Appendix A.
J. P. Harrington Chochenyo Interview Excerpts with Commentary (By Randall Milliken)

This appendix contains transcriptions of selected J. P. Harrington notes from his interviews with two speakers of the Chochenyo dialect of San Francisco Bay Costanoan, María de los Angeles Colos and José Guzman, with contextual commentary by Randall Milliken. Harrington conducted most of the interviews with both individuals in Pleasanton, California, in 1921, then returned in 1929 to re-interview Jose Guzman. The excerpts chosen are pertinent to:

- San Francisco Bay Area ethnogeography.
- names of San Francisco Bay Area groups and languages.
- the relationship among the three dialects of the San Francisco Bay Costanoan language.
- interaction between San Francisco Peninsula and East Bay Indian people in the late nineteenth century.

The excerpts are cited from Randall Milliken's set of photocopied Harrington notes, obtained during the 1980s from Catherine Callaghan. Callaghan photocopied the set in the late 1960s while they were at Berkeley, California on loan from the Smithsonian Institution. The original notes were subsequently returned to the Smithsonian Institution, where most, but not all, of them were filmed and made available to libraries in a somewhat different order. Our page references follow Callaghan's order, not the reel/frame system of the microfilm Harrington material.

The Harrington notes are indented below. Our contextual observations are not indented. Note that we have substituted the standard English letter combination "sh" for the symbol Harrington used for the voiceless palatal fricative, a symbol which was not available on the computer used for the current transcription. Common abbreviations are "Inf." for the chief informant, Angela Colos and "Nesc." for "does not know." (Cited references are listed in the main bibliography of this report.)

Names Applied to People from Various Areas

The following excerpt shows the terms typically used by the Mission San Jose people for themselves and for people from other missions.

- The Chocheños called the Juaneños 'uhráimas
- The Ind. name of the Chocheños is lisiánish Impt.

- Nesc. Ind. name of Clareños or Doloreños or Rafeléños (Harrington 1921-1929:57).

This reference and others suggest that the Mission San Jose Indians used the term Chocheño for themselves as a slang derivative of "Jose-eño." (The latter term never appears in any Harrington notes.) The next entry supports this interpretation of Chocheño as a reference to a mission community that derives from a Spanish slang term.

> The San José Indians were of many tribes – gathered at the mission. They are called Chocheños. Inf. knows the Carmeleños. There were some of them here at Pleasanton.… They committed several murders here (Harrington 1921-1929:110).

Colos also used directional terms for groups of people, a typical practice among California natives.

> I asked inf. how to say Abajeños, but inf. never heard the term. But inf. knows how to say Arribeños. ´awáshtush Arribeños. When I asked if these were the Indians of Oakland. Inf. said no, that they were from the *estero* (with a gesture to the north), evidently meaning Martinez way (Harrington 1921-29:110)

The reference to "Awashtush" recalls Father Palou's interpretation of a similar term as a reference to San Francisco Bay. Other evidence suggests it meant "northerners." On a separate sheet, Harrington recorded contrasting terms for northerners and southerners:

- 'awashtush are the people of Sonoma, Napa & all up there …
- Kakóntush, abajeños. Includes Juaneños, Monterreyanos (Harrington 1921-29:368).

On still another sheet Harrington repeated a Chochenyo term for southerners and provided terms for the people to the east and west.

- Jakmui, The east, knows well jakmuitush (l.q.) …
- Rámai = ag. *al otro lado del mar* – in S. Francisco
- kakóntush. abajeños. Ind. Carmeleños (Harrington 1921-29:286)

Language and People of the East Bay

Angela Colos passed on other names that could be applied to the Indian people of the local Mission San Jose area.

> Lisjanis, ch. *tribu*. They said that S. José was an early mission. They called the Inds. here sometimes *los viejos cristianos* (Harrington 1921-29:62).
>
> lisjánes were the San José – this name covered up as far as S. Lorenzo Angela thinks. Sing[ular]. Lisjan. *Yo soy lisján*. The Doloreños were not lisjanes, nor were the Clareños (Harrington 1921-29:95 [supplemental box 22]).
>
> hásan, *mujer en la lengua de Lecianos*. Inf.s mother said that the Lecianos called women hásan (Harrington 1921-29:457).

We suggest that the "Lisjanes" refers to the people who lived at "Alisal," the late nineteenth century Indian village near Pleasanton. (Of note, Uldall and Shipley [1966:216] record "Lisjan" as a placename for Pleasanton in their *Nisenan Texts and Dictionary*.)

The term Nepe was also applied to East Bay Indians, and may actually refer to the original local people who spoke what is now called Chochenyo Costanoan, in contrast to the inland people who brought the Plains Miwok language to Alisal.

> Call the local Inds. (of S. Lorenzo) *los* Nepes. So called because they use nép'e, *este* = the Acuenas (Harrington 1921-29:184).
>
> Népe, *este*. *nupe is no word in Choch. (Harrington 1921-29:293).
>
> The Nepes say kamniknish, *Hombre*, instead of tráesh, man

Jose thinks miw is a helawali word. Angela that it was an

Akwena word (Harrington 1921-29:301).

