

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO THE
EARLY HISTORIC PERIOD OF SOUTHERN
ARIZONA

By ALBERT H. SCHROEDER*

ARCHAEOLOGICAL occupation in the lower Salt River Valley of southern Arizona ceases around 1400 A.D., according to present evidence. Any of the several tribes inhabiting the surrounding area in early historic times may have played a part in the abandonment. Before treating with these groups it is necessary first to limit the distribution of the Pima as recorded by the Spanish.

Pima

Aside from Fray Marcos de Niza and the chroniclers of the Coronado expedition, who refer to the probable group now known as the Sobaipuri, Kino is our first source for detail on the Pima of Arizona. He reported a number of Sobaipuri rancherias on the San Pedro River and 6 or 7 Pima rancherias around Casa Grande along the Gila River, but not once did he mention other Pimas north of the Gila which he once did cross.¹ The westernmost village on the Gila was San Bartolomé, 3 leagues above the Gila-Salt junction.² Bolton, Kino's historian, is the only source to state that the Pima were on the Salt River, yet he presents no evidence for this statement, nor does Kino offer anything to support such a statement.³

Later evidence indicates the Salt was unoccupied. In 1716 Velarde referred to the Sobaipuri on the San Pedro River

* The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Erik Reed for making copies of two documents in the Santa Fe Archives and to Mrs. Helen Bretnor for checking data in the Bancroft Library.

Mr. Schroeder is employed by the National Park Service, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

[When first cited in a footnote, a reference is given in full. In subsequent citations it is given in abbreviated form. Ed.]

1. Jesse W. Fewkes, *Casa Grande, Arizona*, p. 86 (22nd Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, pt. I. Washington, 1904); Kino in Herbert E. Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimeria Alta*, vol. 1, pp. 170-172 (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948).

2. Mange in *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 196.

3. Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, p. 50.

and to the north Pima on the Gila.⁴ In 1743 Keler crossed the Gila and proceeded to the junction of the Verde and the Salt. From there he went down the Salt to its junction with the Gila. He continued beyond to the first Cocomaricopa (Maricopa) rancheria and then returned. No mention was made of any Indians on the Salt.⁵ In 1744 Sedelmayr crossed the Gila at Casa Grande and further north he forded the Rio de Asunción (lower Salt). He followed it down to the junction with the Gila without referring to any Indians. Beyond the junction lived the Cocomaricopa. Sedelmayr also referred to the Pima around Casa Grande as a branch of the Pima separate from the Sobaipuri.⁶ In 1763 the *Rudo Ensayo* stated the upper Pima lived from Cucurpe to Caborca and from Dolores to the Gila River and down the Gila.⁷ In 1775 and 1776 Garcés continually referred to the Pimas Gileños in contrast to the Sobaipuri.⁸ In 1774 Anza noted the westernmost Pima village (Sutaquison) 13 leagues east of Gila Bend. The easternmost village was 2 leagues away. Díaz said it was 15 leagues from Gila Bend to Sutaquison and 3 leagues further past 2 large villages to the easternmost Pima village of Uturituc which was 4 to 7 leagues west of Casa Grande. He noted 6 villages in all on both sides of the river in these three leagues.⁹ Garcés placed Sutaquison 17 leagues from San Simon y Judas (Opasoitac) which was on Gila Bend. The Pima villages he placed as follows: Sutaquison on the west end and 4 leagues to Uturituc on the east end. Font said within 6 leagues on the Gila were 5 pueblos, 4 on the south side and one on the north.¹⁰

In 1794 Pfefferkorn, who left America after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767, wrote "From the abode of the

4. Velarde in Rufus K. Wyllys, ed., "*Padre Luis Velarde's Relacion of Pimeria Alta, 1716*," *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. 6, p. 145.

5. Sedelmayr in Ronald L. Ives, tr., *Sedelmayr's Relacion of 1746*, p. 104 (Bulletin 123, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, 1939).

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 104-106.

7. Esuebio Guiteras, tr., *Rudo Ensayo*, American Catholic Historical Society, vol. 5, p. 189.

8. Garcés in Elliott Coues, tr., *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer, the Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés*, (American Explorers Series, III. Francis P. Harper, New York, 1900).

9. Anza and Díaz in Leslie Spier, *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River*, pp. 81-82 (University of Chicago Press, 1933).

10. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 109-113, 102-106.

Pimas, [around Casa Grande] 12 miles [Spanish mile of 1¼ hours] are counted to the Rio de la Asunción [lower Salt River]. The country where this river drops into the Gila is very pleasant, flat, and very good to bring forth all kind of grain and plants. It is populated on both sides of the river [Gila] by the Cocomaricopas.¹¹ Next to them border the Nichoras [Yavapai] who extend from the northerly sides of the Gila to the Sierra Azul and are constantly at war with the Cocomaricopas. Because more timid, they receive mostly the short end. In these encounters the Cocomaricopas are not trying to kill the enemies, but try to get them alive. They sell the prisoners to the neighboring Pimas . . ."¹²

In 1762 the Sobaipuri were driven from the San Pedro valley by the Apache, and Spier states that prior to 1800 some of those in the Santa Cruz were driven further west by the Apache.¹³

In summary then we have a known distribution of the Sobaipuri from 1539 to the 1760's along the San Pedro and from 1694 into the 1800's in the Santa Cruz valley. The Gila Pima were restricted to 5 or 6 villages on the Gila a short distance above the Gila-Salt junction from 1694 on. Not one mention is made of any tribe on the Salt through which several padres passed.

Apache

With the distribution of the Pima as outlined above, we can now proceed with a discussion of the surrounding tribes. The Apache have most often been referred to as a possible cause of the pressure exerted on prehistoric cultures of east-central Arizona and on the Hohokam which brought about the abandonment of the large settlements around 1400 A.D.¹⁴

11. Theodore E. Treutlein, *Pfefferkorn's Description of Sonora*, vol. XII, p. 29, (vol. 12, Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540-1940, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1949) translated this "Both sides of these two rivers are inhabited by the Cocomaricopas."

12. Ignatz Pfefferkorn, *Description of the Landscape of Sonora including other remarkable news of the internal part of New Spain, etc.* Colonne, vol. 1, p. 6 (New York Public Library manuscript, in German). I am indebted to Louis Schlesinger for the translation of this passage. Parens are mine.

13. Guiteras, *Rudo Ensayo*, p. 192; Spier, *Yuma Tribes* . . . , p. 1.

14. Cosmos Mindeleff, *Aboriginal Remains in Verde Valley, Arizona*, p. 260 (18th Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, 1896); Jesse W. Fewkes,

The first reference to these nomads was made by the chroniclers of the Coronado expedition of 1540. They were found east of the Rio Grande in New Mexico and were referred to as Querechos.

In 1583 Espejo said the mountain people near Acoma were called Querechos by the Indians of Acoma.¹⁵ This term was also employed by Luxán and Obregón in referring to groups in the Little Colorado River and Verde Valley areas and by Luxán to describe wanderers in the present Laguna area. Obregón used the term along with Vaqueros as a synonym. He also used the term Querecho in referring to a group in northern Mexico two days away from the plains.¹⁶

In all the above instances the Spanish were simply referring to wandering tribes, and transferred the term as originally employed east of the Rio Grande to other areas after 1583. As further indication of this practice we find Castañeda, Luxán, Obregón, and Garcés, from the late 1500's through 1776, using the Mexican term Chichimeco instead to imply wandering or wild tribes in the vicinity of the

Two Summers' Work in Pueblo Ruins, p. 20 (22nd Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, pt. I, Washington, 1904); Gladwin in E. B. Sayles, *An Archaeological Survey of Chihuahua, Mexico*, p. 98 (Medallion Papers, no. 22, Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona); Winifred and Harold S. Gladwin, *The Eastern Range of the Red-on-buff Culture*, p. 257 (Medallion Papers, no. 16, Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona); Irene Vickrey, "Besh-ba-gowah," *Kiva*, vol. 4, p. 19 (Arizona State Museum, Tucson); Henry W. Kelly, "Franciscan Missions of New Mexico," *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. 16, p. 42; Donald E. Worcester, "The Beginnings of the Apache Menace of the Southwest," *ibid.*, vol. 16, p. 2; Emil W. Haury, "Recent Field Work by the Arizona State Museum," *Kiva*, vol. 7, p. 20 (Arizona State Museum, Tucson); H. S. and C. B. Cosgrove and A. V. Kidder, *The Pendleton Ruin*, No. 50, p. 147 (Contributions to American Anthropology and History, Publication 585, Carnegie Institution, Washington, 1949).

