

his at the time he was president, and had done much damage to his property and to that of his friends, he feared that Don Fernando Cortes would want to pay him back in the same way, or worse. So he decided to establish the town of Culiacan there and to go back with the other men, without doing anything more. After his return from this expedition, he settled at Jalisco, where the city of Compostela is situated, and at Tonala, which is called Guadalajara, and now this is the New Kingdom of Galicia. The guide they had, who was called Tejo, died about this time.¹¹

Footn. *Castañeda, Winship's Translation, Bu. Eth. Ann. XIV, 473.

It should be noted here that, by royal order, the pretentious name of Mayor España (Greater Spain) was replaced by that of Nueva Galicia (New Galicia).¹²

Footn. Bancroft XV, p. 39.

Guzman's original plan ~~was~~ seems to have been to explore the province of Ciguatan and the Pacific Coast regions adjoining, and thence to cross the sierras to the interior region of present Durango and Chihuahua, ^{and so} "up through the country between the two seas, following the northern direction," ~~to~~ the way to the Seven Cities of Cibola, as described by ^{the return of Cortes} the Indian Tejo. But the bursting of "the Amazon bubble" of Ciguatan, ^{the death} of Tejo, and the difficulty of crossing the sierras and the barren interior, ^{together with his illness}, threw an effectual damper on Guzman's aspirations for far northern conquest; and his attempt to discover the Seven Cities was abandoned.

Nevertheless, even after his return to Jalisco, he ~~gave~~ a portion of his attention to ^{directing} ~~explorations~~ ^{by his subordinates} beyond the frontier of Culiacan. With these, in the main, we are not here concerned, but in order to understand better, when we shall come to it, the geography of that important antecedent of Coronado's expedition, the 1539 summer journey of Fray Marcos de Niza, it will be well here to notice ~~one of them~~ somewhat particularly ^{one of them} the earliest exploration that extended any considerable distance northward through the Pacific Coast region, and that has left to us a fairly well recorded itinerary. I refer to the expedition led by ^{Captain} Diego de Guzman in 1533, by order of Nuño de Guzman, from Culiacan northward to the aboriginal town of Navamo, on the Yaqui River: an undertaking of which we have the captain's own narrative, condensed by Bancroft in Volume I (pp. 55, 56) of his History of the North Mexican States and Texas, where are added notes from an anonymous narrative supposed to relate to the same ~~expedition~~ ^{Southern Historical} ~~expedition~~.

*According to a Spanish clause quoted in Bancroft's Contributions (p. 43), from the *Proceso del Marques*. Diego de Guzman was of this expedition "captain chosen and appointed by the very grand Señor Nuño de Guzman."

Starting to Guadalajara, the Yaqui River
was reached as early as 1532, and hardly
a year later, in September, descended to the
sea. (See *Historical* ¹²⁴.)

This "expedition under Diego

"Of the two documents used by Bancroft, that writer says (l. c., page 55), "The first is the Relacion de lo que yo Diego de Guzman he descubierto en la costa del Mar del Sur por S. M. y por el Ilmo Sr Nuñez de Guzman, in Florida, Col. Doc., 95-103, and in Pacheco, Col. Doc., XV.

325-38. The second is [Nuño de] Guzman, 2^{da} Rel. Anón. The first is an official diary giving all details of dates, distances, pueblos, and minor events, written during the trip and sent to the authorities; while the other is a more general account, omitting most details, naming only the principal rivers, and paying more attention to the general features of the country and the customs of the natives, apparently written from memory some time after the occurrence of the events described. ~~It is supposed to have been written by one of the same expedition, either Diego de Guzman or Nuño de Guzman.~~ A. F. W. Budge (Handbook Am. Indians, Pt. 2, p. 992) seems to think that the Segunda Relacion Anónima relates to a northern excursion of Nuño de Guzman in 1531, and Bancroft cites Herrera as giving "an account evidently taken from the anonymous relation, under the date of 1532", yet considers the latter to refer to Diego de Guzman's exploration for ~~the~~ ^{the} Nuño de Guzman in 1533. I regret that I have not been able to consult the original Spanish documents that relate to the matter; but in the absence of these, I can not help feeling that Diego de Guzman would hardly have ~~intended~~ ^{intended} ~~used~~ ^{used}, in the title of his official diary, the words, "that which I Diego de Guzman have discovered....for the Most Illustrious Sr Nuño de Guzman", if Nuño ^{himself} ~~had~~ ^{himself} ~~made~~ ^{made} a northern tour of exploration and discovery some two years earlier. In the Proceso del Marqués del Valle y Nuño de Guzman, Nuño claims to have taken possession of the "Rio Santiago"; ~~in~~ this ~~he~~ ^{he} ~~would~~ ^{can} be evidently ~~must~~ ^{have} ~~done~~ ^{done} ~~done~~ ^{done} through ^{Captain} Diego de Guzman in 1533, since ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~latter's~~ ^{latter's} ~~own~~ ^{own} diary shows that this river was discovered and ~~named~~ ^{named} "Santiago" ~~in~~ the latter year.