Colos, says Harrington, thought one of the words in the list above was a "helawali" word, in reference to one of the Miwok-speaking groups. If "Nepe" is the word she meant, it lends credence to the idea that Nepe was the Miwok term for speakers of Chochenyo Costanoan.

The word "Acuena," mentioned in in the set above, seems to have been another term applied to the East Bay area people.

> The Inds. & Span. Col.s used to speak of the Indians in fun as los acuénas. Borrowed from the Ind. 'akwéna no hay, probably.
>
> Inf. does not know origin of the *tribu*, but point out the resemblance.
>
> José & inf. both heard the Inds. spoken of as *los acuénas*. Sing. Acuena José
>
> kept using the term in fun all the afternoon (Harrington 1921-29:358).

The word Muwekma, a term used by a modern descendent organization, appears in the notes with the meaning "person" and "people."

> Ménem hishmetr múwékma, *tu eres buena gente* (Harrington 1921-29:247).
>
> holshe wáka muwékma, *bonito es esa gente* (Harrington 1921-29:297).
>
> 'rí'te muwékma jakájin, *hay mucha genta enfermos* (Harrington 1921-29:362).

San Francisco Peninsula People and Language

Angela Colos remembered interacting with people from the San Francisco Peninsula at some time during her youth.

> The Inds. of *Yerba Buena* said (the Doloreños): pétlei = *sientate*, but here at S. Jose the same word = *acuestate*! Once S. Jose Ind. entered and stood & that they would say tshaurai but they said petlei. And they had just put a big *sandia* there to eat. Why do they tell me to lie down? (Harrington 1921-29:30).
>
> Francisco Solis was Doloreño, Angela volunteers!!! He once came here to *pasearse aque en un baile que hicieron aqui*. Angela met him here, but José did not. He came here from Mission Dolores, where he lived. He was not yet old, still well preserved, a widower & had 2 daughters who may be still living in S.F. Inf. heard he died, supposes he died at S.F. (Harrington 1921-29:95 [supplemental box 22]).
>
> Uncle was good fustero. Went to live at San Mateo. Had plenty of money when he left. … Uncle married a Span. Cal. Woman here & sold ranch and gave ½ money to suegro & ½ to suegra who were still living. He did not have hair white when he left here. Inf. once saw him dance once here at rancho of the Moragas … He wore the red headdress, & all. Venima was uncle's younger brother [sic]– she was married to a Russian man. Inf. once heard her father & others talking and joking in Russian. (Harrington 1921-29:23-24).

At one point Harrington brought out the "Costano" word list that was taken from Pedro Alcantara of Mission Dolores in 1850 and published by Schoolcraft (1853). The following selections include a portion of the notes from that session:

> The S.F. voc.
>
> trátresh himhen, un hombre or
>
> Some said himen & other himhen –
>
> *Siempre le suben la palabra un poquito*

hímen traresh, un hombre.

'áitakishmak, 2 or more women

shiníshmin, muchachos Pl only

Never say 'shiníshmak – no such word. Carefully obtained

'shiníshmatshis, *muchachos*. Pl. only (Harrington 1921-29:189)

Some of the material points to constrasts beteween the San Francisco and East Bay dialects:

Todo lo que hablan in Dol. has

'átre (ch.) – if it is no, if it is yes,

nunca falta el 'átre. Dol. 'átré,

No? No es verdad? (used just like ger.

Nicht wahr).

Dol. 'átretamkisha, *no digas asi* [*nada*]

= Choch. Júwa tem ki.

Choch. Júwatem jisha nómo,

no bailes aquí = Dol. 'átretam jisha!

(Harrington 1921-29:198)

More comments are made about San Francisco people on another sheet:

José heard Pedro Alcantara mentioned much as at S. Clara

when there were lots of people still at S. Clara

Inf. heard a real Dol. named Pedro Nolasco talking to a compadre

Doloreño named Tadeo ´átretamshali kumpa, no hables nada (malo) compadre

(Harrington 1921-29:211).

Tells story of going to S. Francisco (?) to baptize child. Bought watermelon for $1.50. Inf. was sick here for 2 weeks thereafter (Harrington 1921-29:238).

A somewhat cryptic entry on still another sheet discusses interaction between Doloreños and Chocheños:

Tells story of the sit down. At time if …[illegible]… a man from here went up to S. Fran.c The Doloreños had lots of fine crops. Man arrived there and spoke with indearment to his friends, "Lie down!" Man remained standing. "Why do you not sit down?" another who spoke Choch. Wen

Júwatem musun wáka, do not believe or *hacer caso* in him!

Pétlei kimak makin, *nosotros decimos acuestate* (man said). (Harrington 1921-29:266).

Colos tells about how her aunt used to come from Yerba Buena to visit her family on the east side of the bay.