15. Coronado in Adolph F. Bandelier, *Final Report of Investigations Among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, etc.*, American Series III, pt. I, p. 28 (Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, John Wilson & Son, Cambridge); Coronado in George P. Winship, *The Coronado Expedition, 1540-42*, pp. 580-581 (14th Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, pt. 1, Washington, 1896); *Relación del Suceso* in *Ibid.*, p. 578; Espejo in Herbert E. Bolton, ed., *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, 1542-1706*, p. 188 (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1916).

16. Obregón in G. P. Hammond & A. Rey, eds., *Obregón's History of the 16th Century Explorations in Western America, entitled Chronicle, Commentary, or Relation of the Ancient and Modern Discoveries in New Spain and New Mexico*, pp. 19-20, 194, 323, 380 (Wetzel Publishing Co., Inc., Los Angeles, 1923); Luxán in G. P. Hammond & A. Rey, eds., *The Espejo Expedition into New Mexico made by Antonio de Espejo, 1528-83 as revealed in the Journal of Diego Perez de Luxán*, pp. 86, 97 (Quivira Society, Los Angeles, 1929); See Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, Series III, pt. I, pp. 28-29 for quotations from original sources.

Hopis.¹⁷ Certainly they didn't imply Mexican wanderers were in this area!

The meaning and use of the word Apache has been cause for most of the misinterpretation relating to our historic Apache. The word itself was first used as "Apades" or "Apiche" in documents pertaining to Oñate's entradas of 1598. In 1608 Fray Francisco de Velasco and in 1626 Zarate used "Apache" to refer to the Apache de Nabaju in north-western New Mexico.¹⁸ Benavides noted a group which he called the Apache de Xila west of the region of Socorro, New Mexico, in the headwaters of the Gila in 1630.¹⁹ The word "Apache" now began to replace Querecho. "Apache" activity after that date was more commonly documented. With the adoption of the horse about 1660 their movement and spread was more rapid.²⁰ By the time of the Pueblo Rebellion of 1680, the Apaches began to move south into Chihuahua. In 1683 they pressed on the Sumas on the west bank of the Rio Grande below El Paso, and shortly afterwards in 1684 they made a league with the Sumas in Chihuahua.²¹ From this region the Apaches spread into southeastern Arizona and Sonora. The use of the term thus began in New Mexico and

17. *Ibid.*, Series III, pt. I, pp. 28-29; See also Adolph F. Bandelier, "Documentary History, of the Rio Grande Pueblos, New Mexico," (NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW), vol. 5, p. 342 where he said Chichimecatl was used for roving and warlike people; See Carl Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico*, Ibero-Americana, no. 5, p. 7 (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1934) for same use by Ponce in 1587; also Frederick W. Putnam, *Report upon U.S. Geographical Surveys west of the 100th Meridian*, vol. 7, p. 8 (Washington, 1879) and Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, p. 365.

18. Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, American Series III, pt. I, p. 180; Zárate in Charles F. Lummis, tr., *Fray Zarate Salmeron's Relación, Land of Sunshine*, vol. 12, p. 183; F. W. Hodge, *History of Hawikuh*, p. 19 (Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, 1937); Bolton, *Spanish Exploration . . .*, pp. 217-218; Worcester, "The Beginnings of the Apache Menace . . .," NMHR., vol. 16, p. 5; Earliest use in 1598 in Oñate's *Obediencia y vasallaje de San Juan Baptista in Doc. Ind. de Indias*, XVI, p. 114 "Todos los Apaches desde la Sierra Nevada hacia la parte del Norte y Poniente."

19. F. W. Hodge, et al., *Fray Alonso de Benavides' Revised Memorial of 1634*, pp. 81-84 (vol. 4, Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publication, 1540-1940. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1945).

20. Robert Denhardt, "The Beginning of American Horses, NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW, vol. 13, p. 255. Worcester, *The Beginnings of the Apache Menace . . .*, NMHR, vol. 16, p. 5 implies as early as 1608.

21. Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, American Series III, pt. I, pp. 91-92; Mendoza in Bolton, *Spanish Exploration . . .*, pp. 316-317, 322-323.

recorded activity indicates a gradual spread to the south and west.

Up to the time of Kino's travels beginning in 1694 the region northeast of the San Pedro River, later occupied by the Apaches, was apparently uninhabited or sparsely so. In 1539 Fray Marcos noted a "despoblado" from near the San Pedro-Gila River junction to the Cibola (Zuni) villages.²² If his report is not to be accepted we still have the same evidence in 1540 as Coronado and his chroniclers mentioned the same thing.²³ Fray Marcos' report made record of actual contacts between the Sobaipuri and the Zuni.²⁴ In 1668 Bernardo Gruber, a German trader, went into New Mexico from Sonora with a pack train.²⁵ To do so he would have had to pass through what we now know as Apacheria. When Kino entered southern Arizona he recorded the Sobaipuri in 1691 along the San Pedro River and remarked that prior to the Pueblo Rebellion of 1680 these Indians traded with the Spanish in New Mexico.²⁶ Velarde in 1716 wrote that the Sobaipuri formerly traded with the Hopi, but due to the recent occupation of the pass on the Gila by other Indians, they were unable to resume such trade.²⁷ Thus these early sources denote a late occupation by Indians between the Sobaipuri and New Mexico on the Arizona side of the line, probably post-1680.

Actually it was not the Apache who were first mentioned east of the San Pedro as Bolton earlier thought.²⁸ Kino referred to the Indians of that area as the Jocomé in 1696

22. de Niza in G. P. Hammond & A. Rey, *Narratives of the Coronado Expedition*, pp. 74-75 (vol. 2, Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540-1940, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque).

23. Castañeda in Winship, *The Coronado Expedition* . . . , pp. 482, 487, 517. Also Coronado and Relación del Suceso in *Ibid.*, pp. 555, 572.

24. de Niza in Adolph F. Bandelier, *Contributions to the History of the Southwestern Portion of the United States*, American Series V, p. 153 (Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, Cambridge, 1890); Percy M. Baldwin, "Fray Marcos de Niza and his Discovery of the Seven Cities of Cibola," *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. I, p. 226; de Niza in Hammond & Rey, *Narratives* . . . , pp. 68-74.

25. C. W. Hackett, *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Viscaya and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, vol. 3, pp. 271, 273-277. (Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1937)

26. Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir* . . . , vol 2, p. 257.

27. Velarde in Wylls, Padre Luis Velarde's Relación . . . , NMHR., vol. 6, p. 139. He calls them Apache in one place and Nijora (Yavapai) in another.

28. Bolton, *Spanish Exploration* . . . , p. 382.

along with the Jano in 1697. The first record of the Apache in this region was a mention, but not an actual observation, of an Apache group in 1697 when Kino stated that Apacheria was north of the Gila after turning west from the mouth of the San Pedro River to proceed down the Gila. First actual evidence of Apaches was noted in 1698 at Santa Cruz de Quiburi on the San Pedro, not north of the Gila.²⁹ Bandelier has indicated that the Jano and Suma, who were allies of the Apache and who were also mentioned at this same time, were late arrivals in southeastern Arizona from northwestern Chihuahua, having begun their spread after 1684 when they went in league together.³⁰

Sauer obtained information in the Parral Archives which further substantiates a late arrival for the Jano in southeastern Arizona. He noted the Jano ranged in southwestern New Mexico while the Jcome were in southeastern Arizona and that both, according to Vetancourt in 1686, spoke the same language. At this time they were friendly with the Pima, the latter having given them some land to plant in the Quiburi area near Fairbank, Arizona, according to Sauer. In his treatment of these groups Sauer considered the possibility that the Jano and Jcome may have been Athapascans, not Uto-Aztecs.³¹ Kroeber, in reviewing Sauer's evidence placed these two tribes tentatively in the Uto-Aztecan language group, deciding against the Athapaskan.³² When one considers that the Piman speakers gave these neighbors land, it appears more logical that such an arrangement would be made more readily with kindred Uto-Aztecan speakers and not with Athapascans *who were not farmers*.

The Apaches, after their entry into Chihuahua, with the aid of their companions in league, either displaced or absorbed the Jcome in southeastern Arizona. Opler has remarked on the similarity of the Mescalero of southwestern New Mexico and Chiricahua Apache of southeastern Ari-

29. Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir* . . . , vol. 1, pp. 165, 169, 172, 180.

30. Bandelier, *Final Report* . . . , American Series III, pt. I, p. 114.

31. Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages* . . . , pp. 75, 81.

32. A. L. Kroeber, *Uto-Aztecan Languages of Mexico*, Ibero-Americana, No. 8, p. 15 (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1934).

zona as opposed to the Western Apache.³³ This is in accord with the documented spread of the Apaches from southwestern New Mexico into Chihuahua and then into southeastern Arizona. Perhaps the group that moved south into Mexico and later into Arizona was an offshoot of the Mescaleros that evolved into the Chiricahua Apache.

