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ABSTRACT

This report presents a new understanding of the Salinan and Northern Chumash communities as they might have existed at Spanish contact, between 1769 and 1810. It relies mainly upon evidence in the registers of baptism, confirmation, marriage, and burial for missions San Antonio, San Luis Obispo, and San Miguel. Although the registers contain the names of 205 rancherías (villages and multi-village communities), they contain few direct clues about the placement of those rancherías on the landscape. To aid locational identification, we reviewed all of the J.P. Harrington notes on the Salinan and Chumash. From those and from other scholarly sources, we found evidence for the locations of only 16 of the 205 contact-period rancherías.

To establish relative locations for the 205 rancherías, we used proximity information garnered from a study of kinship ties between rancherías, as documented in the mission registers. Because clues about inter-ranchería kinship ties were scattered among various mission register entries, the data had to be reorganized to reconstruct a regional ethnogeography. Computer databases were built and used to sort and cross-reference life history information for over 4,000 people baptized at Mission San Antonio, over 2,400 people baptized at Mission San Antonio, and over 3,000 people baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo. We then developed a model of population distribution expectations to examine and modify our assumptions regarding the density of village groups across the study area. By adjusting groups to the east, west, north, and south, we arrived at a map of the social landscape that made sense in terms of general environmental parameters. The model was exhaustively applied to the coastal regions from Lopez Point south to San Luis Obispo Bay. Due to time constraints, ranchería placements in the inland areas were less rigorously developed and await future projects in that area. The population model improved our understanding of the relative locations of the rancherías, but not their specific placement on the landscape.

Language boundaries between contact-period Salinans and Northern Chumash were studied as an issue separate from that of specific community locations. Two widely accepted alternative boundaries are in the public record. A coastal dialect or language called Playano was believed by A.L. Kroeber to have been Salinan and by Robert Gibson to have been Chumash. Milliken believes that the preponderance of evidence suggests that Playano was related to Salinan, but it is possible that it was a separate, now extinct, relict language or was indeed a Chumash language. Johnson considers that we do not yet have enough data to determine which of the three alternatives is most likely. Linguistic analysis of Playano personal names by both Salinan and Chumash language scholars may be a future avenue for determining Playano linguistic affiliation.

In addition to linguistic studies, future research should include an integrated analysis of all tribal populations from the San Francisco Bay to the Santa Barbara Channel. Such a study should be based upon fully developed family kinship charts and should include quantitative studies of inter-group marriage patterns, as done by Johnson (1988) for the Chumash. Finally, population model inferences must eventually be ground-checked through systematic archaeological survey and site testing to identify the true distribution of Late Period sites across the landscape.
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FORWARD: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The following document has been reviewed by many individuals, including Caltrans personnel, Native Americans ethnographers, professors, linguists, and archaeologists. The authors would like to thank all reviewers for taking the time to read the report and for preparing comments. The following discussions focus on several issues that we felt needed clarification in response to comments received.

THE POPULATION DISTRIBUTION MODEL

It was stated by one reviewer that the population distribution model “is a great improvement over earlier, less-focused studies of this type,” while another noted that this “computerized study” can be applied to herding animals but not humans, it disregards “culture,” and “adjusts data” to fit the model. While the population distribution model could perhaps have been better explained, we believe that the iterative technique that we used, mapping otherwise unlocatable communities on to an ecologically variable landscape, resulted in a generally accurate portrayal of those community locations. None of the ranchería location adjustments we made were arbitrary, although it may seem that way because our explanations for inferring the locations of group after group in the inland area were made on the basis of only partially analyzed kinship networks. Our description of location adjustments to make “actual numbers” match “expected results” was merely a statement about moving groups three or four miles further to the east, west, north, or south. The exercise does not claim that the groups are perfectly placed, and for that reason we did not draw inferred regional group territorial boundaries. The iterative nature of our model allowed us to correct initial assumptions about relative community placement in space, resulting in a final ethnogeography that improves upon previous attempts.

It was noted by more than one reviewer that we did not take into consideration rules of marriage, clan, and moiety. One reviewer suggested that we look to the work of Raymond C. White with the Luiseño for a good example of such a study. It is our view that White (1963) was building a model of human social organization, and thus his documentation of explicit marriage rules, clans, and moieties was key. For us, the expressed rules of human interaction at Spanish contact are not as important as the physical movement of people as they married and traveled to live with their spouses’ families or set up neolocal residence.

The reviewer’s point about moieties is well taken. If Salinan or Northern Chumash groups lived in moiety-based patrilineal village communities, and married out, not to their nearest neighbors but to appropriate village communities of other moieties, the regional kinship network pattern would be greatly affected. However, our family reconstruction data (see Appendix E) suggest that all large Salinan villages were multi-lineage villages, and that a distance-decay model of inter-marriage patterns is appropriate. Future work should examine the moiety and lineage question more explicitly.

USE OF ETHNOGRAPHIC OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Several reviewers focused on the limited use of ethnographic studies and archaeological data. One reviewer felt that we were selective in our use of J.P. Harrington’s extensive Salinan material and did not give appropriate weight to the views of his consultants when they conflicted with our own interpretation of the earlier record. Having searched through every page of Harrington’s material on the Salinan and the Northern Chumash for any and all ethnogeographic clues, we wove those clues into all of our discussions, and contextualized the lives and family histories of all of Harrington’s consultants.

One reviewer commented that we didn’t apply archaeological data to our study. While it is true that the pattern of Late Period archaeological site distribution would help us understand regional population distribution, unfortunately we are nowhere near having adequate information for the study area at large. We do not believe that archaeological material provides good evidence of linguistic boundaries. Further, no archaeological evidence provides the name of a ranchería community. It is true that the names of some archaeological sites were provided to researchers such as J.P. Harrington, Raymond White, and D.L. True by
ethnographic consultants, but that is ethnographic evidence, similar to the kind that we marshal here, not archaeological evidence.

USE OF PROFESSIONAL LINGUISTS

Some reviewers expressed concern that we “standardized” the spellings of ranchería names as the Spanish wrote them, thus potentially masking evidence for the linguistic underpinnings of ranchería names. The spellings may indeed mask linguistic evidence, but we did not arbitrarily distort the names. For each ranchería, we choose to use the spelling that appeared most commonly in all mission registers as our standard form. Thus, using Spanish pronunciation, one may hear the name of the ranchería as Spanish priests were best able to represent it. The many varieties of spellings are now available to linguists through the computerized databases, along with the names of individual missionaries who wrote them down (see appendices B, C, and D). It will be terrific when linguists reconstruct the proper orthographic spelling of the names, as Richard Applegate did in 1975 for Santa Barbara Channel Chumash villages.

Four reviewers were disappointed by the lack of linguistic analysis of the meanings of village names, feeling that translated village names would indicate which language the people from a specific ranchería spoke. We did not have such a study done because the mission registers are full of village names used by the Mission Indian interpreters in their own language for more distant peoples of another language. Such is the case for use of the Salinan name “Bubal” in the San Miguel registers for the Yokuts ranchería of Wowol. Further north, hundreds of Pomo people were baptized at Mission San Rafael under a series of Coast Miwok names for their Pomo villages. We did initiate work with two linguists to translate personal names from a set of villages near and distant from both sides of the ostensible Chumash-Salinan border. Such a study could only have valid results if: (1) the linguist did not have a preconceived idea of the language spoken by a group in question; and (2) scholars of both linguistic groups carried out the study with the same set of data. Unfortunately, only one of the linguists was able to complete the study, and very few names were translatable by that linguist for any village set. That study, which offers a good possibility for positive results, remains to be completed with participation of the other linguist.

One commentator wrote that a third party cannot determine the location of an ethnic community’s boundaries. Our work does not address the boundaries of today’s Indian groups, boundaries which have emerged out of the evolving post-mission experience. Our work does speak to the issue of cultural continuity from ranchería life through mission aggregation to the emergence of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century people. Further, our work makes available to Indian people computer databases that allow them to trace their nineteenth-century ancestors back through the mission registers to contact-period villages.

CHALLENGE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

It remains our hope that our research and findings will initiate scholarly discussion and, as noted by several reviewers, will serve as a basis for future research and as a reference for years to come.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

RESEARCH STATEMENT

This study reconstructs the social geography of the Salinan and Northern Chumash people at the time of Spanish settlement. At that time, approximately 6,000 people lived on the South Coast Range landscape between the latitude of the present King City on the north and that of the present Arroyo Grande on the south. Beginning in 1771, these tribal people left their communities to join the agricultural-religious missions of San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo. By 1810 no tribal villages existed in the South Coast ranges.

Northern Chumash and Salinan people lived in small villages of 20-200 people prior to the disruption of the tribal social fabric. We can be sure, by extrapolation from detailed ethnographic studies elsewhere in California, that they had placenames for inhabited villages, old village sites, temporary campsites, surrounding hills, flats, bends in streams, and distinctive rock formations. Some names described local resources, some commemorated events of the recent past, and others marked events in the mythic past. We suggest that there may have been as many as 30,000 tribal placenames within the 5,600 square miles of our study area, of which at least 2,500 were the names of utilized or abandoned villages and temporary camps.\(^1\)

The only data source available today that approaches a systematic census of contact-period villages is the information scattered through the Franciscan registers of baptism, confirmation, marriage, and burial from missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo. The registers for the three missions document a combined total of 205 rancherías (Merriam 1955, 1968). (The Franciscans used the term “ranchería” variously to indicate a village, a multi-village territory, or the group of people who inhabited such.) Fewer than a dozen of those rancherías were listed with accompanying clues that allow them to be precisely located on the ground. A larger number were accompanied by unspecific clues, such as “on the coast,” “on the Monterey [Salinas] River,” or “to the east.” A few ranchería names appear on later Mexican era land grant maps (all of which were examined for this study).

It is the task of this study to determine the locations of the 205 rancherías of the pertinent mission records and to identify the language spoken by their members. As will be discussed below, only 16 of them were recognized and located by consultants of later field ethnographers. Therefore, indirect techniques were developed for this study to infer their general locations.

PREVIOUS SOUTH COAST RANGE STUDIES

Early twentieth-century ethnographers gathered information about a few score placenames within our study area. J. P. Harrington was the most successful in that effort. He documented more than 20 placenames known to local Salinan people in the upper San Antonio River watershed and adjacent areas (Jones et al. 2000; Rivers and Jones 1993). Harrington’s Salinan consultants also knew some placenames along the coast from Estero Bay to just north of Lopez Point, and a few placenames in the Paso Robles, Cholam, and Estrella vicinities. His only Northern Chumash consultant knew a handful of placename translations for locations south of Estero Bay, but could only vaguely locate the sites. As valuable as it is for the study of certain local placenames, this early information is not sufficient for the task at hand.

\(^1\) Our place name density predictions are extrapolated from some classic California ethnographies. Waterman (1920:246-248) recorded 142 Yurok place names within a 25 square mile area in the Klamath River region, for a density of 5.6 per square mile. Kniffen (1939:354) recorded the names of 38 Pomo village and campsite locations within a 16 square mile area on the south side of Clear Lake, for a density of 2.4 per square mile. In a much drier area of southern California, Strong (1929:244-248) recorded 93 named Cupa clan landholding tracts within a 110 square mile area around Warner Hot Springs, for a density of 0.85 per square mile.
areas, Harrington’s placename information was not connected to a systematic census of ethnographic village locations and population densities across the study area at large.

The classic texts on South Coast Range ethnography are not rich in ethnogeographic information. Few tribal rancherías are located on the maps in pertinent chapters of Kroeber’s 1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California* or the chapters in the 1978 *Handbook of North American Indians: Volume 8 (California)* by Hester for Salinan (1978:500-504), Greenwood for Obispeño (Northern) Chumash (1978:520-523), and Wallace for the Southern Valley Yokuts (1978:448-461). Those works reflect the loss of knowledge regarding early ranchería locations that had taken place during the nineteenth century.

Our study builds upon earlier mission register-based research pioneered by Robert Gibson, Chester King, Sally McLendon, and John Johnson. Gibson, in a key 1983 study was the first to do family network studies for the South Coast Ranges using mission register data. Gibson’s work made great progress in village placements in our study area, when compared with the classic ethnographic publications. Since the work of Gibson, King (1984) built a detailed web of kinship relations among pre-mission people of western Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties, using mission register clues. More recently, McLendon and Johnson (1999) re-examined King’s kinship charts, then published a slightly modified map of Chumash ranchería locations, including those within our study area around Mission San Luis Obispo. All of these studies were constrained by the limited nature of the direct clues available for reconstructing regional ethnogeography north of the Santa Maria River, and by the absence of an integrated approach to the studies of overlapping recruitment patterns between missions San Luis Obispo, San Miguel, and San Antonio.

Gibson (1983) proposed a much different Chumash-Salinan boundary and a much different Salinan-Yokuts boundary than had been proposed by earlier scholars (Figure 1). Our study re-examines the evidence for those language boundaries as a separate issue from that of specific ranchería locations.

**DUAL USE OF THE TERM “RANCHERÍA”**

The Franciscan missionaries used the term ranchería in two related but distinct ways. From the earliest days they called the clusters of grass houses inhabited by the tribal people rancherías. That usage corresponds to the modern Spanish-English dictionary definition of “a collection of huts, like a hamlet” (Velásquez 1974:551). Eventually some missionaries applied the term in an expanded sense, to signify a community of people who shared a number of villages within a fixed territory (Milliken 1987:59, 1995:21, 233). The dual use of the term ranchería is equivalent to the dual use of the term “pueblo” in Spanish, as either an inhabited place or a community of people with a shared identity who live in a given region.

The missionaries’ flexible use of the term ranchería presents particular problems within our south Coast Range study area. Within the area, the multi-village “tribelet” political organization typical of central California gives way to the system of politically independent local villages of ethnographic southern California. Multi-village tribelets existed in the immediate vicinity of Mission San Antonio in the northern portion of our study area; there the missionaries applied the term ranchería both to specific villages and to the larger districts that contained them. At Mission San Luis Obispo in the south, on the other hand, the missionaries applied the term ranchería only to specific local villages.

Use of the term “ranchería” is most ambiguous for Mission San Miguel, and in San Miguel’s overlapping recruitment areas with missions San Antonio and San Luis Obispo. Numerous rancherías east and northeast of Mission San Miguel were listed in only a few mission register entries, and were never

---

2 A.L. Kroeber coined the term tribelet to refer to small independent political groups that had numerous villages within a definable territory, and who often recognized the leadership of a single chief (1932:257). Such organization is not documented south of Mission San Antonio, although early explorers did note that one famous personage, El Buchón, collected tribute from a number of villages around San Luis Obispo Bay.
Figure 1. Comparison of Kroeber’s (1925) and Gibson’s (1983) Coast Range Language Boundary Placements.
associated with districts. This suggests that they were independent villages. However, entries for the ranchería of Cholam, east of Mission San Miguel, indicate that it referred to both a district with separately named villages and a key village within the district. Another oft-mentioned Mission San Miguel ranchería, Tisagues, may have been a mobile community whose members spread out and coalesced seasonally at sites across the arid Temblor Range. Finally, the coastal ranchería of Tsetacol defies our analysis of scale; it was either a large village or a territory that contained a number of villages.

A large part of this report is dedicated to understanding the different types of South Coast Range communities that the missionaries collectively called rancherías. We reiterate that the term can indicate a village, a political group with multiple fixed villages, or a community of people who moved among a number of temporary encampments. Due to its ambiguity, we do not replace “ranchería” in most of the translations of mission register entry phrases found in this report.

RECONSTRUCTING RANCHERÍA LOCATIONS

We used a variety of direct and indirect methods to identify the general locations of the 205 rancherías that sent people to the study area missions. Like Gibson (1983) and King (1984), we use a combination of stated evidence and inference regarding the locations of rancherías listed in the mission registers. Unlike them, we built computer data bases that cross-reference thousands of mission register entries, linking individual baptisms, marriages, and deaths, as well as parents to children. We have also employed a new population distribution model to aid our intuitive decisions regarding the indirect placement of poorly documented rancherías on the landscape.

Using the data base information, we constructed kinship network charts for 190 extended family groups at missions San Antonio and San Miguel and augmented them with another 58 charts for Mission San Luis Obispo groups provided through the courtesy of King. A total of 150 of those charts, for all coastal families at the three missions, are published here in Appendix E. (Only half of the families from inland regions of missions San Antonio and San Miguel have been charted at this point.) Kinship charts allow us to identify clusters of rancherías whose members were related. They further provide a context for assigning tentative ranchería membership to many baptized people whose rancherías were not listed in the mission registers. Through the consolidation process, over 4,100 baptized tribal people could be assigned to one or another of approximately 56 ranchería clusters.

We initially followed the traditional methods of mission register regional analysis developed by Gibson and King to frame the study area and place the ranchería groups in general relationship to one another on the land. Known coastal groups were placed along the coast. Groups with family links to people at Mission Soledad were placed in the north. Groups with family links to Mission La Purísima were placed in the south. Groups intermarried with Yokuts tribes of the San Joaquin Valley were placed to the east. Inside that frame, groups who first went to a given mission were placed close to that mission. Closely intermarried groups were placed adjacent to one another. Locations were adjusted with the few clues from the early Spanish reports, Mexican land grant maps, and later ethnographic interviews.

The “frame-and-fill” method allows us to reconstruct the positions of the larger rancherías relative to one another. However, the resultant placements might easily be stretched out or bunched together in one direction or another, as one might stretch or bunch the pleats of an accordion. Without specific locational clues for most rancherías, every researcher is free to bunch groups toward the coast, the San Joaquin Valley, the north, or the south, according to his or her own assumptions about the underlying population.

---

3 The Mission San Luis Obispo data base had been completed prior to this study by John Johnson, but Mission San Antonio and San Miguel data bases were constructed for the first time during this study. All three of the data bases will be available to scholars and genealogists within a few years through a consortium of institutions to be announced by the end of 2003.
distribution. Such determinations regarding the fabric of ranchería locations cannot be avoided, but the assumptions that underlie them need to made clear.

We developed a predictive “population distribution model” to explicate our assumptions about where we might expect “bunches” of small rancherías and where we might expect only a few. We identified 28 evenly dispersed and equally sized local regions of the South Coast Ranges. We proposed that there were just short of 6,000 tribal people living within those regions, for an average of 210 people per region. We projected an expected population for each region, above or below that average, on the basis of an initial comparison of environmental variation from region to region. With the regional model populations as a yardstick, we re-examined our initial ranchería locations (and those of Gibson and King), adjusting some of the locations to approach the expectations of the population model.

The precise locations of most rancherías named in the early mission records will never be determined. Explicit locational clues are lacking in the registers themselves, and only a small number of rancherías were remembered by mission descendants. However, this study does offer preliminary conclusions regarding the social geography across the South Coast Ranges. Furthermore, this study sets up a structure for exhaustive research and interpretation in the future.

LOCATING LANGUAGE BOUNDARIES

Ethnographic language boundary analysis is a separate problem from ranchería location analysis. South Coast Range language boundaries indicated in the Handbook of the Indians of California (Kroeber 1925) and in the 1978 Handbook of North American Indians: Volume 8 (California; Heizer 1978) were opened to question by the work of Gibson in 1983. He suggested that the boundary between Salinan and Northern Chumash was much further north than indicated by the earlier ethnographers. The differences between Kroeber’s map and Gibson’s map are dramatic (see Figure 1).

We examine all of the information available to earlier scholars in our attempt to document the Salinan-Northern Chumash language boundary. Those clues derive from Spanish-period reports, from the statements of mission descendants who provided linguistic information to anthropologists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. We do not refer to archaeological studies as an element of this study, because we are not yet convinced that prehistorians have truly characterized linguistically linked “Northern Chumash” and “Salinan” archaeological signatures (see Hughes 1992).

Our studies support Kroeber’s (1925) language boundary for some areas, while they support Gibson’s (1983) language boundary for others. Most intriguing among our findings is the possibility that modern researchers have overlooked a completely distinct language once spoken on the coast north of Estero Bay and west of San Miguel. Franciscan missionaries noted, in their 1813 responses to a government inquiry (the Interrogatorio of 1812), that four languages were spoken at the South Coast Range missions—Chumash, Salinan, Yokuts, and “Playano” (Geiger and Meighan 1976). Playano, a coastal language of uncertain affiliation west of Mission San Miguel, was already going out of use at the time of the 1813 responses. Ethnographers C. Hart Merriam, A. L. Kroeber, and J. P. Harrington concluded that Playano was a Salinan language. Only J. Alden Mason, of the early ethnographers, left open the possibility that it was a separate language. We agree with Mason, and will discuss the question in detail in Chapter 10.

VOLUME ORGANIZATION

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 describes the history of South Coast Range Indians from the Spanish entry in 1769 through 1856, and documents the early homelands of Yokuts-speaking groups in the San Joaquin Valley to the east. Next, Chapter 3 presents information about ethnographers who worked in the study area from 1856 forward, and the Indian consultants with whom they worked. In Chapter 4 we describe the standard approaches that have been used in the past to build ethnogeographies with the aid of mission register data, and point out the exceptional weaknesses of the ethnogeographic data in the registers of missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo.
Chapter 5 describes the inferential population distribution model resulting in the delineation of 28 regions and associated named rancherías. The model has been exhaustively applied only to the seven coastal regions of the study area, from Lopez Point south to San Luis Obispo Bay; results are described in Chapter 6. At this time, only preliminary research has been carried out for inland regions. Chapter 7 documents the probable inland ranchería distributions near Mission San Antonio and inland from it. Chapter 8 describes the probable ranchería locations adjacent to and inland from Mission San Miguel. Chapter 9 discusses the inland rancherías to the east of Mission San Luis Obispo and north of the Santa Maria River.

Language boundaries between Chumash, Salinan, Yokuts, and a possible fourth language, Playano, are addressed in Chapter 10. In that chapter we critique prior attempts to assign language boundaries in the study area, then present our own conclusions. We repeat, and cannot emphasize too strongly, that the solution to language boundary issues is separate from the study of specific ranchería locations. On the one hand, a specific ranchería location can be documented without any regard to the language its inhabitants spoke. On the other hand, language boundaries can be inferred on the basis of a number of sources, some related to information attributable to the people of boundary rancherías, others not at all dependant on specific ranchería locations.

Chapter 11 reiterates the main points of this document and contains suggestions for future studies. Six appendices provide supporting material. Appendix A details the procedure used to build computer data bases for the Mission San Antonio and Mission San Miguel registers, along with a codebook for the information fields in those data bases. Appendices B and C (also on CD) list selected data from the Mission San Antonio and San Miguel data bases, respectively. Appendix D contains baptismal and death register information for Mission San Luis Obispo based upon a different data base format than appendices A-C. Finally, Appendix E contains extended family charts from members of coastal rancherías, derived from analysis of mission register information.

MISSION RECORD CITATIONS

Mission register citations in the text of this report follow a format that requires explanation. Each mission register contains the signatures of at least a dozen individual Franciscan missionaries; therefore the registers cannot be cited by author. Specific mission register entry citations in this report follow a special short-hand format, beginning with a three letter acronym referring to the mission in question, such as “SAN” for Mission San Antonio, “SLO” for Mission San Luis Obispo, and “SMI” for Mission San Miguel, and less commonly, “SCA” for Mission San Carlos Borromeo (Carmel). The mission acronym is followed by a dash and a letter to indicate the type of register cited, as follows:

- “-B” for an entry from a baptismal register;
- “-M” for an entry from a marriage register;
- “-D” for an entry from a death or burial register; and
- “-C” for an entry from a confirmation register.

In our citations, the unique register entry number supplied by the Franciscans follows the letter reference. For example, the citation “SLO-B 2898” refers to baptismal entry number 2,898 at Mission San Luis Obispo, which took place on March 28, 1841. Likewise, “SMI-M 14” refers to 14th marriage entry at Mission San Miguel and “SAN-D 332” refers to the 332nd Mission San Antonio Death Register entry. Mission register entry citations are listed in the bibliography of this volume under their acronyms.
CHAPTER 2
EARLY EVIDENCE IN HISTORIC CONTEXT

This chapter places the available information for South Coast Range ethnogeographic reconstruction into historic context. Its five sections deal with (1) the era of Spanish exploration; (2) the early Mission Era during which most coastal villages were depopulated; (3) the period of final coast range community disintegration; (4) the later Mission Era during which a small number of San Joaquin Valley Yokuts people came to the study area missions, and (5) the period of chaotic change when the missions were closed, mission lands were turned into private ranches, and a vast population of gold-seekers overran California.

FIRST SPANISH DESCRIPTIONS, 1595-1771

Spanish exploration diaries never documented the native names of villages, nor did they ever explicitly mention language group boundaries, at least not within the study area of this review. The Spanish diaries did, however, provide information on native group sizes and, to a lesser extent, on village and foraging camp distributions.

First Documented Contact, 1595

The earliest document that specifically mentioned peoples of the central California coast was written in December 1595 by Sebastián Cermeño, who led a Spanish-sponsored expedition along the California coast, ending in a shipwreck at Drakes Bay. The Cermeño party then made its way down the coast in a launch to Mexico, and an account of their contact with Indian people reads as follows:

Near sundown [Cermeño] anchored in front of some villages where they had many *balsas* on land. He spoke to them, shouting out from the launch that we were Christians. One of them responded and said “Christianos,” and at once came running to the shore, and taking a *balsa* and getting into it came alongside the launch where he was received by the Captain and given some cotton cloth and taffetas. Shortly many other Indians came out in the same kind of crafts and were asked by signs to bring some food which was lacking. They went ashore and very soon came back bringing a quantity of bitter acorns and some acorn mush in baskets shaped like medium-sized plates. They gave this in exchange for some cotton cloth and pieces of silk for which they asked and which were given to them. With this they were very contented and exclaimed “Mexico, Mexico”… The people who are assembled seemed to number about three hundred... Some have long beards and their hair cut round, and some are more painted with stripes on their faces and arms than the Indians first seen [Wagner 1929:161].

This description documents material culture along the San Luis Obispo coast, but tells nothing about native political organization or land-holding territories.

Clearly the people who met Cermeño had been visited by Europeans from Mexico before 1595, but only Juan Cabrillo’s 1542 voyage is known to us today. No interaction between Cabrillo and the native people of our study area was documented.

---

Wagner (1929:365-366) argued that Pedro de Unamuno landed in the Morro Bay vicinity in 1587, and others have accepted his conclusion, for instance Erlandson and Bartoy (1995:159-160). The landmarks mentioned in Unamuno’s account, however, suggest that he made his landing elsewhere in California, perhaps at Santa Cruz Bay (Mathes 1997:416) or even at Trinidad Bay, far to the north.
Portolá’s Northward Exploration, 1769

The first Spanish land expedition into the study area took place during the fall of 1769, when a party of 62 men under Gaspar de Portolá journeyed north from newly founded San Diego in search of Monterey Bay, originally visited from the sea in 1603. Portolá, along with Lieutenant Pedro Fages, the engineer Miguel Costansó, and the Friar Juan Crespi all wrote valuable accounts of what they observed. Upon arrival at the present vicinity of Grover City on September 4, 1769, Costansó contrasted the population density on San Luis Obispo Bay with that of the Santa Barbara Channel to the south:

A great deal of water and grass here, where we were visited by a village group having about forty heathens, not counting others found in its immediate vicinity. Here we are at the foot of the Santa Lucía Mountains. It is to be remarked that the villages here are less populous and they do not live in regular houses as on the channel [in Boneu Companys 1983:203].

Costansó described El Buchón, the head man of the rancherías in the San Luis Obispo Bay region:

The Indians belonging to the village here, which was only a short way from our lodgings, came to visit us in the afternoon with a present of seeds and a little fish which they offered to us. The person of their chief was disfigured by a large growth hanging from his neck, at the sight of which the soldiers nicknamed him the Goitre, el Buchón, the name which was likewise given to his village and the whole spot [Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:205].

After leaving Buchón’s village, which diarist Crespi named San Ladislao, the Spaniards traveled generally north. No Indians were encountered in either the present San Luis Obispo vicinity or in the Los Osos Valley further west.

At Morro Rock on the north end of Morro Bay, the Portolá party encountered Indian people on September 8, 1769. Friar Crespi’s original diary states, “At this spot there is a good-sized village of very poor heathens who possess no more than a single underground house” (in Brown 2001:489). Costansó’s diary, on the other hand, states that he did not see any houses:

Not far from [our camp] was a small-sized, wretched heathen village, scarcely amounting to sixty souls, living in the open without house or hearth. They came over to visit us offering us a sort of gruel made out of parched seeds which we all thought tasted well, with a flavor of almonds [Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:206].

We have no ready explanation for the contradiction between Costansó and Crespi regarding the presence of an underground structure at the Morro Rock vicinity Indian camp, which they gave the short-lived name of San Adriano.

On September 9 the Portolá party passed through the Cayucos vicinity and camped at the mouth of Villa Creek, a place they labeled Santa Serafina; no Indians were mentioned in the diaries of that day. The next morning they initially traveled about six miles up Villa Creek, to a spot where a village had just been moved, “there being no village at this spot, though yesterday the scouts saw one in this neighborhood, where they presented them with some fish that seemed to be doradoes but were snappers instead” (Crespi in Brown 2001:495). The party headed northwest across rolling country to camp in the hills overlooking Santa Rosa Creek east of Cambria. There Costansó wrote, “Some mountain Indians coming down to visit us brought along a [bear] cub... which they were taming, and offered it to us. They must have been about sixty men” (in Boneu Companys 1983:206). Clearly a large village, perhaps of 200 people, was further inland, but just how far into the mountains cannot be judged from this quote. They called the area San Benvenuto during this and the subsequent trip.

Portolá’s party traveled only so far as Pico Creek on September 11. “We met with no village in this day’s march, except for about six of the heathens who had visited us at the spot accompanying us, in order for them to show us the watering places,” wrote Crespi (in Brown 2001:499). On September 12 the party continued northward, passing a well-watered creek with a large grove of trees, which Crespi labeled San Juan de Ducla. This was the site of the present town of San Simeon. They continued on, camping somewhere in
the vicinity of Piedras Blancas Point. “Close before reaching the spot [of the camp for the night], we saw a heathen village off in the distance at the foot of the mountains; some six of them came over to the camp” (Crespí in Brown 2001:501).

On September 13, 1769, the Portolá expedition arrived at Breaker Point, about a mile south of San Carpoforo Creek. Coastal plains and gentle hills gave way there to the steep Big Sur coast. Shortly before stopping at Arroyo de los Chinos, they passed “a small-sized heathen village of some five or six houses but with no heathens in it” (Crespí in Brown 2001:503). Later, at their camp, they were visited by local people:

We have been visited by four or five heathens belonging to the villages encamped at these watering places, very fine and well-behaved heathens. They presented us with very good fresh fish, were presented with the usual beads, and were left well pleased. Later they brought over four or more bowls full of gruels at meal times [Crespí in Brown 2001:505].

The Spaniards stayed at the coastal camp, named Santa Humiliana, for two days.5

The Spaniards turned inland on September 16, up San Carpoforo Creek about three miles to its confluence with Estrada Creek. The next day, September 17, they struggled north to a hollow in the rugged mountains where Dutra Creek meets San Carpoforo Creek. Here at La Hoya de la Sierra de Santa Lucía, in a deep canyon only three miles east of the ocean, they encountered a group of people camping “without house or hearth” (Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:212). Crespí wrote in more detail:

We have a village here of very good, poor heathens (there must be 80 of them) who, though not settled here but belonging a bit further away, came over as soon as they saw our scouts and that we were on the way to stopping here, and brought all of their gear and women and children, in order to make the march with us when we started toward their village, which they say lies along the way we are to take [in Brown 2001:512-513].

The explorers stayed at La Hoya through September 20. Crespí gave it the alternate title of Santa Lucía de Salerno at this time.

On September 20 the Spanish party went over the crest of the Santa Lucía Range and down to a tributary of the Nacimiento River. We suggest that it was Salmon Creek, but alternative possibilities exist. The route took them through what is still one of the most remote and rugged areas of California:

Having reached here we were visited by five big villages of very tractable friendly heathens that they said had their villages in the immediate vicinity. (The 6 or 7 villages [corrected from five] we guessed to be at least about 600 souls; they presented us with a great many pine nuts.) Some they say, are shore dwellers, others mountaineers belonging to this range, and still others from a river that they say is near by, with a harbor, and that we guess to be the Carmelo River [Crespí in Brown 2001:515].

The camp, Real de los Piñones, was about eight miles inland from the ocean. The next day they continued a short way downstream to Arroyo de las Truchas (now the Nacimiento River). Here they camped for three days, without mention of local people.

On September 24, passing northeast into the San Antonio Valley, they encountered “a village of wandering Indians, very poor ones but showing themselves friendly and obliging,” in the Jolon vicinity. Continuing northeast in the direction of King City, they met a group of 218 people in Quinado Canyon on September 26.

---

5 Gibson (1983:216) suggested that the village was “Chitáma cerca del mar en el camino viejo de la expedición [Chitama near the sea on the old road of the expedition]” (SAN-B 166 on January 25, 1774). We agree with him, as we explain in our discussion of the Piedras Blancas region in Chapter 6.
We came upon a large village of very fine heathens encamped close to a small pool of water, without a single house there. They had seeds and pine nuts prepared for us and wished us to stop at their village. We stopped a while and some beads [were given] to the chiefs; our people took some pine nuts. Our Governor counted all of the heathens seated there, counting two hundred eighteen souls, men, women, and children. (A soldier recovered a mule here that he had left worn out, while scouting on the 23rd, and they had set grass and water before it right in their village) [Crespi in Brown 2001:525].

In later Mission San Antonio records, Quinado Canyon came to be known as El Roble Caído [The Fallen White Oak] and to be associated with Quina ranchería (SAN-B 454, 1615). From the canyon the Spaniards continued north into the Salinas River Valley, where they camped near a “very large village of very friendly, good heathens” in the present King City vicinity (Crespi in Brown 2001:527).

The Portolá party passed northward out of the study area on September 27. During its passage through the study area none of the diarists recorded a specific native village name or mentioned any language shifts. Most of the native groups they encountered were at harvesting camps that lacked houses. Group sizes ranged from 60 to some 200 people, although seven camps high in the Santa Lucía mountains totaled 600 people. The largest single group, 218 people camping at the Roble Caído south of King City, was in fact larger than any other group reported between the Santa Barbara Channel and the Pájaro River.

**Portolá’s Return Southward, 1769**

Diary entries for Portolá’s return journey south from San Francisco Bay were relatively brief. The party reached Roble Caído on December 16, 1769. The camp site of 218 people they had left on September 26 was now deserted. Nor were Indian people mentioned in diary entries for the December 17 journey back to the Nacimiento River, or the December 18 trip up to Real de los Piñones just east of the Santa Lucía Range crest. At Hoya de Santa Lucía on San Carpoforo near the coast, however, Costansó wrote, “We found the heathens who had treated us so well the last time, and they did no less on this occasion” (in Boneu Companys 1983:272).

Arriving at the mouth of San Carpoforo Creek on December 21, the Spaniards headed south along the coast. After a short period of travel, they came to one of the villages of Santa Humiliana that had fed them on the way north:

> We… came out of the mountains along the same road which we had first opened, went down to the shore, following along it for the distance of a league and a half, and stopped close to a village of heathens who came out to receive us, having been advised by the mountain people of our coming [Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:275].

The village was either at the mouth of Arroyo de la Cruz, three miles north of Piedras Blancas Point, or Arroyo de los Chinos, another mile farther north.

After a pause on December 22, the Spaniards continued south on December 23. They visited a village at the site of the present town of San Simeon, called Arroyo del Laurel by Costansó. “On this occasion we found upon the stream a small-sized village of heathens who gave us of their gruels and seeds” (Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:276). This was the location called San Juan de Ducla by Crespi. While the stream had been mentioned on the northward journey on September 12, the village had not.

On December 24 the Spaniards arrived at their former camp in the Cambria vicinity, where 60 men from the mountains had visited them on September 10. No one was found at the camp, but the next morning, December 25, “over two hundred heathens of both sexes came by, many of them bringing basins of

---

*Formally, the Spanish league was 2.54 miles in length. In practice, it represented a one-hour walk for most early diarists who were keeping track of distance.*
gruel and some fish” (Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:276-277). The local village seems to have been somewhere up Santa Rosa Creek, away from the sea shore.

On the afternoon of December 25 the expedition continued south, encountering in the Cayucos vicinity another group which had not been mentioned in the northward diary entries. “We stopped a little further south than the Inlet Camp, next to a small-sized village of Indian fishermen from whom we bought a good deal of fish, which was some help to our people. Shortly, a large number of heathens visited our lodgings with basins full of gruel and mush” (Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:277). This reference suggests, again, that the main village in this vicinity was further inland.

No people were noted at the “single subterranean house” village at Morro Bay on December 26. However, while camping in the Los Osos Valley on December 27, they were visited by a group of local men on their way south from some nearby beach, probably heading toward Pismo Creek:

With them there came a heathen man from the Santa Bárbara Channel, dubbed by the soldiers The Crazy Man, El Loco, as he is a very lively, talkative Indian who had accompanied us on the way coming for some days’ march, and vanished when we had reached the large lake of the San Daniel valley [Santa Maria vicinity]... Since he saw that we were coming in such need, lacking foodstuffs, he at once vanished and left us and, as we saw afterward, went off to do us a very great favor, by notifying all the villages to meet us on the way with food (Crespí in Brown 2001:643).

On December 29, the Spanish party arrived at the hollow of San Ladislao in the Arroyo Grande vicinity. There they were met by Buchón and his people:

We... came to the two streams of running water of the hollow of San Ladislao, or of The Goitre [El Buchón], the man so renowned and feared in all this vicinity, whom we conceived to be a sort of petty king of these good and far flung heathen folk. In the afternoon after we had been resting at this spot, we saw the whole large village belonging to this great man The Goitre coming over, and himself as leader, and with them our good heathen man from the Channel who, it was obvious, had gone to notify this Goitre, and all of them came laden with vast numbers of bowls of very good gruel and mush, some very good white-colored pies, some fish, and some fresh deer meat. It was all received from them, and of everything there was enough and more than enough to relieve all of our men from their want, coming as it did in very good time. The officers gave generous presents to this man [Crespí in Brown 2001:645].

The first Portolá expedition passed southward out of the study area on December 30, 1769. Many scholars have since noted that the party would not have survived without the acts of charity by Indian people along their way.

Portolá’s Second Journey Northward, Spring 1770

The next contact between study area people and the Spaniards took place just four months later, in May 1770. Another party under Portolá, again with missionary Friar Crespí, traveled north to found the Presidio of Monterey and Mission San Carlos Borromeo. They arrived in the present Grover City-Pismo Beach vicinity near one of Buchón’s villages on May 10, 1770. Crespí wrote:

We took a northeastward course in order to get over some low ranges of knolls into the San Ladislao hollow, otherwise named a’ [sic] The Goitre’s [Buchón’s] village, he being the Indian held in such awe and fear by so many heathens in all the surroundings for about twenty leagues on both sides, for this heathen is spoken of as far as the Channel and the Santa Lucía Mountains. He employs considerable stateliness, and always has a considerable entourage with him; no one sits down in front of him or his wife and sons without being commanded to. They all, or so we understood, pay him tribute, for they bring some of
everything, whether seeds when they harvest them, meat when they kill it or fish when they catch some, to his house [in Brown 2001:715].

Leaving Buchon’s people on May 12, the expedition went up Price Canyon into the valley lands south of present San Luis Obispo. They probably camped on San Luis Obispo Creek. “We came across a village of very fine well-behaved heathens here on this plain; the women, who must have been twelve in number, along with some children, were gathering their seeds” (Crespí in Brown 2001:719). On May 13 they arrived at the village near Morro Rock. “All that we saw was three or four empty houses,” wrote Crespí (in Brown 2001:721).

The second Portolá party observed a battle between men from Buchón’s village and some men from the Cambria vicinity as they continued north on May 14, 1770. That morning at Morro Rock they were joined by a group of men from the Cambria area, twenty miles to the north:

At about sunrise today, before we set out, eight or ten heathens came to the camp, heavily painted, wearing their feather headdresses, and all of them heavily laden with their usual good-sized quivers full of arrows and their bows. Seemingly, they had news of us and had come to greet us... They reported to us that our three runaway [Baja California] Indians were at their village, which was the spot belonging to the San Benvenuto pinewood [Cambria]... On going about a quarter-league, they became upset and refused to go on, giving us to understand that The Goitre [Buchón] with his village was coming up behind us in order to fight. We told them not to turn back and not to be afraid, as it must not be true; we had not even seen this Goitre. On going about a league, we had a message from the men in the rear with the pack train, reporting that [The] Goitre had just arrived with his village, looking for these other heathens; for they had fought with him not long before and had shot The Goitre himself in the body with two arrows... Our ten heathens commenced to scatter on hearing the news verified, and shortly we saw six of Buchón’s men going by. He was coming up behind, and they had said they were on their way to fight them. The fact is that the ten then clashed with Goitre’s six within view of us, with those on each side shooting of a good many arrows, and there is no denying they must be great warriors and very skillful. Goitre’s six men at once turned and ran back, since no more of their people had come than the aforesaid six, whereas there were ten of the others. We continued on our way, and left them to this entertainment; no telling what may have happened to the poor wretches... About an hour after we had come to the pinewood here [Cambria], the ten heathen warriors we had left on the way arrived and told us they had hit The Goitre with an arrow; however, we did not believe them, as we knew he had been coming with thirty or forty of his people, and these ones must have taken to flight at a quick run as soon as they had seen the situation [Crespí in Brown 2001:721].

The trouble took place somewhere between Cayucos and Cambria. Neither cause nor antiquity of the feud between the Cambria vicinity people and those of the San Luis Obispo Bay vicinity was documented. There is no evidence in the report of language differences among the involved parties.

On May 15 the second Portolá expedition arrived at the creek at the present town of San Simeon, where they encountered the village that they had previously named San Juan de Ducla. Here, they were told, lived two Baja California Indians who had deserted the first Portolá party. The two were sought at this time by Portolá but could not be found (Crespí in Brown 2001:723). Continuing northward on May 16, they retraced their first route to San Carpoforo Creek and inland three miles to the beginning of rugged country. On May 17 they proceeded north to the hollow in the canyon of San Carpoforo Creek where they had met about 60 people twice previously. Wrote Crespí, “We saw, on coming down to this spot, two houses belonging to the village of the very fine folk that are found throughout these mountains; we did not see a single heathen, because, it must be, they are gathering their seeds” (in Brown 2001:725). On May 18 they continued on over the crest of the Santa Lucía Range to the Real de los Piñones, the vicinity where they had seen 600 people the previous September, but no people at all the previous December. Again, they found no one (Crespí in Brown 2001:725).
The May 19, 1770 destination was the Jolon vicinity in the San Antonio Valley. Back on September 24, 1769 there had been 60 people at this locality, which they now called Los Robles de las Llagas de Nuestro Padre San Francisco [The White Oaks of the Wounds of Our Father Saint-Francis]. Crespí wrote about the people and place in glowing terms:

Once we had reached this hollow, a good many heathens belonging to this spot came over; very fine, extremely well-behaved heathens they are; and among them was the heathen who during our return voyage brought us a mule that had been left a day’s march behind… The shoreline heathens of the previous days’ marches had notified them three days earlier of our returning, and these men had come to the village belonging to the hollow here, from a village of dwellers on the shore of these mountains, in order to join us when we should pass by here (Crespí in Brown 2001:727).

Among the people who had come up to the San Antonio Valley “from a village of dwellers on the shore of these mountains” were the two Baja California fugitives who had again turned up missing at coastal San Juan de Ducla (San Simeon) four days earlier.

The second Portolá expedition continued north from the San Antonio Valley to Monterey Bay, where they would found the Presidio of Monterey, and shortly thereafter, Mission San Carlos Borromeo at Carmel. As the party traveled from Jolon through Quinado Canyon down to the Salinas River, they found only “traces of a village that we came upon in the hollow the other time” (Crespí in Brown 2001:727).

Summary of Early Descriptions

The early Spanish expeditions, taken as a whole, describe the study area as inhabited by groups of people who moved about the landscape, sometimes camping without shelters. The median village size seems to have been approximately 60 people. Reported villages seem to have been about six miles apart, although the diaries of the linear routes made no attempt at a comprehensive regional census. North of Estero Bay, coastal people and people of villages as much as ten miles inland knew each other well and joined together for special harvests. However, no explicit language information was provided for any portion of the study area in the extant diaries from Portolá’s expedition.

INITIAL MISSION PERIOD, 1771-1806

The earliest explicit statements about the names and locations of villages in the study area occur in the registers of individual baptisms, marriages, and deaths of missions San Antonio, San Luis Obispo, and San Miguel. The amount of information about home villages and territories in specific mission register entries varied greatly from one priest to another, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4. In this section and the following section we briefly present the ethnogeographic clues in historic context.

First Years of Missions San Antonio and San Luis Obispo, 1771-1775

San Antonio de Padua was the earliest Franciscan mission to be founded in the study area (see Figure 1). Father Junípero Serra dedicated the mission site on July 14, 1771; its first missionaries were Buenaventura Sitjar and Miguel Pieras. Only two other missions were in place that summer, San Diego to the south and San Carlos Borromeo near Monterey to the north. On August 14, 1771, Father Pieras baptized a four year old boy “en el campo, constituydo en artículo de muerto” [in the countryside, on the point of death] at Mission San Antonio (SAN-B 1). He was the first person from the study area baptized by the Franciscans.

---

7 Three years later, in 1773, a young man said to be from the village of Tetachoya “alias San Francisco or Los Ojitos,” would be the groom in the first wedding at Mission San Antonio (SAN-M 1).

8 The present site of Mission San Antonio was not founded until the summer or fall of 1773. The initial mission site, approximately three miles downstream, was abandoned after two years due to lack of summer water.
Also that summer, Father Serra took a boy back north to Monterey from Chuquilim in the Lamaca District. The boy was baptized at Mission San Carlos Borromeo on September 9, 1771, and given the name Clemente; his parents would be christened and married in a church ceremony at Mission San Antonio as Jácome José Fages and María Clara a year and a half later, on May 1, 1773 (Appendix E, Figure E-8). Clemente later married at Mission San Antonio and was buried there (SAN-D 332).

During the rest of the first year at San Antonio, 1771, only seven more people were baptized. Although the missionaries did not record their home rancherías, kinship network reconstitution work with the mission records points to Chuquilim in Lamaca and Quinau to the northeast (Quinado Canyon and perhaps upper Jolon Canyon) as their home groups (see Appendix A for an explanation of kinship network reconstitution techniques).

Mission San Luis Obispo was established 14 months later than San Antonio, on September 1, 1772. The first baptism of a local Indian, a sick boy, took place on October 1, 1772 (SLO-B 1). Christened Francisco, he died and was buried three days later, on October 4 (SLO-D 1). Missionary President Serra (in Engelhardt 1963:20) described the boy’s special status: “On the feast of our holy Father St. Francis, in the presence of many Indians assembled from the rancherías, they celebrated with all possible pomp the burial of a little son of the pagan capitán or chief.” Neither the names of the parents nor their home village were listed in the baptismal or burial records of the boy, but family reconstitution work suggests that the father was later christened Miguel Robles, from the village of Chano, and therefore we presume that the boy’s village was Chano (Appendix E, Figure E-38).

Yokuts-speaking villagers in the Buena Vista Lake vicinity, far to the east, became aware of the Spanish presence in the fall of 1772, when Pedro Fages entered the San Joaquin Valley from the Tehachapi Mountains on his way north from San Diego. After visiting a village at Buena Vista Lake, Fages turned west by an unknown route to arrive at the new Mission San Luis Obispo (Bolton 1931).

By the end of 1772 there were 19 young converts living at Mission San Antonio, but none as yet were living at San Luis Obispo. Mission San Luis Obispo baptism entries #2-5 took place on February 13, 1773, when four pre-adolescent girls were baptized. Their home villages were not listed at the time, but later confirmation records indicate that two of the girls came from the village of Chano and two from Tsquieu. By September 1, 1773, one year after its founding, Mission San Luis Obispo had attracted only seven more new Christians, six boys and one more girl (SLO-B 5-12). By that same date, 148 people had already been baptized at San Antonio, including 10 married couples (SAN-M 1-6, 9, 13-15).

In 1773 the missionaries had difficulty enticing local people to settle at San Luis Obispo. On December 10, 1773, Father Francisco Palóu explained the difficulties:

The reason for the indifference of the Indians... could be traced to the fact that they could gather an abundance of wild seeds and berries, that the chase yielded sufficient venison, and that the seashore gave plenty of fish. On this account... it would not be easy to induce these roving Indians to live at the Mission. Furthermore, inasmuch as their habitations consisted only of tules and mats, when the seeds and wild fruits ceased to be plentiful in one place, they simply moved to another locality, where it required little time to construct their huts anew. Thus it would be possible to reduce the natives to a sedentary manner of life only through their fondness for gifts, and especially of clothing, which was very desirable, as it would grow very cold in winter. They would, indeed, visit the Mission, and remain some days in flimsy tule huts which they constructed for that purpose; but little evidence was given that they would stay there, except on the part of the parents whose children had been baptized [Palóu 1773 paraphrased in Engelhardt 1963:22].

The first four tribally married couples to join Mission San Luis Obispo were remarried before the church on December 8, 1773. The original marriage register was destroyed in a fire a few years later; the reconstructed marriage register does not list anything about the home villages of the spouses. In 1773 a total of 13 tribally married couples took marriage vows in the church at Mission San Luis Obispo. This number would not be exceeded for more than twenty years, until 1794.
The populations of neophytes (new Christians) at missions San Antonio and San Luis Obispo grew slowly in 1773, 1774, and 1775 (Table 1). The San Antonio converts were from the adjacent territories of Lamaca, Lima, and Quinau (regional placenames identified in baptismal entries), all within 10 miles of the mission. Most of the early converts at San Luis Obispo were from the nearby rancherías of Chano and Sepiato, as well as Gmosmu somewhere in the valleys a few miles to the east.

Fages Report, 1775

In 1775 Lieutenant Pedro Fages (1937) penned the only detailed eighteenth-century ethnographic description of California Indians. The report is rich in information, with a noteworthy segment regarding the populous villages and large houses of the Santa Barbara Channel, a glowing report on the lands around Mission San Luis Obispo as the richest in all of upper California, and a very detailed description of the great variety of food resources available to the upland people around Mission San Antonio. Fages did not name any specific rancherías or discuss language differences, but he did contrast the political organization of the San Luis Obispo vicinity with that of the San Antonio vicinity. Regarding the native people around Mission San Luis Obispo, Fages reported:

At the mission of San Luis Obispo and for a radius of about twelve leagues around it, I have observed the following: The natives are well appearing, of good disposition, affable, liberal, and friendly toward the Spaniard. As to their government, it is by captaincies over villages, as in the others [to the south]; the captains here also have many wives, with the right of putting them away and taking maidens only; here also the other Indian men do not have this privilege.

…The men do not often sleep in the houses at night; but, carrying with them their arms, bow and quiver, they are accustomed to congregate in numbers in great subterranean caves [large sweathouses], where they pass the nights in sheer terror; [if they stayed at home] they might be surprised in their beds by the enemy whilst defenseless on account of the presence of their wives and children [Fages 1937:47-48].

Fages described ubiquitous intergroup hostility around Mission San Antonio as well:

They are continually at war with their neighbors; for the purpose of going out on any of these expeditions, the men and women first gather to take counsel in the house of the captain in command... The affair is limited to setting fire to this or that village of the adversary, sacking it, and bringing away some of the women, either married or single [Fages 1937:58].

He contrasted the local political organization at San Antonio with the single-village captaincy that he had reported further south. “Besides their chiefs of villages, they have in every district another one who commands four or five villages together, the village chiefs being his subordinates” (Fages 1937:73). This suggests a multi-village regional political organization was in place around Mission San Antonio, in contrast to a more independent village organization in the San Luis Obispo vicinity.

Expeditions and Opposition, 1776

The Yokuts-speaking tribes to the east had already been visited by Fages in 1772. There seem to have been subsequent expeditions, by which the Spanish soldiers must have come to know the Coast Ranges east of San Luis Obispo. Father Pedro Font, preparing in Sonora to join the Anza expedition later that year, received the following intelligence from Father Domingo Juncosa in Mexico in 1775:

If you wish to go to that [mission] of San Luis... you will have a good road by taking a sort of canyon or valley... from our mission of San Gabriel, or near there, to San Francisco.... In case you follow that valley and wish to come out at San Luis... the Indians already will have told you where the mission is, and perhaps you will find traces of the animals from the various
Table 1. Yearly Baptisms of Tribal and Mission-Born Indians at the Study Area Missions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Antonio</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>San Miguel</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>San Luis Obispo</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Children</td>
<td>Tribal Youth</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Mission Children</td>
<td>Tribal Youth</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Mission Children</td>
<td>Tribal Youth</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>Notes: Year end reflects balance between baptisms and deaths during the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
times the soldiers have crossed from the valley to San Luis when they have gone in search of some deserters who were among the immense tulares which are about on the parallel of San Luis [Juncosa in Bolton 1931:9].

In the winter of 1775-1776 missionary Francisco Garcés traveled into the southern San Joaquin Valley. At some location in the Sierra foothills, perhaps opposite San Luis Obispo, he wrote:

There came to me one [of a group], and begged of me in Spanish (Castilla) paper wherewith to make cigars. I wondered much, and on questioning him he told me that he was from the sea where there are padres like myself; that in four parts had he seen Españoles, and that it was distant from here a four days’ journey. When he took to kiss the Santo Cristo, he did so with great veneration, and set himself to preach to the rest. I had a suspicion that he might be some Christian who had just fled from the missions of Monte-Rey, since he made signs of shooting and flogging [Garcés in Coues 1900:287].

The Indian preacher mentioned by Garcés may have gotten his Christian experience at any of three missions, five year old San Carlos Borromeo at Carmel, four year old San Antonio, or three year old San Luis Obispo. Nevertheless, no identified Central Valley people were baptized at any of the missions until the mid-1790s, and no large Yokuts groups went to any of the three study area missions until 1813.

On March 1, 1776, the Anza expedition, a large party of Mexican colonists driving pack mules and cattle herds, passed through the study area on their way north to Monterey and San Francisco Bay. In the San Luis Obispo Bay region expedition chaplain Font noted in his diary that Captain Buchón had died at some prior time:

The village of El Buchón is so-called because when the first expedition of Señor Portolá came, there lived in this village a very high Indian chief called Buchón, famous in all the Channel for his valor and for the damage which he had done there with his wars. I learned that one of his principal wives still lived there, recognized by the heathen, who paid her tribute of a portion of their seeds; but he is now dead. Another of his concubines became a Christian and lived at the mission of San Luis, married to a soldier [Font in Bolton 1930:268].

The Anza party continued north to Mission San Luis Obispo on the following day, March 2. Subsequent to his visit, and subsequent to his later meeting with fellow Franciscan Hermenegildo Garcés in Sonora, Father Font mistakenly called the native people of San Luis Obispo “Nochis,” a Yokuts word for “friend” that Garcés had learned while in the San Joaquin Valley (Harrington 1944).

On March 3 the Anza party headed north along the already well-traveled inland road from San Luis Obispo to San Antonio, the road that was to become known as the El Camino Real. Expedition diaries indicate that saints’ names had already been bestowed upon stopping places along the way. They passed the place of Santa Margarita at five leagues north of San Luis Obispo and spent the night of March 3 at La Asunción in the present Atascadero vicinity. On March 4 they crossed a river still called the “Nacimiento” and camped at the northward bend of the river still called the “San Antonio” (near the present San Luis Obispo County-Monterey County border). Although Santa Margarita, La Asunción, and Nacimiento were all associated with native rancherías in later mission baptismal register entries, Font specifically mentioned a village only at Santa Margarita (Font 1930:273-277).

The Anza expedition arrived at Mission San Antonio on March 5, 1776. Chaplain Font contrasted the local Mission San Antonio Indian people with those of Mission San Luis Obispo:

The Christian Indians who compose it, who must already be some five hundred persons, are entirely different from the others whom I have seen hitherto. They are of the tribe which lives in the Sierra de Santa Lucía, but I did not learn what they are called or whether they have any name.... Their language is very rough and most difficult to pronounce because it has so many crackling sounds. It has been learned by Father Fray Buenaventura [Sitjar],
through continual application and hard labor, and he has written the catechism in the language [Font 1930:279].

Thus in 1776 the fact of a difference between the language family at Mission San Antonio, now called Salinan, and that of San Luis Obispo, now called Chumash, was clearly known.

During the summer and fall of 1776 Mission San Antonio attracted small numbers of people from the nearby regions of Lamaca, Lima, and Quinau. Mission San Luis Obispo recorded baptisms that summer and fall of people from 14 different villages, most thought to have been west of the Santa Lucía Range between Cayucos on the north and Los Berros Creek on the south. One girl, however, was baptized from Sataoyo, believed to have been somewhere between Atascadero and Paso Robles, on November 12, 1776.

On November 29, 1776, disgruntled natives of the Sataoyo vicinity, known to the Spaniards at the time as the Santa Ysabel district, burned a building of Mission San Luis Obispo (Engelhardt 1963:34-35). Military governor Fernando Rivera y Moncada wrote of the attack on December 9: “It hasn’t been possible to establish for certain the principal authors, but some say it is a heathen who lives at Santa Ysabel called Tamachuelo, others that José Antonio and Signaho have paid several heathens to burn the Mission” (Rivera y Moncada in Burrus 1967:328, cited by King 1984:6). Rivera soon led a raid into the Santa Ysabel district:

Three heathen were determined to have burned the Mission of San Luis and these are of the Ranchería of Santa Ysabel, distant from said mission eight, nine, and ten leagues. It is a place by the mentioned arroyo; the road to Monterey passes below... Although there are only three malicious heathen, they are separated and live in distinct locales and rancherías. One is toward the north and two to the west [Rivera y Moncada in Burrus 1967:347, cited by King 1984:6].

Clearly, Rivera considered Santa Ysabel to be a region containing at least three villages, rather than a single spot on the landscape. The Santa Ysabel villages seem to have been in the present-day Templeton-Paso Robles region (see the Paso Robles region discussion in Chapter 9).

**Mission Outreach, 1777-1797**

Missions San Antonio and San Luis Obispo both grew in fits and starts between 1777 and 1797 (see Table 1). People came to Mission San Antonio from rancherías within the districts of Lamaca to the west, Quiguil to the northwest, Quinau to the northeast, and Lima to the south. Both San Antonio missionaries, Sitjar and Pieras, occasionally provided clues regarding the locations of specific villages and multi-village districts, Sitjar more often than Pieras. Unfortunately, few of the San Antonio locational clues provide enough information to precisely place the rancherías on a modern map. Even fewer locational clues are found in the Mission San Luis Obispo register. There, although many different missionaries were recording converts from over a score of villages, none of them seemed to care about documenting the distances and directions to the places.

Mission San Luis Obispo and Mission San Antonio both expanded slowly through 1781; at the end of that year there were 446 native Indian people at the former, 540 at the latter. Growth of the two missions contrasted greatly, however, during the next eight years. By the end of 1789 the population of San Antonio Mission had nearly doubled to 1,064, while that of San Luis Obispo had grown only to 582 (see Table 1). While San Antonio had seen increasing baptisms of all age groups, most remarkable were the years 1783 and 1784, during which 37 native married couples were baptized and married before the church. Meanwhile, at San Luis Obispo only eight native couples renewed marriages before the church during the entire eight years inclusive of 1782 through 1789.

The small numbers of people baptized at San Luis Obispo during the 1780s may reflect a turn of missionary attention to aiding the foundations of three new missions further south in territories occupied by Chumash-speaking peoples. Between 1771 and 1781 the nearest mission to the south of San Luis Obispo was San Gabriel, some 200 miles away. Mission Buenaventura was founded at present-day Ventura in 1782. Mission Santa Bárbara was founded four years later, in 1786. Mission La Purísima, founded at Lompoc on
December 8, 1787, began baptizing people from villages already represented at Mission San Luis Obispo to the north. Certainly, the missionaries at San Luis Obispo had contributed labor and materials to the foundation of that nearby mission.

