

New Mexico Historical Review

Volume 31 | Number 1

Article 3

1-1-1956

Fray Marcos de Niza, Coronado and the Yavapai (concluded)

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 (concluded)." *New Mexico Historical Review* 31, 1 (1956). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol31/iss1/3>

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.

FRAY MARCOS DE NIZA, CORONADO AND THE YAVAPAI

By ALBERT H. SCHROEDER

(Concluded)

One remaining aspect of the problem needs yet to be considered. DiPeso, in his recent scholarly and detailed report, already referred to, on excavations in certain historic sites along the San Pedro River, has given us considerable additional data to work with, some of which pertains to the problem at hand. I refer particularly to the material from Santa Cruz de Gaybanipitea. This is the village to which (Velarde was told in the early 1700's) "Moquinos," separated from the Sobaipuri by three days' travel, came from the north until sometime shortly before 1716 A.D., to hold their "fairs" for trading.¹⁰⁸

These "Moquinos" could not have been the Hopi, to whom this name was generally applied, because the Hopi were considerably more than three days' travel north of the northmost Sobaipuri. Velarde's conception as to the location of Moqui was in error. He was told by the Sobaipuri that the Cruciferos (Yavapai) lived to the north of the Nifora and at a short distance or higher latitude than the province of Moqui.¹⁰⁹ The Cruciferos actually lived south of the Hopi latitude. The Pimas also told him of a small pool of thick water of the color of silver, which moved and was heavy, in the "Moqui" area.¹¹⁰ Quicksilver has been reported in central Arizona but, in spite of early Spanish rumors to the contrary, not in northern Arizona. The above indicate that Velarde placed his Moqui area *too far south*.

In the 1770's, the Gila Pimas told Garces repeatedly that the Apaches of the north came anciently to fight for Casa Grande, and Garces remarked "being sure that the Indians whom we know by the name of Apaches have no house nor any fixed abode, I persuaded myself that they could be the

108. Wyllys, 1931, p. 139.

109. Velarde in Wyllys, 1931, p. 117.

110. Idem., p. 155.

Moquis who came to fight."¹¹¹ Thus, both of these padres were of the opinion that the Hopi country was fairly close to the Sobaipuri or Pima.

DiPeso pointed out that Gaybanipitea and San Pablo de Quiburi were occupied at the same time, but also remarked that there was no similarity between the architecture of these two villages—a compound village with contiguous rectangular dwellings with four roof support posts at Quiburi as opposed to scattered domed jacals with oval floor plans and no roof supports at Gaybanipitea.¹¹² In attempting to reconcile the presence of domed jacals with oval floors (in this region where they had not been recorded before), each jacal being outlined with a single row of stones several inches to a foot or so apart with no evidence of interior roof post supports, he drew on Pfefferkorn's description of the Sonoran type of dwelling.¹¹³ However, DiPeso failed to recognize several things. Pfefferkorn described a circular house for the Sonorans, not oval, though he did state that "some Indians build long huts, one or two ells longer than they are wide." Moreover, Pfefferkorn does not mention the use of stones on the ground around the perimeter of the jacal structures.

DiPeso then refers to Gladwin's and Woodward's description of the Sacaton phase houses (900-1150 A.D.) of the prehistoric Hohokam horizon. Then he states "Thus one can, with justification, connect the native dwellings as exposed at Santa Cruz de Gaybanipitea with prehistoric Hohokam prototypes."¹¹⁴ In this case he fails to note that the Sacaton phase is not the latest jacal type dwelling of the Hohokam. Hayden and Jewell both refer to Civano phase jacals (1300-1400 A.D.) similar in plan to that of the Sacaton phase house, but larger and without the Sacaton phase entry passages.¹¹⁵ Moreover, both of these Hohokam structures of different phases had a gabled roof (not domed) supported by two poles near each end of the floor (lacking at Gaybanipitea), were in some cases almost oval in plan but most usually were rec-

111. Garces in Coues, 1900, pp. 386-387.

112. DiPeso, 1953, p. 131.

113. Treutlein, 1949, pp. 192-193.

114. DiPeso, 1953, p. 128.

115. Hayden, 1941, p. 227, and Jewell, 1949, ms.

tangular with rounded corners (not oval), and lacked the stones around the perimeter of the jacal walls such as were found at Gaybanipitea. Moreover, the Sacaton phase dwelling exhibits an entry passageway which was not found at Gaybanipitea.