North of the Gila there were no Apaches. From 1583 to 1605 Espejo, Farfan, and Oñate described a group on the middle Verde River which has been accepted as the Yavapai.³⁴ Kino in 1710 included the Yavapai in his references to Apacheria as he stated this area was to the north and northeast of the Pima and extended northwest to the Colorado River.³⁵ His use of the term Apache was loose in this respect as he never once recorded actually seeing one Apache north of the Gila. Moreover, in 1716, Velarde referred to the Nijora, a *Yuman-speaking group*, north and east of the Pima,³⁶ probably the southeastern Yavapai as indicated by other documentary sources noted in a discussion below. In 1743 Keler attempted to reach the Hopi villages from the Gila area and was forced to turn back due to an attack by a group of Indians who spoke a language different from that of the Pima,³⁷ probably the Yavapai. In 1744 Sedelmayr, in 1776 Garcés, and prior to 1767 Pfefferkorn noted the Yavapai north of the Gila Pimas.³⁸ Thus even at this late date the Apache had not yet reached the Pima from the north or the northeast.

The stronghold of the southern Apaches from 1680 until

33. Marvin E. Opler, *A Note on the Cultural Affiliations of Northern Mexican Nomads*, p. 702 (vol. 87, *American Anthropologist*, Menasha).

34. See footnote 78.

35. Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, p. 198 and vol. 2, p. 256.

36. Velarde in Wyllys, "Padre Luis Velarde's *Relación . . .*," *NMHR.*, vol. 6, p.117.

37. Venegas in A. P. Whipple, *Reports of Explorations and Surveys to Ascertain the most Practicable and Economical Route for a Railroad from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean*, vol. 3, pt. 3, p. 116 (83rd Congress, 2nd session, Executive Document no. 91): Sedelmayr in Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación . . .*, p. 112 said Apaches fell on him.

38. Sedelmayr in *Ibid.*, pp. 104, 113; Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 445, 451, 460-462; Pfefferkorn in Treutlein, *Pfefferkorn's Description . . .*, vol. XII, p. 29. One must bear in mind that Pfefferkorn left the area in 1787 at which time the Jesuits were expelled and he wrote later in 1794.

the 1700's was in the headwaters of the Gila in New Mexico. From 1698 through 1744 actual observations by Kino, Velarde, and Sedelmayr located the Apaches on the Gila above the mouth of the San Pedro River and also to the east of the San Pedro.³⁹ The Rudo Ensayo in 1762 and Pfefferkorn reaffirm this distribution, the former being rather explicit, stating the Rio de Assumption was formed by two rivers (Verde and Salt) taking rise in an extensive ridge of mountains *in the land of the Apaches on the other side of the Gila further toward the east.*⁴⁰

The very use of the term Gila Apaches has led to many additional misconceptions. They did not frequent the middle Gila, only the region east of the mouth of the San Pedro and the San Pedro River itself. Velarde in 1716 and Garcés in 1776 pointed out that those groups north of the middle Gila were Yuman speakers. Garcés stated they were Yavapai *often referred to as Apaches by the Spanish.*⁴¹ As an illustration of such one finds Marin, in 1693, referring to the Yavapai of the Middle Verde as Apaches Cruzados, and Escalante in 1775 stating that south of the Hopi were Apaches "who do not attack as the rest do."⁴² Historic Pima legends refer to the Apache of the north in prehistoric times. This had been interpreted as meaning the same as the historic Apache when actually they were simply referring to enemies of the north, the prehistoric Sinagua. Kino, as above noted, may have been partially to blame for misinterpretation along these lines since he referred to the Apache between the Pima and the Hopi.

It is interesting to note that the Southeastern Yavapai use the term Apache in referring to themselves meaning

39. Velarde in Wyllys, "Padre Luis Velarde's *Relación . . .*" NMHR, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 139; Sedelmayr in Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación . . .*, p. 118; Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, pp. 172, 198-199 and vol. 2, p. 256.

40. Pfefferkorn in Treutlein, *Pfefferkorn's Description . . .*, p. 144; Guiteras, *Rudo Ensayo*, ACHS, vol. 5, p. 129.

41. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, p. 208; Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, American Series III, pt. 1, pp. 113-114 quotes Garcés "que es lo mismo que Apaches."

42. Hackett, *Historical Documents . . .*, vol. 2, p. 395; Escalante to Mendinueta in Alfred B. Thomas, ed., *Forgotten Frontiers . . .*, 1777-87, p. 151 (Norman, Oklahoma, 1932).

"persons." They called their eastern Apache enemies "Awache" as did the Northeastern and Western Yavapai.⁴³ Bandelier also commented on the use of Apache. He considered Garcés' use of the term Yavapai, remarking it was in a sense similar to the present use of Apache where it is attached to names of tribes entirely distinct from the Apache, as Apache-Mohave, Apache-Yuma, and Tonto-Apache.⁴⁴ Apparently, on the basis of such misapplication of the term, Thomas placed the west boundary of the Apache as far as the Colorado River.⁴⁵ Additional evidence concerning this phase of the problem is considered below in the discussions of the Yavapai.

In east-central Arizona the earliest references to Apache groups are relatively late. In the general campaign of 1747 in the San Francisco River area down to the Gila River, Indians were encountered and called Apaches. Other were recorded in the White Mountains first in 1808.⁴⁶ Some historians have attempted to place the Apache in this region prior to 1747. Bandelier was under the impression that the Apache were occupying the region between the Sobaipuri and the Zunis in Fray Marcos' and Coronado's day, stating "although they were there, as was subsequently ascertained: and this is accounted for by the numerous escort of Indians which accompanied both him and the negro Estevan."⁴⁷ Aside from this statement he gives no evidence to support his view. Fray Marcos' account, if it is accepted, indicates the Indians voluntarily went along and no mention for purposes of protection is noted. Coronado's chroniclers referred to the area as a despoblado, perhaps only a relative term.

The only indication of a group between the Sobaipuri and the Zuni prior to 1747 that may have been the Apache, was Castañeda's reference to a group near the mouth of the

43. E. W. Gifford, *The Southeastern Yavapai*, p. 181 (vol. 29, University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Berkeley, 1932); E. W. Gifford, *Northeastern and Western Yavapai Myths*, pp. 252-253 (vol. 34, University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Berkeley, 1933).

44. Adolph F. Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, American Series IV, pt. II, p. 379.

45. Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers . . .*, p. 1.

46. Escalante to Mendinueta in *Ibid.*, p. 154; Rabal in Ralph E. Twitchell, *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, vol. 2, p. 219 (Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, 1914); and Salcedo in *Ibid.*, p. 489.

47. Bandelier, *Contributions . . .*, American Series V, p. 175.

San Pedro who were the most barbarous they had encountered, who lived in separate huts and who hunted for food.⁴⁸ Sauer considered these as Apache.⁴⁹ They may well have been Jocomes or even northern Sobaipuri as Mange stated in the 1690's that he and Kino encountered 4 Sobaipuri villages near the Gila with a total of 500 souls living in 130 houses of poles and reeds in the form of dome and gallery,⁵⁰ and Velarde in 1716 noted that the Sobaipuri lived in settlements in the winter and in single huts in the summer.⁵¹ Since Coronado came through this region before winter, since these "barbarous" Indians were not mentioned as being specifically different from the others on the San Pedro through which Coronado had just previously passed, since Kino did distinguish between the northern and southern Sobaipuri which would allow for a difference in culture as implied by Castañeda, and Mange described crude huts used by the Sobaipuri, the weight of the evidence is against the Apache. If this 1540 observation was an Apache group, we must assume the Sobaipuri drove them out soon after as the sources already mentioned recorded trade through this area with New Mexico prior to the Pueblo Rebellion and do not specifically mention the Apache here until 1698.

There is considerable confusion in regard to the Tontos who were first reported as Coyotereros or Mescaleros in the Pinal Mountains in 1788.⁵² In 1799 Pedro de Nava wrote a letter requesting information on the so-called Tontos and Prietos; Apaches Coyotereros (alias Tonto, alias del Pinal) near the presidio of Tucson.⁵³ Barreiro's Ojeada also refers to them as Tontos or Coyotereros in 1828.⁵⁴ It is after this date that the confusion arises. Gifford reported that the Tonto were Athapascan and were first united in 1874 under Chali-

48. Castañeda in Hammond & Rey, *Narratives . . .*, p. 252; and in Winship, *The Coronado Expedition*, p. 516.

49. Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages . . .*, p. 53.

