

Chapter 6. The Multi-Ethnic Doloreños of Mission Dolores, 1817-1834

This chapter describes the closing years of Mission Dolores as a Franciscan mission, beginning when large numbers of Coast Miwoks returned north to San Rafael in the winter of 1817-1818, and ending in 1834, the year that Mission Dolores was secularized (closed as a church-run Indian neophyte commune). Over that 1817-1834 period, Costanoan speakers regained their initial predominance in the mixed-language Mission Dolores Indian community.

The five chapter sections trace a succession of upheavals in the population of Mission Dolores between 1817 and 1824, followed by a long period of low population and poor management up to the mission secularization in 1834.

- The first section discusses the founding of Mission San Rafael with an accompanying transfer of many Coast Miwoks north.
- The second section documents the migration of hundreds of Patwin and Wappo speakers to Mission Dolores from the interior North Bay.
- The third section explains the founding of Mission San Francisco Solano and the accompanying movement of more than 500 people to it from Mission Dolores.
- The fourth section depicts disintegrating Mission Dolores and its outstations in the 1820s as viewed through the eyes of visiting commentators.
- The fifth and final section portrays the Indian families that lived at Mission Dolores in the late 1820s and early 1830s.

COAST MIWOK TRANSFERS TO SAN RAFAEL, 1817-1822

Mission San Rafael was founded in late 1817, ostensibly as a Mission Dolores outstation where sick Coast Miwok people could recuperate from their illnesses. Bancroft describes its founding concisely:

Father Gil was accompanied by Duran, Abella, and Sarría, the latter of whom ... with the same ceremonies that usually attended the dedication of a regular mission, founded the asistencia of San Rafael Arcángel, on the spot called by the natives Nanaguani. Though the establishment was at first only a branch of San Francisco, an asistencia and not a mission, with a chapel instead of a church, under a supernumerary friar of San Francisco; yet there was no real difference between its management and that of the

other missions. The number of neophytes transferred at first I suppose to have been about 230, but there is very little evidence on the subject, and subsequent transfers, if any were made in either direction, are not recorded (Bancroft 1886: II:330).

We say that San Rafael was “ostensibly” founded as an asistencia because there is every reason to believe that the California missionaries intended from the start for it to become a mission on its own. They may initially have been unable to do so due to unsettled political conditions in New Spain; Mexican insurgency had precluded the Spanish government from supplementing the California garrison or paying its soldiers there since 1810. In 1817 San Rafael was the logical place to found the next mission to the north, in order to reach out and proselytize the large non-Christian Pomo populations of the Santa Rosa plain, and to compete with the Russians for the patronage of the Coast Miwok villagers at Bodega Bay. From the very start Mission San Rafael had its own baptismal, marriage, and death registers.

No direct census is available that lists the Indian people transferred north to help found Mission San Rafael. However, we have reconstructed the final mission of residence of hundreds of Mission Dolores converts by cross-reference to all other Bay Area mission registers, using the survivors at the end of 1823 as a benchmark population (Table 6). We find information in the Mission San Rafael registers regarding 155 Mission Dolores Indians listed as parents of baptized children, brides, grooms, godparents or witness by that year, or deceased by that year or in later years; 98% of them were Coast Miwok speakers born on the Marin Peninsula. Another 99 Mission Dolores Coast Miwoks are not accounted for at any mission after 1817; they too probably moved north to San Rafael, even though they do not appear in the later records. Our sum of 254 transferees to Mission San Rafael from Mission Dolores is not far from Bancroft’s estimate of 230.

Table 6. Counts of Mission Dolores Neophytes Living at Various Missions at the End of 1823, by Language and Local Tribe.

LANGUAGE/TRIBE	FR	CL/CR/CA	JO	RA	FS	N/A	TOTAL ALIVE
BAY COSTANOAN—PENINSULA GROUPS							
Lamchin	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Puichon	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Oljon	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Olpen	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ssalson	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Cotegen	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Chiguan	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Quiroste	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Aramai	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mission-born	13	1	0	0	1	7	22
BAY COSTANOAN—EAST BAY GROUPS							
Huchiun	27	0	0	0	0	0	27
Huchiun-Aguasto	17	0	0	1	0	3	21
Jalquin/Irgin ^a	1	0	7	0	1	0	9
Mission-born	9	0	2	0	0	12	23
KARKIN COSTANOAN							
Carquin	17	0	1	0	10	0	28
Mission-born	4	0	0	0	3	0	7
<i>(continued)</i>							

Table 6. Counts of Mission Dolores Neophytes Living at Various Missions at the End of 1823, by Language and Local Tribe *continued*.

LANGUAGE/TRIBE	FR	CL/CR/CA	JO	RA	FS	N/A	TOTAL ALIVE
BAY MIWOK GROUPS							
Saclan	10	0	1	0	1	0	12
Chupcan	6	0	10	0	3	5	24
Tatcan	5	0	3	0	0	0	8
Volvon ^b	1	0	7	0	0	0	8
Mission-born	4	0	2	0	1	4	11
COAST MIWOK GROUPS							
Olema	12	0	0	13	1	15	41
Tamal-Aguasto	11	0	0	14	0	2	27
Omiomi/Geluasibe	9	1	0	25	6	17	58
Costa/Echajuti	7	0	1	27	2	16	53
Echatamal	7	0	0	11	0	11	29
Olompali/Puscuy	2	0	3	24	6	14	49
Huimen	2	0	0	6	1	2	11
Petaluma	1	0	1	8	4	2	16
Alaguali	4	0	5	11	1	1	22
Guaulen	0	1	0	12	0	3	16
Chocoime (Sonomas)	0	0	5	1	3	1	10
Mission-born	6	0	2	0	0	15	23
PATWIN GROUPS							
Ululato/Puttoy	16	1	19	0	72	100	208
Suisun/Malacas	4	3	18	0	53	37	115
Napa	1	0	10	1	6	3	21
Tolena/Puttato	0	0	0	0	15	3	18
Mission-born	1	0	1	0	0	2	4
Wappo Groups							
Canicaymos	3	0	1	1	119	58	182
Mission-born	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
TOTAL FOR EACH LOCATION	224^c	10	99	155	309	335	1,132