There are several similarities between the data of Gaybanipitea and the Yavapai, to whom DiPeso did not refer at all for comparative information. The historic Yavapai built a house *exactly* like those of Gaybanipitea,¹¹⁶ and oval houses with an outline of stones have been recorded in the Agua Fria drainage¹¹⁷ and in the Verde Valley¹¹⁸ with associated ceramics dating between 1150 and 1250 A.D. It is possible that this earlier house of 1150 A.D. *may* have developed out of the Sacaton phase Hohokam house, became established in the area north of the Gila, and *later* was brought to Gaybanipitea in historic times by the Yavapai or a related group rather than having been introduced to Gaybanipitea directly from the Hohokam as DiPeso implies.

In addition to the similarity between the architecture of the Yavapai and that of the site of Gaybanipitea there are other similar traits. One mescal pit was found in association with Gaybanipitea, but not with other sites reported on.¹¹⁹ This is a trait of the Yavapai as well. DiPeso describes a new pottery type which he calls Whetstone Plain,¹²⁰ which occurs at San Pablo de Quiburi (1692-1698 A.D.), is most common at Gaybanipitea (pre-1698 A.D.) and found to some extent in later occupation (post-1704 A.D.) at Quiburi.¹²¹ Whetstone Plain is similar to Tonto Red in several respects (the latter representing the plain pottery of the Tonto Basin between 1150-1400 A.D.) and differs only in having thinner walls and smoother finish, traits perhaps improved by association with the superior Sobaipuri potters, if these pottery types are related. All the above Gaybanipitea-Yavapai similarities con-

116. Gifford, 1936, p. 271.

117. Idem., and Schroeder, 1954.

118. Schroeder, 1953b (Verde Valley ms.).

119. DiPeso, 1953, p. 131.

120. Idem., pp. 154-156.

121. Idem., pp. 68, 80-81, 88, 94, 102-103, 116-117, 130, 132, 274.

sidered together, including the paucity of material recovered at Gaybanipitea,¹²² surely is more than mere coincidence. Then when we consider Velarde's remarks of 1716, that some Indians, whom he called Moquinos, came from the north, three days travel separating them from the Sobaipuri, to trade until recently "when the Moquinos arrived in the valley of the Sobaipuris in the land called Taibamipita (Gaybanipitea)," coincidence is no longer acceptable. The three days travel between the Sobaipuri and the "Moquinos" of Velarde,¹²³ herein considered to be the Yavapai, the traits of Gaybanipitea—house type and pottery type, complete lack of decorated ware, use of mescal pit, location of village on mesa top and paucity of material—all indicate a close tie with the Yavapai pattern.

Of pertinent interest to this situation is data Gifford derived from Southeastern Yavapai informants. When queried as to the cause of warfare between them and the Gila Pima he was told¹²⁴ that "*about 200 years ago*" [which would place the time about 1730 A.D.] the Southeastern Yavapai and Pima *were living close together as friends*. (In 1746, Sedelmayr reported that the Cocomarcopa also were having "friendly and affectionate relations with them [Nijores].")¹²⁵ They *exchanged visits*, held dances, and *intermarried*. *Many Southeastern Yavapai lived in Pima communities* where they had married and were cultivating land. At least for a time, some Pima lived in mountains of Southeastern Yavapai territory. After many years of friendly relations, *some Apache visited* the Southeastern Yavapai living in Pima lands. They stayed, feasted on cultivated foods, then went home. Later, in the same year, they came again passing an old Pima who was felling timber. On their way back they killed him. His relatives found him and burned his body. The Pima blamed the Southeastern Yavapai living among them, and killed all but

122. *Idem.*, p. 131.

