

KINO, HISTORIAN'S HISTORIAN

by
ERNEST J. BURRUS, S.J.

Father Burrus, long a student of Kino's career, has published extensively on the history of the Spanish missions of Mexico. He is a member of the Jesuit Historical Institute in Rome and of its American Section at St. Louis University.

SOME MONTHS AGO, when I suggested in letters to several friends in Tucson that the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of Eusebio Francisco Kino — March 15, 1961 — not be allowed to go by unobserved or uncommemorated, I quickly realized from the enthusiastic and heartwarming response that Tucson is very much "Kino country" and that in this city there are many true *aficionados* of the great frontiersman and Christian pioneer. Father Kino's work as explorer and missionary, as a maker of borderlands history, is well known here. On this occasion, therefore, it may be appropriate to emphasize a lesser known aspect of Kino's remarkable career: his work as a recorder of the history which he did so much to make.*

The highlights of his life are quickly recalled. Eusebio Francisco Kino was born on August 15, 1645, in Segno, a small town near the historic city of Trent in northern Italy. His ancestral stock and native language were Italian; his education and broad culture were obtained in Austria and southern Germany. He entered the Jesuit Order in Bavaria on November 20, 1665. Seven letters written in his hand to the Jesuit General, in which he volunteered for the foreign missions, are still extant. Although he set out from Germany for the Indies early

*This paper was presented at the second annual Arizona Historical Convention, jointly sponsored in Tucson by the University of Arizona and the Arizona Pioneers' Historical Society, on March 17, 1961.

are a few that might be predicated on the proposed projects which Kino recorded in his reports and diaries. Thus, if the towns he envisioned really had been established with sufficient settlers as he insisted, and if the missions had been founded when and where he suggested, would the Apaches have been the frontier scourge that they proved to be still the very turn of our century? Because some of his ideas were put into effect, Baja California was settled and Pimería Alta was given a minimum of missionaries — and both areas provided the springboard for the settlement of Upper California. The modern historian of the borderlands well might wonder, then, what would have been the outcome had Kino's entire program become a reality.

But it is exclusively with Kino's work as a writer of history that this paper will deal, and here four questions arise spontaneously. They are these: (1) What writings in particular merit for Kino the title of historian? (2) Was he accurate, did he possess and exercise a critical spirit, and what were the sources on which he drew? (3) Did certain factors — such as the missionary's need for effective propaganda and the composition of all his key writings in a language not natively his own — detract from his historical impartiality or from his ability to express his thoughts so that subsequent historians could understand unmistakably and unequivocally what he was trying to say? And (4) Are there important manuscripts still to be discovered which may confirm my opinion that Kino deserves to be called "historian's historian?"



From among all of Kino's writings, two may be said to convey most accurately and most adequately both the historical data he wished to set down and the key ideas which inspired his life's work. These are the biography of his fellow missionary, Francisco Javier Saeta, prepared in 1695-96,² and his *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta*.³

²The original manuscript in Kino's hand is preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional, Mexico City (Tomo 1118, f. 139-98). The full title is given by Bolton in *Rim of Christendom*, 602; its first words are *Inocente, apostólica y gloriosa muerta del venerable Padre Francisco Xavier Saeta de la Compañía de Jesús*. It is cited hereinafter as *Saeta*. Bolton did not know the whereabouts of the biography of Saeta when he edited Kino's *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta* for publication in 1919, but found it in time for inclusion of numerous references in *Rim of Christendom*.

³Discovered by Bolton in 1907 and published in English as *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta* (2 vols., Cleveland, 1919) with the editor's expert commentary. A Spanish text, under the title *Las Misiones de Sonora y Arizona*, appeared in 1922 as a publication of

in 1678, it was not until the beginning of 1681 that he was able to obtain passage for Mexico. When he reached Mexico City in the early summer of 1681, two topics were very much the part of every conversation: the Pueblo revolt in New Mexico during the previous September and the impending Atondo expedition to California. At first Kino was very much taken up with the California enterprise, but early in 1686 it was halted by a counter order diverting every *centavo* to Spanish coffers depleted by the recurrent wars in Europe. Undismayed, Kino now turned his attention to the far frontier of Pimería in the northern interior. This remote region was the field of his intense activity from early 1687 until his death on the night of March 15, 1711, in the Sonoran pueblo of Santa María Magdalena, where he had gone for the dedication of a new mission church.¹