Notes: Mission codes are like those for mission register citations, as shown in Table 1, but with the lead “S” removed. ^a The only Seunen at Mission Dolores in 1823 is counted with the Jalquins; ^b the only Julpun at Mission Dolores in 1823 is counted with the Volvons; ^c the Annual Report for 1823 gives a year-end Mission Dolores population of 208 (Bowman 1958) but our database tracks evidence for 224 living people who can be shown to have been in San Francisco during the 1820s.

Not all of the Coast Miwoks baptized at Mission Dolores returned north to Mission San Rafael. Of those who stayed in San Francisco, most were women who had married into San Francisco Bay Costanoan or Bay Miwok families. Among the Coast Miwok women who appear in Mission Dolores records in the 1820s are Lucia Moyenac (SFR-B 3409) and Atanasia Pispigetit (SFR-B 3702) from Olema; Barbara Motus (SFR-B 4051) and Lamberta Joboc (SFR-B 4267) from Omiomi; and Antusa Huyungetit (SFR-B 4265) and Tecla Yencos (SFR-B 4487) from south Tomales Bay.

In addition, at least five Coast Miwok men had families at San Francisco in the 1820s, although some of them also appear as witnesses and godparents at San Rafael in those years. They included Eudasio Guacaya (SFR-B 2613) and Sabel Jumayuva (SFR-B 2729) from the Tamal

Aguastos (San Rafael locality); Nestor Moyo (SFR-B 2661) and Marino Jose Tuyume (SFR-B 3906) from Olema; and Pacomio Uniela (SFR-B 4240) from Omiami (Novato area).

NEW PATWIN AND WAPPO MIGRATIONS, 1819-1822

Replacements of missionary priests were probably traumatic experiences for the Mission Indian people. The missionaries were the religious and secular leaders of the communities. Father Abella served as pastor at Mission Dolores from 1798 until the spring of 1819, when he was replaced by Juan Cabot, newly arrived from Spain. Father Luis Gil moved down from San Rafael to join Cabot. Father Juan Amoros, also newly arrived from Spain, was assigned to San Rafael in Gil's place.

Gil and Cabot ran Mission Dolores with little change through most of 1819 and 1820. During their short tenure, only 17 tribal people were baptized. All were Patwin speakers—Malacas, Suisun, Tolenas, and Ululato adults—from the present Solano County area (SFR-B 5830, 5831, 5838, 5846-5858, 5873). Jose Altimira and Blas Ordaz replaced Gil and Cabot as missionaries at Mission Dolores in the fall of 1820. Over the first nine months of their tenure at Mission Dolores, through the spring of 1821, they baptized only a few mission-born children.

Then, over the five days of June 15-19, 1821, Altimira and Ordaz baptized 387 people, an unprecedented number (Appendix F:Table 5). Their new converts were listed as Ululatos and Canicaymos in the Mission Dolores baptismal register. By the end of 1821, after another 36 Ululatos had been baptized, the Mission Dolores population was up to 1,106, from 884 the previous year (Appendix F:Table 1).

It turns out that the terms “Ululato” and “Canicaymo” were utilized by the Mission Dolores priests in 1821 as cover terms for language groups. The Ululato group included members of three Patwin-speaking local tribes from the lower Sacramento Valley (Ululato, Libayto, Puttoy). The Canicaymos were Wappo-speakers from the Caymus, Huilic, Canijolmano and Mayacma local tribes of the upper Sonoma and Napa valleys. Later Mission San Francisco Solano transfer registers record their actual local tribe names.

The addition of these large groups of Patwin and Wappo speakers resulted in another major shift in the language mixture of the Mission Dolores community. A few more Ululatos and Canicaymos were baptized in 1822. By the end of 1822, Patwin was the dominant language at the mission; it was spoken by 34% of the mission population (see Table 5). Coast Miwok was second in importance (27%), Wappo was third (19%) and the combined Costanoan languages fell to fourth in importance (16%, mainly Carquin Karkins and Huchium San Francisco Bay Costanoans).

SWITCH TO MEXICAN RULE, 1821-1822

Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1821 after ten years of insurgent warfare. The early days of Mexican history were marked by political struggles between large landholding classes and populist entrepreneurial classes, struggles that had implications for control of Indian lands in Old Mexico and New California. The first government of Mexico, under the leadership of Agustín de Iturbide, was supported by the landed aristocracy.

News of Mexican independence reached Upper California in March of 1822. Under the new Mexican governmental structure, the *gente de razon* (people of reason, i.e., Hispanic settlers of various genetic backgrounds) of California were directed to set up their own territorial *diputación* or legislature. In November of 1822, the California *diputación* elected Lieutenant Luis Arguello, commander of the San Francisco Presidio, as governor of California.

Mexican leader Iturbide was driven from power in March of 1823, months after he declared himself Emperor of Mexico. An elected Mexican congress declared a republic in 1824, modeling its

constitution after that of the United States. The progressives and conservatives alternated in power in Mexico throughout the 1820s and 1830s. Both factions claimed to defend the rights of Indians, but each faction maneuvered to improve its chances of acquiring the lands under control of Catholic missions.