123. Hackett, 1937, p. 387 contains a statement indicating the Moqui did not border on the province of Sonora. Valverde, in 1732, attested that none of the Cocomarcopa said the Moquis extended to the province of Sonora.

124. Gifford, 1936, p. 340. Italics are mine.

125. Sedelmayr in Ives, 1939, p. 108.

some who escaped. These mixed Yavapai and Pima had lived near the present south entrance of the Fort McDowell Reservation. This area then became a no man's land.

Another version stated these two tribes and the Maricopa used to gather mesquite in the Verde Valley until one day a Tonto Apache killed a Pima woman. The Southeastern Yavapai were blamed. Later in an attempt to make peace with the Pima, a Tonto killed a Pima man, and since then hostilities continued until brought to a halt by the white man.

The Yavapai story of their relations with the Western Pima in the Fort McDowell area around 1730 coincides exceptionally well with the documentary evidence of Sedelmayr, regarding the friendly relations between the Cocomaricopa and the Nijores in 1746, indicating good relations existed prior to 1750. Velarde's report of trade and visits at Gaybanipitea by "Moquinos" of pre-1700 in the eastern Pima area also coincides with the finds of DiPeso at Gaybanipitea which exhibit a pattern similar to that of the Yavapai. The story and documentation of such relations in the east and west, plus the factual evidence in the east, seem to indicate that Pima-Yavapai relations were fairly close just before 1700 in the east and at least up to 1746 in the west. Perhaps, by no coincidence, the Apache inroads on the San Pedro River in 1690's and further north and west in the Southeastern Yavapai area, between 1747 and 1788, coincided with the enmity which came about at the same time between the Yavapai and Pima in each of the above areas.

Involved in and of more than passing interest in respect to this situation are the Jcome and Jano tribes of southwestern New Mexico, southeastern Arizona and northwestern Chihuahua. Bandelier indicated these two groups lived north of a line between Casas Grandes, Chihuahua and Fronteras, Sonora, that they were enemies of the sedentary Opata people of eastern Sonora before the Spaniards arrived on the scene, and that the Opata abandoned their villages in the above noted region in the late 1680's as a result of attacks from the east.¹²⁶ Sauer stated that the Jano ranged in southwestern New Mexico while the Jcome were in southwestern

126. Bandelier, 1892, pt. I, pp. 91-92 and pt. II, pp. 501, 529.

Arizona and that both, according to Vetancurt in 1686, spoke the same language, though what language is not stated. At this time they were friendly with the Pima (Sobaipuri), *the latter having given them some land to plant in the Quiburi area.*¹²⁷ Gaybanipitea, three miles from Quiburi, again appears to be involved.

In 1695, Kino reported that Jocomé and Jano were pestering Sonora.¹²⁸ The Jocomé were again mentioned by Kino in 1696 as occupying the area east of the San Pedro River. In 1697, he also mentioned the Jano among them. His first actual observation of possible Apache in this region were those who in 1698 attacked Santa Cruz de Gaybanipitea.¹²⁹ Bandelier has pointed out that the Jano (and Suma) apparently were late comers to southeastern Arizona from northwestern Chihuahua, some having begun their spread north after 1684 when they went in league with the Apache in Chihuahua.¹³⁰ Thus, the historic movements and relations of these tribes appear to be closely related with Gaybanipitea.

All of the above points to a chronology of events that have a direct bearing on the problem. As I have previously pointed out, on the basis of documentary evidence and historical studies referred to in the citation below,¹³¹ a group of Apache were in the Gila headwaters of southwestern New Mexico up to about 1680. When the Spanish went south after the Pueblo Rebellion of 1680, the Apache followed apparently for purposes of raiding. They evidently displaced some of the Jano of southwestern New Mexico, since the latter, along with the Suma, were in Chihuahua in 1684 forming a league with the Apache. In 1686, the Jocomé, and apparently some refugee Jano from southwestern New Mexico or northern Chihuahua, were given land by the Sobaipuri in the Quiburi area, quite possibly Gaybanipitea. These two groups, the Jano and Jocomé, spoke the same language. In 1691, the Spanish learned that the Apaches of the Sierra de Gila, confederates of the Janos, Jocomés, Pimas, Sobas, and Sumas, had stolen

127. Sauer, 1934, pp. 75, 81.

128. Bolton, 1948, p. 162 (fn).

129. *Idem.*, pp. 165, 169, 172, 180.