Forgets name of Benina's father – they talked idioma & joked with inf's father in idioma & sang. Jose Dolores was only son of this younger sister. They lived still when inf's father died – came from *la Yerba Buena* as they said. Used to come in *balsa de tules* on *Domingos*. Gabriel was doctor – *curaba los enfermos* (Harrington 1921-1929:281).

Another note, not in any useful context, claims a difference between Clareño and San Francisco speech:

> Clar. & Franc. had dif. Idiomas (Harrington 1921-29:323).

It must be remembered that Coast Miwok and Patwin, as well as the Ramaytush dialect of San Francisco Bay Costanoan, may have been spoken in San Francisco at the time of Angela Colos' youth, whereas the Tamyen dialect of San Francisco Bay Costanoan and Yokuts were the languages of the historic people at Mission Santa Clara.

One note provides the term that led Richard Levy (1978a) to call the San Francisco dialect Ramaytush:

> They call the *lado de San Francisco* rámai', All the side (lado) where the San Francisco is ([illeg.]) – San Mateo, etc., = rámai. Call the people rámáitush (Harrington 1921-29:368).

People and Languages at Missions South of Mission San Jose

One note supports a large amount of other material that places the Costanoan dialects of Mission Santa Clara and Mission San Jose as nearly identical.

> The Clareños were much intermarried with the Chocheños. The dialects were similar (Harrington 1921-29:14).

Angela's family interacted with people from Mission San Juan Bautista:

> The Chocheños called the Juaneños 'uhráimas (Harrington 1921-29:57).
>
> Inf.s padrasto went to S. Juan when *muchacho* & brot many Juaneño, Antoniano & other songs. He was good *cantor & bailador* (Harrington 1921-29:277)
>
> San Juan Song (p. 452)
>
> Were Juaneños married here, _ixed their songs (Harrington 1921-29:455).
>
> [San Juan songs] (Harrington 1921-29:467-478).
>
> All the Juaneño words sound as if they are *medio enojados*. Santiago Piña was inf.s *padrasto*. Was an Ind. who knew Juaneño songs. He was brot up by Piña family. Could read & pray. He died at Kaufman ranch ½ mile Nilesward of where inf. lives here (Harrington 1921-29:479).

Other People and Languages (Not Exhaustive)

A comment was taken down about Indians of Sonoma, where Mission San Francisco Solano had brought in speakers of Coast Miwok, Wappo, and Patwin. The supplied words are Patwin:

> The Sonomeños say mem for water, & call fire po' & wood tok' (Harrington 1921-29:65).

The consultants were asked about the term Olhone, and got an answer referring to the Volvon local tribe of the Mount Diablo area:

> Olhones = wolwolum evidently they were of the sierra Mount Diablo ward.
>
> Nesc. Polya. Inf. says that the tribes along the coast all had names
>
> (Harrington 1921-29:181).

The consultants were asked about the Saclans, a local tribe that moved to Mission Dolores from the Lafayette area of the East Bay in 1795, the fled the mission for a few years:

> José knows Saklanikma and that they talked the lang. like Angela speaks – talk Akwena but not the straight Akwena like Angela speaks (Harrington 1921-29:223).

Harrington may have been going down a list of local tribe names found in Mission San Jose baptismal records. He records a comment that relates to the Anizumne group, Plains Miwoks of the Rio Vista area on the lower Sacramento River:

> José's tia Paula was Angela's comadre was an 'anisum – the 'anisum also talked helawali – from Stockton way (Harrington 1921-29:300).

Appendix B.
San Francisco Peninsula Local Tribes (By Randall Milliken)

This appendix provides information about the specific local tribes of the San Francisco Peninsula at a greater level of detail than was necessary in the main body of the report. The text for each group repeats some information previously published in Appendix 1 of *Time of Little Choice* (Milliken 1995). But important details, including references to specific mission register entries, have been added to the material below. (Citations to tables, figures, and references refer to materials within the main report and in Appendix F.)

Peninsula Groups along San Francisco Bay

Four local tribes of the San Francisco bayshore moved to Mission Dolores in their entirety. They were the Yelamu people of San Francisco, Urebure of San Bruno, Ssalson of San Mateo, and Lamchin of Redwood City.

Yelamu – The Yelamu local tribe held the tip of the San Francisco Peninusula north of San Bruno Mountain (see Figures 1 and 12). The greater part of the Peninsula lands of the GGNRA, including the Presidio, Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Fort Miley, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and Alcatraz Island, were within their territory. The Yelamu, no more than 160 individuals, spent much of the year split into three semisedentary village groups. One group moved seasonally along Mission Creek, from Sitlintac on the bay shore to Chutchui two or three miles further inland. The second group moved between Amuctac and Tubsinte villages in the Visitation Valley area, and a third cluster of families lived seasonally near the beach area facing the sea and the Golden Gate (Petlenuc). Fathers Palóu and Cambón wrote of them as the "Aguazios" in one report: "They [the Ssalsons] have married among those of this place, who are called Aguazios (which translates as `Northerners')" (Palóu and Cambon 1783). Clearly, they were only "Aguazios" in relation to the more southerly Ssalsons. The Yelamu were tied by marriage to villages on the east side of San Francisco Bay; two of the three wives of Yelamu tribal captain Guimas, for example, were from the present Oakland-Richmond area (Milliken 1983:146). Most Yelamu people were baptized between 1777 and 1784 at Mission Dolores; 1781 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 5).