After the founding of Mission La Purísima, Mission San Luis Obispo turned more attention to the northeast, to villages in the Santa Margarita and Paso Robles regions of the Salinas River drainage. An exceptional year was 1791 when large groups of adults moved to San Luis Obispo from the more southerly villages of Stemectatimi on Los Berros Creek, Lachicto (possibly at Nipomo), and Tgmaps (alias Laguna Larga) near Santa Maria. The years 1792 and 1794 witnessed relatively large groups of adults moving to San Luis Obispo from all directions, but with an increasing proportion of Salinas Valley people. No northern or inland villages of more than six inhabitants reached the half-way mark of depopulation prior to 1797, however.

Mission San Antonio’s population grew nearly four-fold between 1776 and 1797, from 313 to 1,176. Within that period, the most significant years of growth were 1783-1786, when the largest number of people from the adjacent districts of Lamaca, Lima, and Quinau had joined the mission community. Large numbers were also baptized from Papuco, a multi-village district reaching from the central San Antonio Valley to the Salinas River and from the district of Lix on and east of the Salinas river. The Mission San Antonio population passed 1,000 in 1788, and fluctuated between 1,028 and 1,176 over the next decade (see Table 1).

In the year 1791, Spanish placenames along El Camino Real between San Luis Obispo and San Antonio were recorded by visiting scientist José Longinos Martínez (Simpson 1939). From San Luis Obispo, Martínez traveled two leagues to La Tasagera [a currently unknown location], three leagues to the ranchería of Santa Margarita, two leagues to the ranchería of La Laguna (later known as La Laguna de Atascadero), four leagues to El Pozo de Robles, two leagues to Las Gallinas (on San Marcos Creek west of present Highway 101), four leagues to El Nacimiento (the Nacimiento River near the dam of Nacimiento Reservoir), three leagues to El Segundo Paso (the Pleito Rancho vicinity along the San Antonio River), two leagues to the ranchería of El Primer Paso (north end of Pleito Rancho, probably the village of Assil), two leagues to Los Ojitos (Jolon vicinity), and three leagues to San Antonio Mission (Gibson 1983:212).

Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad was founded in October 1791 to the north of San Antonio in the Salinas Valley. Among the founding population were 13 Pino and people from Mission San Antonio, as well as Excelen, Eslenajan, and Aspasniajan people from Mission San Carlos Borromeo. All were Esselen-speakers (Milliken 1990:41), whose territory along the coast ranged from Lopez Point north to Big Sur. It is inferred that San Antonio stopped offering religious training in the Esselen language after 1792, if indeed it was even taught prior to that year. Only ten people from Pino or Tesmaymanil were baptized at San Antonio after that year, whereas scores of their relatives and other Esselen-speakers from the headwaters of Arroyo Seco and the coast were baptized at Soledad.

**Founding Mission San Miguel, 1795-1802**

In 1795 Father Sitjar of Mission San Antonio explored “from El Nacimiento to Santa Ysabel all along the road that goes to San Luis Obispo, and for three leagues on either side” in search of a site for the new mission of San Miguel. The spot he chose for the eventual site lay at equal distances between missions San Antonio and San Luis Obispo. In his report, Sitjar (1795) called the main water supply for the mission location, the present upper Salinas River, the “Arroyo of Santa Ysabel.” He also mentioned that the arroyos of San Marcos (San Marcos Creek) and Paso Robles contained large amounts of water. The following quote from the document implies that the language spoken at the chosen Mission San Miguel site was Salinan:

> I spoke with the Indian people of the lands toward the east and those toward San Antonio in the tongue of San Antonio. I heard it said that they desire a Mission. They are affable.

---

9 Tgmaps appears as Ajuaps in the Mission La Purísima registers.
enough. A Christian from the area told me that there are many Indians [in the vicinity; Sitjar 1795].

The nearest substantial Salinan village was probably Etsmal, which had sent a few people to Mission San Antonio by 1795; data are unclear, but it may have been in Vineyard Canyon or Indian Canyon to the northeast.

Father President Fermín Francisco de Lasuén and Father Sitjar founded Mission San Miguel on July 25, 1797 at its present location.¹⁰ Fifteen young people from local villages were baptized on the day Mission San Miguel was founded. All were listed with their home village information. They represented eight different rancherías in the immediate vicinity of the mission (see the Nacimiento and Cholam Hills region discussions in Chapter 8).¹¹ The missionaries brought a seed population of Christian Indians from Mission San Antonio to construct the new mission and aid in religious training of surrounding local people. Some of the members of that seed population appear as godparents and parents in the initial San Miguel Baptismal Register entries, at the times of their deaths in the San Miguel Death Register, and as new spouses in the San Miguel Marriage Register. It is inferred that many of the members of the seed population originally went to Mission San Antonio from rancherías in the San Miguel vicinity. (In Chapter 4 we examine transferred populations to identify the rancherías in outreach overlap areas between Mission San Miguel and Mission San Antonio.)

By 1798 more adults were being baptized at Mission San Miguel than at either Mission San Antonio or Mission San Luis Obispo; this continued through 1802 (see Table 1). Most people baptized during the period came from rancherías called Cholam, Etsmal, and Joyuclac. The baptismal entries at Mission San Miguel always include home ranchería information. Disappointing for ethnogeography, however, those baptismal entries rarely provide distance and/or directional information to the mentioned places, following the habit of the missionaries at San Luis Obispo (see the discussion in Chapter 4).

END OF COAST RANGE RANCHERÍA LIFE, 1803-1812

Traditional Local Community Disintegration 1803-1805

The remaining regional communities of the Coast Ranges disintegrated over the years 1803 to 1805. During most of the late 1790s and up through 1802, the number of adults baptized at San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo together usually totaled between 40 and 60 per year (although 104 adults were baptized in 1798 and 110 in 1799). Total adult baptisms at the three missions jumped five-fold to 505 in 1803. It dropped somewhat to 120 in 1804. The last large groups of people from the South Coast Range study area, totaling 72 individuals, were baptized in 1805 (see Table 1).

The sudden rise in baptisms in 1803 was apparently the result of a decision by Viceroy Iturrigaray to resolve a longstanding dispute between some missionaries and the civil and military government in California regarding the best method to convert the native population (Engelhardt 1930:607). Families who had remained unbaptized in their villages, but who had brought their children to the missions for baptism, were now pressured into joining the mission communities themselves. The phenomenon of mass migration to the missions was even more dramatic further south, where the Santa Barbara Channel missionaries moved quickly to incorporate the remaining populations of mainland Chumash towns into their established communes (Johnson 1988:136-137).

¹⁰ Lasuén (in Kenneally 1965:37-38) identified the native name of the San Miguel Mission site as Vaifca. No ranchería name even similar to Vaifca was listed in study area mission register entries.

¹¹ Over Mission San Miguel’s first year, 106 tribal people were baptized. They came from the following 26 rancherías: Cholam (n=18), Pachac (n=17), Etsmal (n=15), Zicax and Zejoljom (n=9), Chaal and Quetchaal (believed to be an alias for Caunpeje Esmac; n=8), Azzil (n=5), Cazz (n=4), Nana (n=4), Tisja (n=3), Pon (n=2), Tetaco Elka (n=2), Zzical (n=2), Zilecotitx and Telecotech (n=2), Zilaco-Cal (n=2), and one each for Acutsnija, Chulac, Palct, Onet, Oquet Zilac, Quetcheyne, Scanam, Tejacochumaal, Zileo Ezmicoye, Zileo Chaugue, Zileojopnes, Ztueetz (Tisagues), and Rio Nacimiento.
At San Luis Obispo, the 1803 mass immigration began on February 19, with eight baptisms of individuals from villages to the north, east, and southeast. Immediately thereafter, a series of groups of 10-20 people was baptized, continuing through the spring, summer, and fall. The largest single baptismal group was that of October 6; it included 40 people from all directions. The last group, from the village of Sataoyo (somewhere between Atascadero and Paso Robles), was among the 1803 converts at San Luis Obispo. That mission accepted 224 tribal people in 1803, its largest number in the early mission period. Tribal baptisms at San Luis Obispo dropped to 19, 17, and 7 over the next three years (see Table 1).

Mission San Miguel witnessed the greatest yearly population increase of any of the three study area missions in 1803, with the influx of 310 tribal people. It began on January 29 when 37 adults from all surrounding areas were baptized. Groups of 20-26 people were baptized in February and March, all mixed groups from various regions. After a let up during the summer, another series of groups of over 20 people was baptized in September and October. On November 6, 31 people were baptized, and on November 12, another 34. None of those groups were dominated by people from one specific region. Most were from the interior, but small contingents from the “playa” were baptized in the groups of February and March, 1803.

Mission San Antonio gained 140 tribal converts in 1803. Unlike San Luis Obispo and San Miguel that year, the pattern of San Antonio baptisms showed strong separation between coastal and interior village groups over the year. The beginning of the mass migration of the year was on April 9; 19 of 26 people baptized that day were from Tsetacol on the coast. Over the rest of the spring small groups of 6-10 were baptized, again mainly from Tsetacol and other coastal groups. Most people in the smaller groups baptized in the summer and fall were from the interior Coast Range locations, especially Atnil and Ajole. The last large Mission San Antonio group of the year, baptized on December 22, 1803, included people from Atnil and Ajole, rancherías approximately equidistant between San Miguel and San Antonio, as well as people from Cuapej Esmac and Etsmal, villages believed to be nearer the former mission.

Cholam became a haven for runaway Christians prior to the end of 1803. Father Juan Martín of Mission San Miguel went there in the waning months of 1803 to proselytize. The chief of Cholam offered resistance. A paraphrase transcription of a letter from Monterey Presidio commander José de la Guerra y Noriega to the governor, written on January 29, 1804, documents the incident:

Communicates that Father Juan Martín, minister of San Miguel, protected by one soldier, went to a village called Cholam and asked the chief of all the villages thereabouts, named Guchapa, to give him some children to baptize. This was refused by the chief, who told the Father and the soldier to get out immediately or it would go badly with them, for he “was not afraid of the soldiers, who were cowards, and he knew with certainty that they would die like everyone else.”

Commandant Guerra sent a sergeant, a corporal, and thirteen soldiers to take the chief, Guchapa, prisoner. The expedition set out December 22. It returned January 10 bringing captives Chief Guchapa, his son, two other chieftains, and two Christians. (The commandant says he includes the report of the sergeant, but it is not to be found. He talks of “the heroic struggle of Guchapa and the good passage provided them by the Indian Cojapa.”)

The commandant continues saying that Guchapa made the proposition that he would bring out all the Christian Indians there were in his villages. This was accepted and he left his son as hostage [Guerra in Cook 1960:243].

At the time of Guchapa’s arrest, 292 Cholam people had already been baptized. Only 36 future Cholam converts remained on their lands. Unless scores of Cholam people had fled Mission San Miguel, the soldiers raided a very small Cholam village in December of 1803. The remaining 36 people went to Mission San Miguel in 1804 and 1805, most in baptismal groups dominated by Tisagues and Chonen people.

The year 1804 saw far fewer tribal baptisms at the three missions combined than had 1803, but the total of 120 adult converts still represented the third largest of all time. San Luis Obispo essentially played no
role in the continued emptying of interior and coastal villages; it gathered only 19 tribal converts that year. San Miguel gathered 57 tribal converts; they were baptized in small groups throughout the year. Cholam and Tisagues were most highly represented, but Pachac to the west and Staquel and Chelacosaone to the east were relatively well represented. Only one explicit “Playa no” was baptized at San Miguel in 1804. Mission San Antonio surpassed San Miguel in 1804, baptizing 92 tribal people. As in the previous year, representation in the earliest baptismal groups at San Antonio (21 people on February 21, 1804, and 23 people on March 15, 1804) was dominated by individuals who came from Tsetacol on the coast. Later in the year they came from the interior Coast Range to the east as well.

By late 1804 the missionaries were beginning to proselytize in the south San Joaquin Valley, since they would soon run out of Coast Range subjects for their conversions. Father Martín of Mission San Miguel reported:

I left in the month of November in the year mentioned [1804] and at the end of the third day I arrived at the first suburb of the village Bubal [Wowol in Yokuts], to which I gave the name La Salve.... In the evening the people from the main village came to invite me to the place where they lived, saying that where I was there were no people, nor children to give me... I promised I would go the following day, and I did so. As soon as I arrived they presented me with their little sons so that I might carry them away to be baptized...

It happened that the chief was not at this place (which I called La Dolorosa). It was necessary for me to send for him for I did not venture to take them away without his sanction. There arrived a heathen, whom I took to be the chief... My request affected him very badly. He began to rail against the soldiers and their weapons in such a crazy fashion that the poor people... fled in a body and I was left with no one. This man was one of those who with a bow in his hand fears nobody. His name is Chapé... Finally I went home quite disappointed [Martín in Cook 1960:244].

No significant group of Bubal (Wowol) children appeared for baptism at Mission San Miguel until September of 1814 (MI-B 1795-1826).

Mission San Antonio was again the center of tribal conversion in 1805, the last year of the intense “spiritual conquest” of the study area. A total of 137 tribal people were baptized at that mission, mainly from interior Coast Range groups such as Atnil, Escoy, and Lysol. Scattered among the groups were a few coastal people. Six baptisms on September 21, 1805 (five easterners, one Cambria person) marked the end of the 1803-1805 baptismal surge at Mission San Antonio. Second in number of tribal converts in 1805 was San Miguel, which took in 80 people, mainly from Chenen. At San Miguel, the last baptisms of the conversion surge took place on September 7, 1805. San Luis Obispo baptized only 17 tribal people in 1805; they included individuals from Chmimu, Las Gallinas, and Setjala, groups that had family ties to Mission San Miguel.

In review of this important period of community disintegration, it is important to note that interior Coast Range converts stopped appearing in the Mission San Luis Obispo Baptismal Register at the end of 1803, while missions San Antonio and San Miguel continued to bring in large numbers of converts in 1804 and 1805. Either very few people lived east of San Luis Obispo or San Miguel reached south into the dry hills inland closer to San Luis Obispo after 1803. We conclude that the inland vicinity toward the Carrizo Plain was indeed sparsely populated. But we also note that Mission San Miguel did reach south into the Carrizo Plain region (see the La Panza region discussion in Chapter 8 and the Carrizo Plain region discussion in Chapter 9).

12 Father Martín wrote the letter quoted above as a retrospective in April of 1815. The man he named Chapé was probably Tapé of the Copcha group in present Fresno County. Tapé was arrested by the Spaniards for horse stealing in 1815, then released. He was baptized at Mission Soledad in November of 1816 (Soledad Baptism #1566).
Coast Range-Central Valley Migration Overlap, 1806-1812

Between 1806 and 1812 few tribal baptisms took place at any of the Franciscan missions in the South Coast Ranges. All but the most remote villages of the eastern Coast Ranges were empty by the end of 1805. Only 66 tribal people were baptized at San Antonio between 1806 and 1812, mainly in the years 1806 and 1810. A total of 77 tribal people were baptized at San Miguel, most in 1810 and 1811. No tribal people were baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo during that period; it had reached the end of its Coast Range conversions in 1803.

The San Miguel converts during the 1806-1812 period included people from the easternmost Coast Range groups, Sulaltap and Tisagues, as well as a few people from recognizable Yokuts groups, including Tache, Telesmecoyo (possibly a synonym for Wowol or Auyamne), Wowol (as Buhal), and Tulamne. At San Antonio, it is harder to separate the Salinan from the Yokuts groups among those who were baptized during this period.

Places like Catayno, Questpoy, and Staquel seem to have been east Coast Range Salinan locations. Others may have been villages of Yokuts groups from the San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake. Macauelo at Mission San Antonio may represent the Wilmichi Yokuts, while Zucuy at San Antonio seems to represent the Wowol Yokuts.

The low numbers of baptisms at Coast Range missions in 1806 and shortly thereafter are partly attributable to a measles epidemic that ran through the missions in the spring of 1806. The epidemic certainly diverted the attention and concern of the missionaries from proselytization, probably scaring away potential Yokuts converts.

**Interrogatorio, 1812**

Information about native languages and political organization was requested of the California missionaries by the government of the Spanish Empire in a questionnaire (or *Interrogatorio*) sent out from the Department of Overseas Colonies in 1812. The questionnaire, containing 36 questions, was answered by the missionaries in 1814. The answers to questions most relevant to language distributions and tribal culture were first published by A. L. Kroeber in 1908. They have since been translated and published in full by Geiger and Meighan (1976).

The *Interrogatorio* included questions about resource control and political organization that might have produced a rich record of ethnography, but the missionary answers were not sophisticated. Responding to a question about resource control, Father Luis Martínez at San Luis Obispo answered:

> The Indians in their pagan state hold lands by families... it is a weighty matter that produces not a few wars if anyone has the effrontery to go and gather fruits without previously paying and notifying the legitimate owner [Martínez in Geiger and Meighan 1976:110].

Regarding social classes and chiefs, Father Martínez wrote:

> Among the Indians are all kinds of classes, poor and rich. Among the rich however, there is one in each village whom all recognize and whose voice is respected by all who live with him. To him, I do not know by what standards, all pay tribute of fruits, goods and beads. These headmen summon to the pagan fiestas all that assemble who happen to be his friends [Martínez in Geiger and Meighan 1976:122].

This statement by the San Luis Obispo priest calls to mind the descriptions of El Buchón by Spanish explorers 30 years earlier. Unfortunately, the missionaries of San Antonio and San Miguel did not respond in detail to the *Interrogatorio* questions regarding resource control or the institution of chiefs.

The priests at the three study area missions provided details about the languages of their people in 1812. At Mission San Miguel, Fathers Martín and Juan Cabot distinguished four languages. They wrote:
The neophytes of this Mission speak four idioms or languages: 1) that of San Antonio which is considered the principal one; 2) that of the seacoast which is spoken by those who came from that area; 3) the Tulareño spoken in the Tulares region; 4) by Indians dwelling south of here [Martín and Cabot in Geiger and Meighan 1976:2].

Since Kroeber first published these reports, all have agreed that the first language mentioned by the San Miguel priests was Salinan, the third was Yokuts, and the fourth was Northern Chumash. The language of the sea coast, however, has been identified alternately as a Salinan or a Northern Chumash dialect. This issue will be discussed in detail in Chapter 10.

At Mission San Antonio, Fathers Juan Bautista Sancho and Pedro Cabot distinguished a dominant language from a nearly extinct language in their *Interrogatorio* responses:

We know that these Indians speak two distinct languages. The principal one is that of the mission's own area and is understood to the east, south, north, and the surrounding area of the west. The Indians called Playano or shore dwellers because they came from the sea-coast, speak the less important of the two. These, however, are now few in number, and they not only understand the principal one but also speak it perfectly [Sancho and Cabot in Geiger and Meighan 1976:20].

The dominant language at Mission San Antonio was clearly that called Salinan today. The nearly extinct coastal language may have been the Playano dialect identified as Salinan by early twentieth-century ethnographers (Kroeber 1925). The Playano people in the quote above were almost certainly Tsetacol people of the Estero Point region, and perhaps the people of Chaal and other rancherías in the Piedras Blancas region. In Chapter 9 we show that ambiguity remains regarding their linguistic affiliation.

At Mission San Luis Obispo, Father Martínez answered the *Interrogatorio* language question as follows:

The languages spoken at this mission are fifteen different kinds according to the region in which the villages are located whence the converts originated, for every village possesses a distinct idiom. However, when gathered together at this new mission, the natives use only one language although their parents preserve their native idioms in which they have been raised. However, all understand one another in their respective languages [Martínez in Geiger and Meighan 1976:19-20].

The answer suggests that only accent and idiomatic expression, not language itself, varied among the many village communities that moved to Mission San Luis Obispo between 1772 and 1812.

The language responses to the *Interrogatorio* of 1812 are important clues regarding contact period Salinan and Northern Chumash language distributions. The statements will be discussed in depth in Chapter 10.

**MISSIONS AND THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY RANCHERÍAS, 1813-1835**

**Yokuts Tribes of the San Joaquin Valley**

The lakes and sloughs of the southern San Joaquin Valley were occupied by the Tachi, Wowol, Auyamne (probably alias Tuhohi), and Tulamne tribes. These groups were called people of the *tulares* (“tule lands”) by the Franciscan missionaries. Little disagreement exists among ethnographers about the core locations of the southern San Joaquin Valley tribes (cf. Cook 1955b:31-80; Kroeber 1925:526; Latta 1977). A problem arises, however, in determining the extent to which these groups occupied Coast Range lands away from their primary lacustrine villages. Kroeber assigned the first range of Coast Range foothills to two of these groups:

In the whole upper valley, in which the distribution of the Yokuts groups is pretty accurately known, there were only two tribes, the Tulamni and Tachi, in the large tract west of Tulare
Lake and Kings River; and even of these two the Tachi preferred to cross to the east side when summer and autumn dried the overflowed lands and rendered their winter habitat a virtual desert [Kroeber 1925:475-476].

Kroeber (1925) mapped the plains west of the King's River delta, the Coalinga area (Udjiu village), the Kettleman Hills, and Kettleman Plain as Tachi lands (Golon village). He mapped the plains west of Tulare Lake in the Lost Hills area as Wowol lands, but identified no villages away from Tulare Lake. Further south, he placed the Tulamne group on the west side of Buena Vista Lake as far into the hills as McKittrick (Kroeber 1925:527).

Latta, in his information-filled 1949 and 1977 editions of the *Handbook of Yokuts Indians*, did not place western Yokuts boundaries on his maps. From his text, however, it is evident that neither he nor any of his consultants were aware of any Coast Range Yokuts tribes up in the hills west of the Tulare-Buena Vista Lake system. In fact, he emphasized that the Tachi met the Coast Range people to trade at Poso Chaná somewhere on the plain just east of Coalinga (Latta 1949:13-14).

The San Joaquin Valley tribes are discussed singly below. Where the evidence is available, we discuss the outmarriage links of their members at the missions in the 1804-1822 period (Table 2). Those patterns of intermarriage provide our best remaining evidence for establishing which Coast Range groups were the nearest western neighbors of the lake-oriented San Joaquin Valley groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARRIAGE RECORD</th>
<th>MARRIAGE DATE</th>
<th>HUSBAND’S SPANISH NAME</th>
<th>HUSBAND’S GROUP (AS BAPTIZED)</th>
<th>WIFE’S SPANISH NAME</th>
<th>WIFE’S GROUP (AS BAPTIZED)</th>
<th>HUSBAND’S BAPTISMAL RECORD</th>
<th>WIFE’S BAPTISMAL RECORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 288</td>
<td>01/14/1804</td>
<td>Higino Antonio Ugali</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Higina Petra</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1065</td>
<td>MI-B 1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 368</td>
<td>02/15/1806</td>
<td>Francisco Tixauex</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Besariona</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1290</td>
<td>MI-B 0953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 436</td>
<td>10/08/1811</td>
<td>Acursio Tulareño de Hugual</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Besariona</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1555</td>
<td>MI-B 1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 461</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>MatiasQUIYAMNE’ Ua’l</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1646</td>
<td>MI-B 1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 471</td>
<td>02/18/1813</td>
<td>Casimiro Gugual Sumtache</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Viridiana</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1689</td>
<td>MI-B 1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 491</td>
<td>07/27/1813</td>
<td>Juan Tsumtache en Tular</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Juana</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1616</td>
<td>MI-B 1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 496</td>
<td>10/23/1813</td>
<td>Samuel Auyanme Au yamne</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1739</td>
<td>MI-B 1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 504</td>
<td>11/24/1814</td>
<td>Crisogono Gugual</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Maria Magdalena</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1835</td>
<td>MI-B 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 513</td>
<td>04/11/1815</td>
<td>Piao Pano</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Pia</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1853</td>
<td>MI-B 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 541</td>
<td>07/20/1816</td>
<td>Marcellan Hugual</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1926</td>
<td>MI-B 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 558</td>
<td>06/07/1817</td>
<td>Lucas Hugual Gugual</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Teresa de Jesus</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1943</td>
<td>MI-B 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 619</td>
<td>01/08/1822</td>
<td>Jacobo Tisahues Bubal</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Jacoba</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 2155</td>
<td>MI-B 2156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 620</td>
<td>01/08/1822</td>
<td>Benito Hugual</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>Benita</td>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>MI-B 1912</td>
<td>MI-B 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wowol Marriages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 455</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Pedro Auyame</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Coleta</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1637</td>
<td>MI-B 1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 456</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Pablo Esjeleymu</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1638</td>
<td>MI-B 1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 457</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Andres Auyame</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Aguenda</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1639</td>
<td>MI-B 1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 458</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Simon Auyame Tsenechis</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Donula</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1641</td>
<td>MI-B 1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 459</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Juan Auyamne Tsumtache</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Escolastica</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1642</td>
<td>MI-B 1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 460</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Jayme Auyamne Quiyamne</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Jacinta</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1644</td>
<td>MI-B 1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 462</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Mateo Tichaues Auyamne</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1647</td>
<td>MI-B 1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 463</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Bartolome Auyamne</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Micaelina</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1648</td>
<td>MI-B 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 464</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Judas Guenejel</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Eustaquia</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1649</td>
<td>MI-B 1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 465</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Antonio Tulamne</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1650</td>
<td>MI-B 1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 466</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Miguel Ticha’s Auyamne</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Pasquala</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1651</td>
<td>MI-B 1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIAGE RECORD</td>
<td>MARRIAGE DATE</td>
<td>HUSBAND'S SPANISH NAME</td>
<td>HUSBAND'S GROUP (AS BAPTIZED)</td>
<td>WIFE'S GROUP (AS BAPTIZED)</td>
<td>WIFE'S SPANISH NAME</td>
<td>HUSBAND'S BAPTISMAL RECORD</td>
<td>WIFE'S BAPTISMAL RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-M 655</td>
<td>02/10/1813</td>
<td>Ambrosio Gelecto</td>
<td>Hinahú junto a Tulame</td>
<td>Ambrosia</td>
<td>LO-B 2332</td>
<td>LO-B 2333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 660</td>
<td>02/10/1813</td>
<td>Francisco Tulame</td>
<td>Gelecto</td>
<td>Franciscia</td>
<td>LO-B 2334</td>
<td>LO-B 2335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 469</td>
<td>02/18/1813</td>
<td>Domingo Tisahuess</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Dominga</td>
<td>MI-B 1682</td>
<td>MI-B 1662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 470</td>
<td>02/18/1813</td>
<td>Hilario Auyamne</td>
<td>Quihuamne</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>MI-B 1684</td>
<td>MI-B 1692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 660</td>
<td>03/07/1813</td>
<td>Raymundo Sjelectoc</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Raymunda</td>
<td>MI-B 1686</td>
<td>MI-B 1694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 490</td>
<td>07/27/1813</td>
<td>Agustin Auyamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Humiliana</td>
<td>LO-B 2345</td>
<td>MI-B 1669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 492</td>
<td>10/23/1813</td>
<td>Victorino Auiamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>MI-B 1752</td>
<td>MI-B 1741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 493</td>
<td>10/23/1813</td>
<td>Guillermo Auiamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Felicidad</td>
<td>MI-B 1753</td>
<td>MI-B 1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 494</td>
<td>10/23/1813</td>
<td>Viro Auiamne</td>
<td>Tulamne</td>
<td>Modesta</td>
<td>MI-B 1750</td>
<td>MI-B 1751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 495</td>
<td>10/23/1813</td>
<td>Ladislao Auiamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>MI-B 1748</td>
<td>MI-B 1749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 496</td>
<td>10/23/1813</td>
<td>Samuel Auiamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>MI-B 1739</td>
<td>MI-B 1740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 502</td>
<td>11/24/1814</td>
<td>Benvenito Auiamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Benvenita</td>
<td>MI-B 1836</td>
<td>MI-B 1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 503</td>
<td>11/24/1814</td>
<td>Carlos Tulamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Josefa de Jesus</td>
<td>MI-B 1834</td>
<td>MI-B 1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 555</td>
<td>06/07/1817</td>
<td>Pedro Auyamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Margarita</td>
<td>MI-B 1897</td>
<td>MI-B 1698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 556</td>
<td>06/07/1817</td>
<td>Pablo Auiamne</td>
<td>Tisacan</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>MI-B 1898</td>
<td>MI-B 1676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 557</td>
<td>06/07/1817</td>
<td>Romualdo Auyamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Gregoria</td>
<td>MI-B 1685</td>
<td>MI-B 1699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 457</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Andres Auyame</td>
<td>Tulamne</td>
<td>Agueda</td>
<td>MI-B 1639</td>
<td>MI-B 1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 465</td>
<td>02/06/1813</td>
<td>Antonio Tulamne</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>MI-B 1650</td>
<td>MI-B 1663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-M 656</td>
<td>02/10/1813</td>
<td>Francisco Tulame</td>
<td>Gelecto</td>
<td>Francisca</td>
<td>LO-B 2334</td>
<td>LO-B 2335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 468</td>
<td>02/18/1813</td>
<td>Angelo Tuchajale</td>
<td>Tulamne</td>
<td>Hilaria</td>
<td>MI-B 1683</td>
<td>MI-B 1693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-M 659</td>
<td>03/07/1813</td>
<td>Tiburcio Tulame</td>
<td>Quiquamic</td>
<td>Tiburcia</td>
<td>LO-B 2340</td>
<td>LO-B 2341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-M 503</td>
<td>11/24/1814</td>
<td>Carlos Tulamne</td>
<td>Auiamne</td>
<td>Josefa de Jesus</td>
<td>MI-B 1834</td>
<td>MI-B 1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Tachi of Northern Tulare Lake**

The ethnographic Tachi were well-documented on the lower King’s River delta and north end of Tulare Lake. Kroeber (1925:484) described them in that area, but also stated that they wintered at Udjiu, a place at the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley, at the opening of the valley where Coalinga is now located. Latta, on the other hand, suggested that the Tachi came out across the plains to the Coast Range to trade with their Salinan neighbors at the present site of Huron, called Poso Chaná:

The Indian traders used to meet at the Poso Chaná to trade with the coast Indians... The bead and seashell traders from the coast met the Tachi traders at Poso Chaná. The Tachi and the other Indians would not let the people from the west come right up to the lake. They were afraid they would learn how to get things without trading [Latta 1949:274].

Tachi families may have begun to winter at the west edge of the plains after the Salinan villagers along Los Gatos Creek left for the Franciscan missions farther west.
Wowol of Southern Tulare Lake

The southern end of Tulare Lake was controlled by the Wowol Yokuts (Kroeber 1925:483; Latta 1977:195). Known as Bubal at Mission San Miguel, this group was often visited by Spanish expeditions in the 1800-1820 period (see next subsection below). Kroeber (1925:526) shows their territory as being around the entire southeastern edge of Tulare Lake, on both sides of their main village, Sukwutnu. He identifies no specific group southwest of Tulare Lake, in the scrub lands of the Lost Hills, yet he includes that area as a Yokuts-speaking area, with the Tachi village of Walna at Kettleman City as the closest village.

Gibson (1983:180, 251) mapped the Telesmecoyo group of the Mission San Miguel records in the Lost Hills vicinity west of definite Wowol territory. There were only four Telesmecoyo baptisms at San Miguel. That small number, the family ties, and the pattern of placename usages by Fathers Juan Cabot and Pedro Muñoz lead us to our conclusion that Telesmecoyo is equivalent to Auyamne, the group further south around Goose Lake. At Mission San Miguel, early Wowol out-marriages linked them to Tisagues of the Coast Range, to Chunut (Sumtache) on the east edge of Tulare Lake, and to an otherwise undocumented Sierra Nevada foothill group called Yacclamne (see Table 2).

Auyamne of Goose Lake

The first Tulareño group to send significant numbers of people to the study area missions was the Auyamne, so labeled at Mission San Miguel in 1813. Yet no such group was documented by late nineteenth- or early twentieth-century ethnographers. The Goose Lake vicinity, which we assign to the Auyamne, was identified as Tuhohi land by Kroeber. He wrote:

The Tuhohi, Tohohai, or Tuhohayi are extinct. They are said to have spoken a dialect similar to Tulammi and Hometwoli, and to have lived among the channels and tule-lined sloughs of lower Kern River where these became lost in Tulare Lake. They may have ranged as far as Goose Lake [Kroeber 1925:478].

Latta had more success finding information about the ethnographic Goose Lake people, although he too reported that the group was long extinct.

The Tuhoumne (Too-ho-umne) were on Kern River below the Paleumne and Yowlumne and on Buena Vista, Jerry, Goose Lake and Bull Sloughs, from the eastern portion of the Elk Hills past Goose Lake and Adobe Holes toward Tulare Lake... The Tuhoumne have been extinct as full bloods for more than ninety years (1972)... Wahumchah, Lasye, Lawhawseh and Chaamsah all stated that Timoteo was the last survivor of his tribe, and that the name was not Tuhohi, but Tuhoumne. They thought that Timoteo died between 1880 and ’85 [Latta 1977:205, 210, 215].

Note that Timoteo Soria was baptized as a baby at Mission San Miguel on January 23, 1820 to Guillermo of Auyumne and Felicidad of Auyumne (SMI-B 2080, SMI-B 1753, and SMI-B 1730).

We are fairly certain that the Auyamnes were the same people as the Tuhohi and Tuhoumne of ethnographic studies. Marriages and nuclear family links identified through our kinship network analyses indicate that the Auyamnes of Mission San Miguel are also the same people as the Gelectos of Mission San Luis Obispo (cf. Gibson 1983:246).

Tulamne of Buena Vista Lake

The Tulamne tribe of the west shore of Buena Vista Lake were well-documented by Kroeber (1925) and Latta (1977). They were visited by Fages in 1772, at which time the name Buena Vista was coined for their main village. They first appear in mission records at San Fernando in 1803, with only three individuals. Small numbers were baptized at missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo in ensuing years, usually with Auyamnes. Some of them also went to Mission San Buenaventura. At the missions, their tribal name was usually spelled Tulamne. They are not to be confused with the Telamnes of the Visalia vicinity on the Kaweah River. Tulamnes at missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo had marriage links to Auyamne (n=3),
Tuchajale, (n=1; perhaps equivalent to Chojuale of the Garcia Mountain region), and unlocated Chanajai (n=1) prior to 1822. Possible out-marriages of the four Tulamnes who were baptized at Mission San Miguel in the year 1835 have yet to be examined.

Yokuts Proselytization, 1813-1816

A rise occurred in tribal baptisms in 1813 at missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo, caused by the arrival of the first large groups of Yokuts-speakers from villages along the lakes and sloughs of the San Joaquin Valley. Of 98 tribal converts at Mission San Miguel that year, 85 were from newly arriving groups from the San Joaquin Valley, while the other 13 were Coast Range people from Tsican (n=4), Tisagues (n=3), Sjalihuilimu (n=2), Chojuale (n=2), Guenejel (n=1), and Tseneychis (n=1) who had probably been living in the San Joaquin Valley. The 85 San Joaquin Valley Yokuts included people from the Auyamne of Goose Lake (n=51), the Wowol of south Tulare Lake (n=15; baptized at Mission San Miguel as Bubal), the Tulamne of Buena Vista Lake (n=10), the Chunut of east of Tulare Lake (n=2; baptized at San Miguel as Sumtache), and a few people from groups that have yet to be located (Table 3).

Most of this 1813 contingent at San Miguel were Auyamne. Three Auyamnes appeared at Mission San Miguel in early and mid-February 1813. Three people in that group had spouses from eastern Chumash groups, one from Guenejel on the lower Cuyama River, one from Sjalihuilimu on the middle Cuyama River, and one from Tasslipu on San Emigdio Creek in the mountains south of Buena Vista Lake (see Table 2). In late February 1813 a few Gelectos appeared at Mission San Luis Obispo. They came with Tulamnes of Buena Vista Lake, and one of them brought a wife who had been baptized as an Auyamne at Mission San Miguel just a few days before. Family ties among those who went to San Miguel and those who went to San Luis Obispo indicate that Auyamnes and Gelectos were the same people (see above section).

In the following year, 1814, 40 Wowol (Bubal) people from Tulare Lake moved to San Miguel, with a small number of people from neighboring groups. That was the last large group of Yokuts people to move to any of the study area missions until 1834 (Table 3). Over those years, from 1814 to 1834, thousands of Yokuts-speakers from the San Joaquin River and its tributaries moved to missions Soledad, San Juan Bautista, Santa Clara, and San José to the north. A few others from Buena Vista Lake and Tulare Lake moved to Santa Bárbara, San Buenaventura, and San Fernando missions (Johnson 1997; McLendon and Johnson 1999).

A party under Sergeant Juan Ortega, with Father Juan Cabot, left Mission San Miguel for the north side of Tulare Lake in search of Yokuts horse raiders and fugitive Christians on November 5, 1815. That night and the next they camped at “the place called Cholam.” At dawn on November 7 they left Cholam and reached “Chenem,” a place which had sent many people to Mission San Miguel, where they camped for the night and the next day. That night of November 8-9 they “traveled all night so as not to be seen by the Indians” and camped at a bend of the Kings River. On the morning of November 10 the Spanish party attacked the village of the Tache, in search of stolen horses and fugitive Christians; the village was deserted, the Taches having retreated into the marshes. From Tache the party moved east to Notonoto, then south to Telame, Choinoc, and Sumtache (Chunut) without incident. The Spaniards lectured the Sumtaches:

Asked by the Father where were the four Indians of his mission who were fugitives in this village, they replied that two had gone to the village of Bubal to join the Christians who were there with license to travel (as actually was the case) and that the other two had gone the previous week to the village of Tulamne, toward the south. After instructing them that they should accept no fugitives in the future we took the path toward the village of Bubal [Ortega in Cook 1960:268].

After visiting the Wowol (Bubal) village, the Ortega expedition returned north, where it joined forces with another Spanish military party to attack the main centers of horse stealing between the San Joaquin and Merced rivers (see Pico in Cook 1960:268-271).
Table 3. Yokuts Baptisms at the Three Study Area Missions through 1840, by Political Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tachi</th>
<th>Wowol</th>
<th>Auyamne</th>
<th>Quiyamne</th>
<th>Tulamne</th>
<th>Choinoc</th>
<th>Sumtache</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Tulares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AN – Mission San Antonio; MI – Mission San Miguel; LO – Mission San Luis Obispo.

In May of 1816, Father Martínez of Mission San Luis Obispo traveled eastward, with an escort of soldiers and Indian auxiliaries, to proselytize among the Yokuts villages. He provided names of villages, and distances between them; some are recognizable from other sources, but not all, as his quote below indicates:

The names of the villages are: Lucluc, 28 leagues distant from the mission, at the edge of the plain; from here I went to Thuohuala [Wowol at Tulare Lake], about 9 leagues; from here to Gelecto [the Auyamne at Goose Lake], about 9; from here to Lihuahilame [probably the Yawelmani at Bakersfield], about 19; and from there to Quihuame, about 7. At this point we could not cross a big river (the source of which we did not see) which runs from north to south, and south to north [Kern River]. It makes a bend in the plain 7 leagues from Telame [sic – probably Tulamne at Buena Vista Lake]. Its speed and the dense brush along its banks prevented our passage. It fills the lakes of Buena Vista, of Gelecto, and of Thuohuala [Martínez in Cook 1960:271].
At the village of Lucluc on the west side of the valley, Martínez encountered “about fifty Indians with their women and children.” (The village name Lucluc appears in no other historic records; it may have been the westernmost Wowol village or it may have been the eastern Coast Range village called Chulucucunach at Mission San Luis Obispo.) Martínez’s party then spent three days at Bubal, the term he used for the main Wowol village, where he believed he had convinced 70 men to bring their families to San Luis Obispo. At the Gelecto (Auyamne) village, Martínez reported “we found no trace of people except the cemetery, because they had destroyed the village in their wars.”\(^{13}\) He went on to Lihuahilami, which we believe to be equivalent to the Yawelmani, reporting that the group included three hundred married men. He then returned north,

… as far as the village of our friends at Thuohuala, called, in the language of San Miguel, Bubal. There we found that the village had moved. Since on my first visit I had departed on such good terms with these people, I was the more astonished at their fickleness. I decided to send some Indians to let them know I was there and that I would like to see them all together. They received these poor fellows with arrows... They quickly sent word to me at the camp. The corporal and his men went out but found no one there. My Indians did not use weapons against anyone and made no more resistance than to seize arrows and take bows out of the hands of those who were offending. They took three prisoners, two women and a man, who, according to the story, were all yelling 'Kill the Playanos!' The next day the village was burned and everything in it destroyed because the people in it had taken up arms against those who had treated them well [Martínez in Cook 1960:271-272].

That was not the end of the Wowol village fire incident. Father Juan Cabot of San Miguel learned what had happened from some Indian vaqueros who had gone out to visit the Wowol. According to Cabot, Father Martínez met the Mission San Miguel vaqueros in passing on his way back to Mission San Luis Obispo. Martínez warned them that the Bubal people had risen up and that they would be killed if they went out to the village. The vaqueros continued on to Bubal, where the people welcomed them and told them what had occurred with Father Martínez. The vaqueros reported back to Father Cabot as follows:

The Indians said that the troops had burned their village, scattered their grain, and smashed their jars and grinding stones. On account of all this they were in a state of the greatest misery and fear lest the troops come back and kill them [Cabot in Cook 1960:272].

The story as reported by Father Juan Cabot was similar to Father Martínez’s story, except in the ring of condemnation in Cabot’s report and the sense of self-justification in that of Martínez.

Small numbers of Wowol (Bubal) people continued to be baptized at Mission San Miguel during the remainder of the decade and through the 1820s. In contrast, only two Yokuts-speakers went to Mission San Luis Obispo during the twenty-year period following 1813. No Yokuts-speakers at all went to Mission San Antonio during the late teens and 1820s, until 1829 (see Table 3).

**Mission Consolidation and Decline, 1817-1833**

The story of Indian people at the three missions between 1817 and 1834 is essentially the story of former tribal people and their children adjusting to life as skilled and unskilled laborers on hierarchically organized farming communes. Fathers Pedro Cabot and Sancho ran Mission San Antonio from mid-1805 until Sancho’s death in 1829, after which Pedro Cabot continued at San Antonio until the fall of 1834. Father Martín was the lead missionary at Mission San Miguel from the end of 1797 until he died in the autumn of 1824. Martín’s assistant was the brother of Pedro Cabot, Father Juan Cabot, who arrived in 1807. Juan Cabot took charge at Mission San Miguel in the autumn of 1824 and remained there until the end of

\(^{13}\) Martínez’s statement regarding the destruction of Gelecto may explain the paucity of Auyamne/Gelecto baptisms at the missions, and their complete absence from mission records after the year 1816 (see Table 3).
1834. It is through the register entries and reports of these individuals that we receive most of our information about Indian lives during the late mission period.

In 1821 the missions sent reports to Mexico regarding the status of their lands, some with descriptions of outlying ranches. The report for Mission San Luis Obispo described two mission outstations, one at Santa Margarita to the east, the other at “La Playa o Puerto [Beach or Port],” otherwise known as San Miguelito, at Avila Beach (Sancho and Cabot 1821a). The relatively small San Luis Obispo mission population of 491 in 1821 did not need a large number of outstations, it seems. By that year the location of La Asunción at Atascadero had been ceded to Mission San Miguel.

The available transcription of the 1821 Mission San Miguel report notes the outlying rancho of Santa Ysabel, four leagues from the mission, and La Asunción, seven leagues away. This latter site, originally a Northern Chumash village location, was probably taken over by Mission San Miguel from Mission San Luis Obispo because the Mission San Miguel population was twice as large. The San Miguel report also listed three coastal locations where ships might disembark: “Piedras Blancas” on the north, centrally located “San Simeón,” and “the beginning of the Piñal [Cambria]” on the south (Sancho and Cabot 1821b). Rancho San Simeón, founded back in 1810, was mentioned in an 1812 Mission San Miguel baptismal entry for a 66-year-old woman who was on the verge of death. The entry’s margin reads, “Ysabel, A.” de Stajahuiao [Ysabel, adult of Stajahuiao],” and the text reads, “En el rancho de S. Simeon el Indio Nestor bautizó privadamente a una adulta... Ysabel [In the ranch of San Simeon the Indian Nestor privately baptized an adult... Ysabel]” (SMI-B 1609, Appendix E, Figure E-20). A second reference in the San Miguel Baptismal Register, in 1813, was for the infant Pacífica Lorcas “que nació el día 3 de dicho mes en el Rancho de S. Simeon [who was born on the third day of the same month at the ranch of San Simeon]” (SMI-B 1744).

There is no information about surrounding lands and ranches found in the 1821 report for Mission San Antonio (Sancho and Cabot 1821c). However, it is known from other reports that Mission San Antonio had many outstations including: San Miguelito on the Nacimiento River to the west; Ojitos below Jolon to the south; Pleyto, alias San Bartolomé, further south on the San Antonio River; and San Benito, now San Lucas, on the Salinas River (Sprietsma 1988:40-41). In 1826, Mission San Antonio constructed a road “toward the sea in order to reach good pasturage for the mares at a location along the coast 10 ½ leagues [27 miles] south of the mission” (Sancho and Cabot in Sprietsma 1988:41). More detail was reported in the 1827 report: “We needed to pasture the mares and their young along the seashore to the South some 10 and a half leagues” (Sancho and Cabot [1827] in Sprietsma 1988:41). As the crow flies, 10 and a half leagues is the distance to the town of San Simeon. However, no Mission San Antonio baptism or death record mentioned Rancho San Simeón until 1843. The new pasture may have been on the flats at Piedras Blancas Point. Alternatively, it may have been at the old Portolá expedition camp site at the confluence of San Carpoforo and Dutra creeks. When Mission San Antonio lands were inventoried in 1835, a Rancho San Carpoforo was listed (Sprietsma 1988:49).14

Study area mission populations dropped continually until 1834. San Antonio was down to 602 people in 1833, from a high of 1,217 in 1806. San Miguel was down to 598 in 1833, from a high of 1,076 in 1814. Mission San Luis Obispo was down from a high of 961 at the end of 1806, to only 205 at the end of 1833; these tremendous drops in population were due to high infant mortality combined with sporadic epidemics that took the lives of many adults.

14 Lorenc (2003) notes that a mission-era olive orchard exists in the valley at the San Carpoforo-Dutra Creek confluence and that local historians John S. Chase and Mary Alice Baldwin documented stories to the effect that the San Antonio missionaries retired to this spot, then called El Descanso, to seek relief from the intense summer heat further inland. The travel distance from Mission San Antonio would have been about ten leagues.
DISBANDING OF THE MISSION COMMUNITIES, 1834-1855

Secularization and Renewed Yokuts Immigration, 1834-1836

The Mexican law directing the closing of the California Franciscan missions was passed on August 17, 1833. Under the Reglamento that followed in 1834, administrators were to inventory the property of each mission, sell what was necessary to pay its debts, and divide the remainder among its Indian population. The old Spanish missionaries, who opposed the plan, were replaced at most missions between 1833 and 1835 by new Franciscan priests from Mexico. The new priests were quite willing to participate in turning the missions into parish churches.

At the beginning of November 1834, Father Pedro Cabot was replaced at Mission San Antonio by newly arrived Father Jesús María Vásquez de Mercado. Pedro Cabot moved immediately south to Mission San Miguel, where he took over from his brother Juan Cabot, who left to return to Spain. Pedro Cabot continued at San Miguel for eleven months; he was replaced by the Mexican priest Juan Moreno at the beginning of October, 1835. Thus, priests with deep knowledge of or commitment to local Indian populations were retiring as the secularization process unfolded. The one exception was Mission San Luis Obispo, where longtime San Francisco missionary Father Ramón Abella arrived in July of 1834 and remained through November of 1841.

In 1834 and 1835 Yokuts-speaking immigrants flocked to missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo. In the spring of 1834, six months before he left for Spain, Father Juan Cabot baptized 58 Tachis and Wowols (as Bubals) at Mission San Miguel. When his brother Pedro arrived in San Miguel in November, he baptized another 154 Yokuts, mainly Wowols, but also Choinocs, Tachis, Chunuts (Sumtaches), and Notonotos.

At San Luis Obispo, Father Abella baptized large numbers of Yokuts, mainly Choinocs, beginning in late October of 1834. He was assisted by Father Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta, a Yokuts language expert who came down from Mission San Juan Bautista.15 By the end of April of 1835, 113 Choinocs and a few Chunuts, Telamnes, and Wowols had been baptized at San Luis Obispo. At Mission San Antonio, by contrast, during the two year period of 1834-35 only 21 Yokuts people (mainly Tachi) were baptized by Pedro Cabot and the new priest, Father Vásquez.

The immigration of Yokuts groups to San Miguel and San Luis Obispo in 1834 and 1835, after twenty years of aversion, seems to have been a response to an epidemic in the Central Valley. We know that disease struck the Valley in the spring of 1833 from a description by J. J. Warner of the Ewing Young trapper party. He called this virulent epidemic, which had also struck in Oregon, the “ague:"

Late in the summer of 1833 we found the valleys depopulated. From the head of the Sacramento to the great bend and slough of the San Joaquin we did not see more than six or eight Indians; while large numbers of their skulls and dead bodies were to be seen under almost every shade-tree near water [Warner in Cook 1955a:303-326].

No specific accounts document the “ague” epidemic in the Tulare-Buena Vista Lake basin. But epidemic provides the most likely explanation for the Yokuts appearance at missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo from March 1834 to May 1835. Other southern San Joaquin Valley Yokuts people were baptized in large numbers at missions La Purísima, Santa Ynez, and Santa Bárbara during the mid-1830s, almost certainly driven by the effects of the same epidemic.

Post-secularization social breakdown was documented at Mission San Antonio by newly arrived Father Vásquez in a November 1834 letter to Governor Figueroa:

15 Arroyo de la Cuesta (1821) recorded a vocabulary of the Salinan language which was later transcribed by Albert Gatchet.
I need to encroach on your time on behalf of the pagan Indians who are flocking to the ex-
Mission to be instructed in the Faith and to receive the Sacraments... For the last two
months those who have been here or who came here have been so occupied in community
labor, or they come irregularly, or not at all, so that they have not been given instructions,
and cannot be prepared for baptism [Vásquez de Mercado in Sprietsma 1988:48].

As very few Yokuts baptisms took place at San Antonio in 1834 and 1835, this quote suggests either that
“pagans” who went to San Antonio were never baptized, or that they were sent away to missions Soledad, San
Miguel, or San Luis Obispo.

Vásquez wrote the governor again on June 22, 1835 complaining that pagan Indians were living in
the Christian Indian village, and that they were observing their tribal ceremonies and customs while there. “I
have no power to prevent it or to give them the necessary instruction in morals and the fundamental
principles of our Religion, because at every step I encounter obstacles” (Vásquez in Sprietsma 1988:48).

Father Vásquez was basically a parish priest with no control over the mission economic system.

Vásquez wrote to the governor in near despair later in the year 1835, concerned that the Indians were
not ready for emancipation:

The law and Reglamento have not been put into effect, that the Indians should be truly
emancipated, and should govern themselves. The Indians have passed from a state of being
considered Minors, being cared for according to their needs, to a state of real slavery, in
which they find themselves deprived of necessary nourishment. The most feeble and
unfortunate, such as the old, the sick, the widows, the orphans, and the children suffer the
most. The able bodied are compelled to abandon their homes, not only to work for the
community, but to serve C. Juan de Dios Padilla [Vásquez in Sprietsma 1988:49].

Vásquez’s critique argues that the mission social order, good or bad as one might judge it, had been removed
overnight, and no template existed for a new one.

Loss of Lands to Ranchos, 1837-1845

In 1837 the San Miguel baptismal registry began recording an increased number of Christian Indian
children born at surrounding ranches and outstations (Table 4). Most commonly noted were San Simeón and
La Asunción. At the same time, Mexican families were rushing to carve out ranchos for themselves around the
three study area missions. The lands directly adjacent to Mission San Miguel were not initially coveted, but
La Asunción (Pedro Estrada), Paso de los Robles (Pedro Narváez), and Santa Ysabel were soon taken, as was
Huerhuero at Creston (José Mariano Bonillo), and Cholam (Mauricio Gonzales) further to the east.

Ranch tracts of Mission San Antonio soon fell in to private hands, among them nearby Milpitas,
Ojitos, and Pleyto, as well as San Benito in the Salinas Valley. Coastal grazing lands of the missions became
the ranches of Piedras Blancas, San Simeón (Inocente García), Santa Rosa (Julian Estrada), San Gerónimo
(Rafael Villa), and Moro y Cayucos. Mission San Luis Obispo lost its nearby lands and its outlying ranches of
San Miguelito and Santa Margarita (Joaquín Estrada) to private owners.

A process of change from Mission Indian to ranch laborer took place over a six year period from
1837 to 1843. Many of the recent Wowol, Choinoc, and Chunut Yokuts immigrants soon returned to their
homes in the Central Valley as the missions closed. Some of them stayed and married into local Salinan and
Northern Chumash Indian families. Many of the Salinan, Northern Chumash, Yokuts, and mixed-marriage
families who remained in the study area attempted to retain their communities at the missions. Others
became the field and house laborers on the new Mexican ranches. For example, in 1839 José María and
Timotea of Mission San Miguel were “on the ranch of Martín Olivera far beyond El Morro,” a fact noted in
Timotea’s death register entry at Mission San Luis Obispo (SLO-D 2454). In 1840 Julián and Rosa of San
Miguel were given leave “to go to the coast, and were going to the Ranch of Rafael Villa” when Rosa died
(SLO-D 2503).
### Table 4. Children of Mission San Miguel Parents Born or Baptized Elsewhere, 1837-1843.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baptismal Record</th>
<th>Baptismal Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Father’s Group</th>
<th>Mother’s Group</th>
<th>Father’s Baptism Record</th>
<th>Mother’s Baptism Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2787</td>
<td>03/08/1837</td>
<td>“Rancho de S. Simeon en la Playa… bautizó”</td>
<td>Sicpats</td>
<td>Tissimasu</td>
<td>MI-B 0338</td>
<td>MI-B 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2793</td>
<td>06/10/1837</td>
<td>“nacido en el Rancho de S. Simeon”</td>
<td>Sicpats</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 1584</td>
<td>MI-B 2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2795</td>
<td>07/26/1837</td>
<td>“nacido en el Rancho llamado Asuncion”</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 2661</td>
<td>MI-B 2664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2802</td>
<td>08/16/1837</td>
<td>“nacido en la Asuncion”</td>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>Azil</td>
<td>MI-B 0886</td>
<td>MI-B 0159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2863</td>
<td>03/20/1838</td>
<td>“[illegible] de la Asuncpcion”</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 1639</td>
<td>MI-B 2611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2829</td>
<td>09/14/1838</td>
<td>“nacido en la Estrella”</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 0124</td>
<td>MI-B 2681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2837</td>
<td>12/24/1838</td>
<td>“nacido en el Rancho de S. Simeon”</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 2610</td>
<td>MI-B 2614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2848</td>
<td>02/27/1839</td>
<td>“en la Capilla de S. Simeon… echo la Agua”</td>
<td>Zilacomocoye</td>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>MI-B 0042</td>
<td>MI-B 0585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2876</td>
<td>03/06/1839</td>
<td>“nacido en Paso de Robles o en Atascadero”</td>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 1477</td>
<td>MI-B 2157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2856</td>
<td>07/22/1839</td>
<td>“en la Playa de S. Simeon… bautizó”</td>
<td>Sulaltap</td>
<td>Chelacosaone</td>
<td>MI-B 1883</td>
<td>MI-B 2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2888</td>
<td>03/09/1840</td>
<td>“[illeg.] del ranch.o llamado Rafael Villa”</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>Chenen</td>
<td>MI-B 0023</td>
<td>MI-B 1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2895</td>
<td>02/28/1841</td>
<td>“nacido en esta porque… trabajando aqui”</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Tisagues</td>
<td>MI-B 2481</td>
<td>MI-B 2182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2896</td>
<td>03/03/1841</td>
<td>“nacida en Santa Ysabel”</td>
<td>Chenelac</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>MI-B 0625</td>
<td>MI-B 1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2898</td>
<td>03/28/1841</td>
<td>“nacida en el Rancho de San Simeon de la Mision de S.” Miguel”</td>
<td>Sicpats</td>
<td>Playano</td>
<td>MI-B 0334</td>
<td>MI-B 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2902</td>
<td>06/06/1841</td>
<td>“nac. en la Mis. de S. Miguel”</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Sumtache</td>
<td>MI-B 2703</td>
<td>MI-B 2603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2904</td>
<td>06/20/1841</td>
<td>“nac. cañada de los osos”</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>MI-B 0660</td>
<td>MI-B 1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2907</td>
<td>09/26/1841</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B</td>
<td>MI-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 4606</td>
<td>02/06/1842</td>
<td>“nacido en la M. de Sn Miguel”</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>MI-B 0340</td>
<td>MI-B 1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 2890</td>
<td>04/25/1842</td>
<td>“bautise… en la Iglesia de San Luis Obispo”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B</td>
<td>MI-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 4613</td>
<td>06/12/1842</td>
<td>“nacida en la M.n de S.” Mig.I”</td>
<td>Sulaltap</td>
<td>Chenen</td>
<td>MI-B 1528</td>
<td>MI-B 2273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2910</td>
<td>11/22/1842</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chenelac</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>MI-B 0625</td>
<td>MI-B 1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2916</td>
<td>03/27/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Zthenelac</td>
<td>MI-B 1479</td>
<td>MI-B 1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2917</td>
<td>03/28/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 2481</td>
<td>MI-B 2182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2919</td>
<td>03/30/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B</td>
<td>MI-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 4624</td>
<td>04/30/1843</td>
<td>“nacido en la M.n de S. Mig.I”</td>
<td>Chenez</td>
<td>Pachac</td>
<td>MI-B 0727</td>
<td>MI-B 0298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2921</td>
<td>06/16/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 0299</td>
<td>MI-B 2710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2922</td>
<td>06/16/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sicpats</td>
<td>Playano</td>
<td>MI-B 0334</td>
<td>MI-B 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 4633</td>
<td>11/12/1843</td>
<td>“nacido en la M.n de S.” Mig.I”</td>
<td>Checax</td>
<td>Staquel</td>
<td>MI-B 0024</td>
<td>MI-B 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2924</td>
<td>11/12/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pel</td>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>MI-B 1611</td>
<td>MI-B 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2925</td>
<td>11/12/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>MI-B 2623</td>
<td>MI-B 2626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2926</td>
<td>11/12/1843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bubal</td>
<td>Sumtache</td>
<td>MI-B 2706</td>
<td>MI-B 2631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: MI-B – Mission San Miguel baptism, LO-B – Mission San Luis Obispo baptism, AN-B – Mission San Antonio baptism.

The missions received an inspection in 1839 to evaluate their status following secularization. At San Luis Obispo inspector William Hartnell found that the remaining Indians were satisfied with their condition and that the mission still retained a large amount of property. On his return in September of 1840, Indian representatives asked Hartnell to be allowed to return to the old commune system under control of Father Abella. At Mission San Antonio, the Indians reported to Hartnell that they were being abused by their appointed administrator. A new priest was at San Antonio, Father José María Gutiérrez. He had replaced Father Vásquez during the winter of 1839-1840. Gutiérrez reported, “This Mission daily is on its way to destruction, and is beginning to resemble La Soledad” (cited in Sprietsma 1988:50). La Soledad was abandoned and being dismantled by that year. The Indians at San Miguel petitioned Hartnell to keep Paso de los Robles, Asunción, and San Simeón; the petition was not granted.

The year 1841 was the most difficult yet for the Indians at the three missions. Father Gutiérrez reported from Mission San Antonio in 1842, “The pagans are becoming insolent, the Christians rebellious and fleeing. There is stealing and killing” (in Sprietsma 1988:50-51). At San Luis Obispo, visitor Eugene
Duflot de Mofras wrote, “The Indians are now dispersed. At most barely one hundred are left. All the farm lands and the two ranchos of Santa Margarita and Asunció have been given away to private individuals” (Mofras in Engelhardt 1963:141). San Miguel became the religious responsibility of the minister at San Luis Obispo at the end of 1840, when Father Moreno departed. From December 20, 1840 to September 1841, Father Abella of San Luis Obispo journeyed to Mission San Miguel to perform baptisms (MI-B 2877-2883). During that same period he baptized other Migueleños at San Luis Obispo (see Table 4). At the end of 1841 Father Abella retired and was replaced by the Mexican priest José Miguel Gómez.