130. Bandelier, 1892, pt. I, p. 114.

131. Schroeder, 1952b, pp. 143-145, 151.

considerable livestock. Fernández proposed to crush these Apache in the Sierra de Gila, some 70 leagues from El Paso.¹³² In the late 1600's the Apache and their allies in Chihuahua were forced northward by Spanish arms and by 1698 had raided Gaybanipitea in southeastern Arizona.

As a result of this raid Jorinza sent Escalante to check on the victory the Sobaipuri finally realized over the Apache and their allies at Gaybanipitea, with instructions to enlist the Pimas to pursue the enemy. The Pima made excuses saying they were recent allies.¹³³ The recent allies may have been all the tribes listed above by the Spanish in 1691 as their confederates or could have been the Jano and Jcome alone among the attacking group (of Apache, Suma, Jano and Jcome), who were kin to the people to whom the Sobaipuri had given land near Quiburi in 1686, probably Gaybanipitea. Further indication that the Jano, at least, were allies of the Pima is also mentioned by Jorinza. Two years earlier, in 1696, he called on the chiefs of the Jano and Pima to make a general campaign. They met at the Sierra Florida, near the Gila, and succeeded in killing some of the enemy.¹³⁴ This perhaps represents one of the earliest encounters with the Apache east of the San Pedro. At the end of the period of chronological events being considered, Velarde, in 1716, stated that the "Moquinos" from the north, three days travel separating their villages from the Sobaipuri, came to trade at Gaybanipitea until recently, but connections between these two groups had not been re-established because the Apache had occupied the pass on the Gila River.

Why did these northern neighbors of the Sobaipuri, the Yavapai, travel so far up the San Pedro River to trade? In light of the data presented above, I offer the following tentative suggestion. It appears the Jano and Jcome may have been Yuman or Hokan speaking people situated along the Arizona-New Mexico line in southwestern New Mexico, southeastern Arizona and northwestern Chihuahua. If a site was established near Quiburi in 1686, as Sauer's data indi-

132. Espinosa, 1934, pp. 129-130, drawing from Maas, 1929, pp. 123-133.

133. Bolton, 1948, p. 183 (fn).

134. *Idem.*, p. 162 (fn).

cate,¹³⁵ and Gaybanipitea with its totally different architecture and culture material, which DiPeso dates pre-1698, represents the site established by these two tribes, the culture pattern involved was very similar to that of the Yavapai. It would appear that the Yavapai on the Salt River traveled well into the Sobaipuri region to trade at Gaybanipitea only *because a kindred group* (Jano and Jcome) had an established village there. Thus Velarde's "Moquinos" and Nifora of the north, neither of which he ever saw, appear to be one and the same (Yavapai).

The statement that the people of Gaybanipitea were called Sobaipuri¹³⁶ is somewhat counter to the above suggestion that Gaybanipitea was occupied by Yuman speakers. If this was the site given to the Jcome (Yuman speakers) by the Sobaipuri (Piman speakers) in 1686, as herein proposed, then there must have been some length of time represented, before 1686, during which these two groups were on friendly relations and probably learned one another's language to some extent. The Piman language was found to be widely used among Yuman speakers in the west,¹³⁷ and such wide use is just as possible here in the east. Another 12 years of closer association between these two peoples at Gaybanipitea (1686-1698) would allow the Jcome inhabitants of Gaybanipitea to become even more adept with the Piman language. Intermarriage also would bring neighboring Piman speaking Sobaipuri (women), who probably were patrilocal in their residence practices as are the Pima of today, into Gaybanipitea as well as produce offspring who may have also spoken Pima.