Urebure – The people of the San Bruno Creek area just south of San Bruno Mountain on the San Francisco Peninsula seem to have been a single village splinter group. Their home area was just northeast of the Sweeney Ridge GGNRA parcel (see Figures 1 and 12). Only 40 of them were baptized, including 19 adults. Their captain, said to be from "Urebure and other places" at baptism, was called "Captain

of San Bruno" at his son's baptism (SFR-B 35, 40). Another member of the group was "born at San Bruno, the place called by the natives Siplichiquin" (SFR-B 34). The group was entirely absorbed into the Mission Dolores community by the end of 1785. The Mexican Buriburi land grant, centered on San Bruno, probably included more land in the Millbrae area on the south than was in the original Urebure group territory. Urebure people were baptized between 1777 and 1785; 1783 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 6).

Ssalson – The Ssalsons lived in at least three main villages along San Mateo Creek, near the west shore of San Francisco Bay and in the San Andreas Valley (see Figures 1 and 12). Mission register entries provide the names of some villages of this regional group (see Brown 1973a:9-12). For instance, a child was baptized at Mission Dolores from "Oturbe on the Arroyo of San Mateo, called by the heathen Salsson" (SFR-B 174). Also, a man came from "the Nation called by its natives the Salsones" (SFR-B 498) had a son from "Altagmu village in the area of San Matheo" (SFR-B 133). The Ssalson villages of Altagmu, Aleitac, and Uturbe were said to be along branches of the Arroyo of San Matheo, certainly San Mateo Creek (SFR-B 173, 175, 176, 177, 213). Of a probable pre-mission population of around 210, 176 Ssalsons were baptized. Most of them went to Mission Dolores from 1780 through 1793; 1788 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 6).

Lamchin – The Lamchin local tribe held the bay shore of the San Francisco Peninsula and adjacent interior valleys from present day Belmont south to present day Redwood City. The Phleger Estate GGNRA parcel was almost certainly within their lands (see Figures 1 and 12). Some of their specific villages are named in mission register entries. One child was baptized from "Cachanigtac of the Lamchin Nation" (SFR-B 554). Another child of Lamchin parents came from "Cachanigtac, commonly called Las Pulgas [The Fleas]," probably on Pulgas Creek in the present city of San Carlos (Brown 1973a:16). Supichom was another village mentioned often in the Mission Dolores registers. Other Lamchin villages mentioned are Usséte, Guloisnistac, and Oromstac (Milliken 1983). Multiple Lamchin headmen were named, including Sapecse (SFB-1176), Guatmas (SFR-B 1192), and Gimas (SFR-B 1233). The pre-mission population was probably around 240 (see Table 4). Most Lamchin people moved to Mission Dolores between 1784 and 1793, but a few went to Mission Santa Clara in those years; 1791 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 6).

Peninsula Groups along the Coast

The four local tribes that moved to Mission Dolores from the Pacific Coast south of the Golden Gate in the 1780s and early 1790s were the Aramai, Chiguan, Cotegen, and Oljon groups. Oljon territory is actually closer to Mission Santa Clara than to Mission Dolores (see Figure 12). However, they were attracted north in the late 1780s and early 1790s to a Mission Dolores farm and chapel in the present city of Pacifica. That site, the outstation of San Pedro and San Pablo, eventually became the headquarters of Mexican Period Rancho San Pedro, and most recently, Sanchez Adobe County Park. The four coastal groups are described here.

Aramai – Aramai is a regional name for the area of two small village communities, Pruristac at Pacifica and Timigtac at Rockaway Beach. The presumed hinterlands of these communities include the Milagra Ridge, Mori Point, and Sweeney Ridge GGNRA parcels (see Figures 1 and 12). The total group from the two villages probably included no more than 53 people at Spanish contact. Yet two of its families were intermarried with one another, so they were not isolated patrilineages. Like the people of nearby Urebure to the east, the Pruristac and Timigtac people seem to have been independent bands, rather than members of any of the adjacent multi-village local tribes. The headman of Pruristac, 70-year-old Yagueche (SFR-B 319), was the oldest male in a family that had direct marriage ties to the south and east. Yagueche had been born at Satumnumo in Chiguan lands (now the Princeton area) to the south, where his 60-year-old brother Camsegmne was headman. Yagueche's daughter Torpete (SFR-B 309) lived at Urebure as one of the wives of headman Loyexse (SFR-B 306), while another daughter, Lulits

(SFR-B 308) was the wife of Urebure headman Loyexse's son Ssurire (SFR-B 307). These links might suggest that Urebure, Aramai, and Chiguan together formed a single local tribe. However, each group had just as many complex family ties with other neighboring groups as they did with each other (Milliken 1983). ThePruristac and Timigtac people moved to Mission Dolores in the 1779-1786 period; the average year of adult baptism was 1784 (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 7). Mission Dolores priests built the outstation and chapel of San Pedro at Pruristac in 1787 (Milliken 1995:102, 108).