The mission secularization process that began in 1834, one outcome of early Mexican political struggles over Indian land rights, is addressed in Chapter 8. Specific Mexican period events pertinent to the Mission Dolores Indians prior to 1834 are discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

TRANSFERS TO MISSION SAN FRANCISCO SOLANO, 1823-1824

Altimira's Attempt to Close Mission Dolores

In 1823, Mission Dolores was 50 miles to the south of its only source of future converts. Mission Prefect Mariano Payeras discussed with Governor Arguello the possibility of moving the mission to the "northeastern contra costa [opposite shore] on the gentile frontier" in late 1822 (Bancroft 1886:II:496). Father Altimira of Mission Dolores recommended the transfer to the *diputación territorial* (hereafter "territorial legislature") in March of 1823 without seeking explicit permission from Payeras, who was on his death bed at the time. The territorial legislature decreed on April 9, 1823 that missions Dolores and San Rafael should be consolidated and moved further north. A note to that effect was sent to the new mission prefect, Father Jose Señan. But Señan was also sick, and did not initially respond to the notice.

Father Altimira and 21 citizens toured the North Bay valleys in late June of 1823 in search of a new mission site. Crossing the lower valleys of Sonoma Creek, the Napa River, and Suisun Creek, on June 29, Altimira showed insight into the future of the area: "We observe on the plains and hills great white oaks. We crossed long stretches of land very appropriate for vineyards" (Altimira 1823). All of the lands of the near North Bay were empty at the time. Their tribal people were at missions Dolores and San Jose. The surveyors recommended the Sonoma Valley for the new mission site. Altimira went north again in late August of 1823 with a group of Indians and soldiers under Lieutenant Ignacio Martinez to begin construction on the new mission in the Sonoma Valley. Martinez stopped along the way to confiscate Mission San Rafael properties, against the protests of Father Amoros of that mission.

On August 23, 1823, Mission Prefect Señan, in Monterey, signed a letter declaring the transfer of Mission Dolores and closure of Mission San Rafael to be illegal actions. In September a compromise was reached between Governor Arguello and the new Prefect, Father Sarria. Missions Dolores and San Rafael were to remain open. The new mission in Sonoma Valley would be allowed to go forward under a new name (eventually San Francisco Solano), and Father Altimira would be its pastor.

Mission Dolores Land Losses prior to 1824

By the end of 1823, two of seven San Francisco Peninsula tribal land tracts and two of four East Bay tribal land tracts had been taken out of mission hands, and thus were placed out of reach for possible future ownership by Mission Dolores tribal descendants. Lamchin and Urebure lands on the San Francisco Peninsula were confiscated as government stock ranches, Las Pulgas and Buri Buri respectively, before the year 1800. The Las Pulgas Ranch was transferred into the private hands of Luis Arguello some time before 1824 (Bancroft 1886:II:592). In 1820 Luis Peralta received the southern Huchiun lands along the East Bay shore facing San Francisco, as Rancho San Antonio.

Mission Dolores established a livestock ranch and outstation on San Pablo Creek on the east side of San Francisco Bay by 1820, if not earlier. Nine births and five deaths of Mission Dolores Indians at the site were recorded between April of 1820 and June of 1823. In 1823 the outstation included a living quarters and a storehouse, both probably constructed of adobe (Hendry and Bowman 1940:488).

The San Pablo outstation was given up into private hands in 1823, without protest by Father Altimira, as part of the arrangement to found the new mission in the Sonoma Valley. The San Pablo land and buildings were granted that year to Francisco Castro, alcalde of the Pueblo of San Jose and one of the individuals who had encouraged Father Altimira to move the mission to the North Bay. Castro's new ranch was named "San Pablo, alias Los Cuchigunes" after the Huchiun San Francisco Bay Costanoans who had once held that land and who still formed part of the Mission Dolores community (Hendry and Bowman 1940:489).

Transfers to Mission San Francisco Solano in 1823

The Mission Dolores population was down to 208 at the end of 1823 from 958 the year before (Appendix F:Table 1). It had been approximately 1,228 at the beginning of 1822. Deaths during the year do not account for the precipitous population drop. It was clearly the result of population transfer. Many hundreds of Indian people were transferred north to the future site of Mission San Francisco Solano over the fall of 1823. The question arises, who were the 208 people who were still at Mission Dolores at the end of 1823? The answer is a complicated one. If any census was taken that listed the remaining 208 individuals, it has not survived.

In order to determine who the 208 people were that remained at Mission Dolores, we looked for evidence accounting for them as parents, godparents, spouses, witnesses, and deceased individuals in post-1823 Mission Dolores register entries. By the same token, many people could be identified as having transferred by their appearance as parents, godparents, spouses, witnesses, or deceased persons in the registers of other missions. Evidence for transfer or on-going residence at Mission Dolores was tracked for each baptized Bay Area individual, using the computer database that was enhanced for this study. Resultant Table 6 shows the aggregate numbers of people baptized at Mission Dolores, and known to be alive in 1823, that could confidently be assigned to one mission or another. During that tracking effort, we specifically identified 206 individuals active at Mission Dolores, almost all of the 208 aggregate total reported Mission Dolores end-of-year 1823 population.