This strenuous doer of deeds was also a scrupulous recorder of them. Kino's writings were numerous and deal with a considerable variety of subjects: astronomy, cartography, ethnology, geography, linguistics, and political, social and ecclesiastical history. He furnishes indispensable biographical data on himself and numerous key figures civil, military, and religious. To appreciate the wealth of information his writings furnish, the modern historian has only to try to prescind from them in discussing such personalities as Admiral Atondo, Governor Jironza, Captains Manje and Bernal, or Fathers Juan Ugarte, Salvatierra, Francisco María Piccolo and Saeta. Without his reports, the Indian chiefs whom Kino immortalized for their loyalty and bravery would be completely unknown to us. How unwaveringly he defends the Pimas against false accusations in a statement that he copied over and signed many times! On each of the numerous tribes of Baja California and Pimería what a wealth of detail he gives, how he penetrates and reveals their character and distinctive traits! How, then, to write on the history of Lower California without Kino's contribution? How to deal adequately with the late seventeenth or early eighteenth centuries in Pimería Alta without studying his works?

If ever a monograph is written on the effective mission methods employed in northern Mexico during those decisive years, it will have to draw heavily on Kino's words. Among the fascinating "ifs" of history

¹The most complete and scholarly biography of Kino is Herbert E. Bolton, *Rim of Christendom* (New York, 1936). This volume was reprinted in 1960 by Russell and Russell, New York.

His life of Saeta was Kino's only serious attempt at biography, and after the *Historical Memoir* is his longest composition. The biography taught Kino a decisive lesson in historical method: the preservation and use of primary sources. A considerable part of the book is given to reproduction of the correspondence of Kino with Saeta and military and religious leaders. The preservation of such documentary data became with Kino a life-long habit so that later, when he came to prepare the *Memoir* for the press, he had at hand his own archive of precious source materials.

In the biography of Father Saeta, the confused events of a turbulent time are untangled and presented with sufficient background and evident cause and effect. The guilty few are clearly distinguished from the numerous innocent. This important distinction had its practical consequences in the treatment meted out by the military authorities and in the ultimate pacification of the region, and likewise in the decision of the highest ecclesiastical authorities to step up rather than abandon the evangelization of the area. To help his readers follow the geographical descriptions in his narrative, Kino drew two accurate maps of the entire region that are in themselves important landmarks in the cartography of Mexico.⁴ The narrative, which treats in minute detail the history of Pimería from 1687 to the close of the year 1695, comprises seven extant books.⁵

In Book I of *Saeta* Kino describes the coming of the missionaries to Caborca. He develops an exact historical account by specifying events, dates, places, distances, and the actors in the moving drama. He gives a detailed explanation of the economic status of the mission: the number of cattle, what kinds of grain and vegetables were planted and

the Archivo General of Mexico. Kino's original manuscript is preserved in the Archivo General, Mexico City (*Misiones*, Tomo 27, f. 1-227). It is interesting that neither Bolton's edition nor the Mexican edition retained Kino's original and poetical title of *Favores Celestiales*.

⁴The *Teatro de los Trabajos Apostólicos* and the [*Martirio del*] *Venerable Padre Francisco Xavier Saeta*, both preserved in the Jesuit Central Archives, Rome, and reproduced in Bolton, *Rim of Christendom* (272, 290). The superb original of the *Teatro* is in colors.

⁵At the end of Book VI (f. 183v) Kino wrote a huge "VII" to indicate that the next page would begin with that book; but instead Book VIII follows, and there is no Book VII in the manuscript. Since the manuscript was not originally paginated or foliated, it is impossible to know whether the seventh book was removed from the volume. Was it ever written? I think not, and for this reason: Kino stated on f. 178v that he would cite the *Cédula real* in Book VII for a certain reason, and left a blank space to indicate what chapter in Book VII would contain the document. Since he did not fill in that blank space on f. 178v, it would seem that he did not write the projected seventh book but instead went on to Book VIII.