Actually no one has demonstrated that the natives of Gaybanipitea were Sobaipuri. This was the only village that was not enclosed by protective walls and it was here that the na-

135. Sauer, 1934, suggested that these two groups were Athapascan and Kroeber, 1934, p. 15 tentatively placed them in the Uto-Aztecan language group. I formerly favored Kroeber's identification (Schroeder, 1952b, p. 148). Orozco y Berra, 1864, p. 59 included the Jano and Jcome among the Apache family. However, he also indicated (page 40) that he considered the Apache and Yavapai languages as one and the same thing. Thus his language classification indicates the Jano or Jcome *could have been Yuman speakers* instead of Athapascan, since he did not recognize a difference between them.

136. DiPeso, 1953, p. 273.

137. Kinó in Bolton, 1948, Vol. I, pp. 128, 246, 480.

tives built a fort on the insistence of the Spanish,¹³⁸ a circumstance suggesting these natives were not Sobaipuri. Kino said, in referring to the raid of 1698 by the Apache and their allies on Gaybanipitea, "*of the Pima natives in the rancheria of Santa Cruz five died, and nine were wounded, but recovered.*"¹³⁹ Why did Kino say "*of the Pima natives in the rancheria*"? Was he implying there were others there, in this village of 100 people,¹⁴⁰ who were not Pima? It would certainly appear to be so as the material culture discussed above would indicate. In fact, it would appear that the Pima in the village were very much in the minority.

SUMMARY

The ethnological traits reported by the early Spanish, who recorded their travels of 1539 and 1540 through Arizona, point to the Yavapai as the people who occupied the area on the north side of the four-day *despoblado*, where Chichilticalli was located. Internal evidence within these early documents also indicates that Fray Marcos and Coronado followed the San Pedro to its mouth, not just to Tres Alamos or Aravaipa on the San Pedro, and that from here they crossed the Gila and went over to the Salt River as Undreiner suggests. I further propose that they went down the Salt almost to the mouth of Tonto Creek, then up Salome Creek and over the north end of the Sierra Anchas and then generally north-east over the Mogollon Rim across to Zuñi. There is little or no evidence to indicate they went east from the San Pedro at Tres Alamos or via Aravaipa Creek and then across the present day San Carlos Apache country to Zuñi. Such a trail would necessitate a route directed to the north or north-north-east, rather than northeast as the documents state.

There is little in the documents to suggest any Apache occupation in the Chichilticalli region prior to 1750. The Apache of southwestern New Mexico apparently absorbed a number of Jano and Jocome between 1680 and 1700 in their swing south into Chihuahua and north into southeastern Ari-

138. *Idem.*, p. 178.

139. *Idem.*, p. 183. *Italics are mine.*

140. *Idem.*, p. 170 (fn).

zona as indicated by the Apache league with the Jcome, Jano and Suma in Chihuahua in 1684, by Kino's observations of 1698 east of the San Pedro River where he noted the Apache, Jano, Jcome and Suma together in raids, and by Velarde in 1716 who mentioned the recent occupation of the pass on the Gila River by the Apache. I previously suggested¹⁴¹ that continued Spanish pressure forced the Apache and their allies north, in the last half of the 1700's, into the general area of the Gila above its junction with the San Pedro River. A part of the end result was the Tonto Apache, a group that was closely associated and intermixed with the Southeastern Yavapai in later years. The name Tonto ("fool" in Spanish) first appeared in 1796 along with "Biniedine," the Chiricahua Apache designation for them (meaning "people without sense").¹⁴²

These data suggest that the Apache reached the area herein identified as Chichilticalli at a rather late date, (post-1750), regardless of the direction they may have approached it. The termination of one period of friendly relations between the Yavapai and the Pima coincides with the appearance of the Apache, a situation which also seems to imply a late entry for the Apache—1690's in the San Pedro area and post-1750 near the Tonto Basin. Thus, the Yavapai remain as the only possible group, separated by four days' travel, that bordered the Sobaipuri on the north in 1539 and 1540.

Baldwin, Percy M.