50. Mange in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, p. 171.

51. Velarde in Wyllys, "Padre Luis Velarde's *Relación . . .*," NMHR, vol. 6, p. 184.

52. Zuñiga in George P. Hammond, "The Zuñiga Journal, Tucson to Santa Fe," NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW, vol. 6, p. 63.

53. Twitchell, *Spanish Archives . . .*, vol. 2, p. 395.

54. Lansing Bloom, tr., "Barreiro's Ojeada," NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW, vol. 3, p. 174.

pan which is an Athapascan name and he further remarked that many Tontos were part Yavapai in blood and bilingual in speech.⁵⁵ However, Gatschet indicated earlier that the Tontos were not Apache, but a Yuman-speaking group.⁵⁶ On this basis Bandelier surmised that the Tonto as Yavapai were later absorbed by the Apache.⁵⁷ Of interest in this respect is the fact that the Yavapai (first called Cruzados by Oñate in 1598) told Corbusier in 1886 that it was the Yavapai (northeastern) who had cane crosses,⁵⁸ and later in 1936 they informed Gifford that it was the Tonto, not the Yavapai, who wore cane crosses.⁵⁹ Historical references to the Yavapai of the middle Verde Valley and to the west from the 1860's on refer to them as Apache-Mohave or Mohave-Apache, indicating along with the above that the northeastern Yavapai possibly became pretty well mixed with other groups in the 1800's.⁶⁰ Modern reservation Yavapai state they can best converse with the Mohave, the Yuma less so, and the Tonto with difficulty. The fact that the Yavapai refer to their eastern Apache neighbors as "Awache" meaning enemy, and to the Tonto as "Awakaya" meaning sticky or dirty people might indicate mixture in the latter's case. The latter are more politely referred to as "Ahawa" meaning something like enemy.⁶¹

In recent years Goodwin placed the northern Tonto on the middle Verde from Camp Verde north to Flagstaff and the southern Tonto east of the Verde below Clear Creek to the Salt River. He further remarked that the three west-

55. Gifford, *The Southeastern Yavapai*, p. 181; Gifford, *Northeastern and Western Yavapai*, p. 253.

56. Gatschet in George M. Wheeler, *Annual Report upon the Geographical Exploration and Surveys west of the 100th Meridian, etc.*, p. 184 (Washington, 1875) "With the Apache dialects and that of the Tonto Apaches, who call themselves Gohuns, and belong to the Yuma stock, I found . . ." See also Gatschet in Putnam, *Report upon U. S. Geographical Surveys . . .*, vol. 7, pp. 406, 414, 415.

57. Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, American Series III, pt. I, pp. 102, 113-114; Bandelier, *Final Report . . .*, American Series IV, pt. II, p. 467.

58. William F. Corbusier, "The Apache-Yumas and Apache-Mohaves," *American Antiquarian*, no. 8, p. 337.

59. Gifford, *Northeastern and Western Yavapai*, p. 319.

60. Corbusier, "The Apache-Yumas and Apache-Mohaves," *American Antiquarian*, no. 8, pp. 276-284 and 325-339; Edmund Wells, *Argonaut Tales* (Hitchcock Co., 1927); Hodge notes the name Tonto was applied to the Tulkepaia (Yavapai) and Apache in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer, . . .*, p. 458.

61. Gifford, *The Southeastern Yavapai*, p. 181; Gifford, *Northeastern and Western Yavapai*, pp. 252-253.

ernmost bands of the northern Tonto intermingled with the Northeastern Yavapai who shared the region with them.⁶²

The Tonto are first referred to as Yavapai people and later as a mixture of Yavapai and Apache. In recent times the name Tonto has been taken to refer to an Apache group. Since we definitely know that in 1716 a Yuman-speaking group was northeast of the Pima and have no definite reference to the Apache in the Tonto lands until the Tonto are first mentioned, we must assume that the Apache entry from the east into this section of Arizona occurred late in the 1700's.

There is other evidence to support this supposition. The Yabipais Tejua (Yavapai near the Yumas at the mouth of the Gila River) told Garcés in 1776 that among their friends were certain Yavapai of the east who were enemies of the Spanish whom these friends feared because many Spanish entered their lands.⁶³ If this statement refers to true Yavapai it can only allude to the southeastern Yavapai being effected at that date by various Spanish expeditions into eastern Arizona. The Spanish were attempting to open a road from Santa Fe to Sonora as well as to eliminate the true Apache menace. The drives were the general campaign of 1747 which entered the San Francisco River area, the Zuni expedition of 1754 into the upper Gila country, and the expeditions into the area during Garcés' day from Janos and Fronteras. These expeditions indicate along with Velarde's observation of 1716 that the San Francisco River area to the Gila River may have been Yavapai country. Miera, who had been in the 1747 campaign, told Escalante that near the mouth of the San Francisco River was an "Apache" rancheria *where corn was raised*. In 1754 Barreira noted various "Apaches" in the same area *who did not roam about or have horses, but who had much corn*. In 1775 Escalante wrote at Zuni that the Hopi were bounded on the south and southwest by Apache "who live on this side (north) of the Gila and who do not attack as the rest do." Echegaria in 1788 and Zuñiga, who came through this general vicinity in 1795, mentioned no specific rancheria, but did note hostile

62. Grenville Goodwin, *The Social Divisions and Economic Life of the Western Apaches*, pp. 55-56 (vol. 37, *American Anthropologist*, Menasha, 1935).

63. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 209-210.

Indians and smoke signals.⁶⁴ Perhaps between 1754 and 1788 these corn-raising, quite possibly Yavapai, who did not roam about on horses, moved west in the face of the incoming Apache who were being pushed into the area by the Spanish from all directions except north and west, as well as by the Comanche from the east. Perhaps continued Apache inroads to the west between 1754 and 1788 brought about the first mixture of Apache and Yavapai groups.

The lack of any reference to Indians in the despoblado between the San Pedro River and the Zuni villages in 1540, and the definite presence of Indians there in 1699 and 1716 (the latter reference definitely applying to Yavapai) brings up another point bearing on the Yavapai and Apache. Since Benavides recorded the Apache de Gila to the east of this region in the headwaters of the Gila in 1630, a group that did some farming in contrast to a true Apache group to the east of them, the Perrillo Apache with their dog and travois who at this time were strict nomads,⁶⁵ it appears quite likely that the Apache de Gila may have been Yavapai or were Apache who picked up farming from their western Yavapai neighbors. On this basis, the Yavapai entry into this general region might well be set back, from Velarde's observation of a Yuman-speaking group in 1716, to 1630, and probably into prehistoric times.

Final evidence which bears on a recent Apache entry into the region is found in Zuñiga's diary of 1788. He stated that Zuni was menaced by the Coyotero Apaches of the Pinals to the south (Yavapai-Apache?) who were there (at Zuni) called Mescaleros (Escalante's designation of the Yavapai south of the Hopi) and to the north by Apaches of the San Francisco and Mogollon Ranges. "*They have penetrated inland pursued by our arms. They are called Gileños there.*"⁶⁶

64. Escalante to Mendieta in Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers* . . . , pp. 12, 155-156; Rabal in Twitchell, *Spanish Archives* . . . , vol. 2, p. 219; Zuñiga in Hammond, *The Zuñiga Journal* . . . , NMHR, vol. 6, pp. 34,59,61.

65. Hodge, *Benavides' Revised Memorial*, pp. 81-84.

66. Hammond, *The Zuñiga Journal* . . . , NMHR, vol. 6, p. 63. As early as 1744 Sedelmayr suggested placing forts on the Gila River, at Terrenate and Coro de Guache on the south, and at Janos in the east. This general plan was later followed resulting in a northern move "inland" by the Apache. See Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación* , p. 113.

No matter how one interprets the evidence, there is no possible manner by which the Apache can be placed anywhere near the Hohokam of the Gila-Salt River areas in pre-historic times. They were first noted in 1540 as Querechos and were restricted to the eastern half of New Mexico, east of the Rio Grande, at least prior to 1583 as both Rodriguez and Espejo found a long stretch along the river uninhabited in their travels. The term Querecho, like Chichimeco, was haphazardly applied to other groups in northwestern New Mexico and northeastern Arizona. After Spanish settlement on the Rio Grande, the word "Apache" replaced Querecho and again the new term was applied to miscellaneous non-related groups. By 1630 the Apache de Perrillo had crossed to the west side of the Rio Grande. After the adoption of the horse by these Apache around 1660, they became more mobile and by the time of the Pueblo Rebellion of 1680 there was a concentration in southwestern New Mexico. By 1684 some of this group reached Chihuahua where they began their absorption of the Jano and Suma groups. Spanish retaliation in Chihuahua forced these Apaches into southeastern Arizona by 1698 where they apparently absorbed the Jocome and by 1700 they had entered Sonora.