which thrived, what buildings were erected. So specific and circumstantial is the data that one can conclude only that Kino kept a day-by-day record on which he later drew for his narrative.⁶ Book II is based on a series of Saeta's letters which report in detail on the second period of this work at Caborca.⁷ Book III is more than a mere recital of the events leading to the assassination of Saeta; it is a penetrating analysis of causes, with practical suggestions for remedying the situation. Kino rejects the false accusation that all the Indians of the region were involved. He proves from numerous sources that the chief cause of the tragedy was the injustice inflicted upon the Indians of San Pedro y San Pablo de Tubutama, and particularly the calling in of the Opatá overseers. Often he returns to the theme that the Pimas were unjustly accused of theft, and he deplores the consequent punishment of them by Spanish troops. The Indians of San Antonio de Oquitoa, he points out, joined in the raid on Caborca because they felt deceived and insulted by the numerous promises made to them and never kept — especially the promise that missionaries would be sent to them.⁸

Book IV of the biography of Saeta is one of the most carefully worked out of all Kino's writings. Here he cites countless letters from military and religious officials to prove his contention that only a few of the Indians of Pimería participated in the Caborca raid, and only then after they were induced to the act by injustice and cruelties. Further, he shows that all these officials were optimistic about the future of Pimería. To give a solid historical basis for his views, Kino dips deep into Mexican history and draws vignettes of fifteen missionaries besides Saeta who gave their lives for the same cause. Their missions, he points out, were not abandoned — and currently they were flourishing. Why, then, should anyone wish to follow a different policy in regard to Saeta's mission?⁹ This reasoned plea is followed in Book

⁶ *Saeta*, f. 142-47. Book I contains four chapters.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 149-53. Book II contains four chapters.

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 154-60v. This book, longer than the two preceding, contains five very substantial chapters.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 161-68v. This book, though it contains only four chapters, is lengthy because of the biographical sketches included in the last chapter. Possibly Kino intended to add nine more, for in the dedicatory letter to the Mexican Provincial, Diego de Almonacir, the figure "25" is written over the figure "16" in the same hand and ink that corrected the preface from "Dedicatoria" to "Carta a." The two corrections are found in f. 140v and f. 140 respectively.

V with a clear account of the campaign to pacify the rebellious natives and to punish the guilty. Kino devotes an entire chapter to the cooperation of the friendly Indians, and manfully relates the tragic mistakes of some of the Spanish soldiers and their native allies.¹⁰ His frankness in this book may account for the fact that the biography of Saeta did not find its way into print.

Book VI of *Saeta* is Kino's minute description, written on the very eve of his departure for Mexico City, of the state of the Pimería missions and the area in general.¹¹ He devotes much of this book to five possible objections against continuance and extension of the missions in the north. Knowing that everyone in authority at the capital, from the Viceroy and the Provincial down, would urge certain questions against him when he came to beg for funds and more manpower, Kino anticipated these questions and faced them squarely. The five objections which he discusses and refutes in Book VI are essentially those which appeared in numerous subsequent reports and in his *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta*. Significant for what it shows of Kino's command of documentary detail, his handling of the five objections deserves recounting here.

To the first objection that Pimería had no native population or at very best a few scattered Indians, Kino answers that the area had more than 10,000. He goes into exact figures, naming various towns and citing the testimony of Salvatierra who had been sent in 1691 to investigate. With this statement he brings his list of specifics to a close: "I personally saw and counted in San Francisco Javier del Bac 553 Indians at a single gathering." To handle the second objection — that, if there were a few wretched natives, the whole country was one interminable desert — Kino brings up heavy artillery. He cites the written testimony of royal officials, gives exact statistics on the amount and kind of produce, and concludes with the triumphant boast: *Esta Pimería es de las más fértiles y pingües tierras que tiene toda la Nueva España* [This Pimería of ours is in the category of the most fertile and productive lands in all of New Spain]. On the third objection Kino was very sensitive and brought up even more formidable weapons. Enemies of the Pimería enterprise had spread reports that the northern natives

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 169–75v, consisting of three chapters.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 176–83v, consisting of five chapters.