In July of 1842, Mission San Miguel was officially placed under the jurisdiction of Father Gómez at Mission San Luis Obispo. The San Miguel Baptismal Register contains three entries for baptisms in March and April 1844 by Father Gómez (MI-B 2891-2893). However, those entries explicitly state that the baptisms took place at San Luis Obispo, where Father Gómez had presumably taken the San Miguel registers. Between November 1844 and June 1853, marriages of San Luis Obispo parish Indians and San Miguel parish Indians were entered in the San Miguel Marriage Register, without reference to the location of the event, but probably at San Luis Obispo. Until 1851, Mission San Miguel parents who were still attending Catholic religious events brought their children to Mission San Antonio or Mission San Luis Obispo for baptism. Father Doroteo Ambris began to baptize at San Miguel in August of 1851 (Casey 1976).

The Christian Indians of San Miguel received small grants of land at Las Gallinas, El Nacimiento, and La Estrella from Governor Micheltorena in July 1844 (Ohles 1997:43). Those grants were later rejected by US courts, on the claim that the Indians had not carried out the required improvements on the land (Cowan 1977). Parish priest Gómez attempted to claim La Estrella and the adjoining San Juan Creek vicinity to the southeast in a petition of June 6, 1846, although it is not clear if he wanted it for the Indians or for himself (Ohles 1997:18). At the close of the rancho era little land was controlled by Indian families, but they were living at La Estrella and on other ranches throughout the study area.

United States Takeover, 1846-1854

The occupation of California by US troops began on July 7, 1846. Protection of Indians and their land rights was not an important part of the early military government’s agenda. Under the succeeding territorial and state governments, Mission Indians had even fewer rights than they had under the Mexican system. The Indians of the south central coast, however, were not subjected to as great a degree of persecution by Gold Rush era invaders as were Indians in many other parts of California.

The early American period was the time of young adulthood for the people who would later supply information to ethnographers. Onésimo Baylon, a consultant to H. W. Henshaw, was born in 1830 at San Miguel and married for the first time at San Miguel in 1848 (SMI-M2:343; Appendix E, Figure E-2). Perfecta Encinales, a consultant to C. Hart Merriam, was a Wowol Yokuts, born in 1832 in her home village, who was raised around San Miguel and married Pastor at San Miguel in 1847 (SMI-M2:332; Appendix E, Figure E-3); when she died she lived “with the viejos y viejas [old men and old women]” then moved to Mission San Antonio in the mid-1850s to marry Salinan Eusebio Encinal (Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 325). This was also the period of childhood or infancy for three important consultants to J. P. Harrington, Pacífico Gallego (born in 1841 [SMI-B 2882]; Appendix E, Figure E-4), Rosario Cooper (born in 1841 [SLO-B 2897]; Appendix E, Figure E-5), and María de los Angeles Baylon (born in 1853 [SMI-B 2899]; Appendix E, Figure E-2).

Indian life in the early years of US control of California was, for the most part, poorly documented. However, the 1852 California census for San Luis Obispo County lists the names and ages of Indians who were living and working in the county. For instance, page 1 of that census lists 20 Indians immediately following Antonio María Villa, a farmer, and his two children. Census page 2 lists two Indians living with José María Villa, his wife, and seven children. Eleven Indians living with José Martínez, farmer, are listed on page 3. Many other Indian groups are listed on succeeding pages, and the possibility exists to match them with specific places on the ground. This has, in fact, been done by Farris (in Rivers 2000:134), who found a listing for three generations of the Baylon family living at Estrella, near San Miguel, in the 1852 California census.
CHAPTER 3
HISTORY OF ETHNOGEOGRAPHIC STUDIES

This chapter describes ethnographic and linguistic studies in the South Coast Ranges since the area was brought under control of the US. The chapter is divided into sections reflecting three different periods of research, a nineteenth-century period of linguistic field research, an early twentieth-century period of professional field anthropology, and the late twentieth-century period of mission register analysis and archival research. Specific field consultants of some of the researchers are discussed and, in some cases, their genealogical charts are shown in Appendix E. Influential publications and maps, as well as field work, are discussed. Through the twists and turns of accumulating facts and ideas, one may come to see how today’s controversies developed and why they have not been resolved.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY ETHNOGEOGRAPHY

The former inhabitants of the South Coast missions and their children survived as ranch workers and house servants during the late nineteenth century. Most of them spoke Spanish in their public interactions, although some continued to use their native languages amongst themselves. Over time, some of the descendants of tribal villagers were visited by interested linguists and ethnographers.

Alexander Taylor, 1856-1864

During the late 1850s, Alexander Taylor gathered information regarding traditional culture, old village locations, and tribal names through much of California. His information came from Indians that he met, from non-Indian immigrants, and from the Franciscan mission records. He recovered a Salinan vocabulary that had been written by Father Sitjar prior to 1795 and sent it to the Smithsonian Institution (Sitjar 1861). Taylor (1860-1863) published a series of articles in the California Farmer newspaper.

In 1864 Taylor created a master map of the locations of California Indian groups, the first of its kind (Figure 2). The map shows five groups in the vicinity of Mission San Antonio, of which only “Jalones” is both legible and recognizable as a local name. It shows three groups in the San Miguel vicinity, Lamacas on the coast to the west, “Saxlapags” just north of the mission, and “Cholam” to the east. In the vicinity of Mission San Luis Obispo, the map shows five groups, “Huasna” and “Nipomo” to the southeast, “Sagollumuis” to the east, “Teulowis” to the west, and “Pie[ches]” at Estero Point to the northwest.

Taylor’s map is most important for the presence of a firm line down the crest of the Coast Ranges, possibly drawn to separate the coastal groups from the Yokuts groups of the San Joaquin Valley. A Yokuts language boundary along the Coast Range crest was accepted by all subsequent scholars up to the 1980s.

Alphonse Pinart, 1878

French linguist Alphonse Pinart visited the study area missions in the summer of 1878 from his base in San Francisco. His journal indicates that he traveled by coach through the central coast in July and August. At Mission San Antonio, he obtained a Salinan vocabulary from a man named Lorenzo. The interview resulted in a manuscript vocabulary of the native language at Mission San Antonio (Heizer 1952; Pinart 1878). It is likely that the consultant was Lorenzo Quintana, a Mission San Antonio man baptized in 1838 to a Lamaca father and Tsetacol mother (SAN-B 4538; Appendix E, Figure E-14).

H. W. Henshaw, 1880s

H. W. Henshaw gathered linguistic information along the Santa Barbara Channel, then at Santa Ynez, San Luis Obispo, and Jolon in 1884. Henshaw did not speak Spanish, and most of his consultants did not speak English. He was aided in communicating with Indian people by local people bilingual in English and Spanish. Henshaw’s field notes were written on the back of printed Bureau of American Ethnology
Figure 2. A Portion of Alexander Taylor’s 1864 Map of California Indian Tribes, Showing the Coast Range and Transverse Range Areas.
vocabulary schedules (Henshaw 1880-1884); they have not been examined for this report. Instead, we refer to paraphrases by John Wesley Powell (1888, 1891) and to Henshaw notes copied by Mason (1912) and Harrington (1985).

Henshaw’s findings established for linguistic science the separation of the Chumash and Salinan language families:

The existing dialects [of Chumash], named according to the missions around which they were spoken, are as follows: San Buenaventura, Santa Barbara, Santa Rosa Island, Purissima, Santa Inez, and San Luis Obispo. With the exception of the last named the several dialects are very closely related... The dialect formerly spoken at San Luis Obispo differs much from any of the others, and a critical comparison is necessary to reveal a sufficient number of words possessing identical roots to render their common parentage obvious.

Extensive vocabularies of the dialects of San Antonio and San Miguel were obtained, there being about a dozen Indians who speak these languages around the old San Antonio mission. These languages have been supposed to be of the Santa Barbara family (as it has hitherto been termed, now called Chumashan family), but the material obtained by Mr. Henshaw disproves this, and for the present at least, they are considered to form a distinct family [Powell 1888:xxxii-xxxiii].

Henshaw’s field information provided the basis for the first map of the Chumashan and Salinan linguistic families, published in the Smithsonian Institution’s Indian Linguistic Families of America North of Mexico (Powell 1891:Plate 1 [Figure 3 in this report]). That linguistic map, which was not at a very close scale, assigned the Salinan languages to the Salinas River drainage and coastal streams from Lopez Point south to Pismo Beach. The map assigned the Chumashan languages to areas south of Pismo Beach as far as Malibu Point in Los Angeles County.

Henshaw encountered only one Northern Chumash speaker, a man named “Alikano,” whom he met at a place called Jasper’s Ranch near San Luis Obispo. “His speech was at all times low and indistinct, and thus hard to catch... [The vocabulary] was by far the most difficult of notation of any I have met. It will prove, I think, to be not related to the Santa Barbara family” (Henshaw 1884). Alikano’s Northern Chumash vocabulary was subsequently determined to be a divergent form of Chumash, as Powell reported in the previous citation. Alikano has been identified as a Choinoc Yokuts boy who moved to Mission San Luis Obispo at age six and was baptized Galicano (SLO-B 2689). Thus, Northern Chumash was probably his third language after Yokuts and Spanish.

Arriving at Jolon, Henshaw was aided in communicating with Salinan Indian people by lawyer Alonzo Forbes, who was bilingual in English and Spanish. Henshaw “was able to learn of the existence of only about a dozen Indians of this family” (Powell 1891:102). His main Mission San Antonio consultant was Hilario Mora (Appendix E, Figure E-6). Hilario told Henshaw “that there were but five natives who spoke the San Antonio language correctly. The others used more or less of the San Miguel dialect in their conversation” (Mason 1912:117). Henshaw’s main San Miguel consultant was “Anesimo” (Onésimo) Baylon of mixed San Miguel Salinan and Yokuts ancestry (Appendix E, Figure E-2). Another consultant was José Cruz.16 Cruz and Onésimo were remembered about 40 years later: “Cruz and Onesimo are the ones who gave Mr. Forbes his material. Cruz was Antoniano, but Anesimo was Mig[uel]eno. Mr. Forbes was del paiz, & a lawyer, as far as informan[t] knows” (Dave Mora 1922, in Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 338).

16 The family chart of José Cruz (SAN-B 4432), who was born in 1834, has not been prepared at this time. He and his brother Benancio (SAN-B 4367) were discussed by twentieth-century consultant Dave Mora (Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 648). They were the sons of Pacomio Cruz and Humiliana Lagarra, both born at Mission San Antonio. Pacomio’s parents were from Quinau (SAN-B 596) and Lima (SAN-B 591), while Humiliana’s were from Janulo (SAN-B 511) and Quinau (SAN-B 79).
Figure 3. A Portion of John Wesley Powell’s (1891: Plate 1) Map of Linguistic Stocks of North America, with the Yokuts Family Labeled “Mariposan.”
Henshaw gathered a small amount of placename information from his Jolon consultants. His most critical piece of information concerned the Cholam area; it was described to him as a vast territory south and east of San Miguel, inclusive of three sub-districts. This and other Henshaw information will be cited in succeeding chapters of this report.

EARLY TWENTIETH-CENTURY ETHNOGRAPHERS

C. Hart Merriam, 1902

In 1902, and again in the 1930s, C. Hart Merriam gathered linguistic, ethnobotanic, and ethnogeographic information from Salinan descendants in the area northwest of Mission San Antonio that came to be known as “The Indians.” On the first day of his August 1902 visit, Merriam hired Tito Encinales to guide him on a hike to the top of Santa Lucía Peak. (See Appendix E, Figure E-3 for the Encinales family genealogy.) Merriam spoke no Spanish and Tito Encinales spoke no English, but they were able to converse through a local Spanish-English interpreter (Merriam 1902:115). In addition to getting a word list, Merriam learned from Tito about the families in the vicinity. “He says only 3 families are left and his mother is the oldest of those now living. One family of young people went from here to the coast” (Merriam 1902:120). Merriam returned to the little cluster of houses in the valley the next day. There he encountered a group of Indian children:

The old folks were away but 4 children were at home—3 girls and a little boy. The eldest girl is apparently about 14 & talks a little English, which she learnt at Milpitas School. She told me that the acorns of both valley & live oaks are good to eat, but the valley oak is best...

...[I] continued down the trail... on the way met 2 more Indian girls—one a little child; the other perhaps 17 or 18... [on the return from a corn field] found no one at the adobe but found 3 women in a watermelon patch along the edge of the large cornfield. One was an old woman, doubtless the mother of the man who guided us up the mt., the other two were middle aged women, one the wife of the above-mentioned man, the other the mother of the 4 children at the first house (in the canyon)... As they could talk no English, and I no Indian or Spanish, I quit & went down to the large adobe house [Merriam 1902:127-128].

The old woman encountered by Merriam was Perfecta, mother of Tito Encinales. She was a Sumtache (Chunut) Yokuts by birth who had spent most of her life among Salinan-speakers (SAN-B 4709; Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 355). We do not know the name or family of Tito’s wife in 1902. The other woman, the mother of four children, was probably Francisca Gambusera, wife of Pedro Encinales (Mason 1912).

On the last day of his 1902 visit, Merriam engaged in his final conversation of the trip with the Encinales family:

In afternoon E.A. Goldman & I made a round of the three Indian places & took a few photographs & in Sp. talked with the old mother of Tito Encinales & got an additional vocabulary. I got from her also 5 baskets—two bowls, 1 circular winnower, & 2 deep pockets. She says her people came originally from Cholam, beyond San Miguel, and that her husband (now dead) came from San Antonio Mission. She says their people are commonly called Gentiles... but knows no tribal name except Tcho-lam [Merriam 1902:137].

Merriam was a trained biologist who was interested in native uses of plants. He obtained information from Perfecta regarding her family’s acorn preferences:

The old squaw, Encinales mother told Goldman that acorns of _Quercus agrifolia_ are bitter & used only for mush (after leaching), while the other two, which do not require leaching, are used for acorn bread. _Q. lobata_ used both for mush & bread & that _douglasii_ makes best bread of all [Merriam 1902:140].
This is one of very few references to the importance of blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), so common in the interior South Coast Ranges, as an important ethnographic food source.

**A. L. Kroeber, 1901-1908**

Alfred L. Kroeber did very little direct field work in the South Coast Ranges, yet he is one of the most important contributors to the study of Chumash and Salinan ethnogeography through the chapters in his 1925 *Handbook of Indians of California* based on his interpretation of the field work of others. Kroeber first visited the south and central coast to conduct field work in December of 1901, where he gathered some information from Chumash-speakers at Santa Ynez. On his way back north, he obtained a short Salinan vocabulary from María Ocarpio in the San Antonio Valley on December 31 (Kroeber 1901).

In 1903 Roland Dixon and Kroeber published an article entitled “The Native Languages of California” which included a new map of ethnographic native language distributions. The map (Figure 4) outlines the Salinan-Chumash-Yokuts boundaries much as they had been portrayed by Powell in 1891. However, a year later, in 1904, Kroeber published a revised map of the Salinan-Chumash boundary in the article “The Languages of the Coast of California South of San Francisco” (Figure 5). That map finally gave the San Luis Obispo area to the Chumash language family and the entire upper Salinas River watershed to the Salinan language family.

By 1908 Kroeber was aware of the 1812 missionary report to the effect that a completely different language had been spoken along the coast west of Mission San Miguel. He wrote, “Nothing is known of the coast language of this region, nor about the dialectic divisions of the Salinan family” (1908:18).

**J. Alden Mason, 1910**

J. Alden Mason gathered ethnographic and linguistic information in the Jolon vicinity, near Mission San Antonio. During his first visit, in September of 1910, Mason wrote the following regarding the Indian people he found living near Mission San Antonio:

Careful inquiry produced the names of forty-one full-blood Salinans, thirteen of whom claim to be of the Miguelño division, and twenty-eight of the Antoniño, but as they have intermarried to a considerable extent, little purity of speech or blood is possible. Of the thirteen Miguelño, none are children and all are able to speak the language, but three only are of sufficient age to remember anything of the older culture. Only one patriarch exists among the group of San Antonio, while eleven are children or unmarried young people, unable to speak the tongue. The other sixteen are of middle age [Mason 1912:117].

Mason gathered most of his information from Perfecta Encinales “of San Miguel” and José Cruz “of the San Antonio division” (Mason 1912:99). Mason provided more information about his main consultants in his 1918 report on the Salinan language:

Here a little work was done with the oldest member of each of the two divisions, José Cruz of the Antoniano and Perfecta Encinales of the Migueleño dialect. An incomplete acquaintance with Spanish, the medium of communication, coupled with a lack of satisfactory interpreters and other disappointing circumstances, rendered this visit not wholly profitable. Consequently... Pedro Encinales, one of the middle-aged Indians, visited San Francisco... from Thanksgiving until Christmas [Mason 1918:4].

José Cruz, one of Mason’s two oldest consultants, was a “viejo” (elder) during this period (SAN-B 4432, born in 1834); he had contributed information to Henshaw in 1884. Perfecta Encinales, Yokuts-born mother of Tito Encinales, has already been introduced as a consultant to Merriam in 1902. Mason introduces us in 1912 to her son Pedro, a brother of Tito Encinales who had been born back in 1859 (Appendix E, Figure E-3). Mason’s 1912 Plate 24 shows Pedro’s family without identification. But later commentary by
Figure 4. Alfred L. Kroeber’s First Map of California Linguistic Family Distributions (from Dixon and Kroeber 1903: Plate 1).
Figure 5. Kroeber's 1904 Map of Language Distributions of the Coast South of San Francisco.
María de los Ángeles to J. P. Harrington (1985:Reel 86, Frame 477) identifies the whole family. Other Harrington information about the Encinales family and their lands in the early 1900s has been published with photographs by Rivers and Jones (1993).

**J. P. Harrington, 1912-1916**

J. P. Harrington’s first contact with study area Indian people occurred in June of 1912 at the San Luis Obispo County Hospital. There he met Juan Solano, a Miguéleno who had been born on the coast and who knew information about both Miguéleno (Salinan) and Obispeño (Northern Chumash) languages. Within a few days Harrington met another Miguéleno speaker at the hospital, Pacífico Archuleta, aka Pacífico Gallego (Appendix E, Figure E-4). They worked with Harrington on three separate occasions in 1912 and 1913 (Mills 1985:130; Turner 1987).

In 1913 Harrington began linguistic work with Rosario Cooper, a Northern Chumash speaker (Appendix E, Figure E-5). Rosario lived in Lopez Canyon above Arroyo Grande at the time (Black Gold System Advisory Board and Johnson 1997; Klar 1991; Mills and Brickfield 1986:4-5).

Harrington visited Pacífico again in 1915, and he worked with Rosario Cooper again in 1916. Solano and Archuleta/Gallego were familiar with the coastal area of northern San Luis Obispo County. Harrington provided only brief statements about the history of Juan Solano. They indicate that he was born at Piedras Blancas, learned some Obispeño (Northern Chumash) as well as Miguéleno (Salinan), left California for many years, but remained on the coast during the period that he lived in the study area:

[Juan Solano] was born here but left here when 10 years old. Wandered all over America, & returned here 10 years ago. Was born at Pacheco Ranch at Piedra Blanca. All there used to call Miguéleno. Cayuco means turtle in Slo. language. Slo. said p’ismák for Pismo = “well of tar.” Was a Spring of tar a short distance to right (n.) of mouth of Prices canyon and 100 yds from bluff. Used to pick wild fresas [strawberries] on the sandbars at Pismo. The Slo used to call salamanques lizards = wa ajna’ [Information from Juan Solano in Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 02].

Tule River Indians came over from Tule River. The captain was Šápáka. They danced 2 or 3 nights in front of old lady Wilson’s house. Pacífico was here. He danced. Juan’s mother danced. Also 3 Spanish women danced. Pacífico knows all the songs... This was about 1858. For Juan left here in 1850 [Information from Pacífico in Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 92].

Juan Solano’s baptismal entry has not yet been definitively identified, but he was probably a son of Juan de Mata Solano (of a Sicpats family) and Sabina Enterria (of Wowol [Bubal]). That couple and their relatives were living in the San Simeón vicinity during the late 1830s and early 1840s, during a time when mission register record-keeping was not very good.17

---

17 The surname Solano was used by two related families at the study area missions whose family charts were not rendered for this study. Juan Solano of Sicpats was born around 1752 (SMI-B 657) and his wife Juana Solano of the same group was born around 1756 (SMI-B 672). The younger of their two children was Francisco Solano of Sicpats, born in 1790 (SMI-B 338), who had two sons, but no grandchildren on those lines (two daughters were born at Rancho San Simeón: SMI-B 2787 in 1837 and SMI-B 2898 in 1841). Juan and Juana’s older child, Orosia María of Sicpats (SMI-B 682), married Orosio Solano of Zthenecal; they had seven children between 1800 and 1820, of whom only their son Juan de Mata Solano (SMI-B 1584), born in 1812, had a family that might have included Harrington’s Juan Solano. Juan de Mata Solano married Sabina Enterria from Wowol (SMI-B 2146) in 1831 (SMI-M 743). They had three identified children, Pancrasio at San Miguel in 1834 (SMI-B 2578), José at San Simeón in 1837 (SMI-B 2793), and María del Carmel, baptized at San Luis Obispo in 1844 (SMI-B 2893). Based on the typical pattern of birth intervals among mission women, children of the couple would have been expected in 1839 and 1842, a time of poor church record-keeping; Harrington’s Juan Solano may have been born at that time.
Pacífico Archuleta, alias Pacífico Gallego, was the son of Hermenegildo Guardián, called “Merijildo” (Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 862) and of Rita Aragón; he was baptized on July 7, 1841 as “un niño de 40 días de nacido... siendo su padrino el neofito de la misión de Sn Luis Obispo Pacífico y su mujer [a 40-day-old baby... the godparents being Mission San Luis Obispo neophyte Pacífico and his wife)” (SMI-B 2882). He was interviewed by Harrington in 1912:

Pacífico Archuleta... says that he was born at Santa Ysabel (a place between San Miguel and Paso Robles) under an oak tree about 100 years ago in the month of April [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 54].

Pacífico lived as a youth at the Santa Rosa Ranch on the coast at Cambria (Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 995). It was said that he wanted to die at the old Juan de los Reyes ranch of Tecolote on upper Toro Creek, a place where “old Pacífico” had lived in the days of Henshaw (José Baylon 1932, in Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 549):

Pacífico came to Tecolote shortly before he died & said he was from the hospital & wanted to die at Tecolote. But he went back to the hospital and died there [Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 538].

Pacífico died some time after 1915, presumably in the San Luis Obispo Hospital. Subsequent Harrington consultants stated again and again that Pacífico’s mother spoke a language of the coast that was different than the standard inland form of Migueleño. The mother, Rita Aragón (SMI-B 1352), had been born in 1807 to Lorenzo Aragón from Patzac on the Nacimiento River and to Bruna from an unlocated area called Cheyne (Appendix E, Figure E-4). Rita Aragón’s language will be discussed in detail in the portion of Chapter 10 regarding languages of the coast.

Harrington’s Northern Chumash consultant, Rosario Cooper, had been baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo shortly after birth in 1841 (SLO-B 2897). She was the youngest of eleven children of mission-born Ana María Masta, whose parents were from Chliquin in the Arroyo Grande area and Sepiato near Avila Beach (Appendix E, Figure E-5). Rosario visited the Salinan community on the Rafael Villa Ranch west of Cayucos, where she remembered many traditional cultural events, including those led by Yokuts visitors from the San Joaquin Valley (Rivers 2000:25-27). She married William Olivas in the early 1860s. By the time Harrington worked with her, she was married to Mauro Soto and living near present day Lopez Lake. Her memory of placenames was limited mainly to areas south of San Luis Obispo.

J. Alden Mason, 1916-1918

J. Alden Mason made a second trip to the Jolon region near Mission San Antonio in January of 1916. When he arrived he found that both José Cruz and Perfecta Encinales, his most knowledgeable consultants in 1910, had died:

But better linguistic informants were found in the persons of Dave Mora, a pure Antoniano Indian, and María Ocarpia, a pure Migueleño... Another old Indian, Juan Quintana, was found to be an unsatisfactory linguistic informant, but gave a number of mythological stories in Spanish, which were translated into Salinan by María Encinales, a sister of Pedro, and by David Mora [Mason 1918:4].

Here we are introduced to four people who had not been consulted by any earlier ethnographers. Dave Mora, not identified thus far in any baptismal register, seems to have been born around 1868 (Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 355; Appendix E, Figure E-6). He was married to María Encinales (SAN-B on 3-24-1870), daughter of Eusebio and Perfecta and a sister of Tito and Pedro Encinales (Appendix E, Figure E-3). Juan Quintana (also not yet identified in any baptismal register) descended from Sixto Quintana of Lamaca (SAN-B 2585; see also Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 766) and Fausta of Tsetacol on the coast (SAN-B 3617). María Ocarpia, who would subsequently be an important consultant to J. P. Harrington, will be discussed below.
A. L. Kroeber, 1919-1925

Kroeber knew so little about the Salinan that he placed them in a tiny combined chapter with the Esselen in his 1925 *Handbook of Indians of California*. In the *Handbook*, Kroeber’s map shows a number of specific village locations that had been collected by himself and other late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century ethnographers (Figure 6). The map shows three divisions of the Salinan: the San Antonio, San Miguel, and Playano divisions. Kroeber followed Mason’s reasoning in this division of the Salinan language and in placing almost the entire upper Salinas River watershed east of San Luis Obispo within Salinan territory.

Kroeber provided neither a close scale map nor specific boundary information about the Northern Chumash in his *Handbook*. Regarding the boundary with the Yokuts, he wrote:

> Along the west of the San Joaquin we have less certain knowledge. This territory seems to have belonged to the Yokuts... This very doubt indicates an unimportant occupation; and while the area was almost certainly visited by the Yokuts... the number of residents must also have been very few [Kroeber 1925:476].

Despite Kroeber’s own doubts, until recent years most students of ethnology have accepted the boundaries on his maps implicitly.

Kroeber was not very rigorous in his placement of locations. For instance, he showed a Salinan village of Tslakaka at the present-day town of San Simeon. That placename, collected by twentieth-century ethnographers, but not listed in the mission records, has since been shown to have been at Big Creek, north of Lopez Point, based on Harrington’s notes (Jones et al. 1989:89).

J. P. Harrington, 1922-1932

J. P. Harrington visited the Mission San Antonio vicinity for the first time in 1922 and again in the early 1930s (Jones et al. 2000; Mills 1985; Rivers and Jones 1993). In 1922, he met Dave Mora, Mason’s consultant of a few years earlier, and Dave’s wife María Jesuíta, a daughter of Eusebio Encinales and a sister of Pedro and Tito Encinales.® Joining them, but providing little information, was Petronilo Gómez, an Antoniano (Jones et al. 2000; Rivers and Jones 1993:156-158). Since Dave Mora’s dialect was Antoniano, and María Jesuíta’s was Migueleño, Harrington was eager to work with them in 1922 on a comparative study of two dialects (Mills 1985:131-132).

Harrington met María de los Angeles Baylon (Mason’s “María Ocarpio”) when he returned to the Mission San Antonio area in 1930. At that time she was 77 years old and living with Tito Encinales at his home in Milpitas Valley, northwest of Mission San Antonio. María de los Angeles became Harrington’s most important Salinan consultant. She was a daughter of Henshaw’s Migueleño consultant Onésimo Baylon, born at Vineyard Springs just north of Mission San Miguel in 1853 (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 437; Appendix E, Figure E-2 for the Baylon family).

María’s family lived at Estrella during her youth, but by 1870 she had moved to the Villa Ranch on the coast (Rivers and Jones 1993:156). She also worked as a cook on a ranch in the mountains west of Paso Robles (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 550). At some point she married an older man, Fernando Ocarpio (baptized as Fernando Causa), who was born at San Miguel in 1830 (SMI-B 2423).® She moved to the

---

® Rivers and Jones (1993:153-54) reproduce a photograph of María Jesuíta Encinales and David Mora at their ranch, taken by C.H. Merriam in 1933.

® Fernando Ocarpio’s father Ynocencio, born in 1792 (SMI-B 340), hailed from Etsmal near Mission San Miguel; his mother Jacinta, born in 1808 (SMI-B 1325), was the daughter of a Northern Chumash family from Las Gallinas (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 383, 565, 675).
Figure 6. Kroeber's 1925 Map of Salinan Territory and Villages.
Mission San Antonio area where she was listed in the 1900 census as María Ocarpia, widowed with four children (Rivers and Jones 1993:156). She and Tito Encinales were living together by the mid-1920s.

Between 1930 and 1932 Harrington conducted extensive interviews with María de los Angeles Baylon and Dave Mora about both linguistics and geography, with some input from Tito Encinales, María Jesusa Encinales (wife of Dave Mora), and José Baylon. This work included a series of placename trips. The first trip, in February of 1930, took them from Milpitas Valley south to Mission San Miguel, then up Vineyard and Indian canyons, back west to the Adelaide area, and south to Atascadero (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 430-450). Tito Encinales and Dave Mora took Harrington on two placename trips in the valleys and mountains north of San Antonio and south of Arroyo Seco in the spring of 1931 (Rivers and Jones 1993).

An important placename trip into the earlier homelands of María de los Angeles took place in March of 1932. Beginning on March 4, 1932, María de los Angeles Baylon, María Jesusa Encinales, and Harrington headed east from San Miguel. The extant notes are in rather chaotic order, so we made no attempt to reconstruct the precise path of the trip, which included stops at Estrella, Shandon, and the Cholam Store (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 474-531). From those valleys they drove west to Templeton, then up into the Santa Lucía range to the ranch of Tecolote on the saddle between Old Creek and Toro Creek, where José Baylon, the younger brother of María de los Angeles Baylon, was living (his baptismal entry has not been identified). José Baylon joined the group at his home on upper Toro Creek for the coastal portion of their March 1932 placename trip (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 531). They went west, down Toro Creek Canyon to the coast, then north to Cayucos, and on up the coast beyond “San Carpojo” (San Carpoforo) Creek to Salmon Creek, then turned back to the south. On the return trip, taking the advice of local Villa descendent Eligio Villa, they turned inland on Old Creek Road south of Cayucos, following it up over the Santa Lucía Range to Jack Creek and on to Paso Robles. All along the way María de los Angeles knew Salinan words for local landmarks (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 531-559).

Another trip, less well-documented, seems to have been made by Harrington and María de los Angeles from Atascadero to Santa Lucía by way of San Luis Obispo on March 15-16, 1932 (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 560-570). Harrington took a short trip with Tito Encinales and María de los Angeles in the upper Nacimiento River region over March 16-19, 1932 (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 573-597). A final expedition explored west and northwest of Mission San Antonio in October of 1932, probably Harrington with Tito Encinales and Dave Mora (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 618-651; Rivers and Jones 1993).

Other pieces of data regarding placenames and genealogical relationships are scattered throughout Harrington’s voluminous linguistic lists and in his notes on follow-up discussions with Mason’s consultants. This information has been examined, and pertinent excerpts will be presented throughout the remainder of this study.

C. Hart Merriam, 1933-1934

C. Hart Merriam returned to Milpitas Valley, west of Mission San Antonio, in September of 1933. He found that the place where the Encinales family had lived had been taken over by a private resort, the “Indian Club,” with lodges and a swimming pool:

After arranging a cabin I... was fortunate in getting a Spanish Mexican named Santos Boronda to accompany me as Int & translator—as the Indians here neither speak nor understand English. Found only one couple—both old. The man is Tito Encinales with whom I worked many years ago, in August 1902. His old wife is intelligent and speaks fairly plainly [Merriam 1932-33:86].

Tito Encinales “had slightly improved his very limited English,” wrote Merriam in 1933 (1902-1934: Reel 38, Frame 454).
Through the translator, Merriam understood Tito and his wife to say, “Our country goes from Santa Lucia Mts. [Junipero Serra Peak] south to include San Antonio River, but not Nacimiento [sic] River; west to Cone Peak—not beyond” and “East—not to Salinas Valley—but to Ridge between Jolon & Salinas Valley” (Merriam 1902-1934:Reel 38, Frame 454). Tito Encinales was probably describing the land that his own family had farmed and ranched, not as Merriam’s notes suggest, the full range of the ethnographic Salinan language group.

Merriam wrote a summary of his work with the Salinans in 1933, emphasizing his agreement with Kroeber that there was a northern and southern language division. He placed the Salinan-Chumash coastal boundary along Morro Creek at the north end of Morro Bay (Heizer 1966, Map 5):

The Indians of this region recognize two major divisions or tribes, the northern, extending from Santa Lucia Peak southward to the divide between the San Antonio and Nacimiento rivers; the southern, the San Miguel region in a general way—limits unknown.

So far as I have ascertained there remain alive, of the northern division only two men, both rather elderly, and only one woman... Tito Ensenales [sic]... original home being in the little Milpitas valley... Dave Mora... always lived in the San Antonio Mission country. He now occupies a ranch house on the north side of Nacimiento River.

So far as I am aware these two men are the sole survivors of the so-called Santa Lucia or San Antonio tribe. Of the southern division... there are two survivors, both women past middle age. One is the wife of Tito Ensenales [sic] and lives with him on the south-westerly slope of Santa Lucia mountain... The other, Maria, wife of Dave Mora [Merriam 1932-33].

Merriam photographed each of these couples in 1933 (Hoover and Hoover 1985:4-5). When he returned to Milpitas Valley in June of 1934, he learned that Tito Encinales had died on May 20 of that year (Merriam 1902-1934:Reel 38, Frame 380).

LATE TWENTIETH-CENTURY ARCHIVE-BASED STUDIES


The ranchería names in the San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo ecclesiastical records have been abstracted and studied by a number of scholars over the past 145 years. We have already noted that Alexander Taylor published ranchería names that he found in the registers. Alphonse Pinart abstracted ranchería names and lists of married couples. Later, H. W. Henshaw went into the field armed with lists of ranchería names from the mission registers, as did J. Alden Mason, J. P. Harrington, and C. Hart Merriam.

C. Hart Merriam hired Stella R. Clemence to abstract the ranchería names, count the number of times that they occurred, and sort them into alphabetical order in 1919. Merriam then used the lists to prompt the memories of his field consultants. After Merriam’s death, the lists languished in storage for many years. R. F. Heizer and others eventually recognized their importance. The lists from missions San Luis Obispo and San Miguel were published in 1955 under Heizer’s editorial direction (Merriam 1955:201-216). Heizer published two separate lists from the Mission San Antonio records in 1968, one purely from baptismal register entries and the other from a wide variety of sources, including San Antonio Marriage Register entries and the notes of early field ethnographers (Merriam 1968).

The published lists of ranchería names introduced the potential wealth of South Coast Range mission register information to a wider community. Taken out of context, however, the lists can seem like a bewildering series of names that cannot be fixed to specific places on the landscape. In the following chapter, we present most of the ranchería names that were accompanied by additional locational information, not as they appear on the published Merriam lists, but within phrases abstracted them from the original registers.
Mission Register-Augmented Ethnogeographies in the 1960s

Indirect techniques for identifying ranchería locations from mission registers were pioneered by James A. Bennyhoff (1961) for his Ph.D. dissertation, *Ethnogeography of the Plains Miwok*. While Bennyhoff’s research area in central California was to the north of our own, his “concentric circle” and “marriage pattern” analytical methods underlie all succeeding mission-register based ethnogeographies, including our own. Concentric circle outreach analysis was well explained by Bennyhoff. He wrote, “By plotting the tribelet names and the numbers baptized against the years, a significant constellation appears for each tribelet by which one can judge the approximate distance from the mission and the year of most intensive contact” (Bennyhoff 1977:20). Taken alone, this relative approach helps determine the order of distance from a mission of two or more ranchería groups.

Marriage pattern analysis was another relative approach first developed by Bennyhoff. It presumes that groups that were heavily intermarried lived adjacent to one another, while groups without any intermarriages lived great distances apart. It can help order the spatial relationships among groups, but cannot in itself tie the groups to particular spots on the ground. Bennyhoff explained how he combined direct clues, time of baptism analysis, and marriage pattern analysis to reconstruct a regional ethnogeography:

Having mapped the tribelets with known locations, one attempts to find a year constellation among the unplaced names which best fits a vacant space on the map. All the available data are brought to bear on the first attempt—Do the marriages and alliances make sense in terms of distance or known ethnic affiliation? [Bennyhoff 1977:21].

Bennyhoff (1961) applied mission register data to the techniques to create an ethnogeography of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River delta, the first detailed ethnogeography for central California.

In southern California, the first rigorous use of clues from the mission records to help determine Chumash village locations was undertaken by Alan K. Brown (1967). While Brown did not systematically evaluate quantitative family links among villages, he carefully extracted quotations from specific baptismal entries to emphasize inter-village relationships that supported locational surmises. Techniques introduced by Bennyhoff and Brown formed the basis of later studies that have reconstructed the locations, sizes, inter-group marriage links, and histories of Chumash villages in the present Santa Barbara County area (Horne 1981; Johnson 1988; King 1975, 1984; McLendon and Johnson 1999).

The California Volume, 1978

Articles pertinent to the South Coast Ranges in the 1978 *Handbook of North American Indians: Volume 8 (California)* are survey compilations, rather than original research. For the most part, they repeat ethnogeographic information published by Kroeber in 1925, including wrong information. Hester (1978:500-504) synthesized previously unpublished ethnographic information in his chapter about the Salinans, including a description of Salinan. His map of the Salinan language area placed some rancherías listed by Merriam (1955, 1968) from mission registers, together with some rancherías recorded by early ethnographers. Unfortunately, he conflated a limited selection of district names, large ranchería names, and tiny hamlet names into a series of 21 mostly mislocated dots on the map. Hester also misassigned some Esselen lands north of King City toward Soledad to Salinan-speaking people.

Greenwood (1978:520-523) referenced mission register information in her informative *Handbook* article on Obispeño (Northern) and Purisimeño Chumash people. Her accompanying map, however, showed only two of the 48 ranchería locations north of the Santa Maria River that were recorded in Mission San Luis Obispo registers.

In his *Handbook* article for the Southern Valley Yokuts, William Wallace (1978:448-461) followed all earlier sources in assigning interior Coast Range lands west of Tulare Lake to Yokuts groups. Also, like all earlier sources, he identified no specific Yokuts communities further west than Udjiu at the edge of the hills east of Coalinga.
Gibson’s South Coast Range Mission Register Study, 1983

The first South Coast Ranges mission register-based ethnogeography was written by Robert Gibson (1983). Gibson combined direct clues from the mission registers regarding ranchería locations with indirect clues from family network pattern analysis, concentric circle outreach analysis, and field notes from J. P. Harrington to develop an ethnogeography for the areas around missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo (Figure 7).

Gibson (1983) made a startling new proposal regarding coastal language boundaries that challenged Kroeber’s (1925) view that the ethnographic Salinan-Northern Chumash boundary had been at Toro Creek, just north of Morro Bay. Gibson argued that the people spoke Northern Chumash on the coast as far north as Ragged Point, inclusive of the Piedras Blancas Point and Estero Point vicinities:

On the basis of several lines of ethnohistoric evidence I suggest the Chumash/Salinan boundary on the coast should be moved north approximately forty miles to the general area of San Carpojo Creek/Ragged Point (noted by the Spanish as the beach of Humiliana) [Gibson 1983:94].

Gibson (1983) based his argument for a dramatic northward extension of Chumash territory not upon his study of ranchería locations, but upon his interpretation of ambiguous information regarding inter-marriage networks, an inadequate set of female personal name endings, and an interpretation of information in Spanish period diaries and reports regarding cultural differences between the people in the San Luis Obispo and San Antonio vicinities.

Gibson’s 1983 study was a preliminary one. It did not resolve important problems of scale and synonymy among the placenames that represented groups at the three South Coast Range missions: San Luis Obispo, San Miguel, and San Antonio. For instance, Gibson portrayed Cholam as a single large village, while we will argue below that it represented a multi-village district. Also, he represented Quinau as a regional center for all the groups around Mission San Antonio, whereas we believe its population size rendered it no larger than five other local districts.

In summary, Gibson’s (1983) study pioneered the use of kinship charts for sorting and analyzing indirect mission register information about marriage links between rancherías. He also pioneered the use of personal name suffix analysis for language distribution information in the area. He was the first to argue, probably correctly, that Salinan-speaking villages once existed all the way to the east edge of the Coast Range. He also challenged Kroeber’s assertion that Salinan was spoken along the coast from Cayucos north to Ragged Point. He asserted that Northern Chumash was spoken along that part of the coast (see Figure 1). The language boundary along this section of the coast has remained an open question, which we will discuss in Chapter 10.

Chester King’s Vandenberg Ethnogeography, 1984

In the late 1960s King began developing family relationship charts for individuals from Chumash rancherías. The charts synthesized disparate facts spread throughout the mission records regarding individuals and their family relationships. The technique exposed alternative names of villages that sent people to more than one mission. It allowed King to understand which villages were close together and which were far apart, following Bennyhoff’s marriage pattern analysis technique, augmented by a picture of multiple rancherías of origin, in some cases, for different children of a single set of parents. The charts helped him develop the first detailed map of Chumash ranchería locations as far north as San Luis Obispo Bay (King 1975). In his 1984 study King published 106 family charts, covering all individuals mentioned in mission registers from ten villages in the Vandenberg area and their neighbors. King (1984) built a picture of Chumash ethnogeography in western Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties in his study of the Spanish-contact period people of the Vandenberg Air Force Base vicinity.
Figure 7. Gibson's 1983 Map of Salinan and Northern Chumash Territories and Rancherías.
King’s extended family charts are effective aids for locating rancherías in western Santa Barbara County because they were augmented by a rich array of other historic ranchería location sources for that area. These sources include good ranchería location information from Mission Indian descendants, ranchería names embedded in Mexican land grant names, and ranchería locations on land grant maps. King’s (1984) ranchería location mapping for San Luis Obispo area rancherías, however, involved quite a bit of guesswork, because few historic clues were available to him to augment the inferential pattern of village relationships that he developed from kinship network analysis.

State Agency Contributions, 1986-2000

Since 1986, California State Parks and Recreation researchers Glenn Farris and Betty Rivers have contributed some important details to the reconstruction of ethnogeography within our study area. In a 1986 study edited by Rivers, Farris (1986:84-91) relied partially on primary Mission San Luis Obispo baptismal data to reconstruct the ethnohistory of the San Simeon Creek area. At the time Farris wrote it, he followed King and Gibson in assuming that the Mission San Luis Obispo villages of Stjahuayo and Sataoyo were one and the same place, on the coast in the Cambria-San Simeon Creek vicinity. In a later report, Farris (2000:138) showed evidence that Sataoyo was a separate village in the Templeton-Atascadero region.

Rivers coauthored a detailed publication regarding Salinan village locations in the Mission San Antonio outreach area with Terry Jones (Rivers and Jones 1993). That study documented the work of J. P. Harrington with members of the Encinales, Baylon, and Mora families. Well supplied with maps and photographs, the study shows the large amount of detail that was retained regarding villages northwest of Mission San Antonio, in the Lopez Point region. Some of the places documented in this report also appear in early Mission San Antonio registers, while others do not. More recently, Jones et al. (2000) have published additional Harrington notes for the same area, adjacent to and northwest of Mission San Antonio.

Rivers worked with Farris again in 1994 to produce a detailed ethnographic section in a testing report for Morro Bay archaeological site CA-SLO-165 (Rivers and Farris in Jones et al. 1994:10-28). In that report the two researchers brought together translations of Spanish-period documents, extracts of field notes from J. P. Harrington, and primary Mission San Luis Obispo register data to shed light on coastal ethnohistory, and on the Northern Chumash people of the Morro Bay village of Chotcagua, in particular.

The most recent contributions to study area ethnohistory by Rivers and Farris are found in A Line Through the Past (Rivers 2000). The ethnography section in that study gives special attention to Indian life in the Estero Point region during the mid-nineteenth century, as remembered by Rosario Cooper, the main Northern Chumash consultant to J. P. Harrington. That section emphasizes the mixture of Salinan, Northern Chumash, and Yokuts people in the South Coast Range area after the missions closed (Rivers 2000:9-27). In an addendum, Farris published clues that he has retrieved from land grant case records regarding the locations of Cholame, “Tisaizues” (Tisagues), Camate, “L’huegue” (Lehuege), Sataoyo, Stemectatimi, and Lospe rancherías listed in study area mission registers (Farris in Rivers 2000:131-140).

Throughout their research from 1986 to 2000, Rivers and Farris accepted Gibson’s conclusion that Northern Chumash was originally spoken on the coast from San Luis Obispo north to Ragged Point.


Johnson (1988:248-288) applied quantitative techniques that he borrowed from social-network analysis and cultural geography to examine inter-village social relationships among Chumash of the Santa Barbara Channel. In order to compile the data base necessary for his analysis, he constructed detailed genealogical charts for all people baptized from forty Chumash towns and villages within the Santa Ynez Valley and along the Santa Barbara Channel coast between Point Argüello and Rincón Point. Diagrams included in King’s 1984 report were corrected and augmented during this process using additional information gleaned from the mission records.

Beginning in 1993, a comprehensive study was initiated by the Applied Ethnography Program of the National Park Service to apply ethnographic research techniques to trace cultural affiliation and lineal descent
of Chumash peoples who formerly inhabited areas now under National Park stewardship. A team of ethnohistorians, including Johnson and King, and eight Chumash research assistants pooled their efforts to create a six-mission data base, encompassing all of the territory inhabited by Chumash peoples between missions San Fernando and San Luis Obispo (McLendon and Johnson 1999). One of the specific objectives of the project was to create for the first time a map that showed all of the Chumash towns and villages listed in the early mission records. Because many village locations within the Northern Chumash region were uncertain, Johnson applied social geographic principles to map these unknown settlements. The technique he used was to anchor his map on the villages with known locations, and scale distances between these known settlements and those that were uncertain in inverse proportion to numbers of inter-village links as tabulated from diagrams of reconstituted families prepared by King for his 1984 study (McLendon and Johnson 1999:31).

Figure 8 reproduces that portion of McLendon and Johnson’s map covering the Mission San Luis Obispo outreach area. Their Northern Chumash ranchería placements differ in certain significant respects from the earlier placements of Gibson (1983) and King (1984). Their quantitative technique suggests different locations. Also, they benefitted from historic clues discovered by Farris (2000), and from consultation with linguists who had studied Chumash languages. Richard Applegate (1975) and Kathryn Klar (1977, 1991) are the recognized linguistic experts for the Northern Chumash language. McLendon and Johnson sent Klar a list of variant spellings of ranchería names that had been carefully compiled by King from the San Luis Obispo baptismal and confirmation records. Based on Klar’s understanding of Northern Chumash phonology and the examples of a few placenames provided to Harrington by Rosario Cooper, she provided linguistic reconstructions of all Northern Chumash names for rancherías that possessed more than five baptisms in the mission records (1993). This allowed McLendon and Johnson to label their map with linguistically appropriate ranchería spellings.

Following up on the National Park Service ethnohistory project, Johnson undertook a related study for Vandenberg Air Force Base to trace lineal descendants from Purisimeño Chumash villages (Johnson 1999). In the course of this work, the San Luis Obispo portion of the six-mission data base was checked and augmented considerably, and the genealogical diagrams previously prepared by King (1984) and by Johnson for his 1988 dissertation were developed further.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Mason received some information about historic Salinan lands in the headwaters of the Salinas River, but learned nothing from local Indians about the old villages and languages along the coast. He did, however, take cognizance of the early Spanish texts about the “Playanos” of the coast west of San Miguel. Mason (1912:105) concluded that they may have spoken an extinct language, but that it was more likely that they spoke a divergent form of Salinan.

Harrington (1985) asked his consultants about early villages mentioned in mission records, about Henshaw’s evidence, and about the linguistic and folklore information gathered by Mason. He received conflicting evidence regarding the language that had been spoken along the coast from Piedras Blancas south to San Luis Obispo. Some of his clues suggested that Playano was a divergent form of Salinan, others that it was the language of San Luis Obispo. Harrington never published any map showing his conclusions regarding the boundaries between Salinan and Northern Chumash territories.

Kroeber, who spent only a few field days with Salinans, and no time at all with Northern Chumash, produced the first detailed map of the Salinan-Chumash boundary in his 1925 Handbook. Following Mason (1912), he assigned the coast west of missions San Antonio and San Miguel to the Playano division of the Salinan language family. He mapped the boundary at Toro Creek, thus assigning Old Creek to the north to the Playano Salinans and Morro Creek to the south to the Northern Chumash. He continued the Chumash-Salinan boundary from Toro Creek inland to the crest of the Santa Lucía Range in the Cuesta Pass area, southeast to approximately the latitude of San Luis Obispo, thence east to the Carrizo Plain. He placed a
Figure 8. A Portion of “Chumash Towns at the Time of European Settlement,” Courtesy of McLendon and Johnson (1999:31).
boundary between the Yokuts and both the Salinans and Chumash along the central crest of the Coast Ranges, mapping all east-flowing streams of the Coast Ranges to undocumented Yokuts groups. The prominence of Kroeber’s 1925 *Handbook* has led to the acceptance of these linguistic boundaries as definitive by most anthropologists, and the general public. They were, however, based largely on conjecture, and in the case of the Salinan-Chumash boundary, upon the previous work of Mason.

Gibson (1983) challenged Kroeber’s placements of the Chumash, Salinan, and Yokuts language boundaries in the South Coast Ranges. Gibson introduced Bennyhoff’s concentric circle outreach and marriage network pattern analytic approaches and King’s more detailed kinship network/kinship chart approach to the study area mission records. King (1984) applied the same techniques to the study of western Santa Barbara County, reaching north to overlap Gibson’s work in the Mission San Luis Obispo vicinity. More recently, McLendon and Johnson (1999) have examined King’s evidence and altered some village locations in the San Luis Obispo vicinity on the basis of Farris’s (2000) findings and additional research.

By the year 2000, different scholars had different sets of evidence to reach different conclusions about the contact-period distributions of the Salinan and Northern Chumash language groups. It was time for a new look at the ethnographic data.
CHAPTER 4
MISSION REGISTER-BASED ETHNOGEOGRAPHY

Spanish mission record sources supply more information regarding study area ranchería ethnogeography than all other sources combined. The Franciscan missionaries recorded information about every Indian they baptized, married, and buried under their ecclesiastical rules. Most of the Franciscan priests noted the names of the home rancherías in their baptismal register entries. Abstracted lists of rancherías have been published for most missions (Merriam 1955, 1968, 1970). During the late twentieth century, new techniques were developed to infer the locations of named rancherías through a study of relationship patterns of baptized individuals (Gibson 1983; Johnson 1988; King 1984; Milliken 1991).

Unfortunately, the registers of missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo offer more problems for inferential ethnogeography than those of any other missions between San Francisco Solano (Sonoma) on the north and San Buenaventura (Ventura) on the south. The bulk of this chapter will be devoted to showing why this is the case. Before we do that, however, we offer a brief description of the standard practices of mission register ethnogeographic analysis as they have been applied successfully in various parts of California.

STANDARD MISSION REGISTER TECHNIQUES

Three assumptions provide a basis for predicting the locations of rancherías named in mission registers:

- First, rancherías close to missions generally sent their people for baptism earlier than villages at greater distances, leading to “concentric circle” studies;
- Second, rancherías near one another had a greater number of extended family ties, either husband-wife or parent-child, than rancherías separated by great distances; and
- Third, rancherías with territories between two missions sent people to both missions.

With relative locations in mind, it is possible to analyze the patterns of relationships between groups, slowly building a regional pattern of spatial relations, with iterative reference to more explicit facts about the group locations.

To identify family relationship patterns among rancherías, one must identify kinship ties among individuals listed in the mission registers. Family kinship chart reconstruction, based on family links indicated in the mission registers, has been carried out by all ethnogeographers who have relied on mission registers since Johnson (1982), Gibson (1983), Milliken (1983), and King (1984). With family charts in hand, the ethnogeographers often develop a matrix that records and illustrates the relative number of family links among all the rancherías of a given mission outreach area.

A sophisticated form of family network studies was carried out by Johnson (1988:248-297), who applied quantitative techniques derived from social-network analysis and cultural geography to examine inter-village social relationships among Chumash rancherías of the Santa Barbara Channel area. Later, Johnson mapped the locations of unknown Northern Chumash settlements by scaling the distances between them in inverse proportion to the number of inter-village links as tabulated from diagrams of reconstituted families prepared by King for his 1984 study (McLendon and Johnson 1999:31).

Johnson’s studies were successful for the Santa Barbara Channel because of two conditions of his data set that, unfortunately, do not hold true for our current Coast Range data set. First, the locations of more than half of the rancherías with which he worked were already known to him through clues from Spanish-period diaries, land case records, and information from Indian descendants. Second, ranchería sizes in Santa Barbara County were quite large relative to rancherías within our study area. Regional spatial patterns of relative ranchería locations are easily discerned when the ranchería groups are large and many inter-group
family links were documented. With such extensive data sets it could be assumed that rancherías with numerous family ties were closer to one another than those with no family ties. Such conclusions are more difficult to reach in the South Coast Ranges given the numerous very small rancherías and the paucity of direct ethnographic evidence.

LOCATIONAL DATA QUALITY OF STUDY AREA MISSIONS

The quality of home ranchería information varies from mission to mission and is actually a reflection of differences in practice among individual Franciscan missionary scribes. The names of converts’ home rancherías were entered in 98 percent of the Mission San Miguel tribal baptismal entries, 80 percent of the Mission San Luis Obispo tribal baptismal entries, and 71 percent of the Mission San Antonio tribal baptismal entries. Below we discuss the quality of placename information at each of the three study area missions, with attention to the idiosyncracies of individual missionary scribes.

Mission San Antonio Records

The Mission San Antonio Baptismal Register contains records for 1,949 tribal people baptized between 1771 and 1810 from the area south of Arroyo Seco. Esselen-speakers from Arroyo Seco and the Greenfield vicinity north of King City, most of whom transferred to Mission Soledad after 1792, are excluded from this count. Most of the entries (1,407) were accompanied by some statement regarding homeland. Great variety occurs in the spelling of individual home places; this is to be expected, considering that 27 different priests were hearing foreign languages and writing placenames. For instance, a village near Bradley was spelled “Caunpej-Esmac” and “Kaupeg-esmec” by Sancho, “Caunopec Ejmec” by Sitjar, “Caunocexmac” by López, “Caunop Esmac” and “Caupeg Esmac” by Marcelino Ciprés, “Caunpegesmag” by Father Benito Catalán, and “Cumpej-esmac” by Miguel Cambón. In this case, and all others throughout this report, we use the form that appears most often in Spanish sources (e.g., Caumpej Esmac).

Father Pieras made the largest number of tribal entries of any of the 27 priests of record at San Antonio. Nonetheless, Pieras was also the priest who most often left out home-place information; of his 905 tribal baptismal entries, 419 contained absolutely no homeland information. Ciprés made 375 baptismal entries, of which only 41 were without home-place information. Sitjar (323 entries, 47 without home place), Pedro Cabot (109 entries, 12 without home place), and Sancho (101 entries, mainly Yokuts after 1810, three without home place) were other priests who made large numbers of tribal baptismal entries.

The few really rich entries for homeland locations appear in early marriage register entries (Merriam 1968:63-77). We repeat them here with some additional contextual information, as follows:

“[husband] de Tetachoya; alias de S.” Francisco, situada como dos leguas de la Mision en los ojitos, por toda la cañada abaxo, rumbo El este... [wife] de Quinau, alias S.ta Clara, situado como 4 leguas de La Mision en La cañada del Roble caydo, rumbo Nornordeste” Pieras on May 1, 1773 [SAN-M 1].

“[husband] de Chuquilim, alias de S.” Alexos, situado como dos leguas de La Mision en el valle de S.n Alexos, rumbo LesSueste [sic]... [wife] de Quinau, alias S.ta Clara” Pieras on May 1, 1773 [SAN-M 2].

“[husband] de Chuquilim, alias de S.” Alexos... [wife] de Esmal, alias de S.n Buenaventura, situada en La Playa por el Rumbo NorNorueste.” Pieras on May 1, 1773 [SAN-M 3].

“[wife] de Scama alias de Maria S.ma, que es cituada en las orillas del rio q. pasa por esa cañada rumbo nornorueste.” Pieras on May 1, 1773 [SAN-M 5].

“[husband] de Ejeita, alias de S.” Josef situada como tres leguas de la mision, rumbo Norte.” Pieras on May 1, 1773 [SAN-M 6].

“[husband from Sinaloa]... [wife] Lechamtimil, alias de S.” Fran.co Solano cituada en las riberas del Mar, por el camino de lamaca” Pieras on May 16, 1773 [SAN-M 7].
“[husband] de Tilacuzama, alias de S.” Miguel situada como dos leguas de la Mision rumbo nornorrest... [wife] de la rancheria llamada Esmal, alias de S.” Buenaventura” Piers on May 16, 1773 [SAN-M 8].

Such detailed levels of information were never provided again after May 16, 1773, perhaps because it became an overwhelming task. One can imagine the quality of South Coast Range ethnogeography that could be reconstructed had the missionaries included this type of information in all ecclesiastical entries.

In addition to those few early marriage records for places quite close to the mission, other Mission San Antonio baptism, death, and marriage entries occasionally provided locational hints. Examples include phrases attached to ranchería names, such as “en la playa,” “en el camino de San Luis,” “en el rio de Monterey,” or “oriente del rio de Monterrey.” Some of the richest examples, with original citations, are as follows:

“en la rancheria llamada Cáulom camino para la playa bautize privadamente... natural de Ónet en Lamaca” Sitjar on October 15, 1777 [SAN-B 464].

“en la rancheria de Zuletocha en el rio de MonteRey bautizé...” Piers on June 26, 1778 [SAN-B 502].

“en una de las rancherias de Papuco bautizo el P. Buenaventura Sitjar...” Piers on December 12, 1780 [SAN-B 695].

“una hija de P.P. [padres] gentiles de distinta lengua y nación de los de aca, y vecinados con animo de acristianarse” Sitjar on August 14, 1782 [SAN-B 835].

“natural de Lix en las rancherias Atnél Zama” Sitjar on November 15, 1786 [SAN-B 1399].

“natural de Téxjá en el rio de Monterrey” Sitjar on October 11, 1794 [SAN-B 2084].

“bautice privadamente como quatro leguas mas alla del Rio de Monterrey en una Rancheria llamada Atnil” Ciprés on August 24, 1796 [SAN-B 2185].

The register entries of Sitjar illustrate his perception that the Coast Range villages lay within named regions. Examples are “Expinit en Lima” (SAN-B 142), and “Monet en Lamaca” (SAN-B 356). One term that he and Piers used, “Lix,” seems merely to have meant “the east;” in succession in 1786 he baptized a person from “Lix en las rancherias de Atnel Zama” and from “Lix... en las Rs Quecheye Zama” (SAN-B 1399, 1400).

Father Ciprés provided relatively good home-place information between 1796 and 1805. He noted many specific villages that crossed over to later Mission San Miguel records, such as Cheyne, Chuclac, and “Pachac debajo del Pleyto” (SAN-B 2252). While he usually gave directional clues without distances, Ciprés did provide an important distance for “Atnil... 4 leguas mas alla del Rio de Monterrey” (SAN-B 2186). Of note, Father Ciprés stated that some villages were on or beyond the “Rio de San Benito.” The stream known today as the San Benito River follows the interior Coast Ranges north to the Pajaro River from the area east of Soledad. Ciprés placed the rancherías of Zebasten and Caunpej Esmac on the San Benito River. Thus we believe that he meant the Río de Monterey (the current Salinas River), with which other priests associated those two villages.

Father Piers was the most prolific scribe of baptismal entries at San Antonio. He wrote detailed entries in the early marriage records, but after May 1773 he was the least helpful regarding directional clues and village/region relationships. When he did write homeland information, he was usually satisfied to use only regional terms, such as Janulo, Lamaca, Lima, Papuco, and Quiguil, the names of multi-village districts. Occasionally he would note that a person was from “una de las rancherias de Papuco” (SAN-B 873) or “una de las rancherias de Lima” (SAN-B 877), but never did he name a specific village as part of such an entry.