The language background of the 206 Mission Dolores people was mixed, as Table 6 indicates. Some "Old Christian" San Francisco Bay Costanoans and Karkin Costanoans still lived at the mission or at its outstations, as did some Bay Miwok, Coast Miwok, Patwin, and Wappo people. Huchiun San Francisco Bay Costanoans had the highest number of survivors (27 people), followed by Huchiun-Aguasto San Francisco Bay Costanoans (17 people), Carquin Karkins (17 people), and recent migrant Ululato Patwins (16 people). Coast Miwoks continued to be well-represented, even though it was now six years after Mission San Rafael opened; Olema (12 people), Tamal-Aguasto (11 people) and Omiomi (9 people) were the most highly represented. Some Bay Miwoks were still at Mission Dolores as well, primarily Saclans (10 people).

Some back-and-forth population flow occurred between missions Dolores, San Jose, San Rafael, and San Francisco Solano in 1824. Bancroft reports that the compromise agreement allowing the establishment of San Francisco Solano provided for the Indians of the involved missions to determine where they wanted to stay.

Neophytes might go voluntarily from Old San Francisco to the new establishment, and also from San Jose and San Rafael, provided they came originally from the Sonoma region, and provided also that in the case of San Rafael they might return if they wished at any time within a year (Bancroft 1886:II:503-504).

With that in mind, we point out that the Mission Dolores population jumped back up to 265 at the end of 1824 (Appendix F:Table 1). This was an increase of 54, despite that fact that only ten Indian people were baptized at Mission Dolores during 1824, while 39 people were buried. Clearly, some of

the transfers of 1823 returned to Mission Dolores during 1824, but we can only identify a few specific individuals that are mentioned in subsequent records.

We have been able to document ten Mission Dolores people who moved south to either Mission Santa Clara, Mission Santa Cruz, or Mission San Carlos and were still alive in 1823, through cross-reference to their appearances in the marriage registers of those missions (see Table 6, column 3). Four of them were San Francisco Bay Costanoans from the early Peninsula cohort (mainly men), four were Patwin women, and two were Coast Miwok women.

Mission Dolores sent 99 transferees to Mission San Jose who were still alive in 1823 and whom we can identify from their appearance in subsequent baptismal (as parents or godparents), marriage, and death records of the latter mission (see Table 6, column 4). Most were Patwin-speakers, including 19 Ululatos, 18 Suisuns, and 10 Napas. Many others were Bay Miwoks, including 10 Chupcans, 7 Volvons, and 3 Tatcans. Also 7 bi-lingual Bay Miwok/San Francisco Bay Costanoan Jalquins from Mission Dolores were alive at Mission San Jose after 1824. Five Alaguali, five Chocoime, and three Olompali Coast Miwoks also went to Mission San Jose and remained there during the 1820s and 1830s, rather than transfer north to Mission San Rafael.

Mission San Rafael was the new home, by the end of 1823, and perhaps for many years prior, of 155 people converted at Mission Dolores (see Table 6, column 5). All but three of them were Coast Miwoks, not a surprising discovery. Additionally, most of the 99 Coast Miwoks that can not be accounted for in subsequent records at any mission (see Table 6, column 7) were probably at Mission San Rafael by the end 1823.

Mission San Francisco Solano was the new home of 482 neophytes from Mission Dolores and Mission San Jose by the end of 1823, according to its year-end report of that first year. We can explicitly document 309 of those who went north from Mission Dolores (see Table 6, column 6). The largest groups were from the Patwin and Wappo-speaking local tribes that had just arrived at Mission Dolores in 1821 and 1822. Of interest, 10 Carquins, speakers of a Costanoan language, moved north to the new mission in Sonoma Valley, as did 3 Chupcan Bay Miwoks and 1 Saclan Bay Miwok.

The home mission of 335 individuals alive at the end of 1823 could not be documented for the present study (see Table 6, column 7). Of 16 unaccounted San Francisco Peninsula Costanoans, ten were mission-born people who were probably living at Mission Dolores but not appearing in vital records. The unaccounted Coast Miwoks were almost certainly at San Rafael. The large groups of unaccounted Patwins were probably at Mission San Francisco Solano at the end of 1823. The unaccounted Wappos certainly went to Mission San Francisco Solano as well. Of 227 Wappos baptized at Mission Dolores (Canicaymos on Appendix F:Table 1), only four can be shown to have remained in San Francisco after Mission San Francisco Solano opened in 1823.

Language Mix at Mission Dolores after the 1823 Transfers

San Francisco Bay Costanoan returned to predominance at Mission Dolores at the end of 1823, following the removal of so many Coast Miwoks, Patwins, and Wappos back to the north. Of 206 people surely in the Mission Dolores community, 93 (45%) were San Francisco Bay Costanoans (39 people from East Bay groups and 21 people from Peninsula groups). Another 21 people (10%) were Karkin speakers. However, Coast Miwok was still an important language at the mission; it was the native or ancestral language of 61 of the 206 probable mission inhabitants (30%). No major changes occurred in the language community mix over the next year, although a few people returned south from Mission San Francisco Solano (see Table 6).

Many “Old Christian” Costanoan-speaking widowers found wives among the newer immigrant Coast Miwok and Patwin groups before and during the 1820s. There were always a large number of widowers seeking wives because the death rate of women at Mission Dolores was much

higher than that of men. The disparity in death rates was probably due to gender contrasts in daily life—the close confinement of women in the mission village versus the diverse outdoors work assignments for most men (Cook 1943a).

It would be of interest to carry out a quantitative study of contrasting language backgrounds of women and men in the mission population at the end of 1823. Future research will probably substantiate that far more than 50% of the men alive at San Francisco in 1823 spoke either San Francisco Bay Costanoan, Bay Miwok, or Karkin Costanoan, while half or more of the women at the mission that year were either native Coast Miwok or Patwin speakers, but such a study is beyond the scope of the present investigation.