Campaigns by the Spanish from Zuni in 1747 and 1754, as well as others from Chihuahua and the highway along the Rio Grande, had the effect of forcing these Apaches of southwestern New Mexico and southeastern Arizona toward the west where by 1762 they in turn forced the Sobaipuri out of the San Pedro west into the Santa Cruz Valley. Retaliation from this southeastern area up to 1780, as well as coordinated efforts from Janos and Fronteras, caused the southern Apache to move back into the Chiricahua Range and also into the San Francisco River area for refuge. In the latter region, about 1788, the Apache probably dislodged the above-discussed Yuman (probably Yavapai) groups, first observed here in 1716, who moved west. Additional thrusts from the south by the Spanish from 1780 to 1784 and later, kept the Apache moving toward the north which resulted in a Navaho-Gila Apache alliance in 1784. Even as

late as 1780 and 1786 the major part of the Apache attacks were still from New Mexico.⁶⁷

The above noted Navaho relations carried the Apache through the White Mountain region from 1784 on but they were not recorded as living in the area until 1808 by the Spanish.⁶⁸ It appears that Apache relations with the Navaho as well as with the Yavapai undoubtedly effected the culture of these westernmost Apache sufficiently to bring about a cultural difference which now distinguishes them from the Southern Apache whose culture was probably influenced by contacts with the Uto-Aztecan groups of northern Mexico and southern Arizona. Probably the late 18th Century Navaho-Gila Apache relations evolved out of a combined movement toward one another. Farmer has indicated the Navaho began spreading over northwestern New Mexico after 1600 and by 1750 had moved west to Canyon de Chelly, Arizona, and south of Mt. Taylor in New Mexico. Bourke has indicated that many Western Apache and Navaho clans can be correlated further indicating close relations.⁶⁹ This implies considerable Navaho influence which apparently had its origin post-1780 A.D. Interestingly enough, the Chiricahua designation of the Western Apache as Biniedine, meaning "people with no sense," seemingly first appears in 1834.⁷⁰ This is 35 years after the first use of Tonto (fool) by the Spanish to designate a Western Apache group. There is no indication who actually used the term "fool" first, but both uses post-date the 1784 Navaho-Gila Apache alliance and the eviction of the Yavapai from eastern Arizona. If such a designation referred to a group in the Western Apache area or to the Western Apache as a group, it is strange that it, or some other name, does not appear before

67. Twitchell, *Spanish Archives* . . . , vol 2, p. 300; Alfred B. Thomas, ed., "Governor Mendinueta's Proposals for the Defense of New Mexico, 1772-1778," *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. 6, p. 37; Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers* . . . , pp. 45-46, 197; Navarro in *Ibid.*, p. 186 and Medino and Ugarte, pp. 359-360.

68. Letter of Nemesio Salcedo of 1809, #1936, Santa Fe Archive. "Coyotero Indians who inhabit the Pinal, Tabano and White Mountains, on the frontier of Sonora." See also his letter of 1808, #2142, wherein he states the Indians of the Pinals are intermediate to those of the White and Tabano Mountains.

69. Malcolm F. Farmer, *The Growth of Navaho Culture*, San Diego Museum Bulletin, vol 6, p. 14; J. G. Bourke, "Notes on the Gentile Organization of the Apache of Arizona." *Journal of American Folklore*, vol 3, pp. 111-114.

70. Jose A. de Escudero, *Noticias estadísticas del estado de Chihuahua*, p. 212 (Mexico, 1834).

1780 if such a group was in existence prior to that time. The weight of the evidence indicates a beginning of an Apache-Navaho mixture around 1780 wherein apparently the Navaho dominated to some extent, in this area closer to their home, over the scattered Apache groups driven north by the Spanish. The increasing Comanche pressure from the east on the Navaho in the early and middle 1700's also coincides with the first appearance of the Navaho in Arizona in the Hopi area and the region southwest of Zuni where they met the Apache.

On the basis of an Apache legend which relates of contacts with stone house dwellers it has been thought by some that such indicated the Western Apache were in this area at a date early enough to make contact with the prehistoric pueblo groups of the area. This legend is a record of the Tzekinne variously interpreted as "people of the rocks" or "stone house people." This group was composed of descendants of Apache and Sobaipuri people, the latter having been captured when the Apache drove the Sobaipuri out of Aravaipa Canyon in the early 1800's.⁷¹ The group and legend evolved out of historic fact, not a prehistoric event.

The present Western Apache area was described as a despoblado in 1540. First actual record of Apache here was in 1805. Between these two dates reference is made to two groups possibly living in the area concerned. These groups, the Cipias and Ypotlapiguas, first are mentioned in 1632 in Spanish documents and as yet neither have been identified. Most authorities have placed them in northern Sonora apparently on the basis of Orozco y Berra's reference of 1860 to the Potlapigua in the Babispe Valley of Sonora. However, the earliest sources to refer to these groups, 1632-1648, locate them south and west of Zuni.⁷²

Custodio Manso stated he discovered the Ypotlapiguas in

71. Bourke, *Notes on Apache Mythology*, p. 114.

72. Bandelier, *Final Report* . . . , Amer. Series IV, pt. II, p. 381; Frank H. Cushing, *Outlines of Zuni Creation Myths*, p. 328 (13th Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, 1896); Fewkes, *Two Summers' Work* . . . , p. 23; France V. Scholes, "The Supply Service of the New Mexican Missions in the Seventeenth Century," *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. 5, pp. 189-190; France V. Scholes, "Problems in the Early Ecclesiastical History of New Mexico," *Ibid.*, vol. 7, pp. 47-66; France V. Scholes, "Church and State in New Mexico, 1618-50," *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 288, 301-302; Hodge, *History of Hawikuh*, pp. 91, 98, 123-124; Hodge, et al . . . *Benavides Revised Memorial* . . . , p. 80.

1632 and that they lived next to the Cipias south and west of Zuni. For several years the friars had been interested in these groups. In 1638 some friars were selected to go to the Ypotlapigua country with Fray Antonio Artega as commissary of the group by appointment from Fray Juan de Salas, Custodio. In the spring of 1638 Governor Rosas led these friars and some soldiers to the area. On arrival among them, it was said the Governor forced the Ypotlapiguas to bring in feathers and hides, robbed them, and threatened to burn their villages with the result the Indians fled to the mountains. Perea made an investigation of the expedition.

In 1645, while Custodio, Manso sent 4 friars to preach to the Ypotlapiguas who lived near the Cipias. Following this effort the Jesuits visited them and a controversy over their jurisdiction was started. In 1699 Mange mentioned the Potlapiguas in association with the Opatas of north-eastern Sonora.

Sauer believed that Orozco y Berra's designation of these as a Piman group was incorrect. Noting that Mange had recorded Franciscan activity among the Ypotlapigua, he tentatively placed them in northwestern Chihuahua in the Franciscan domain thus removing them from Jesuit Sonora. He concluded the name may be Concho.⁷³

As to the Cipias, the first mention of them is concerned with Fray Francisco Letrado who learned of them while among the Zunis who told him they were to the west. Letrado applied to go to these Indians, but was refused and Fray Martin de Arvide was sent instead. He went in 1632 and on February 27, 5 days out of Zuni, he was killed in his camp by Zunis. These Cipias supposedly lived in northern Sonora.

In 1634 Benavides made a brief reference to the Zipios. In 1638 and 1645 they were referred to as living near the Ypotlapiguas. In 1686 Fray Alonso de Posadas said the Cipias lived north of Sonora where they were pressed upon by the Apache.⁷⁴ In the late 1800's the Zunis told Cushing

73. Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages* . . . , p. 51.

74. C. F. Duro, 1882, pp. 62-63. An earlier edition in *Documentos para la historia de Mexico*, 3rd Series, Mexico, 1856, pp. 220-221 gives the author's name as Fray Alonso de Paredes, rather than Posadas.

that the Ciplias were a people who lived far to the southwest on the headwaters of the Salt River. They called them Tsi-piakwe (kwe=people) meaning "people of the coarse hanging hair." Since the Yavapai wore their hair long in contrast to the Zuni, they (the Zuni) may have selected this trait in referring to the Ciplias who might well have been Yavapai. Bandelier, on the basis of Cushing's information, placed the Ciplias in Arizona south of the Hopi saying the Zuni had lost track of them completely. According to Cushing the Zuni stated the Ciplia were exterminated by the Apache soon after the attempted visit of Arivide.

The Hopi informed Fewkes that according to the Zuni the Ciplia lived between them and Zuni and also that the Zuni called a ruin midway between Awatobi and Zuni Tcipiya. On this basis Fewkes placed the Ciplia at the mouth of Cheylon Fork west of Zuni.