Father Piers and Father Ciprés of Mission San Antonio and the only priests who attempted to differentiate members of neighboring language groups. They did this with the use of the term “Nación.” Piers noted the arrival of a Northern Chumash speaker from the southern coast in 1780, “natural del Mar y Nación de San Luis” (SAN-B 731). He noted the arrival of Esselen-speakers among the people of the coastal
district of Quiguil between 1782 and 1786: “de distinta lengua y nacion” (SAN-B 835); “de Quiguil y de distinta nacion” (SAN-B 837); and “de Quiguil de la nacion Tesmaynalit” (SAN-B 1324); other evidence suggests that most people from Quiguil spoke Salinan (see Chapter 6). In 1793, Father Ciprés baptized three people from the “Nación llamado Zoltanel,” probably Ohlone-speakers, among a group of interior Coast Range people (SAN-B 2001, 2002, 2004). The next year, 1794, Ciprés noted the baptism of a person “de la Nación de los Tulares,” presumably the earliest Yokuts-speaker at Mission San Antonio (SAN-B 2027). Neither Pieras nor Ciprés seems to have been systematic in such notation, and none of the other scribes at Mission San Antonio followed the practice at all.

Mission San Miguel Records

The Mission San Miguel Baptismal Register contains records for 1,159 tribal people baptized between 1771 and 1810. A home group (village or region) was listed for all but 24 of those individuals. Twelve priests made baptismal entries for tribal people during that period. Father Martín made the largest number of entries, 752; he provided home ranchería information for all but two of his baptismal entries. Pedro Martínez made 330 baptismal entries for tribal converts, of which only four lacked home-place information. Other priests with significant numbers of baptismal entries for tribal people were Pedro Cabot (163 entries, mainly Yokuts in 1834-35), Juan Cabot (160 entries), and Pedro Muñoz (103 entries). Father Baltasar Carnicer was least disciplined in supplying home-place information; he completely omitted a home-place location in 10 of his 70 tribal baptismal entries in 1799 and 1800.

While most Mission San Miguel baptismal entries included home ranchería names, the priests provided very few clues regarding distance or direction to the named rancherías. Only one baptismal entry included distance. The original entry by Father Sitjar in 1798 reads: “En la ranchería llamada Chal, como 3 leguas distante de esta Mision de S. Miguel” (SMI-B 58). Another five rancherías listed at Mission San Miguel were directionally linked to some other unlocated place. They follow here:

“de Llugge rumbo de las Gallinas” Martín on January 28, 1800 [SMI-B 295].

“de Sic, pats del rumbo del Oriente de mas alla de la ra. lla. Pel” Martín on July 27, 1800 [SMI-B 337].

“de Chelaco Saoné cerca de Loyam” Martín on Nov. 12, 1804 [SMI-B 1162].

“de Lapa al oriente de Joyaclak” Martínez on Dec. 5, 1802 [SMI-B 728, see also SMI-B 494].

“Tissimasu, o de la playa” Martín on Oct. 14, 1803 [SMI-B 967].

A major obstacle to ethnogeographic reconstruction from Mission San Miguel baptismal entries is the Cholam problem. Mission San Miguel missionaries identified large numbers of people with a ranchería called Cholam. Baptismal entries suggest that the placename Cholam was used both to mark a region that contained specific villages and to mark a specific village, probably the largest, within that region. The Cholam problem is discussed in detail in Chapter 8.

Mission San Luis Obispo Records

The Mission San Luis Obispo Baptismal Register contains records for 1,574 tribal people baptized between 1771 and 1840. Of them, 949 (640 adults) were baptized from study area South Coast Range rancherías from the San Luis Obispo Bay region northward. (The well-located rancherías south of Arroyo Grande, which sent their people both to Mission San Luis Obispo and to Mission La Purísima, are excluded from this South Coast Range study.) Of those 949 people, 191 were listed in the baptismal register without accompanying information about home ranchería. Their home rancherías have been inferred from the named rancherías of their relatives.

A total of 28 missionaries made baptismal entries for tribal people at Mission San Luis Obispo during that period. Father Luis Martínez made the largest number of entries, followed by Father José Cavaller, and Miguel Giribet. Father Cavaller, one of the more prolific priests of record, was most likely to leave home-
place information entirely out of his baptismal entries. Luckily for our study, some of the early converts who were not identified to a home ranchería at baptism were listed by home ranchería in their entries in the Mission San Luis Obispo Confirmation Register, a discovery first exploited by King (1984).

While the Mission San Luis Obispo Baptismal Register commonly lists home ranchería names, it seldom provides specific locational clues. Three entries pertinent to rancherías north of the Santa Maria River contain information that helps locate a ranchería. They are the following:

“Tsiquieu sita acia la Playa” Estévan Tapis on January 16, 1791 [SLO-B 1477].

“Tuaya, sita en el rio de Nacimiento.” Giribet on March 2, 1792 [SLO-B 1089].

“Chano, sita cerca de la ranchería de Scahuayo.” Giribet on March 16, 1792 [SLO-B 1098].

The locational entries in the Mission San Luis Obispo Baptismal Register do not even mention associations with the “mar [sea shore]” or the “oriente [east],” with the exception of those listed above. More helpful in the San Luis Obispo records are the occasional associations of rancherías with Spanish placenames that were retained into later historic times. Three examples are “Chotcagua, alias el Morro,” “Sclegin junto al Arroyo grande,” and “Etsmoli en el Arroyo Grande.” Three separate rancherías, Chetpu, Chotnegle, and Topomo were said to be aliases for the place called Santa Margarita.

The Mission San Luis Obispo Death Register did contain two pieces of specific locational information, as follows:

“en la Rancheria llamada Tsmoli... mas de diez leguas distante de la Mision” Cavaller on February 28, 1785 [SLO-D 163].

“en la rancheria llamada Checdala como ocho leguas distante de la mis.on murio una Christiana llamada Candida... casada con Ambrosio Gongora, y en la rancheria llamada Chotcagua la enteraron” Cavaller on July 30, 1785 [SLO-D 176].

The rarity of direct clues about its ranchería locations makes the San Luis Obispo vicinity a difficult area for ethnographic reconstruction.

Overview of Locational Data Quality

While home ranchería information was provided for the great majority of baptized individuals at missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo, few of those places can be associated with locations on the modern landscape. Examples such as “Chotnegle, alias Santa Margarita” in the Mission San Luis Obispo registers and “Azzil, alias El Pleito” in the Mission San Antonio registers are the exception. Most of the named rancherías can only be located through the indirect methods.

INTER-MISSION OUTREACH OVERLAP

In this section we examine the rancherías represented by people who transferred among the three study area missions. (McLendon and Johnson [1999:47-48] provide a discussion of the overlap between Mission San Luis Obispo and Mission La Purísima, the next mission to the south.) In some parts of California, a few unlocated rancherías have been placed on the landscape because they sent large numbers of people to more than one mission. Such groups usually lived at equal distances between the missions in question, and many individuals later moved from one of the missions to another to marry or rejoin their family. Inter-mission transfer was not common between any two of the three study area missions, as the following findings will illustrate.

Mission San Antonio-Mission San Miguel Overlap

Mission San Antonio transferred at least 43 people to Mission San Miguel (Table 5). Many of them were sent south to help found Mission San Miguel in 1797. Among those who transferred were mission-born
Table 5. List of Mission San Antonio Indians Who Appeared in Mission San Miguel Registers between 1797 and 1816.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baptism Record</th>
<th>Baptism Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Record</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Rancheria</th>
<th>Marriage Record</th>
<th>San Miguel Marriage Date</th>
<th>Spouse’s Baptism Record</th>
<th>Spouse’s San Miguel Rancheria Record Date</th>
<th>Earliest Baptism Entry As Parent or Godparent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0007</td>
<td>11/10/71</td>
<td>Gabriel Villa</td>
<td>MI-D 0570</td>
<td>05/08/10</td>
<td>Lamaca</td>
<td>MI-M 076</td>
<td>08/01/00</td>
<td>MI-B 0368</td>
<td>Tisagues</td>
<td>Godparent</td>
<td>03/17/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0048</td>
<td>03/07/73</td>
<td>Diego Bravo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 317</td>
<td>06/22/04</td>
<td>MI-B 0725</td>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>MI-B 211</td>
<td>03/11/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0055</td>
<td>03/14/73</td>
<td>Gertrudis Noceras</td>
<td>MI-D 0478</td>
<td>07/01/08</td>
<td>Lamaca</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0118</td>
<td>06/21/73</td>
<td>Remigio Martinez</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tsetacol</td>
<td>MI-M 087</td>
<td>06/29/01</td>
<td>MI-B 0311</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>MI-B 618</td>
<td>03/20/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0128</td>
<td>07/13/73</td>
<td>Maria Teresa Noceras</td>
<td>MI-D 0335</td>
<td>11/04/05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0156</td>
<td>11/05/73</td>
<td>Gregorio Henmoso</td>
<td>MI-D 0883</td>
<td>10/19/15</td>
<td>Lamaca</td>
<td>MI-M 411</td>
<td>04/09/09</td>
<td>MI-B 1117</td>
<td>Tisagues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0220</td>
<td>06/07/75</td>
<td>Adeodato</td>
<td>MI-D 0435</td>
<td>02/24/07</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0264</td>
<td>07/14/75</td>
<td>Maria Ambrosia Riozo</td>
<td>MI-D 0003</td>
<td>06/18/98</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0270</td>
<td>07/22/75</td>
<td>Juan Villa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>MI-M 131</td>
<td>05/01/02</td>
<td>MI-B 0608</td>
<td>Chenez</td>
<td>MI-B 1052</td>
<td>11/26/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0353</td>
<td>12/03/75</td>
<td>Francisco Xavier Bravo</td>
<td>MI-D 0033</td>
<td>07/26/99</td>
<td>Lix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 83</td>
<td>06/09/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0663</td>
<td>08/04/80</td>
<td>Anacleta Maria Noceras</td>
<td>MI-D 0459</td>
<td>02/20/08</td>
<td>Quinau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0686</td>
<td>10/21/80</td>
<td>Silverio Maria Garces</td>
<td>AN-D 2023</td>
<td>08/23/07</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 225</td>
<td>06/01/99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0701</td>
<td>12/22/80</td>
<td>Manuela Josefa Granada</td>
<td>MI-D 0394</td>
<td>05/25/06</td>
<td>Lix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Godparent</td>
<td>11/20/97</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0753</td>
<td>07/30/81</td>
<td>Placida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 225</td>
<td>06/01/99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0771</td>
<td>10/19/81</td>
<td>Domitila Maria Flores</td>
<td>MI-D 0691</td>
<td>03/18/12</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0912</td>
<td>08/10/83</td>
<td>Lorenzo Garrido</td>
<td>MI-D 0454</td>
<td>11/14/07</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0951</td>
<td>11/02/83</td>
<td>Geminiano Mra Garrido</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 452</td>
<td>01/08/13</td>
<td>MI-B 0368</td>
<td>Tisagues</td>
<td>MI-B 168</td>
<td>11/29/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0952</td>
<td>11/02/83</td>
<td>German Maria Garrido</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 147</td>
<td>07/28/02</td>
<td>MI-B 0195</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>MI-B 1126</td>
<td>05/11/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0969</td>
<td>12/06/83</td>
<td>Donulo Marnes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>MI-M 018</td>
<td>11/23/98</td>
<td>AN-B 1272</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 0999</td>
<td>01/01/84</td>
<td>Juvenal Marin</td>
<td>MI-D 0500</td>
<td>09/02/08</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1023</td>
<td>02/10/84</td>
<td>Saturo Larregui</td>
<td>MI-D 0792</td>
<td>05/18/14</td>
<td>Janulo</td>
<td>MI-M 316</td>
<td>03/19/04</td>
<td>MI-B 0771</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>Godparent</td>
<td>12/03/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism Record</td>
<td>Baptism Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Death Record</td>
<td>Death Date</td>
<td>Rancheria</td>
<td>Marriage Record</td>
<td>San Miguel Marriage Date</td>
<td>Spouse’s Baptism Record</td>
<td>Spouse’s Rancheria</td>
<td>Earliest Baptism Entry as Parent or Godparent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1027</td>
<td>02/10/84</td>
<td>Escolastica Garrido</td>
<td>MI-D 0138</td>
<td>05/22/02</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 447</td>
<td>01/08/12</td>
<td>MI-B 0826</td>
<td>Zecal</td>
<td>Godparent 12/03/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1079</td>
<td>08/19/84</td>
<td>Yndalecio Velasquez</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Janulo</td>
<td>MI-M 099</td>
<td>08/13/01</td>
<td>MI-B 0133</td>
<td>MI-B 1308</td>
<td>Godparent 11/20/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1150</td>
<td>03/27/85</td>
<td>Peregrino Mra Rubio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 144</td>
<td>06/27/02</td>
<td>MI-B 0312</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1256</td>
<td>12/08/85</td>
<td>Julio Cavedo/Aklecoa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 038</td>
<td>06/29/99</td>
<td>MI-B 0114</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1257</td>
<td>12/07/85</td>
<td>Maria Ambrosia Cavedo</td>
<td>MI-D 0349</td>
<td>03/14/06</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 013</td>
<td>05/22/02</td>
<td>MI-B 0312</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1265</td>
<td>12/17/85</td>
<td>Proto Cavaller</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lix</td>
<td>MI-M 211</td>
<td>06/17/03</td>
<td>MI-B 0703</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1269</td>
<td>12/20/85</td>
<td>Cayetana Quevado</td>
<td>MI-D 0019</td>
<td>12/01/98</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 018</td>
<td>11/23/98</td>
<td>MI-B 0306</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1272</td>
<td>12/21/85</td>
<td>Caridad Gances</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 019</td>
<td>11/23/98</td>
<td>MI-B 0038</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1291</td>
<td>01/11/86</td>
<td>Samuel Centol</td>
<td>MI-D 0480</td>
<td>07/08/08</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 117</td>
<td>12/08/01</td>
<td>MI-B 0140</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1297</td>
<td>01/17/86</td>
<td>Elias Rivo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Janulo</td>
<td>MI-M 302</td>
<td>01/29/04</td>
<td>MI-B 0076</td>
<td>Quechaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1301</td>
<td>01/17/86</td>
<td>Alipia</td>
<td>MI-D 0048</td>
<td>03/22/00</td>
<td>Janulo</td>
<td>MI-M 112</td>
<td>12/07/01</td>
<td>MI-B 0030</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1465</td>
<td>07/25/87</td>
<td>Maria Beatriz Rivo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 0053</td>
<td>12/13/00</td>
<td>MI-B 1588</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1468</td>
<td>07/27/87</td>
<td>Francisco Solano Chumag</td>
<td>MI-D 0463</td>
<td>03/14/08</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MI-M 003</td>
<td>05/03/03</td>
<td>MI-B 1304</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1539</td>
<td>04/12/88</td>
<td>Angel Jose Bravo</td>
<td>MI-D 0053</td>
<td>12/13/00</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 0179</td>
<td>09/03/02</td>
<td>MI-B 0016</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1565</td>
<td>07/10/88</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 018</td>
<td>11/23/98</td>
<td>MI-B 0038</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1580</td>
<td>08/12/88</td>
<td>Nector Godoy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Janulo</td>
<td>MI-M 019</td>
<td>11/23/98</td>
<td>MI-B 0038</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1776</td>
<td>01/24/91</td>
<td>Timoteo Hermoso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 040</td>
<td>08/28/08</td>
<td>MI-B 0062</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1873</td>
<td>04/12/92</td>
<td>Olalla Rivo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 403</td>
<td>08/28/08</td>
<td>MI-B 0062</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1878</td>
<td>05/03/92</td>
<td>Atanasio Larregui</td>
<td>MI-D 0035</td>
<td>08/03/99</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 362</td>
<td>11/29/05</td>
<td>MI-B 0036</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1913</td>
<td>11/04/92</td>
<td>Carlos Antonio Arillaga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MI-M 0053</td>
<td>12/07/92</td>
<td>MI-B 1588</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 1978</td>
<td>07/27/93</td>
<td>Odon Tapis</td>
<td>MI-D 0599</td>
<td>11/01/10</td>
<td>Janulo</td>
<td>MI-M 373</td>
<td>02/07/06</td>
<td>MI-B 0846</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2027</td>
<td>02/04/94</td>
<td>Jose Antonio Suquet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tularas</td>
<td>MI-M 138</td>
<td>06/27/02</td>
<td>MI-B 0016</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1194 03/24/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2028</td>
<td>02/04/94</td>
<td>Josefa Antonia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lix</td>
<td>MI-M 0053</td>
<td>12/12/05</td>
<td>MI-B 0016</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1588 01/17/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2055</td>
<td>06/06/94</td>
<td>Maria Trinidad Violin</td>
<td>MI-D 0179</td>
<td>03/04/03</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>MI-M 0241</td>
<td>03/25/11</td>
<td>MI-B 0078</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1592 01/17/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2065</td>
<td>07/22/94</td>
<td>Maria Magdalena</td>
<td>MI-D 0321</td>
<td>07/29/05</td>
<td>Assil [Janulo]</td>
<td>MI-M 0424</td>
<td>03/25/11</td>
<td>MI-B 0078</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1592 01/17/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2084</td>
<td>10/11/94</td>
<td>Dionisio</td>
<td>MI-D 0161</td>
<td>09/03/02</td>
<td>Teaxjä</td>
<td>MI-M 069</td>
<td>05/25/12</td>
<td>MI-B 0078</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1592 01/17/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2104</td>
<td>02/08/95</td>
<td>Faustino Bravo</td>
<td>MI-D 0698</td>
<td>05/25/12</td>
<td>Assil [Janulo]</td>
<td>MI-M 0424</td>
<td>03/25/11</td>
<td>MI-B 0078</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1592 01/17/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2201</td>
<td>12/28/96</td>
<td>Orosio Lasala</td>
<td>MI-D 0793</td>
<td>05/18/14</td>
<td>Assil [Janulo]</td>
<td>MI-M 0424</td>
<td>03/25/11</td>
<td>MI-B 0078</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>MI-B 1592 01/17/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2222</td>
<td>05/20/97</td>
<td>Bernardina</td>
<td>MI-D 0234</td>
<td>01/21/04</td>
<td>Rio de Mtra</td>
<td>MI-M 115</td>
<td>12/08/01</td>
<td>MI-B 0040</td>
<td>Zilac</td>
<td>MI-B 211 03/11/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2244</td>
<td>08/28/97</td>
<td>Hermes Tello</td>
<td>MI-D 0535</td>
<td>09/27/09</td>
<td>Zelaco-Chaune</td>
<td>MI-M 115</td>
<td>12/08/01</td>
<td>MI-B 0040</td>
<td>Zilac</td>
<td>MI-B 211 03/11/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. List of Mission San Antonio Indians Who Appeared in Mission San Miguel Registers between 1797 and 1816. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAPTISM RECORD</th>
<th>BAPTISM DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEATH RECORD</th>
<th>DEATH DATE</th>
<th>RANCHERIA</th>
<th>MARRIAGE RECORD</th>
<th>SAN MIGUEL MARRIAGE DATE</th>
<th>SPouse’s BAPTISM RECORD</th>
<th>SPouse’s SAN MIGUEL RANCHERIA</th>
<th>EARLIEST BAPTISM ENTRY AS PARENT OR GODPARENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2248</td>
<td>08/28/97</td>
<td>Rafael Valenzuela</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mehénaque</td>
<td>MI-M 077</td>
<td>08/01/00</td>
<td>MI-B 0310</td>
<td>Recodo</td>
<td>MI-B 614 03/07/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2252</td>
<td>09/03/97</td>
<td>Petra Pinelo</td>
<td>MI-D 0051</td>
<td>05/25/00</td>
<td>Pachac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2321</td>
<td>08/03/98</td>
<td>Estevan Soto</td>
<td>MI-D 0024</td>
<td>06/13/99</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2364</td>
<td>02/28/99</td>
<td>Jose Tomas Lorcas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Zanim</td>
<td>MI-M 056</td>
<td>10/13/99</td>
<td>MI-B 0232</td>
<td>Cholam</td>
<td>MI-B 379 10/19/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2372</td>
<td>03/09/99</td>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chanen</td>
<td>MI-M 423</td>
<td>03/25/11</td>
<td>MI-B 0122</td>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2385</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td>Francisco de Paula Rodrigz</td>
<td>MI-D 0403</td>
<td>06/29/06</td>
<td>Cuchanamat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2386</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td>Maria Viridiana</td>
<td>MI-D 0904</td>
<td>02/09/16</td>
<td>Cuchanamat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2397</td>
<td>05/02/99</td>
<td>Atanasio Rodriguez</td>
<td>MI-D 0342</td>
<td>02/02/05</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2440</td>
<td>11/21/99</td>
<td>Cecilio Sobrevia</td>
<td>MI-D 0247</td>
<td>03/31/04</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2442</td>
<td>11/25/99</td>
<td>Fidel Valenzuela</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Papuco</td>
<td>MI-M 404</td>
<td>08/28/08</td>
<td>MI-B 0147</td>
<td>Zimoque</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2565</td>
<td>04/25/01</td>
<td>Marcos Chuaal</td>
<td>MI-D 0784</td>
<td>03/26/14</td>
<td>Chucac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2606</td>
<td>12/10/01</td>
<td>Eulalia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chucac</td>
<td>MI-M 484</td>
<td>05-22-13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2667</td>
<td>06/24/02</td>
<td>Jose Raymundo</td>
<td>AN-D 1489</td>
<td>06/14/02</td>
<td>Cheyne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 614 08/01/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2739</td>
<td>02/02/03</td>
<td>Candido Marquina</td>
<td>MI-M 454</td>
<td>01/29/13</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 0453</td>
<td>Pel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2827</td>
<td>07/24/03</td>
<td>Ursistino Velasquez</td>
<td>MI-D 0768</td>
<td>12/05/13</td>
<td>Tixja</td>
<td>MI-M 337</td>
<td>06/10/05</td>
<td>MI-B 0874</td>
<td>Recodo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 2832</td>
<td>05/30/03</td>
<td>Ruñilio Petero</td>
<td>MI-D 0521</td>
<td>05/28/09</td>
<td>Ajok</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 1286 12/10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 3061</td>
<td>03/09/05</td>
<td>Jose Cevallos</td>
<td>MI-D 0720</td>
<td>12/31/12</td>
<td>Tsetacol</td>
<td>MI-M 383</td>
<td>07-11-06</td>
<td>MI-B 1286</td>
<td>Stajahuayo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 3366</td>
<td>11/14/07</td>
<td>Carlos Bormoneo Noceras</td>
<td>MI-D 0458</td>
<td>02/02/08</td>
<td>Mision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MI-B 1286 12/10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-B 3516</td>
<td>07/16/10</td>
<td>Protasio Mariner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Zucúy</td>
<td>MI-M 444</td>
<td>01/08/12</td>
<td>MI-B 1496</td>
<td>Zelacochaune</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AN-B – Mission San Antonio baptism; MI-B – Mission San Miguel baptism; MI-D – Mission San Miguel death; MI-M – Mission San Miguel marriage. * This is the date that an earlier event, a conditional baptism, was entered in the San Antonio Baptismal Register.
children of Lamaca and Lima families near Mission San Antonio, and Papuco families from the San Antonio and Salinas valleys equidistant between Mission San Antonio and Mission San Miguel. Tribally born people who moved south initially included people from Janulo, alias Azzil, in the lower San Antonio Valley between the two missions. Very few individuals from Chelacosaone, Cheyne, Chuclac, and Menaki later moved to Mission San Miguel from Mission San Antonio, but their numbers are just too low to help point out their locations on the ground.

Mission San Miguel sent at least 20 people north to live at Mission San Antonio between 1801 and 1806 (Table 6). Most were people who had been associated with “Nacimiento” when they were baptized at Mission San Miguel; they married Azzil and Tsetacol people at Mission San Antonio. At San Miguel, “Nacimiento” referred to a variety of places in the general Nacimiento River drainage (see the discussion under “Nacimiento Region” in Chapter 8). Joyuclac was another Mission San Miguel ranchería that sent people back to Mission San Antonio (see the discussion under “Sargent Canyon Region” in Chapter 7).

**Mission San Luis Obispo-Mission San Miguel Overlap**

Mission San Luis Obispo sent 29 people north to join the Mission San Miguel community (Table 7). Only 10 of them could possibly have been part of an initial seed population at the founding of Mission San Miguel, because the other 19 were baptized in or after the year 1800. Of those 10 people baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo before 1800, only one can be proven to have been at San Miguel prior to 1800. She was an 18-year-old convert named Eulalia from Gmimu, a ranchería that may have been far to the east on the Carrizo Plain (SMI-D 1).

Four of these first 10 people were from the ranchería of Chesquio. We suggest that Chesquio is probably the Northern Chumash name of the village that was called Las Gallinas at Mission San Miguel (see the Nacimiento region discussion in Chapter 8). Most other San Luis Obispo converts who moved to Mission San Miguel came from villages in the Morro Bay and Paso Robles regions. In 1813, however, six people from the San Joaquin Valley and the hills far to the south transferred from Mission San Luis Obispo to Mission San Miguel.

Mission San Miguel transferred only three people to Mission San Luis Obispo in the mission era, as far as can be documented. Earliest was Fortunata, one of only two people baptized at Mission San Miguel from La Asunción; she was married in the church at Mission San Luis Obispo in 1802 to her long-time spouse, Bernabé Lcaiyo, baptized at San Luis Obispo from Sataoyo (SMI-B 502, SLO-B 1696, SLO-M 455). Second was Benvenuta, the only person baptized at Mission San Miguel from Teycha, who married José Miguel Leisa from Sososquiquia in 1803 at Mission San Luis Obispo (SMI-B 773, SLO-B 1744, SLO-M 470); the two women and their husbands all came from the Salinas River drainage in the Paso Robles vicinity (see the Paso Robles region discussion in Chapter 9).

The third woman known to have transferred south from Mission San Miguel to Mission San Luis Obispo was Humiliana, baptized as an Auyamne at San Miguel in February of 1813. She appeared at Mission San Luis Obispo one month later with her husband, Agustin Gualanay of the Gelecto group (SMI-B 1669, SLO-B 2345). Auyamne and Gelecto probably refer to a single Yokuts-speaking group of the Goose Lake vicinity.

**Mission San Luis Obispo-Mission San Antonio Overlap**

Five Mission San Luis Obispo people are known to have moved north to Mission San Antonio during the mission period; all appear in the Mission San Antonio Death Register (Table 8). Four of those five people were from marginal groups at Mission San Luis Obispo known to have gone to Mission San Antonio in large numbers; they were merely rejoining their relatives at San Antonio. For example, people said to be from Stjahuayo at San Luis Obispo were linked to people from Tsetacol and Janulo at Mission San Antonio (see the Estero Point region discussion in Chapter 6).
Table 6. List of Mission San Miguel Indians Who Appeared in Mission San Antonio Registers between 1797 and 1816.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baptism Record</th>
<th>Baptism Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Record</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Rancheria</th>
<th>Marriage Record</th>
<th>Marriage Date</th>
<th>Spouse's Baptism Record</th>
<th>Spouse's Rancheria</th>
<th>Children at San Antonio: Baptism Record</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0522</td>
<td>09/20/01</td>
<td>Antonina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Joyuclac</td>
<td>AN-M 840</td>
<td>02/15/08</td>
<td>AN-B 1658</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0523</td>
<td>09/20/01</td>
<td>Adriana</td>
<td>AN-D 1671</td>
<td>05/28/04</td>
<td>Joyuclac</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0537</td>
<td>10/23/01</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Joyuclac</td>
<td>AN-M 624</td>
<td>09/21/02</td>
<td>AN-B 1332</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0561</td>
<td>12/10/01</td>
<td>Zaquea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Joyuclac</td>
<td>AN-M 617</td>
<td>09/07/02</td>
<td>AN-B 0683</td>
<td>Lix</td>
<td>AN-B 3382</td>
<td>04/10/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0687</td>
<td>08/02/02</td>
<td>Yldelonso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Joyuclac</td>
<td>AN-M 621</td>
<td>09/07/02</td>
<td>AN-B 2694</td>
<td>Tsumuam</td>
<td>AN-B 3100</td>
<td>06/29/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0755</td>
<td>01/29/03</td>
<td>Felipe de Neri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Texat</td>
<td>MI-M 170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AN-B 2861</td>
<td>10/11/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0756</td>
<td>01/29/03</td>
<td>Ynes Maria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Texat</td>
<td>MI-M 170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AN-B 2861</td>
<td>10/11/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0829</td>
<td>02/27/03</td>
<td>Ninfa Josefa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>AN-M 662</td>
<td>07/24/03</td>
<td>AN-B 2791</td>
<td>Pleyto</td>
<td>AN-B 3279</td>
<td>06/07/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0836</td>
<td>02/27/03</td>
<td>Rudesinda</td>
<td>AN-D 1663</td>
<td>05/18/04</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>AN-M 653</td>
<td>05/01/03</td>
<td>AN-B 2767</td>
<td>Pleyto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0840</td>
<td>03/12/03</td>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>AN-D 2157</td>
<td>04/02/09</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0843</td>
<td>03/12/03</td>
<td>Casimba</td>
<td>AN-D 1663</td>
<td>04/02/09</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>AN-M 995</td>
<td>07/26/18</td>
<td>AN-B 2799</td>
<td>Zoacazoey [Tsetacol]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0854</td>
<td>03/22/03</td>
<td>Damian Casaus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chetacol</td>
<td>MI-M 194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AN-B 3316</td>
<td>01/25/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0855</td>
<td>03/22/03</td>
<td>Dionisia</td>
<td>AN-D 1963</td>
<td>02/20/07</td>
<td>Chetacol</td>
<td>MI-M 194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AN-B 3316</td>
<td>01/25/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 0869</td>
<td>03/22/03</td>
<td>Luis Pedro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Playano</td>
<td>AN-M 652</td>
<td>05/01/03</td>
<td>AN-B 2797</td>
<td>Tsetacol</td>
<td>AN-B 2753</td>
<td>03/28/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 1081</td>
<td>01/14/04</td>
<td>Pasqual Baylon</td>
<td>AN-D 2405</td>
<td>09/05/12</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>MI-M 285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AN-B 2749</td>
<td>03/06/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 1083</td>
<td>01/14/04</td>
<td>Nabor Chumpa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>MI-M 719</td>
<td>04/30/04</td>
<td>AN-B 2953</td>
<td>Tsetacol</td>
<td>AN-B 2929</td>
<td>02/12/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 1089</td>
<td>01/14/04</td>
<td>Pasquala</td>
<td>AN-D 1934</td>
<td>10/03/06</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>MI-M 285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AN-B 2749</td>
<td>03/06/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 1090</td>
<td>01/14/04</td>
<td>Vicenta Ferrer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>MI-M 718</td>
<td>04/29/04</td>
<td>AN-B 2926</td>
<td>Tsetacol</td>
<td>AN-B 3231</td>
<td>10/26/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 1091</td>
<td>01/14/04</td>
<td>Veneranda</td>
<td>AN-D 2071</td>
<td>02/10/08</td>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>MI-M 712</td>
<td>03/12/04</td>
<td>AN-B 0751</td>
<td>Lamaca</td>
<td>AN-B 2743</td>
<td>02/27/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI-B 1316</td>
<td>07/22/06</td>
<td>Ysidoro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Recodo</td>
<td>AN-M 804</td>
<td>08/31/06</td>
<td>AN-B 3301</td>
<td>Lehuege</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AN-B – Mission San Antonio baptism; AN-D – Mission San Antonio death; AN-M – Mission San Antonio marriage; MI-B – Mission San Miguel baptism; MI-M – Mission San Miguel marriage.
### Table 7. List of Mission San Luis Obispo Indians Who Appeared in Mission San Miguel Registers between 1797 and 1820.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLIEST CHILD AT SAN MIGUEL: BAPTISM RECORD</th>
<th>BAPTISM DATE</th>
<th>NAME B URIAL RECORD</th>
<th>DEATH DATE</th>
<th>RANCHERIA MARRIAGE RECORD</th>
<th>MARRIAGE DATE</th>
<th>SPOUSE'S BAPTISM RECORD</th>
<th>SPOUSE'S RANCHERIA RECORD</th>
<th>MARRIAGE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 016</td>
<td>06/01/77</td>
<td>Maria Teresa</td>
<td>MI-B 0273</td>
<td>07/20/04</td>
<td>Choteagua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 098</td>
<td>07/06/83</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>MI-B 519</td>
<td>01/04/04</td>
<td>Lechuize</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1055</td>
<td>12/17/83</td>
<td>Felisitas</td>
<td>MI-B 392</td>
<td>07/14/06</td>
<td>Torquato</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1147</td>
<td>10/11/92</td>
<td>Salistro</td>
<td>MI-B 0395</td>
<td>02/09/02</td>
<td>Pitepey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1188</td>
<td>10/11/92</td>
<td>Eudisia</td>
<td>MI-B 0001</td>
<td>01/17/98</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1302</td>
<td>03/07/95</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>MI-B 0056</td>
<td>04/02/01</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1320</td>
<td>06/26/05</td>
<td>Maria Yamela</td>
<td>MI-B 0151</td>
<td>12/29/01</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1468</td>
<td>04/29/98</td>
<td>Torquato</td>
<td>MI-B 0552</td>
<td>09/16/04</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1555</td>
<td>02/08/00</td>
<td>Salistro Maria</td>
<td>MI-B 0250</td>
<td>04/07/04</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1578</td>
<td>06/21/00</td>
<td>Grilla</td>
<td>MI-B 0207</td>
<td>12/29/01</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1580</td>
<td>07/09/00</td>
<td>Ferminta</td>
<td>MI-D 1180</td>
<td>08/24/20</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1668</td>
<td>02/19/02</td>
<td>Ramosmo Maria</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1792</td>
<td>05/22/03</td>
<td>Jose Miguel</td>
<td>MI-D 436</td>
<td>02/24/07</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1903</td>
<td>06/28/03</td>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>MI-D 1180</td>
<td>08/24/20</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1905</td>
<td>06/26/03</td>
<td>Viridiana</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1906</td>
<td>10/28/03</td>
<td>Graciano Riano</td>
<td>MI-D 436</td>
<td>02/24/07</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1907</td>
<td>06/28/03</td>
<td>Osvaldo</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1908</td>
<td>06/26/03</td>
<td>Osvaldo</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1909</td>
<td>11/12/03</td>
<td>Rosario</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1910</td>
<td>03/07/14</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1911</td>
<td>06/05/13</td>
<td>Evandro</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1912</td>
<td>06/05/13</td>
<td>Evandro</td>
<td>MI-D 777</td>
<td>03/04/14</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1913</td>
<td>04/28/13</td>
<td>Prospero</td>
<td>MI-D 345</td>
<td>02/02/06</td>
<td>Chotequiso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Graciano Riano was the adult child of San Miguel converts Casco Riano (SMI-B 990) and Santa Arminda (SMI-B 1036). 

**a** Reginalda’s home group was not listed at San Luis Obispo, but she was married to a man from Chotequiso when she was first baptized there. 

**b** Prospero was the adult child of Pablo Chonco of Auyamne (SMI-B 1898). 

**c** Reginalda’s home group was not listed at San Luis Obispo, but she was married to a man from Chotequiso when she was first baptized there. 

**d** Relevant marriage at Mission San Luis Obispo.
Table 8. List of Mission San Luis Obispo Indians Who Appeared in Mission San Antonio Registers Prior to 1820.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baptism Record</th>
<th>Baptism Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ranchería at Baptism (and Official)</th>
<th>Death Record</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Relationships Mentioned in San Antonio Death Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1392</td>
<td>11/06/1796</td>
<td>Lorenzo Moral</td>
<td>Stajahuayo (Father Peyri)</td>
<td>AN-D 1880</td>
<td>05/28/1806</td>
<td>viudo de Marcelina, Cristiana de S. Luis Obispo y afiliado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1399</td>
<td>12/30/1796</td>
<td>Consorcia</td>
<td>Tuaya (Father Peyri)</td>
<td>AN-D 1685</td>
<td>06/20/1804</td>
<td>hermana menor de Lorenzo Moral… agregados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1400</td>
<td>12/30/1796</td>
<td>Marcelina</td>
<td>Tuaya (Father Peyri)</td>
<td>AN-D 1782</td>
<td>11/06/1805</td>
<td>muger de Lorenzo Moral… empadronaron en esta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 1556</td>
<td>02/08/1800</td>
<td>Pedro Bautista</td>
<td>Stacalocloc (Father Lasuén)</td>
<td>AN-D 1530</td>
<td>02/08/1803</td>
<td>[age 14 at death, no family ties, only mention of group]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO-B 2057</td>
<td>10/02/1804</td>
<td>Maria Ventura</td>
<td>Pleyeto (Father Ciprés)</td>
<td>AN-D 2302</td>
<td>04/18/1811</td>
<td>muger de Narciso, los dos son Christiano… de S. Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  a Concorcia’s San Luis Obispo husband had died in 1800 at San Luis Obispo;  b Maria Ventura’s mother (SLO-1089) was one of three Tuaya people not on this list, and Maria Ventura’s father was Ticeuelka (AN-B 3411) of “Aziz vulgo el Pleyeto,” and her husband Narciso (LO-B 961), from the tiny ranchería of Scsitce, had a Stajahuayo tie through his first wife (SLO-M 373).

Two Mission San Antonio people are known to have moved down to San Luis Obispo. One of them, Apuleyo María, did not come from an overlap area; he was a member of the Pastor family of Quinau, far to the north in the direction of Soledad. As a widower, he moved down to Mission San Luis Obispo to marry the widow Blandina of Chmimu in January of 1787 (SAN-B 1004, SLO-B 351, SLO-M 172). The other case of a transfer from San Antonio south to San Luis Obispo occurred much later, in 1808, when Petronio Esjonojo Montaner of Janulo district moved to San Luis Obispo to marry Quintiliana of Chotcagua at Morro Bay (SAN-B 1614, SLO-B 1298, SLO-M 614).

Summary of Mission Outreach Overlap

In summary, inter-mission transfer was not great between any two (or pair) of the three study area missions. Most such moves occurred from Mission San Antonio to Mission San Miguel. Next in importance was movement from Mission San Luis Obispo to Mission San Miguel. Some movement north from Mission San Luis Obispo and San Miguel to Mission San Antonio also occurred. Movement to San Luis Obispo, from either Mission San Antonio or Mission San Miguel, was rare during the mission era. No significantly large blocs of people from a single ranchería were baptized at one of the missions, then moved to another.

PROBLEMS INSOLUBLE THROUGH STANDARD METHODS

In the previous section we showed that outreach overlap hints at the relative locations of a very few rancherías in the study area (Azzil, Chelacosaone, and Joyuclac are the best examples), but strong patterns do not emerge. In this section we review the limitations imposed by our study area data on some other standard mission register approaches to ranchería location.

The Problem of Unidentified Individuals

Not all mission-register entries for tribal people contain home-village information, as has been pointed out in the discussion of varying data-entry practices among missionaries. Most individuals who lacked direct home ranchería identification can be tentatively assigned to a ranchería through examination of the home places of their relatives. For instance, some priests supplied homeland information for the first baptized person from a nuclear family, then left such information out of the entries for subsequent family members. A fair inference can sometimes be made regarding the home place of all members of a nuclear family by first building charts of family groups, then bringing together on those charts any clues about homeland.
information available for all family members. Such tentative home place assignments, while not conclusive for all individuals, provide an adequate basis for assigning individuals to groups for purposes of regional studies.

An example of a reconstructed family chart providing a home-place identity is that of Antonio, the first person baptized at Mission San Antonio (SAN-B 1) and his parents (Appendix E, Figure E-7). San Antonio de Padua Confirmation #1, written a few years after his baptism, states that Antonio was the son of Tomás José Morillo (SAN-B 63) and María Magdalena (SAN-B 72). Home village was not provided in any of their baptismal entries. When we turn to San Antonio Book of Marriages #3, however, we find that Tomás José was from “Chuquilim, alias San Alexos” and María Magdalena was from “Esmal, alias San Buenaventura, situada en la Playa por el Rumbo NorNorueste [Esmal, alias San Buenaventura, situated at the beach to the northnorthwest]”. The Christian marriage took place on May 1, 1773, almost two years after Antonio had been baptized. The son, Antonio, is inferred to be from Chuquilim, since patrilocal residence is found in the great majority of directly documented cases.

Family network analysis allows us to assign a home ranchería for all but a dozen of the otherwise unassigned Mission San Luis Obispo people. However, over 40 Mission San Antonio people who were not identified with a ranchería at baptism have yet to be indirectly linked. The problem does not exist in the Mission San Miguel records.

A Problem with Concentric Circle Analysis

Mission registers in areas farther north in California present a picture of a fairly orderly migration of a succession of multi-village tribelet groups. Each group contributed the greater part of their mission converts in short two- or three-year periods, with only a few converts appearing before or after that time of peak migration. That pattern continued as people moved to those missions from greater and greater distances. Assuming a “concentric circle” principle of tribal conquest, one can infer their relative distance from a given mission. This assumption works only in a somewhat muddled fashion at the missions within our study area. Indeed, the migration-distance relationship between missions and their surrounding villages is much more complicated than one of simple distance, as Coombs (1979) has shown for Mission Santa Bárbara.

At San Luis Obispo, villages that supplied some of the earliest converts continued to provide a few families to the mission for another 20 years. Most of these nearby villages still had non-Christian members when the final missionization campaign took place in 1803. For instance, seven people from Sepjato were baptized in the 1780s, another 18 people in the 1790s, and the final six people in 1803. This long period of intermittent baptism tends to obscure the evidence for differences in village distances from the mission. Some sense is gained of the relative distances of villages from the mission, however, by comparing their mean years of mission recruitment (cf. Johnson 1988:137-138; McLendon and Johnson 1999:100).

Villages near Mission San Antonio also sent small numbers of people for baptism year after year, for many years. But the resultant problem is less severe than it is for San Luis Obispo, because the villages near San Antonio were tied to multi-village districts, and the recruitment curves for the nearest regions are consistently earlier than those for more distant districts. Most people from the core-area regions of Lima, Lamaca, and Quinau were baptized prior to the large number of people who came in from east of the Salinas River and the coast south of San Carpoforo Creek. However, some local Lima, Lamaca, and Quinau people were still being baptized as late as 1805.

At Mission San Miguel, in contrast, the period of baptisms of the vast majority of Coast Range people was truncated into the short period of time between 1798 and 1805. A few people from villages proselytized mainly in 1803-1805 continued to come in with Yokuts neighbors until as late as 1821, offering evidence that they were east Coast Range neighbors of those Yokuts tribes. Nevertheless, the truncation renders any “concentric circle” pattern of outreach difficult to observe at San Miguel.

We have found that we get a clearer view of the relative times of baptism among most South Coast Range groups of more than 14 people by comparing the dates at which half of their adult members were baptized. This technique does not work for very small groups or for the giant Cholam group, which is actually a composite of local groups.
The Problem of Small Ranchería Size

The most significant reason that regional ethnogeography reconstruction is more difficult in the Mission San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo areas than in other west-central and southern California areas is the very small size of most named ranchería groups surrounding these missions. Franciscan priests recorded the baptisms of 4,054 native South Coast Range people in the baptismal registers of missions San Antonio, San Luis Obispo (north of the Santa Maria River), and San Miguel between 1771 and 1810. The priests listed the home ranchería (village or multi-village district) of 3,300 of those people. The names of 205 rancherías were listed between 1771 and 1810, taking into account alternate spellings and redundant ranchería names from one mission to another. Thus one named place was recorded for every 16 people baptized (Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tribal Adults</th>
<th>Tribal Children</th>
<th>Tribal Total</th>
<th>Entries Listing a Ranchería</th>
<th>Entries Without a Ranchería</th>
<th>Listed Rancherías Remembered Later</th>
<th>People per Ranchería</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad and La Purísima</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Excludes Esselen from areas reassigned to Mission Soledad; Excludes Northern Chumash from areas reassigned to Mission La Purísima; Study area includes eight adults baptized at Mission Soledad and five adults baptized at Mission La Purísima; Of 245 study area rancherías named at the three missions, 40 are redundant between missions.

Quantitative techniques do not work well for inferring ranchería proximity from identified family links in situations where many ranchería groups are represented in the records by fewer than a dozen people, and only one or two marriages. The smaller the number of identifiable extended family links a ranchería has to others, the more likely it is that the presence of an anomalous outmarriage will cause the analyst to make a false judgment regarding its location relative to other rancherías. For instance, imagine two tiny adjacent groups, each with three couples. Two of the couples in each group are involved in outmarriages with the other group, but only one of those marriages is recorded and known to the analyst. One of the groups also has a recorded anomalous outmarriage with a distant group. Although the two groups are adjacent, the known marriage pattern would not provide a good indication that this is so. With larger ranchería groups of 20-25 couples, renewed marriages reported at the missions have a better chance of reflecting the actual marriage pattern.

Counts of individuals identified per ranchería are much higher at missions in west-central California to the north, varying from 38 to 60. We suggest four contributing reasons for a large number of village names in the mission records. For one thing, people were highly mobile among a number of specific sites within their territories; thus members of specific extended families came from a number of local sites over the months and years of their absorption into the mission communities. Secondly, specific places could have more than one name, including names in two or more neighboring languages, and the personal names of head people. Third, many local places existed within larger named regions; a person could be said to be from a region without evidence being given regarding his/her local village, or the other way around. Finally, each priest heard and spelled these foreign (to them) placenames in his own way, a common source of confusion considering that 29 different priests made entries in the early San Antonio books, 28 at San Luis Obispo, and 21 at San Miguel.

The jumble of synonymous terms for places, for regions, for main villages, and for temporary camp sites recorded in the mission registers provides the false picture of a very splintered landscape of tiny, independent hamlets. Reconstituted family kinship charts expose problems of synonymy and multi-localational
groups by exposing the patterns of matched places that continually appear among various members of specific extended families. While married couples said to be from different places may reflect marriage links between neighboring socio-political groups, families with pre-adult children from a mixture of sites are likely to have moved back and forth between those sites.

Kinship network reconstitution helps to coalesce splinter groups into larger clusters of locationally related people. In our computer data bases for missions San Antonio and San Miguel, we have one “Group” field for entering any ranchería explicitly related to a particular individual, and a second “Codegroup” field for a standardized spelling of the group’s most commonly used placename (see Appendix A for more information). At Mission San Antonio, people from Zojocolom, known from family chart patterns to be “one of the rancherías of Papuco” are identified as Papuco people in the “codegp” field of our data base. Johnson’s original Mission San Luis Obispo data base identified people to their local rancherías, but an additional field was added to the database to track people from closely related hamlets under the name of the best-represented ranchería of the cluster, an example being the single group made up of Tez and Tequie people (see the La Panza region discussion in Chapter 8).

OVERVIEW OF CONSTRAINTS ON STANDARD APPROACHES

Mission register studies that have worked well elsewhere cannot be uncritically applied in the South Coast Ranges. It was our goal at the outset of this study to determine the home ranchería of all 4,069 tribal individuals from the study area who were baptized at Franciscan missions, and to determine the location of each of the 205 named rancherías, at least to within a few miles’ radius of their actual locations.

Standard methods of inference do not produce an accurate ranchería location map in the South Coast Ranges. The following questions illustrate problems that we encountered:

1. Tsetacol, a large ranchería, cannot be located from direct evidence. Its inhabitants were the last coastal people to move to Mission San Antonio, in 1803 and 1804. Gibson (1983) placed it at Ragged Point on the basis of “concentric circle” expectations. If placed there, it gives the Piedras Blancas vicinity a huge population, but leaves only a few people in the Estero Point region nearer to San Luis Obispo. It seems probable to us that Tsetacol actually was in the Estero Point vicinity. However, this inference would be hard to prove, and hard for others to accept, because it defies the assumption that groups went to the nearest missions.

2. We were sure that Cholam, represented by over 300 people at Mission San Miguel, was a multi-village area rather than a single large village, but how large was the region, and how would one determine its boundaries?

3. Despite the fact that Mission San Miguel was physically closer to eastern portions of the study area than Mission San Antonio the latter mission converted more adults from the inland Coast Ranges—763 versus 704. We were concerned that Mission San Antonio’s outreach area might include valleys that were actually closer to Mission San Miguel than to Mission San Antonio.

4. Mission San Luis Obispo stopped bringing in interior Coast Range converts in 1803, while Mission San Antonio and Mission San Miguel continued bringing in converts through 1805. This suggested to us that Mission San Miguel’s outreach area might include inland valleys that were actually closer to Mission San Luis Obispo than to Mission San Miguel.

These issues led us to conclude that we needed additional tools to reconstruct the ethnogeography of the study area. Thus, we developed a regional population model, described in the following chapters, to aid in the analysis of the locations of poorly documented early mission-period groups.
CHAPTER 5
THE POPULATION DISTRIBUTION MODEL

Detailed ethnographic evidence about regional community territorial areas is not available for most Salinan and Northern Chumash groups. Inference is the only way to assign the 205 rancherías to a ground location. Gibson (1983) and McLendon and Johnson (1999) mapped many rancherías on the basis of inference from traditional “concentric circle” studies and quantitative regional linkages based on family network analyses. We have suggested alternative placements based on new solutions to some problems of ranchería scale and synonymy. Through our marriage network analyses, we reduced the 205 contact-period rancherías to 56 ranchería clusters. As we began to construct the fabric of ranchería locations, it became clear that our placements depended upon assumptions about how closely or far apart groups would have been spaced across the study area landscape at large.

We developed an inductive method to identify the spacing. First, we broke the study area into 27 equal-sized hexagonal regions and a 28th region (Point Buchon) smaller in size (Figure 9). Next, we reconstructed a hypothetical pre-mission population for each region, without regard to any clues about specific ranchería locations (Table 10). Then we tentatively assigned the actual ranchería populations to specific regions on the basis of “migration-distance relationships” and family network-based proximity linkages. After that we moved some doubtfully located ranchería populations into adjacent regions in an iterative process that generally matched the baptized ranchería populations to the expected regional populations. Sometimes the process of matching totals of baptized individuals to predicted regional totals meant apportioning a particular village’s population, and therefore, its land base, among several adjacent hexagons.

The population model required us to think critically about how the aboriginal population was distributed across the landscape and thereby highlighted areas where previous studies have either over-counted or under-counted a region’s likely inhabitants. Below we briefly describe the process of dividing our study area into regions, estimating the likely population by region, defining the edges for our study, and apportioning particular rancherías to local regions.

MODELING POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY REGION

We broke the study area into 27 equal-sized inhabited regions, plus Point Buchon which encompasses the protruding coastline and is one-third the size of the others (Figure 9). Each complete region is approximately 16 miles in diameter, the size of most multi-village tribelet territories further north in the Mission San Carlos and Mission San Juan Bautista outreach areas (Milliken 1987, 1990). However, these regions are arbitrary equal-size units of space, not political units. Each local region was assigned a name that would be meaningful to present Monterey and San Luis Obispo county inhabitants.

The baptized population of Mission San Antonio (excluding those who moved to Mission Soledad in 1792), Mission San Miguel, and Mission San Luis Obispo (excluding those who moved to Mission La Purísima in 1789) was 4,069 children and adults (see Table 9). However, the regional pre-mission population was certainly larger, reduced by disease and death immediately following the Spanish arrival. We therefore multiplied 4,069 by 1.5, the formula suggested by Sherburne Cook (1976) and Alan Brown (1967), to arrive at 5,840 as the hypothetical pre-mission population.

The 5,840 people were divided among the 27.3 regions to arrive at an average of 214 people per region; however, we intuitively weighted each region to a higher or lower population on the basis of the following considerations:

1. Areas of high rainfall (22-30 inches per year) supported more people than dry areas (6-10 inches per year), other factors being equal.
Figure 9. Study Regions for the Study Area Population Distribution Model.
Table 10. Model Populations and Baptized Adult Populations for 28 Regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>EXPECTED PRE-MISSION POPULATION</th>
<th>EXPECTED PERCENT BAPTIZED</th>
<th>EXPECTED NUMBER BAPTIZED</th>
<th>--------------</th>
<th>-----</th>
<th>------</th>
<th>-----</th>
<th>------</th>
<th>-----</th>
<th>-------</th>
<th>-------</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL A DULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenal</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrizo Plain</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholam Hills</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholame Valley</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estero Point</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>119.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia Mountain</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinado Canyon</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>145.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Panza</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Valley</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>137.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez Point</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos Creek</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Ojios</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>145.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKittrick Summit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro Bay</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>139.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Temblors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paso Robles</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>119.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedras Blancas</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Buchon</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest Valley</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramid Hills</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason Peak</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo Bay</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Margarita</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent Canyon</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>130.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shandon</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>133.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MODEL POPULATION</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>2,569.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Assigned Population

Notes: PU – Mission La Purísima; LO – Mission San Luis Obispo; MI – Mission San Miguel; AN – Mission San Antonio; SO – Mission La Soledad.

2. Areas with permanent running streams (such as the Nacimiento and Salinas rivers) supported more people than areas lacking permanent streams, other factors being equal.

3. Areas with mosaics of oaks and grasslands supported more people than areas of closed canopy live-oak-pine forest or areas of pure grassland, other factors being equal (Figure 10).

4. Areas with large tracks of chaparral (such as the Garcia Mountain region) supported fewer people than grasslands or oak savannahs (such as the Paso Robles region), while areas of desert alkali flats, east of the Antelope Valley region, supported no people at all.

5. Areas of rolling hills and flat valleys supported more people than steep mountainous areas, other factors being equal.
Figure 10. Vegetation of the Study Area, also Showing Key Landscape Features, Franciscan Missions, and Present-day Towns (after Küchler 1977).
6. Areas of sparse resources adjacent to and between two biologically rich areas (such as the Los Gatos Creek region) supported more people than areas of sparse resources lacking adjacent rich resources areas (such as the La Panza region).

Our resulting expected regional populations are shown in parentheses in Figure 9 and listed in Table 10, Column 2. Expected population was highest in the high rainfall coastal and near coastal regions, and lowest in the dry interior regions to the southeast. Note that we assign the highest hypothetical population densities, 310 people, to the Nacimiento region of rolling hills, oak woodlands, relatively high rainfall, and a large amount of captured water in the lower Nacimiento River. The lowest predicted population densities, 20 and 30, are assigned to the near desert North Temblores and McKittrick Summit regions. Areas just east of our study area—the Lost Hills immediately east of the Antelope Valley region and the Huron vicinity east of the Los Gatos Creek region (see Figure 10)—had no permanent population at all; however, these areas were certainly utilized in the spring by visitors from rancherías in neighboring regions.

CALCULATING EACH REGION’S BAPTIZED ADULT POPULATION

Only a portion of the region’s contact-period tribal population was baptized. In all regions of the study area, life expectancy at birth plummeted soon after the Spanish arrived, and populations declined before everyone was baptized. Long-term depression in population density was most affected by infant death which greatly increased over time. Groups baptized after 1800 brought many fewer children with them than did groups baptized in the 1770s and 1780s. Adult populations were of course negatively affected, but to a lesser degree and at relatively later times. To minimize the distortions due to differential disease history between regions, we limited our analysis of ranchería groups to adults only (above age 14, based on the worldwide standard for small-scale societies (Acsádi and Nemeskéri 1970).

We developed a calculus to project an expected “baptized” adult population from the model total pre-mission populations of each of the 28 regions (see Table 10). We hypothesized a 95-97 percent baptism rate for the adult populations of regions immediately adjacent to popular Mission San Antonio, a 90 percent baptism rate for regions adjacent to the less successful Mission San Luis Obispo, a 90 percent rate for regions adjacent to Mission San Miguel, founded 20 years later, and a rate as low as 80 percent for adult recruitment from distant regions of the inner South Coast Ranges.

In practice, we had to adjust the expected number of people per region and the expected adult baptism rates by small amounts until we arrived at a total of expected adult baptisms that equaled the true number of baptized adults identified in our study area data bases (2,569). The final model presumes a pre-mission total population (adults and children) of 5,840 for the study area (see Table 10). This figure is close to the 6,000-person study area population that we presumed at the outset of the exercise.

THE STUDY AREA EDGES

The historic ranchería populations of California interacted with their neighbors in an endless series of overlapping family network spheres, irrespective of cultural and language boundaries, that reached from coast to Sierras and beyond. No matter how we define the edges of our study area, some ambiguity will arise regarding membership within and outside the area. Yet we needed to define edges. In the introduction to this report we briefly mentioned that our study area’s northern boundary is the mission outreach interface zone between missions San Antonio and Soledad (a generally east-west line equidistant between missions San Antonio and Soledad), that the southern boundary is the mission outreach interface zone between missions San Luis Obispo and La Purísima (Santa Maria River), and that the eastern boundary is the break between the Coast Range and the San Joaquin Valley.

In the sections below we will explain more thoroughly the edge areas. We will document how we chose to exclude from our study population some Mission San Antonio people with links to Soledad and some San Luis Obispo people with links to La Purísima. We will discuss our choice of the flat lands of the San Joaquin Valley, with its Yokut-speaking tribes, as the eastern edge of our study area. Finally, we will examine evidence for edges and overlap areas between the three study area missions.
Coastal Study Area Edge

The Pacific Coast presents the obvious western study area edge. Coastal families are the anchor groups for the web of family networks extending inland all the way to the San Joaquin Valley. For that reason, our first exhaustive family network reconstructions were carried out for families identified with the coast, using the population distribution model described below (see Chapter 6; Appendix E).

Northern Study Area Edge

Five Coast Range regions border our study area on the north (not shown in Figure 9): the Marble Peak region along the rugged coast, the Arroyo Seco region, the Greenfield region, the Upper San Benito region, and the Cantua Creek region. Rancherías in these regions have been provisionally reported in a mission register-based study by Milliken (1990). Most people from these five regions moved to Mission Soledad between 1791 (the year of that mission’s founding) and 1806. However, 92 Esselen-speakers from rancherías in the Marble Peak, Arroyo Seco, and Greenfield regions were baptized at Mission San Antonio prior to the founding of Mission Soledad. Later, most of them transferred north to Mission Soledad; therefore, they are not included in our study population. On the other hand, some people baptized at Soledad in the 1790s are presumed to have come from the Lopez Point region within our study area. Although no specific Lopez Point villages have been identified in the Soledad records, we arbitrarily assign five adults baptized at Mission Soledad to Lopez Point and include them in our study population (see Table 10).

Farther east, some rancherías of the inner Coast Ranges sent small numbers of people to both Mission San Antonio and Mission Soledad. One of those was Escoy which sent 13 adults to Mission San Antonio, and another was Lysol represented by 11 adults at Mission San Antonio. At Soledad, baptismal entries mention “Escoyzama del rumbo de Nixnilat [Escoyzama in the direction of Nixnilat]” and “Lisoli, frente San Benito [Lisoli on the face of San Benito (mountain?)]” It is not yet possible to determine how many people were baptized at Mission Soledad from those places, since the great majority of inner Coast Range people baptized at Soledad were lumped under the vague regional placename Chalon. We have assigned both Escoy and Lysol to the Los Gatos Creek region, closer to Mission San Antonio than to Mission Soledad. It is possible that these two villages were actually out of our study area to the north. But that likelihood is balanced by the possibility that some Soledad converts not counted by us did come from within our study area. We are likely to change our understanding of ranchería locations along the northeastern edge of our study area following future family-network-based analyses of the Mission Soledad records.

Southern Study Area Edges

Adjacent to our study area on the south are regions we label Guadalupe, Santa Maria, North Sierra Madre, Caliente Range, and South Temblor Range. They reach from the coast at the mouth of the Santa Maria River to just west of Buena Vista Lake in the southern San Joaquin Valley. Mission San Luis Obispo received many tribal converts from the two westernmost regions, Guadalupe and Santa Maria, and smaller numbers of people from other areas further south in present Santa Barbara County, all the way to the Santa Barbara Channel. Mission San Luis Obispo outreach into these regions ended in late 1787 with the founding of Mission La Purísima.

