said (not a translation) "the soil was fertile and well irrigated." Oblasser said "It is all under irrigation and presents the appearance of one immense garden." ²³

19. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 157.

20. Idem. p. 205.

21. Idem., p. 165.

22. Undreiner, 1947, p. 460.

23. Hakluyt, 1928, p. 152; Baldwin, 1926, p. 21; Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 72; Bandelier, 1890a, p. 144; Oblasser, 1939, p. 16.

The Spanish version reads "riégase todo y es como un vergel."²⁴ "Regar" means to water, to irrigate or to wash or water (as rivers and clouds). Since the verb is reflexive, "riégase," it seems to me that the implication is that the valley was well watered *by the river*, not irrigated by man.

In addition, Fray Marcos said "tan abastado de comida que basta para dar de comer en él a mas de trescientos de caballo." Baldwin, like Undreiner, translates this to mean there was enough food for over "three hundred horse." Hakluyt said "three thousand [sic] horsemen." Hammond and Rey say "three hundred men and horses," and Oblasser said "three hundred horsemen."²⁵ Bandelier doesn't make reference to this sentence. If "horses" is correct, then no irrigation is implied. If mounted men is correct, then, if irrigation was practiced, it must have been on a small scale because Coronado and his 75 horsemen and 25 foot soldiers (according to Hammond and Rey)²⁶ could not find sufficient to eat after two days rest there. Coronado said, "I rested for two days at Chichilticalle, and there was good reason for staying longer, considering how tired the horses were; but there was no chance to rest further, because the food was giving out."²⁷

The above does not seem to be the kind of statement one would expect in late spring or early summer, if this were an agricultural area. It bears out Undreiner's, Baldwin's and Hakluyt's translations indicating that little or no irrigation was practiced on this (the Salt) river and that Fray Marcos' reference to food in the valley, as discussed above, probably referred to horses more than men. If irrigation was practiced and crops were not yet mature when Coronado was here, it would seem he would have referred to the green crops, since he again made such a point referring to his plight after leaving here.

To the above implication, that little or no irrigation was

24. The above partial quotation in Spanish, as well as others referred to below, were kindly supplied by Dr. George P. Hammond who states it is exactly the same in both the manuscript copy of Fray Marcos' *Relacion* and in the version given in Pacheco y Cardenas, Vol. III, pp. 339-340.

25. Hakluyt, 1928, p. 152; Baldwin, 1926, p. 21; Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 71; Oblasser, 1939, p. 16.

26. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 162, 179, 206 (50 mounted men and a few footmen according to Castañeda and 75 horsemen and 30 footmen according to *Traslado de Las Nuevas*).

27. *Idem*, p. 166.

practiced, can be added Castañeda's statement pertaining to his observations in 1540 that the natives of Chichilticalli were the most barbarous thus far encountered on their journey. He said *they lived by hunting and in rancherías without permanent settlements*, most of the region being covered with pine forests and oaks with a sweet acorn.²⁸ This description, in addition to ruling out irrigation at Chichilticalli, automatically rules out any possibility of the Casa Grande region (area proposed by Oblasser) and the lower Salt near Phoenix (included in Undreiner's area) as being Chichilticalli. Pines and hunting people are not known to have existed in these regions where irrigation was practiced at one time or another.

In trying to resolve this problem of whether "horses" or "horses and men" were intended in the above statement of Fray Marcos, I consulted Miss Eleanor B. Adams, Research Associate in History at the University of New Mexico library. She pointed out that in later periods each man on an expedition had several remounts, not just one horse. This would imply that there would be more than 300 horses for 300 men. Thus, one couldn't correctly translate the above by saying 300 horses and men, if the practice of having several remounts was common in Fray Marcos' day, 1539. In other words, one could cite separately the number of horses or men on an expedition, but not give one figure to apply to both horses and men, since each man had a varying number of remounts.

In checking the muster roll of Coronado's expedition of 1540, it is quite evident that many of the men had several horses, Coronado having 22 or 23.²⁹ Since the practice of having a number of remounts was current in 1540, it seems then that Fray Marcos meant either "more than 300 horses" *de caballo* being employed in the sense of *stock* or *mounts* on an expedition, or "300 horse," as in old English. One cannot infer on the basis of this translation alone that "de caballo" implied irrigated crops were available for men, especially when Castañeda's statement on the people of this area, living by the hunt and in impermanent settlements, is considered.

28. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 252; Winship, 1896, pp. 516-517.

29. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 87-104.

Jaramillo's narrative, relating to his observations of 1540, bears out the above interpretation of the lack of irrigation on the north side of the four-day *despoblado*. He stated that after crossing this *despoblado* they reached another arroyo which they understood was called Nexpa (Undreiner's Salt River). Some poor Indians came out to meet them bringing presents of little value such as maguey leaves and pitahayas.³⁰ On the south side of this *despoblado*, irrigation and crops are specifically referred to (among the inhabitants along the San Pedro) by all sources as discussed above.

However, Jaramillo's account, regarding the approach on the south side of the four-day *despoblado*, is somewhat garbled. He said that from Corazones "passing a sort of small gateway [near Ures, if the Sonora valley of today] very close to this arroyo, we went to another valley made by this same arroyo" called Señora. It also was irrigated and had similar settlements and food, being 6 or 7 leagues in length. From here he says they went to Ispa, crossing meanderings of the arroyo (as does the present road), one day's journey from the previous settlement, and then proceeded over the four-day *despoblado* to the Nexpa.³¹ Obviously he overlooked at least 3 days travel if we compare his account with that of Fray Marcos as outlined below:

| <i>Fray Marcos</i> | <i>Jaramillo</i> |
|--|---|
| Left Petatlán | Left Petatlán |
| Went 25 or 30 lgs. (3 days) | 3 days to Cinaloa R. |
| Crossed 4-day <i>despoblado</i> (valley east of here) | 5 days to Cedros Arroyo (valley east of here) |
| 3 days to Vacapa | 3 days to Yaquemí |
| traveled 3 days | traveled 3 days and crossed 2 arroyos |
| | (discrepancies begin) |
| traveled 5 days | 2 days to Corazones |
| traveled 2 days | 1 day to Señora Valley |
| | 1 day to Ispa |
| crossed 4-day <i>despoblado</i> | crossed 4-day <i>despoblado</i> to Nexpa River |

30. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 297.