de Guzman left Culiacan early in July 1533, by the same route that Samaniego had followed, and a week later", or hence presumably at a distance of ~~about~~ ^{39th 35 leagues, reached the river now called Sinaloa, which had been named "Rio Petatlan" in 1531 by Samaniego, and which had marked the northern limit of the latter's exploration. Captain Guzman also calls this river "Rio Petatlan", and his route probably reached it at a town of Petatlan about 4 leagues up-stream from present Bamo, the immigrant town settled a few years later, through Cabeza de Vaca's influence, by Pimas Bajos from Corazones and south-central Sonora; ^{not more than} or ^{present} 2 or 3 leagues below the ^{present} town of Sinaloa, through which passes ~~the~~ highway to the north." Following}

*In his Contributions (p. 65), Bandelier gives, concerning the Cabeza de Vaca party and the Lower Pima Indians who had accompanied it from Corazones and south-central Sonora, an extract in the Spanish from Ribas' Historia (p. 22), ~~in~~ of which the following is a substantial, if somewhat free, translation: "Thus did Cabeza de Vaca and his companions, being grateful to them for having been faithful company and ~~good~~ guard on so perilous a journey. It was arranged to give them a location where they should settle and have planting-grounds; and on the river of Petatlan, four leagues (down stream) from where to-day is the village [of Petatlan], ~~they~~ on this site they formed a pueblo called Bamos, which persists to-day, ~~which~~ and is of tongue and nation belonging a hundred leagues farther up in the country." Hence the

village of Petatlan was still in existence down at least to about 1645, the year when Ribas' work was published, and was both on a stream formerly called "rio de Petatlan" and on the same stream as Bamoá. Now Bamoá yet survives, and is on the stream that to-day is called "Rio Sinaloa"; the "rio de Petatlan" was therefore the present Rio Sinaloa, and the Pueblo de Petatlan was on this Rio Sinaloa, apparently not more than ^{a league or} ~~two or three~~ leagues below the present town of Sinaloa. On the page cited, Bandelier refers to Bamoá as "near the Rio del Fuerte", which, by the passage he quotes from Ribas, would put the village of Petatlan also near Rio del Fuerte; but Ribas' statement—to the effect that the village of Petatlan was on the Rio de Petatlan, and that Bamoá was 4 leagues farther down the same stream—enables us positively to ~~identify~~ connect the village and identify the river of Petatlan with the stream now called Rio Sinaloa, a stream 30 or 35 leagues from Culiacan, and that could be reached thence by "a week" of travel, confirming the official diary of Diego de Guzman's expedition of 1533. In view of these mutually supporting and highly authoritative testimonies of 1533 and 1645, it is curious that we should have also ~~two~~ statements which, if they were the only evidence, would lead us to identify the Rio de Petatlan with Rio Mocorito. ~~Identifying the Rio de Petatlan with Rio Mocorito.~~ These are by Castañeda and Jaramillo, old pioneers of San Miguel de Culiacan, both of whom, as members of Coronado's expedition, had marched northward over the coast-province road in 1540, and returned over it in 1542. About 1560 or '62, in his narrative of Coronado's expedition, Castañeda wrote, "Petatlan is 20 leagues from Culiacan." According to Jaramillo, who wrote at about the same period, it was about 4 days' journey—which is the equivalent of 20 leagues—from the valley of Culiacan to the river of Petatlan, and about 3 days' journey from the river of Petatlan to that of Sinaloa. Now 20 leagues is the distance from Culiacan to Rio Mocorito. ~~the river of Petatlan~~ ~~reached the Rio Mocorito~~ It ~~is~~ ~~reached~~ ~~which is estimated to be about 90 leagues from~~ ~~where they head of the Rio Sinaloa".~~ ~~With the Rio Sinaloa and~~ ~~called Rio Mocorito~~ ~~in accordance with the beginning of Castañeda~~ ~~and Jaramillo's 24 Mocorito, for the distance from Culiacan to~~ ~~the Rio Sinaloa is about 100 leagues diminished by 20 for the Rio Mocorito.~~ It should be observed that the waters of the Rio Mocorito, although discharging into the gulf independently, form with those of the Rio Sinaloa a strongly converging stream-group; and that the Mocorito, being a relatively short stream, the northward road passes only an upper part of it, whose course tends directly toward the Sinaloa (the Rio de Petatlan of Diego de Guzman), of which, in middle decades of the sixteenth century, it may have been supposed to be a tributary, so that—by Jaramillo—reaching the southern branch of the stream that we now call Mocorito, was perhaps to be reaching a part of the Rio de Petatlan. Castañeda also could hardly have had the settlements on the short Rio Mocorito alone in mind when he spoke of "Petatlan", for he added by way of explanation, "Petatlan is a settlement of houses.....collected into villages extending along a river from the mountains to the sea." The truth perhaps is, that the "province" which Castañeda defines as that of Petatlan included the valleys of the two rivers now called Sinaloa and Mocorito, the principal settlements being on the former, which had upon it the native villages of Petatlan and (from 1536 onward) the immigrant town of Bamoá; while the province of Petatlan began and its first river was reached at the Mocorito, 20 leagues from Culiacan. That it took the party of Diego de Guzman 7 days to reach Petatlan, and that of Coronado and Jaramillo but 4, is not necessarily—under this hypothesis—inconsistent; since Guzman may have reckoned to the main river and town of Petatlan province, while Jaramillo and Castañeda ~~reached the Rio Mocorito~~ reckoned to the beginning (as reached from the Spanish settlements) or first river of the province. Jaramillo's "three days"—that is, 15 leagues—for the distance from "a river called Petatlan (or