BACKWATER MISSION DOLORES, 1824-1833

This section brings together information about Mission Dolores and its outstations from comments in diaries of the 1820s and from statements in mission register entries.

Mission Dolores Outstations in the 1820s

By the 1820s, Mission Dolores had lost some important tracts of land along the San Francisco Peninsula bay shore, specifically, the Las Pulgas and Buri Buri tracts (discussed above in this chapter). Mission Dolores continued to use its two main outstations, one at San Mateo on the bay shore and the other in the San Pedro Valley along the Pacific Coast. Franciscan Prefect Mariano Payeras described the San Francisco Peninsula ranches, including the San Mateo ranch, during a trip north from Mission Santa Clara to Mission Dolores in late 1821:

We visited the Holy Church [Santa Clara] and other places and at 1 P.M. [sic] took the road to the northwest. After five leagues, we passed through San Francisquito, a sheep ranch of that mission, and after eight leagues through Las Pulgas, a stock ranch of the Presidio of San Francisco, and after 10 leagues we found ourselves in San Mateo, a ranch of field crops and sheep belonging to the Mission of Our Father San Francisco. Here there are houses and storage bins for what the place produces in the way of grains (Payeras [1821] 1995:330).

An 1828 report of mission holdings listed 28 Indian people (six Indian men, eight women, ten boys, and four girls) living at “Rancho San Mateo, to the south 9 leagues, for small livestock and crops” (Anonymous 1828, see also Estenega 1828).

Mission Dolores baptismal and death register entries provide very little evidence regarding the specific Indian families at San Mateo in the 1820s. Two children baptized at Mission Dolores during the decade were explicitly noted as having been born at San Mateo. One child was Andrea, daughter of Pantaleon and Caridad (Appendix F:Table 14, Family 2), who was baptized on March 20, 1827. The other child was Maria Antonia, daughter of Nestor and Maxima (Appendix F:Table 14, Family 10), baptized on August 8, 1826. The first pair of parents were San Pablo Bay Huchiun/Carquins, while the second were Marin Peninsula Coast Miwoks. Mission Dolores’s death register mentions only one death at San Mateo during the 1820s, that of 23-year-old Teodoro, a Huchiun Bay Costanoan, in January of 1825 (SFR-D 5134, SFR-B 2429). Altogether, these references may underestimate the actual number of births and deaths at San Mateo in the 1820s and early 1830s, because the missionary, Father Estenega, was not a systematic record keeper.

Agricultural activity continued at the Pacific Coast outstation of San Pedro y San Pablo, in present day Pacifica, down into the 1820s, even though baptisms at its chapel had been curtailed in 1792. Father Estenega reported in 1828, “To the south, over the mountains on the coast, the mission has a ranch named San Pedro, with cultivation, the pastures for horned stock” (Estenega 1828). A separate

1828 report on Mission Dolores holdings listed 26 Indian people (8 men, 8 women, 6 boys, 4 girls) living at “Rancho San Pedro to the southwest seven leagues, for livestock and crops” (Anonymous 1828).

Beechey’s British View of Mission Dolores in the 1820s

British naval officer Frederick W. Beechey wrote extensive commentaries about the Indian people of central California during his visit to San Francisco Bay as captain of the Blossom in November and December of 1826. Beechey’s descriptions of conditions at the various San Francisco Bay Area missions reveal his negative biases against Indians and Hispanic enterprises, but also contain valuable information.

In some of the mission much misery prevails, while in others there is a degree of cheerfulness and cleanliness which shows that many of the Indians require only care and proper management to make them as happy as their dull senses will admit of under a life of constraint (Beechey [1826] 1831:20).

Mission Dolores, it seems, was one of the poorly run missions.

The two missions of *Sán Francisco* and *Sán José* are examples of the contrast alluded to. The former in 1817 contained a thousand converts, who were housed in small huts around the mission; but at present only two hundred and sixty remain—some have been sent, it is true, to the new mission of San Francisco Solano, but sickness and death have dealt with an unsparing hand among the others. The huts of the absentees, at the time of our visit, had all fallen to decay, and presented heaps of filth and rubbish; while the remaining inmates of the mission were in as miserable a condition as it was possible to conceive, and were entirely regardless of their own comfort. Their hovels afforded scarcely any protection against the weather, and were black with smoke: some of the Indians were sleeping on the greasy floor; others were grinding baked acorns to make into cakes, which constitute a large portion of their food (Beechey [1826] 1831:20-21).

A party from the Blossom borrowed horses and made a land trip south to Monterey via missions Santa Clara and San Juan Bautista. On the first day they stopped at a hut at the government stock ranch of Buri Buri, at the San Mateo Ranch building, and at the small house on the Las Pulgas Ranch. Beechey’s description of San Mateo is repeated here:

Herds of cattle and horse were grazing upon the rich pasture.... Instead of a noble mansion, in character with so fine a country, the party arrived at a miserable mud dwelling, before the door of which a number of half-naked Indians were basking in the sun. Several dead geese, deprived of their entrails, were fixed upon pegs around a large pole, for the purpose of decoying the living game into snares, which were placed for them in favourable situations. Heaps of bones also of various animals were lying about the place, and sadly disgraced the park-like scenery around. This spot is named *Sán Matheo*, and belongs to the mission of *Sán Francisco* (Beechey [1826] 1831:44).