were incurably lazy and could never be taught to work. For those who would believe only certified and notarized statements, Kino has a whole bagful; for those who clamored for visible proof of the natives' willingness and ability to work, he points to what they already had accomplished at Dolores and other centers in constructing houses and provisional missions and in planting fields. To the fourth objection that the Indians of the province were born thieves — a calumny Kino felt he must scotch and lay low forever — he uses a triple-barreled refutation. He denies that the least evidence of theft ever was found among the Pimas despite all the surprise forays of Spanish troops into their country; he recalls that during the month of June, 1695, General Juan Fernández de la Fuente and General Domingo Terán de los Ríos did uncover stolen property in the possession of the Hojomes of Cerro de Chiricahui; and he notes that the Pimas were content to cultivate their fields and live off the produce while the Hojomes, the Janos, and the Sumas were nomadic Indians who found it more congenial to loot and to steal horses and mules. To the final objection that the settling of the north put a heavy drain on the royal treasury, Kino answers that such a complaint could be used against the progress of any area. Were the Spaniards to stop colonizing and evangelizing in order to save a few *pesos*? He promises to cite the royal decree stating that the advantage of the mission system far outweighed the expense involved. Who would dare doubt the King's word?

For historians the most valuable part of Kino's biography of Saeta is the last book,¹² for it furnishes the key to Kino's methods as a frontier missionary. Kino tells how he won the natives, how he was able to travel among them even unescorted when he so chose, how he secured their cooperation in evangelizing an area far beyond the limits of his own mission — in short, how he gained Indian confidence, allegiance, and devotion to a degree unparalleled in the mission annals of Mexico. Clearly, then, Kino's *Saeta* is more by far than the life story of one man; it is the detailed and documented history of the entire region with the geographical, ethnological, political, economic, military, and ecclesiastical aspects minutely presented and analyzed. Although some of its content subsequently was summarized by Kino in the *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta* and used by Bolton in his *Rim of Christendom*, there

¹²*Ibid.*, f. 185-98. Book VIII, consisting of six chapters, is the longest in the biography.

is so much that remains new and unused that the *Saeta* very much deserves publication.[†]

The second of Kino's important works, his *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta*, is a detailed history of the region from 1687 to 1707 and a summary account of Lower California and subsequent events in Pimería. The author was the principal actor in this region for a quarter of a century. From his own archive of source material, preserved at his mission of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores, he cites about two hundred documents in the *Memoir*, giving some in their entirety. To appreciate its immense contribution to historical knowledge, one need only compare the *Memoir* with the relatively meager information on the area as provided by all writers previous to the rediscovery and publication of Kino's original manuscript by Bolton in 1907.

In the years immediately preceding 1739 Miguel Venegas consulted Kino's original manuscript in order to write his *Empressas Apostólicas*; but Venegas was more interested in the chapters on the pioneer missions of Lower California than in those which dealt with Pimería Alta. In the 1740s copies of Kino's manuscript and Venegas' *Empressas*¹³ were sent to Madrid where Andrés Marcos Burriel consulted both for his *Noticia de la California*, the first edition of which appeared in three volumes in Madrid in 1757. Several translations of Burriel followed quickly: an English edition in two volumes appeared in London in 1759, a Flemish version in two volumes in Harlem in 1761-62, a French edition in three volumes in Paris in 1766-67, and a German edition in four volumes in Lemgo in 1769-70.¹⁴ But the publication which made the most extensive use of Kino's manuscript was the *Apostólicos Afanes* in three books, the second of which was compiled by Juan Antonio Balthasar in more than a hundred pages. Balthasar was visitor to the northern missions in the mid-1740s and superior of the

†Editor's Note: Shortly after preparing this paper Fr. Burrus signed a contract for a Spanish edition of Kino's biography of Saeta. The volume was published late in 1961 under the title *Vida del P. Francisco J. Saeta, S.J., Sangre Misionera en Sonora* (México: Editorial Jus), with prologue and notes by Fr. Burrus. It is to be hoped that an edition in English will soon follow.

¹³The complete original manuscript is in the Bancroft Library, University of California. When consulted in 1957 by the present writer, it was designated M-M 701. A complete copy in Venegas' hand is in a private collection. Numerous nineteenth-century copies are extant, e.g., in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Most of these are incomplete.

¹⁴Henry R. Wagner, *The Spanish Southwest . . .* (Albuquerque, 1937), 415-26. The editors of a Mexico City edition in 1943-44 missed a chance to correct and supplement the Venegas-Burriel *Noticia de la California* by checking it against Kino's original, which by this time had come to light.

entire Mexican Province from 1750 to 1753. To compile the second book of the *Afanes* he simply made a summary of Kino's *Memoir*. The editor in Barcelona, Francisco Javier Fluvía, took Balthasar's version and made it uniform with the other two books, publishing all three in one volume in 1754. History now repeated itself: the summary was so clear and interesting that the original was forgotten except by a few scholars. One of these was Francisco Javier Alegre, who had Kino's original before him from 1764 to 1766 when he wrote the history of the Jesuits in New Spain. Alegre repeatedly corrected accounts given in the *Afanes* in the light of the more circumstantial data of Kino's *Memoir*.