- 1926 "Discovery of the Seven Cities of Cibola, by Fray Marcos de Niza." *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vol. I, No. 2.

Bandelier, Adolph F.

- 1881 *Historical Introduction to Studies among the Sedentary Indians of New Mexico*. Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, American Series I, Boston.
- 1890a *Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States*, etc. Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, American Series III, part 1. Cambridge.

141. Schroeder, 1952b, p. 151.

142. Cordero in *Noticias relativas a la Nacion Apache*, 1796, quoted by Orozco y Berra, 1864, Chapter XXV. I had previously erroneously reported 1834 as the earliest date for the use of Biniedine (Schroeder, 1952b, p. 152). Cordero was a Spanish officer who soldiered against the Apache from 1770 to 1795.

- 1890b *Contributions to the History of the Southwestern Portion of the United States.* Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, American Series V. Cambridge.
- 1892 *An Outline of the Documentary History of the Zuni Tribe.* Journal of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. III.
- Bartlett, Katharine and Colton, Harold S.
 1940 "A Note on the Marcos de Niza Inscription near Phoenix, Arizona." *Plateau*, Vol. 12, No. 4, Museum of Northern Arizona. Flagstaff.
- Bolton, Herbert E.
 1916 *Spanish Exploration in The Southwest, 1542-1706.* Scribner's Sons, New York.
 1931 *Font's Complete Diary.* University of California Press, Berkeley.
 1948 *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimeria Alta.* 2 Vols. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
 1949 *Coronado, Knight of Pueblos and Plains.* Whittlesay House and University of New Mexico Press.
- Bourke, John Gregory
 1892 *Medicine Men of the Apache.* 9th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington.
- Corbusier, William F.
 1886 "The Apache-Yumas and Apache-Mohaves." *American Antiquarian*, Vol. VIII, pp. 276-284 and 325-339.
- Coues, Elliott
 1900 *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer, etc.* 2 Vols. American Explorer Series III. Francis P. Harper, New York.
- Curtis, Edward S.
 1907 *The North American Indian*, Vols. I & II.
 1908 University Press, Cambridge.
- DiPeso, Charles C.
 1951 *The Babacomari Village Site on the Babacomari River. Southeastern Arizona.* Amerind Foundation, No. 5. Dragoon.
 1953 *The Sobaipuri Indians of the Upper San Pedro River Valley, Southeastern Arizona.* Amerind Foundation, No. 6. Dragoon.
- Emory, William H.
 1848 *Notes of a Military Reconnaissance from Fort Leavenworth in Missouri to San Diego in California.* Senate Ex. Doc. No. 7, 30th Congress. 1st Session. Washington.
- Espinosa, Jose M.
 1934 "The Legend of Sierra Azul." *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vol. IX, No. 2, pp. 113-158. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

- Farish, Thomas E.
1915 *History of Arizona*. 3 Vols. Phoenix.
- Gifford, E. W.
1932 *The Southeastern Yavapai*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 29, No. 3. Berkeley.
1936 *Northeastern and Western Yavapai*. University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 34, No. 4. Berkeley.
- Hackett, Charles W.
1937 *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya and approaches thereto, to 1773*. Collected by Adolph Bandelier. Vol 3, Carnegie Institution. Washington.
- Hakluyt, Richard
1928 *The Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of Foreign Voyagers, etc.* Vol. X. J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London.
- Hammond, George P. and Rey, Agapito
1928 *Obregon's History of Sixteenth Century Exploration in Western America, etc.* Mexico, 1584. Wetzel Publishing Co., Inc. Los Angeles.
1940 *Narratives of the Coronado Expedition*. Coronado Historical Series, Vol. II. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
1953 *Don Juan de Oñate, Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628*. Coronado Historical Series, Vols. V and VI. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Hayden, Julian
1941 *Report of Excavations in the University Indian Ruin*. Manuscript. Tucson.
- Hodge, F. W.
1907 *The Narrative of the Expedition of Coronado by Pedro de Castañeda*, in *Spanish Explorers in the United States, 1528-1743*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Hodge, F. W., Hammond, G. P., and Rey, A.
1945 *Fray Alonso de Benavides' Revised Memorial of 1634*. Coronado Historical Series, Vol. IV. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Ives, Ronald L.
1939 "Sedelmayr's Relacion of 1746." *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 123, pp. 97-117. Washington.
- Jewell, Donald P.
1949 *Recent Excavations at Pueblo Grande*. Manuscript. Phoenix.