31. *Idem.*, pp. 297.

From the point where the discrepancies begin, Fray Marcos took 7 days to reach the *despoblado* while Jaramillo records only 4 days to cover the same stretch. The latter's reference to Ispa could be the same as Castañeda's "Arispa" east of Señora, probably modern Arispe. If so, Jaramillo's four-day *despoblado* above Ispa would include what was occupied territory (across from the headwaters of the Sonora River to those of the San Pedro and down that stream) during Kino's day and into prehistoric times according to Di-Peso's findings.

Other accounts, moreover, indicate that the region north of Señora was occupied in 1540. Tovar, according to Castañeda, in the spring of 1541, returned to Señora at which time the Spaniards had an encounter with a nearby pueblo. As a result of this fight, Tovar ordered the town of Señora moved to the Valley of Suya, 40 leagues to the north. The people of this valley were described as being like those of Señora in dress, customs, etc.³² Castañeda also reported that on Coronado's return from Cibola, he passed through Chichilticale, and before reaching the natives of Corazones, there were outbreaks by the Indians and some horses were killed.^{32a} Thus, we can only assume that Jaramillo left a portion of the journey out.

It appears that the travel from the upper Sonora river to Chichilticale had been overlooked by Jaramillo, yet he *may*, instead, have omitted mention of about 3 days travel just prior to reaching Corazones. If so, his Ispa may have been "Jiaspi" on the lower San Pedro River, referred to by Kino in the early 1700's, where crops were raised and cotton was woven.^{32b} As already stated, Jaramillo described their passing through an irrigated valley before reaching a narrows, and after passing the narrows, they continued along the same arroyo to Ispa, just before reaching the four-day *despoblado*. The stretch along the San Pedro Valley, to which Jaramillo *might* be referring, is described almost in the same manner by Manje in 1697.^{32c}

32. Idem., pp. 233-234, 250.

32a. Idem., p. 273.

32b. Bolton, 1948, p. 170.

32c. Manje, 1954, pp. 78-81.

He and Kino left Quiburi, just above the mouth of Babacomori Creek on November 11, 1697. By the night of November 12, they had proceeded 23 leagues down the river to the north. On the morning of November 13, Captain Francisco Ramírez went with an advance party and returned to inform Manje that there were many places of possible ambush from Apaches between two cliffs, where the river narrows its course about one-half a league. This is between the present Rincon and Dragoon Mountains.

"After passing through this narrow gorge, the river widens again into a large valley," said Manje. Another 4 leagues north of the narrows, they reach Jiaspi.

Castañeda referred to this as the valley of Suya in which the town of San Hierónimo was established, and described the traits of the Pima living here.³³ Jaramillo called it the Señora Valley,³⁴ which name Castañeda applied to the Sonora Valley.³⁵ Castañeda said they went from the Suya Valley to the beginning of the 15 day *despoblado*³⁶ and Jaramillo said the same regarding the trip from the Señora Valley. Obviously, Jaramillo left out a portion of the itinerary in his narrative and perhaps confused the Señora with the Suya Valley.

Fray Marcos also implies hide clothing was worn by the natives on the north side of the four-day *despoblado*, not cloth clothing like that encountered among the previous groups below it, such as also was described for the Sobaipuri on the San Pedro by Kino and Velarde in the early 1700's.³⁷ Fray Marcos said "y muy buenas mantas y cueros de vaca." Hakluyt's translation of the above, pertaining to the clothing seen on the north side of the four-day *despoblado* reads "and [they] goe in good apparell, and skinnes of Oxen." Hammond and Rey translated this "they had very good blankets and skins of cattle." Baldwin's translation reads "they were dressed in very good cloaks of ox leather." Bandelier said

33. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 250-251.

34. Idem., p. 297.

35. Idem., p. 250.

36. Idem., p. 251.

37. Wyllys, 1981, pp. 129, 132; Bolton, 1916, p. 459.

(not a translation) "The women were dressed in good skirts and chemises."³⁸

These two distinctions, pertaining to agriculture and clothing, immediately set the people above the four-day *despoblado*, who wore buckskin clothing and lacked agriculture (Yavapai), apart from those below on the San Pedro who wore cotton apparel and practiced irrigation agriculture (Sobaipuri). In addition, the latter, who decorated their pottery in historic times, were stated to have fine vases (decorated ?), a trait not mentioned among the former, who lacked decorated ware.

In a previous article I referred to Castañeda's "barbarous" group, mentioned above, and stated "these may well have been Jocomes or even northern Sobaipuri," but not Apache or Sobaipuri proper.³⁹ Had I been acquainted with Undreiner's proposed route of Fray Marcos de Niza from the Gila to the Salt, at the time of writing the above, which in turn affects a new route through this area for Coronado, a re-examination of the narratives of the expeditions would have indicated the Yavapai probably were the "barbarous" group considered throughout this paper. This is supported by Fray Marcos' "barrios" (small camps), Castañeda's "barbarous" Indians who lived by the hunt and in "impermanent settlements" and Jaramillo's "poor Indians," all of which were referred to as being on the north side of the four-day *despoblado*. These terms are more descriptive of the Yavapai and their camps than the Sobaipuri and their villages. There is no doubt that two different ethnic groups lived on either side of the *despoblado*. The only locality in southeastern Arizona where a nomadic and sedentary peoples were separated by a four-day *despoblado*, as far as present evidence is concerned, would have been the region bordering between the Sobaipuri and Yavapai.

Regarding the villages noted by Fray Marcos on his trip to check on the coast (five-day trip down the Salt according to Undreiner), Bandelier adds an interesting point which

38. Hakluyt, 1928, p. 151; Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 71; Baldwin, 1926, p. 20; Bandelier, 1890a, p. 142.