Beechey wrote extensively on the use of force by the missionaries and their Mission Indian allies against non-Christian tribal people of the interior. While he was in San Francisco Bay, the San Francisco Presidio soldiers and a large group of Mission San Jose Indian auxiliaries went out into the Sacramento Valley to punish the Cosomne Plains Miwoks for harboring Mission San Jose Christian Plains Miwok Indian people who had decided they did not like mission life. The expedition was successful from the point of view of the troops, in that it sacked the Cosomne village, killed many people, and returned to the Presidio with numerous prisoners. Beechey ([1826] 1831:29) described the incident and recorded his distaste for the comportment of the troops under Alférez Jose Antonio Sanchez.

Duhaut-Cilly's French View of Mission Dolores in the 1820s

French trader Eugene Duhaut-Cilly visited San Francisco Bay on the ship *Héros* in January of 1827, and again in October of that year. He met with Father Estenega at Mission Dolores on January 27, reporting that the mission buildings, including a large church, storehouses, and the living quarters of people, formed a quadrangle around an open square.

Beyond this group of buildings, and separated from it by a large court where runs a stream of fresh water, are the habitations of the Indians attached to the mission. These are arranged in an orderly way and divided by straight streets at regular intervals. Some years ago this establishment had become one of the most considerable in California, both for the wealth of its products and for the number of its Indians. But in 1827 there remained of this splendor only the many structures that had once been needed, most of which were now falling into ruin (Duhaut-Cilly [1827]1999:54).

Duhaut-Cilly learned from Father Estenega that there were 260 Indian people attached to the mission, and that it was one of the poorest missions in the system.

The Frenchman traveled down the Peninsula to San Jose in October of 1827. On the way he stopped for the night at the ranch house of the government ranch of Buri Buri, which was manned by a son-in-law of Ignacio Martinez, then provisional commander at the Presidio of San Francisco. A dinner was followed by "a fine basket of strawberries gathered in the mountains by the Indians" (Duhaut-Cilly [1827] 1999:127).

Duhaut-Cilly noted that Mission Dolores, with only 260 Indians, was one of the least productive missions along the coast.

All that was needed to bring about the decline was the successive administrations of two missionaries without talent or energy. Fray Tomás succeeded them, and under him the establishment was not likely to recover. He was an excellent man, but poor health made him indifferent to the conduct of affairs, and he left the management to stewards while he enjoyed the peaceful life he needed (Duhaut-Cilly [1827] 1999:55).

By comparison, he was impressed with Mission Santa Clara, which in 1827 had, he reported, an Indian community of 1,200.

Duhaut-Cilly saw the missions through the eyes of the new commercial class that was roving the world in the 1820s. He was on the California coast in hopes of joining the trade of goods to the missionaries, in return for cash. But the cash-poor missionaries offered him hides and tallow for merchandise. The tallow could be sold in Lima, Peru for cash, and the hides could be sold to American vessels. Thus Duhaut-Cilly joined the short-lived hide-and-tallow trade of the mid-1820s to the mid-1840s.

DOLOREÑOS AND HISPANICS, 1824-1833

This section focuses on the individual Indian people who lived at Mission Dolores and its outstations between 1824 and 1833, as well as the overtaking of Indian infant baptisms by Hispanic infant baptisms on the San Francisco Peninsula during that period.

Indian Families at Mission Dolores, 1824-1833

A good snapshot of the Indian families of Mission Dolores in the 1820s, and of their diverse tribal heritage, is acquired through reconstruction of the mission couples who were having children during the period. Between the beginning of 1824 and the end of 1833, 36 Mission Dolores women gave birth to 72 baptized children. Of the 36 women, 27 had more than one child during the period

with a single husband, and thus can be shown to have had some continual family presence. Those 27 women, and their families, are listed in Appendix F:Table 14 along with 14 additional families active subsequent to 1833. The families are listed in the table in order of the marriage dates of the parental couple. Although most of the marriage dates are known, some are implied because they do not seem to have been logged in any marriage register.

The first 27 families listed in Appendix F:Table 14—those that had children prior to 1834, represent numerous language backgrounds. The 54 spouses in the 27 marriages include 20 Coast Miwoks, 16 East Bay San Francisco Bay and Karkin Costanoans, 7 Peninsula San Francisco Bay Costanoans, 6 Patwins, and 5 Bay Miwoks. One might write an entire research paper examining the inter-tribal and inter-language marriage patterns illustrated by the couples. However, we bullet below only highlights and we present them separately for San Francisco Peninsula Costanoans, East Bay Costanoans, and Coast Miwoks.

San Francisco Peninsula Costanoans or their descendents were represented by seven of the spouses having children between 1824 and 1833 (Appendix F:Table 14):

- A Yelamu man was married to a Suisun Patwin woman.
- A Cotegen/Yelamu man was married a Suisun woman.
- Two Yelamu men were married to Omiomi Coast Miwok women.
- A Puichon man was married to a Saclan Bay Miwok woman .
- A Puichon man was married to a Tatcan Bay Miwok woman.
- An Acsaggis (Olpen) man was married to a Huchiun-Aguasto woman.

All were men and all were married to women whom they probably would not have met or married in tribal times. Note that the descendents of the Cotegen/Yelamu-Suisun couple, Pedro Alcantara and Crisanta (Family 19) can be traced into the twentieth century, as can the descendents of a Puichon-Saclan couple, Evencio and Geronima (Family 25). Those two extended families will be discussed in detail in Chapter 9.