Several factors stand out that must be considered in analyzing the situation. First, it must be kept in mind that Sonora and the region to the south was Jesuit domain. The southern Opata of Sonora (modern geographic limits) were first reached in 1622 by Padre Olinano. The west central section of Sonora was not reached by the Jesuits until after 1630, and the north section was untouched until Kino's entry of the 1690's. To the east in Chihuahua, the Franciscans began moving west toward the Sonora line about 1650 when the Sumas of the area, bordering on Babispe, were being brought into the fold.⁷⁵ So even the eastern border of Sonora was not reached until 1650, this being 18 years after the Ypotlapigua and Ciplia are first mentioned. Thus, a Sonoran location is not possible in this area as far as the Franciscan domain is concerned.

Also to be considered is the fact that the north boundary of Sonora was never established in the 1600's. The people of Santa Fe referred to the region to the southwest as Sonora. In addition, New Mexico was under the Franciscan order and everything to the west was considered within their domain. Moreover, all expeditions went into the Ciplia and

⁷⁵. Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages . . .*, pp. 46-47, 70-71.

Ypotlapigua country from New Mexico, not Chihuahua, and all personnel concerned were from New Mexico. The statement that the Cipias were pressed on by the Apache in 1686 and a similar remark by the Zunis in the late 1800's, intimating that they were exterminated by the Apache in the middle or late 1600's, certainly suggests that the Cipia were non-Apache.

The above points indicate an Arizona location rather than Sonoran. Mange, a late source, is the only one who gives a possible true Sonoran location and then only to the Ypotlapiguas who by this date (1699) may have been forced south and west by Apache pressure into Sonora. The statements of the Zuni and Posadas pertaining to Apache pressure on the Cipia correlates with the Apache pressure building up in southwestern New Mexico in the headwaters of the Gila at that time, the late 1600's. Such had not effected Sonora until the beginning of the 18th Century. Moreover, the Zuni located the Cipia in what Cushing took to mean the headwaters of the Salt River. On the basis of the foregoing discussions on the Apache and Yavapai, it appears that the people of the coarse hanging hair, the non-Apachean Cipias, were probably Yavapai people living in the southeastern section of the Yavapai country in the headwaters of the Salt and Gila Rivers near another possible Yavapai group, the 1630 mention of the Apache de Gila. The Ypotlapiguas probably were a more southern group since Mange gives them a Sonoran location and the Franciscans and Jesuits, who had a controversy over them, bordered one another's domains only in northern Mexico at this early date. Thus, the Cipias, the only possible group in the Western Apache region between 1540 and 1805, cannot be considered as Apache, much less Navaho.

To return to the Apache proper, the derivation of the word Apache is problematical. Several authorities have proposed various explanations regarding its origin. (See Hodge and Bandelier who indicate Yuman and/or a possible Zuni origin.) Another possibility is presented here along lines suggested by Harrington.⁷⁶

76. John P. Harrington, *Southern Peripheral Athapaskan Origins, Divisions, and*

The words "Apades" and "Apiches" occur first in documents pertaining to Oñate's explorations. He and several of his henchmen went through Yuman-speaking areas (Yavapai) in 1598, 1599, 1604-05. Perhaps they picked up the Yavapai word "Apache" meaning "persons" directly from them or even before this indirectly from some other group. One of two possibilities present themselves. Either documents exist pertaining to these groups which make use of the term Apache prior to 1598, or the word was known to the Spanish prior to its use in literature at this date. The use first of "Apiche" or "Apade" implies either a misprint in copying or a misspelling of the word "Apache," both of which suggest prior use.

Yavapai

Reference is now made to the Yuman tribes. It is interesting to note that Yavapai legends appear to indicate a relatively long period of occupation in Arizona. The Southeastern Yavapai claim origin in the San Francisco Mountains at Flagstaff, and relate of a later split from the Northeastern Yavapai in the middle Verde Valley of central Arizona after which they moved south. Gifford stated his evidence tends to show the Yavapai were not in the Verde Valley much over 400 years. The Western Yavapai claim origin in the middle Verde Valley at Montezuma Well or in the Red Rock country later splitting and moving southwest from the Northeastern Yavapai.⁷⁷ Thus, the Yavapai near the Gila claim origin north of their present habitat and recount of a split in the Verde Valley all of which indicates a general move to the south.

Historically Espejo first encountered the Yavapai in the middle Verde Valley in 1583 where they were also noted by Farfan, Escobar, Zaldivar, and Oñate from 1598 up through

Migrations, p. 518 (vol. 100, Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1940).

[See also, Barbara Aitken, *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. 26, pp. 334-35 (October, 1951) Ed.]

77. Gifford, *The Southeastern Yavapai*, pp. 243, 247; Gifford, *Northeastern and Western Yavapai Myths*, pp. 349, 403-404; Gifford, *Northeastern and Western Yavapai*, p. 251.

1605.⁷⁸ In 1700 Kino remarked that entry to the Hopi was difficult from Pimería as the Pima were "on very unfriendly terms with the Apaches who live between."⁷⁹ These were undoubtedly the Yavapai who Kino always referred to as Apache north of the Gila. In 1716, Velarde mentioned the Nijores, locating them between the Gila and Colorado Rivers to the northeast of Pima country. He further remarked that they were Yuman-speaking people with whom the Pima fought, and that north of them were the Cruciferos to whom the cross was a sacred sign. This source thus definitely discards the possibility of Apache north of the Gila by recording Yuman speakers in the area. A map in the Genaro García collection places the Nijores at the headwaters of the San Francisco River, perhaps based on Humboldt's map of 1804.⁸⁰ From 1583 to 1605 Espejo, and others who entered the middle Verde, described the native custom of wearing crosses on the forehead for which Oñate named the Yavapai "Cruzados." Thus, Velarde's remarks indicate the Cruciferos were the Northeastern Yavapai and the Nijores were the Southeastern group. The legendary split must then of necessity have occurred before 1716 as at that time the Southeastern Yavapai were fighting with the Sobai-puri, and the latter had sufficient knowledge of the Northeastern Yavapai further north to distinguish them from their enemies, the Nijores or Southeastern Yavapais.

In 1746 Sedelmayr wrote that further up in 37 degrees, north of the Cocomaricopa, were the Nijores who spoke the Yuman language and with whom the Cocomaricopa had friendly relations.⁸¹ On his trip to the Cocomaricopa on the Gila in 1744 he decided to go further west. From the villages below the Gila-Salt junction he proceeded more or less west-north-west to the Colorado River passing near what was

78. Luxán in Hammond & Rey, *The Espejo Expedition . . .*, pp. 106-107; Espejo in Bolton, *Spanish Exploration . . .*, p. 187; Zarate in Lummis, *Fray Zarate Salmeron's Relación*, p. 182; Bolton, *Spanish Exploration . . .*, pp. 83, 187, 270; George P. Hammond, "Don Juan de Oñate and the Founding of New Mexico," *NEW MEXICO HISTORICAL REVIEW*, vol. 1, pp. 460, 470.

79. Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, p. 237.

80. Reproduced in H. B. Carroll & J. V. Haggard, *Three New Mexico Chronicles (Quivira Society, Albuquerque, 1942)*.

81. Sedelmayr in Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación . . .*, pp. 108, 110.

later the southern border of the Western Yavapai country. However, he did not mention the presence of any Indians along that route.⁸² In 1758 Venegas recorded the Cocomaricopa at war with the Nijores, the prisoners being sold to the Pima.⁸³ In 1774 Garcés attempted to reach the Nifora but couldn't due to Pima hostilities with them.⁸⁴ In 1776 he called the group north of the Cocomaricopa Yabipais Tejua, and stated that they knew only one Cocomaricopa village further remarking that both the Pima and Cocomaricopa fought them. Font placed the Yavapai north of the Gila on his map.⁸⁵ In 1794 Pfefferkorn referred to the group north of the Cocomaricopa in 1767 as Nichoras who extended from the northerly side of the Gila to the Sierra Azul. He also remarked that the Cocomaricopa were constantly at war with them.⁸⁶

Thus, the name first given, Nijores, referred to the Southeastern Yavapai, and other forms—Nifora, Noragua, Nichora—were later used to designate Yavapai groups, probably all Southeastern Yavapai. Pfefferkorn in 1794 used the term Nichora, after Garcés' 1776 designation of Yabipais Tejua, probably due to the fact that he left the area in 1767 with the expulsion of the Jesuits and wrote his report at a later date. Garcés also employed the name Apache for the Yavajai. He stated ". . . there arrived here [in the Yuma area] 9 Indians whose nation they here call Yabipais Tejua, and we Apaches." He also noted the Pima called the Yabipais Taros or Nifores, the Mohave called them Yavapais, and the Spanish called them Apache. "All those whom I designate by the name Yabipais are in reality Apaches."⁸⁷

On the basis of the above discussion, the Southeastern Yavapai as a threat to the prehistoric Hohokam might be discounted since their presence is not recorded until possibly as early as 1630 in the form of the Gila Apache (or Cipias in

82. Sedelmayr in *Ibid.*, pp. 108, 110.

83. Venegas in Whipple, *Reports of Explorations and Surveys . . .*, p. 116.

84. Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, p. 45.