39. Schroeder, 1952b, p. 147.

indicates these settlements were small as Castañeda describes them, not large as Undreiner implies by referring to the pre-historic sites exhibiting irrigation ditches on the Salt River. The word used by Fray Marcos de Niza to refer to these settlements was "barrios" ("estan los barrios a media legua y a cada cuarto de legua"). Bandelier devoted almost one-half page to a footnote dealing with the definition and derivation of the word "barrio" to indicate that a small settlement was implied. Of pertinent interest here is one phrase contained in the definition, which might well describe a Yavapai camp—"y assi vale tanto barrio como casa de campo."⁴⁰

Coincidentally, the Southeastern Yavapai had a practice of congregating at a camp called Amanyika (quail's roost), about two miles south of the Salt River, where the Fish Creek and Salt River cliffs made it difficult for approach by the Maricopa or Gila Pima. In some seasons a *hundred houses* would be seen there. In the spring the Yavapai came here to gather seed, and in the summer to obtain prickly pear fruit, rabbits and woodrats. The caves just north of here were occupied in the winter.⁴¹ This practice of congregating in one small area is also known among the other Yavapai divisions. Corbusier stated that in time of plenty as many as 100 souls would be in one village, *each family group having their huts together*.⁴² Mike Burns, a Western Yavapai wrote that in the late 1800's "They camped on the rim of a row of ranges between the Superstition Mountains and what is called Fish Creek. The camps were in four distinct parts, a few miles from each other, but the middle one contained the most in numbers."⁴³ Thus, Fray Marcos' description of a number of closely situated "barrios" in this very area along the Salt River apparently was most fitting and accurate, each of his *barrios* probably representing a family or extended family group.

We have another trait mentioned which further implies these people on the north side of the *despoblado* were Yava-

40. Bandelier, 1890b, p. 144.

41. Gifford, 1932, p. 181.

42. Corbusier, 1886, p. 283.

43. Burns in Farish, 1915, Vol. 3, p. 304.

pai. Obregon, in writing about Espejo's expedition which approached the middle Verde Valley from the northeast in 1583, remarked that the practice of the natives of the middle Verde Valley (considered to be Northeastern Yavapai by all sources) of wearing crosses was due to instructions by others further back⁴⁴ (toward Mexico). I had previously stated "The exact meaning of this latter statement is not clear, but it is quite possible that the Yavapai, who had contacts with the Yuman speaking people on the Colorado River, picked up the use of the cross from their western neighbors after Alarcon, who sailed a short distance up the Colorado River, had introduced the cross to the lower Colorado groups in 1540."⁴⁵ Since Fray Marcos specifically stated that he erected crosses in this valley (Salt River according to Undreiner) through which he passed in search of the turning of the coast, it now becomes apparent that perhaps the Northeastern Yavapai of the middle Verde Valley may have obtained the idea and use of the cross from another group further back, as Obregon put it, the Southeastern Yavapai, a much closer source.

Zárate, in describing Oñate's expedition to the sea in 1604, explained the presence of the cross among the natives of the middle Verde Valley by stating that some Franciscans (plural) had passed through this area a long time before and had instructed the Indians to wear the cross when the Spanish came.⁴⁶ Escobar stated most of the crosses were of reed and worn on the forehead.⁴⁷ Yavapai medicine men are known to have used small crosses formed of two pieces of cane about 2 inches long, wrapped in red and blue yarn, and tied together. These were secured to a lock of hair to prevent or cure a pain in the head.⁴⁸ This seems to be similar to the description given by Escobar. If any Franciscans passed through or near the Verde Valley, they could only have been those accompanying Coronado or his army in 1540, since Fray Marcos, in 1539, was traveling without any religious companions.

44. Hammond and Rey, 1928, p. 330.

45. Schroeder, 1952a, p. 112.

46. Bolton, 1916, p. 270.

47. Escobar in Hammond and Rey, 1953, p. 1015.

48. Corbusier, 1886, pp. 334, 336.

As late as 1716 Velarde stated that the Pima fought with a Yuman-speaking group (Nifora) to the north of them and that they knew of another more distant group to the north of the Nifora whom they referred to as Cruciferos because the cross was sacred to them.⁴⁹

Though there is no evidence to favor the introduction of the cross from the lower Colorado River groups or from the Southeastern Yavapai, the circumstances were such that either could have introduced this feature to the Northeastern Yavapai. The above remarks are based on the assumption that the cross was introduced by the Spanish. The possibility remains that the cross among the Yavapai may have been a survival of the prehistoric wood or yucca cross.

Coronado stated that the Indians of Chichilticalli told him that the sea was 15 days distant and that when they went to the sea (probably meaning the Gulf of California) for fish, or anything they need, they traveled across country and it took them 10 days.⁵⁰ The five day discrepancy may indicate the sea was 15 days away, but they only went ten days to the west where they obtained what they needed through trade. In 1598, in the middle Verde Valley, Farfan was told by the natives, who had shell ornaments, that it was a 30 day journey to the sea (probably via the Mohave Indian country to the Gulf). Oñate, in 1604, said it was 20 days.⁵¹ Thus, in both cases these people were acquainted with the sea, indicating they ranged over a considerable area. In 1776, Padre Garces recorded a meeting with some Yavapai (Tejua), near present day Yuma, who were acquainted with the Yavapai of the east who were being pressed by the Spanish,⁵² apparently in the upper Salt or Gila region.⁵³ These instances indicating movements and contacts over a large area from the upper Salt to the lower Colorado River by one group of people can refer only to the Yavapai on the north side of the *despoblado*,

49. Wyllys, 1931, p. 117.

50. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 165. Gifford, 1932, p. 249 states the Southeastern Yavapai did not eat fish. However, Corbusier, p. 326, said, "A few A[pache]-Yumas who came from near the Colorado river ate fish caught in that river." His Apache-Yumas are Western Yavapai.

51. Hammond and Rey, 1953, p. 413; Zárate in Bolton, 1916, p. 270.

52. Coues, 1900, pp. 209-210.

53. Schroeder, 1952b, p. 149.

not the Gila Pima or Sobaipuri who were restricted to a smaller area to the south, *and definitely not the Apache*, even if they were near this region as early as 1540, *because the Apache never claimed to have gone to or to have known about the Gulf.*

Fray Marcos stated he took some 30 "chiefs" from the area (Chichilticalli on the Salt River) as well as other men along with him on his trip across the extensive *despoblado* to Zuñi. By "chief" it appears he probably was referring to heads of different small nomadic bands such as are found among the Yavapai. Some 300 people had accompanied Estevan. (Castañeda said about 60 accompanied him.)⁵⁴ Thus, the natives who were killed with Estevan at Zuñi apparently were Yavapai, unless some Indians from the San Pedro River had also accompanied him that far. Those with Fray Marcos, when they received the news of the death of their relatives at Zuñi, lamented that they would no longer be able to go to Zuñi as they had in the past. Whether this enmity continued is a moot point.