East Bay San Francisco Bay and Karkin Costanoans speakers or their descendants represented 16 of the 54 spouses in the first 27 marriages shown on Appendix F:Table 14. They included seven Carquins, seven Huchiuns, and two Huchiun-Aguastos:

- Ten of the East Bay Costanoan speakers were married to one another.
- Three were Huchiuns married to Coast Miwok speakers (one to Omiomi, two to Tamales Bay area people).
- One was a Carquin married to a Saclan Bay Miwok.
- Two San Pablo Bay spouses made atypical marriages, one to an Acsaggis (Olpen) San Francisco Bay Costanoan from far south on the Peninsula (Family 9), the other to a Tolena Patwin from far to the north (Family 21).

The majority of the East Bay Costanoan speakers at the mission were married in traditional patterns, to people from nearby groups. But the marriage to an Acsaggis San Francisco Bay Costanoan from far to the south and the one to a Tolena Patwin from far to the north is of greater distance than expected for a traditional link.

Coast Miwok speakers or their descendants represented 20 of the 54 spouses having multiple children during the 1824-1833 period (the most highly represented of the three key language groups). Highlights of their marriage patterns are:

- Fourteen Coast Miwoks were involved in seven endogamous Coast Miwok marriages, in expected traditional patterns.

- Three Coast Miwoks were married to Huchiun San Francisco Bay Costanoans; the Huchiuns came from the San Pablo Creek vicinity just across the bay from the lands of Coast Miwok groups on the Marin Peninsula.
- Two Coast Miwoks were Omiomi women married to Yelamu Bay Costanoan descendants. In tribal times the Yelamu had lived directly adjacent to a Coast Miwok group across the Golden Gate, but they had been separated from the Omiomi by two intervening groups, so these ties must be considered atypical in relation to traditional patterns.
- Another atypical Coast Miwok marriage at Mission Dolores in the 1820s involved the Olema widower Teofilo and the Chupcan Bay Miwok widow Teotima (Family 24).

Some of these Coast Miwoks would return to the Marin Peninsula after Mission Dolores was closed in the 1830s. For instance, Teodorico of Family 18 was probably the man who was later the lead person of the group that temporarily received the Nicasio land grant west of San Rafael on the Marin Peninsula (see Dietz 1976).

In summary, the patterns of inter-group marriages at Mission Dolores in the 1820s varied, depending upon the language group under investigation. The few remaining San Francisco Bay Costanoans from Peninsula local tribes were all men who were married to women from distant local tribes with whom they would not have married in earlier times. Most of the San Francisco Bay Costanoans from East Bay local tribes, on the other hand, had spouses from nearby local tribes, as did most of the Coast Miwoks at the mission. We suggest that the individuals who engaged in non-traditional long-distance marriages did so because spouses from traditional neighbors were no longer available.³⁴

Mission Dolores Costanoans and Bay Miwoks at other Missions, 1824-1833

Former Mission Dolores neophytes lived at many other central California missions as secularization approached. We have already discussed the wholesale transfers of people among the San Francisco Bay Area missions in a section above. The other reason for the appearance of Mission Dolores people at distant missions was the emancipation program initiated in the mid-1820s. In 1826 Governor Echeandía issued the *Decree of Emancipation in Favor of the Neophytes*. The decree allowed a limited group of Indians to leave their missions and find work and lodging in the civil community “provided they had been Christians from childhood or for fifteen years, were married, or at least not minors, and had some means of gaining a livelihood” and provided they had the approval of their Franciscan priest and the local presidial commander (Hackel 2005:376).

Appendix F:Table 15 lists San Francisco Bay Costanoans and Bay Miwoks who were originally baptized at Mission Dolores and were living during the 1820s and early 1830s at missions San Carlos Borromeo, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Jose, and San Francisco Solano. The only people on the table likely to have been emancipated were Respicio and Tiburcio at Mission Carmel and

³⁴ Godparent listings in baptismal records are another information source regarding families and individuals who were participating in communal life at Mission Dolores in the 1820s. Among the godparents are individuals who did not appear as parents. Among them were two Coast Miwok men who played roles in the history of Marin County to the north. One was Marino (SFR-B 2182), a Huimen Coast Miwok who was a godparent at a conditional baptism at the San Mateo outstation in 1826 (SFR-B 6493) and a Mission Dolores baptism in 1827 (SFR-B 6500). The other was Quintino (SFR-B 2038), an Habasto Coast Miwok who served as a godparent at Mission Dolores in 1826 (SFR-B 6492). Additionally, an 1828 godparent was Dimas, the alcalde of Mission Dolores (in SFR-B 6513). Dimas (SFR-B 1172), a 35-year-old Ssalson San Francisco Bay Costanoan, did not have children during the 1820s.

Josefa Patrocinio at Mission Santa Cruz. Other Mission Dolores people were probably emancipated and living in many parts of California, even on ranches on the San Francisco Peninsula, prior to secularization. However, the post-1827 ecclesiastical records of the San Francisco Bay Area missions do not differentiate emancipated and non-emancipated Mission Indians.

Quite a few San Francisco Bay Costanoan, Karkin Costanoan, and Bay Miwok descendants from Mission Dolores who were living at Mission San Jose and Mission San Francisco Solano during the late 1820s and 1830s are listed on Appendix F:Table 15. Of note:

- The 19 Mission Dolores adults at Mission San Jose were all Bay Miwoks or bilingual Costanoan/Bay Miwok Jalquins.
- The nine Mission Dolores adults at Mission San Francisco Solano included four adult Carquin Karkin Costanoans, one Huchiun San Francisco Bay Costanoan, one Huchiun-Aguasto San Francisco Bay Costanoan, one bilingual Jalquin, and two Saclan Bay Miwoks.