85. *Ibid.*, pp. 436, 452. Font map on frontispiece.

86. Pfefferkorn, *Description of the Landscape of Sonora . . .*, vol. 1, p. 6; Trentlein, *Pfefferkorn's Description of Sonora*, p. 29.

87. Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 402, 417, 432, 445, 446, 457.

1632) and definitely by 1716 in the vicinity of the upper Gila some distance northeast of the Pima. Moreover, it is above passing interest to note that the Yavapai were on friendly relations with the Cocomaricopa in 1744, but in 1758 they were being taken as prisoners, and in 1767 and 1774 they were constantly at war with the Pima. This coincides with the aforementioned possible Southeastern Yavapai withdrawal from the San Francisco River area between 1754 and 1788 due to Apache pressure, and perhaps represents the beginning of Southeastern Yavapai incursions to the west on Cocomaricopa territory. The fact that they knew only one Cocomaricopa village in 1776 adds further to this belief that they were newcomers to the more western region.

Maricopa

The Maricopa are the last Yuman group to be considered. When first recorded as the Cocomaricopa by Kino in 1694, the Pima told him this group lived on the lower Gila, on the Rio Colorado and Rio Azul (Bill Williams River).⁸⁸ Spier remarked in his studies of this same area that Maricopa, Kaveltcadom, and Halchidoma cultures were essentially alike prior to their mixture in the 1800's, thus supporting Kino's statement with modern ethnological studies.⁸⁹ In 1744 Sedelmayr reported that the Cocomaricopa on the lower Gila were the same as those on the Colorado River as far up as the Rio Azul.⁹⁰ After Garcés' travels in 1776, the term Cocomaricopa was restricted to the group on the Gila below the junction of the Gila and Salt Rivers. The other groups to the west and north on the Colorado River were referred to as Jalchedun (Halchidhoma).⁹¹

Often heard is the statement that the Maricopa recently came up the Gila from the Colorado River. Emory suggested that the Maricopa moved gradually from the Gulf of California to their present location in juxtaposition with the Pimas. He stated that Carson found them as late as the year

88. Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, p. 128.

89. Leslie Spier, *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River*, preface p. ix (University of Chicago Press, 1938).

90. Sedelmayr in Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación . . .*, p. 108. This statement he may have borrowed from Kino as he did from Mange concerning Pima legends.

91. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 443-444.

1826 at the mouth of the Gila, and that Dr. Anderson, who passed from Sonora to California in 1828, found them on the Gila a few miles west of the Pima.⁹² The observation of Carson, as Spier points out, was a probable Halchidhoma flight to Sonora.⁹³ Gatschet stated the Maricopa had been in their habitat for centuries,⁹⁴ and Kino's explorations indicate that as the Cocomaricopa they had been on the Gila River since 1694.

It is with these Cocomaricopa on the Gila that we have additional reference to the Pima. I have found no specific mention or discussion of this situation in modern literature. Kino was the first to give us evidence of this material. He reported that a Yuman-speaking Cocomaricopa fiscal, who came to visit him while among the Pima, understood Pima. From him Kino, in 1694, obtained the information that some of his people knew both languages well.⁹⁵ He also stated "there are always among them (Cocomaricopa) many Pimas and others who speak the Pima language well."⁹⁶ On another occasion Kino noted that the Pima language was extensively spoken among the Cocomaricopa, Yuma and Quiquima.⁹⁷ In 1698 he noted on the occasion of an Opa and Cocomaricopa visit to San Andrés on the Gila that their dress, features and language were distinct from the Pima though they were connected by marriage with the Pima.⁹⁸ In 1699 he reported 50 Pima, Yuma, Opa, and Cocomaricopa were gathered at the Gila-Colorado River junction, and he named this spot San Pedro. In 1700 he referred to the Pima, Opa, and Cocomaricopa governors from near the Rio Colorado.⁹⁹ In 1701 he arrived at San Pedro where "Yumas and Pima natives mingled, welcome us."¹⁰⁰ There

92. W. H. Emory, *Notes of a Military Reconnaissance from Fort Leavenworth, in Missouri, to San Diego, in California, etc.*, p. 89 (30th Congress, 1st session, Senate Executive Document no. 7, Executive Document no. 41, Washington, 1948); see also A. P. Whipple, T. Eubank, and W. W. Turner, *Pacific Railroad Reports*, vol. 3, pp. 101-102 (1855).

93. Spier, *Yuman Tribes . . .*, p. 89.

94. Gatschet in Putnam, *Report . . .*, vol. 7, p. 415.

95. Kino in Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir . . .*, vol. 1, p. 128.

96: *Ibid.*, p. 246.

97. *Ibid.*, p. 480.

98. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

99. *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 235.

100. *Ibid.*, pp. 811-812.

is no doubt, on the basis of the above information, that the use of the Pima language, as well as the observation of the Pima in various localities, covers a wider area than we have been accustomed to think.

In 1744 Sedelmayr noted the distance to the first Cocomaricopa village west of the Gila-Salt junction and along the bend of the Gila to the north was 12 leagues. He remarked that this rancharia was inhabited also by Pima and that most of them, as well as the Cocomaricopa, understood both languages. Moreover, the Pima here built their own individual huts, not the large house of the Cocomaricopa.¹⁰¹ Anza in 1774 reported that in the vicinity of Gila Bend were some Papago or Pima who left their own country due to drought. Diaz also noted some Pima in the easternmost village.¹⁰² Spier pointed out that Kino's names for the eastern Cocomaricopa villages were Piman in form, not Yuman.¹⁰³ Garcés stated in 1776 that those at Opasoitac, the eastern village, were clothed like the Pima but spoke Yuman. Further down stream, at San Bernardino, Gracés limited the west end of the Cocomaricopa nation and observed that though this was the end of the "Opa or Cocomaricopa nation . . . some of them are found further down river."¹⁰⁴ The above remarks are further indication of Piman living to the west of the Gila-Salt junction among the eastern Cocomaricopa villages.

A review of the literature reveals that those villages containing Pimas on the eastern end of the Cocomaricopa territory are those referred to by the Spanish as Opas. Spier considered the Opa in his work on the Gila River Yuman tribes. He placed the Maricopa above Gila Bend prior to 1800, and the Kaveltcadom below the bend extending half-way down to the Colorado River. He concludes that the modern Maricopa are made up of a nucleus of Maricopa with small additions of Kaveltcadom and Halchidhoma joining them after the early 1800's.¹⁰⁵ If such is true, it is

101. Sedelmayr in Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación . . .*, pp. 104, 107-109.

102. Anza and Diaz in Spier, *Yuman Tribes . . .*, pp. 31-32.

103. *Ibid.*, p. 28

104. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 116, 122, 123.

105. *Ibid.*, preface, p. ix.

difficult to understand why the name of the eastern group, the Opa, was not retained. As it is, the modern tribe is designated as Maricopa, derived from Cocomaricopa.

With the knowledge that Piman groups were actually living in the eastern villages, a point that Spier did not stress, another interpretation seems plausible. The use of the name Opa is encountered in early documented sources from 1694 through 1794. Kino used it first and such is seen on the N de Fer map of 1700 below the Gila-Salt junction and east of the Cocomaricopa who were located from Gila Bend west.¹⁰⁶ Both Garcés and Anza implied a separation as they reported population estimates for villages above and below Gila Bend.¹⁰⁷ The Rudo Ensayo used the term Opa and definitely separates it from the Cocomaricopa by a list of tribes as “. . . the Oopas, the Cocomaricopas . . .”¹⁰⁸ Garcés placed the Opas east of the Cocomaricopas and described a visit to the Cocomaricopa of Agua Caliente from where he journeyed east to the rancherias of the Opas.¹⁰⁰ Anza, though he noted Opasoitac as a Cocomaricopa village, also said that in traveling up the Gila he came to the Cocomaricopa “after which came the Opas and Pimas.”¹¹⁰ Diaz reported that Opasoitac, another village one league to the west, and another 5 leagues further west were Opa.¹¹¹ Font also referred to those in the west at Agua Caliente as Cocomaricopa and those in the east at Opasoitac as Opas.¹¹² Garcés referred to Opasoitac as a settlement of the Opas at Gila Bend.¹¹³ Anza was the only one to refer to Opasoitac as the last Cocomaricopa upstream, though he did state both Opas and Cocomaricopa lived there.¹¹⁴

The chief point of confusion as Spier has pointed out seems to rest with these same sources. Font referred to the Opa and Cocomaricopa saying these were one and the same

106. I. A. Leonard, *Mercurio Volante* (Quivira Society, Los Angeles, 1932).

107. Spier, *Yuman Tribes* . . . , p. 3.

108. Guiteras, *Rudo Ensayo*, p. 181.

109. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer* . . . , pp. 436-437.