Further evidence suggesting those who accompanied Fray Marcos to Zuñi were Yavapai is found in Díaz' letter to Mendoza in which he stated that the people of Cibola, after their encounter with Estevan in 1539, had told these people he had reached, at the beginning of the *despoblado* to Zuñi, not to allow the Spanish to come through again.⁵⁵ Since Coronado did march through the following year, and these people (Yavapai on the Salt River) did not stop him, the Zuñi may have afterwards cut off all relations with these people to the southwest. Interestingly enough, Gifford found the North-eastern Yavapai, even though they lived closer to Zuñi than the Southeastern Yavapai, had no name for the Zuñi.⁵⁶ On the other hand Bandelier stated the Yuman stock, from the Colorado River to the Tonto Basin, had commercial relations with the Zuñi.⁵⁷

Evidence pertaining to the location of Chichilticalli and

54. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 74, 199.

55. *Idem.*, p. 160.

56. Gifford, 1936, p. 252.

57. Bandelier, 1890a, pt. 1, p. 106.

the point where the expedition turned northeast to cross the extensive *despoblado* to Zuñi is contained in the various narratives. Coronado, in his letter of August 3, 1540, to Mendoza, was the first to use the word "Chichilticalli" which Undreiner suggests was the Tonto Cliff Dwellings. Castañeda, who was the only one to refer to a ruined pueblo at this location, described this place as a large roofless ruined house built of red mud that may have been a fortress, formerly occupied by a people who broke away from Cibola.⁵⁸ This would describe most any fair-sized pueblo but not a structure in a cave such as the Tonto Cliff Dwellings.

Jaramillo, however, as well as all others, employs the name Chichilticalli as a place name only. After crossing the four-day *despoblado* he stated they reached a stream which they understood was called Nexpa (Undreiner's Salt River). From here, he said they continued *down* this stream for two days. Then they left the stream by going to the right (northeast, he later said) and an additional two days' travel brought them to the foot of the cordillera where they learned it was called Chichilticalli. In another portion of his narratives Jaramillo stated this name of Chichilticalli was applied to this pass in this range because they had heard from some Indians further back (probably on the Salt River) that it was called by this name.⁵⁹

Castañeda said that many rams and goats were seen between the Valley of Suya (a portion of the San Pedro River Valley)⁶⁰ and Chichilticalli, and that the land changes and thorny trees disappear at Chichilticalli (as actually occurs after crossing the Salt River). This, he reasoned, was because the ridge of the sierra turns as does the coast. The sierra (either the Sierra Ancha or the Mogollon Rim) and the point where it actually turns west is some distance northeast of the Nexpa (Salt) River, over two days travel as Jaramillo described it. Thus the topography and biology fit the area

58. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 207, 251-252.

59. *Idem.*, pp. 296-297.

60. *Idem.*, p. 251. Regarding the location of Suya, in which the town of San Heronimo was situated on a little river, Hodge, 1907, p. 371 says "The San Pedro River, in Sonora near the Arizona boundary." Undreiner's routing and dating, then, would place Suya on the Arizona side of the U.S.-Mexico boundary.

between the Yavapai and Sobaipuri. It is also interesting to note that Castañeda employs the same reasoning in the above, in regard to the turning of the coast *without actually going to see the coast*, as Undreiner suggests Fray Marcos de Niza did when he surmised the coast turned west. Fray Marcos has been lambasted for his statement, but historians have been strangely silent in regard to this similar statement made by Castañeda.

Perhaps one criticism that may be leveled at the route beyond the San Pedro is the identification of the Gila River. Some may question its identification since it is referred to by Fray Marcos as an "arroyo" rather than a "rio." Perhaps the following observations concerning the flow of the Gila River will help to show that the Gila is truly insignificant at times.

Pumpelly, in writing of his experience in Arizona in the fall of 1860, referred to the Gila River saying "the bed of which above its junction with the Salina [Salt] river is often, and below that point sometimes, dry."⁶¹

Bandelier, in discussing Alarcon's voyage up the Colorado River, in the month of August, 1540, stated that during August, September and early October "The Gila is so low that it scarcely would attract attention from anyone who, like Alarcon, was ascending the main stream [Colorado] in boats."⁶²

Font, on November 1, 1775, while at Uturituc near Casa Grande Ruins, stated the Gila was not high enough to enter the Indian ditches, reaching only halfway up their legs. He remarked the stream was only large during times of flood.⁶³

Pima farmers told Russell that they often had to resort to gathering and hunting every five years or so as the Gila River would dry up.⁶⁴

Emory, coming west on the Gila River, stated on November 7, 1846, "The *river bed* at the junction of the San Pedro [the exact spot where Fray Marcos and Coronado crossed, according to Undreiner] was seamed with tracks of deer and turkey; some "signs" of beaver and one trail of wild hogs."⁶⁵

61. Pumpelly, 1870, p. 9.

62. Bandelier, 1890a, pt. I, p. 108.

63. Bolton, 1931, pp. 43-44.

64. Russell, 1908, p. 66.

65. Emory, 1848, p. 73. *Italics are mine.*

Fray Marcos passed through here in mid-April 1539 and Coronado in late June of 1540. Since Fray Marcos only referred to what is herein thought to be the Gila, and then only as an arroyo, the Gila may have failed as the Pima relate, or at least it was so insignificant that Coronado and his chroniclers did not refer to it. In fact, Fray Marcos, Coronado and the Viceroy all referred to drought conditions. The former reported after proceeding north from Petatlán "everywhere they received me with receptions, gladness, and triumphal arches, giving me of whatever food they had, although it was but little, *because they said it had not rained for three years.*"^{65a} The Viceroy referred to Díaz's trip north to check on Fray Marcos' route and stated "It is said that since it was a poor year, Díaz had to endure hunger in many places."^{65b} Coronado remarked "the hardships have been so very great and the lack of food such that I do not believe this enterprise could have been completed before the end of this year."^{65c} In addition, Terah L. Smiley of the Tree Ring Laboratory, University of Arizona, has indicated that the mid-1500's experienced a period of severe drought, possibly of greater magnitude than the "great drought" of 1276 to 1299 A.D. Thus, several possibilities are present that may explain the reference to the Gila as an arroyo. Moreover, since Jaramillo refers to many of the streams as arroyos, including those along which he observed irrigation being practiced,⁶⁶ there seems to be no reason to doubt the identification of the Gila merely because it was referred to as an arroyo.