Chiguan – The tiny Chiguan local tribe held the Pacific coast of the San Francisco Peninsula in the present Half Moon Bay area (see Figures 1 and 12). The group's pre-mission population was probably only about 51 people. Two Chiguan villages were named in the Mission Dolores Baptismal Register. One was Ssatumnumo, said to be "about three leagues south of `The Mussels' [San Pedro Valley]" i.e., in the Princeton area (SFR-B 337). The other village was Chagúnte, "about a league hither from said place [Ssatumnumo]," perhaps at the present town of Half Moon Bay (SFR-B 337). Explorer diaries suggest that the villages were only seasonally occupied. Camsegmne (SFR-B 345), contact period headman of the Chiguan, was the 60-year old younger brother of the 70 year old headman of Pruristac in Aramai to the north, Yagueche (SFR-B 319). The small Chiguan group consisted of approximately 51 people, of whom 44 were baptized between 1783 and 1791; 1788 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 7).

Cotegen – The Purisima Creek watershed and nearby small creeks on the coast south of Half Moon Bay was the home of the Cotegen local tribe. No GGNRA lands are within the area that they probably inhabited (see Figures 1 and 12). One of their towns was "Ssalaime, the principal place of the Cotegenes" (SFR-D 216). Another village location was Torose (Milliken 1983:85). Cotegen outmarriages were predominately with the Oljon to the south and Chiguan to the north; fewer links can be identified from mission records to the larger bayshore groups to their east. The pre-mission Cotegen population is estimated to have been 65 people (see Table 4). Most members of the group moved to Mission Dolores or its outstation of San Pedro between 1786 and 1791; also, we tentatively identify five people baptized at Mission Santa Clara from the San Bernardino District as Cotegens. The average year of adult Cotegen baptism was 1790 (Appendix F:Table 1). The man who provided the only first-person Ramaytush word list available to linguists, Pedro Alcantara, was a Cotegen (by birth and paternal line, with a Yelamu mother) who was baptized at Mission Dolores as a child in 1786 (SFR-553).

Oljon – The Oljon were a local tribe on the lower drainages of San Gregorio Creek and Pescadero Creek on the Pacific Coast, west of the Santa Clara Valley (see Figure 12). Village names mentioned in Mission Dolores records include Zucigim (SFR-B 569) and Pructaca (SFR-B 588). Their headman was Lachi or Lachigi (SFR-B 1003), a man with four co-wives (Milliken 1983:171). People from this group who went to Mission Santa Clara were lumped together as "San Bernardino" people, with all other people from the Santa Cruz mountains and coast. Cross-references to Mission Dolores relatives suggest that they were the same people as the Solchequis subgroup of "San Bernardino" people at Santa Clara. We estimate a pre-mission Oljon population of 157 people (see Table 4). Most of the 135 Oljons and Solchequis who were ever baptized joined the missions between 1786 and 1793; 1790 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 7).

Groups of the Mission Dolores-Mission Santa Clara Overlap Region

Local tribes from three regions of the Santa Cruz mountains and bayshore that moved mainly to Mission Santa Clara also sent some people north to join Mission Dolores. They were the Olpens (alias Guemelentos) of Portola Valley, the Puichons of the Palo Alto and Los Altos areas, and the Quirostes of the coast in the Point Año Nuevo area. Were they Ramaytush speakers? Were they Tamien speakers? Perhaps the Quirostes were Awaswas speakers. Most likely, each group spoke a unique dialect along a clinal path between the better documented languages of the missions to their north, east, and south.

Olpen – The only San Francisco Peninsula local tribe lacking either coastal or bayshore lands that went to Mission Dolores was the group known both as Olpens and Guemelentos in the Mission Dolores registers. From a few hints in the records that indicate their homeland was in the upper drainage of San Francisquito Creek, we infer that they held interior hill and valley lands of La Honda Creek on the coast side, as well as the Corte de la Madera Creek portion of the upper San Francisquito Creek watershed (see Figure 12). Ten related individuals, alternatively called "Olpens" and "Guemelentos" were listed at Mission Dolores from this area. Additionally, four Acsaggis, one a woman from the "Acsaggis family in the vicinity of Sorontac at the source of San Francisquito Creek (SFR-B 676)" are now considered to have been from this area, although they have elsewhere been considered equivalent to Achistaca at Mission Santa Cruz (cf. Milliken 1995:234). Other Mission Dolores converts are inferred to have been Olpens, Guemelentos, or Acsaggis, due to their time of baptism and family links. Mission Santa Clara probably absorbed the greater part of the local tribe under the general district designation "San Bernardino." At Mission Santa Clara one "San Bernardino" district person was explicitly identified as a "Guemerenta" (SCL-B 256) and another as an Olpen (SCL-B 2429). The overall pre-mission population of these groups was about 286 (see Table 4). The 227 explicitly and tentatively identified Olpens moved to the two missions between 1786 and 1804; 1794 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Tables 2 and 7).