The last to see the *Memoir* before its rediscovery by Bolton was a Franciscan, Fray Francisco García Figueroa, who late in the eighteenth century was in charge of the copying of key Mexican manuscripts for the Spanish government. Figueroa noted the existence of Kino's manuscript, but explained it would not be copied since it was published in substance in the *Apostólicos Afanes*.¹⁵ García Figueroa's statement was echoed by the bibliographer Henry R. Wagner when he wrote in 1937 regarding Bolton's edition of the *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta*: "The basis of this book is a translation of Kino's *Favores Celestiales*. . . . The substance of it had already been printed in the *Apostólicos Afanes*, published in Barcelona in 1754."¹⁶ García Figueroa and Wagner were mistaken. In quantity the proportion of the *Memoir* to the *Afanes* is approximately six to one; there is no comparison that adequately gauges the difference in quality and accuracy.

Kino planned to publish both the *Saeta* and the *Memoir*, but death in 1711 intervened. Unlike Salvatierra and Piccolo, Kino published during his lifetime only one work and in one edition — his ill-fated treatise on the comet in 1681.¹⁷ Other works of his did appear before his death, but all were edited and published by others.¹⁸

What were Kino's qualities as a historian? Was he accurate? Did

¹⁵Section of *Historia*, Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City, vol. 393, f. 294.

¹⁶*The Spanish Southwest*, 504.

¹⁷*Exposición Astronómica* (México, 1681).

¹⁸Notably the *Relación Puntual* of 1683, an account of the arrival of missionaries in Lower California, which was republished in 1685, 1686, 1743, and 1762.

he possess and exercise a critical spirit? Of the greater part of the events which he related, Kino was an eyewitness or a participant or even the principal actor. His accuracy and veracity, where these can be checked against the writings of others, meet the tests of critical scholarship. His description of the attempts to settle Lower California between 1683 and 1686 can be checked against those of Atondo; his accounts of Pimería can be tested against those of Manje, Jironza, Bernal, Carrasco, Fernández de la Fuente, Terán de los Ríos, and other prominent figures in the northern enterprise.¹⁹ Kino regarded his maps as aids to the full understanding of his text as well as evidence to support his contentions. Their accuracy can be checked against modern cartography and the scientific calculation of geographic positions.

In order to evaluate correctly both Kino's writings and his maps, one must make distinctions in time and space. Obviously one would not go to the *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta* for a primary account of the Cortés and other early expeditions to Lower California, for Kino did not have at hand the abundant source material that is available today. When he refers to Gran Quivira, Moqui, Yeso, or Gran Teguayo, both his writings and his maps inevitably shade off into nebulous imprecision and uncertainty. But in general it may be said that Kino's historical contribution rests on two firm pillars: his careful and painstaking observation and his scrupulous regard for the competent information furnished by others. His evidence was not always in the form of documents; it might be in the continuity of the land, in the persistence of blue shells from the west coast of Lower California to the mainland, or in the identity of the ritual dance that he used to prove the peninsularity of Lower California. But all his evidence he sifted and weighed in the light of other evidence and of reason.

Was Kino objective and clear? Did his desire to promote the cause of the northern missions have the effect of slanting, coloring, or forcing out of perspective his historical accounts — and was the fact that he wrote in a foreign language an obstacle to clarity? To begin with, one should distinguish two elements in Kino's writings: the statement of facts and his interpretation of them. Thus, as in Kino's discussion of

¹⁹See Bolton, *Rim of Christendom*, 610–12, for the exact titles of their writings. In checking Kino's writings against those of Manje and others, Bolton finds much proof of Kino's accuracy and critical spirit.

Lower California, we are given a careful description of events — often a day-by-day narrative — which is a factual statement that can be corroborated, in part at least, by both contemporary and subsequent writing. Hence his factual presentations may be taken as accurate. On the other hand, his judgment of the land's productivity and his opinion of the character of the natives may well have in them much wishful thinking. This was the natural exuberance of the spirit of an incurable optimist who was able to get more out of arid land and out of the arid souls of many Indians than any of his contemporaries or successors.