I find it difficult to accept a portion of the route Undreiner proposes between the Gila and Salt and to accept his identification of Chichilticalli. Anyone familiar with the country around Globe would scarcely attempt to reach the Salt River by going northwest across the mountains toward Tonto Creek as Undreiner proposes. The easiest and most logical route would have been to follow Pinal Creek as did the early ranchers, wagon trains and settlers. Water and pasture would have

65a. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 64. Italics are mine.

65b. Idem., p. 157.

65c. Idem., p. 167.

66. Idem., p. 296.

been available and travel would not have been difficult. Moreover, the Salt River Valley, below Pinal Creek, meets the descriptions of Fray Marcos and Castañeda. It is open and in spring presents a green appearance, and, moreover, the vegetation changes in the adjacent highlands on the north side of the Salt River. Prior to the development of Roosevelt Dam and the creation of the reservoir behind it, the Salt River to the west of Pinal Creek meandered through and flooded over this rather flat lying portion of the area and undoubtedly presented the appearance of a "well-watered garden" in spring.

The most simple route from Globe to the Salt River would have been to go down Pinal Creek to Wheatfields, which is located just above the point where the canyon boxes up. From here a traveler only would have to go over a low pass to the east and then follow a north-eastern flowing arroyo to the Salt River, opposite the mouth of Cherry Creek. At this point, except when the river is high during the spring thaws, one can easily ford the Salt River. From here, to reach Tonto Creek, one would have to turn northwest and proceed down the Salt across the low ridges between Coon Creek, Chalk Creek, Parker Creek and Salome Creek to reach Tonto Creek, at least one and a half day's travel on foot.

Another factor favoring the route down the Salt is the occurrence of several large mounds on the north side, the crumbled remains of prehistoric mud or mud and rock walled structures, most of which are now under the waters of Roosevelt Lake. Castañeda's description of Chichilticalli (house built of mud) appears to have been an open site, not a cave site (such as the upper or lower ruins at Tonto National Monument which Undreiner suggests may have been Chichilticalli), and would have fitted any of these sites abandoned about 1400 or 1450 A.D., if they were standing in 1539 and 1540. Some may argue these are not impressive sites. Apparently they weren't as Castañeda is the only one to have mentioned one.

Further evidence favoring the Pinal Creek route is encountered in several narratives. Fray Marcos, after he reached the people on the north side of the *despoblado* (Salt),

stated he went through that valley for five days in search of the coast. This means he had to go west. If on the Salt, it took him to the mouth of Tonto Creek in two days, and from there, down the Salt River another three days. He undoubtedly skirted the narrow canyons of the Salt River below Tonto Creek by following a trail on the south side of the river up over the mountains and down Fish Creek back to the Salt River, a route used by the Yavapai and Apache in more recent times. I doubt, however, that he went as far west as the Salt River Mountains as Undreiner proposes, since he passed through very rough country below Tonto Creek and apparently visited a number of the Indians (on Fish Creek or near the historic site of Amanyika) and gathered information as he went. Moreover, the view from the nearby west slopes of the Mazatzals or from Four Peaks would have presented him with a vista similar to that in the lower mountains further west. It is to be noted that his return trip consumed only three days, which would imply he went back upstream only as far as the mouth of Tonto Creek. He rested here for a few days before proceeding to the beginning of the extensive *despoblado*, which from here, near the mouth of Tonto Creek, he stated was four days distant.⁶⁷

Jaramillo stated that on arriving at the Rio Nexpa (Salt) on the north side of the *despoblado*, they went *down* this arroyo two days. If they had taken Fray Marcos' route as outlined above to the mouth of Pinal Creek, two days down the Salt River would have brought them close to the mouth of Tonto Creek. Jaramillo then states they left this arroyo, *down* which they had been traveling, and went to the right (northeast, as he indicates later). Thus he and Fray Marcos agree on two days travel down this river before turning off to take the trail over the extensive *despoblado* to Zuñi.

The *Relacion del Suceso* approximates this same route stating they went north from Culiacan to 34½ degrees and then turned northeast.⁶⁸ The junction of Tonto Creek and the Salt River is located just under 34 degrees. Bolton's and

67. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 74.

68. *Idem.*, p. 286.

Sauer's route would have Coronado turning at 32 degrees.⁶⁹

Ordinarily, a trip from the mouth of Pinal Creek to the mouth of Tonto Creek might not consume more than a day and a half. However, since Fray Marcos' five day trip downstream and three day return leaves a two day difference, and Jaramillo stated that they traveled down the arroyo for two days, perhaps travel was slowed by the gap in the Salt River Canyon just below Pinal Creek, by visiting with Indians along the way or some other circumstance such as making the trip in one and one-half days and deciding to camp where the trail left the river and rest for two days, before leaving permanent water.

Since Undreiner did not attempt to go into any detail on the journey from the Salt River to Zuñi, the following is an attempt to fill the gap. In tracing the route from the vicinity of the mouth of Tonto Creek to Zuñi, I am depending primarily on Jaramillo's account,⁷⁰ as other narratives only briefly touch on this portion of the trip.

Jaramillo said "We continued down this arroyo [Nexpa] for two days [down the Salt River from Pinal Creek to Salome Creek just above Tonto Creek]; leaving the arroyo we went to the right in two days' travel to the foot of the cordillera, where we learned it was called Chichilticalli [from near the mouth of Tonto Creek, probably up Salome Creek, to the northwest slopes of the Sierra Anchas]. Crossing the cordillera [through Board Tree Saddle Pass (which Dale King has suggested to me as a likely pass) and over the north end of the Sierra Ancha], we went to a deep arroyo and ravine where we found water and grass for the horses [Cherry Creek, probably some distance below the Asbestos Mine]."