Eight adults baptized at Mission La Purísima from rancherías within our study area were included in our study population (see Table 10). Five of them were from rancherías unequivocally within our study area: Chliquin in the San Luis Obispo Bay region (n=2), Chetpu in the Santa Margarita region (n=1), Chojuale in the Garcia Mountain region (n=1), and Tsquieu in the Point Buchon region (n=1). We counted another three La Purísima converts as members of the McKittrick Summit region although we cannot specify any La Purísima individuals as having derived from there. La Purísima outreach vectors should have brought them into the McKittrick Summit area. It is possible that some of the people baptized at La Purísima from the Cuyama Valley ranchería of Sjalihuiliimu were actually from one or more of the small bands of the Carrizo Plain or McKittrick Summit regions. Another small village, not discussed in our study, was likely located just south of the Carrizo Plain and McKittrick Summit regions on the east flank of the Caliente Range (see
Fourteen inhabitants from this ranchería were baptized at La Purísima, Santa Bárbara, and Santa Inés (Johnson 1985, 1988:86).

Adults baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo were excluded from our study population if they came from rancherías in the Guadalupe region, Santa Maria region, and other regions south of our study area. Most important among the excluded rancherías are Ajuaps (alias Laguna Larga) of the coastal Guadalupe region, Guasna, Lachicto, and Stemeqtatimi of the Santa Maria region, and Saxpil (alias Graciosa Vieja), Lospe, and Nauco of the Orcutt region further south. King (1984) has written an excellent ethnohistory of the rancherías of western Santa Barbara County, while the most up-to-date interpretation of ranchería locations in these regions has been compiled by McLendon and Johnson (1999).

Eastern Study Area Edge

Our study area reaches inland to the eastern edge of the Coast Range hills (see Figure 9). The flat lands of the San Joaquin Valley are excluded as they were controlled by Yokuts-speaking groups called Tulareños by the Spanish missionaries. We have described the territories of the Tulareños (the Tachi, Wowol, and Auyamne [alias Gelecto and Tuhohi]) in Chapter 2, and have found no evidence that these Yokuts-speakers held any Coast Range hill lands in the early historic period. The dry, seasonally inhospitable plains formed a natural buffer between the lands of most Coast Range groups and most riverine Tulareño groups. The nature of that buffer varied slightly from north to south (see Figure 10).

To the northeast, the hill and valley lands of our Los Gatos Creek region are bordered on the east by the dry plains around Huron, which we suggest were uninhabited for most of the year but utilized in spring months by Tachi villagers from the Kings River. Further to the south, the lightly populated Avenal region within the study area reached east to the Kettleman Hills, but did not quite reach the western edge of Tulare Lake which was under Tachi control. Farther south, the Pyramid Hills region within the study area just touches Tulare Lake at the north end of Dudley Ridge, the only vicinity along our boundary where Coast Range and lacustrine peoples might have lived within a few short miles of one another for significant portions of the year.

The next two regions to the south, Antelope Valley and Northern Temblor Range, reach down from the grassy Temblor Range onto the flat, dry, salt bush scrub lands of the Antelope Plain and the Lost Hills, lands that probably lacked human inhabitants for the greater part of each year. The Lost Hills, outside the study area, and the eastern portion of the North Temblor region, within the study area, include these flat, dry lands, another buffer area between Coast Range and riverine Tulareño Yokuts groups.

In the southeast, the McKittrick Summit region is primarily mountains and foothills of the grassy Temblor Range; its eastern portion was accessible from the sloughs northwest of Buena Vista Lake and may therefore have been utilized seasonally by Yokuts groups that we exclude from our study population. However, the fact that Chumash groups originally held all of the mountainous country west and south of Buena Vista Lake indicates that the southern Yokuts groups were lake- and river-oriented people.

ASSIGNMENT OF RANCHERÍA GROUPS TO LOCAL REGIONS

As noted above, our data bases indicate that 2,569 tribal adults were actually baptized from within the study area: 1,124 at Mission San Antonio, 792 at Mission San Miguel, 640 at Mission San Luis Obispo, and another 13 at adjacent missions. Our next task was to assign each of those adults, as members of local rancherías, to one of the 28 study areas, first on the basis of historic clues, concentric circle analyses, and family network analyses, and then with some shifts and placements designed to bring each “assigned” regional population into approximate conformity with its “predicted” population. Table 10, columns 6-11, show the resulting counts of individuals from each mission assigned to each of the 28 study regions.

The iterative process by which we assigned specific individuals and their ranchería groups to one or another region involved a series of steps, briefly detailed here. The first step was to separate out and identify the adults who could be assigned to coastal regions (309 at Mission San Luis Obispo, 88 at Mission San
Miguel, 361 at Mission San Antonio, and 8 at other missions), and then assign those 766 individuals to their most likely coastal region. The next series of steps was taken to assign 1,803 non-coastal tribal adults to inland regions: 763 from Mission San Antonio; 331 from San Luis Obispo; 704 from Mission San Miguel in a wedge between the San Antonio and San Luis Obispo mission outreach areas, and five individuals from other missions (see Table 10). Several steps were then undertaken to reconcile over- and under-population estimates in some of the inland regions until the assigned regional populations approximately mirrored those predicted by our hypothetical regional model (see Table 10, columns 5 and 11).

Figure 11 illustrates our tentative placement of rancherías, based on the above described method. Our confidence is greatest for the seven coastal regions because, of the 28 study area regions, only they were analyzed exhaustively. Project scope and time limits constrained us from completing family charts necessary for rigorous network analysis of most interior rancherías, rendering regional assignments of interior populations more tentative. Chapter 6 presents the results of the in-depth study of the coastal regions. Chapter 7 discusses the tentative results for rancherías near and to the east of Mission San Antonio, which we call the northern interior. Chapter 8 discusses tentative results for a large number of interior regions near and east of Mission San Miguel, the central interior. In Chapter 9, we discuss the southernmost interior regions, just east and southeast of Mission San Luis Obispo.
Figure 11. Mission Locations and Locations of Major Rancherías Named in the Mission Registers.
CHAPTER 6
RANCHERÍAS OF THE COASTAL REGIONS

Tribal people of the California coast were not constrained to live along a narrow strand from the beach to a few hundred yards inland. We infer from early Spanish accounts that coastal hunter-gatherers maintained both seaside and interior villages and camps. For instance, Portolá found no people in Cambria when he arrived there in September of 1769. The closest village was somewhere further inland, as indicated by a diary entry that day: “Some mountain Indians coming down to visit us brought along a [bear] cub... They must have been about sixty men” (Costansó in Boneu Companys 1983:206). On the same rugged seven miles, expedition diarist, Crespi, noted a large gathering of coastal and inland people:

Having reached here we were visited by five big villages of very tractable friendly heathens that they said had their villages in the immediate vicinity. (The 6 or 7 villages [corrected from five] we guessed to be at least about 600 souls; they presented us with a great many pine nuts.) Some they say, are shore dwellers, others mountaineers belonging to this range, and still others from a river that they say is near by, with a harbor, and that we guess to be the Carmelo River [Crespi in Brown 2001:515].

We do not address here the complex question of seasonal scheduling, the degree to which coastal groups divided their time between the sea shore and interior valleys (cf. Bouey and Basgall 1991; Farris 1986), but we do argue that people who had camps or villages along the coastal strand were members of communities that also controlled and used adjacent inland valleys.

Six of our seven coastal regions are approximately 16 miles wide, including the coastal strip and extensive inland areas. We have labeled them, from north to south, the Lopez Point, Willow Creek, Piedras Blancas, Estero Point, Morro Bay, and San Luis Obispo Bay regions (see Figure 9). The seventh region, Point Buchon, is really a partial region with one-third the land area of the other six, but also includes both coastal strip and inland areas. Our population distribution model predicts that 766 adults would have been baptized from the seven coastal regions (see Table 10). We have, therefore, placed that number of baptized adults in these coastal regions based on a mixture of explicit references, family ties, and unassigned people baptized during the same period.

In many cases, we have assigned individuals to a coastal region on the basis of direct clues. Many rancherías listed at Mission San Antonio were said to be on the coast. A few people listed at San Miguel were said to be from “La Mar,” and three villages listed at Mission San Luis Obispo were said specifically to have been on the coast. All the other coastal rancherías were assigned to regions through family links to known coastal rancherías. Table 11 shows yearly baptisms of people (adults and children) from the key coastal zone rancherías.

Below we discuss the seven coastal regions and their rancherías in order from north to south. We show the general ranchería locations along the coast, as currently understood, in Figure 12. Counts of people baptized each year from the coastal regions are listed in Table 12.

LOPEZ POINT REGION

The Lopez Point vicinity stretches along the Monterey County coast from the Big Creek drainage south to the Mill Creek drainage. Its inland areas extend from the present-day Escondido Campground south beyond the Indians Guard Station vicinity to Chalk Peak. This is a very rugged region. Although rainfall is the highest of any study area, averaging 30 inches, the region contains only short, small stream watersheds. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 220 people in this region, and a baptized adult population of ±99 individuals (see Table 10).
Table 11. Baptisms per Year of People (Adults and Children) from Key Coastal Ranchería Clusters and Independent Rancherías.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quiguil</th>
<th>Lamaca</th>
<th>Chaal</th>
<th>Cazz</th>
<th>Playa</th>
<th>Playa-Pinal</th>
<th>Nacimiento (Tsetacol)</th>
<th>Tsetacol</th>
<th>Nacimiento (Tsetacol)</th>
<th>Stjahuayo</th>
<th>Playa-San Luis</th>
<th>Chimu</th>
<th>Chotcagua</th>
<th>Petpatju / Chano</th>
<th>Toqui</th>
<th>SEPtotl / Pismu</th>
<th>Chimu / Chiquin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a Quiguil count includes inland and coastal rancherías; b Lamaca count includes inland and coastal rancherías; c Chaal count includes eight Esmerileua people and two Tay people; d Cazz count includes 17 said to be from Cazz, 24 said to be from Recodo, 30 of their relatives from Nacimiento, two from Namsuk, and one from Quepexau; e the Playa and Playano group at San Miguel includes 10 people said to be from Tissimasu, five from Stjahuayo, three from Tay, two from Tsetacol, one from Zaaaltaneel, 10 Playa or Playano variously related to Tay (n=3), Tissimasu (n=3), Stjahuayo (n=2), Tsetacol (n=1), and Cazz (n=1), and one person "de la playa [from the beach]") without relatives; f Playa-Pinal at San Antonio includes Steloglamo, Zassalet, Zatrama, ZizayoZisxja, and others explicitly related to Pinal or Tsetacol, but exclusive of Tsetacol; g the Tsetacol column includes only explicitly identified Tsetacol people at Mission San Antonio; h the Nacimiento (Tsetacol) column includes a small number of Nacimiento people at Mission San Miguel who are close relatives of Tsetacol people at Mission San Antonio; i the Stjahuayo column includes only the identifiable Stjahuayo people at Mission San Luis Obispo; j the Playa-San Luis column includes Mission San Antonio people from Zoacau Zey and from "la playa de San Luis [the beach at San Luis]") who may have come from either the Estero Point or Morro Bay region. AN – Mission San Antonio; MI – Mission San Miguel; LO – Mission San Luis Obispo.
Figure 12. Rancherías (Districts and Villages) of the Coastal Regions.
| Year | SO | AN | MI | LO | AN | MI | LO | AN | MI | LO | LO | PU | LO | PU |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1771 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1772 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1773 | -  | 4  | 14 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1774 | -  | -  | 1  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1775 | -  | 1  | 12 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1776 | -  | 3  | 11 | -  | 2  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1777 | -  | 1  | 8  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1778 | -  | 2  | 6  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 3  | 2  |
| 1779 | -  | 11 | 9  | -  | 3  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 6  | -  |
| 1780 | -  | 2  | 5  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 7  | -  | -  | 5  |
| 1781 | -  | 5  | 6  | -  | 4  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  |
| 1782 | -  | 3  | 5  | -  | 3  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| 1783 | -  | 15 | 9  | -  | 4  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | -  | 2  | -  |
| 1784 | -  | 4  | 5  | -  | 4  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | -  |
| 1785 | -  | 4  | 3  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 4  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1786 | -  | 6  | 12 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1787 | -  | -  | 1  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | 3  | -  | 1  | 1  | 2  | -  | -  |
| 1788 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | 4  |
| 1789 | -  | 2  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 2  |
| 1790 | -  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1791 | -  | 1  | 4  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | -  | 3  | 4  | -  |
| 1792 | -  | 1  | 3  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | 5  | -  | 2  | -  |
| 1793 | -  | 2  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 4  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | 4  | -  |
| 1794 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | 2  |
| 1795 | -  | 1  | 4  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | -  |
| 1796 | -  | 3  | 1  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | 1  | 2  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 4  | -  |
| 1797 | -  | 2  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | 1  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1798 | -  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | 3  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | 4  |
| 1799 | -  | 2  | 4  | -  | 1  | 6  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | 3  | -  |
| 1800 | -  | 1  | -  | 1  | 1  | 3  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | 3  | -  | 4  |
| 1801 | -  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | 7  | -  | 1  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | 2  | -  | 1  |
| 1802 | -  | 3  | -  | -  | 3  | -  | 2  | -  | 1  | -  | 5  | -  | 4  | -  | 4  |
| 1803 | -  | 3  | -  | 1  | 6  | 3  | -  | 21 | 5  | 14 | -  | 1  | 1  | 19 | 15 |
| 1804 | -  | 1  | 2  | -  | -  | 2  | 8  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 5  | 2  | -  | 1  | 1  |
| 1805 | -  | 1  | 5  | -  | 2  | 2  | 1  | -  | 9  | 2  | 5  | 5  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1806 | -  | 1  | -  | -  | 2  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  |
| 1807 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1808 | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1809 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1810 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1811 | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1812 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1813 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1814 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1815 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 1816 | -  | -  | -  | -  | 1  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |

**Subtotal (5)** | 85 | 138 | 4 | 68 | 3 | 125 | 2 | 36 | 1

**Total** | 90 | 142 | 117 | 132 | 121 | 127 | 37

Notes: AN – Mission San Antonio; LO – Mission San Luis Obispo; MI – Mission San Miguel; PU – Mission La Purísima; SO – Mission Soledad. * Five people at Mission Soledad are presumed to be from the Lopez Point region, but the individuals have not been identified.
Most people from the Lopez Point region moved to Mission San Antonio where they were said to be from the district of Quiguil or one of its specific villages (Appendix E, Figure E-7 for selected family charts). We have assigned 90 people to the region, 85 from the Mission San Antonio Baptismal Register, and another five from the Mission Soledad Baptismal Register. This is nine short of our model’s expectations. This fact leads us to remind the reader that there is no reason to expect that the native designation “Quiguil” would refer to a district that precisely matches our arbitrary Lopez Point region. With that in mind, we note that the Lamaca people of the adjacent Willow Creek region to the south had nine more baptized people than our model predicted. This suggests that the Lamaca district, rather than the Quiguil district, may have controlled a small southern part of our Lopez Point region, perhaps the Kirk Creek and Mill Creek areas. Most Quiguil baptisms at Mission San Antonio occurred between 1779 and 1786; half of the adults were baptized by December of 1783.

Quiguil was recognized by the Mission San Antonio priests, and later by Gibson (1983:115) as a multi-village district. One person was baptized from “las rancherías de Quiguil [the villages of Quiguil]” (SAN-B 1681). Some references mentioned locations on the sea shore, such as the “Mar por la parte de Quiguil [the portion of the sea shore in Quiguil]” (SAN-B 305), “Mar de Quiguil [the sea shore of Quiguil]” (SAN-B 575), and “Ranchería del Mar de Quiguil [the ranchería of the sea shore of Quiguil]” (SAN-B 1087).

Specific coastal villages of the Quiguil group include the following:

**Zmaal (Etsmal)** – Zmaal, also commonly spelled Etsmal, was listed 19 times in the Mission San Antonio registers. It was probably the largest Quiguil town. References include "Esmal, alias de Sn Buenaventura, situada en La Playa por el rumbo NorNorueste [Esmal, alias San Buenaventura, situated on the beach on a course to the north-northwest]” (SAN-M 3), “Etsmal en el Mar [Etsmal at the sea shore]” (SAN-B 377), “Zémal asia la Playa [Zémal near the beach]” (SAN-B 472), “Etsmal asia la playa [Etsmal near the beach]” (SAN-B 1974), “Zmaal al rumbo del Noroeste [Zmaal on a course to the northwest]” (SAN-B 2246), “de la rancheria Zmal, en la Plaia, hacia el norte [the village of Zmal, at the beach, toward the north]” (SAN-B 2443), “de la playa rumbo del carmelo de la rancheria Zmal [at the beach on a course for Carmel, of the village of Zmal]” (SAN-B 2483), “en la rancheria de Stmal [at the village of Stmal]” (SAN-B 2617), “Etsmal a la playa del noroeste [Etsmal at the beach of the northwest]” (SAN-B 2822), and others. We do not know the specific location of this important coastal village, but suggest that it might have been in proximity to lower Big Creek, the largest watercourse in the Lopez Point region. Alternatively, it may have been in the vicinity of the modern town of Lucia.20

**Tejacalem** – One Quiguil family member came from “Tejacalem acia la playa [Tejacalem near the beach]” (SAN-B 466). Its specific location is unknown.

Inland villages of the Quiguil district included the following:

**Squem** – The major inland village of Quiguil seems to have been Squem. People came to the mission from “la rancheria llamada Squem como 4 leguas de esta misión, por la parte de Quiguil, que es acia el norte [the village called Squem about four leagues (10 miles) from this mission by that part of Quiguil that lies to the north]” (SAN-D 94), “Easquem” (SAN-B 386), “la Rancheria Sque-m” (SAN-B 2184), and “Ezquen” (SAN-B 2619). This is probably the same place as Sk’eyem, recorded by Harrington at the old Merle Ranch, where the San Antonio River comes out of the mountains into the flats south of “The Indians” (Rivers and Jones 1993:152).

**Scamá** – A place called Scamá was mentioned twice, once as “Scama, alias de Maria Santisima, que es situada en las orillas del rio que pasa por esa cañada rumbo nororueste [Scama, alias María Santísima, 20 A completely different village of Etsmal existed in the Bradley vicinity, just a few miles north of Mission San Miguel. Kinship pattern analysis makes it absolutely clear that the two villages were separate places. The inland Etsmal ranchería near Mission San Miguel is discussed in detail in the Cholame Hills section of Chapter 8.
which is situated on the banks of the river that passes through that canyon to the north-northwest)” (SAN-M 5), the other as “la Ranchería Escamá” [the ranchería of Escamá]” (SAN-B 110). This is probably the same place as Tcamák, recorded by Harrington about 1.5 miles north of the old Merle Ranch and about 2.5 miles southeast of “The Indians” (Rivers and Jones 1993:152).

**Chitazama and Chitacaou** – The villages “Chita Zama de Quiguilit [Chita Zama of Quiguilit]” (SAN-B 911) and “Chitacaou de Quiguil [Chitacaou of Quiguil]” (SAN-B 1128) cannot be specifically located within the district. Note that a village with a similar name, Chitama, existed just south of Lamaca in the Piedras Blancas region.

**Cogy** – A ranchería called Cogy was mentioned once in the San Antonio Baptismal Register (SAN-B 342) for a member of the Marnes family. Another member of that family was said to be from “el Mar [the sea shore]” (SAN-B 637). Consultants to Harrington (in Rivers and Jones 1993:152) noted a spiritual rock called Koy-e in the upper San Antonio River watershed near “The Indians,” with which the ranchería name Cogy may have been associated.

Documented Quiguil out-marriages were preponderantly with people from Quinau further east. Quiguil people also had marriage connections to Lamaca, Lima, and Esselen-speaking groups to the north. A small number of Quiguil people went to Mission Soledad after 1792 with relatives from Esselen-speaking groups of the Arroyo Seco drainage and coast west of that drainage (Milliken 1990:27-51).

Finally, some Quiguil district people were themselves Esselen-speakers, as noted by a baptismal entry for one person “de Quiguil, y de distinta nación [of Quiguil and of a distinct nation]” (SAN-B 837) and another for a person “de Quiguil de la nación Tesmaymanil” [of Quiguil of the Tesmaymanil nation] (SAN-B 1324). Tesmaymanil was a designation at Mission San Antonio for the Esselen-speaking district in the Salinas River Valley just north of King City, a district that the missionaries also called “El Pino.” Occasionally the missionaries used the term Tesmaymanil to refer to all members of the Esselen “nation” or language group. We infer that the two entries referring to members of the distinct Tesmaymanil nation in Quiguil were written to suggest that the Esselen-speakers were not typical members of the Salinan-speaking district.

**WILLOW CREEK REGION**

The Willow Creek region includes westward-flowing Willow and San Carpoforo creeks, as well as upland areas in the Sycamore Springs and old San Miguelito land grant vicinities, predominately in what is now south coastal Monterey County. Along the coast it extends from Wild Cattle Creek south to Ragged Point in San Luis Obispo County. The land is a mix of coastal terrace, rugged mountains, and upland flats. Rainfall averages a relatively high 26 inches. Coastal San Carpoforo Creek and Willow Creek carry large amounts of water, and permanent portions of the upper Nacimiento River run through the eastern portion of the region. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 280 people for the region, and a baptized adult population of ±133 (see Table 10).

We assign 138 people from the Mission San Antonio registers to the Willow Creek region, all associated with the native multi-village Lamaca district, identified by the baptismal entry for a person from “una de las rancherías de Lamaca” (SAN-B 274, Appendix E, Figures E-8-15). Our total assigned population for the region is 142, including another four Lamaca people identified in the Mission San Miguel Baptismal Registers. Most baptisms occurred between 1773 and 1786 (see Table 12). Half of the adults we assign to the region were baptized by August of 1781.

The 142 people we associate with the Willow Creek region are nine more than the 133 people predicted by our population distribution model. Remember, however, there ended up being nine fewer people than expected in the neighboring Lopez Point region to the north. Thus, we suggest that Lamaca district reached north into the arbitrary Lopez Point region in the Mill Creek drainage west of Chalk Peak.
Two important inland Lamaca villages can be placed generally on or near the upper Nacimiento River:

**Chuquilim** – Chuquilim was about five miles southwest of Mission San Antonio. Entries mention “Chuquilim, alias de S. Alexos, situado como dos leguas de la Mission en el valle de San Alexos, rumbo el Sueste [Chuquilim, alias San Alexos, situated about two leagues (five miles) from the mission in the valley of San Alexos, toward the southwest]” (SAN-M 2), “Chuquilim al poniente [Chuquilim to the west]” (SAN-B 2949), and “Ranchería llamada Chuquilim encima del Rancho acia el Poniente [ranchería called Chuquilim above “The Ranch” toward the west]” (SAN-B 2233). Numerous kinship network charts show specific nuclear families with members from Chuquilim and Lamaca, but only one mission register entry explicitly ties Chuquilim to Lamaca. An older woman was baptized “en la ranchería de Chuquil en Lamaca... natural de Quiguilit [in the ranchería of Chuquilim in Lamaca... a native of Quiguil]” (SAN-B 500).

**Onet** – The other large inland village was Onet, probably in the Piojo land grant vicinity. Detailed entries include “Monet en Lamaca” (SAN-B 358), “Onet en Lamaca” (SAN-B 464), “del rancho de esta Mission de la ranchería llamada Onét [of the ranch of this mission of the ranchería called Onet]” (SAN-B 2413), and “el rancho del ganado de la ranchería llamada Onet [the livestock ranch of the ranchería called Onet]” (SAN-B 2501). Mission San Miguel was the site, in 1811, of the last Onet baptism, a woman from “Monet” who was married to a man from the east Coast Range ranchería of Sulaltap (SMI-B 1554, SMI-M 435).

Lamaca also had coastal villages. The two important ones seem to have been Zatepquex and Mosjuelat. Information about them is limited to the following:

**Zatepquex** – The earlier named of the two frequently mentioned Lamaca coastal villages, Zatepquex is associated with Chuquilim on some family kinship charts. We infer that it was west of Chuquilim, probably on lower Prewitt Creek or Willow Creek. Baptismal entries refer to “Zatepquex cerca del Mar [Zatepquex near the sea shore]” (SAN-B 286), “Zetepquex cerca de la playa [Zatepquex near the beach]” (SAN-B 463), and “Zatepquex en la Playa [Zatepquex at the beach]” (SAN-B 3036).

**Mosjuelet** – Mosjuelet, also frequently mentioned in the baptismal register, is associated with Onet on family kinship charts. It was probably south of Zatepquex, therefore, in the Salmon Creek vicinity near the present Monterey-San Luis Obispo County border. Mosjuelet’s people were said to be from “Mosjuélet en la orilla del mar [Mosjuélet at the sea shore]” (SAN-B 442), “de la playa de la Ranchería llamada Mosjuelet [of the beach of the ranchería called Mosjuelet]” (SAN-B 2334), “Mosjuelet rumbo del sudoeste [Mosjuelet in a southwesterly direction]” (SAN-B 2577), “Moslijuélet asia la playa [Mosjuélet near the beach]” (SAN-B 2581), and “Moslijuélet en la cercanía del Mar [Mosjuélit in the vicinity of the beach]” (SAN-B 2585).

Another three people were baptized from “la ranchería llamada Zimoupáco Mozziúal asia la playa [the ranchería called Zimoupáco Mozziúal near the beach],” all by Father Sitjar in October of 1776 (SAN-B 474-476). Among the three was a Lamaca headman named Zauy, whose parents were from Onet (SAN-B 474). Zauy’s reconstructed family chart shows that he had three co-wives and seven baptized children. One child’s baptismal entry read “hija de PP.s [padres] gentiles, cuyo Padre es conocido por el Nombre de Zauy, y por otro nombre el Capitan Coxo, es natural dicha muchacha de la ranchería llamada Chuquilim [daughter of non-Christian parents, whose father is known by the name Zauy, and by the other name of Captain Coxo (Cripple); this girl is a native of the ranchería called Chuquilim]” (SAN-B 180).

In addition to the specific coastal references, some Lamaca people were merely stated to have been “from the coast.” One person was explicitly stated to be from the “Mar del Lamaca [coast of Lamaca]” (SAN-B 576), another from the “Mar en Lamaca [coast in Lamaca]” (SAN-B 1396). Other individuals from the “ranchería del Mar” (SAN-B 1060), “las orillas del Mar [the shore of the sea]” (SAN-B 615, 629, 740), “la Playa [the beach]” (SAN-B 1287), and “la costa del Mar [the sea coast]” (SAN-B 1789) were members of nuclear families otherwise identified with Lamaca.
Six Lamaca villages or temporary camps mentioned in the San Antonio registers cannot be even generally attributed to coast or upland vicinities:

Islay and Lechamtnil – The rancherías called Islay and Lechamtnil were both mentioned only once in mission registers. On May 1, 1773 Margarita de Cortona, a young mother of two, was baptized by Father Pieras, who did not note her home ranchería. Her mother and grandmother were baptized two weeks later, at which time they were said to be from “Islay, alias San Juan Bautista.” At her marriage to Spanish soldier Juan Maria Ruiz, Margarita de Cortona was said to be from “Lechamtnil, alias de San Francisco Solano situada en las riberas del Mar, por el camino de Lamaca [... situated on the streams of the coast, on the Lamaca road]” (SAN-M 7). Since all lands west of Mission San Antonio were within Lamaca, Lechamtnil on the “Lamaca road” was certainly within the district. But it is impossible to locate either Lechamtnil or Islay specifically.21

Maliti, Quixtauay, Silacomap, and Zichuacho Col – A woman from “Maliti” had one daughter from “Silacomap,” alias “Tila comap,” another daughter from “Qui’tauay en Lamaca,” a son from the inland Quinau district, and another son from Tetchoya in the inland Lima district. That woman was said to have died at “Zichulacho Col en el río de Chuquilim en Lamaca [Zichulacho Col on the river of Chuquilim in Lamaca]” (SAN-D 91). She had been baptized together with an older woman from Maliti who later died “en el Mar” (SAN-B 137, SAN-D 187). The first-cited woman’s husband was baptized “en Lamaca” and both her parents died “en Lamaca” (SAN-B 248, SAN-D 69, 91).

Most Lamaca district out-marriages were to people from neighboring Quiguil, Quinau, and Lima districts. As noted in the section regarding Onet, one Lamaca woman was married to a Sulaltap man from our Pyramid Hills region of the eastern Coast Ranges.

Our ranchería assignments in the Willow Creek region are different in two important cases from Gibson’s (1983:180) assignments. Like us, he placed Chuquilim, Mosjuelet, and Onet within the region. However, he placed two additional rancherías in this region that were probably located further south—Chal and Tsetacol. He placed Chal in the Pacific Valley vicinity, west of Chuquilim; we place Chal in the Piedras Blancas Point region. He placed the large ranchería of Tsetacol just north of Ragged Point, while we tentatively place it much further south in our Estero Point region (see discussion below).

PIEDRAS BLANCAS REGION

Our Piedras Blancas region includes the coast from Arroyo de los Chinos Creek on the north to the ridge between San Simeon and Santa Rosa creeks on the south. It reaches eastward into the interior as far as the watersheds of Little Burnett Creek, Tobacco Creek, and a small portion of the Nacimiento River. Like the Willow Creek region to the north, this is a well-watered area with large streams and extensive oak groves. It has more open coastal terraces and valleys than the Willow Creek region, but fewer areas of open upland valleys. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 300 people in this region, with a baptized adult population of ±128 people (see Table 10).

We have been able to identify only 117 adults who probably went to the missions from the Piedras Blancas region, on the basis of inter-marriage networks, relative time of baptism, and degree to which their members appeared at one or more mission. The largest numbers, 68 people, went to Mission San Miguel from the coastal Tissimasu area, the inland Cazz (alias Recodo) area, and from the undifferentiated “Mar [sea shore or coast].” Another 46 adults went to Mission San Antonio from coastal Chaal, Chitama, Esmerileua, and Tey, as well as inland Chapeuex. Only three adults from this region seem to have been baptized at

21 Islay is the Salinan word for the fruit of the holly-leaf cherry [Prunus ilicifolia Nutt.]. The term was incorporated into California Spanish before 1775 (see Fages 1937:59). It has subsequently been applied to landmarks through much of the plant’s range. For instance, it appears as “Islay Creek” and “Islay Hill” in the San Luis Obispo vicinity. Far to the north, in San Francisco, “Islais Creek” has been buried by Interstate Highway 280.
Mission San Luis Obispo, all from Tissimasu. The southern and inland portions of this region may also have been utilized by Tsetacol people, whose key villages were along Santa Rosa Creek just to the south in the Estero Point Region. Most of the people of the Piedras Blancas region were baptized between 1799 and 1804 (see Table 12). Half of the adults assigned to the region were baptized by October 1802.

Some shift in political organization may have occurred between the Willow Creek and Piedras Blancas regions, or at least a change in group labeling. There is no evidence that any of the Piedras Blancas region rancherías, other than Chitama in the north, were parts of multi-village districts such as Lamaca and Quiguil further north.

Gibson (1983:165, 169, 170, 180) counted the people of Cazz, Zay (Tey), Tissimasu, and “Miscellaneous of the Coast” (recorded as Playanos [beach people] at Mission San Miguel) in his table of coastal peoples, as we do. However, we assign these village groups to different vicinities along the coast. We place Pachac in the Nacimiento region further east, and map Cazz where Gibson mapped Pachac. Coastal rancherías in the Piedras Blancas region, as we tentatively place them from north to south, were the following:

**Chitama** – Only four people were identified from Chitama, three at Mission San Antonio (Appendix E, Figure E-16) and one at Mission San Miguel (SMI-B 1405). The first was a man baptized in 1774 “*de la ranchería llamada Chitama cerca del mar en el camino viejo de la expedición* [of the ranchería called Chitama near the sea shore on the old road of the expedition]” (SAN-B 166). In 1782 a sick man was baptized “*en las orillas del mar en la ranchería llamada E’chitama* [at the edge of the sea in the ranchería called E’chitama]” (SAN-B 864). Finally, in 1796 a woman was baptized “*en la Playa en la Ranchería llamada Chetama* [at the beach in the ranchería called Chetama]” (SAN-B 864). From these entries, it is clear that Chitama was a village at or just south of San Carpoforo Creek, since the “old road of the expedition,” presumably the Portolá expedition, went inland at that point. Identifiable relatives of the three Chitama adults baptized at San Antonio were from Lamaca, and the San Miguel baptism makes it clear that it was part of the Lamaca district. Thus the area at the mouth of San Carpoforo Creek, just within the Piedras Blancas region, must be considered the southern edge of the Lamaca district.

**Chaal** – Chaal was the earliest ranchería in the region to send numerous people to a mission; it appears in Mission San Antonio records from 1773 to 1804, predominately in the 1790s (Appendix E, Figure E-16, 17, 18). Register entries include “*Chal, del Mar*” (SAN-B 105), “*Cháal en la playa*” (SAN-B 389), and “*Cháal junto de la Playa*” (SAN-B 2267). It is assumed that “*Qué’chaa’l en orillas del mar*” is the same place (SAN-B 423, SAN-D 161). The coastal ranchería of Chaal may have been a village on the open flat at Piedras Blancas Point or in the valley of Arroyo de la Cruz behind that flat. Alternatively, Chaal may have been a small, multi-village district. Chaal families had two affinal ties to Quiguil, which may be the reason that Gibson (1983:180) mapped it in the Willow Creek region. Chaal also had affinal ties with nearby Esmerileua. Marriages between Chaal people at San Antonio and Cazz people at San Miguel were expected but have not been discovered.22

**Esmerileua** – Esmerileua sent people to Mission San Antonio between 1799 and 1803 (Appendix E, Figure E-18). It is recorded with details as “*en la playa en la ranchería llamada Esmerileuau* [at the beach in the ranchería called Esmerileuau]” in 1800 (SAN-B 2522), “*Esimililiga en la cercanía del Mar* [Esimililiga in the vicinity of the sea shore]” in 1801 (SAN-B 2584), and “*Esmerileua rumbo de Oueste* [Esmerileua toward the west]” in 1802 (SAN-B 2661). We speculate that the village may have been at the present-day town of San Simeon or a small distance inland from that town.

---

22 Confusion arises when one examines Chaal’s possible ties to Mission San Miguel, because six people were baptized at San Miguel from an inland place called Chal, which one priest documented as “*la ranchería llamada Chal, como 3 leguas distante de esta Mision de S. Miguel*” (SMI-B 58). Kinship charts indicate that the inland Chal was synonymous with or adjacent to Caunpej Esmac just north of the present town of Bradley (see the Sargent Canyon region discussion in Chapter 7).
Tay – Tay was the last coastal village in the Piedras Blancas area to send people to the missions. The ranchería was first recorded at Mission San Miguel in 1803 (Appendix E, Figure E-22). One entry reads “de la playa del parage Etay [from the beach at the place called Etay]” (SMI-B 985), while others of nuclear families are entered merely “de Tay [from Tay]” (SMI-B 1021, 1032) or the “Playa [Beach]” (SMI-B 827, 872, 986). Additionally, Tay appears in two Mission San Antonio baptismal records; a sick person was baptized “en la ranchería llamada Te y, asía la Playa [in the ranchería called Tay near the beach]” in 1777 (SAN-B 462), and a man from “Emtay en la Playa [Emtay at the beach]” was baptized at San Antonio in 1804 (SAN-B 2941). Tay, listed later than Chal, and earlier than the Cambria vicinity rancherías, is the most likely village to have been located on Pico Creek or San Simeon Creek, at the southern end of the Piedras Blancas region.

The final placename relevant to the coast, Tissimasu, may have referred to cardinal direction rather than a village:

Tissimasu – Fifteen people went to the missions from Tissimasu, twelve to Mission San Miguel, and three to Mission San Luis Obispo (Appendix E, Figure E-22). This vicinity was north of Cambria, as indicated by a baptismal entry at Mission San Luis Obispo in 1804 which reads “Tichimachu mas alla del Pinal [Tichimachu far beyond The Pine Grove]” (SLO-B 2061). Only one Mission San Miguel register entry elaborates; it refers to “Tissimasu, o de la Playa [Tissimasu, or from the Beach]” (SMI-B 967). Other versions of the name are “Chisimasu” (SMI-1167, 1168), “Chipimaso” (SMI-B 1256), and “Tichimachu” (SMI-B 1904). María de los Angeles told Harrington, “Playa o tissimasu – Mla tecema[-’:]co – knows it well. Plcn in la orilla. Thinks it is Rancho de Don Santos Beronda” (recorded by Steve Craig at the Smithsonian Institution from Harrington’s Mission Register Placename Notes, Box 2, folder 4, before the notes were microfilmed). Tissimasu appears to be related to the Northern Chumash word for “northerners,” since Rosario Cooper stated that “Tisimā = norte” (Harrington 1986:Reel 1, Frame 68).

Two inland villages in the Piedras Blancas region have been provisionally located. They are the following:

Cazz – The rancherías of Cazz and El Recodo [The River Bend] at Mission San Miguel were either very close to one another, or were synonyms for a single place. People from those places were also inter-married with people from the La Playa and El Nacimiento. Cazz was listed as the home of 14 people baptized at Mission San Miguel between April 1798 and November 1803. Another 24 Mission San Miguel baptismal entries listed El Recodo alone, between September 1798 and July 1806. A single early entry by Father Martín referred to “Cazz Recodo [Cazz - River Bend]” in the margin (SMI-B 190). However, on March 22, 1803, Martín baptized a cluster of inter-married adults, listing four of them from the Playa, three from Recodo, two from Cazz, and two from Nacimiento (SMI-B 860-870). Years later, in 1806, Father Pedro Muñoz baptized a man “del Nacimiento y Playa, y ranchería llamada Case [of the Nacimiento and the shore, and of the ranchería called Case]” (Luis María Gil, SMI-B 1315 – Appendix E, Figure E-21). Of 81 persons baptized from Nacimiento at Mission San Miguel, 30 belonged to extended families clearly associated with Cazz or Recodo (Appendix E, Figures E-19, 20, 21, for examples). We suggest that Recodo [The River Bend] was along the Nacimiento River where it turns from a southeasterly direction to an easterly direction, in the rugged lands west of present-day Nacimiento Reservoir. Cazz may or may not have been the same place, but it was certainly in the same general vicinity.

Chapeuex – Three people baptized at Mission San Antonio over a very long time span were said to be from a village called Chapeuex (“en Zacouex” [SAN-B 901] in 1783; “de Chepenix hacia el sur” [SAN-B 2439] in 1799; “de Chape-eúx” [SAN-B 3193] in 1805; Appendix E, Figure E-24). This seems to be the place that Harrington’s consultants remembered as having been near Bryson, a post office location just east of the Nacimiento River. “Sapéwes a place below San Antonio. Means fire is put out” (Pacificco and Juan Solano), “Cepéwec, place in El Pleito” (María de los Angeles), “Cepéwec = Bryson Post Office” (Dave Mora; all in Harrington 1985: Reel 87, Frame 816). The Bryson location is in the easternmost portion of our Piedras Blancas region.
Two other villages within the Piedras Blancas region cannot be located at all. They include:

**Kepexau** – Kepexau, mentioned just twice in San Miguel records: “de Nacimiento... en Quepesau” (SMI-B 394) and “Caach de Kepexau” (SMI-B 615). It could be another spelling for Chapeuex in the Bryson area.

**Met** – All three Met baptisms occurred at Mission San Antonio. Entries include “Miet” (SAN-B304) in 1775; “de las inmediaciones de la Playa al rumbo del Sur... [of the vicinity of the beach in a direction to the south...]'” in 1799 (SAN-B 2416); “murió en la rancharía llamada Mit [died in the ranchería called Met]” (SAN-D 1232); “de Mèt asi a la Playa [of Met towards the beach]” in 1805 (SAN-B 3069). Note that they were distributed over a great time period.

Out-marriages of villagers of the Piedras Blancas region were with people from the Lamaca district villages to the north, the Tsetacol villages to the south, and with the villages of the Lima and Janulo districts to the east, as would be expected. A very interesting long-distance marriage was renewed at Mission San Antonio in August of 1806 between Ysidro Zicol of Cazz on the Nacimiento River and Justina of Lehuege in the mountains west of Paso Robles (Appendix E, Figure E-24).

We are surprised that we have not found marriages between Cazz people at San Miguel and coastal Chaal or Esmerileua people at Mission San Antonio. Marriage links among people labeled “Nacimiento,” “La Playa,” and “Playano” at Mission San Miguel could be masking links between coastal and inland people of the Piedras Blancas region.

**ESTERO POINT REGION**

The Estero Point region includes the coast from Santa Rosa Creek (Cambria vicinity) on the north to the Old Creek watershed (southeast of Cayucos) on the south. Inland it reaches into the mountains at Cienaga Creek and Cypress Mountain, but not quite to Las Tablas Creek. This region receives 26 inches of rainfall in an average year, the same as the Willow Creek region to the north. Its major watersheds, Santa Rosa Creek and Villa Creek, are larger than those on the coast to the north. Its terrain is a mix of open coastal terrace, gentle hills, and rugged mountains—somewhat more gentle than regions further north. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 280 people and a baptized adult population of ±119 people (see Table 10).

We identified 132 baptized adults from the Estero Point region. People from this area went to all three missions, but not in an expected or predictable pattern. In fact, Estero Point region missionization did not follow the typical “concentric circle” outreach pattern. The largest number of people from the region traveled far to the north to Mission San Antonio, where they first appeared in 1773 under the ranchería name Zassalet and later, during the 1803-1805 period, under the ranchería name Tsetacol. Another 38 adults were baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo from Setjala, Stjahuayo, and Pinal rancherías. A small number of adults (15) were baptized at San Miguel as Nacimiento and Stjahuayo people (see Table 1). The Estero Point people went to the three missions from 1773 to 1806. It was not until October 1803 that half of the adults were baptized.

We agree with Gibson (1983:165) that Stjahuayo was in this region. We offer alternatives to his other placements. He placed Chmonimo in this region; we suggest it was in the Paso Robles region. He located Tipu in this region; we believe it was in the Santa Margarita region. Saltanel (Zoltanel), which he also

---

23 The 1827 Annual Report of Mission San Antonio mentioned construction of a 700 yard long water ditch “Se ha hecho una Zanja desde el Met, (camino para la Soledad) hasta pegado à la poza de mas arriba de esta Misio... tiene un trozo como 300 varas de largo” [A ditch was constructed from Met (on the road to Soledad) to join the pool nearest above the mission... it has a basin about 300 varas (or 855 feet) long] (Sancho and Cabot 1827). The Met of the ditch report, toward Mission Soledad and within 700 yards of Mission San Antonio’s upper Mission Creek springs, was just north of the latter mission. It cannot be the same place as the Met of San Antonio baptismal records.
placed in this region, was probably a term for Ohlone-speakers of the Chalon area, east of Soledad. Most importantly, we place Tsetacol in this region, while he placed it farther north in the Willow Creek region.

Kinship networks relative to the Estero Point region are found in Appendix E, Figures E-20, 25-36. Below we will walk through a discussion of the Estero Point placenames in the order in which they first appeared in mission records:

Steloglamo – The placename Steloglamo was used only by Father Sitjar and appeared in only six records. Four siblings from “Steloglamo” were baptized at Mission San Antonio on the same day in 1773 as the first Zassalet individuals (SAN-B 119, 124-126). In 1775 the father of the first four, Pedro Sobrevia, was baptized at San Antonio from the same ranchería (SAN-B 223); years later, in 1804, a seven-year-old granddaughter of Pedro Sobrevia was baptized at Mission San Antonio from Tsetacol. One Sobrevia family head was from Lamaca, while all others had connections with Estero Point rancherías; they had no kinship ties to Chaal or Cazz families (SAN-B 2993; Appendix E, Figure E-26). The placename Steleglamo last appeared in 1783, when Homobono Salvatierra from “Este’iclamo” was baptized at San Antonio without relatives (SAN-B 869).

Zassalet – Zassalet may be the Salinan word for Stjahuayo, alias Pinal, a ranchería discussed below. The first baptized neophyte from the Estero Point region was a 15-year-old boy from “Zassalet” (SAN-B 118); he was baptized at San Antonio in 1773, although his mother, baptized in 1776, was “natural de la Sierra acia a la costa del entre San Luis y aca; pero existente en la Ranchería llamada Monet en Lamaca [native to the mountains adjoining the coast between San Luis and here; but she lives in the ranchería called Monet in Lamaca]” (SAN-B 356; Appendix E, Figure E-25). The second person explicitly identified from the village was baptized by Mission San Antonio priests in 1782 in “Zé’asal, en el camino de San Luis por la Playa [on the road to San Luis via the beach]” (SAN-B 803); his mother and brothers were baptized at San Miguel in 1805 from “Estajuayo” (SMI-B 1281, 1286, 1287), while his father was baptized at San Antonio in 1805 from “Zazzalét asia la Playa [toward the beach]” (SAN-B 3061; Appendix E, Figure E-25). Also, an infant from “Zasale” from a Tsetacol/Stjahuayo family was baptized at San Antonio in 1805 by newly arrived Father Sancho (SAN-B 3051, 3059, 3064; Appendix E, Figure E-31). Finally, a woman from “Zasauxlaamel,” whose mother was from “Stajahuaito” was baptized at Mission San Miguel with her husband from Cazz (Appendix E, Figure E-20).

Stjahuayo and Pinal – The placename Stjahuayo appeared in 14 mission records (nine at Mission San Luis Obispo and five at Mission San Miguel) between 1788 and 1812. People from Stjahuayo were always in nuclear families with “Playano,” “Tsetacol,” and/or “Zassalet” people (see the Ceballos family, Appendix E, Figure E-25). Stjahuayo first appeared in a Mission San Luis Obispo baptism in 1788, as the variant “Tscauayo” (SLO-B 828 [no relatives apparent]). Five people from “Tcsuaiao (Fr. Giribet and Fr. Pieras),” “Estajuayo (Fr. Fernández),” and “Scauiáio (Fr. Peyri)” were baptized at San Luis Obispo during the 1790s (SLO-B 1030, 1032, 1074, 1280, 1392, 1525; Appendix E, Figure E-32). A child was baptized at San Miguel from “Las Gallinas” in 1799 whose mother was said to be from “Stajahuayo” (SMI-B 219); when later baptized, both parents were documented from Las Gallinas (SMI-B 1093, 1104). In 1801 a boy from “Stajahuayo” was baptized at Mission San Miguel (SMI-B 501). One of his sisters was baptized as a “Playano” at San Miguel in early 1803 (SMI-B 861). Another sister was baptized late in the year at San Antonio from “Tsetacol” (SAN-B 2874); that sister, it was soon reported, “ha fallecido en el Pinal de la Playa acia San Luis [has died at The Pine Grove at the beach toward San Luis]” (SAN-D 1643). Still another sister was baptized from “Tasale” at Mission San Antonio in 1805 (SAN-B 3051). The father of the family, Pompeyo Espuy of “Zepjato-elka acia la Playa [toward the beach]” was the last adult male ever baptized from the

---

24 Gibson (1983) considered Sataoyo and Stjahuayo to be synonyms for a single coastal group. Farris (2000:138) proved that Sataoyo was a completely different place in the Paso Robles region.
Estero Point region (SAN-B 3264; Appendix E, Figure E-31). Seven people were baptized at San Luis Obispo from Stajhuayo or El Pinal in 1803-1804. One of them was a woman married into a Chmimu family of the Morro Bay region who was said to be from “Estajauayyo acia el Pinal [toward The Pine Grove]” in 1804 (SLO-B 2052, Fr. Luis Martín; Appendix E, Figure E-33). Another was a man from El Pinal who was the patriarch of a Chmimu family of the Morro Bay region (SLO-B 2063, Fr. Ciprés; Appendix E, Figure E-32). The last person baptized from “Stajahuyoo,” in 1812, was the mother of the woman from Zaasaltaamel, “en el rancho de S. Simeon” (SMI-B 1609, Fr. Martín; Appendix E, Figure E-20).

Zizayho Zixja – Five people were baptized from Zizayho Zisja at Mission San Antonio between 1793 and 1799. The first was Monica from “Zitchayte’xja a la parte del Sur,” who married widower Ciriaco Sobrevia in 1793 (SAN-B 1955; Appendix E, Figure E-26). Next, in 1797, was another woman named Monica and her two sons, from “de la playa acia el Sur de la Ranchería llamada Zisayo Zixjá [of the beach toward the south, of the ranchería called Zizayho Zixjá]” (SAN-B 2214-2216; Appendix E, Figure E-26). Finally, in 1799, a person was baptized from “Zichariozisja en la playa [at the beach]” (SAN-B 2369). Six of ten people directly or indirectly identified with this place were members of the Sobrevia family, a family that otherwise came from Steloglamo.

Escon – Three people with affinal relations to Tsetacol were baptized from Escon. The first was a man baptized in 1799 from “la ranchería Exzasomur rumbo del Sur acia la Playa [in a southerly direction near the beach]” (SAN-B 2375). The second was a child baptized in 1803 “nacida en la Ranchería de Escon en la Playa al Sur [born in the ranchería of Escon on the beach to the south]” (SAN-B 2743) whose mother was baptized as part of a Nacimiento family at San Miguel (SMI-B 1091) and whose father was an unbaptized man named Escon. The final one was a brother of the aforementioned child’s mother, baptized in 1804, “natural de Escón ranchería de la playa [native of Escón ranchería at the beach]” (SAN-B 2929); his mother and nephews were from Tsetacol (SAN-B 2749, 2750, 2953; Appendix E, Figure E-25).

Tsetacol – Variants of the specific placename Tsetacol were used at all three missions between 1799 and 1805, for 69 baptismal entries in all. The first explicit Tsetacol baptismal entry took place at Mission San Luis Obispo in 1799, when a boy was baptized from “Estacotocol;” his mother was from Tuaya on the Nacimiento River (SLO-B 1525, 1398; Appendix E, Figure E-32). The next entry for Tsetacol was recorded by Father Ciprés, in the Mission San Antonio Baptismal Register on January of 1802, for a sick young man who had been baptized “en la Playa en el parage llamado Timeo quilichu... natural de la ranchería llamada thetacol [at the beach in the vicinity called Timeo quilichu... native of the ranchería called Thtacol].” Two children baptized at San Miguel in February of 1803, one from “Nacimiento” (SMI-B 813; Appendix E, Figure E-30) and another from “la Playa” (SMI-B 814) had Tsetacol parents (SAN-B 2933, SMI-B 829; SMI-B 866; SMI-B 827). Various versions of the placename that appeared in 1803 records with additional information included “Tsacol en la Playa al Sur [at the beach to the south]” (SAN-B 2749), “Chetacol... Playano” (SMI-B 854), “Tsetacol en la Playa al Sur” (SAN-B 2751), and “Zetacol rumbo del sur acia la playa [in a southerly direction toward the beach]” (SAN-B 2756); for these and other examples, see Appendix E, Figure E-27. Similar entries continued in 1804, including “de la playa de la ranchería Tsetacol [from the beach of Tsetacol ranchería]” (SAN-B 2926), and “Tsetaqcol en la playa azia el Sur [Tsetaqcol at the beach

---

25 Harrington (1985:Reel 85, Frame 344) recorded a word for the pines of the Cambria vicinity from Salinan consultant Pacifico Gallego: “Pqésanel is a kind of pine of which there is much at Santa Rosa and Cambria.” Rehearing the word from María de los Angeles Baylon years later, Harrington (in Craig, n.d.) wrote, “páxe’sa-nel, Cambria Pine.”

26 Ten years earlier, in 1789, a man named “Ze’ tacol” was baptized at Mission San Antonio. Said to be from “Ranchería del Mar,” he had been married since pre-mission times to an inland Quinau district woman (SAN-B 1419, SAN-C [Confirmation] 830; Appendix E, Figure E-27).
toward the south)” (SAN-B 2964; Appendix E, Figure E-29). Variants of Tsetacol were listed three times in 1805 by newly arrived missionary Pedro Cabot at Mission San Antonio; they were parts of families that other priests linked to “Zoaacu Zey,” perhaps Chotcagua in the Morro Bay region (SAN-B 3062, 3067, 3068, 3073, 3077; Appendix E, Figure E-29).

Setjala – We suggest that the placename Setjala at San Luis Obispo is equivalent to Tsetacol at missions San Antonio and San Miguel. Time of baptism for the 33 people from Setjala at Mission San Luis Obispo was split, with some baptisms in the 1773-1779 period, the preponderance in the 1803-1805 period (Appendix E, Figures E-33-37). An important Mission San Luis Obispo Death Register entry places Setjala about 20 miles up the coast from the mission; “en la rancheria llamada Chedcala como ocho leguas distante de la mission murio una Christiana llamada Candida... y en la rancheria llamada Chotcagua la enteraron [in the ranchería named Chedcala some eight leagues from the mission a Christian named Candida died... and in the ranchería called Chotcagua they buried her]” (SLO-D 176; Appendix E, Figure E-34). The general distance of eight leagues (20 miles) north of San Luis Obispo would place Setjala on Cayucos Creek. Setjala had numerous family ties with Chano, Chotcagua, and Chmimu. Setjala family connections have been documented to El Pinal up the coast, to Lehuege further inland, to Tsquieu in the Point Buchon region, and to all of the Morro Bay region rancherías (Appendix E, Figures 33-37).

Selected Estero Point kinship connections to surrounding areas have been discussed on a village-by-village basis. In sum, Estero Point region people had family ties to all surrounding areas.

It is impossible at this time to specify the relative locations of rancherías that we believe to have been within the Estero Point region. Steleglamo was an early term at Mission San Antonio for the area or village within it. Stjahauyo, Zasselat, and El Pinal all certainly refer to the Cambria area. Setjala was said to be about 20 miles north of San Luis Obispo in the Cayucos area. The placename Tsetacol of Mission San Antonio records (Estacotocol at Mission San Luis Obispo) may have referred to the village at The Pine Grove near Cambria. Alternatively, it may be a cover term for all of the small hamlets in and near Santa Rosa Creek, as well as eastward over the Santa Lucía Range crest in the Las Tablas Creek watershed.

MORRO BAY REGION

The Morro Bay region extends along the coast from Toro Creek on the north, through Morro Bay to Islay Creek, just short of Point Buchon, on the south. Inland it includes the valleys of Toro Creek, Morro Creek, Chorro Creek, and Los Osos Creek, to the crest of the Santa Lucía Mountains. Rainfall is lower than in coastal regions further north, but higher than any inland region, averaging 22 inches. Stream catchments are small, yet year-round surface water is plentiful. Vegetation is mixed grassland and oak woodland, like the other coastal regions, but the landscape is much more gentle than further north. We suggest a pre-mission population of 280 people in the region, with a baptized adult population of ±126 people.

The Morro Bay region was the first region in the Mission San Luis Obispo outreach area to send half its baptized adults to the mission, although adults from the region went to the mission in very small groups over the long period from 1773 to 1805. We have identified 121 baptized adults that we believe came from the Morro Bay region, including 107 baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo, 13 baptized at Mission San Antonio, and one person baptized at Mission San Miguel. Of the villages that we assign to this region, Chano, Chmimu, Chotcagua, Guejetmimu, and Petpatsu, only the ranchería of Chotcagua in the vicinity of Morro Rock can be assigned with confidence to a particular local area within the region. People baptized at San Miguel from Szajuc (only one adult) and people baptized at San Antonio from the Ranchería del Mar de San Luis, Zartama, and Zoaacu Zey are thought to have come from this region.

Gibson (1983:169-170) placed only one ranchería, Chotcagua, within the land area of the Morro Bay region. McLendon and Johnson (1999) placed Chotcagua (Chitqawi’), Guejetmimu (Wexetmimu’), Petpatsu, and Scitse (Tsiqsitye) in this region, and placed Chano in the Point Buchon region to the south. In this study, we tentatively identify Scitse with the Sososquiquia ranchería of the Paso Robles region.
The Morro Bay region rancherías are discussed below in the order in which their occupants went to the various missions, as follows:

**Guejetmimu** – The small village of Guejetmimu was somewhere very close to Mission San Luis Obispo. It supplied only six converts, five in 1774. Evidence in later mission baptismal entries suggests that Guejetmimu was commonly visited and well known, despite the small number of neophytes from it. Fr. Cavaller baptized an adult woman at “Guajetmimu” the day after he performed a baptism at Gmosmu in 1787 (SLO-B 744). Then comes evidence that Christian Indians were living and working at the village during the early 1790s; three Christian children were baptized at “Guejetmimu” by Fr. Giribet in 1790-1791 (SLO-B 885, 898, 989). Finally, in 1792, an older woman “de Gmosmu” was baptized “en Lhuegetmimu” in 1792 (by Fr. Tapis; SLO-B 1115). The only identifiable pre-mission Guejetmimu marriage was to a person from Sepjato in the San Luis Obispo Bay region. Other clues about Guejetmimu’s regional links derive from contradictory ranchería assignments in the baptismal and confirmation records of two individuals (SLO-B 45 – Guejetmimu and Chano; SLO-B 298 – Guejetmimu and Gmosmu). There is little basis for any specific placement of this town on a map. The map in McLendon and Johnson (1999) places this small village 15 kilometers north of Pismo Beach, in valley lands just south of Mission San Luis Obispo. Alternatively, it might also have been just north of San Luis Obispo, along the road over the Cuesta Grade to Santa Margarita.

**Chano** – Chano was the first major village to send a significant number of people to Mission San Luis Obispo; by the end of 1776, 29 of its eventual 57 converts (35 adults) had moved to that mission (Appendix E, Figures E-34, 35, 38-40). Miguel Robles (SLO-B 25) of Chano was identified as a godparent and “Capitán de la Ranchería de dicha mission” in a 1777 baptism (SLO-B 120; Appendix E, Figure E-38). These bits of evidence suggest that it was the closest major village to the mission. However, in 1792 Fr. Giribet baptized a young man “natural de la Ranch, de Chano, sita cerca de la Ranch, de Scahuayo [native of the ranchería of Chano, located near the ranchería of Scahuayo]” (SLO-B 1098; Appendix E, Figure E-40), providing what would appear to be convincing evidence that Chano was up the coast from Mission San Luis Obispo, probably in the Estero Point region. Later Mission-period references mention that the “Campamento de Chano” was the principal landing for ships that traded with Mission San Luis Obispo (Luis Martínez 1815-1825). Of 12 identified pre-mission Chano out-marriages, three were to other Morro Bay region rancherías, two each were to Gmosmu in the inland Garcia Mountain region, two were to Sepjato in the San Luis Obispo Bay region, two were to Tsquieu in the Point Buchon region, and one each were to Chliquin in the San Luis Obispo Bay region and the southern rancherías of Ajuaps and Stemectatimi. After discussing all of this evidence, the two authors of this report disagree regarding the probable specific location of Chano. Johnson considers it probably that it was at Cayucos in the southern part of our Estero Point region, citing Giribet’s baptismal register entry and historical evidence that an important port for San Luis Obispo was once located in the Cayucos area (Angel 1883:341; Hoover et al. 1948:304). Milliken, on the other hand, believes that the original Chano ranchería was an interior Morro Bay region village on Chorro Creek or in the Los Osos Valley. Milliken explains later references to Chano further north as an indication that the village name eventually came to be used as a cover term for Estero Bay and the shoreline as far as Estero Point.

---

27 Miller (2001:23), describing shipping trade with Mission San Luis Obispo in 1812, states that the ship Mercury anchored in the Morro Bay vicinity.

28 King (1984:1-3a) located Chano just west of Avila Beach. Gibson (1992) and McLendon and Johnson (1999) placed it on the outer coast, south of Point Buchón and west of Pecho Creek. All three authorities based their locations upon Rosario Cooper’s general statement in the early twentieth century to the effect that a place called “Ch’anu” was at a canyon west of See Canyon (Klar 1977:52; see also “Ts’anu - arroyo between Avila and J. M. Soto ranch” in Greenwood 1972:83). A placement of Chano ranchería south of
Petpatsu – Petpatsu was a small hamlet that supplied 11 adults to Mission San Luis Obispo. Its temporal pattern of baptisms was similar to Chano; more than half its converts were baptized by the end of 1776. Three people recorded from Chano at baptism were identified with Petpatsu in their confirmation records. Mission register evidence points to numerous family ties to Chano, as well as family ties to Sepjato, Chliquin, and the interior ranchería of Gmosmu. Although mission registers give no clues regarding Petpatsu’s location, it has been mapped on the coast between Avila Beach and Shell Beach by King (1984) and Gibson (1992), and on the coast further northwest at the mouth of Islay Creek by McLendon and Johnson (1999). A clue to the location of Petpatsu may be found in the name of the Mexican Period ranch Pecho y Islay which lay along the coast just south of Morro Bay. Klar (1993) notes that “pete” is the Northern Chumash word for “abalone.” The rancho’s coast, from Islay Creek to Point Buchon, includes good abalone habitat. The Spanish name Pecho may have been derived from its perceived similarity to the Northern Chumash name pete (although see discussion of Tsquieu in the Point Buchon region for another possible Chumash synonym for the Spanish word pecho). On the basis of such slender clues, Petpatsu is thought to have been a coastal hamlet in the Islay Creek vicinity.