As to his use of Spanish — a language which he presumably did not begin to study until he was thirty-four years old — in over ninety-five per cent of his writing, it is important to consider that Kino early enjoyed a mastery of two allied languages, Italian and Latin.²⁰ He learned to write Spanish, therefore, in a remarkably short time; and a detailed study of the matter might well show that precisely because Kino made little effort to imitate the literary Spanish then in vogue, his writings present less difficulty to the modern scholar than had he striven for the prevailing Gongorism with its inflated style and stilted form of expression. That Kino strove instead for clarity and precision is evident from his numerous corrections, re-writings, and new corrections. He early made it a practice to write pairs of synonyms, one above the other, presumably to be checked by one whose native language was Spanish. Even in his very last writings there are scarcely anywhere more than a few lines left unamended.²¹

²⁰His native Italian he wrote with facility and propriety, as his letters to the Duchess of Aveiro demonstrate. Kino's Latin letters and reports are models of clarity. With the exception of the deed on his family property — a tri-lingual document in Italian, Latin, and German — there is to my knowledge only one other example of Kino's written German: three lines in a letter to the Duches of Aveiro which I think were more to show the lady what that language looked like than to express his thoughts. Kino's letter in *Der Neue Welt-Bott* (Augsburg and Gratz, 1726), 107–10, is a translation into German of a communication to the official Jesuit representative of the Spanish overseas provinces resident in Seville, May 13, 1687.

²¹In my own reading of Kino's Spanish I find it necessary to distinguish between those writings in his own hand and those copied by others and not revised or corrected by Kino. The first is easy to follow; the Spanish text here is a good vehicle for his thought. The second, on the other hand, is often difficult: phrases are omitted and proper names are disguised under impossible forms, adding greatly to the modern reader's trouble in identifying geographical and ethnological references and the meaning of native terms. In the above discussion I have left out of consideration the later copies of Kino's maps which in some instances are a hodge-podge of many languages, all equally unintelligible, and for which Kino cannot be held responsible.

What of the future? Are there still important Kino manuscripts that have not come to light? Yes, there are quite a few yet to be discovered. First, the considerable archive that Kino amassed at Dolores — and on which he drew for the *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta* — is still missing; the whereabouts of only one document that seems to belong to this collection is now known.²² Also missing are the registers of the letters sent from headquarters in Rome (1683–1711) and copied in their entirety into ledgers for later reference; and the very numerous letters of the Jesuit Generals to Kino directly and about Kino to the Mexican Provincials and Superiors of the northern missions. Only a very few of these letters were incorporated by Kino in the *Memoir*.²³ Another group of missing letters are those to and from Kino which are known to have existed because of clear reference to them in extant documents. The number of these was perhaps twice that of the letters which have been preserved. Finally there are Kino's linguistic writings: the sermons and talks he gave in Pima and the catechetical and other religious instructions he imparted in that language.²⁴

Such then is a very incomplete consideration of some of the writings of Kino that seem to merit for him the title "historian's historian" by virtue of the considerable amount of historical information he has transmitted to us, gathered and composed from his own observation and the writings of others, expressed in a medium that on the whole enables us readily to grasp his thought. And if Kino deserves the title by reason of the manuscripts still extant, how much more so if additional ones come to light!

²²The 1698 *Relación diaria de la entrada al norueste* in Section of *Historia*, Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City, vol. 393, f. 316–38.

²³Recently I discovered among a series of letters, dated 1695 to 1698 and signed by the Jesuit General Tirso González, seven letters to the Mexican Provincial which discuss Kino's enterprise in Pimería and his role in the establishment of the missions of Lower California. These appear in *Correspondencia del P. Kino con los Generales de la Campaña de Jesús, 1682–1707* (Mexico: Editorial Jus, 1961), 37 *et seq.* In 1954 I was fortunate enough to find four letters from an earlier Jesuit General, Giovanni Paolo Oliva, directly to Kino. These were published in *Kino Reports to Headquarters* (Rome, 1954), 10–21, in both Spanish and English.

²⁴The one linguistic work attributed to Kino — a grammar of Baja Pimería with a *doctrina* and *confesionario* — is clearly not his. See Bolton, *Rim of Christendom*, 606.