Petatlan)" to his "river called Cinaloa", equals, in terms of modern geography, either the distance from Rio Mocorito to Rio Sinaloa, or that from Rio Sinaloa to Rio del Fuerte; but as there is reason for believing that the Rio Sinaloa (or "Cinaloa") of Jaramillo's day was that upper part of Rio del Fuerte which is near the present towns of Fuerte and Tshueco, where the river forks, and where it flows through the fertile region which in 1533 Diego de Guzman called "the province of Sinaloa", and as Jaramillo, ~~in the early part of his career~~ may have extended the name ~~given~~ to the lower part of the river also (called river of Tamotchala by Guzman), and used "Cinaloa" for the name of Rio del Fuerte as a whole, his "three days" was probably his estimate of the distance between the rivers to-day called Sinaloa and del Fuerte. ~~These in~~

Fray Marcos' Descubrimiento ~~in the early part of his career~~ contains a clause which in some sense identifies "Petatlan" with Rio del Fuerte; this is quoted in the Spanish on page 114 of Bandelier's Contributions, and may be translated, "and with another great number of Indians of Petatlan, who might be fifty leagues from the said village." The "said village" was San Miguel de Culiacan; 50 leagues from which was Rio del Fuerte. The explanation of this probably is, that the province of Petatlan, in its widest acceptation, extended from Rio Mocorito to a part of the river del Fuerte, ~~and~~ below Guzman's "province of Sinaloa", and that it was in this acceptation that Fray Marcos ~~had~~ used the term "Petatlan."

down the stream for 5 leagues, he "heard of a town called Tamotchala on a river toward the north. Francisco Velasquez with twenty men was sent in advance and took the town by assault, the inhabitants for the most part jumping into the river and escaping. The rest of the army coming up, remained here eight days and explored the river down to a village ^[Ahoma] called Oremy." Subsequently finding "but a small store of supplies, though the banks were well dotted with petate huts, the army marched up the river nearly to the sierra, and early in August arrived in the province of Sinaloa, which has given its name to the modern state. Here the dwellings were better, and large fields of maize, in the milk at the time, gave promise of plentiful supplies. The natives at first ran away in fright, but presently ~~were~~ returned with

^{Footnote} *Spelled "Hoomi" (Ho-o-mi) by Zapata, who in 1678 reported the ~~new~~ mission of "Asuncion Hoomi", with a population of 626, situated 8 leagues (between 22 and 23 miles) southwest of ~~the~~ San Gerónimo Mochicagui (Mochicavi). (See Bancroft XV, 240.) This is the ~~same~~ position of Ahoma.

green reeds in their hands which they placed on the ground in token of friendship and submission; yet they were suspected of treacherous intent and closely watched." While his headquarters were at Tamotchala, this "stream of Tamotchala" was named "Santiago" by Diego de Guzman, according to whose estimate it was 12 leagues from ~~Santiago (and the river)~~ "Rio Petatlan", though 20 according to the anonymous narrative. An intermediate distance is given in the *Proceso del Marqués del Valle y Núñez de Guzman*, which informs us (as per Bancroft) that on "July 28th, formal possession was taken of the Rio Santiago 15 l. from the Petatlan."* This would make the Tamotchala-Santiago about 50 leagues from Culiacan; Bancroft's identification of it with the later Rio del Fuerte, is therefore undoubtedly correct. One of the shorter intervals between the two rivers ~~is about 12 leagues~~ is about 12 leagues; ~~the distance between the two rivers~~

*This "15 leagues" is confirmed by Jaramillo (Winship's *Transia...*, Ru. 8th. Ann. XIV, 584), whose "three days", for the journey from his "river called Pateatlan" to his "river called Cinaloa", is its equivalent.