Jaramillo then repeats himself and said, "From this last arroyo Nexpa that I have mentioned we turned almost to the northeast, it seems to me. Following this same route [in the sense of direction] we went from here [Nexpa], in three days, I believe, to a river which we named San Juan [Cherry Creek], as we reached it on St. John's Day [June 24]." A

69. Bolton, 1949, p. 105, Sauer, 1932, p. 36.

70. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 297-298. The quotations which follow referring to Jaramillo are taken from these two pages.

statement by Coronado also indicates that Jaramillo was repeating himself, as he said the San Juan River was the beginning of the *despoblado*, "I entered the borders of the uninhabited region on Saint John's Eve."⁷¹

Fray Marcos, while located near the mouth of Tonto Creek, said of his trip in 1539, "The natives of this village begged me to rest here for three or four days, because the *despoblado* began four days travel from here."⁷² Thus, both he and Coronado are in agreement that the *despoblado* was three or four days travel beyond their camping spot in Chichilticalli (on the Salt River near the mouth of Tonto Creek). This agreement again indicates that Jaramillo was repeating himself and was not referring to an additional three days travel beyond the San Juan.

By way of summary and comparison to this point, Jaramillo said they turned northeast from the Nexpa and took three days to reach the San Juan. This route entailed two days travel from the Nexpa to the foot of the cordillera, from which point they crossed the mountain and reached a deep arroyo and ravine where they found water and grass, this last apparently taking another day's travel. Sauer's proposed route would have them follow an "old Hopi Trail" which went northeast from the Nexpa (from Cascabel on the San Pedro River) and then almost north to the San Juan River (which he identifies as the Gila) even though Jaramillo did not mention any change in direction. Sauer would also have them cross a creek (Aravaipa) midway between the Nexpa (his San Pedro) and the San Juan, a stream which Jaramillo doesn't mention. He also would have them pass through fairly good country "well supplied with grass and water"⁷³ rather than a fairly mountainous region such as Coronado implies when he describes the next leg of the journey. Coronado said of his route from the San Juan, "I entered the borders of the uninhabited region on St. John's Eve, and for a change from our past labors, *we found* no grass during the first days, but *a worse way through the mountains and more dangerous*

71. *Idem.*, p. 166.

72. *Idem.*, p. 74.

73. Sauer, 1932, p. 36.

passes than we had experienced previously."⁷⁴ This implies that they had been traveling in mountains before reaching the San Juan River, such as occur between the mouth of Salome Creek and upper Cherry Creek, namely the Sierra Anchas. Neither the Aravaipa Creek or Tres Alamos routes proposed by historians would take the Spanish through country such as Coronado implies above. Sauer describes the route from Cascabel to the Gila as very direct and well supplied with grass and water.

Coronado also said of this portion of the trip from Chichilticalli, "the way is very bad for at least thirty leagues and more, through impassable mountains. But when we traversed these thirty leagues, we found cool rivers and grass like that of Castile."⁷⁵ Thirty leagues amount to about 80 miles. The route I have projected from the Salt River to the "cool rivers and grass" country (Rio Frio), in the plateau country above the Mogollon Rim, is just about 85 miles. Coronado's 30 leagues of rough country would have to include the stretch before the San Juan, if he passed through the country herein proposed, since thirty leagues travel from the San Juan through rough country would put him too far east of the course as outlined by Jaramillo.

From the San Juan River (Cherry Creek) Jaramillo said, "On leaving this place we went over somewhat hilly country to another river [upper waters of Canyon Creek, June 26], and from there more to the north to the river we named Las Balsas [the rafts, Carrizo Creek, June 28] since we used some rafts for crossing it because it was swollen. It seems to me that it took us two days to go from one river to the other."

"From here [Carrizo Creek] we went to another arroyo which we called La Barranca [June 30]. The distance between them is two short days travel, and the direction is almost northeast." La Barranca (the ravine or precipice) would fit quite nicely here since they were now at the Mogollon Rim, deeply cut by streams above and below. This perhaps was Mortensen Creek, near Pinedale, or any other of the deep streams encountered in this region.

74. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 166. Italics are mine.

75. Idem., p. 166.

Jaramillo continues, "From here we went to another river which we named Rio Frio [cold river], because it was cold, reaching it in a day's travel [July 1]." This may have been either Showlow or Silver Creek, both of which drain high country and carry cold water.

"Then from here we continued through a pine forest, almost at the end of which we found a spring and a cool little arroyo. This took another day's travel [July 2]." If by "pine" he was including pinyon, then, they were near Mesa Redondo, almost due west of Concho. If pinyon was not intended to be included, then the route I've projected is a bit too far to the north.

"From here, in two days and in the same direction, but not so much to the northeast, we went to another arroyo which we named Bermejo [bright reddish color]. Here we saw [July 4] one or two Indians whom we later thought belonged to the first settlement of Cibola." The reddish color of the river would certainly apply to the Little Colorado River below the Zuñi junction. However, Castañeda said this river was reached 8 leagues from Cibola.⁷⁶ If he was correct this may have been the Zuñi River instead and this would mean they traveled only 6 leagues the following day and 2 leagues the last day, as both he and Jaramillo state it was another 2 days to Cibola from this river. I am inclined to think that Castañeda, who wrote some 20 years after the expedition started, was in error. Certainly it would not have taken them two days to travel from the Little Colorado River (which would then become the Rio Frio) to the Zuñi River (which would then become the Rio Bermejo).

Coronado, as noted above, told of coming to cool rivers and grass, and then said "There was a considerable amount of flax near the banks of one river which was called Rio de Lino on this account." He immediately follows by saying "No Indians were seen during the first day's march, after which [on the second day] four Indians came out with signs of peace, saying they had been sent to that *desert* place to say that we were welcome."⁷⁷ This is the first time he mentions

76. *Idem.*, p. 208.