Puichon – The Puichon were the largest local tribe on the west shore of San Francisco Bay. Their lands were along lower San Francisquito Creek and lower Stevens Creek, now the areas of Palo Alto, Los Altos, and Mountain View (see Figure 12). Their San Francisquito Creek village of Ssipùtca was mentioned six times in the Mission Dolores baptismal records. At Santa Clara they were lumped into the "San Bernardino" district with other people from west of Mission Santa Clara. Some of them were identified more specifically as being from the rancheria of San Francisquito (SCL-B 1463, SCL-D 1065). Nuclear family ties of family groups that sent people to both missions suggest that those few San Bernardino people who were further identified as "Auloquis" were probably from the group identified as Puichons at Mission Dolores. The Puichons have been lumped with other Santa Clara Valley groups (including the Tamiens of the Santa Clara vicinity and the Alsons of the Alviso area) for the population density study reported in Table 4. That study projects a pre-mission population of 6.3 persons per square mile for the area at large. A newer study, not ready for publication, suggests that the Puichon area had a still higher population density of 7.8 persons per square mile, the highest of any Costanoan-speaking local tribe. Puichon/Auloquis people went to Mission Dolores between 1781 and 1794 and to Mission Santa Clara between 1781 and 1805; 1792 was the average year of adult baptism (Appendix F:Table 1).

Quiroste – The Quiroste local tribe lived on the Pacific Coast in the Whitehouse Creek and Año Nuevo Creek area, and possibly inland beyond Butano Ridge (see Figure 12). We do not understand the exact inland extent of Quiroste territory, due to the absence of good locational data in the Mission Santa Clara records. Quiroste individuals were among the earliest San Francisco Peninsula coastal groups baptized at Mission Dolores. Sujute, wife of an Oljon, was "from Churmutcé, farther south than the Oljons" (SFR-B 679, October 27, 1787). Uégsém, wife of a Cotegen, was from "the family of the Quirogtes of the village of Mitine to the west of Chipletac" (SFR-B 711, October 19, 1788). Quirostes led a resistance against Spanish intrusion in the early 1790s under a leader named Charquin (SFR-B 1002). Most Quirostes went to Mission Santa Clara under the San Bernardino District label. A few of them (12 individuals) went to Mission Santa Cruz under the designations "Mutenne" (SCR-B 186), "San Rafael" (SCR-B 187), and "San Rafael, alias Mitine" (SCR-B 316) in 1793 and 1794. Although their lands were much closer to Santa Clara than to San Francisco, about one third of them were baptized at Mission Dolores, possibly to be kept near the Presidio in light of their past resistance activities (Appendix F:Table 1). Average year of Quiroste adult baptism was 1793.

Appendix C.
The Unique Social Formation of the Mission System (By Laurence H. Shoup)

The detailed studies of the specific histories of local groups in chapters 4-6 portrays demographic and immigration events from one historical moment to the next, but fails to capture either the daily life experiences of Indian people within the missions or the contextual processes that were controlling those experiences. This appendix provides that contextual information for the Mission Period. (Citations to tables, figures, and references refer to materials within the main report.)

Colonial Strategy for Territorial Control

The Spanish colonists who arrived in the Bay Area in the 1770s were sent by the Viceroy of Mexico, who was the direct agent of the Spanish king. The king and viceroy were pursuing traditional imperial goals: developing a colony, seizing and controlling the land and labor of the local Indian population, and preventing rival nations (Russia and England especially) from taking over California and threatening Mexico's northern frontier. In addition, the Spanish leadership was motivated by personal philosophy to aid the Catholic church in bringing the Indian people of the New World into its fold.

In the process of seizing power and expropriating the native lands of coastal California, Spanish goals and tactics had to take account of demographic realities. Availability of Spanish manpower for colonization was very limited, while there were much larger numbers of Indians. Therefore the natives themselves had to be converted and used as the labor force for the new colony. This dictated the careful strategy the Spanish had to follow. The new colonists had several factors working in their favor. One was their technological superiority in the military field. They had guns, swords, lances, horses, leather and sheepskin armor, making the Spanish soldier on horseback by far the most formidable fighting man of that time and place. A second factor was their centralized leadership and unity of command. A third was the Machiavellian attitudes and actions of their leaders, using duplicity to achieve hidden goals destructive to the colonized peoples. A final factor was the array of material culture they commanded, including the animals and seeds they brought for food, the beads and clothing they wore and the buildings they conceived and built. This material culture dazzled the native people and was a key factor in initially attracting them to the missions. As one missionary expressed it:

> They can be conquered first only by their interest in being fed and clothed, and afterwards they gradually acquire knowledge of what is spiritually good and evil. If the missionaries had nothing to give them, they could not be won over (Palou [1786] in Milliken 1995:82-83).