As stated in an earlier section, the transfer of Bay Miwoks and bilingual Jalquins to Mission San Jose from Mission Dolores in the 1820s seems to have been programmatic. The presence of San Pablo Bay Costanoans (Carquins, Huchiun-Aguastos, Huchiuns) at Mission San Francisco Solano, on the other hand, was surprising to us. It should not be surprising, in retrospect, since the east shore of San Pablo Bay and Carquinez Strait area was geographically between the San Francisco Peninsula and the North Bay area of Mission San Francisco Solano and its outstations.

Demographic Shift to Hispanic Predominance, 1824-1833

There came a time in most mission vicinities when the population of Hispanic immigrants became greater than that of the indigenous California Indian population. On the San Francisco Peninsula, that time was the mid-1820s, soon after the vast majority of Patwin and Wappo neophytes went back north to found Mission San Francisco Solano. In the absence of any good census of Hispanics in San Francisco in the 1820s and 1830s, we determine the time of the shift to Hispanic predominance indirectly, through a comparison of yearly counts of Indian baptisms and Hispanic *gente de razon* (people of reason) baptisms.

The overall Hispanic population at the San Francisco Presidio, the Mission, and the few nearby ranchos fluctuated between 200 and 280 over the years 1817 to 1830, according to Hubert Howe Bancroft. His sources, a large number of Mexican-era censuses, contained no reliable statistics for the area as a whole. The sources suggest, however, that the 1817 Hispanic population was 380, that it dropped to 280 by 1828, and perhaps was as low as 200 in 1830 (Bancroft 1886:II, 371, 586). By comparison, the overall Indian population of Mission Dolores ranged between 219 and 265 from 1822 to 1830 (Appendix F:Table 1). It seems, therefore, that the overall Hispanic and Indian populations were essentially equivalent on the Peninsula during the 1820s.

To illuminate the dynamics of population change, it is useful to compare the Hispanic and Indian birthrates at Mission Dolores in the 1820s. Table 7 presents baptism counts for Indian and Hispanic infants, as well as tribal converts, during the 1820s and 1830s at Mission Dolores and the other San Francisco Bay Area missions. Between 1823 and 1825 Hispanic infant baptisms averaged 12.2 per year, while Indian infant baptisms averaged 9 per year. Then, between 1826 and 1830, Hispanic infant baptisms averaged 11 per year, and Indian infant baptisms averaged ten per year.

During the 1831-1835 period, the birthrate shifted significantly in favor of Hispanics, with an average of 15 reported births per year, in contrast to four reported births per year in the Indian community (Table 7). By the end of the mission era, more Hispanic women than Indian women on the San Francisco Peninsula were bringing babies to Mission Dolores for baptism, an indication that the overall growing Hispanic population would soon surpass the still-shrinking Indian population.

Table 7. Yearly Baptismal Counts for Tribally-born Indians, Mission-born Indian Infants, and Hispanic Infants at Five Bay Area Missions between 1818 and 1848.

	SANTA CLARA			SAN JOSE			DOLORES			SAN RAFAEL ^c		
	ALL		INFANTS	ALL		INFANTS	ALL		INFANTS	ALL		INFANTS
	TRIBAL	MISSION	RAZON	TRIBAL	MISSION	RAZON	TRIBAL	MISSION ^a	RAZON ^b	TRIBAL	MISSION	RAZON
1818	52	34	18	246	55	1	22	36	13	168	13	0
1819	72	34	19	105	56	0	3	32	12	129	18	0
1820	87	44	30	188	46	0	14	37	8	102	12	0
1821	87	32	15	109	59	0	449	27	14	144	12	0
1822	115	40	23	16	42	1	57	28	6	181	18	0
1823	81	37	20	220	48	0	2	10	13	94	24	0
1824	114	34	33	300	33	2	0	11	20	208	20	0
1825	63	37	31	157	42	1	0	7	8	137	22	0
1826	99	42	21	168	48	5	0	13	10	120	18	1
1827	118	31	34	154	38	3	0	8	6	32	15	0
1828	91	33	27	186	28	3	0	12	19	69	16	0
1829	8	20	30	28	35	2	0	8	11	2	15	0
1830	12	19	36	185	35	4	0	8	7	4	19	0
1831	19	21	41	304	32	1	0	6	11	143	15	2
1832	0	15	46	4	26	5	0	1	3	5	15	0
1833	2	21	41	43	48	4	0	4	13	0	15	0
1834	51	18	32	510	37	7	0	6	14	3	7	0
1835	67	29	40	56	47	6	0	3	19	0	13	1
1836	62	36	45	68	44	15	0	5	16	0	11	3
1837	27	29	42	8	55	10	0	1	16	2	8	2
1838	8	29	35	15	39	18	12	5	20	2	10	3
1839	11	31	42	9	40	14	0	1	9	8	11	4
1840	9	27	49	178	56	14	0	3	10	-	-	-
1841	21	36	57	36	30	16	5	3	6	-	-	-
1842	5	20	45	28	43	21	0	1	11	-	-	-
1843	34	35	55	29	30	13	0	2	5	-	-	-
1844	8	27	57	18	26	14	5	2	8	-	-	-
1845	3	14	59	9	14	11	3	1	12	-	-	-
1846	9	21	75	3	12	9	5	2	7	-	-	-
1847	13	37	81	5	8	2	3	6	16	-	-	-
1848	12	22	72	6	11	5	3	2	7	-	-	-

Notes: ^a Mission count at Mission Dolores includes 15 children listed only in death register; ^b *Razon* count at Mission Dolores includes 19 children listed only in death register; ^c Mission San Rafael baptismal data continued past 1839 with a second baptismal register; it was not examined for this project.