Chotcagua – Chotcagua sent 36 people (21 adults) to Mission San Luis Obispo, over half between 1775 and 1786, the remainder through 1803. It is one of the few rancherías well located in the Mission San Luis Obispo registers. In 1778 a girl from “El Morro” was baptized (SLO-B 290); she was identified with “Chotcagua” at her confirmation (Appendix E, Figure E-36). In 1801 a boy was baptized “en la ranchería del Morro, llamado Chotcagua [in the ranchería of El Morro called Chotcagua]” (SLO-B 1643; Appendix E, Figure E-37). Chotcagua was probably the ranchería of 60 people encountered by the Portolá expedition at the north side of Morro Bay in the fall of 1769 (see Chapter 2). The word appears under a number of different spellings (Appendix E, Figures E-35-37). A similar placename “Chotosilul,” recorded for a young couple baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo by Father Lasuén in 1800, may be synonymous with Chotcagua. Chotcagua people were in kinship networks with Chmimu and Chano and also with Setjala in the Estero Point region, Sepjato in the San Luis Obispo Bay region, Gmosmu, which seems to have been in the inland García Mountain region, and Stemectatimi in the Santa María region.

Chmimu – Approximately 44 people from Chmimu were baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo, most between 1802 and 1805 (Appendix E, Figures E-33-37). The first Chmimu convert, however, was Doroteo Estrada, who renewed his marriage to Rosa of Chotcagua on the day he was baptized in 1773 (Appendix E, Figures E-35). The ranchería “Szajuc,” listed in the San Miguel Baptismal Register in 1803 as the home of the father and brothers of Graciono Sucumusu of Chmimu, could conceivably be a synonym for Chmimu (Appendix E, Figure E-23). Chmimu people had many
family ties with the other rancherías of the Morro Bay region and with Setjala in the Estero Point region. No explicit clue about its location was ever provided in any mission register entry. Its late absorption into Mission San Luis Obispo and its family ties to Setjala indicate that Chmimu was the farthest village from Mission San Luis Obispo of the five Morro Bay region rancherías. Thus we suggest that it may have been in the Toro Creek watershed at the north end of the region.

Surprisingly, 21 individuals baptized at Mission San Antonio, from places identified as the Ranchería del Mar de San Luis, Zatzama, and Zoacáu Zey seem to have come from the Morro Bay region. These tentative assignments are spurred by the expectations of the population distribution model, because the explicit evidence regarding the rancherías tells us only that they were closer to Mission San Luis Obispo than to Mission San Antonio. Before discussing the assignment further, let us first examine the baptismal entries that mention the rancherías:

**Ranchería del Mar de San Luis** – Between 1780 and 1791 missionaries Pieras and Sitjar at Mission San Antonio baptized eight people from unnamed villages at the sea shore near Mission San Luis Obispo. Example mission register entries read “*natural de San Luis* [native of San Luis]; *natural de las orillas del mar de S. Luis, hijo de gentil Ispione de la Nación de San Luis* [native of the sea shore of San Luis, son of the non-Christian Ispione of the Nation of San Luis]” (SAN-B 669 in 1780; SAN-Confirmation 402), “*natural del mar y nación de San Luis* [native of the sea shore and nation of San Luis]” (SAN-B 677 in 1780), “*de una de las rancherías del mar así a San Luis* [of one of the rancherías of the sea shore near San Luis]” (SAN-B 856 in 1782), “*ranchería del mar de San Luis* [ranchería of the sea shore of San Luis]” (SAN-B 932 in 1783), and “*de la ranchería de la Playa de San Luis* [of the ranchería of the beach of San Luis]” (SAN-B 1790-1792 in year 1791). Some of them were parts of families from Zatzama, Zoacáu Zey, and Tsetacol. Others had no family ties at all (Appendix E, Figure E-31).

**Zatzama** – Three people were baptized from “Zat Zama,” all at San Antonio and all by Father Sitjar in 1793. Two of them, a married couple (SAN-B 1984, 1986) had children from “*Zoacauzay a la parte del Sur* [Zoacau Zey in the land to the south]” (SAN-B 1954) and “*las orillas del Mar* [the sea shore of the sea]” (SAN-B 1947; Appendix E, Figure E-30). The other was an old woman (SAN-B 1989) with a son and grandchild from “*la ranchería del Mar de San Luis* [ranchería of the coast of San Luis]” (SAN-B 932, 1790; Appendix E, Figure E-30).

**Zoacáu Zey** – Ten people were said to be from Zoacáu Zey at Mission San Antonio. The first was a young woman baptized in 1793, “*natural de la ranchería llamada Zoacau Záy, a la parte del sur* [native to the ranchería called Zoacau Záy, in the section to the south]” (SAN-B 1954), whose parents were from Zatzama. The placename was not listed again until 1803, when newly arrived Father Ibañez baptized some children from “*Zoacau Zuy rumbo del Sur* [in a southern direction]” and “*Tsoacao Tsay*” (SAN-B 2799-2804); the identified parents of these children were baptized from “Tsetacol” a few months later by Father Ciprés (SAN-B 2849, 2850, 2974; Appendix E, Figures E-28, 29). In 1805 Father Pedro Cabot identified a number of adults from “*Zoacau Zé y asi a la Playa* [near the beach]” whose children were identified from “Tsetacol,” again by Father Ciprés (SAN-B 2931, 2964, 2957, 3062, 3064, 3068, and 3073; Appendix E, Figure E-29). Father Ciprés never used the term Zoacau Zey. He seems to have lumped all people from south of San Simeon Creek under the blanket term Tsetacol. We suggest that Zoacáu Zey may be the placename used at Mission San Antonio for Chotcagua at Morro Bay.

One might wonder why we assign the people of the Mission San Antonio rancherías of Ranchería del Mar de San Luis, Zatzama, and Zoacáu Zey, to the Morro Bay region. This assignment is in part driven by the population distribution model. If we were to assign these people to either the Piedras Blancas or Estero Point regions, those regions would be over-represented by baptized adults, while the Morro Bay region would be severely under represented. When they are assigned to the Morro Bay region, on the other hand, they bring the identified baptized adult population of that region up toward the expected level. We also include the minor Mission San Luis Obispo rancherías of Taxpalala (Appendix E, Figure E-33) and Tipepspa.
(Appendix E, Figure E-34) in the Morro Bay region, despite a lack of evidence assuring us that they were indeed in this region.

In summary, Chano (with a disputed location) and Chmimu (probably on Old Creek) were the two largest rancherías of the Morro Bay region. Each of them may have originally contained 100 people. Also in the region were Chotcagua, a middle-sized village for the area (approximately 60 people) on the north end of Morro Bay, and the small hamlets of Petpatsu (just south of Morro Bay) and Guejetmimu (near Mission San Luis Obispo).

**POINT BUCHON REGION**

The Point Buchon region west of San Luis Obispo reaches from Point Buchon to Point San Luis, the other coastal region study areas, averaging 16 inches. Summer surface water is limited because the largest watershed in the region, that of See Canyon, is quite small. Our population distribution model predicts that a full-sized region with such habitat would have sustained 240 pre-mission people, so that this one-third size region would have supported 80 pre-mission people. We expect a baptized adult population of ±36 people.

We have identified 37 baptized adults from the Point Buchon region, all from the ranchería of Tsquieu. Fr. Tapis baptized a woman from “Tsquieu, situada en la Playa [Tsquieu, located at the beach]” in 1791 (SLO-B 931). Rosario Cooper remembered, “Tsquieu, rancho del Pecho” [Harrington 1986, Reel 1, Frame 399). On the basis of these clues, the village may have been at the mouth of Pecho Creek, five miles west of Avila Beach. Tsquieu sent people to Mission San Luis Obispo from 1781 to 1803; half the adults were baptized by October of 1788. One Tsquieu person was baptized at Mission La Purísima in 1803.

Four pre-mission marriages are documented to the Morro Bay region, including two to Chano, one to Chotcagua, and one to Chmimu. Two pre-mission marriages to Sepjato in the San Luis Obispo Bay region are documented. Additionally, Tsquieu had two pre-mission marriage links with Gmosmu in the Garcia Mountain region, one with Gmimu in the La Panza region, and one each with Stemectatimi, Silimastus, and Zutaca to the south. Example kinship charts for Tsquieu people are shown in Appendix E, Figures E-37 and E-41. We agree with King (1984:1-3) and McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) in their placement of Tsquieu.

**SAN LUIS OBISPO BAY REGION**

The San Luis Obispo Bay region includes the coast from Avila Beach south to the mouth of Arroyo Grande Creek, as well as the watershed of San Luis Obispo Creek (east of See Canyon), Pismo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek, excluding the Los Berros Creek tributary (see Figure 9). It is a land of rolling hills and wide valleys, rising steeply in the east to Piney Ridge, over 3,000 feet in elevation. Overall rainfall in the region is slightly lower than in the more coastal northerly regions, 18 inches per year on average. However, the land is well-watered by its relatively large watersheds. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 280 people, with a baptized adult population of ±126 people (see Table 10).

We have identified 127 adults baptized from the San Luis Obispo Bay region, 125 at Mission San Luis Obispo from the rancherías of Chliquin, Chmoli, Pismu, and Sepjato, and two from Chliquin at Mission La Purísima. This group of villages contained the families associated with Chief Buchón prior to 1776 (Appendix E, Figure E-42). Adults were baptized from the four San Luis Obispo Bay region rancherías from 1773 to 1806 (see Table 11). Half of them were baptized by November of 1787.

**Pismu** – Pismu means “place where there is tar” in Northern Chumash (Klar 1977:53). The village reached the half way point in its mission absorption in 1777. It may have been a temporary camp site of the ranchería of Sepjato, because of the many nuclear family ties and baptism/confirmation links between the two, and because the only pre-mission marriage of a Pismu person was to a Sepjato person (SLO-M 29). King (1984) placed Pismu about two miles inland from the beach on Pismo Creek. Gibson (1992) placed it another half mile inland on the same creek. McLendon and Johnson (1999) placed it about five miles inland, again on Pismo Creek, based on the presence of asphaltum seeps at this location.
**Sepjato** – Sepjato sent more than half its people to Mission San Luis Obispo by the end of 1777, making it the second ranchería to do so, after Chano in the Morro Bay region. The last baptism for a person from this village states that she was from “Sepjato en la playa [Sepjato at the beach],” so its coastal location is certain. Klar (1977:52) has suggested that Sepjato is equivalent to the term “Tsipxatu = ‘whale’s cove,’” documented by Harrington as a Northern Chumash ranchería near Avila Beach. On the basis of these clues, we place Sepjato at Avila Beach, as did King (1984), Gibson (1992), and McLendon and Johnson (1999). Sepjato had four pre-mission marriages to Gmosmu to the east, three to Stemectatimi to the south, two to Chano, and one each to a number of other towns. It was definitely associated with Pismu, as nine people said to be from Pismu at baptism were identified with Sepjato at their confirmations.

**Chliquin** – The ranchería of Chliquin sent some people to Mission San Luis Obispo during the 1773-1781 period, but its neophyte conversions did not reach the halfway point until more than a decade later in 1793. This pattern of baptisms over time is similar to Chmoli, also in the San Luis Obispo Bay region, and Stemectatimi on Berros Creek just to the south. Chliquin’s seven pre-mission outmarriages include two ties to Gmosmu further east and one each to Chano, Sepjato, and the more southerly towns of Stemectatimi, Guasna, and Nauco. Additional Chliquin links to Sepjato are evidenced by two people baptized from Sepjato who were said to be from Chliquin at confirmation, while one baptized Chliquin person was said to be from Sepjato at baptism. It is possible that Chliquin was the village of Buchón described by diarists of the Portolá and Anza expeditions (see Chapter 2). Only one bit of direct evidence exists regarding its location, a death register entry that states that it is “junto al Arroyo Grande [adjoining Arroyo Grande]” (SLO-D 642). King (1984) and Gibson (1992) placed Chliquin on Arroyo Grande about five miles inland from the beach. McLendon and Johnson placed it, with a question mark, 10 miles inland, on the headwater area of Arroyo Grande where Lopez Lake now lies. If Chliquin was Chief Buchón’s village, it was probably on lower Arroyo Grande Creek.

**Chmoli** – The pattern of Chmoli baptisms was like that of Chliquin and Stemectatimi. People joined Mission San Luis Obispo over the long period from 1773 to 1803, with fewer than half of them baptized by 1794. The last Mission San Luis Obispo Baptismal Register entry for the group, in 1804, is for a person “de la Ranchería Etsmoli en el Arroyo Grande [of Etsmol: Ranchería on the Arroyo Grande]” (SLO-B 2070). The ranchería had only five identifiable pre-mission marriages, two to Stemectatimi, one to Sepjato, one to Ajuaps to the south, and one to Elmismey far inland to the northeast. Additional nuclear family links are indicated to Stemectatimi and Chano. King (1984) located Chmoli 19 miles east of Pismo Beach at Pozo. Gibson (1992) located it 7 miles east of Pismo Beach, in the headwaters of Arroyo Grande. McLendon and Johnson (1999) located Chmoli, with a question mark, along the middle course of Arroyo Grande about four miles from the beach. Because Chmoli is closely associated through family ties with Stemectatimi on Los Berros Creek we suggest that it was in the Lopez Lake vicinity on Arroyo Grande Creek.

The baptismal record for Buchón’s oldest son states that he was from Sepjato; however, his confirmation record states that he was from Chliquin (Appendix E, Figure E-42). Since Buchón’s only identified wife also hailed from Chliquin, it is likely that all three villages, Sepjato, Pismu, and Chliquin were habitation sites of a single group of closely inter-married people in the Pismo Beach-Arroyo Grande vicinity.

**OVERVIEW OF COASTAL RANCHERÍAS**

The coastal rancherías were, relatively, the easiest rancherías to assign to specific regions on the study area landscape because there is no question about them existing any further to the west. However, assignment of small rancherías to one or another of the seven coastal regions is provisional, based upon interpretation of very messy patterns of relationships among people documented with over 100 extended family genealogies (Appendix E).
We remind the reader that, in most cases, we can only suggest possible locations for villages, since the data do not lend themselves to specificity. Future revisions of ranchería placements may become necessary if additional information comes to light from some hitherto unrecognized archival sources. We are satisfied with the pattern of village locations and baptismal history that we have presented above for the coastal regions.

Because we have reported our coastal region ethnogeography in such detail, we take the opportunity here to reiterate some of the most important points about them.

- People from the northernmost region, Lopez Point, were from Quiguil, explicitly identified as a multi-village area. Most went to Mission San Antonio between 1775 and 1786. An unknown number of people may also have gone to Mission Soledad during the 1790s.

- West of Mission San Antonio was the Willow Creek region. The multi-village Lamaca district covers the entire region and may have extended into the very southern portion of the Lopez Point region and the very northern portion of the Piedras Blancas region south of the San Carpoforo Creek watershed. Its largest village, Chuquilim, was inland on the Nacimiento River to the southwest of Mission San Antonio. Most Lamaca people went to Mission San Antonio between 1771 and 1786.

- To the south was the Piedras Blancas region. Within it were the independent rancherías of Cazz, Chaal, Chapeuez, Esmerileua, Met, Tey, and Tissimasu, some of which may have been synonymous names for the same rancherías, depending upon which language was used to record the names. People from the Piedras Blancas region went to Mission San Antonio in small numbers from 1771 through 1803, and in slightly larger numbers to San Miguel from 1798 to 1803.

- Further south was the Estero Point region, which included the village or region of Tsetacol, the major village of Stjahuayo near Cambria, as well as a number of minor villages. Although a few people from the region went south to Mission San Luis Obispo and inland to Mission San Miguel, most of them moved north to the more distant Mission San Antonio in 1803 and 1804. This is an atypical mission outreach pattern, suggesting that the antipathy between the Cambria people and the San Luis Obispo Bay people, noted by the Portolá expedition, was deep seated.

- The Morro Bay region included the independent rancherías of Chano, Chmimu, Chotcagua, and Petpatsu. Chotcagua was near Morro Rock, but the locations of the other rancherías are unknown. Most difficult to locate is Chano which, based on time of baptism and kinship networks, should have been in the Los Osos Valley. But nineteenth-century evidence suggests that the “Campamento [encampment]” of Chano may have been up the coast in the Estero Point region. Most of the Chano people were incorporated into Mission San Luis Obispo by 1780, while the Morro Bay Chotcagua people were not absorbed into the mission until 1791. Chmimu was the last Morro Bay region ranchería brought in to Mission San Luis Obispo. Most of its people appear in the baptismal records between 1802 and 1805.

- The Point Buchon region is only one-third the size of the other regions. We have presented it as containing the single ranchería of Tsquieu, but the location and land-use catchment of Sepjato (assigned by us to the neighboring San Luis Obispo Bay region) probably included the Avila Beach vicinity within this region.

- The San Luis Obispo Bay region is the southernmost coastal region in the study area. It included the rancherías of Sepjato, Chliquin, and Chmoli, all probably under the leadership of Captain Buchón at the time of the Spanish entry. The people assigned to this region probably also utilized the eastern portion of the adjacent Point Buchon region, west of Avila Beach.
CHAPTER 7
RANCHERÍAS OF THE NORTHERN INTERIOR REGIONS

In this chapter rancherías are tentatively placed in six interior regions in the northern part of the study area. The regions, as identified in Figure 9, are Quinado Canyon (146 adults), Los Ojitos (146 adults), Long Valley (138 adults), Sargent Canyon (130 adults), Priest Valley (101 adults), and Los Gatos Creek (88 adults). These regions sent most of their people to Mission San Antonio (see Table 10). However, our evidence suggests that the Los Ojitos region sent 12 of its 146 adults to Mission San Miguel, the Los Gatos Creek region sent 12 of its 88 adults to Mission San Miguel, and the Sargent Canyon region sent 62 of its 130 adults to Mission San Miguel. Thus, of the regions discussed in this chapter, only the Quinado Canyon, Long Valley, and Priest Valley regions came purely under the influence of Mission San Antonio.

While this chapter is oriented to the discussion of regions rather than to specific mission outreach areas, we take time here to highlight aspects of Mission San Antonio outreach in the interior Coast Ranges. Of 1,124 study area tribal adults baptized at Mission San Antonio, 763 came from interior regions and only 361 adults came from the coastal regions described in Chapter 6. The 763 interior adults baptized at Mission San Antonio are somewhat more than the 704 interior adults baptized at Mission San Miguel. Keep in mind, though, that Mission San Antonio had a 26 year head start on Mission San Miguel, so a higher number of interior adult converts would be expected. However, Mission San Miguel actually squeezed Mission San Antonio off from many interior rancherías after 1797 (see the discussion in Chapter 8).

The six northern interior regions covered in this chapter are discussed in the order in which most of their people moved to the missions. Figure 11 illustrates the placements of the larger rancherías of the regions. All placements are tentative, pending further development of kinship network charts for pertinent families.

QUINADO CANYON REGION

The Quinado Canyon region includes Mission San Antonio, Mission Creek, Quinado Canyon to the east, and a portion of the Salinas River Valley in the present King City vicinity (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 16 inches. Perennial streams in the western part of this region are quite small, but the large Salinas River runs through its eastern portion. The region contains extensive oak woodlands, savannahs, and grasslands, and some chaparral on a mixed, but relatively gentle, topography. We model a pre-mission population of 300 for the area, and a baptized adult population of ±146 (see Table 10).

Early Mission San Antonio baptismal entries suggest that two multi-village communities were in the Quinado Canyon region: Lima in the upper San Antonio Valley (59 adults) and Quinau in the more easterly Quinado Canyon portion (131 adults). Of Lima’s 59 adults, 40 were assigned to this region, and the other 19 were assigned to the Los Ojitos region to the south. The Quinau population was also split in our model; 106 were assigned to Quinado Canyon, and another 25 were assigned to the Long Valley region to the east. Overall, half of the adults that we assign to the Quinado Canyon region were baptized by 1782.

Our tentative conclusions regarding this region are somewhat different than Gibson’s (1983:180). He placed Lima, Quinau, and Tetachoya within the Quinado Canyon region, as we do. But he placed Papuco and Zocolom (Zojocolom) in the region, which renders the local population far greater than we can expect. We place the latter rancherías within the Los Ojitos region to the south.

LOS OJITOS REGION

The Los Ojitos region is centered in the Lockwood area of the San Antonio Valley. It reaches from the Jolon vicinity south to the central portion of present San Antonio Reservoir, and eastward to include a small portion of the west side of the Salinas River Valley in the San Ardo vicinity. Environmentally the Los Ojitos region is similar to the Quinado Canyon region, with only slightly less annual rainfall at about 15 inches. The San Antonio Valley portion of the region has small streams, while the large Salinas River flows...
through its eastern portion. The region is a mosaic of blue oak and live oak woodlands, chaparral, and valley oak-grassland savannah. Much of the topography is relatively gentle valleys and rolling hills, but with some steep lands. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 300 and a baptized adult population of ±146 (see Table 10).

To the Los Ojitos region we tentatively assigned 42 adults of the multi-village Papuco district, approximately half of the people associated with the multi-village group of Janulo (56 adults), and 19 adults associated with the multi-village district of Lima. In addition, we assigned to this region the people of the unassociated village of Tetachoya and the majority of the adults baptized without locational attribution (26 adults). Papuco seems to have included the Jolon and Lockwood vicinities of the central San Antonio Valley and may have reached east to include the village of Zojocolom on the Salinas River at or near San Ardo; we assign five of 24 Zojocolom people to the Los Ojitos region, and the other 19 to the adjacent Sargent Canyon region. The main village of the Janulo district, Assil, alias El Pleito, is on the boundary with the Nacimiento region, and some of its people are assigned to that region (see the Nacimiento region discussion in Chapter 8). Half of the people that we assign to the Los Ojitos region were baptized by February of 1784.

Our tentative conclusion regarding the Los Ojitos region contrasts with Gibson’s (1983:180). He placed Janulo, its village of Assil, and the tiny village of Jol in this region, but that results in only 84 adults from the region. Addition of the adults without locational attribution brings the total up only to 110, still far short of the expected baptized adult population of 146. Recognition that the Papuco villages belong in the area of Los Ojitos within this region solves the problem.

LONG VALLEY REGION

The Long Valley region is centered on east-west trending Long Valley, which runs through the hills between the Salinas River Valley and the upland Peach Tree Valley. Its western portion includes the Salinas River Valley from San Lucas south to San Ardo (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 12 inches across this area, somewhat lower than surrounding regions. However, permanent surface water is supplied to the region by the Salinas River and San Lorenzo Creek. The region is predominately grassland with extensive areas of blue oak woodland. Topography is relatively gentle. We model a pre-mission population of 290 and a baptized adult population of ±138 (see Table 10).

To the Long Valley region we tentatively assign 25 of the adults from the district of Quinau, the largest portion of the adults from Lix (32), all 19 adults from the ranchería of Zebasten, all 57 people from Atnil, and five of the adults that could not be associated with any home location, for a total of 138. The word Lix does not seem to refer to any particular place, but generally to easterners, since “lec” is the direction term “east” in Salinan (Gibson 1983:225; Turner 1980). A few of the Lix people assigned to the Long Valley region were more specifically noted as being from the Salinas River villages of Alecha, Cheteya, Choleyte, and Chunap. Families from these villages probably lived seasonally in hamlets in the nearby hills to the east and in the San Lorenzo Creek drainage further east. Peak years of baptism were 1784, 1786, and 1799; half of the adults were baptized by the end of January 1786. However, Quinau and Zebasten individuals continued to be baptized as late as 1807, and the last two Atnil people were baptized in 1812.

Our tentative assignment of groups to the Long Valley region is at odds with that suggested by Gibson (1983:180). In addition to Zebasten and Atnil, he mapped Lachayuam and Chuculac in this region. We only agree with his placements of Zebasten and Atnil. Gibson equated Lachayuam with Alecha on the Salinas River, an association for which we find no evidence. Of 46 explicitly identified Lachayuam people 44 were baptized between 1802 and 1809, during the period of east coast range conversions. Entries pointing to an inland location include, “Asi el oriente del otro lado del Rio de Monterey [toward the east on the other side of the Monterey River]” (SAN-B 3435), “Lecchieuam en dicha cana da Atnel [in the same Atnel Canyon]” (SAN-B 3026), and “Lasayuam mas al oriente que San Benito [further east than San Benito]” (SAN-B 2925). We now suggest that Lachayuam ranchería was in the old San Lorenzo land grant area or further east in Priest Valley.
SARGENT CANYON REGION

The Sargent Canyon region includes the Salinas Valley and hills to the east, from San Ardo and Pancho Rico Creek on the north to Bradley and Indian Valley on the south (see Figure 9). Sargent Canyon itself runs northeast to southwest through the center of the region, reaching the Salinas River between Bradley and San Ardo. Annual rainfall averages about 14 inches. This region is predominately blue oak woodland with extensive grasslands and pockets of live oak woodland and chaparral. Topography is mixed, with open valleys, rolling hills, and some incised stream canyons. We model a pre-mission population of 290 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±130 (see Table 10).

The Sargent Canyon region is one of two regions that seems to have been proselytized almost equally from Mission San Antonio and Mission San Miguel, the other being the adjacent Reason Peak region to the east (see Table 10). The earliest converts from this region went to Mission San Antonio from Salinas River villages. The largest village was Caunpej Esmac, alias "La Brea," known to be near Bradley on the basis of information from María de los Angeles (Harrington 1985; Reel 88, Frame 450); its people were baptized from 1773 to 1788. Joyuclac and Cheyne adults at Mission San Miguel, however, were baptized later, between 1800 and 1805. Overall, it was not until August of 1800 that half of the adults that we assign to this region were baptized.

We tentatively assign five groups of 18 or more people to the Sargent Canyon region, Caunpej Esmac, alias La Brea in the present San Ardo oil field vicinity along the Salinas River (19 adults), Joyuclac in middle Indian Valley vicinity (32 adults), Cheyne in nearby upper Indian Valley (24 adults), a portion of the Papuco people thought to have lived along the Salinas River (18 adults), and a group of 19 Zojocolom adults. Additionally we assign the seldom mentioned locations of Cinissil and Zecax to this region (18 adults) on the basis of their family links to the above mentioned groups. However, Zecax may be an alias for Tisja and Texat, groups that we tentatively place just to the south in the Nacimiento region (see Chapter 8).

Gibson (1983:180) presents a more limited set of locations within the Sargent Canyon region. He does place Campegesmac in the Bradley area and Cinissil on the Salinas River near San Ardo. However, he places Meneque in the eastern portion of this region, at approximately the ridge between Big Sandy and Cholame creeks. We consider Meneque to be part of the greater Cholam district, probably the mountain area north of Parkfield. Our placements are tentative, but they remedy Gibson’s lack of local adults for this region.

PRIEST VALLEY REGION

The Priest Valley region is an upland area along the Coast Range crest, centered on Priest Valley and nearby 4,536 foot Center Peak (see Figure 9). Average annual rainfall of approximately 18 inches feeds headwater streams that flow to the northwest, southwest, and east. The region’s southwestern edge includes the southernmost portion of Peach Tree Valley and the headwaters of Pancho Rico Creek. In its southeast portion is upper Wartham Creek, a tributary of the Los Gatos Creek watershed. Upper Los Gatos Creek itself flows toward the San Joaquin Valley from the eastern portion of this region. The vegetation of Priest Valley is valley oak savannah, while the surrounding mountains and valleys are predominately blue oak-grey pine woodlands, with some canyon live oak and coast live oak groves and some areas of chaparral. Our population distribution model predicts a pre-mission population of 240 for this rugged but biologically diverse region and a baptized adult population of ±102 (see Table 10).

We tentatively give the Priest Valley region to the Escoy, Chuclac, and Lachayuam people. The Escoy people, 13 adults, lived in the northern portion of the region; they also went to Mission Soledad. We place the mixed nuclear families of Lachayuam and Chuclac in Priest Valley itself (53 adults). To round out the adult population expected in our model, we assign 29 of the last unspecified Lix adults and one Zoltanel adult to this region. Most adult baptisms from the Priest Valley region occurred between 1802 and 1805. The halfway point in adult baptisms from the region was reached in October of 1803, the same time that the coastal Estero Point reached the halfway point in adult baptism. Future work may show Mission Soledad connections to this region as well.
Our assignments for the Priest Valley region are different than those proposed by Gibson (1983:180), who placed Ajole, Atmil, and Quetaayno in this region. We will argue in other sections that Ajole was further to the southeast (see the Reason Peak region in Chapter 8) and that Quetaayno was further east (see the Los Gatos Creek region below). Gibson (1983:227-228) did not consider Lachayuam for this upland area, despite its late baptisms, because he considered it to be equivalent to Alecha, a Salinas Valley village. Initial genealogical chart work shows many nuclear families with both Lachayuam and Chuclac members, indicating that they may be equivalent terms for a single group. Of interest, Lachayuam was also called San Lucas in early records, possibly another factor that led Gibson to place it on the Salinas River. Our reconstruction suggests that Priest Valley was originally called San Lucas.

LOS GATOS CREEK REGION

The Los Gatos Creek region includes the northern and downstream watershed of Los Gatos Creek, from Juniper Ridge on the west to the edge of the San Joaquin Valley on the east; the present town of Coalinga is in its southern portion (see Figure 9). Rainfall averages only nine inches; summer surface water was probably supplied by Los Gatos Creek, fed by the higher rainfall of the Priest Valley region to the west. The hills and valleys of the southern and eastern portions of the region were covered with grassland, while the mountainous northwest quarter was a mosaic of chaparral and blue oak woodland. We model a pre-mission population of 200 for the area and a baptized adult population of ±80 (see Table 10).

We assign all or part of ten different named groups to the Los Gatos Creek region. In order of number of adults represented, they include Quetaayno (13 adults), Lysol (11 adults), Zula (9 adults), Staquel (17 of 29 adults), Quetspoy (8 adults), Questmeu (6 adults), Teyeyau (4 adults), Tepaseyat (3 adults), and Zisjazama (1 adult), as well as three unspecified easterners from Mission San Antonio. None of these group names, with the exception of Staquel, appeared in the Mission San Miguel records. Lysol people also appeared at Mission Soledad, but until more work is done, we assign five Soledad individuals to the region. All of these groups appeared in their greatest numbers at the missions during the 1804-1806 period, the very end of concerted Coast Range missionization. Adult baptisms for the region reached its halfway point in July of 1805.

Gibson (1983:280) mapped the intermarried Staquel and Chenen groups in the Los Gatos Creek region; Chenen at the present town of Coalinga and Staquel in the Juniper Ridge area to its west. We give the Coalinga vicinity to Staquel, as well as the Jacalitos Creek in our Avenal region. We place Chenen further southeast on Zapato Chico Creek in our Avenal region (see the discussion in Chapter 8). Results of further analyses of genealogies for this area from Mission San Antonio, San Miguel, and Soledad may support our conclusion or may indicate that Gibson (1983) was more likely to have been correct.

SUMMARY

This chapter has described the probable contact-period inhabitants of the six northern interior Coast Range regions, all of which were predominately within the Mission San Antonio outreach area. All or most of the Quinado Canyon, San Antonio, and Long Valley region people went to Mission San Antonio. The Sargent Canyon region was clearly an overlap area, with more than 40 percent of its people baptized at Mission San Miguel. The more eastern regions, Priest Valley and Los Gatos Creek, sent all but 13 of their adults to Mission San Antonio.
We discuss the tentative placement of ranchería groups in ten central interior regions in this chapter. The regions are, from west to east, Nacimiento (141 adults), Cholame Hills (111 adults), Reason Peak (94 adults), Shandon (103 adults), Cholame Valley (94 adults), La Panza (64 adults), Avenal (56 adults), Pyramid Hills (32 adults), Antelope Valley (16 adults), and North Temblor (8 adults). These regions are brought together in this chapter precisely because Mission San Miguel dominated each of them. Although most people from these inland regions were sent to Mission San Miguel, significant numbers were baptized at Mission San Antonio (see Table 10).

Of 792 Coast Range adults baptized at Mission San Miguel, 88 came from coastal regions (discussed in Chapter 6) while 704 came from interior regions. Mission San Miguel did not begin proselytizing tribal people until 1797, more than 25 years after missions San Antonio and San Luis Obispo. Placed further inland than the latter two missions, it immediately became the predominate destination for tribal migrants from all portions of the upper Salinas River watershed except the Paso Robles, Santa Margarita, and Garcia Mountain regions.

The ten central interior regions are discussed below in the order in which they sent people to the missions. First, however, we present a section dedicated to the unique problem of Cholam/Tisagues etymology. Our placements of the larger rancherías from the central interior regions are mapped on Figure 11. All ranchería placements in these regions are tentative, pending further development of kinship network charts for pertinent families.

THE CHOLAM-TISAGUES PROBLEM

The unique Cholam-Tisagues problem is an issue separate from population model-based regional analysis. The location of Cholam, the home ranchería of 24 percent of the tribal adults baptized at Mission San Miguel (188 of 792 adults), has been the subject of discussion, as has the political meaning of the term. Some consultants and scholars have equated it with Tisagues, a separate ranchería according to Mission San Miguel baptismal entries.

Hundreds of people went to Mission San Miguel from a multi-village district called Cholam between 1798 and 1805. Henshaw, Mason, and Kroeber cite evidence from Salinan descendants to indicate that Cholam reached from Cholame Valley south to Santa Margarita and the headwaters of the Salinas River. On the other hand, neither Gibson (1983:180) nor Farris (2000:132-136) believed that Cholam reached south of the Estrella River. An additional problem arises in considering the relationship of Cholam ranchería to Tisagues ranchería. Missionaries at San Miguel treated Cholam and Tisagues as separate places in the baptismal registers, yet Salinan consultants to the early ethnographers seem to have considered them to be equivalent terms for the same people.

Cholam was identified as the home of 295 people in the Mission San Miguel records, including people from specific villages like Kmel, Mehenaque, Nana, and Sca. Another eight Cholam people are identified in the Mission San Antonio Baptismal Registers. Cholam people had nuclear-family links to people from the small Chelacosaone, Cheyne, Pel, Sulaltap, and Ztheneclac rancherías and to the large Etsmal and Tisagues rancherías. Unfortunately for ethnogeographic reconstruction, the missionaries added no specific locational clues to their baptismal listings for Cholam, other than a Mission San Antonio entry saying that it was “to the east” of that mission.

Farris (2000) has provided a thorough discussion of the various past applications of the word “Cholam,” its possible translation, and its relation to the area of Rancho Cholam.
In 1804, Spanish troops under José de la Guerra y Noriega (in Bancroft 1886:150) raided the remnant Cholam village, somewhere within the Cholam Creek watershed. Following the mission period, the name Cholam was applied to the 1844 land grant of Mauricio Gonzales, Rancho de Cholame. The grant included the lower Cholam Valley around the Highway 41/46 confluence and north for a distance of about eight miles. Farris (2000:132-136) summarized the land-grant documentation. The grant’s diseño (map) showed lands north of the modern highways as “Cholamen” and the lands south of the modern highways as “Techague.” Farris pointed out that the names on the map represented Cholam and Tisagues, separate but adjoining areas north and south of modern Highway 46 in the Cholame Valley.

Henshaw’s Cholam Data

Henshaw, writing in the 1880s, stated that his Migueleño consultant Onésimo described three separate sub-areas of Cholam in an arc east and south of Mission San Miguel:

The so-called San Miguel Indians came from Tcholame near the mission of S. Miguel. There were three Cholam gens or villages called (1) Tcs’a-lam-tram at the town of Cholam—the largest, (2) Ti caú-wis-tram lived upper part of Cholam canyon, (3) Tro-lo-lé-tram near the Santa Margarita Ranch in San Luis County [Henshaw 1880-84, Schedule 30].

The first-mentioned village would seem to have been at the Cholam store (present Jack Ranch on Highway 46), or at the old Jack Ranch headquarters in Cholame Valley. The second area was the land of the Tisagues people, here suggested to have been somewhat on upper Cholam Creek. (In the following subsection regarding the Yokuts boundary, we will argue that Tisagues was originally in Antelope Valley further east.) Onésimo’s third Cholam area, Trolole-tram, while clearly stated to be “near” Santa Margarita Ranch, could not have been in the Santa Margarita Valley itself, unless Cholam included both Salinan and Northern Chumash villages. Onésimo may have been suggesting that it reached as far south as the latitude of Santa Margarita (i.e., that it was in the areas of our La Panza region).

Kroeber’s Ideas Regarding Cholam

Kroeber’s (1925:548) map of the Salinan landscape east and south of San Miguel reflects his interpretation of Henshaw’s information (see Figure 6). He placed the village of Cholam about four miles north of Highway 46 in Cholame Valley. He placed “Teshaumis,” certainly Henshaw’s Ti caú-wis-tram, in the Parkfield area of upper Cholame Creek. He placed Trolole on his map twice, with the following justification:

Trolole has been located at points so widely separated as Santa Margarita and Cholame. Cholame, the most important town of the San Miguel division, is stated by some to have been situated at that mission, by others on Cholame Creek... Conjecture, however is all that is possible on such disputed points [Kroeber 1925:547].

One of Kroeber’s two locations for Trolole, the third of Henshaw’s Cholam subgroups, was just a mile or so southwest of the old Cholam store location. The other was at Santa Margarita, where Northern Chumash was spoken prior to 1806 (see the discussion in the San Miguel-Santa Margarita section in Chapter 10).

Harrington’s Notes on Cholam and Tisagues

Harrington gathered a great amount of information about the vicinity east and south of the Estrella River from Salinan-speakers. Harrington asked María de los Angeles Bailón, who had spent her youth on the Estrella River east of Mission San Miguel, about Cholam. During rehearings of earlier comments and on placename trips she made a number of comments regarding Cholam, Tisagues, and even about Painted Rock on the Carrizo Plain:

Te’câwec, Mg. onde tomaban agua / on mas [rehearing Mason] M. umticúwec, at Cholam [María de los Angeles, February 1930, Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 779].
Tecúwec means “onde está pintado” o ‘pintura’ [María de los Angeles, February 1930, Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 779].

Tecúwes means “onde se pintura” is name of a plain – at tcolám’. Went to valle to S. of Cholam, cañada all the way came to plain where lots of tar & 2 spgs., & dried panocha ½ day. No plzn (placename) – called it merely Tc’ál, panocha. Tsolám’ is SP., tho Mig. pronounce it this way. But real name is Tecúwec [February 1930, Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 781].

Mla has heard of the Piedra Pintada (in SLO County)... called it in M. Cá’yeck cxáp [May 1931, Harrington 1985:Reel 86, Frame 520].

Mla Te ca’c was the Cooy Inocente mentioned the lugar. This word means se pinta alguna cosa, mla imagines, but Dave cps. A. Te cewec, la lomadera. Mla agrees that Tcolam & Tecawec’ is the same place & it has 2 names, where the store is, she agrees [February 26, 1932, Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 743].

Mla said at Cholame ranch last night that Tecawec & Cholam were 2 names for 1 place & did not agree that one n. goes to the store & the other the ranch. Tul. insf. might possibly know these names [March 1932, Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 504].

The Shedd place 10.5 miles beyond Shandon, is un lugar viejo de los inditos, & was an indito... Mla was never at Piedra Pintado, but heard it mentioned as c. cxóp’ [March 1932, Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 510].

Harrington and María de los Angeles may have been talking at cross purposes about Cholam and Tisagues (his Te ca’c). At times he understood her as saying they were equivalent terms tied to the Jack Ranch Café area and Rancho Cholam. At other times, María emphasized a relationship between Tisagues and the Carrizo Plain far to the south, a relationship that did not hold for Cholam. 33

Harrington’s consultants had a negative opinion of the Cholam people. Early Salinan consultant Pacífico Gallego gave him the following information regarding the meaning of the word Cholam:

Tsólám, Cholame, means gente muy mala, no creen en Dios ni en nada [transl. – Cholame means ‘very bad people,’ they don’t believe in God or anything; Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 788].

Many years later Harrington asked María de los Angeles Bailon to comment on Pacífico’s statement regarding the meaning of the word Cholam. She seems to have agreed with Pacífico:

Pac. said this of the Cholam people for they were very malcriados, and perversos & todo. That was what Pac. was trying to say. The word has no etym [María de los Angeles, February 1932, in Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 739].

One interpretation of these two statements is that the Cholam people, among the last Salinans to be baptized, were considered to be uncivilized by more westerly Salinan families who had become Christian in earlier periods.

Gibson’s Treatment of Cholam

For purposes of his analysis, Gibson treated Cholam as a single large village in the heart of modern Cholame Valley, although he did offer evidence suggesting that it was really a multi-village district (1983:119-

---

33 Farris (2000:134) points out that Mason presumed an equivalence of Tisagues and Cholam. In a Salinan story about an early earthquake, told by María de los Angeles, the event occurred “umticu-(w)ec,” in the Salinan text, but Mason (1918:120) substituted “in Cholam” in his English translation.
He placed Tisagues as a separate ranchería at the old Cholam post office site (Jack Ranch Café), following information provided by María de los Angeles Bailon (Gibson 1983:180, 244, 245).

Gibson’s study can be interpreted to suggest that his Cholam village placement represented the “central place” for a nomadic group that harvested resources throughout the landscape between the Salinas River and the Cholame Valley. Gibson did not consider any of the villages that can be tied to the Cholam district to have held lands south of Estrella Creek. In those more southerly areas, he placed the Mission San Luis Obispo ranchería of Setjala at Creston and Chmimu in the La Panza vicinity. Gibson’s (1983) text did not address the evidence of the earlier scholars for Cholam ranchería and the Salinan language south of the Estrella River.

Summary: Cholam as an Extensive Non-Political Region

We suggest that the inclusiveness of the term Cholam expanded from the time it was used by the missionaries (1780-1812) to the time that it was explained to ethnographers by Mission San Miguel descendants (1884-1932). We agree with Farris (2000:132) that “Cholam,” as it was used in the Mission San Miguel records, was probably a region of small hamlets centered on the Cholame Valley. The people identified in Mission San Miguel records from Cholam appear to have lived over a wide area east and northeast of Mission San Miguel, including some valleys in the Cholame Hills, the entire Cholame Valley, and eastward to Sunflower Valley. They did not live south of the Estrella River. We will discuss original Cholam people in sections below as probable members of our Cholame Hills, Cholame Valley, Reason Peak, and Pyramid Hills regions.

The Tisagues people were a separate group from the Cholam people during the mission period. The area attributed to Tisagues by the early ethnographers and their consultants, the Cholam Store vicinity along Cholame Creek, seems to have been in the northwestern portion of their original territory which, we will argue in sections below, extended south into the Shandon, La Panza, Antelope Hills, and North Temblor Range regions.

We suggest that the term “Cholam” probably came to be used as a linguistic reference for all eastern Salinan-speakers during the mid-nineteenth century. The term “Salinan” had yet to be coined. The Cholam descendants were the largest group of living Salinans, so it was easy to use the term to refer to all upper Salinas River watershed people who were neither Northern Chumash nor Yokuts. Thus, Cholam started out as a cover term for a large multi-village district centered in Cholame Valley, and came to be used as the local term for “Eastern Salinan.”

NACIMIENTO REGION

The Nacimiento region includes the lower watersheds of the Nacimiento and San Antonio rivers west of Mission San Miguel. It extends from Bradley on the north to Adelaide and San Marcos Creek on the south (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 20 inches, the highest of any of the inland regions in the study area. Moreover, perennial surface water is supplied by the Nacimiento River, fed from areas of even higher rainfall to the west. The region’s topography is mixed, some open valleys and some steep rugged mountain lands. Vegetation is mainly blue oak or live oak, with some open valley oak-grassland savannah. Northwest of Adelaide are the only large groves of black oak in the study area. We model a pre-mission population of 310 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±140 (see Table 10).

We assign four groups to the Nacimiento region with confidence (Azzil, Pachac, Las Gallinas, and Tuaya), and we assign one group, Texja, to the region with less confidence. Azzil, alias Pleito was located on the San Antonio River; its territorial surroundings fell partially into this region, hence we have assigned a portion of its population here (13 adults) and another portion (20 adults) into the Los Ojitos region, as described in Chapter 7. Pachac was somewhere on the lower Nacimiento River (19 adults). Las Gallinas (probably alias Chesquio, from the Mission San Luis Obispo records) was on San Marcos Creek in the southeast portion of the region (47 adults). Most people from this region went to Mission San Miguel between 1798 and 1803 (100 adults). Janulo people baptized at San Antonio, but not identified to either
Azzil or Pachac (11 adults), were baptized singly or in small groups from 1773 to 1809. Also, five adults from Chesquio, four from Tuaya, two from Las Gallinas, and one from Pleito went to Mission San Luis Obispo between 1792 and 1805. Region-wide, half the adults were baptized by November, 1802. Actual counts of adults from each of this region’s named rancherías are difficult to quantify, because they were identified only under “district” terms in some cases. For instance, Janulo at Mission San Antonio was sometimes equivalent to Azzil, sometimes to Pachac, sometimes to undifferentiated Nacimiento people at Mission San Miguel.

Initial genealogical reconstruction indicates that Mission San Miguel priests used the term Nacimiento in reference to at least three, maybe four, specific local vicinities within the overall Navimiento River watershed. The three definite rancherías or vicinities lumped under Nacimiento were Pachac (21 adults), Cazz further west in the Piedras Blancas region (18 adults), and, unexpectedly, Tsetacol in the Estero Point region (7 adults). Another ten Nacimiento adults who we assign to the Nacimiento region cannot yet be linked to any specific ranchería; they may have lived in small hamlets in the black oak woodlands in the table Creek drainage of the Nacimiento River.

Chesquio at Mission San Luis Obispo is, we infer, the equivalent of Las Gallinas at Mission San Miguel. Four of its five people baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo later transferred north to San Miguel, where their only links are to Las Gallinas people. Most Las Gallinas baptisms (40) were in 1802 and 1803 at Mission San Miguel. Tuaya at Mission San Luis Obispo, represented by a single baptized person also said to be from Nacimiento, may have been the Northern Chumash name for Cazz in the Las Piedras district or any of the locations in this Nacimiento district.

Our reconstruction of Nacimiento region ethnogeography varies greatly from that of Gibson (1983:180). We are in concert with him only regarding the placement of Las Gallinas in the San Marcos Creek area at the south end of the region, a location that can be established with reference to land grant diseños and other historical information (Ohles 1997:22, 67). We do not agree with his placement of Pachac outside the Nacimiento region to the west, at the bend of the Nacimiento River in the Piedras Blancas region, the location where we place Cazz, alias El Recodo (see Chapter 6). Nor do we agree with Gibson’s placement of the large Etsmal group within the northeast portion of the Nacimiento region. We place Etsmal in the Cholame Hills and Shandon regions, to be discussed in sections below.

CHOLAME HILLS REGION

The Cholame Hills region includes lands east of Mission San Miguel, the Estrella River from its confluence with the Salinas River southeast almost to Whitley Gardens, as well as the upland watersheds of Vineyard Creek, Ranchito Creek, and other small drainages of the Cholame Hills (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 14 inches. Summer surface water was limited to low flows on the Estrella River and upland creeks. The topography is a mixture of open valleys and rolling hills with numerous incised washes. Vegetation is predominately blue oak woodland, valley oak savannah, and grassland with small pockets of live oak woodland and chaparral. We model a pre-mission population of 250 for the Cholame Hills region, and a baptized adult population of ±112 (see Table 10).

We assign the Cholame Hills region to three groups that also extended out to neighboring regions, Cholam (71 of 196 adults), Etsmal (36 of 100 adults), and the Tesja/Texat/Zical group (4 of 25 adults). Cholam baptisms occurred more often than Etsmal baptisms in the first three years of baptisms at Mission San Miguel (43 Cholam and 35 Etsmal), indicating that at least part of the extensive Cholam district was just as close to Mission San Miguel as was the Etsmal vicinity. We tentatively assign the entire northern and central portion of the Cholame Hills region to the western part of the Cholam district; Cholam villages were probably along Vineyard and Ranchito creeks. Etsmal, on the other hand, seems to have been along the Estrella River itself, from the present Estrella location in this Cholame Hills region eastward into the Shandon region, from Whitley Gardens as far as the modern town of Shandon. Of the 111 adults we assign to the Cholame Hills region, 107 were baptized at Mission San Miguel, preponderantly in 1798-1800, while another 4 adults were baptized at San Antonio in 1797-1799, the latter from Cholam, Scanam, and Etsmal. Half the adults assigned to the region were baptized by September of 1799.
Further study is needed to analyze the relationship of Zical and Tisja of Cholam (4 adults assigned to this region), Texja on the Monterey River, Texat on the Arroyo (14 adults assigned to the Nacimiento region), and Zecax (7 adults assigned to the Sargent Canyon region; see Chapter 7). These may be various spellings of a single location in the immediate vicinity of Mission San Miguel, at the boundary of the arbitrary Cholame Hills and Nacimiento regions, and just upstream from the Sargent Canyon region. People from this group may have been part of the Cholam district.

Gibson (1983:180) mapped only the small Tisja group in the entire Cholame Hills region. It is hard to comprehend so few people in this region, which received an average of 20 inches of rain in its upland eastern zone, feeding Vineyard Creek, Ranchito Creek, and the Estrella River. The earliest large groups represented in baptisms at Mission San Miguel, other than Pachac, were Cholam and Etsmal. Gibson (1983:180) mapped Etsmal just north of the confluence of the Nacimiento and Salinas rivers in the Nacimiento region on the basis of María de los Angeles’ report that “Tr’mal” meant a place where red milkweed grew west of the Salinas River between Bradley and San Miguel (Harrington in Gibson 1983:239). Our tentative analysis suggests that the place of Tr’mal toward Bradley was a different place than the mission period Etsmal ranchería, a place with perhaps a similar sounding name to the western ear. Our rules of population distribution, together with initial genealogical work, indicate that the Etsmal people probably lived from Estrella to Shandon along the Estrella River. Because of the explicit reference by María de los Angeles, however, the Etsmal location will continue to be uncertain.

REASON PEAK REGION

The Reason Peak region straddles the Coast Range crest, from Smith Peak south to the Parkfield vicinity (see Figure 9). Reason Peak itself, 3,753 feet high, is in the center of the region. The eastern portion includes the upper watersheds of Wartham and Jacalitos creeks, while the western portion includes the upper watershed of Cholame Creek and Stone Canyon, the headwaters of Big Sandy Creek. Annual rainfall averages about 16 inches. The region is a complex mosaic of blue oak woodland, chaparral, and grassland with some canyon and coast live oak stands on moist slopes. Topography is rugged; the upper Cholame Valley in the Parkfield area is the only extensive level terrain. We model a pre-mission population of 220 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±94 (see Table 10).

We tentatively divide the Reason Peak region into three areas, Ajole on the north (39 adults, including 3 unspecified Lix people), Cheneclac on the east (9 adults from the larger Chenen group of the Avenal region), and Chelacosaone/Cholam in the center and south (49 adults, including Chelacosaone, Lapa, Loyam, and Mehenaque). We suggest that Ajole is on the east side of the Coast Range crest in the canyon of Wartham Creek and that its people also had access to nearby upper Jacalitas Creek. The area of the region west and south of Reason Peak was held by groups associated with the Cholam district, Chelacosaone, Lapa, Loyam, and Mehenaque. They lived along upper Cholame and Little Cholame creeks upstream from Parkfield. Slightly less than half of the people from this region went to Mission San Antonio (43 adults), from as early as 1776 to as late as 1805. Most went to Mission San Miguel (51 adults), predominately from 1801 to 1803. Adult baptism reached the halfway mark in May of 1802.

Gibson (1983:180) mapped six groups within the Reason Peak region: Chelacosaone, Cheyne, Joyuclac, Lapa, Loyam, and Sulaltap; of these, only Chelacosaone and Loyam match our assignments. We place the intermarried Joyuclac and Cheyne people further west (see the Sargent Canyon section in Chapter 7). We consider Lapa and Loyam to be sub-groups of Cholam, and through a Harrington note we associate Loyam with Mehenaque, the latter a large mountain that may be Reason Peak (Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 776; Reel 88, Frame 437-438). Lapa might have been anywhere in the eastern Cholam zone.

SHANDON REGION

The Shandon region includes the present Whitley Gardens and Shandon areas along the Estrella River, as well as Shedd Canyon and lower San Juan Creek watersheds to the south (see Figure 9). The area
consists of open valleys and rolling hills. Annual rainfall averages about 11 inches. Summer surface water in this region may have been limited to occasional stretches of the main streams mentioned above. Vegetation of the region was predominately grassland, augmented by areas of blue oak woodland and valley oak savannah. We model a pre-mission population of 210 for the area and a baptized adult population of ±89 (see Table 10).

We tentatively assign to the Shandon region two groups that overlapped into adjacent regions, Etsmall (64 of 100 adults) and Tisagues (21 of 71 adults). The Etsmall people probably held the western half of the region, including present Whitley Gardens on the Estrella River and the Shedd Canyon drainage, as well as the Estrella vicinity in the Cholame Hills region to the west. We suggest that the Tisagues people, placed by María de los Angelos Bailón at the Cholam store along Cholam Creek, were actually a mobile group that ranged across Antelope Valley area and the Temblor range. Their large numbers and fairly early initial baptisms indicate that they also held the lower courses of Cholam Creek and the San Juan River east and southeast of present Shandon. Also, a small splinter group at Mission San Luis Obispo, Elmismey, is tentatively assigned to the Shandon region (4 adults), on the basis of its family ties to the Paso Robles and Santa Margarita regions, to the fact that one of its men seems to have had a Salinan name (“Elcanasava” [SLO-B 1803]), and to our belief that a small amount of overlap between missions is expected in this region. Half of the adults assigned to this region were baptized by August 1802.

Gibson (1983:180) presents a different picture of the ethnogeography of this region. He places only one group, Tisagues, in the region. His map suggests that they not only utilized the eastern portion of our Shandon region, but that they were centered there, east of Shandon and just west of Palo Prieto Canyon (see the discussion in the Antelope Valley/North Temblor Range section below). We find it improbable that a group with 71 adult baptisms could have been concentrated in that small area along Cholam Creek.

CHOLAME VALLEY REGION

The Cholame Valley region centers on the main portion of Cholame Valley, from the southern end of that valley north to the present site of Parkfield. The region’s western edges reach to the crest of the Cholame Hills, while on the east the region extends beyond the high hills of the Coast Range crest to include the upper canyon of Little Avenal Creek at the head of Sunflower Valley (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 13 inches. Summer surface water is probably limited to upland springs, creek headwaters, and limited stretches of Cholam Creek. The flats of Cholame Valley are grassland, while blue oak woodlands, grassland, and patches of chaparral covered the surrounding hills. We model a pre-mission population of 220 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±94 (see Table 10).

All 94 people that we assign to the Cholame Valley region are listed from Cholam in the mission registers, either directly stated as such, or from Cholam hamlets such as Kmel, Lapam, and Nana. The Cholame Valley region is the core area of the Cholam multi-village district that extends into three adjacent analytic regions: Cholame Hills to the west (70 Cholam adults), Reason Peak to the north (49 Cholam adults if Chelacosaone is included), and Pyramid Hills to the east (9 Cholam adults). Of the adults assigned to the Cholame Valley group, 91 went to Mission San Miguel, predominately between 1802 and 1804, while three Lapam people went to Mission San Antonio in 1804 and 1805. Half of the adults were baptized by February 1803. We note that we have assigned the Cholam hamlet of Sca to the Cholame Hills region and some other specific hamlets to the Reason Peak region, but that in fact we have not parsed out their most likely locations on the basis of specific family network analyses. Such work will depend upon future genealogical analysis of all Cholam families.

Gibson (1983:180) places the Cholam ranchería precisely in the center of our Cholam Valley region. Gibson (1983:129, 132, 218) proposes that there was a single large core village location named Cholam, from which 318 persons (children and adults) were baptized at Mission San Miguel. We suggest that nowhere in the Cholame Valley region was there a large enough amount of available surface water, in either winter or summer, to support a village of such a size. We suggest that the 220 adult pre-mission people that we posit for the Cholame Valley region may have been distributed in the winter into three villages of about 60-80 persons
LA PANZA REGION

The La Panza region of eastern San Luis Obispo County reaches from Black Mountain on the west to the north end of the Carrizo Plain on the east (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 12 inches, but varies dramatically from 16 inches in the mountainous western portion down to 10 inches in the valley of San Juan Creek on the east side of the region. Summer surface water, therefore, is probably limited to the upland springs and creeks on the west side of the region. Vegetation is primarily grassland, with blue oak-grey pine woodlands limited to the uplands in the southwest and south. We model a pre-mission population of 160 for the La Panza region and a baptized adult population of ±64 (see Table 10).

To the La Panza region we assign Pel at Mission San Miguel (32 adults), Tpelipe at Mission San Luis Obispo (3 adults), a portion of Tisagues at Mission San Miguel (18 of 71 adults), and the Tez representatives at Mission San Miguel (2 adults, labeled Tequie, of 31 adults). The Pel vicinity, including the hamlet of Camaate, probably included the Camatta and Indian creek drainages in the relatively well-watered northwest, west, and central portion of the La Panza region. We suggest that Tisagues were a mobile group that ranged across the Antelope Valley region, the Temblor Range, eastern portion of the La Panza region, along San Juan Creek, and on the far northern Carrizo Plain. Tez (with its alias names Texmimu and Tequie), which we suggest was centered in the boundary area of the Carrizo Plain, Garcia Mountain, and La Panza regions, went primarily to Mission San Luis Obispo. Tez will be discussed in detail in the Carrizo Plain section of Chapter 9. La Panza region people from Tez first went to Mission San Luis Obispo in 1794. Most Pel people went to Mission San Miguel in 1803. Half of the adults that we assign to the region were baptized by September 1803.

Gibson (1983:180) assigned only one group, Chmimu of Mission San Luis Obispo, to the entire La Panza region. Gibson (1983), as well as King (1984), treated what we believe to have been two different rancherías, Gmimu and Chmimu, as a single ranchería. We infer that Chmimu was in the coastal Morro Bay region and that Gmimu was in the Carrizo Plain region (see the section discussions in Chapter 9). Gibson (1983:180, 242, 243) placed one of our key La Panza region groups, Pel, far to the north in the Cholame Valley-Pyramid Hills regional boundary on the basis of a family link to Zthenelac, believed to be an alias for Chenen. He placed Tez as the only group within the Garcia Mountain region east of Mission San Luis Obispo, not far to the west of our placement for it. Our placements of Pel and part of Tez in the La Panza region are inferential, as were the alternative placements by Gibson and King. Our placements, however, satisfy explicit expectations of regional population distribution more adequately than do those of previous researchers.

AVENAL REGION

The Avenal region includes the eastern Coast Range edge area, from lower Jacalitos Creek (just south of Coalinga) to Zapato Chico Creek, and farther south to the Avenal area of the Kettleman Plain. The eastern edge of this region on the present Fresno-Kings county border falls about five miles short of reaching Tulare Lake in the Kettleman Hills area (see Figure 9). Topography includes a portion of the steep Kreyenhagen Hills on the west, but is mainly flat plains and rolling hills. Annual rainfall is low, averaging about 8 inches. Summer surface water was probably limited to upland springs and pools along small valley watercourses. Vegetation was predominately grassland, with some blue oak woodlands and chaparral on the western ridges. We model a pre-mission population of 140 for this dry region and a baptized adult population of ±56 (see Table 10).