The Spanish and later the Mexican colonial system had three structural elements, the military presidio, the Indian mission, and the civilian agricultural pueblo. In California, the presidio and mission were the most important, the pueblo least important.

The Pueblos –There were only three civilian pueblos in California, at San Jose, Santa Cruz, and Los Angeles in the distant south. The pueblos were always small and partially dependent upon Indian labor, non-Christian Indians at first, emancipated Mission Indians later on. The mission communities themselves were eventually supposed to become civil pueblos, with the mission churches devolving into parish churches, as christianized native Californians became sufficiently acculturated and trained in western ways. This, of course, never happened.

The Presidios – The presidios were at the heart of state power. It was the political, military and administrative center, commanded by the military governor housed in the Presidio of Monterey. Three other presidios also existed—at San Francisco, Santa Barbara and San Diego. The soldiers at the presidios made up the police and military force. The governor, appointed by the Spanish king, was an absolute ruler, a local king, commanding the military and sanctioning the use of state violence. He also controlled all government functions, administrative, legislative and judicial. Land ownership, very important in this agricultural colony, was also under the purview of the governor, who enforced the "right" of the king of Spain to own virtually all of California. This political system was, therefore, a hierarchical absolutist state that choreographed the activities of vast numbers of people across a large part of the world, in stark contrast to the loose hierarchy and almost libertarian organization of the numerous native local tribes.

The Missions – The missions made up the second part of the power structure of Spanish and Mexican California into the 1830s. They were the most important economic institution of the colony. The missions were a type of totalitarian religious commune in which the Catholic priests ruled the Indian neophytes, who were seen as perpetual children. The missions were the places where the bulk of the production needed to sustain the colony took place. Native people made up the labor force necessary to sustain the 21 California missions and the entire colonial enterprise. Indians did all the planting, harvesting, cooking, animal husbandry, weaving, construction, wood cutting and other economic activities at the missions (Webb 1952:84; Forbes 1982:41).

Life and Death at the Missions

The California missions—located along the coastal strip from San Diego in the south to Sonoma in the north—were organized by Catholic priests of the Franciscan order, men who were given significant independence by the governor in handling the Indians so long as production was assured. A barter system was set up, and the missions exchanged some of their surplus production with the Spanish authorities for some items that they could not produce (such as some tools, iron, cloth, and glass beads), and, as time went on, increasingly for worthless promises to pay from the military officials who ruled the colony. Soon the entire colony came to depend upon the missions and Indian labor to produce the necessities of survival on this frontier. The priests were the labor organizers and brokers in this hierarchical system (Shoup and Milliken 1999:49-60). During the sixty years from 1769 to 1829, this production system developed into a powerful economic institution.

At their peak, the 21 missions housed about 30,000 Indians, controlled about 8 million acres of land, had extensive field crops (especially wheat and corn) and as many as 420,000 cattle, 320,000 sheep, and more than 60,000 horses and mules (Hittell 1885 II:207; Hornbeck 1983:56-57). The

Indians, whose options were restricted when the Spanish colonialists seized their land and resources to use for grazing Spanish livestock and raising Spanish crops, were attracted into the missions with a combination of goods (food, beads, cloth) and promises of security (including security from Spanish violence), and salvation. In exchange, the Indians lost much of their culture, their freedom and, once baptized by the priests, they could not leave except with permission. Their lives were totally controlled and regulated 24 hours a day for their entire lives. The only exception was when, once a year or so, they were given permission and a pass to return to their villages for a few weeks' holiday. Running away, along with numerous other disciplinary infractions, both minor and major, were punished by solitary confinement, flogging, branding, the use of stocks, hobbles (chaining to weights), and other humiliations (Cook 1943a:91-101; Jackson and Castillo 1995:44; Jackson 1994a:126, 165-166; Castillo 1978a:101). As one contemporary observer later recalled:

> Indians belonging to the missions could not leave them without special permission... Frequently they were sent to work in the towns or the presidios under contract. They were not paid for the work they did...I do not know whether or not the padres sometimes exceeded their authority in delivering punishments. I do know that they frequently castigated the Indians who had committed faults with lashes, confinement and chains. On some occasions I saw Indians working in chains...and I also saw them in stocks (Lugo [1877] 1950:226-227).