110. Anza in Spier, *Yuman Tribes* . . . , p. 36.

111. Diaz in *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

112. Font in *Ibid.*, p. 37.

113. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer* . . . , p. 113.

114. Anza in Spier, *Yuman Tribes* . . . , pp. 31-32.

distinguished only by the district they inhabited. Garcés said "of the Opa nation, or Cocomaricopa, which is the same," and "Opa or Cocomaricopa nation which is all one." Anza made the same statement.¹¹⁵ It will be noted, however, that these statements are restricted to the late explorers just prior to the discontinuance of the use of the term Opa.

On the basis of the above, it appears that the term Cocomaricopa was usually applied to the group extending from about Agua Caliente east to Gila Bend and, on occasions in later days, to the inhabitants from Gila Bend east toward the Gila-Salt River junction. These latter, where apparent Pima mixture occurred, were more often referred to as the Opa in the earlier days. After Garcés' time the eastern group was no longer differentiated. The fact remains that the majority of the Spanish did attempt to distinguish between two groups on the Gila, whatever the basis may have been. The Pima elements in the eastern group may have brought this about.

The word Cocomaricopa, for which Spier's informants could not offer any satisfactory etymology, was first used by Pimas on the Gila when informing Kino of these people down stream. Underhill has recently worked out a possible derivation of the word in the Piman language as follows: *Kokomarik* meaning "flat place" plus *aw-pap* (the last "p" barely audible) meaning "stranger" or "enemy"; thus, "flat place strangers" or "flat place enemies."¹¹⁶ Also similar is a name Lumholtz listed for a Papago village: *Kukomalik* which he interpreted as *Ku*, "large" or "big," and *Komalik*, "mountain crest."¹¹⁷ With the addition of *aw-pap* one could derive "people of the big mountain crest"—perhaps the Estrella Mountains.

Apparently the Spanish used the entire name correctly for the Yuman groups below Gila Bend and the word Opa to distinguish those above the bend. It is interesting to note

115. Garcés in Coues, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer . . .*, pp. 113-114, 123; Anza and Font in Spier, *Yuman Tribes . . .*, pp. 38, 37.

116. I am grateful to Dr. Ruth Underhill for volunteering this information and granting me permission to use it.

117. C. Lumholtz, *New Trails in Mexico*, p. 381 (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1912).

the Pima use of this word when Font recorded a legend in which he stated one group of Pima in prehistoric times lived down the Gila as far as the Opa.¹¹⁸

Thus, in summary it appears possible that the Cocomaricopa in late prehistoric times were represented by the entire span of Yuman-speaking villages on the Gila, the eastern portion of which became mixed with Piman peoples and traits (possibly around 1400 A.D.) which led to the designation of Opa in early historic times. After the mixture became a blend, the Opa were no longer recognizable as a unit, and by 1776 this designation was dropped. This is the only group that offers any evidence of possible prehistoric contact with the Hohokam-Sinagua of the Gila Basin. However, if such a contact did occur at 1400 A.D., there is nothing to indicate that these Cocomaricopa had any part in causing the abandonment of the Gila Basin around 1400. Since Pima-Maricopa relations were so close in early historic times, it appears more likely that the Cocomaricopa sheltered some of the refugees who left the Gila Basin area about 1400 A.D. Apparently we must look to another group entering the Gila Basin from the east, as legend implies, to explain satisfactorily the abandonment of the large villages of the Salt River Valley and Gila Basin.

Sobaipuri

There is only one possibility of an eastern archaeological entry into the Gila Basin, and that is from the San Pedro or Santa Cruz areas. Several factors, archaeologically and historically, appear to support the probability of such a thrust which in turn would account for Piman mixture with the eastern Cocomaricopa a short distance to the west. We know that archaeological trade existed between the east and the Gila Basin by the presence of Tanque Verde Red-on-brown pottery in the latter region during the Classic period and by the occurrence of two flexed burials in trash-mounds at Casa Grande, this type of interment being common in the Santa Cruz and San Pedro regions. Out of this

118. Fewkes, *Casa Grande* . . . , p. 44.

Classic period contact (1300-1400 A.D.) between the two groups perhaps friction developed causing those in the east to sack Casa Grande as legend indicates. There is the possibility that 1300 A.D. inroads by the Gila-Salt group up the Gila River and down the Santa Cruz (where they introduced and established their Classic period culture) in combination with the post-1300 A.D. Chihuahuan drive from the south-east contributed toward a 1400 A.D. dispersal out of the San Pedro-Santa Cruz area resulting in a western extension into the Gila.

A comparison of archaeological and historical observations tends to support such a possibility, regardless of the cause. De Niza and Coronado noted the San Pedro was heavily populated in 1539 and 1540.¹¹⁹ Kino noted the same in the 1690's and also mentioned concentrations on the Santa Cruz and a relatively sparse population on the Gila.¹²⁰ The early explorers noted "cabin" houses in 1540 and "dome and gallery" houses in the 1690's on the San Pedro,¹²¹ and round houses among the Gila Pima.¹²² Also recorded was bottomland irrigation among the Sobaipuri as well as among the Gila Pima.¹²³ The Sobaipuri continued the practice of the prehistoric groups of their region by disposing of their dead in a flexed position up into recent times.¹²⁴ That there was mixture, to some extent, with those on the Gila as late as the 1850's or 1860's is indicated by this type of burial occurring along with extended inhumations.¹²⁵ In 1864 and

119. Hammond & Rey, *Narratives* . . . , pp. 71, 207, 284.

120. Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir* . . . , vol. 1, pp. 170-174. Mange's figures —2,000 plus on the San Pedro, 6,000 plus on the Santa Cruz, and 730 around Casa Grande. Kino in his report, p. 186, indicates the same relative proportions.

121. Hammond & Rey, *Narratives* . . . , p. 252. Castañeda said they lived by hunting, in *rancherías* without permanent settlements. See also Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir* . . . , vol. 1, p. 171; Winship, *The Coronado Expedition* . . . , p. 516.

122. Ives, *Sedelmayr's Relación* . . . , p. 107. Sedelmayr says individual huts. See Pfefferkorn, *Description of the Landscape of Sonora* . . . , vol. 2, pp. 116-117, or translation in F. Scantling, *Excavations at the Jackrabbit Ruin, Papago Indian Reservation, Arizona*, p. 16 (University of Arizona Master Thesis, Ms., 1940), or in Treutlein, *Pfefferkorn's Description of Sonora*, p. 192.

123. Fewkes, *Casa Grande* . . . , p. 37; Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir* . . . , pp. 170-172.

124. G. L. Boundey, *Tumacacori National Monument Report in Southwestern Monuments Reports*, p. 42 (National Park Service, January, 1934, mimeographed).

125. C. R. Steen, "Notes on some 19th Century Pima Burials," (*Kiva*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 6-10, Arizona State Museum, Tucson).

in 1902 and 1903 observations of flexed burial ceremonies were described on the Gila.¹²⁶

The above circumstances seem to indicate that the presence of round houses, flexed burials, and bottomland irrigation among the Gila Pima may be due to an eastern influx, post-1400 A.D. in time. Aside from the use of round houses, no one of these traits could have been derived from the Yavapai. The lack of rectangular houses, the occasional use of cremation, and the absence of terrace irrigation among the historic Gila Pima, traits which were common to the Hohokam-Sinagua of the same region in prehistoric times, appears to be explained most simply by the above postulated eastern influx dominating the culture of the remnant Hohokam-Sinagua blend. Some caution concerning the proportions of eastern and western Piman traits must be considered here since the Apache drove the Sobaipuri west in 1762. Continuing pressure may have brought about further western moves up to as late as 1800 as Spier indicates.¹²⁷ These additional entries, if they occurred over a period of 40 years, would have heavily influenced the proportion of eastern and western traits in the Gila Basin after 1762. Excavation only can clarify the situation.

126. A. Woodward, "Historical Notes on the Pima," *The Masterkey*, vol. 28, pp. 144-146 (Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, 1949).

127. Spier, *Yuman Tribes* . . . , p. 1.