~~the "12" and "20" may be estimates of distances from a common point, the crossing of the river "Petatlan": one writer reckoning to "Tamotchala", where they reached the river "Santiago", and the other reckoning to the more important "province of Sinaloa" (probably the region of present Fuerte, farther up-stream, near the junction of two rivers where they left it, "guided by a Sinaloa native."~~

"The 17th of September crossing the river in balsas, the Spaniards resumed their march" northward, and at 30 leagues* from the river Tamotchala, Santiago, or Fuerte, and after

~~The *Proceso* (which speaks for Núñez de Guzman) through one of his officers, Bancroft ~~says~~ says "40 leagues"; but in Diego de Guzman's official diary and the *Segunda Relacion Anónima*, written by participants in the expedition, both say "30", which is about the actual distance on the present main thoroughfare. The "40" perhaps included the 8 or 10 leagues of up-valley travel from Tamotchala, where they reached the river "Santiago", to "province of Sinaloa", where they ~~left~~ left it.~~

~~they had stopped three days~~ ^{with} ~~the way~~, at a "town of Teocomo on a small stream" which, Bancroft ^{can} ~~not~~ only identify ~~with~~ with "the Rio Alamos of modern maps", they "arrived on the 24th at the Rio Mayo," ~~which~~ (called "Mayomo" by the commander), "where they found plenty of dry maize and salt, and spent five days killing their hogs which had been driven up to this point. They named the river San Miguel," and according to the *Proceso del Marqués*, says Bancroft, "Possession was taken, September 29th, of the San Miguel." From the San Miguel-Mayo, they "went on in search of a town of Novamo, possibly the origin

of the tribal name Novome, on a large river; crossed the river the 4th of October, and halted at the town of Yaquimi* on its northern

Footnote "The Cahita plural of "Yaqui."

bank, where they remained seventeen days, but were unable to overcome the fears of the natives, who had fled at their approach. This ~~wide~~ river, the largest they had crossed, the present Yaqui, was christened San Francisco."

According to Bancroft, "Captain Guzman makes the distance between the Mayo and Yaqui 18 leagues." It is probable that Rio Mayo was crossed near the mouth of its affluent, Rio Cedros, where ~~it was also to be~~ crossed by Fray Marcos de Niza, ~~in 1540~~ returning from Cibola in 1539, and by Coronado, northward bound, in 1540. Eighteen leagues is about the present traveling distance from that crossing to Buena Vista, where an old and important (apparently the ~~most important~~ chief one) crosses the Rio Yaqui. As Buena Vista is situated on the Yaqui, "on its northern bank", ~~in~~ ^{on} ~~in~~ fertile land and where the stream is crossed by a natural ~~middle~~ highway, there can be ^{little} question of its having been the position of an aboriginal town long before the coming of Diego de Guzman. In view of these facts, I believe that Buena Vista is the spot where Diego de Guzman reached the town and river of the Yaquimi in 1533. I am aware that Buena Vista has by recent writers been regarded as a town of the Low Pimas, as at a later day perhaps it was, at least in part; but the evidence that Buena Vista was the ancient town of Yaquimi, of the first third of the sixteenth century, is so strong ~~as to indicate that~~ any occupancy of the place by Low Pimas was secondary, and was either added to that by the Yaquis, or — if the latter withdrew to the other Yaqui towns down the river — was substituted for it. That even as early as 1533 there was some reason —possibly increased later by the fact that, as the main crossing-place, Yaquimi was much frequented by the Spaniards — why this aboriginal town should be abandoned by the proud-spirited Yaquis, so noted for their love of independence, appears from the following incident related by Bancroft. "The anonymous narrative of these events, followed by Herrera and others, describes an encounter with the natives of this town, only vaguely alluded to by Guzman. The Yaquis appeared in large numbers, and forbade the Spaniards to pass a line indicated on the ground. Guzman explained his peaceful intentions and asked for food. The Indians offered to bring food if the Spaniards would first allow themselves and their horses to be tied. Guzman did not accede to this modest request, but ordered his men to charge with the battle-cry of Santiago, and the Yaquis were routed after a ^{wounded} desperate struggle, in which two Spaniards and twelve horses were