In addition, since the missions were very unhealthy places and the Indians, not surprisingly, were very depressed living there, their immune systems were reduced and often could not resist the new diseases introduced by Europeans. Syphilis may have been the most deadly of the new diseases, because it not only slowly killed adults, but also killed infants and led to sterility. A virulent form of syphilis was spread by Spanish soldiers to Indian women early on (Sandos 2004:115-127). Colonial officials spoke against the common practice of soldiers assaulting Indian women, which the scholar Sherburne Cook called "notorious," but they never instituted effective deterrents (Cook 1943a:24-25). California mission founder Father Junipero Serra himself stated that some of the Spanish soldiers were so evil that sometimes "...even the children who came to the mission were not safe from their baseness"(in Tibesar 1955:362-363). Cook concluded that it is:

> clear that from the time the Spanish first set foot in California there was ample opportunity for the introduction of syphilis to the native population, not at one but at many places. Indeed, since there were soldiers stationed at every mission, since the troops were continually moving around from one place to another, and since this military group was itself generously infected, the introduction may be regarded as wholesale and substantially universal (Cook 1943a:25).

Beginning in 1793-1794, the reports of Spanish officials frequently mention syphilis as a serious health problem. As time went on and the mission population was increasingly saturated with chronic venereal disease, the Indians easily succumbed to the maladies which arrived all too regularly—measles, dysentery, typhoid, tuberculosis, typhus and pneumonia. Since huge numbers were dying of disease at the missions, the missionaries seldom faced the need, after 1798, to build new mission facilities to house the new tribal people their Christian Indian evangelists were constantly recruiting from greater and greater distances.

About 85,000 Indians were baptized in the missions during 1769-1834, but so many died or ran away that there were only 15,000 left in the mission system in 1834 (Hornbeck 1983:48-49). As the free Indians near the missions were depleted, the Spanish had to go further and further east into the interior of California, the Central Valley and the Sierra foothills to find new converts. Indians in places remote from the missions had more options and were thus more reluctant to come to live in a distant and alien institution. Indians who came from these distant areas could and did escape from the missions and return to their homelands. Some of them actively resisted Mission Indian envoys

sent to bring them back. Such actions led to Spanish military raids with devastating results for the defenders of the fugitives. Many Central Valley local tribes arrived *en masse* at the missions within a year or two after such Spanish attacks.

One effect of cheap Indian slave/peon labor was the almost total lack of technological advances during the entire Mission Period. Even though windmills and water-powered mills were well known to the Spanish and Mexicans, these labor-saving devices were almost entirely missing from the early California economy. As was the case for other similar economies in the historical past, there was no incentive for technological innovation.

Mission Social Formation: A Special Form of Peonage

Since Indians were at the bottom of a rigid caste system from which there was no legal escape, and because their labor was forced, the system was labeled by contemporary observers, as well as later scholars, as "slavery" or "practical slavery" (Bannon 1964:191; Archibald 1978:181; Hittell 1885 II:59, 77, 210; Caughey 1940:193). For example, Jean F. La Perouse, a French visitor to the missions in the 1780s concluded that even by this early date the California missions were all too much like the slave plantations of Santo Domingo (La Perouse [1786] 1989:41, 81). The 1997 *Historical Encyclopedia of World Slavery* pointed out that Mission Indians were held in "virtual slavery...were tied to the mission lands...and had every aspect of their lives controlled by the priests" (Rodriguez 1997:605).

The Indians were not bought and sold, however, as slaves usually were. So the concept of peonage is needed to fully understand the mission labor system. In a sense the Indians became debt peons when they joined the missions, except this debt was religious, not monetary. One scholar recently argued that the Indians in the mission system had the status of spiritual debt peons (Sandos 2004:178-179).

The mission system was thus a form of class exploitation which tried to morally justify itself in two key ways. The first justification was a paternalism under which the Indian was seen as a perpetual child, who always needed the assistance of the "people of reason". Under this paternalism the forced labor of Indians was viewed as a fair return for the mission's protection, direction and for the new goods and foods it offered. This paternalism represented an attempt to overcome one of the fundamental contradictions of the mission system—the impossibility of the mission Indian slave/peon ever becoming what he or she was supposed to become—an independent citizen equal to a 'person of reason'. (As a perpetual child, the Indian never had this chance so long as he or she stayed in the mission and obeyed, as so many did.)

The second justification for the mission system was that mission lands and property were being held in trust as a community asset for all the Indians. While many of the priests were undoubtedly sincere, this concept was essentially a dead letter, since it was the king and later the Mexican state which actually held title. This left the way open to expropriate and distribute all mission property to leading official families during the 1830s (see text Chapter 8). A precedent had been set during the earlier period (1769-1832), when about 50 provisional land grants had been given, in scattered areas of California, to retired military men and their families (Hornbeck 1983:58).

In summary, the dominant social formation during the Mission Era can be characterized as a type of unfree labor system, best called the mission labor system, which was a combination of slavery and spiritual debt peonage where surpluses were coercively extracted from the Indian primary producer. This unpaid forced labor system operated within the context of a rigidly hierarchical caste system where colonial domination, racism, sexism, violence, and military force were constants. The two office holding groups, the ruling class of military officers and priests, directly benefited from the labor of tens of thousands of Indian slaves/peons, who were born, lived, worked and died in the missions, presidios and pueblos of early California.