We tentatively assign the Chenen group (44 adults) and a portion of the Staquel group (12 of 29 adults) to the Avenal region. The Staquel group has already been discussed in Chapter 7 as a key group of the
Los Gatos Creek region, which shares the lower Jacalitos Creek watershed with the Avenal region. We believe that the primary Staquel village may have been on Los Gatos Creek just west of the present town of Coalinga, and that its people also used the lower Jacalitos Creek watershed (see the Los Gatos Creek discussion in Chapter 7). We assign Zapato Chico Creek, Canoas Creek, and the northern Kettleman Plain to the Chenen group, within which we include Chenen (34 adults), Chenelac (4 adults), Chemama (4 adults), and Zehneclac (2 adults, with others in the Reason Peak region). Half the adults assigned to the region were baptized by March 1805. This late average date of baptism reflects the last 12 adults baptized after 1809, the last one in 1816.

Our placement of Chenen in the Avenal region is slightly at odds with Gibson (1983:18), who placed it at Coalinga, within our Los Gatos Creek region. Geographic evidence is too sparse for precision, but we prefer to give the immediate Coalinga vicinity to Staquel. We agree with Gibson (1983:237) that Chenen is possibly the source for the name of an old Mexican hamlet at the edge of the San Joaquin Valley east of Coalinga that was documented by Frank Latta:

East of the city of Coalinga there is an old Mexican settlement which, since an early period in the Spanish settlement of California, has been known as the Poso Chaná... While questioning an old Spaniard... I asked, “What is the meaning of Chaná?”... [He] remembered distinctly having taken the Indians from the village of Udjiu (Ood-ge-oo) which was settled at that time by the Spaniards and re-named by them after the people who were being removed, the Chaná Indian tribe [Latta 1949:14].

Poso Chaná was at a place where four ridges ran back up to the hills, where the Tachi people traded with bead and seashell traders from the coast, according to Latta’s consultant Yoimut. At nearby Polvadera Gap (lower Zapata Chico Creek) was a place with better water, called Sawkeu by the Tachi (Latta 1949:274). Note that a raiding party of Spanish soldiers from Mission San Miguel stopped at Chenen the night before they attacked the Tachi on the King’s River in 1815 (see Chapter 2).

PYRAMID HILLS REGION

The Pyramid Hills region is a land of arid hills and plains west of Tulare Lake, through which Highway 41 passes today. It includes the southern Kettleman Plain, Sunflower Valley, the Pyramid Hills which separate them, and the Kettleman Hills overlooking Tulare Lake to the east (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averaged about 6 inches, the lowest of any region for which we postulate some summer habitation. Summer surface water must have been limited to springs in Cottonwood Canyon at the southeast edge of the region or along Reef Ridge in the far northwest portion of the region. Most of the region was sparse grassland, with saltbush scrub on the open plains south and east of Devil’s Den, the southeast portion of the region. We model a pre-mission population of 80 people for the region and a baptized adult population of ±32 (see Table 10).

To the Pyramid Hills region we tentatively assign the Sulaltap group of Mission San Miguel (19 adults), the Chulalta group of Mission San Antonio (3 adults), and the last of the Cholam converts at Mission San Miguel (10 adults), to arrive at a total of 32 adults. Sulaltap was one of the two last named groups to move to Mission San Miguel before the Yokuts tribes arrived, along with Tisagues. These two groups are therefore assumed to have been the most easterly Coast Range people. Initial analysis of Sulaltap family ties indicate that many members of their nuclear families were identified as unspecific “Cholam” people. Thus, the last Cholam converts are identified as having been part of the small Sulaltap group. Half of the adults assigned to the Pyramid Hills region were baptized by October of 1805, with individuals appearing for baptism as late as 1811 (8 adults), 1814 (1 adult), and 1815 (1 adult).

Gibson (1983:180) placed the Sicpats group in the Pyramid Hills region and Sulaltap further west, within our Reason Peak region. We suggest that Sicpats was far to the south in the Carrizo Plain region (see Chapter 9).
ANTELOPE VALLEY/NORTH TEMBLOR RANGE REGIONS

The Antelope Valley and North Temblor Range regions together take in the northern Temblor Range, portions of the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley to its east, and parts of the San Juan Creek watershed and Carrizo Plain to its west, from Antelope Valley on the north to Chico Martínez Creek on the south (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall in this Coast Range rainshadow area averages about eight inches. The area contained no perennial streams. Summer surface water was probably limited to pools and springs in the drainages of Palo Prieto, Franciscan, Bitter Water, and Chico Martínez creeks. The San Joaquin Valley portion of the region was covered with saltbush scrub, while the hills were predominately grassland with some chaparral and occasional poplars along creek beds. We model a pre-mission summer population of 60 people for this double-sized area and a baptized adult population of ±24 (see Table 10).

We infer that the Antelope Valley and North Temblor range regions were the heartland of the Tisagues group (24 adults), a group which we also infer to have ranged into the southern Cholame Valley region (8 adults), eastern Shandon region (21 adults), and eastern La Panza region (18 adults). Harrington consultant María de los Angeles identified Tisagues (written “Tecawec” by Harrington) as a watering place at the old Cholam post office, along Cholame Creek in the very northwest portion of the large area to which we assign the group. María de los Angeles’ placement is supported by an early map for Rancho Cholam which marks the area south and east of Cholame Valley as “Techague” (Farris in Rivers 2000:133).

Tisagues family relationship patterns, including ties to Cholam and Etsmal, do support their location on lower Cholame Creek. Tisagues was also the only Coast Range group at Mission San Miguel with marriage links to the Auyamne Yokuts of Goose Lake. Some of them were not baptized until the Auyamnes moved to missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo in the 1813-1816 period. We suggest that the Tisagues people lived in migratory bands of fluid composition, exploiting all the dry lands from the Palo Prieto Pass area eastward out onto the Antelope Plain and south along the Temblor Range almost as far as McKittrick Pass. The first half of the portion of Tisagues people that we assign to their eastern lands, the Antelope Valley and North Temblor regions, were not baptized until April of 1808.

Gibson (1983:180) mapped one group, Telesmecoyo, in the eastern portion of the Antelope Valley and no groups further south in the North Temblor region. We tentatively identify Telesmecoyo as an early alias for the Auyamne Yokuts of Goose Lake, on the basis of numerous nuclear family links.

SUMMARY

In the central interior regions, dominated by Mission San Miguel outreach, we have mapped several large groups in completely different locations than Gibson (1983), who was the only previous scholar to make a serious attempt to locate them. Unlike Gibson, we center Etsmal at Whitley Gardens on the Estrella River, Pel in the Camate Creek area south of Shandon, Sicpats on the Carrizo Plain, Tisagues all the way along the North Temblor Range, and Sulaltap in the Pyramid Hills region just west of Tulare Lake. We do agree with Gibson (1983:180) that the heart of the Cholam area was central Cholam Valley, but we emphasize that it is a central spot for a multi-village district, rather than a single large village location.

We have proposed that some of the eastern San Miguel outreach area groups behaved as mobile bands, more similar to ethnographic Great Basin people than to the semi-sedentary people of more well-watered areas of the Coast Range. Yearly rainfall drops rapidly just beyond the crest of the Coast Ranges, from 16-20 inches down to 6 inches per year over distances as little as five miles. Because of this the eastern Coast Range foothills are quite arid. We suggest that the Sulaltap people of the Pyramid Hills, the Tisagues people of the Temblor Range, as well as some of the Cholam groups in the Cholame Valley region formed small bands of fluid yearly composition, following a completely mobile lifeway.

Among our more speculative inferences are those regarding people labeled “Nacimiento” at Mission San Miguel. Family network charts suggest that the term was applied by the missionaries to people from at least four villages in three of our regions. They were Pachac and Tuaya in the Nacimiento region, Cazz in the Piedras Blancas region, and Tsetacol in the Estero Point region.
Finally fewer people moved to Mission San Miguel from the coast than we would have expected on the basis of “concentric circle” outreach inference. In fact, only 88 adults seem to have gone to Mission San Miguel from coastal regions. In contrast, 361 adults went to Mission San Antonio from coastal regions and 309 adults went to Mission San Luis Obispo from coastal regions.
CHAPTER 9
RANCHERÍAS OF THE SOUTHERN INTERIOR REGIONS

This chapter describes the tentative placement of rancherías within five southern interior regions: Paso Robles (122 adults), Santa Margarita (102 adults), Garcia Mountain (68 adults), Carrizo Plain (44 adults), and McKittrick Summit (12 adults; see Figure 9). These regions sent their people predominately to Mission San Luis Obispo (see Table 10). However, some of the people discussed in this chapter moved north to Mission San Miguel, most notably 30 of the 122 Paso Robles region adults and 8 of the 44 Carrizo Plain region adults. The Mission San Luis Obispo outreach was quite restricted. Only 331 of the 640 baptized adults who went to Mission San Luis Obispo from our study area came from regions inland from the coast. This contrasts with the much larger counts for inland Coast Range adults at Mission San Antonio and Mission San Miguel, 763 and 704 respectively. The low inland baptized population at Mission San Luis Obispo partly reflects a low pre-mission inland tribal population in an environment with small watersheds and the rainshadow effect on the Carrizo Plain from the La Panza Range. But it also reflects the pinching effect of the Mission San Miguel outreach area which reached down the San Juan Creek drainage east of Mission San Luis Obispo during the 1803-1805 period.

The five southern inland regions are discussed below in order of the mission absorption of their populations. Figure 11 illustrates placements of the larger rancherías of the regions, aided by information from an unpublished set of Mission San Luis Obispo kinship charts constructed by King and augmented by John Johnson.

SANTA MARGARITA REGION

The Santa Margarita region takes in the upper Salinas River watershed in the Santa Margarita and Santa Margarita Lake vicinities, from Cuesta Pass on the west to Black Mountain on the east (see Figure 9). Annual rainfall averages about 15 inches. A number of perennial streams are present, but they are small with limited upland catchments. Vegetation is predominately blue oak woodland and valley oak savannah, with live oak woodlands in the southwest and spots of chaparral throughout. Valley flats are limited, but overall relief is relatively severe only in the east and southeast. We model a pre-mission population of 250 for the region and a baptized adult population of 106 (see Table 10).

We tentatively assign five groups of over 10 adults each to the Santa Margarita region—Chetpu, alias Santa Margarita (29 San Luis Obispo adults and 1 La Purísima adult), Tipu (15 adults), Chotnegle, alias Santa Margarita (14 adults), Sceele (11 adults), and Tchena (10 adults)—and five small splinter groups—Tipexpa (6 adults), Topomo, alias Santa Margarita (4 adults), Lhomo (1 adult). Additionally we assign to this region a portion of the Gmosmu group, which seems to have been centered in the Pozo area of the adjacent Garcia Mountain region (7 of 42 adults). Finally we randomly assign three of the many unplaced Mission San Luis Obispo tribal adults to the region. Thus we reach a total of 103, close to the model population for the region of 106. Adults assigned to the Santa Margarita region were baptized at San Luis Obispo in small numbers over a very long time, from 1773 to 1806, half by November of 1791.

Previously, Gibson (1983) and McLendon and Johnson (1999) reached somewhat different conclusions regarding the rancherías of the Santa Margarita region. Gibson (1983:180) mapped Chotnegle and Setjala within the region, with which we agree with regard to Chotnegle only. Gibson’s assignments do not provide enough adults to this region and clearly must be augmented. That was partially done by McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) who placed Chetpu, Chotnegle, Tchena, and Tipu in this region, as we have now done; but they also assigned Sataoyo (in our Paso Robles region), Chmonimo (in our Paso Robles region), and Tequie (in our Carrizo Plain region) to this area, assignments we now change to other regions.
GARCIA MOUNTAIN REGION

The Garcia Mountain region is a rugged area east of Mission San Luis Obispo centered on Garcia Mountain, a five mile-long ridge over 3,000 feet high (see Figure 9). The upper reaches of the Salinas River flow north from the ridge. Alamo Creek flows southeast and Huasna Creek flows southeast, both into the Santa Maria River watershed. Annual rainfall averages about 18 inches. Despite the relatively high rainfall, the local watershed catchments are all small, generating only small perennial streams. The vegetation of the rugged region is blue oak woodland and chaparral. We model a low pre-mission population of 160 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±68 (see Table 10).

We tentatively assign four Mission San Luis Obispo groups to the region, specifically Gmosmu (35 of 42 adults), Chojuale (22 adults), Tez (7 of 31 adults), and Tzo (3 adults). Garcia Mountain people, like those from the Santa Margarita region, went to Mission San Luis Obispo in small groups over a long period, from 1774 to 1804. Half of them were baptized by the end of February 1792.

Gmosmu may be the tribal group of the Pozo vicinity in the northern portion of the region on the upper Salinas River watershed (Tecomosmú and Moqusmu by Father Figuer, Tzmozmú by Father Pablo Mugártegui, Mosmu by Father Cavaller, Tiajmo by Father Paterna, Lmosmu by Father Giribet, Comosmu by Father Tapis, and Gmosmu by Father Gregorio Fernández). More San Luis Obispo baptisms took place at Gmosmu than at any other native village away from the mission ranchería; Christian families were living at Gmosmu in the 1790s, as indicated by the baptisms of their children there in 1792, 1798, and 1799 (SLO-B 1156, 1448, 1459, 1494). Finally, a Christian burial ceremony occurred there in 1785, “more than 10 leagues distant” from the mission.

The village of Chojuale may have been on the headwaters of Alamo Creek in the southeast portion of the region; its people were baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo (19 adults), San Miguel (2 adults), and La Purísima (1 adult). The village of Tez held land at the juncture of the La Panza, Carrizo Plain, and Garcia Mountains regions (see the Carrizo Plain section below for a discussion). The village of Tzo, represented only by the three adults assigned to Garcia Mountain, may actually have been anywhere in the inland areas east of Mission San Luis Obispo.

Gibson (1983:180) placed both Chojuale and Tez within our Garcia Mountain region, but did not map Gmosmu at all. McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) placed Chojuale, Gmimu, and Chulucucunach within the region (see the Carrizo Plain section for our alternate placement of Gmimu, and see the McKittrick Summit section for our placement of Chulucucunach).

PASO ROBLES REGION

The Paso Robles region of the Salinas River drainage northeast of Mission San Luis Obispo reaches from the present Paso Robles vicinity in the north to the present Atascadero vicinity in the south (see Figure 9). On the west it includes much of the Jack Creek/Paso Robles Creek watershed and to the east it reaches to the Creston vicinity. Annual rainfall averages about 15 inches, like the Santa Margarita region to the south. Unlike the Santa Margarita region, however, it not only receives surface stream flow from the rainy areas on its western edge (Paso Robles Creek), but also through Salinas River runoff from outside the region to the south. The vegetation of the region is primarily blue oak woodland and valley oak savannah, with local areas of mixed oak woodland and chaparral. We model a pre-mission population of 280 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±119 (see Table 10).

Groups almost certainly from the Paso Robles region include Lehuege (33 adults: 21 at Mission San Luis Obispo, 11 at Mission San Miguel, 1 at Mission San Antonio), Sataoyo (28 adults: 27 at Mission San Luis Obispo, 1 at Mission San Miguel), Sososquiquia, alias La Asunción (27 adults: 23 at Mission San Luis Obispo [including Scitce and Sopsich] and 4 at Mission San Miguel), Chmonimo (19 adults: 17 at Mission San Luis Obispo and 2 at Mission San Miguel), and Santa Ysabel (6 adults: 3 at Mission San Luis Obispo and three at Mission San Miguel). One other group, Llecmoni (10 adults), has been included in this region with a bit more doubt. Possible historic ranchería locations within the Paso Robles region are Summit Creek, on a
tributary that drains into upper Paso Robles Creek for Lehuege; Atascadero for the Sososquiquia, Scsitce, Sopsich cluster; Templeton for Sataoyo; Creston for Chmonimo; and Paso Robles for Llecmoni. Adults from the Paso Robles region went to Mission San Luis Obispo (91 adults) and to Mission San Miguel (30 adults) over a long period, from 1779 to 1804. It was not until June of 1802, however, that half of them were baptized.

The term Santa Ysabel, equated in an 1802 baptismal entry with Sososquiquia, is a problem. Four other baptismal entries explicitly equate Sososquiquia with La Asunción (SLO-B 1694). In Chapter 2 we quoted a report of the mid-1780s to the effect that the “Ranchería of Santa Ysabel” was “distant from [San Luis Obispo] mission eight, nine, and ten leagues... Although there are only three malicious heathen, they are separated and live in distinct locales and rancherías. One is toward the north and two to the west” [Rivera in Burrus 1967:347, cited by King 1984:6]. Thus it seems that the term Santa Ysabel was applied to a multi-village cluster, and possibly to any specific village within that cluster, including the village alternatively known as La Asunción.

Our tentative mapping of groups in the Paso Robles region is at variance with both Gibson (1983) and McLendon and Johnson (1999), none of whom account for nearly enough adults in the Paso Robles region to reflect the population model which we have proposed. While we assign five main groups to the region, Gibson (1983:180) mapped only two groups, Sososquiquia (among our five) and Sceele (which we now suggest was in the Santa Margarita region). He mapped Lehuege and Chmonimo, which we place in this Paso Robles region, to the west in our Estero Creek region. Gibson (1983) did not map two of our important groups of this region, Sataoyo and Llecmoni. McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) also placed fewer groups within the Paso Robles region than we do today. They placed Chesquio (which we identify with Las Gallinas and place in the Nacimiento region), Sososquiquia, and Lehuege in the Paso Robles region, but put Sataoyo and Chmonimo further south in the Santa Margarita region. By examining early maps, Farris (2000) discovered that the Salinas River just north of Santa Margarita was once called the “Arroyo de Satagollo.” However, this fact does not necessarily imply that the ranchería of Sataoyo was located as far south as our Santa Margarita Region, so we have adjusted its position northward from that shown on the McLendon and Johnson map (cf. Figures 8 and 11).

CARRIZO PLAIN REGION

The Carrizo Plain region east of Mission San Luis Obispo includes the central Carrizo Plain from Soda Lake west to the spine of the La Panza Mountains (see Figure 9). The south end of the region is marked by 3,770 ft Branch Peak, separating the region’s San Juan Creek watershed from the Cuyama River system to the south. Annual rainfall averages about 15 inches. Some year-round surface water may be available from springs or in the short streams in the western part of the region (San Juan Creek, San Rafael Creek, and Pilitas Canyon) but the eastern Soda Lake portion of the region is devoid of potable surface water in the summer. The western third of the region is blue oak woodland, the middle third is grassland, and the eastern third includes the most parched saltbush scrub of the central Carrizo Plain. We model a pre-mission population of 110 for the area and a baptized adult population of ±44 (see Table 10).

We place three groups in the Carrizo region, the Gmimu group (23 adults), a portion of the Tez group (13 of 31 adults) of Mission San Luis Obispo, and the Sicpats group (8 adults) of Mission San Miguel. Half the people that we assign to the region were baptized by June of 1803.

The terms “Sicpats” and “Gmimu” may be references to the Carrizo Plain in Salinan and Northern Chumash, respectively. Klar (1993) glossed Gmimu as “‘t-qmimu ‘carrizo’,” probably on the basis of Harrington’s Obispeño notes. Harrington elicited “Sepk’áts’ (carrizo, willow)” from Salinan María de los Angeles (Harrington [1980]: Box 3, file 1). Sicpats, said at Mission San Miguel to have been “‘al oriente alla de Pel [to the east beyond Pel]” (SMI-B 337), was probably in the northern portion of the region and may be an
alias for the Tez group of Mission San Luis Obispo (see the Garcia Mountain section above for a discussion of
the Tez ranchería). All groups of this region probably spent the dry months in the blue oak woodlands along
San Rafael Creek in the southwest portion of the region.34

Gibson (1983:180) placed the tiny Chulucucunach group of Mission San Luis Obispo in the
southern portion of our Carrizo Plain region, while we tentatively locate them in the McKittrick Summit
region of the Temblor Range further east (see the discussion, including our misgivings about our placements,
in the McKittrick Summit section below). Gibson (1983:180) placed Gmimu, combined with coastal
Chmimu, in the La Panza region to the north and placed Sicpats far to the north in the Pyramid Hills region
where we place Sulaltap. McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) identified only one small ranchería, Coochup
(K’o’owshup), within the Carrizo Plain Region; however this village likely was situated south of the territory
considered here and may be correlated with archaeological site CA-SLO-100 on the Washburn Ranch south
of Painted Rock, which contains evidence of historic period occupation.

MCKITTRICK SUMMIT REGION

The McKittrick Summit region straddles the Temblor Range, rising up from Soda Lake on the
Carrizo Plain to 4,332-ft-high McKittrick Summit and then down to the present town of McKittrick in a
valley at the east base of the range. Rainfall averages 8 inches across the region, but is almost 20 inches at
McKittrick Summit. Small east-flowing streams, such as Temblor Creek on the north and Buena Vista Creek
on the south, are believed to have had some year-round surface water. The low flats in the western and eastern
portions of the region are saltbush scrub, while grasslands cover the higher fans and much of the Temblor
Range in the central area. Stands of blue oak occur in the less arid areas along the summit of the Temblor
Range. We model a pre-mission population of 30 for the region and a baptized adult population of ±12 (see
Table 10).

We suggest that Chulucucunach was the ranchería most likely to have been in the McKittrick
Summit region. Only 10 people from Chulucucunach were baptized, nine adults and one child at Mission
San Luis Obispo. However an 1805 death register entry at Mission La Purísima for an elderly woman from
Guasna states that she died at the ranchería of “Sulucucunaj” (MLP-D 737). Chulucucunach had family links
to Gmimu, to Auyamne Yokuts, and to Sjalihuilimu in Cuyama Valley. The first adult was baptized in 1785,
the second in 1791, and the other seven in 1803. Other children from this group could have been baptized at
Santa Barbara, La Purísima, or Santa Ynez, under some other ranchería designation, although no likely
candidate has yet been established.

Neither Gibson (1983:180) nor McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) placed any groups at all in the
McKittrick Summit region. McLendon and Johnson (1999:31) placed Chulucucunach in the Garcia
Mountain region, which we now believe to have been too far to the west. Gibson (1983:180) placed
Chulucucunach in the Carrizo Plain region, and he may be correct in that inference.

SUMMARY

This presentation of probable ranchería locations inland from Mission San Luis Obispo indicates that
all previous researchers crowded San Luis Obispo groups too far to the west. Our placements of Tez and
Gmimu in the Carrizo Plain region, of Chulucucunach at McKittrick Summit, and of many small groups in
the Paso Robles region, are based on population model inference, admittedly not a strong basis for placement.
But our placements are an improvement on previous ones, which were based neither on fact nor theory but
merely upon a compressed family network structure anchored along the coast.

A boy from “Gmimu, o Gphe” was baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo in 1803 (SLO-B 1784), suggesting a link between Gmimu
and Heqep, a ranchería south of the Cuyama River whose people went to Mission La Purísima.
Two regions east of Mission San Luis Obispo, La Panza and North Temblor, were discussed in Chapter 8 to emphasize that the Mission San Miguel outreach pinched off Mission San Luis Obispo’s potential outreach area in the interior after 1803. Although 33 tribal baptisms took place at Mission San Luis Obispo over the 1804-1806 period, most were holdouts from long-proselytized rancherías near the coast. During the 1807-1812 period there were no tribal baptisms at all at Mission San Luis Obispo. In those years, small groups of interior Coast Range people were being baptized at Mission San Miguel, and Cuyama Valley people were moving to Mission La Purísima. A small spurt of tribal baptisms did occur at Mission San Luis Obispo in 1813 when some Tulamne, Gelecto (Auyamne), and Quiyguamne Yokuts were baptized along with a handful of people from the Transverse Range rancherías of Caluaca and Taxlipu, as well as unlocated Chogoy.

Five of the 33 converts in 1804-1806 came from regions adjacent to the mission: a Chano man, a Sepjato woman, and three Chmimu adults. Ten came from farther up the coast at Sejala, Pinal, Stjahuay, Tissimasu, or the “Playa de San Antonio.” Nine came from Chmonimo, Chonnegle, El Pleito, Las Gallinas, Sosoquiquia, or Sataoyo in the Salinas River corridor. Only four people came from rancherías farther to the east, two from Chojuale in the far portion of the Garcia Mountain region and two from Tez in the Carrizo Plain region. (Another five of the 33 tribal converts in 1804-1806 time period cannot be identified to a ranchería.)
CHAPTER 10
ETHNOGRAPHIC LANGUAGE BOUNDARIES

Language boundaries between Salinan-, Northern Chumash-, and Yokuts-speakers have been the subject of ethnographic study since Pinart and Henshaw worked in the South Coast Ranges in the 1870s and '80s. Ambiguity in the evidence has led to great differences in language boundary placements, especially along the Salinan-Yokuts and Salinan-Northern Chumash boundaries. Figure 13 illustrates the contrasting boundary determinations of Kroeber (1925), Gibson (1983), Milliken (1987, 1990, 1994), King (2004), and Milliken and Johnson (this report), exemplifying just how divergent such interpretations can be. Language boundary issues arise in four portions of our study area:

1. Coastal “Playano” Language Affiliation;
2. Salinan and Chumash in the San Miguel-Margarita corridor;
3. Salinan and Chumash in present Eastern San Luis Obispo County; and
4. Yokuts-Salinan boundary along the eastern edge of the South Coast Ranges.

Different forms of evidence are available for each problem area and different levels of confidence accompany the resolution of each problem. Our tentative conclusions regarding the language boundaries in the study area are shown in Figure 11.

COASTAL PLAYANO LANGUAGE AFFILIATION

The missionary responses to the Interrogatorio of 1812 suggest that there were four languages in the study area: Chumash, Salinan, Yokuts, and a separate “Playano” language of the sea coast west of Mission San Miguel (see the Interrogatorio section in Chapter 2). Mason (1912) and Kroeber (1925) consider this fourth language to have been a Salinan dialect. Gibson (1983) proposed that it was a Northern Chumash dialect. We suggest that the question cannot be resolved, and that it is even possible that Playano was an independent language of unknown affinity. Our tentative language boundary reflects continued uncertainty regarding the linguistic affiliation of “playano” (Figure 13).

Following a review of the Interrogatorio responses, we present the conclusions of Mason and Kroeber who give the entire coast from Cayucos north to Salinan-speakers, and the contrasting stance of Gibson who places the Chumash as far north as San Carpofooro Creek. Harrington had contradictory evidence regarding the coast, and some Salinan myths mention Morro Rock, a place regarded by all authorities as having been located in Northern Chumash territory.

Playano in the Interrogatorio Responses

The missionaries of both missions San Antonio and San Miguel indicated in their responses to the Spanish Interrogatorio of 1812 that non-Salinan coastal people came to their missions. Father Sancho noted that two languages were spoken at Mission San Antonio. The principal language, which must have been Salinan, was “understood to the east, south, north, and the surrounding area of the west.” The less important language had been spoken by the “Playano or shore dwellers because they came from the sea-coast” (see full direct quotation in the Interrogatorio section of Chapter 2). These Playano-speakers were already few in number by 1813.

The Interrogatorio response from Mission San Miguel also listed a language of the coast (“la playana” in the original text). It was one of four languages spoken at that mission in 1813; the other three were that of Mission San Antonio (definitely Salinan), that of the Tulares region (Yokuts, without doubt), and the language spoken south of Mission San Miguel, i.e., the Northern Chumash of Las Gallinas (see the full direct
Figure 13. Ethnographic South Coast Range Language Areas within Caltrans District 5, as We Understand Them, Also Showing Boundaries by Kroeber (1925) and Gibson (1983).
quotation in the *Interrogatorio* section of Chapter 2). The San Miguel *Interrogatorio* response clearly indicates that the Playano language was neither standard Salinan, nor the Northern Chumash that we will argue was spoken in the Paso Robles-Santa Margarita corridor.

As will be seen, subsequent scholars have considered the possibility that the fourth language was Esselen, divergent Salinan, or divergent Northern Chumash. None of them entertained the possibility that Playano might have been a completely different relict language.

**Playano Salinans of Mason and Kroeber**

The problem of the Playano language was known to field anthropologists from the time Kroeber translated and published the *Interrogatorio* responses in 1908. He stated upon first examining the responses, “Nothing is known of the coast language of this region” (Kroeber 1908:18). However, by 1925 Kroeber considered the coastal Playano language to have been a dialect of Salinan. That change came about through the influence of J. Alden Mason.

Mason was a doctoral student of Kroeber’s at Berkeley. He expressly sought information about Playano when he talked with local Indian people in southern Monterey County and northern San Luis Obispo County. In 1912, Mason concluded in print that Playano had been a dialect of the Salinan language, a conclusion that was accepted by Kroeber and most subsequent scholars. Mason first considered Esselen a candidate for the mystery Playano language of the *Interrogatorio* responses. His argument for dismissal of Esselen and acceptance of Playano as a coastal Salinan dialect is repeated here:

Eliminating from the last-named report the language of the Tulareño (Yokuts), and that of the south (Chumash), we find that there are two languages mentioned from each mission, not the dialects now known as San Antonio and San Miguel, but the speech of the people of the inland—the principal dialect—and that of the people of the shore. Had this “Playano” language been reported from San Antonio alone, it would probably have been interpreted as Esselen but reported from both of the missions it is doubtless a mere variant dialect of the Salinan... There would seem therefore, to have been two “languages” of the Salinan stock, one of the valleys, comprising the existing dialects of San Antonio and San Miguel, and a language of the shore which has entirely disappeared, leaving to us no idea of its degree of divergence... The two dialects of San Antonio and San Miguel, while variant, were conceived as similar when opposed to the divergent language on the coast, and the speech of the component rancherías of the respective dialects, while practically identical, had sufficient peculiarities to enable their respective inhabitants to be identified [Mason 1912:105-106].

Mason’s rejection of Esselen as the Playano language would appear to be correct on geographic grounds because this distinct language mentioned in the two *Interrogatorio* responses was west of Mission San Miguel, not west of Esselen’s home mission, La Soledad. Mason offers no real evidence for his alternative conclusion, that the extinct Playano was a Salinan dialect, divergent from the Antoniano or Migueleño dialects known to him in 1912.

Kroeber (1925) followed the lead of Mason by assigning Playano as a divergent Salinan dialect in his short Salinan article in the *Handbook of the Indians of California*. He wrote, “Along the steep harborless coast one dialect or division of the language, the extinct ‘Playano’ or ‘beach’ idiom, was spoken; in the mountains and valley the second or ‘principal’ [language was spoken]” (Kroeber 1925:546). His map shows the “Playano” branch of Salinans along the entire coast from Lucía to Cayucos. This placement indicates that the Tsetacol group of Estero Point were Salinan-speakers, while the Chmimu people of the Toro Creek area and the Chotcagua people at Morro Rock were Northern Chumash-speakers. Scholars down through the 1970s accepted Kroeber’s map of the coastal language distribution, with the exception of C. Hart Merriam, who extended Salinan territory a little farther south to include the Toro Creek watershed (Merriam and Talbot 1974:13).
Gibson’s Argument for Chumash North to Ragged Point

Gibson (1983) offered numerous pieces of evidence that led him to his dramatic northward extension of Chumash on the coast. His evidence is wide ranging, including an interpretation of early historic accounts and the first attempt to use personal name distribution evidence in support of a study of language boundaries. We will characterize his arguments below and conclude that they do not provide strong evidence for Chumash north of the Cambria area.

First, Gibson (1983:94-95) argued that Fages implied a language boundary at Ragged Point in his 1775 report, *A Historical, Political, and Natural Description of California* (Fages 1937). Fages discussed the Indians around Mission San Luis Obispo in Article IV, which dealt otherwise with coastal natural history north to Ragged Point. Fages separately discussed the Indians around Mission San Antonio in Article V, which otherwise dealt with natural history in the mountains from Ragged Point northeast to the Salinas River. Gibson (1983:94-95) concluded, therefore, that Fages was indicating that Ragged Point defined the Chumash-Salinan boundary. In point of fact, Fages wrote in Article IV, “at the mission of San Luis Obispo and for a radius of about twelve leagues around it, I observed the following: the natives were well appearing” (1937:47). In Article V Fages wrote, “Idolatry is greater and more insolent here than in the preceding localities, it being understood that this [part of the] narrative concerns a radius of twelve leagues around the mission of San Antonio” (Fages 1937:59). Both statements suggest a cultural boundary at Cambria which is 12 leagues or 30 miles south of Mission San Antonio. Fages clearly found that the Cambria area marked some sort of boundary. Does it have relevance to language boundaries? We do not know.

Gibson (1983:96-97) notes also that the Portolá expedition diarists of 1769 and 1770 perceived no interruption in culture, physical appearance, or language between San Luis Obispo Bay and the Ragged Point area. Gibson cites the following statement by Crespi to argue for cultural continuity along the coast: “These Indians are very docile and friendly and from El Buchón to here [San Carpofooro Creek near Ragged Point] it is a beauty to have them among us” (Crespi in Piette 1947:373). We reject this statement as evidence of any language group boundary at Ragged Point, or anywhere else along the coast. It was merely a remark about the positive nature of the interaction between the first Portolá party and the native people of a series of local coastal villages.

Further, Gibson’s study of female personal name endings suggested to him that Playano was a Northern Chumash language (1983:174). One-third to one-half of the women’s names recorded from Salinan groups east of Mission San Miguel, such as Cholam, Etsmal, Joyuclac, and Pel, ended with three-letter suffixes consisting of “[consonant] + ’at’ or ’et’”; typical names with such terminal sounds included Ancheget, Hielat, Tayemat, and Ztheyeyat. None of the women from groups south and west of Mission San Miguel, groups Gibson considered to have been Northern Chumash (such as Cazz, Lhuege, and Pachac), had natives names with such endings. Gibson concluded: “If no other locational information were available, a ranchería at San Miguel Mission could be identified as Migueleno Salinan... by the characteristic... female suffixes” (Gibson 1983:82). However, Gibson could not get a sufficient sample of female personal names from the Mission San Miguel records for any coastal ranchería because Mission San Miguel priests did not record many female names for the few people they baptized from Tey, Tissimasu, and Tsetacol on the coast. Nor did he establish an expected pattern for Northern Chumash female personal name endings. (Our own attempt to determine language boundaries from personal name analysis was unsuccessful.)

Gibson considered the Playano language of the *Interrogatorio* answers from missions San Antonio and San Miguel to have been Chumash:

It is suggested from the San Miguel Mission *Interrogatorio* and in this analysis that there were both a coastal dialect of Chumash noted as Playano at San Miguel and San Antonio, and an interior dialect of Chumash, that spoken south of San Miguel Mission [Gibson 1983:106].

We do not agree with Gibson that the San Miguel Mission answers to the *Interrogatorio* suggest that Playano was a coastal dialect of Northern Chumash. In fact, it states that the Playano language was different from either the predominant language at San Miguel (Salinan) or that of San Luis Obispo (Northern Chumash).
In summary, Gibson provided no positive evidence that the language spoken along the coast from Cayucos to Ragged Point was Northern Chumash. Nor did he provide any strong information suggesting that there was any language boundary at any particular point along the coast. Only Fages’s (1937) use of Cambria as a dividing point between two cultural areas in 1775 may be a clue to some kind of coastal language boundary.

Harrington’s Search for the Playano Language

Harrington recorded conflicting statements regarding the original language spoken along the present San Luis Obispo County coast north of Morro Bay. His earliest Salinan consultant, Juan Solano, recalled that the area from San Carpoforo Creek south to San Simeon Creek had been Salinan:

[Miguelino] spoke as far north as San Carpoforo [Solano in Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 3].

At San Simeón was Pujol’s ranch. Miguelinos lived around there. Headquarters at Santa Rosa. Totoipico’ 4 miles n. of old San Simeón Miguelino [Solano in Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 5].

On the other hand, he told Harrington that the people in the Cayucos area had originally been Northern Chumash:

The ranchería at Cayucos was originally a SLO ranchería – when they died off [Solano in Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 4].

Pacífico Gallego, the other Salinan consultant interviewed by Harrington in 1912, knew words relating to the Cambria area that seem to be Salinan, but he stated that the original people of the Cambria area had spoken Northern Chumash:

Pqesanel is a kind of pine of which there is much at Santa Rosa [Creek] and Cambria [Harrington 1985:Reel 85, Frame 344].

All the north coast about Cambria is of the Luiseños [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 835].

Pac does not know what language was spoken at Piedra Blanca or Cayucos [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 836].

Taken together, the statements of Juan Solano and Pacífico Gallego portray the coast from San Simeon Creek to the north as originally Salinan, the coast from Cambria to the south as originally Northern Chumash.

Harrington’s Northern Chumash consultant, Rosario Cooper, was well known to many of his Salinan consultants: “Mla: Maria knew Rosario Cooper & knew O. [Obispeño-Northern Chumash] words for devil & drunk – can still remember. She recalls others at SLO that talked the language” (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 661). Rosario Cooper exhibited no knowledge of Northern Chumash placenames farther north than Morro Bay (Klar 1977).

In 1922 Harrington learned some coastal Salinan placenames from Dave Mora and María Jesusa. Dave and/or María reported:

Ant. mat’l tsqá’, Piedra Blanca (near San Simeon) [Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 353].


These placenames support the information Harrington had separately obtained from Juan Solano and Pacífico Gallego, suggesting, but not strongly, a Miguelino-Obispeño (Salinan-Chumash) boundary between San Simeon Creek and Santa Rosa Creek (Cambria).
Harrington’s primary consultant, Mission San Miguel native María de los Angeles Bailon, gave Harrington conflicting information regarding the original language spoken on the coast. In March of 1932, María de los Angeles and her half-brother José Bailon gave Harrington a short list of Spanish and Salinan placename terms for spots along the coast during a trip from Toro Creek north to Ragged Point (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 531-544). However, a few weeks earlier, on February 5, 1932, during a discussion at Tito Encinales’ house near Mission San Antonio about the language of her former mother-in-law, Jacinta, María de los Angeles stated that a variant Northern (Obispeño) Chumash had once been spoken on the coast as far north as San Carpojo Creek:

Jacinta, Mla’s suegra talked S.L.O. Jacinta was parienta of Rosario Cooper... When asked about [illegible, perhaps ‘Jcnta’] that Costeños talked something like SLO, at least as far up as San Carpojo [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 383].

Evidence for a San Luis Obispo language north to San Carpojo (San Carpoforo Creek) supports Gibson’s thesis. Later in the month, on February, 25 1932, just prior to leaving on the coastal placename trip, María de los Angeles provided contrary evidence. She stated that Pacífico Gallego had learned a special coastal form of Salinan from his mother:

Cmate’hk, capealo! La madre de Pacifico used this word, she & other viejas did. She was bautizada en S. Miguel & used the Mig. idioma, pero era de aca (inf. points toward the coast), era de aca de la costa... The idioma of Pac’s mother was that of the coast. She was Migueleña in that she was baptized at Mig. Mission, but her language was not Mig. nor was it San Luiseño [Obispeño]. It was different from both. A Mig.[ueleño] wd. not understand it any more than he wd. understand A.[ntoniano] or San Luiseño tho certain ones of the coast were baptized at S.L.O., as others were at Mig., and were therefore San Luisefios [Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frames 734-735].

This statement suggests that Pacífico’s mother had spoken an extinct coastal dialect. Note that she said that a Migueleño could no more understand it than she could understand San Luiseño, which might indicate that she considered it equally divergent from Salinan and Chumash. However, in the same breath she contrasted it with Antoniano, a suggestion that it was just a varied dialect of Salinan. María de los Angeles continued:

Pacífico’s mother used a word tóna, Mig. derechito used e.g., of the padre de una casa being straight and not crooked... This dialect & tribe was called Lamakhnél, sing. but LamakEnelah, pl. And Pacifico’s father also was a Lamakhnél. His name was Meregildo. Mla know only these two words. Pac’s father & mother lived at Roberto Villa’s ranch when they were old... Lamakhnéles son de la costa, but the Migueleños were del oriente, eran Lecnéles [Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 735].

“Lamakhnél” refers to people of the west, as does “Lamaca,” the name of a multi-village district listed in the Mission San Antonio Baptismal Registers (see Chapter 6). Pacífico’s parents were remembered as westerners, but they were not from the Lamaca District (Appendix E, Figure E-4).

María de los Angeles continued, using the example of her own parents to illustrate the difference between westerners and easterners at Mission San Miguel:

The madres y los padres de Mla eran lecneles pero estaban bautizados en S. Miguel y se hicieron Migueleños despues [The forebearers of María de los Angeles were lecneles, but they

---

36 María de los Angeles was of mixed Salinan, Yokuts, and Northern Chumash background, predominately Salinan. Her mother, Paula, was born at Mission San Miguel to a Salinan man from Sulaltap in the eastern Coast Ranges and a Salinan woman from Monet, probably a Nacimiento River town in the Lamaca district. Her father, Onésimo, was born at San Miguel to mission-born Pasqual Bailon of mixed Salinan (Zebasten)-Chumash (Gallinas) parentage, and to Gregoria, a Wowol (Bubal) Yokuts (Appendix E, Figure E-2).
were baptized at San Miguel and were recognized as Migueleños thereafter; Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 735].

Harrington’s notes over the next two days indicate that he believed that the coastal “Lamakhel” language of Pacifico Gallego’s parents was a dialect of Salinan. On February 26, 1932, upon further discussion with María de los Angeles, he wrote up his conclusion that Salinan had originally been divided into coastal and inland dialects, and that Pacifico’s mother had spoken the coastal dialect:

Mla [María] says when I ask if the language spoken on the coast w. of Dave’s house here was A[ntoniano] or was language of Pacifico’s mother, says positively it was language of Pacifico’s mother, and agrees with my suggestion that A. was an inland or Sierra dialect. If this is true, coast Mig. is bottled up against Esselen or Carmel in the Lopez Pt. region [Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 740].

It was Harrington’s impression that the coastal dialect remembered by María de los Angeles had once been spoken all along the coast as far north as Esselen territory, essentially Kroeber’s (1925) Playano Salinan territory. On February 27, Harrington received two more statements from María de los Angeles and Dave Mora, seemingly substantiating that conclusion:

Pac’s mother did not talk S. Luiseno, she talked Mig., but another dialect, agrees that ‘es de la costa’ [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 815].

M la tewé, pelican. Explains tewi’ of Pac. notes as surely idiom de su madre de él. Rhg [rehearing-ed]. Mla thinks Tewi must be in Pac’s mother’s language. She puro Migueleño [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 816].

It would be easy to conclude from Harrington’s information that the Playano problem is solved, that it was clearly a dialect of Salinan. However, the evidence only proves that Pacifico Gallego’s mother spoke a Migueleño Salinan dialect. In fact, neither the mother nor the father of Pacifico Gallego came from true coastal-area families. Pacifico’s mother, Rita Aragón, was mission-born in 1807 to a father from Pachac in the Nacimiento region and a mother from Cheyne, an inland Salinan location north of San Miguel. Pacifico’s father, Hermenegildo Guardián, was mission-born in 1807 to a couple from Salinan villages in the Nacimiento region (Appendix E, Figure E-4).

In summary, most of the Harrington notes suggest a language break between San Simeon Creek and Cambria, suggesting that the original people of Chaal, Esmerileu, Tey, and Tissimasu in the Piedras Blancas region spoke Salinan, while the people of Stjahuayo and Tsetacol in the Estero Point region spoke Northern Chumash. If a completely separate language had ever been spoken along the coast between Ragged Point and Cayucos, it had become extinct before Harrington’s early twentieth-century consultants were born.

Salinan Mythology Regarding Morro Bay

Morro Rock is a prominent location in Salinan myths and myth fragments recorded in the early part of the twentieth century. This fact raises a question about possible Salinan occupation in the Morro Bay region, a region mapped as Chumash in all ethnographies since Kroeber (1925). In one story, recorded in 1910 by J. Alden Mason, Hawk and Raven were trying to kill a terrible two-headed snake. They shot the snake with arrows, one from either side, then fled the scene:

They traveled swiftly in the direction of Morro Rock on the seacoast, but the snake came swiftly after them, breaking down all the trees in his way. “Come on! Don’t be afraid!” the Hawk who was in the lead kept calling to the Raven. Now the dust was close behind, but the Hawk said, “When we reach the Morro we’ll be safe. The wind will help us there!” At last they reached the Morro... [Mason 1912:193].

At Morro Rock, the two heroes eventually cut the snake into pieces. In another version of the story, told by María de los Angeles in 1916 and published as “The Serpent” by Mason in both English and Salinan, Prairie Falcon and his uncle Raven flew from two inland power mountains near Cholam, called “Asomeneka” and
"Asumloyam" to the power spot at Morro Rock. Morro Rock was called “umle’saM” and “hole’saM” at various points in the Salinan text (Mason 1918:112-114).

J. P. Harrington reviewed the Morro Rock myth with his consultants. Salinan Pacífico Gallego knew of “Lesámù, El Morro... a place for which they had much respect and fear” (Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 249). Rosario Cooper told Harrington that the Northern Chumash name for “El Morro” was lisamu’ (Klar 1977:53). Harrington reviewed another version of the Morro Rock story, “The Whirlwind,” with Salinan María de los Angeles:

It is very retirado from Loyam to the sea... lo trozó y se hice muchos viboritas chiquitas... esos que hay en el Morro [Harrington 1985:Reel 86, Frame 500].

This translates as, “It is far from Loyam to the sea... he finished it and many small snakes were created... those that are at Morro Rock.” María de los Angeles also mentioned a story about a sea turtle in the Morro Bay area (Harrington 1985: Reel 86, Frame 501). That story was expanded by her friend Antonio Durazo, “It was a tortuga that put the rocks from S.L.O. to El Morro. Salio de S. Luis...” (Harrington 1985:Reel 88, Frame 571).

These myth fragments are important parts of the corpus of material that represent South Coast Range cultural history. They are not, however, useful for determining the language boundaries in the Morro Bay region. In aboriginal California, landmarks in one cultural area are frequently mentioned in the narratives of groups in neighboring areas across linguistic boundaries (Blackburn 1975; Gayton 1935; Kroeber 1907). For example, the first recorded myth from any California Indian tribe, obtained from Yuman-speakers along the lower Colorado River during the Oñate expedition of 1605, described Condor’s creation of a ranchería on Santa Catalina Island composed entirely of women (Harrington 1944:35). No one would seriously consider that Colorado River Yumans controlled Santa Catalina Island at any time in the recent ethnographic past.

Salinan consultant María de los Angeles, source of most of the Morro Rock myth fragments, was part Northern Chumash through a paternal great-grandmother, Bárbara of Las Gallinas (SMI-B 728). She had grown up, like so many study area people, in a mixed Salinan-Northern Chumash-Yokuts culture that first emerged in the 1840s. However, even prior to such mixing, local Salinan and Northern Chumash groups may have shared myth elements across their language boundaries.

Evidence for Coastal Salinans South of San Luis Obispo

Migueleño Salinans lived in towns south of San Luis Obispo in the post-Mission period. In 1912, Salinan Juan Solano told J. P. Harrington, “Migueleño was spoken as far south as Arroyo Grande and as far north on coast as San Carpojo (15 or 20 miles n. of Piedra Blanca on the coast)” (Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 02). All other evidence indicates that the contact-period villages of Chliquin and Chmoli in the Arroyo Grande area were Northern Chumash. Juan Solano must have been referring to Migueleños who lived at Arroyo Grande during his own lifetime. Remember that Migueleños and Obispeños mixed together after secularization. People from both missions found work on Mexican ranches up and down the coast. Harrington recorded that Migueleños Faustino Mora, older brother of Dave Mora, Dave’s sister Amelia, and her husband Cayetano Quintana all lived in Santa Maria in the early twentieth century (Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 971; Reel 88, Frame 441). After 1912, Harrington never asked Migueleño consultants about placenames for the Arroyo Grande or Santa Maria areas, indicating that he knew that such areas were south of ethnographic Salinan territory.

The other ethnographic quote that may be interpreted to suggest contact-period Salinan presence on the coastal plain south of Morro Bay comes from the notes of C. Hart Merriam. Upon speaking with members of the Bailon family on Toro Creek in 1934, Merriam wrote:

They say that on the south, they included Santa Maria Valley and the land south of the river including the towns of Guadalupe and Santa Maria. On the west they owned the coast from Santa Maria River North to San Simeon, north of which the western boundary was the summit of the Santa Lucia Range [Merriam 1934:37].
Our work with the genealogies of the Bailon family, María de los Angeles and her half-brother José Bailon, demonstrates that their tribal ancestors were all from the Salinas River drainage near Mission San Miguel, that they had lived and worked near Cholam and Shandon, as well as along the coast at Cayucos and in the hills of Toro Creek. If they said in 1934 that their “territory” spread south to Guadalupe and Santa Maria, they must have been telling Merriam about the places where they had visited, worked, and resided over their lifetimes and those of their relatives.

Summary View Regarding Coastal Language Boundaries

The evidence that we have inspected to date suggests that Salinan was the coastal language in the Lopez Point and Willow Creek regions, northwest and west of Mission San Antonio, respectively. We are also certain that Northern Chumash was spoken around Mission San Luis Obispo in the San Luis Obispo Bay and Morro Bay regions. For the Piedras Blancas and Estero Point regions in between, however, the evidence is ambiguous. One or both of these areas were the homes of the “Playano” people mentioned in the Mission San Miguel Interrogatorio responses of 1813. We lack conclusive evidence as to the linguistic affiliation of the Playano dialect.

If there had been no mention of a coastal language in the Interrogatorio answers, we would have argued for Salinan in the Piedras Blancas area, south to include San Simeon Creek, and for Northern Chumash in the Estero Point region, north to include Cambria and the Santa Rosa Creek drainage. These conclusions draw support from the Fages report of 1775 and from the various responses of the J. P. Harrington consultants in the early twentieth century. Yet the Interrogatorio answers do exist, and they do indicate that a divergent dialect was spoken somewhere on the coast prior to 1813.

The vast majority of coastal people as far south as Estero Point moved to Mission San Antonio. Their coastal language was almost extinct in 1813. The most southerly of them were the Tsetacol people of the Estero Point region. Some members of their families had been explicitly called “Playano” at the times of their baptisms (SAN-B 2751-2804, 2842-2853, 2936-2977). No linguistic sample of the Tsetacol dialect was ever recorded. Thus, we cannot discount the possibility that they spoke a language completely different than Salinan or Northern Chumash. Nevertheless, they easily integrated at the Mission San Antonio with the local Salinans and came to be part of the descendant Antonio community.

More recently, Chester King has suggested strong social ties between the villages of Chotcahua, Sepjala, and Chmimu that mark them as distinct from village groups at Los Osos Creek and further south (King 2004:219,229). This evidence suggests that these villages may have been part of the poorly understood Playano group, extending Playano south to Morro Rock (Figure 13; see also Figure 11)

SALINAN AND CHUMASH IN THE SAN MIGUEL-SANTA MARGARITA CORRIDOR

In this section we examine evidence for the Northern Chumash-Salinan boundary in the upper Salinas River corridor. We disagree with scholars who placed the entire San Miguel-Santa Margarita corridor within the Salinan language area (Greenwood 1978:501; Hester 1978:520; Kroeber 1925; Mason 1912). We also find ourselves at variance with Gibson (1983:103-107, 108), who gave the entire corridor, as well as the entire lower Nacimiento River, to the Northern Chumash. We conclude that the Salinan-Chumash interface was a few miles south of Mission San Miguel, between the mission and San Marcos Creek. Below we review the evidence.

---

77 We believe that the Quiguil people, as a group, spoken a Salinan dialect. Some individuals from Quiguil, however, were singled out as members of the Tesmaymaniel Nation, the Esselen speakers; “de Quiguil, y de distinta nación [from Quiguil and of a distinct nation]” (SAN-B 837) and “de Quiguil de la nación Tesmaymaniel [from Quiguil of the Tesmaymaniel Nation]” (SAN-B 1324).
Early Evidence for Chumash at San Marcos and Santa Margarita

Compelling early evidence exists to show that Northern Chumash was originally spoken in the San Miguel-Santa Margarita corridor as far north as the village of Las Gallinas at San Marcos Creek, as Gibson (1983) argued. The earliest specific mention to this effect was written by Fages in 1787, when he described the native language spoken in the Santa Ysabel, Paso Robles, and Atascadero areas as being Northern Chumash:

The language [at Mission San Luis Obispo] appears to be the same, with little difference, as that of the Indians on the northern end of the Santa Barbara Channel, and it extends along our road for ten leagues north of the Mission [Fages [1787] translated in Englehardt 1963:40].

A ten-league distance north of San Luis Obispo along the Camino Real over Cuesta Grade would bring one to the Paso Robles area.

The village of Las Gallinas was located between Paso Robles and San Miguel, on San Marcos Creek (see the Nacimiento region discussion in Chapter 8). The most decisive clue for Las Gallinas as a Northern Chumash village comes from the linguist-missionary Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta, who between 1821 and 1837 compiled a notebook of Indian languages spoken at various California missions. Following presentation of a number of Chumash vocabularies, Arroyo wrote:

Who would not say that those of San Luis Obispo, and those of Las Gallinas of San Miguel, Purisima, Santa Ynez, Santa Barbara and... San Buenaventura are not of a single language which is rather variegated. By this assertion there are many other proofs which are more clear than the light of the noonday sun... [translated from Arroyo de la Cuesta 1837].

Harrington also gathered evidence supporting Las Gallinas as a Northern Chumash ranchería. His consultant María de los Angeles Bailón remembered that her former mother-in-law, Jacinta, spoke Northern Chumash:

Jacinta, Mla’s suegra talked S.L.O. Jacinta was pariente of Rosario Cooper [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 383].

Mla thinks she heard her suegra Jacinta use the word noxsom. Jacinta hablaba mucho con la Rosaria Ku-per en S. Luiseno [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frames 836-857].

Jacinta, mother of María de los Angeles’ first husband (Fernando Ocarpio) was the daughter of a Las Gallinas couple at Mission San Miguel (SMI-B 1325, 1093, 1104). Harrington learned that her family’s language was the same as that of Rosario Cooper, i.e., Northern Chumash.38

Harrington consultant Pacífico Gallego, another Salinan speaker, evidenced the early presence of a non-Salinan language at Paso Robles:

---

38 Harrington questioned his consultants about the San Marcos Creek vicinity, perhaps aware that it was a key language-transition area, as follows: “Mla l ccox’táy’ helk’á n., pestaños del coyote = site of old San Marcos store a las Gallinas queda mas alla of the S. M. store on that same rd. that went to S.L.O.” (placename trip with María de los Angelos, Feb. 1930 in Harrington 1985:Reel 85, Frame 443); “Mla n. about Tasajera & S. Margarita. S. Marcos is far from there, to north. Pac’s leplepo is for lalalapa, Mla knows well... Rhd. [reheard] When I call Mla’s attention to Pac’s form, says at once that that is in the idioma of Pacifico’s mother, that Mla knows it in that language too, that it is Lép lep’ s. Pac’s mother did not talk S. Luiseño, she talked Mig., but another dialect, agrees that “es de la costa” (María de los Angelos, Dave on Feb 27, 1932 in Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 815); “Mla lap’lap’a, in the hills west of the pestaños del coyote plcn [placename]... Mla láplap’a San Marcos kn...” The page continues with documentation of disagreements among Dave, María de los Angelos, and María Jesusa regarding the meaning (María de los Angelos, Dave, María Jesusa on Mar. 3, 1932 in Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frames 812-813). Harrington then writes “... Mj asks why Mla wd have both lap’lap’a and coyote’s eyebrows as the name for San Marcos. Is not one name enough?” (María de los Angelos and María Jesusa in Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frames 813).
Pac. could not understand the words of the Paso Robles language, though it is so near to San Miguel [Harrington 1985:Reel 87, Frame 835].

Elsewhere, Pacifico Gallego clearly documented his understanding that the old Northern Chumash language had disappeared from the Santa Margarita corridor at a very early time:

An[tonianos] would come to M[iguel] & M[igueleños] to Slo[San Luis Obispo] & S. Ynez, visiting at fiestas, going back & forth... At Santa Margarita talked lang related to Luiseno. They were not many years there. Can’t remember what called them [Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 9].

These many quotes refer to the San Marcos Creek area, and certainly to Paso Robles as well, but only in general to the Santa Margarita region.

By the end of 1805, the villages of the Paso Robles and Santa Margarita regions were empty. Their people were at Mission San Luis Obispo. Answers in 1813 at Mission San Luis Obispo to the 1812 Interrogatorio indicate that all groups who moved to Mission San Luis Obispo spoke mutually intelligible dialects, while the answers for Mission San Miguel indicate that the southerners at that mission, i.e., the people of Las Gallinas and Lehuege, spoke the language of Mission San Luis Obispo (Martín and Cabot in Geiger and Meighan 1976:20; quoted in Chapter 2). Also, Arroyo de la Cuesta included all of San Luis Obispo as speakers of Chumash languages ([1837]). We therefore infer that the inhabitants of all the Paso Robles and Santa Margarita region spoke Northern Chumash, as did the Las Gallinas people of San Marcos Creek.

Late Evidence for Salinans South to Santa Margarita

Kroeber (1904, 1925) assigned all of the upper Salinas River drainage, as far south as Santa Margarita, to the ethnographic Salinan. His evidence was in the form of notes gathered by Henshaw back in the 1880s:

The so-called San Miguel Indians came from Cholame near the Mission of S. Miguel. There were three Cholame gens or villages... [the third being] tro-lolé-tram near the Santa Margarita Ranch in San Luis County [Henshaw 1884:228].

Mason (1912) speculated, on the basis of this evidence and earlier writings by Alexander Taylor, the following:

Little is really known concerning the limits of the Salinan territory... The head of the Salinas drainage is within a few miles of San Luis Obispo, the native name of which was tixilini according to Taylor. It is not known whether the latter name is Salinan or Chumashan, but as the blood at this mission is prevalingly Chumash with a mixture of Salinan, it may be assumed that the boundary was somewhat north of San Luis [Mason 1912:102].

Harrington and Merriam also obtained information suggesting Salinan occupation of the Paso Robles-Santa Margarita area, although neither had an influence on the published opinions of Mason or Kroeber. Harrington was told explicitly by Salinan Juan Solano in 1912:

The dividing line between Migueleno and Slo. was S. Margarita grade summit [Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 03].

39 Mason finished this speculative quote regarding the Chumash-Salinan boundary in a manner that confuses us, as follows: “it may be assumed that the boundary was somewhat north of San Luis, very probably, as the writer was informed, at Santa Miguelita, or Chuquilim as identified by Taylor” (Mason 1912:102). Within the context of his discussion, one would think he was referring to the Mission San Miguel area. But Chuquilim was a village west of Mission San Antonio, on or near San Miguelito Rancho. If he really thought the border was at Chuquilim, he was not giving the Salinans very much territory. Yet in the rest of his article he clearly considers all inland Mission San Antonio lands as Salinan.
Merriam summarized his view of Salinan occupation throughout the headwaters of the Salinas River in his journal entry of June 16, 1934, during a visit with the Bailon family:

The Migueleños of Toro Canyon tell me that their territory reaches easterly from Paso Robles to the Temblor Mts., thus including the small towns of Shandon and Cholame (easterly from Paso Robles), and that it included Pozo, east of San Luis Obispo [Merriam 1934:37].

Merriam never published any map illustrating his precise views on the language boundaries.

The Salinan consultants to Henshaw, Mason, Harrington, and Merriam were correct in asserting that the San Miguel-Santa Margarita corridor was inhabited by Salinan-speakers during the middle and late nineteenth centuries. In Chapter 2 we showed how Mission San Miguel took over Rancho Asunción in the 1820s, as the population of Mission San Luis Obispo shrank to a point where it did not need that outstation. The ethnographers from the 1850s forward met Salinan descendants living and working on ranches in the Santa Margarita area and throughout San Luis Obispo County. Without doubt, however, had ethnographers visited the Paso Robles, Atascadero, and Santa Margarita regions before 1800, they would have found that the local villagers were Northern Chumash-speakers.

Gibson’s Argument for Chumash on the Nacimiento River

Gibson was correct in asserting that the Santa Margarita, Paso Robles, and San Marcos Creek areas were controlled by Chumash-speakers at the time of Spanish contact. But he was probably not correct in arguing for Chumash control of areas farther north on the lower drainage of the Nacimiento River (see Figure 1). We argue in this subsection that Salinan was the most likely language spoken on the lower Nacimiento River (cf. Gibson 1983:103-107, 177-184).