77. *Idem.*, p. 166. *Italics are mine.*

meeting Indians. This encounter must have occurred on July 4, because Jaramillo and Castañeda both mentioned seeing Indians for the first time two days before reaching Cibola.⁷⁸ Further agreement is noted in that Coronado said they met the Indians in the desert and Jaramillo and Castañeda referred to the reddish river as the locale, which herein is identified as the Little Colorado River almost two days northeast of pinyon country.

The Rio de Lino may have been the cool arroyo encountered on July 2. Not only does flax grow in this region but also two poisonous plants, either of which may have been the plant referred to by Jaramillo when he said, "At this place on this arroyo a Spaniard named Espinosa and two other persons died as a result of some plants they ate because of their great privation."⁷⁹ Coronado said of this incident they lost "several Indian allies and a Spaniard named Espinosa besides two negroes who died of eating some herbs because they were out of food."⁸⁰

Plants in this general region that are known to be dangerously poisonous are Waterhemlock (*Cicuta douglasi*) and Death Camas (*Zigadenus* sp.). The former, though larger in size, bears a familial resemblance to parsley and the latter resembles a small onion. Either of these could well have been mistaken by the Spanish as plants that might be edible because of their resemblance to vegetables of Spain. Of course there also is the possibility that they mistook one of the poisonous mushrooms, *Amanita* spp. for an edible variety.⁸¹

Jaramillo terminates the journey stating "In a march of two days we went from here [Little Colorado River] to the said pueblo, the first one of Cibola [July 6]."

If I have interpreted correctly Jaramillo's one statement as being a repetition, then this 15 day journey includes three which were in inhabited country—the first three days to Rio

78. Idem., pp. 208, 298.

79. Idem., p. 298.

80. Idem., p. 166.

81. I am indebted to Naturalists Natt M. Dodge and Leslie P. Arnberger of the National Park Service for bringing these plants to my attention. Kearney and Peebles, 1942, p. 646, say of Waterhemlock "Plants violently toxic to warm-blooded animals, especially the roots and young growth. No antidote is known."

San Juan which Coronado said bordered on the *despoblado*. Thus the uninhabited zone took 12 days to cross.

Castañeda said of this journey "From here [where the house built of red mud was located] they proceeded over the *despoblado* and after 15 days, at a distance eight leagues from Cibola, arrived [July 4] at a river which, because its water was muddy and red, they called Red River. Here it was that they saw the first Indians in that land—two of them—who fled and went to warn the others. On the night of the following day [July 5], two leagues from the pueblo, the Indians began shouting from a safe place. . . . On the following day [July 6], in good formation, the soldiers entered the inhabited land."⁸² His version contains two additional days. This is because he starts from the mouth of Pinal Creek, where they first encountered Chichilticalli, or his red house. From this point it was two days downstream [on the Nexpa] to the place where Coronado began his journey, which Jaramillo describes. Deducting the three days of occupied country from here to the San Juan River, which Jaramillo's and Coronado's accounts together describe, Castañeda's *despoblado* totals 12 days, as does that of Jaramillo. Neither narrative counts the two days rest Coronado took at Chichilticalli⁸³ in their itinerary.

Fray Marcos said "I entered the *despoblado* on May 9. . . . In this manner I traveled twelve days." Then he met two of the wounded Indians who had accompanied Esteban and remarked he was "one day's journey from Cibola." His narrative thus gives 13 days travel for the *despoblado*.⁸⁴ It appears again that all chroniclers were in close agreement as to the time it took to cross the *despoblado*.

There are certain linguistic data that could be considered along with the evidence already discussed. The sudden appearance in documents in 1598 of the word "Apache" may have stemmed from the Zuñi word "Apachu"⁸⁵ meaning enemy or from these early above discussed encounters with

82. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 207-208.

83. *Idem.*, p. 166.

84. *Idem.*, pp. 74-76.

85. Hodge, et al., 1945, p. 302, Note 11.

the Yavapai in 1539 and 1540, who, like the Walapai, are said to have referred to themselves as Apatieh (*apa*, man, plus the plural suffix *tieh*, people),⁸⁶ or Apache.⁸⁷

The word "Nexpa," used by Jaramillo to designate the Salt River, appears to have affinities with the Yavapai tongue, particularly the ending "pa" (from *apa*) which occurs at the end of all Yavapai band names. Whether this word represents a corruption of the Yavapai name for the Pima, "Hutpa," or is merely the corruption of the end of the name for the Southeastern Yavapai band, "Wikedjasapa," which frequented this area, or some other word, is questionable.

The word Chichilticale, as it is spelled for the first time in Coronado's letter of 1540,⁸⁸ has an interesting history. Only one of Coronado's contemporary chroniclers repeats the use of this name, Jaramillo, who spelled it "Chichiltic Calli."⁸⁹ The remaining contemporary narratives do not refer to this place name in any way—*Traslado de la Nuevas, Relación Postrera de Sivola or Relación del Suceso*.⁹⁰

In 1555, Molina published a dictionary of Mexican words in which he listed the word Chichiltic-calli, spelled exactly like Jaramillo's rendition, and gave its meaning as "a red object or house."⁹¹ In the 1560's Castañeda wrote his narrative, and *for the first time* a reddish walled structure is mentioned as having been present at "Chichilticalli," as he spelled it.⁹² The only map to show this place is that of "The Interior of New Spain," after Mercator, dated 1569, on which the name is spelled "Chichilticale"⁹³ as originally rendered by Coronado.