- Kearny, Thomas H. and Peebles, Robert H.
 1942 *Flowering Plants and Ferns of Arizona*. U. S. Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication No. 423. Washington.
- Kroeber, A. L.
 1934 "Uto-Aztecan Languages of Mexico." *Ibero-Americana*; 8. University of California Press. Berkeley.
- Maas, P. Otto
 1929 *Misiones de Nuevo Mejico, Documentos del archivo general de Indias (Sevilla) publicadas por primera vez y anotadas*. Madrid.
- Manje, Juan Mateo
 1954 *Luz De Tierra Incógnita*. Part II. Tr. by Harry J. Karns and Associates. Arizona Silhouettes. Tucson.
- Molina, Alonso de
 1555 *Aqui comienza un vocabulario en la lengua Castellana y Mexicana*. Mexico.
- Morgan, Lewis H.
 1869 "The Seven Cities of Cibola." *North American Review*. April.
- Oblasser, Bonaventure
 1939 *Arizona Discovered, 1539*. Topawa, Arizona.
- Orozco y Berra, Manuel
 1864 *Geografía de las Lenguas y Carta Etnográfica de Mexico*. Mexico.
- Potter, Samuel O. L.
 1908 "Chichilticalli." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society*, Vol. XL, No. 5, pp. 257-276. New York.
- Pumpelly, Raphael
 1870 *Across America and Asia*. (3rd edition) London and New York.
- Putnam, Frederick W.
 1879 *Report upon U. S. Geographical Surveys West of the 100th Meridian*. Vol. 7-archaeology. Washington.
Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (Various dates cited in the footnotes). Washington.
Report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1873-1874. 1st Session, 43rd Congress, Vol. I, Washington.
- Russell, Frank
 1908 *The Pima Indians*. 26th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington.
- Sauer, Carl
 1932 "The Road to Cibola." *Ibero-Americana*: 3. University of California Press. Berkeley.

- 1934 "The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico." *Ibero-Americana*: 5. University of California Press. Berkeley.
- Schroeder, Albert H.
- 1952a "A Brief History of the Yavapai of the Middle Verde Valley." *Plateau*, Vol. 24, No. 3, Museum of Northern Arizona. Flagstaff.
- 1952b "Documentary Evidence Pertaining to the Early Historic Period of Southern Arizona." *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vol. 27, No. 2. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.
- 1953a "The Bearing of Architecture on Developments in the Hohokam Classic Period." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 9, No. 2. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.
- 1953b Manuscript on the Archaeology of the Verde Valley. Arizona. (in preparation)
- 1954 "Four Prehistoric Sites near Mayer, Arizona, which Suggest a New Focus." *Plateau*, Vol. 26, No. 3. Museum of Northern Arizona. Flagstaff.
- Squier, Ephraim George
- 1848 "New Mexico and California." *American Review*. November.
- Treutlein, Theodore E.
- 1949 *Pfefferkorn's Description of Sonora*. Coronado Historical Series, Vol. XII. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.
- Twitchell, Ralph E.
- 1911 *The Leading Facts of New Mexican History*. Torch Press, Cedar Rapids.
- Undreiner, George J.
- 1947 "Fray Marcos de Niza and his Journey to Cibola." *The Americas*, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 415-486. Washington.
- Weekly Arizona Miner*. Published in Prescott, September 6, 1878.
- Winship, George P.
- 1896 *The Coronado Expedition, 1540-1542*. 14th Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology, part 1. Washington.
- Wylls, Rufus K.
- 1931 Padre Luis Velarde's *Relación* of Pimería Alta, 1716. *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vol. VI, April.