Several questions arise. Did Molina in 1555 borrow the word from Jaramillo, whose account may have been more readily available than Coronado's letter of 1540 which contained a map or sketch of the route that has never been found? Did Castañeda, who wrote in the 1560's, conjure up

86. Curtis, 1907, p. 5.

87. Gifford, 1936, p. 249.

88. Coronado in Winship, 1896, p. 554.

89. Jaramillo in *Idem.*, p. 585.

90. See Winship, 1896, for translations.

91. Molina, 1555.

92. Castañeda in Winship, 1896, p. 471.

93. Map in *Idem.*, between pp. 376-377.

the red-walled structure at Chichilticalli out of the definition applied by Molina? Was the map of "The Interior of New Spain" based on the sketch Coronado sent to Mendoza, since the spelling is the same? Since Chichilticalli is specifically treated only by Coronado, referred to as a pass by Jaramillo, not mentioned by any other contemporaries, and stated to be the spot where a red-walled structure was located only by Castañeda, who wrote much later and after Molina had assigned a meaning to the word, it appears that Chichilticalli has been vastly over-rated by modern historians. This name appears to represent a general region or province rather than a specific locale, particularly when one notes that Coronado, while at Chichilticalli, said that the Indians took ten days to reach the sea, and that the sea turned west opposite Corazones "where I learned that the ships of your Lordship which had gone in search of the *Port of Chichilticale* . . . had been seen."⁹⁴

Just where Castañeda's ruin of Chichilticalli should be placed on the route of travel, on the Nexpa River or beyond it, has been debated variously. An article⁹⁵ relating to the possible location of Chichilticalli concludes (on the basis of research and field investigation in 1868) that it was located on the Salt River below the mouth of Pinal Creek. In addition, the author points out that he was not the first to suggest the Salt River as the locale since Squier,⁹⁶ in 1848, placed Chichilticalli north of the Gila and Morgan,⁹⁷ in 1869, located it either on the Gila or directly north on the Salt River. Though Potter's approach to the problem of the location of Chichilticalli differs from that herein presented, it is of more than common interest that the same conclusions were reached. Of particular interest is his finding of an apparently early Spanish burial⁹⁸ on the east side of Salome Creek near its mouth, the place where I suggest Coronado spent his two days of rest at Chichilticalli. This burial, however, probably represents a

94. Hammond and Rey, 1940, p. 165. Italics are mine.

95. Potter, 1908.

96. Squier, 1848.

97. Morgan, 1869.

98. Potter, 1908, p. 274.

post-1780 interment, at which period the Spanish were making scouts into this country.

In his account, Castañeda refers to the ruin when the General reaches Chichilticalli. From here (the ruin) he said it was 15 days' travel to the Red River.⁹⁹ Jaramillo's account states that, from the time they reached the Nexpa River, 15 days' of travel were necessary to reach the Bermejo River.¹⁰⁰ Thus, since both narratives agree on the time element, Castañeda's ruin would have had to be located on the Nexpa River, *not four days travel beyond at the Pass of Chichilticalli* described by Jaramillo, where Bolton and Sauer attempted to place it.¹⁰¹ Since the ruin was described as having been built of red mud, its location on the Salt (following the route proposed herein) where mud walled sites do occur, is much more acceptable than a locale near the north end of the Sierra Anchas, where masonry walled sites occur.

Below is a list of some words which resemble "Chichilticalli" that occur among the Yavapai and Apache,¹⁰² the latter included to indicate that near cognates can be found in other languages:

| | | | | | |
|-------------|------|------|------|-------|----------------------|
| Spanish use | —Chi | Chil | ti | calli | |
| Apache | —Tli | chi | | kowa | —"red house" |
| Apache | —Chi | chil | | kain | —"Oak People" (clan) |
| Yavapai | —Chi | chi | itch | kwali | —"mother plants" |

On the face of it there is some similarity between the Spanish rendition and both the Apache and Yavapai examples. I believe this word could well have been derived from the Yavapai since there is nothing to indicate that the Apache were in the area under discussion in the 16th century as will be discussed below.

It might be well to state here that I previously expressed the belief that the Apache de Gila, first encountered some

99. Hammond and Rey, 1940, pp. 207-208.

100. Idem., pp. 297-298.

101. Bolton, 1949, pp. 105-106; Sauer, 1932, p. 37.

102. Terms taken from Gifford, 1932, p. 193 and 1936, pp. 252, 262; Gatschet in Putnam, 1879, pp. 414, 434, 450; Curtis, 1908, pp. 132, 140, 143, and Schroeder, 1954, field notes on Yavapai.

distance west of Socorro, New Mexico, by Benavides in 1628, may have been Yavapai or an Apache group that had picked up farming from the Yavapai.¹⁰³ In light of the route and data discussed herein, it now appears that the Apache de Gila were true Athapascan Apache. In re-examining the evidence pertaining to the latter I found an additional item that further suggests that the Gila Apache were Athapascan. Benavides described a painted deerskin, presented to him by the Apache, bearing the sun and moon above their gods and creators.¹⁰⁴ Curtis describes and illustrates such a skin, once owned by an Apache medicine man in the late 1800's, which is remarkably similar to that described by Benavides.¹⁰⁵ Painted deerskins are not listed among early Yavapai traits, and thus it appears that my former belief that the Apache de Gila may have been Yavapai was unduly influenced by the presence of small scale agriculture among the Gila Apache, a trait which they may have obtained from the Yavapai (a possibility I previously considered), or perhaps from another group in New Mexico. These Gila Apache, though some distance east of the Yavapai, were the Apache closest to the Yavapai at this date, 1628.

It is evident, according to Velarde's remarks, that the Yavapai in 1716 were still north of the Pima,¹⁰⁶ and that the Apache had not yet entered into Arizona north of the Gila River to any great extent, though at that date they were raiding the Sobaipuri from the east, but south of the Gila River. DiPeso erroneously indicated, on the basis of my statements in this respect in the above cited reference (1952b, p. 150), that I suggested the Apache inhabitants east of the San Pedro may have been Yavapai.¹⁰⁷ No such statement was made or intended.

(To be continued)

103. Schroeder, 1952b, p. 150.

104. Hodge, Hammond and Rey, 1945, pp. 82-83.

105. Curtis, 1907, pp. 30-35. See also Twitchell, 1911, Vol. I, p. 42, for an illustration of an Apache medicine shirt decorated in a somewhat similar fashion. Other Apache painted shirts, though not decorated in the same vein, are illustrated by Bourke, 1892, plates VI-VIII: mentioned by Thomas F. M. McLean in a letter to Sylvester Mowry, December 25, 1859, in the Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, The National Archives; and described as being worn by wounded Tonto Apaches by Corbusier, 1886, p. 335. After the introduction of the Ghost Dance Cult Southeastern Yavapai shamans painted people, birds and mammals on buckskin (Gifford, 1932, p. 239).

106. Wyllys, 1931, p. 117.

107. DiPeso, 1953, p. 265.