Salinan was clearly the language of the immediate vicinity of Mission San Miguel. Sitjar, in 1795, noted that the people in the vicinity of the eventual Mission San Miguel spoke the same language as those at Mission San Antonio. The San Miguel priests in 1812 answered the Interrogatorio to the effect that the local people around San Miguel spoke the same language as the people at San Antonio. However, Gibson placed the boundary with Northern Chumash only one or two miles west of Mission San Miguel and assigned the Nacimiento River rancherías of Pachac and Cazz to the Northern Chumash. He made the assignment on the basis of inter-village kinship patterns and female personal-name distribution patterns derived from mission records. Regarding kinship patterns of villages west of San Miguel, including Pachac, and south of San Miguel, especially Las Gallinas, Gibson wrote:

The kinship networks for these rancherías [south of San Miguel] are clearly within the sphere of the Chumash... Both these interior rancherías and the coastal rancherías are part of a similar kinship network with acknowledged Obispeño and Purisimeño Chumash territories. In the most general sense, this Chumash kinship network consists of an even scattering of various sized rancherías throughout their territory interconnected by both short- and long-distance marriage kinship ties (fifty to sixty miles or more). This is roughly twice as long as the long-distance Salinan marriage ties [Gibson 1983:103-104].

Gibson did not truly compare the Salinan kinship patterns with the Northern Chumash kinship patterns because of two shortcomings in his data. First, he did not appreciate that the San Miguel missionaries had lumped together distinct villages into the vast regional “Cholam” designation. To a lesser extent, the same problem existed with the “Lix” group at Mission San Antonio. This lumping disguised the grain of marriage network patterns at missions San Miguel and San Antonio. Second, Gibson misplotted some important village locations, for instance Tsetacol and Pel. Therefore, Gibson’s (1983:181-184) representations of Chumash and Salinan kinship networks in space are not reliable. The marriage network pattern contrasts between Chumash and Salinan that Gibson describes does not hold up in the light of our re-arranged ranchería locations. Speakers of both Chumash and Salinan languages had some short-distance and some long-distance marriage links. Provisionally, we find no kinship web interruptions throughout the region.
Gibson’s other basis for arguing for Chumash as the language of Pachac west of San Miguel derives from personal-name analysis. He argued that he could distinguish Salinan villages north and east of San Miguel from Chumash villages south and west of San Miguel on the basis of differences in the suffixes on female personal names (1983:105-106). We have already explained that we find Gibson’s personal-name evidence insufficient for making any language-boundary determinations in the area earlier in this chapter. Strong evidence is wanting for the extension of Northern Chumash north from the San Marcos Creek drainage along the San Miguel-Santa Margarita corridor.

Conclusion: Chumash from San Marcos Creek Southward

The preponderance of the evidence indicates that Northern Chumash was spoken by the people of the village of Las Gallinas on San Marcos Creek (see Chapter 8). Salinan was spoken west and east of the site of San Miguel, i.e., at Pachac on the lower Nacimiento River and at rancherías along the Estrella River. All of the ranchería groups south of San Marcos Creek were Northern Chumash, including Chmonimo at Creston, Sataoyo at Templeton, Sososquiquia at Atascadero, and the many villages in the Santa Margarita region. They all moved to Mission San Luis Obispo (see the Santa Margarita and Paso Robles sections in Chapter 9).

SALINANS AND CHUMASH IN EASTERN SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

The remaining area of scholarly disagreement regarding the Chumash-Salinan boundary is eastern San Luis Obispo County, the Estrella River, San Juan Creek, and the northern Carrizo Plain (see Figure 1). Kroeber (1925), Greenwood (1978), and Hester (1978) assign all of the area to Salinan-speakers on the basis of late nineteenth-century statements by Salinan descendants. Gibson (1983), on the other hand, assigned the entire area, our Shandon and La Panza regions, to Northern Chumash-speakers.

This language boundary disagreement must be understood within the context of the Cholam/Tisagues problem that was discussed in Chapter 8. Salinan-speaking consultants told Henshaw, Mason, Kroeber, and Harrington that Cholam reached south into the San Juan Creek region, perhaps to its headwaters. Scholars agree that the Cholam people were Salinan-speakers, although no written note expressly states that to be the case. However, Juan Solano told J. P. Harrington in 1912 that Salinan was spoken into southeastern San Luis Obispo County:

Migueleño extended east as far as Carrizo & La Panza. About same as county line...Migueleños at Huerhuero. Tulareno 45 or 50 miles over [Harrington 1985:Reel 84, Frame 05].

Gibson (1983), by mapping the Huerhuero (Creston), La Panza, and Carrizo vicinities as Chumash, seems to have believed that Salinan-speakers moved south into those areas during the post-1820 Migueleño population movement.

We agree with the early ethnographers that the Salinan language was spoken in the Shandon and La Panza regions during the Spanish-contact period (see Figure 12). Those two regions were controlled by three rancherías that moved to Mission San Miguel: Etsmal, Pel, and Tisagues. From the point of view of the missionaries, Tisagues was not part of Cholam. Thus, we also agree with Gibson that Cholam was originally limited to lands north of the Estrella River (see the Cholam-Tisagues Problem section in Chapter 8). We suggest that the term Cholam, as the name of the dominant Salinan-speaking ranchería at Mission San Miguel, came to be used as the cover term for the eastern dialect of the Salinan language in the minds of Mission San Miguel descendants. Thus, the people of Etsmal, Pel, and Tisagues came to be thought of as Cholam people by the late nineteenth century. All three groups almost certainly spoke Salinan dialects.

For the Tez ranchería in the southern part of the La Panza region and northern Carrizo Plain region, we have little evidence to make a linguistic assignment. Its people went to Mission San Luis Obispo. This suggests, but does not prove, that they spoke a Northern Chumash dialect. The possibility must be left open that they were Salinan-speakers or that they were a bilingual Salinan-Chumash group.
Looking still further south, Kroeber (1925) and Gibson (1983) both place our Carrizo Plain region in the Chumash language area (see Figure 1). We suggest that they were probably correct, but that there is a chance that the Sicpats people of Mission San Miguel, whom we assign to the northeastern part of this region, were Salinan. The Gmimu people of the southern part of the Carrizo Plain region probably spoke a Northern Chumash dialect. But Sicpats and Gmimu, both of which mean “carrizo place,” may refer to the same ranchería. If that is the case, it suggests that the entire Carrizo Plain region may have been inhabited by a mixed speech community.

Because our evidence for the linguistic affiliations in the southern La Panza and northern Carrizo Plains regions is negligible, Figure 13 portrays a wide language boundary area across those regions.

THE SALINAN-YOKUTS BOUNDARY

The Yokuts-Salinan boundary was mapped by Kroeber (1925) along the Coast Range crest. That placement reflected the point-of-view of all late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century anthropologists. Gibson (1983) challenged that point-of-view, arguing that no Yokuts groups lived in the Coast Range hills west of Tulare Lake before the mission period. Figure 1 illustrates the major differences in assignment of lands between Gibson and earlier scholars. Below we will bring forward the bits of evidence upon which the two conclusions are based and conclude by agreeing with Gibson (1983) that Salinan groups held all of the eastern Coast Range hill country.

Arguments for the Coast Range Crest as the Yokuts Boundary

Taylor (1864) presented the earliest map portraying a western boundary for Yokuts language territory (see Figure 2). On the map, a strong line seems to follow down the Coast Range crest separating the Salinas River drainage from streams that flowed east into the San Joaquin Valley. In 1891, Powell gave the same area east of the Coast Range crest to the Yokuts, his “Mariposan” language group (see Figure 3). He confined the Salinans to the Salinas River drainage and the Chumash to the Santa Maria River drainage. The source of Taylor’s inference is unknown, but Powell’s map derives from the field work of Henshaw, who encountered no Salinan-speakers who claimed lands east of the crest.

Dixon and Kroeber (1903) and Kroeber (1904) followed Powell, assigning to the Yokuts the east-draining streams of the Coast Ranges (Figures 4 and 5). Mason was the first scholar to examine the evidence closely. He considered the Yokuts-Salinan boundary to be in doubt. “Of the boundary between the Salinans and Yokuts... one can do no better than to repeat the statement of Taylor to the effect that it is not known how far to the east the Salinan ranged” (Mason 1912:103). He was aware of no permanent villages between the old Cholam post office location and the sloughs of the Tulare-Buena Vista Lake system. Thus he suggested: “the mountains of the Coast Range were probably merely hunting grounds and contained no permanent settlements of either stock” (1912:103). Kroeber never did argue for Yokuts use of the east Coast Range hill country beyond Coalinga. Yet he portrayed that area as Yokuts by restricting the Salinan to the area “from the sea presumably to the main crest of the Coast Range” (1925:546).

Frank Latta, in his information-filled but editorially uneven 1949 and 1977 editions of the Handbook of Yokuts Indians, placed no western Yokuts boundaries on his maps. From his text, however, it is evident that neither he nor any of his consultants were aware of any Coast Range Yokuts tribes up in the hills west of the Tulare-Buena Vista Lake system south of McKittrick. In fact, he emphasized that the Tachi and the Coast Range people met to trade at Poso Chaná on the plain just east of the Coalinga area (Latta 1949:13-14).

Hester (1978:500) and Wallace (1978:448), in the California volume of the Handbook of North American Indians, followed Kroeber in placing the Salinan-Yokuts language boundary at the Coast Range crest. With each passing standardized reference volume, that unsubstantiated Coast Range Crest border became firmer and firmer. We cannot help but conclude that Henshaw and Kroeber would readily have admitted their lack of certainty had they been asked to defend their assignment of this territory to the Yokuts.
Argument for Salinan-Speakers to the Foothill Edge

Gibson (1983:99-102) was the first scholar to place Salinan lands east of the Coast Range crest (see Figure 7). He mapped the centers of the important Yokuts groups along the low lakes and sloughs of the Tulare-Buena Vista Lake system, beginning from north to south, with Sumtache (Chunut) on the northeast shore of Tulare Lake, Wowol (Bubal) on its southeast shore, Auyamne at Goose Lake, Gelecto at Buttonwillow, and Tulamne on the northwest shore of Buena Vista Lake. Facing them from the foothills to the west, he placed Chenen and Sicpat s; further into the hills, but still in the east Coast Range, he placed Staquel, Cheyne, and Pel. He identified these groups as Salinan-speakers.

The early anthropologists assigned the inner Coast Ranges to the Yokuts on the basis of historic period circumstances. The Salinan people with whom they spoke had spent their lives on ranches west of the crest; they remembered the interior Coast Ranges as places from which Yokuts visitors emerged to come to the coast for visits. Powers was told that Yokuts people had been on the west shore of Tulare Lake “at the American advent” (Powers 1877:370). He knew that some Yokuts people from Tulare Lake had moved to the missions even before then. “After a long residence there, upon the breaking up of the mission, they returned to their native land; but meantime a new generation had grown up, to whom the old mission was their home. They yearned to return, and to this day they make an annual pilgrimage to San Luis, where they remain for a month” (Powers 1877:382).

We agree with Gibson in his presumption that the east Coast Range foothill groups along the edge of the San Joaquin Valley spoke Salinan, although no strong positive evidence is available to support either Salinan or Yokuts identification of such groups. Our population distribution model works well with the assumption that groups such as Staquel, Chenen, Sulaltap, and Tisagues did hold the eastern Coast Range valleys and foothills from Coalinga south to the Carrizo Plain (see chapters 7, 8, and 9). The Tachi, Wowol, and Auyamne Yokuts held the margins of the lakes, rivers, and sloughs of the San Joaquin Valley.

Summary View of the Yokuts Boundary

We argue here that Yokuts groups were confined to the level plains of the San Joaquin Valley at the Spanish-contact period. Salinan-speaking groups held the hills of the eastern Coast Range from the Coalinga vicinity south to the northern end of the Carrizo Plain; they may or may not have held the Kettleman Hills almost to the west shore of Tulare Lake. The only Yokuts groups to hold lands in the hills west of the San Joaquin Valley were the Tulamne of Buena Vista Lake, who appear to have held the valley of Buena Vista Creek. Chumash groups who moved to missions La Purísima, Santa Ynez, and Santa Bárbara held the Cuyama Valley southwest of Buena Vista Lake.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING LANGUAGE BOUNDARIES

Our view of the ethnographic language boundaries is illustrated in Figure 13. Most scholarly sources describe three ethnographic languages in the South Coast Ranges—Northern Chumash, Salinan, and Yokuts. However, the only early description of language distributions in the South Coast Ranges, the answers to the Interrogatorio of 1812, cloud the picture by suggesting the presence of a completely different fourth language in the area, Playano. Kroeber and Mason considered Playano to be a divergent dialect of Salinan, while Gibson argued that it was Northern Chumash. We consider both conclusions to be possible, but also caution that Playano may have been a totally separate language, extinct since the mission period.

The inland Paso Robles, Atascadero, Santa Margarita area has also been subject to controversy. We find the early evidence for Northern Chumash in those areas to be straightforward. Salinan-speaking people seem to have moved into these areas during the 1820s as Mission San Miguel took over some ranches from the much smaller Mission San Luis Obispo. After the missions closed as organized agricultural communes during the 1830s, Salinan-speaking people from missions San Antonio and San Miguel mixed with the much smaller remnant Chumash-speaking population of Mission San Luis Obispo, as all of them sought work on Mexican land grants throughout the South Coast Ranges.
Further east, evidence supports Salinan control of the upper reaches of the southern Estrella River tributaries, east of Santa Margarita. But the boundary is impossible to draw precisely further south in the La Panza and northern Carrizo Plain areas, the eastern portions of which may have been visited by Salinan-speaking bands from the north and Chumash-speaking bands from the west and south.

The reader who expects definitive answers regarding the boundaries between the contact-period language areas of the South Coast Ranges will be disappointed by some of our conclusions. We see no other way to honestly appraise the small amount of available evidence than to emphasize that some areas remain open to differing interpretations. One avenue towards the resolution of language boundary questions does remain open, however. New insights may be gained through detailed personal name analyses by professional linguists with extensive background in Salinan and Northern Chumash.
CHAPTER 11
RESEARCH SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although two years of research have gone into the present study, much work remains. Analyses of tribal ranchería locations were exhaustive only for the seven coastal regions from Lopez Point to San Luis Obispo Bay (see Chapter 6). Analyses of inland regional ranchería locations were limited because we did not have time to develop full family network charts for all of the inland people at the three study area missions (see Chapters 7-9).

The incomplete nature of the ranchería analysis has implications for our portrayal of the Salinan, Playano, Chumash, and Yokuts language boundaries. The boundaries are based upon clear factual evidence in some regions, and upon inference in others. Below we highlight some of our most intriguing findings, then share our ideas for future research.

NEW FINDINGS OF NOTE

Ethnographic Ranchería Locations

We began our study with knowledge of approximately 4,000 Coast Range adults and children baptized at missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo from areas north of the Santa Maria River (La Purísima Mission took over the groups south of the river), reflecting a probable pre-mission study area population of 6,000. From the mission records we knew of 205 ranchería (village, region, or community) names, but we had explicit evidence for the locations of only 16 of them. Initially, we could infer that some were relatively closer than others to a given mission and that some were relatively closer to Yokuts groups of the San Joaquin Valley than others. Outmarriage patterns indicated that some groups were relatively near to one another, but we had no systematic way of placing them on the landscape.

We overcame the lack of explicit locational references by assigning ranchería groups to one or another of 28 arbitrary regions, working inward from better established groups from the coast, north from Mission La Purísima, south from Mission Soledad, and west from the San Joaquin Valley. We presume that populations were not spread equally across the landscape. Instead, we built a model of adult population distribution based on expected differences in available surface water, resource biomass, impact of historic disease, and speed of group proselytization.

Our resultant ethnogeography is, we believe, an improvement over all prior efforts to map Salinan and Northern Chumash ethnography. Some of our highlighted findings are repeated below:

- Mission records document named multi-village districts around Mission San Antonio, including Quiguil in the Lopez Point region, Lamaca in the Willow Creek region, and Papuco in the Los Ojitos region. Cholam, east of Mission San Miguel seems to have been a multi-village district as well. Throughout the study area it is not possible to determine if the larger rancherías, such as Tsetacol on the coast and Etsmal in the interior, were villages or multi-village districts.

- Tsetacol ranchería, the last coastal group baptized at Mission San Antonio (in 1803-1804), has been placed in the Estero Point region, even though missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo were closer (cf. Gibson 1983). This placement was made based on Tsetacol’s presumed equivalence with Setjala ranchería at Mission San Luis Obispo, and also because Estero Point was the only coastal region whose expected population had been only partially baptized in 1803.

- The multi-village district of Cholam covered a large area centered in present Cholame Valley. While a mission descendant told Henshaw that a portion of Cholam extended further south toward Santa Margarita, this was not the case during the early mission period.

- Key to sorting out relative village locations in the mountains east of the Salinas River is recognition that Quinau territory extended east across the Salinas River from Quinado Canyon,
and that Lachayuam, said to be in Lix, was probably in Priest Valley. Family network charts show that Lachayuam was the last of the Lix groups to be baptized. They had marriage ties to Quinau and to the last small Coast Range rancherías baptized at Mission San Miguel, Catayno, Lysol, Quetsmeu, Quetspoy, and Staquel.

- Chano, in the Morro Bay region, remains a problem. Concentric circle and family network analyses suggest that it was west of Mission San Luis Obispo in or near Los Osos Valley. Yet some explicit historic statements suggest that it was far to the north, toward Cayucos. Chano may have been both the name of a local village and the name of the entire Morro Bay region adjacent to Estero Bay.

- Village location assignments are most problematic in the arid lands inland from Mission San Luis Obispo. Our locational assignments in the La Panza and Carrizo Plain regions for Chulucuncunach, Gnimu, Sicpats, and Tez are subject to more doubt than our assignments for any other rancherías.

Ethnographic Language Areas

This report has reconstructed ethnographic boundaries between Salinan, Playano, Chumash, and Yokuts in the South Coast Ranges. We have concluded that some boundaries can be accurately located, while others cannot. Highlights of our findings are repeated below:

- Playano linguistic affinities remain open to question. The Playano dialect seems to have been spoken by the people of the Estero Point and Piedras Blancas regions. One author of this report (Milliken) believes it was probably a dialect of Salinan, possibly a completely separate language; the other author (Johnson) agrees, but adds the possibility that it may also have been a divergent Chumash language (cf. Gibson 1983; Kroeber 1925; Mason 1912). Be that as it may, their descendants became Salinan-speakers prior to 1813 at Mission San Antonio.

- Northern Chumash was spoken in the vicinities we now refer to as Santa Margarita, Atascadero, Paso Robles, San Marcos Creek, and probably Creston at the time of Spanish settlement. Chumash villagers from these areas were removed to Mission San Luis Obispo by the end of 1803. Salinan-speaking Mission San Miguel people later moved onto mission outstations east of San Luis Obispo, probably beginning in the 1820s.

- Salinan-speaking groups held most of the San Juan Creek portion of the headwaters of the Salinas River watershed, east of Mission San Luis Obispo. Doubt exists regarding the precise Salinan-Chumash language boundary in that area. People of the southern portion of the La Panza region and the northern portion of the Carrizo Plain region may have been bilingual or they may have been Northern Chumash-speakers (cf. Gibson 1983).

- Salinan-speaking groups, not Yokuts-speaking groups, probably held all of the tiny streams and springs in the eastern foothills of the Coast Ranges, from the north end of the Carrizo Plain north to Los Gatos Creek, at the time of Spanish entry (cf. Kroeber 1925). After the Salinans moved to missions San Antonio and San Miguel between 1802 and 1810, that hill country was available for direct resource exploitation by Yokuts-speakers from the Tulare-Buena Vista Lake region.

Patterns of Ranchería Outmarriage

Without doubt, all the small rancherías in the study area participated in marriage alliances with their neighbors. This is to be expected in the light of a large body of world-wide ethnographic research regarding regional intermarriage in low population gathering societies. Whether families live their daily lives in bands of 20 people each or in villages of 300 people each, they will find spouses for their young people within a large community of at least 500 people, driven by the nature of their demographic structure and rules against marriage within the nuclear family (Adams and Kasakoff 1976; Wobst 1976).
No single study area community, except multi-village Cholam, had more than 300 members. Some of the named rancherías had as few as 20 members. None of our 28 local regions are likely to have had populations larger than 310 people (estimated for Nacimiento) at the time of Spanish entry into the area. To participate in pools of 500 or more people, rancherías of every local region must have had some marriage ties outward to rancherías in neighboring regions. This is especially true of rancherías directly on the coast, who could find no marriage partners to the west.

In the coastal and Salinas River regions, where population density ranged from 1.2 to 1.8 per square mile, people could participate in 500-person interaction pools by reaching out to all the villages in their own region and the nearest villages in each surrounding region. In those areas, marriages among people from villages farther than 20 miles apart cannot be explained by practical needs to participate in a 500 person community. Such longer distance marriages probably reflect economic and political alliance.

In the arid interior, population density along the Temblor Range was probably less than 0.2 persons per square mile. The Chulucucunach, Tisagues, and Sulaltap people had to interact with neighbors over a very wide area to participate in a 500-person marriage community. Thus they are expected to have numerous outmarriages to the large Yokuts villages of the San Joaquin Valley, and to villages as far as 25 or 30 miles to their west. For them, such long distance outmarriages would not reflect special economic or political alliance, but practical need.

FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS

This study has provided new information about tribal communities around missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo during the early mission period. However, much can be done to modify and improve its tentative conclusions. Quantitative studies of inter-group marriage patterns, not undertaken in this study, would be valuable for refinement of our picture of social networks. In addition, kinship charts need to be developed for more of the communities of the inland regions. Three other possible future approaches are described in more detail below:

1. integrated inter-mission kinship analyses from San Francisco to Santa Barbara;
2. archaeological studies to verify locations of heavy and light population during the protohistoric period; and
3. professional linguistic analysis of male personal names in the mission registers, to determine local area language affiliations.

A Complete Coast Range Population Model Study

An exhaustive study of South Coast Range ethnogeography would bring together every shred of documentary evidence and review the likelihood of every inference. We have not done that for any single local region within the South Coast Ranges. The work of J. Alden Mason and A. L. Kroeber resulted in a first-pass ethnogeography (Kroeber 1925). The family-network analyses of Robert Gibson contributed a second-pass ethnogeography of the region. Our population distribution model allowed us, we believe, to develop a third-pass inferential ethnogeography for the entire study area. But the complete ethnogeography of the South Coast Ranges can only be completed through an exhaustive study of the entire south-Central California area, using integrated family charts for groups from San Francisco Bay to the Santa Barbara Channel. Such a study would eliminate, as far as possible, ongoing concerns regarding mission outreach overlap, all the way down the South Coast Range.

For us to have a comprehensive picture of all the local groups who moved to missions San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo from Coast Range valleys over the 1771-1810 period, an ethnographic study is needed for the entire Coast Ranges, without regard to prejudged language boundaries or specific mission spheres of influence. From Mount Diablo on the north to the Carrizo Plain on the south, mission registers and ethnographic studies have provided very few direct clues regarding specific village locations. Clues from all missions are necessary to understand tribal hinterlands for any one mission, because each
Franciscan mission down the Coast Range overlapped in its recruitment with its neighboring mission to the north and south.

The total baptized tribal population between Pacheco Pass and the Carrizo Plain, and west of the San Joaquin Valley, was 9,329. People from the area went to San Juan Bautista (1,502 people), San Carlos Borromeo (1,535 people), Soledad (1,156 people), San Antonio (2,085 people), San Miguel (1,149 people), and San Luis Obispo (682 people north of the La Panza Range). A comprehensive study would begin by analyzing kinship networks, nearest neighbors, and alias names for each village group, small or large.

**Linguistic Personal-Name Analysis**

We recommend a study of Salinan and Chumash male personal names from the study area missions, in order to shed more light on the languages spoken in rancherías of ambiguous boundary areas. An initial personal name study, performed by Milliken with minimal involvement of professional linguists, hinted at differences between Chumash and Salinan male names, but was not conclusive. A future study must be carried out by professional linguists.

Village name linguistic analysis may also be valuable, but is not as likely to produce clues regarding language distributions as personal name analysis. A specific village name, as written by a Franciscan priest in a baptismal record, may not be the name that was used by that village’s inhabitants. The Indian translator at a mission was not from the language group of the people being baptized. For instance, Bubal, the Salinan name, was used in the San Miguel registers for the Yokuts Wowol group.

Linguists performing personal-name analyses need to have access to each recorded version of a specific individual’s native name (as ego in a baptism and marriages, as father or mother in a different baptism, and as father or mother in confirmations). They need to be familiar with the handwriting of specific priests, or have trust in the transcriptions of the people who typed the names into computer data bases.

**Archaeological Studies**

Systematic archaeological survey and site testing will be a necessary component of a more accurate model of the contact period population distribution. Armed with a complete data base of known Late Period site locations, future researchers will be in a much better position to infer the locations of specific rancherías discussed in this study. To date, only limited portions of federal lands and lands along state highways in the South Coast Ranges have received complete archaeological survey. Also, very few archaeological sites have been dated.

**Archival and Ethnographic Studies**

We agree with one reviewer that a wonderful study of the cultural, tribal, and family histories of the Salinan and Northern Chumash descendants can be carried out in the future using federal censuses, Hearst Business and Family Records, BIA Records, Cemetery Records, and records form the Sherman Indian School, along with another reexamination of the J. P. Harrington material. Such work could be enriched by the active participation of twenty-first-century Salinan and Northern Chumash descendents.

**REFLECTION**

Between 1925 and 1983, the world of South Coast Range ethnography seemed simple. Anyone who wanted to learn about Indian people of the area at the time of Spanish settlement could pick up Kroeber’s (1925) Handbook to learn about the life ways and territories of the Salinan and Chumash language groups. In those years, differences of opinion about long uninhabited village locations and about precise language boundaries were not debated in the anthropological literature. That changed in 1983 when Gibson offered new evidence for village locations and language boundaries. The differences between Kroeber’s and Gibson’s language maps were profound. Consequently, the world of South Coast Range ethnography was no longer a simple one.
We undertook our study (1) to verify Gibson’s ranchería locations, and (2) to determine whose language map, Gibson’s or Kroeber’s, was correct. After completing our study, we feel that most language boundaries in the South Coast Ranges are now clear. However, a question remains for the language of one small area, the coast of present San Luis Obispo County from Cayucos north to Ragged Point. Was the Playano language of that area a Salinan dialect, a Northern Chumash dialect, or a distinct language? We cannot answer this question with certainty, although Milliken believes the preponderance of the evidence points to Salinan. Linguistic studies may be able to resolve the issue in the future.

We also attempted to understand Gibson’s evidence for the placement of specific ranchería locations on the landscape. Only a few rancherías known to the consultants of J. P. Harrington can be mapped to a specific spot on the ground. Having brought a great body of evidence together in this report, including scores of new extended family kinship charts, we agree with some of Gibson’s ranchería placements and suggest alternatives for others. Certainly, ambiguities will remain regarding the precise locations of many rancherías. Was a specific ranchería a village at a given place, or was it in the next valley over? Or did its name refer to a region and its mobile inhabitants, and not a village at all? Despite the uneven nature of the evidence, we believe that we have mapped all of the larger study area rancherías to within five or ten miles of their actual locations. We have also laid out a study procedure for South Coast Range ethnogeography that can be refined in the future.
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APPENDIX A

COMPUTER-AIDED ANALYSIS
OF
STUDY AREA MISSION RECORDS
APPENDIX A

MISSION REGISTER CONTENTS AND DATA MANIPULATION

Computer data bases have aided the study of Mission San Antonio, Mission San Miguel, and Mission San Luis Obispo registers. They provide rapid retrieval and sorting of information that address the following research domains:

- California Indian demography at the colonial contact period
- Colonial contact period village group sizes and relative locations
- Colonial contact period language group distributions
- Colonial contact period history
- Family history information for modern descendants

Region-wide genealogical studies of church records have been undertaken in Europe since the 1950s to reconstruct patterns of change in fertility, mortality, population density, and regional intermarriage. Such genealogical methods, which build patterns from the life histories of hundreds or thousands of individuals, has been called family reconstitution (Wrigley 1966). Family reconstitution studies develop the orderly relationships among myriad bits of information, turning thousands of meaningless names into the stories of individuals and families, documenting individuals' length of life, number of marriages, number of children, and the ages at baptism, marriages, and death.

From the late 1960s forward, similar regional studies based on patterns of family relationships have been undertaken in California. Searching California mission vital records for all the references to each person and that person’s relatives, however, is akin to seeking the proverbial needle in a haystack. An individual may be mentioned in a number of different mission register entries – as the subject of a baptism in one, as a parent or other relative in another, and as a god-parent in still another. The same individual may appear as a spouse in a marriage register entry and as the deceased person in a death entry. A computerized data base is the key to efficient family reconstitution for California mission register information.

This appendix explains the data bases that have been developed for computer-based regional studies in California. Appendix A, Part 1 describes the mission records, the computer data bases, and family network reconstruction. Part 2 lists the current status of computer data entry for the study area missions, and Part 3 contains a Code Manual for the Mission San Antonio and Mission San Miguel data bases.
APPENDIX A

PART 1

CALIFORNIA MISSION REGISTER CONTENTS

Each Franciscan mission in California kept a set of vital registers in which they entered the sacramental events of community members, one register for baptisms, one for marriages, one for deaths/burials, and one for confirmations. Some missions also kept padrons (censuses and/or indexes) for specific years or groups of years. Most of the early registers were saved in archives of the Catholic church in California, where they continue to exist today.

Mission register entries at all California missions follow fairly standard formats. Types of information common to baptismal, marriage, confirmation, and death register entries include:

1. unique index numbers at the left margin of each individual register entry;
2. date of the register entry (written only with the initial entry of the day);
3. a statement about the place where the event took place (usually in a mission church, sometimes at the mission village, another mission, a tribal village, or in some other location away from the mission);
4. the Spanish first name (and occasionally surname) given the individual at their time of baptism; and
5. the signature of the priest of record. Handwriting indicates that most missionaries made their own register entries, yet at times unknown scribes wrote entries which were signed by other people.

Beyond the standard information, records vary in the amount of additional detail. Each missionary priest developed his own unique approach to record keeping. Because many of the priests moved from one mission to another, as much variation exists in the entry formats within a register of a given mission as exists between the registers of the various missions (see discussion in Chapter 4).

Information Specific to Baptismal Registers

Baptismal registers generally contain more information about individuals than the other registers. The following areas of information commonly appear in the baptismal registers but only rarely appear in others.

Indian Name. Priests at Mission San Miguel entered the native names of almost all persons over one year of age in their baptismal entries, male and female. Priests at San Antonio usually provided native names of males, but with numerous lapses; they never provided the native names of females.

Age. The priests entered an estimated age for baptismal registrants. Junípero Serra noted the problem of assigning age to people whose birth dates had not been previously recorded:

Concerning the age of the Indian neophytes . . . it may be remarked that since most of them were baptized in adult age, we cannot know exactly how old they are because they themselves cannot give us the information. Accordingly, the age is put down at what they appear to be – no exact figures being possible – as has always been our practice in census and baptismal records (Serra 1956:3:171).

Disproportionately large numbers of persons at some missions were age "clumped," that is, with guessed ages such as “about thirty,” “forty, more or less,” or “more than fifty” years of age. That is not the case at either San Antonio or San Miguel.
Home group or village. Some of the Franciscans provided the names of the home rancherías of each of their converts. (The word ranchería as they used it is a very imprecise term; it could indicate a specific village or a political community, much as the word “pueblo” is used in the current Hispanic world.) The priests at San Antonio provided village/group names for only three of the first 100 converts, but improved to 650 of the first 1,000 converts. At San Miguel, the priests provided the village/group names of most of their converts, although the group name “Cholam” was used so frequently that it may not mean much more than “Easterners.”

Godparent. Each baptismal registrant was assigned a godparent. In the early years all godparents were members of the Spanish community – soldiers, colonists, or visitors from the supply ships. Christian Indians became sponsors after 1786.

Other Relationships. The first converts of each particular political group were usually children whose parents were non-Christians. At both San Antonio and San Miguel the native names of non-Christian fathers were recorded in the entry for the first child brought by a family. In cases where non-Christian parents continued to bring other children in for baptism over time, the relationship of those later children to the family was often indicated only by a cross-reference to the previously baptized siblings.

Common Information in Marriage Registers
Most priests were careful to note the prior marital history of everyone married in their churches. Three marriage statuses pertained – recruited couples renewing their tribal marriages before the Church, previously unmarried people, and people widowed from a Church marriage. As in the baptismal registers, Christian names are always listed. Marriage records list at least one set of witnesses, those for the wedding itself. Some priests also listed separately the witnesses who initially testified that there was no impediment to the marriage.

Baptismal register numbers were entered for most individuals in the marriage records at San Miguel. Such cross-referencing is seldom found, however, in the marriage register at San Antonio. At both missions priests only occasionally supplied information about the parents of Indian spouses, but always supplied such details for Hispanic immigrants.

Common Information in Death Registers
Death register entries usually list the date of interment, or the date that the priest found out that a person had died away from the mission. Information about the cause of death was very seldom provided, and when it was, it was always deaths of violence such as a murder, from a snake bite, or from drowning. Some entries indicate that the deceased had been a runaway. Death register entries mention disease names or symptoms during only two periods, that of an unknown peste epidemic in 1802 and that of a measles epidemic in 1806.

Confirmation Register Information
Confirmation records are usually brief lists of the Spanish given names of large numbers of individuals confirmed on a specific date. The Confirmation Register of San Antonio adds additional valuable information for many people, such as their surnames (which often had not been assigned at baptism) and the Spanish given names of the parents (often not stated at baptism).

Padrones and Indexes
Some missions produced detailed census records, or padrones, listing all the individuals alive during a given year, in alphabetical groups. In some cases those padrones were updated by checking off people who had died and adding the names of newly baptized people. Such padrones do not, therefore, represent just the year that they were first created. Mission San Antonio has such a padrón, created at an unknown date. It lists the native names of some fathers and the Spanish given names of some fathers or mothers that do not appear in any other records.
CALIFORNIA MISSION RECORD DATA BASES

Three distinct California mission register computer data base systems exist at this time. Milliken built data bases for missions San Carlos Borromeo, San Francisco Asís, Santa Clara, San José, and San Juan Bautista between 1978 and 1996, using a specific data entry format which we will call the Northern Format. Separately, between 1980 and 1996, Johnson and other scholars built a data base of records from missions San Fernando, San Buenaventura, Santa Bárbara, Santa Inés, La Purísima, and San Luis Obispo, using a format that we will call the Southern Format. More recently, a new data base format, the Early California Population Project Format, has been developed and used under direction of Stephen Hackel to enter records from Mission San Gabriel, the Los Angeles Plaza Church, the Santa Bárbara Presidio, and Mission San Diego.

Northern Data base Format

Under the Northern Format, the vital register data for each mission have actually been organized into two distinct data bases, a baptism/death records table and a separate, but cross-referenced, marriage records table. The baptism/death records table for a mission contains an individual record with 34 data fields for each baptized person. The thirty-four fields represent six different kinds of data, as follows:

- Direct information from ego's (person being baptized) baptismal record (14 fields)
- Direct information from ego's death/burial record (9 fields)
- Parental cross-reference information that may derive from a number of sources (4 fields)
- Ego's home ranchería, which may derive from a number of sources, in standard spelling (1 field)
- Source/reliability fields for information not explicit in baptism or death record (4 fields)
- Special field to highlight remarkable entries and Notes (memo) field for extensive mission record text quotes, and for discussion of inferences (2 fields)

In the Northern format, a separate Marriage Records table contains twenty-two fields – sixteen fields of direct information about the marriage and the involved spouses, two fields each for the unique mission/baptismal numbers of the two spouses, and two source/reliability fields to mark how the unique baptismal numbers of the spouses were identified.

The Northern format was originally developed in the "dBASE" data base structure for DOS operating systems. Its data are directly transferable into the Microsoft Access 2000 software for Windows operating systems. As of the year 2002, records for approximately 47,000 individuals have been entered and fully cross-referred in the Northern format, including 3,785 completed records for Mission San Antonio and 2,418 completed records for Mission San Miguel.

Southern Data base Format

Under the Southern format, the basic data for baptisms, marriages, and deaths are in a single table. The forty active fields in the format are assigned to the following types of information:

- Direct information from ego's baptismal record (13 fields)
- Direct information from ego's death/burial record (3 fields)
- Parental cross-reference information that may derive from a number of sources (8 fields)
- Ego's home ranchería, which may derive from a number of sources, in standard spelling (1 field)
- Marriage number for up to five marriages (15 fields)

The Southern format does not include source/reliability fields to mark how linkage decisions were made for death events and marriage events, nor to mark how ranchería assignments were determined.

The Southern format was initially developed using the "dBASE" data base structure (Johnson 1988; McLendon and Johnson 1999). Subsequently, Johnson supervised the creation of data bases for Mission San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano in an expanded version of the Southern format, using the Microsoft Access program (Johnson 1999; Johnson, Crawford and O'Neil 1998: Appendix I; Johnson and O'Neil 2001: Appendix III). The version of the Southern format used for Mission San Luis Rey and Mission San Juan Capistrano contains additional fields, including note fields for discussing differences in reported ranchería affiliation found in various
records for a given individual (see Johnson, Crawford and O’Neil 1998:8-16, Appendix I; Johnson and O’Neil 2001:Appendix III). As of the year 2002, records for approximately 31,000 individuals have been entered and fully cross-referred in the Southern format, including 3,083 individuals baptized at Mission San Luis Obispo.

**Early California Population Project Format**

The data base format for the Early California Population Project (ECPP) was initially developed in July of 1999 at a meeting hosted by the Huntington Library Two scholars familiar with the Northern Format (Milliken and Hackel) and two who had used the Southern format (Johnson and David Earle) met with a computer programmer (Scott Edmondson) to design a new system that would combine aspects of both formats in a relational data base that would incorporate additional fields to accommodate other kinds of information. Microsoft Access 2000 was selected as the platform for this new system with the awareness that an upgrade to SQL Server would at some point become necessary to manipulate a single very large data base.

Initial data entry since 1999 under the ECPP format has taken place for information from the books of baptisms, marriages, and burials for the four southern establishments that had not yet been entered into comprehensive data bases. These were the sacramental registers for Mission San Diego (which included the Spanish-Mexican population of the San Diego Presidio), Mission San Gabriel (which included the Spanish-Mexican population of the Pueblo of Los Angeles), the Los Angeles Plaza Church (established 1826), and the Santa Bárbara Presidio (which maintained separate registers from those used at nearby Mission Santa Bárbara).

Under the ECPP format, separate tables were created with the Access data base for baptisms, marriages, and burials. As the project progressed many more fields were added to systematically capture virtually all of the information contained in each entry in the registers. After two years of data entry, most of the explicit register information from the four institutions have been entered into the data base, up to the year 1848. Baptism, marriage, death, and parent cross-references have been established for more than half of the entries in the three Access tables. The ECPP format has not been used to computerize information from the missions San Antonio, San Miguel, or San Luis Obispo sacramental registers.
In this section we describe steps used to mark family links and identify ranchería populations using computer data bases. This process forms the basis for kinship chart development (see Appendix E) and for assigning ranchería membership to most individuals not identified with a ranchería at baptism.

Step 1. Computer Entry of Baptismal Data – A record is created for each baptismal entry at a mission. Baptism number, date, age of ego (person being baptized), and ego’s christened Spanish name (in a standardized spelling), are each typed into a dedicated field. If ego’s native name is given, it is also entered in a dedicated field. In the northern data bases, fields are available for the father’s and mother’s names. Home ranchería is entered in the “group” field (“origin” field in the Southern format data base). Godparent information has not been computerized, but could be added in the future. Atypical bits of information about home place, relatives, or the conditions of the baptism are entered verbatim in memo (text) fields for records in the northern data bases, but not the Southern format data base.

Step 2. Death Register Data Linkage to Baptismal Records – Next, burial records are sequentially matched to the records of baptized individuals, and their pertinent data added to dedicated fields in the appropriate record. It is critical to match the death record to the correct baptismal record, an action that often entails determining who the deceased was among two or more people with a particular given name. For death records in which the scribe supplied the baptismal number of the ego, the matter is easy. In cases where they didn’t, there was seldom a problem in identifying the appropriate person, since the same Spanish name was rarely used for more than one living person of the same generation.

Step 3. Marriage Register Cross-References – Marriage record cross references were handled differently in the Northern and Southern format data bases. The Northern format, used for missions San Antonio and San Miguel, involved marriage tables with a record for information about each marriage, in a completely separate table from the baptism/death record table. In the Southern format, used for Mission San Luis Obispo, the marriage record number of each spouse was entered in a field in that spouse’s baptismal/death record. In both systems, a decision must be made that identifies a spouse in a marriage record as a particular individual in the baptism/deaths table. Some missionaries supplied the baptismal numbers of participants in their marriage record entries. Where this was not the case, it was necessary to identify the baptismal number of a spouse from the people with the appropriate name in the baptismal data base, picking the actual participant through analysis of appropriate age and marital status of living people with that name. This step is critical, and it is occasionally difficult to find the right person. In the Northern format, code letters are used to mark the confidence of all links, and all uncertain links are discussed in the memo field associated with the appropriate marriage record.

Step 4. Initial Child-to-Parent Cross-References – Baptismal numbers of all identifiable parents were placed in the fields for “father” and “mother” in each person’s record in the baptisms/deaths data base. Some of those numbers were supplied by the priests at the time of baptism. Many adults were stated to be the parents of previously baptized children. In other cases, people were identified as siblings, only one of whom can also be directly linked to the parents. Thus indirect ties are made between many children and their parents.1

1 Confirmation records occasionally give identities of parents not otherwise available. At this time, all Mission San Luis Obispo confirmation records have been checked for parental cross-references, as have the earliest Mission San Antonio confirmation records. Some parents can be identified by their Christian names only in their children’s confirmation records. The Mission San Luis Obispo confirmation
Step 5. Inferring Ranchería Membership – When all possible parent-child links are made, baptism/death records of people are sorted into family groups on the basis of their parental baptismal numbers. At this time, ranchería membership is inferred for individual family members that lacked a ranchería identification at baptism. Such individuals are assigned to the ranchería to which the majority of family members belong in the Northern format, or according to inferred rules of post-marriage residence in the Southern format. In the Northern format, the inferred ranchería name is not placed in the “Group” field, but in a separate field, called “Codegroup,” where direct and inferential ranchería membership assignments are listed in standardized spelling form. At the same time, a code letter is entered in a related field to indicate the confidence level of the home-village assignment. The Southern format’s “origin” field mixes direct and inferred ranchería assignments, with ranchería name in a standardized spelling. Under both formats, home ranchería information becomes available in computerized form for the maximal amount of baptized individuals only after hundreds of hours of effort have been expended to reassemble individuals into family groups and to cross-refer information among various kinds of registers.

Step 6. Creation of Extended-Family Charts – Examples of fully elaborated extended-family charts, noting the clues by which family groups have been identified, are shown in Appendix E, Figures 1-42. Draft versions of extended-family charts are often created by the analyst during the initial review of family information, to link baptisms to deaths and marriages. Final charts are most conveniently generated while specific villages, or clusters of related villages, are being studied.
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CURRENT STATUS OF DATA ENTRY
FOR STUDY AREA MISSION RECORDS

The status of data entry as of 2002 for registers from mission San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo are described here.

MISSION SAN ANTONIO REGISTERS – NORTHERN FORMAT

*Libro Primero de Bautismos en que asientan las partidas de los Bautismos de los gentiles que se Christianan en esta nueva Mision de San Antonio de Padua*

- **Baptisms 1-3,785 (August, 1771 through February, 1815)**
  - Full direct data entry, complete parent ID cross-references, complete inferred surname entry, complete standardized spelling of ego's ranchería

- **Baptisms 3,786-4,176 (February, 1815 through May, 1824)**
  - Date, Spanish given name, surname, and group

- **Baptisms 4,177-4,722 (May, 1824 through October, 1859)**
  - Spanish given name, surname, group, intermittent date; full data entry for tribal people

*Libro Primero de Difuntos en que se asientan las partidas de los Entierros de Los que mueren en esta nueva Mision de San Antonio de Padua*

- **Deaths 1-2,508 (August, 1771 through February, 1814)**
  - Full direct data entry of records cross-linked to baptisms; previously undocumented surnames placed in surname field, and occasional incidental information placed in appropriate fields

- **Deaths 2,509-4,089 (February, 1814 through February, 1862)**
  - No data entry.

*Libro Primero de Matrimonios, En que se asientan las Partidas de las Presentaciones, Informaciones y Matrimonios de los que se Casan en esta Nueva Mission de San Antonio de Padua*

- **Marriages 1-1,006 (May, 1773 through October, 1819)**
  - Full direct data entry, complete verification of identity of spouses (seldom supplied in the entry), with previously undocumented surnames placed in surname field of Baptisms/Deaths data base and occasional incidental information placed in appropriate fields in the Baptisms/Deaths data base.
Marriages 1,007-1,282 (October, 1819 through June, 1846)

No data entry, no cross-checking for people from other missions. (A score or so more marriage entries continue sporadically, without entry numbers, through 1872)

San Antonio Book of Confirmations, Volume 1 [original title page missing]

Confirmations 1-308 (December 13, 1778 partially through December 26, 1778)

Entry of cross-referenced confirmation number in the appropriate record in the Baptisms/Deaths data base; previously undocumented surnames and/or parent information placed in appropriate fields in the same data base.

Confirmations 309-1,517 (Partially through May 3, 1799)

Selective entry of cross-referenced confirmation for 353 records; the records chosen were, for the most part, those which contained surname information about an adult ego. This skipped material includes valuable information.

Confirmations 1,518-1,730 (July 28, 1835 through May 20, 1844)

No data entry. After May, 1844 confirmations continued in this book through 1872, but with a different recording format that did not include sequential numbers for individuals.

MISSION SAN MIGUEL REGISTERS – NORTHERN FORMAT

Libro Primero de Bautismos de la Mission del Gloriosíssimo Principe Archangel Señor San Miguel

Baptisms 1-2,418 (July, 1797 through March, 1830)

Full direct data entry, complete parent ID cross-references, complete inferred surname entry, complete standardized spelling of ego’s ranchería

Baptisms 2,419-2,918 (March, 1830 through June, 1862)

Date and Spanish given name

Libro Primero de Difuntos de la Mission del Gloriosíssimo Principe Archangel Señor San Miguel

Deaths 1-825 (January, 1798 through January, 1815)

Full direct data entry of records cross-linked to baptisms, with previously undocumented surnames placed in surname field and occasional incidental information placed in appropriate fields

Deaths 825-961 (January 1815 through end of 1816)

Selective cross-links for people baptized at San Antonio or San Luis Obispo

Deaths 962-end (Spring of 1817 through an undocumented date)

No data entry
Libro Primero de Casamientos de la Mission del Gloriosíssimo Príncipe Archangel Señor San Miguel

Marriages 1-711 (January 24, 1798 through September, 1828)

Full direct data entry, complete verification of identity of spouses (usually supplied in the entry), with previously undocumented surnames placed in surname field of Baptisms/Deaths data base and occasional incidental information placed in appropriate fields in the Baptisms/Deaths data base.

Marriages 712-871 and Second Series 273-287 (September, 1828 through November 16, 1839)

Date of event and names of spouses, notation of San Antonio and San Luis Obispo spouses

Marriages Second Series 288-400 (January 6, 1840 through April 18, 1860)

No data entry, no check for San Antonio and San Luis Obispo spouses

MISSION SAN LUIS OBISPO REGISTERS – SOUTHERN FORMAT

Libro Primero en que se asientan las partidas de los Bautismos de la Gentildad, que se Christiana en esta nueva Mision de San Luis Obispo de Tolosa

Baptisms 1-2,549 (October 1772 through September 1821)

Full direct data entry, complete parent ID cross-references, complete standardized origin entry (including inferred origin)

Libro [Segundo ] de Bautismos de la Mission de San Luis Obispo de Tolosa

Baptisms 2,550-3,085 (December 1821 through August 1850)

Full direct data entry, complete parent ID cross-references, complete standardized origin entry (including inferred origin)

Baptisms 3,086-3,954 (September 1850 through December 1865)

No data entry

Libro 1.o de Entierros en que se asientan las Partidas de los que mueren en esta Mission del S.r San Luis Obispo de Tolosa

Deaths 1-2,441 (October, 1772 through September, 1838)

Full direct data entry of records cross-linked to baptisms,

Libro 2.do de Entierros en que se asientan las Partidas de los que mueren en esta Mision del Sor. San Luis Obispo de Tolosa

Deaths 2,442-2,707 (November, 1838 through December, 1850)

Full direct data entry of records cross-linked to baptisms,

Deaths 2,708-5,500 [3,098-4,999 were not used] (December, 1850 through July, 1884)

No data entry
Libro de Matrimonios . . . que se celebran en esta Mision de San Luis Obispo de Tolosa

Marriages 1-864 (1772 through May, 1844)

Marriage numbers placed in appropriate fields of the each spouse's computer record.

Marriages 865-end of register (years 1854-1902 – entry numbers not used)

No data entry
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NORTHERN FORMAT DATA ENTRY MANUAL – MISSIONS SAN ANTONIO AND SAN MIGUEL

BAPTISMS/DEATHS TABLE FIELDS AND CODES

The Baptisms/Deaths tables in the Northern format contain separate records for each baptism subject or “ego.” Each record contains 34 fields. Only 14 of those fields are dedicated to information found in the ego’s baptismal record. Nine fields are dedicated to information regarding the ego’s death record. One field (codegp) contains a standardized place of origin, derived from any of a number of sources. Six other fields allow marking of special information about the ego, or about the source and quality of some related field. Thus a particular record becomes a transcription of various linked primary sources regarding an ego (see Table A1).

Listed below are descriptions of each of the 34 fields, their typical contents, and special codes used within them:

Field 1 MSSN (2 columns) Source Mission

The following codes differentiate the various missions:

- BU = San Buenaventura
- PU = La Purísima Concepción
- AN = San Antonio
- CA = San Carlos Borromeo
- DI = San Diego
- FE = San Fernando
- FR = San Francisco de Asís
- FS = San Francisco Solano
- GA = San Gabriel Arcangel
- JO = San José
- JB = San Juan Bautista
- JC = San Juan Capistrano
- LO = San Luis Obispo
- LR = San Luis Rey de España
- MI = San Miguel
- RA = San Rafael
- BA = Santa Bárbara
- CL = Santa Clara
- CR = Santa Cruz
- YN = Santa Ynez
- SO = Soledad, Nuestra Señora

The Baptisms/Deaths table contains records for many individuals who died at a mission, but have no baptismal record in any of the above listed missions. The people listed in such records moved into California from elsewhere and appear as egos in California mission burial registers. They are marked in Field 1 (MSSN) as follows:

- ## = foreign-born Hispanics
- && = foreign-born Indians (usually Baja California)
- == = foreign-born, neither Hispanic nor Indian
Field 2 BAPTNUM (5 columns) Baptismal entry number of ego

This is the unique sequential entry number provided by the priest at the left margin of the entry. Entries are treated as alphanumeric characters, not as mathematical numbers. Four spaces leave room for numbers up to 9999. The fifth column is reserved for those few cases in which the priest repeated a baptismal number, either deliberately or by accident. Repeated numbers are further marked sequentially with “A,” “B,” etc. in column 5.

To keep the numbers in the proper columns, zeros are included in numbers below 1000. For instance, “0004” rather than “4” is entered.

Field 3 DATE (8 columns)

This is always the date of baptism. Usually there is only one baptismal date, but occasionally people were conditionally baptized when at danger of death, with a later supplementary ceremony following recovery and completion of a catechism exercise.

Field 4 SITE (2 columns)

This field contains information about the site at which the baptism took place. There are two types of information: a) the specific location of the event, and b) the conditions of baptism.

1st column for Location:
- 1 = mission church
- 2 = mission ranchería
- 3 = home village of ego
- 4 = other native village
- 5-7 = specific outstations unique to each mission
- 8 = some other mission
- 9 = miscellaneous (in memo field)

2nd Column for Special Condition:

An “e” is placed in the second SITE column if the ego was baptized conditionally (artículo mortis or moribundo).

A “p” is placed in the second column if the ego was baptized at the mission, but was born while the missionized parents were “en paseo” (on holiday).

An “h” is placed in the second column if the ego was baptized at the mission, but was born to missionized parents who have been huido (runaway).

Field 5 SEX (1 column)

The missionaries marked the gender of their converts in so many ways that it is impossible for this bit of information to be missed.

M = male  F = female
Field 6 AGE (3 columns)

This column contains numbers only. A “0” is entered for a child described as less than one year old at baptism. In the rare times when no age is given, a variety of cross-reference means are used to decide upon an estimated age, which is entered here, and marked as a guess in the following field.

Field 7 AGELVL (10 columns)

This field qualifies the information in the preceding field. It typically contains an “A” for años. However, if specific age in months or days had been given for a “0” year old, that information is provided here as “Días-[number]” or “Meses-[number]” as appropriate.

Some infants are merely listed as recién nacido (recently born) in which case “Rec. nac.” is added here.

This is also the place where a guessed age is marked by “Guess.”

Field 8 SPANNAME (24 columns)

This is always the Spanish name provided at a person’s baptism. It is standardized to a form that allows alphanumeric sorting of all people who have been given the same name, irrespective of the idiosyncrasies of spelling by individual missionaries. Examples include the following:

- Theresa changed to Teresa
- Vernavela changed to Bernabela
- Josepha changed to Josefa

Capitalized Spanish “I” usually looks identical to “Y.” In these data bases the keyboard letter “Y” is always used for both letters.

Prepositional links in names were used by some priests, dropped by others. Therefore they have been moved to the ends of given names. For instance:

- “Juan de Dios” entered as “Juan Dios -de”
- “Maria de la Concepcion” entered as “Maria Concepcion -de la”

This allows alphabetical sorting and searching for such names, since some nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers drop the prepositions.

Field 9 INDNAME (22 columns)

This field may contain the native name of an individual even if it was not recorded in the baptism. The native name may have appeared in the earlier record of one of the individual's children, or rarely in a later marriage or death record of the individual. If the name did not derive from the baptismal record, it is followed with “-H” (child's record), “-M” (marriage record), “-N” (death record) or some other cross-reference code.

Indian names are sometimes difficult to transcribe, due to an individual scribe’s unclear hand-writing or idiosyncratic letter formation. Transcribers must become familiar with the script of each scribe, by making an alphabet of each capital and lower case letter that the scribe formed in known Spanish words. Especially difficult to differentiate are the letters “r” from “x,” “a” from “o,” and “c” from “e”. Difficulties with unclear handwriting cannot always be overcome. Procedures for letters difficult to transcribe are as follows:

1. Where a letter or group of letters in the original are ambiguous, the best guess is entered first, followed immediately be the second choice in parentheses. For example:
“Tiri??m” might be entered “Tiri(o)m”.

2. Where the letters in the original are ambiguous, without there being alternative guesses, guessed letters are entered in brackets. For example:
   Toc??? might be entered “Toc[rum]”

3. Where a letter is completely indiscernible, dashes (“-”) are entered within brackets. For example:
   Tur??? might be entered “Tur[---]”

Field 10 SURNAME (20 columns)

Spanish surnames were given to all males and most females at San Antonio and San Miguel by the time of their confirmations or marriages (an uncommon practice in most of the California missions). The surnames are placed in this field with standardized spellings. As with native names, if the surname in this field did not derive from the baptismal record, it is followed with -H (child’s record), -M (marriage record), -N (death record), or some other cross-reference code.

The surnames of children of gente de razón (settlers and soldiers) are placed in this field with a “#” in the lead column. The surnames of Baja California Indians are placed here with an “&” in the lead column.

Field 11 GROUP (34 columns)

Information about the home group of the ego is placed here, with the key word in the left-hand column. If no information was given, a “-” is entered in the left-hand column. In some cases the ego’s home group can only be identified from later marriage or burial register information. In such a case the information is added to this field to the right of a back-slash (/). The specific source of that supplemental information is indicated by a “-M” (from marriage), “-N” (from death record), or some other cross-reference code.

“**” indicates that a detailed entry is briefly characterized in this field, and more fully transcribed in the NOTES memo field.

Field 12 CODEGP (18 columns)

Whereas the “Group” field contains the spelling of the person’s tribe or village just as recorded in the baptismal record, this field contains the standardized spelling or more typical name for the person’s tribe. If various records have contradictory information about tribal membership, the most logical choice is entered in this field.

This “CODEGP” field is the basis for counts of tribal size and for sorting tribal membership lists.

Field 13 GCFD (2 column)

This field (Group Confidence Field) is a route marker, pointing to the source location for the information about tribal group entered in the previous field, that of “CODEGP.” It also indicates the amount of guess work and contradiction involved in the decision about tribal group membership for the individual. Codes used and their meaning are found in Table A2 in this appendix.

Field 14 PRIEST (6 columns)

This field is for the priest who signed the entry. It contains the priest’s surname or a seven-letter code that characterizes his name.
Sometimes the handwriting of an entry is clearly not that of the priest who signed off on the bottom of the entry. It will be valuable in the future to decipher the true scribe of each entry.

Field 15 SPECIAL (10 Columns)

This field is used to mark occasional and exceptional occurrences, such as the mention of a capitán or a person who was ciega (blind), or huida (runaway).

Field 16 DMSSN (2 columns)

Mission of ego's death record. Same code scheme as Field 1.

Field 17 DNUM (5 columns)

Unique death record number for the person explicitly stated by the priest of record to have been the person baptized under the baptismal number in Field 1, or the named person inferred by the researcher to be this person (see Field 18 below).

Field 18 DCFD (2 columns)

This field contains a code that signifies how the link of the death record was made to the specific individual baptized in the entry marked in Fields 2. See the code choices in Table A3.

Field 19 DSITE (2 columns)

This column notes the place of death. When the field is empty, the person was buried at the mission church without any comment regarding the place of death.

Place of death is not always the same as the place of burial. Codes are the same as those for Field 4. Lower case letters following numbers indicate special information, found in memo field (p = died en paseo, i.e., on a holiday in the field; h = died while a fugitive; v = died under violent conditions).

Additional codes note deaths at other missions (see Field 1 above) or Presidios:

PB = Presidio at Santa Bárbara
PD = Presidio at San Diego
PF = Presidio at San Francisco
PM = Presidio at Monterey

Field 20 DDATE (8 columns)

The date that leads the entry for the ego in the Register of Burials is entered here. It is usually the date of the actual funeral ceremony and burial, which may be on the day of death, but was often one or two days later.

About one entry in fifty was made on the basis of hearsay evidence of death. These were usually added to the Book of Burials at the year end. In such cases, an arbitrary date of death during the prior year has been assigned, so that statistical studies will not indicate an inordinate number of December deaths.
Field 21 DENTRY (8 columns)

This field for the “Date of death record entry” is used only when the actual death occurred weeks or months prior to the date of record entry in the mission book of deaths. It is used mainly for the “end of year” additions of people who died away from the missions.

Field 22 DAGE (3 columns)

Very few priests actually noted the age of people in their death records, other than as adulto or parula (children between about two and ten years old). On those few occasions when age in years was entered, the information was recorded here.

Field 23 DALVL (10 columns)

General age, almost always noted in death entries as adulto/a or párul/a, is written here. If the person is noted as “casada” (married) or “viuda” (widowed) at the time of death, that information is noted here.

The string “Casada” in this field indicates that the name of the person’s spouse was given in the record and has been listed in the NOTES field of this record.

Field 24 DGROUP (32 columns)

Information in the death record about the home group of the ego, or about the place of death, is entered with the key word in the information set in the left hand column. If no information was given, a “-” is entered in the left-hand column.

Field 25 DPRIEST (6 columns)

This field is for the priest who signed the entry. It contains the priest’s name or a six-letter code that characterizes his name.

Field 26 MNAME (26 columns)

This column contains the names of the ego’s parents, if given. In cases where the parent is a non-Christian, it would be a native name. The Christian names of Christianized parents are always provided.

This field can contain the name of the father from a number of sources in addition to the ego’s baptismal record. If the name comes from some other source, however, it is followed by a “-M” (marriage record), “-N” (death record), “-I” (Index), “-T” (confirmation record), or some other source code.

Field 27 MMIS (2 columns)

This field uses the mission ID codes from Field 1 for the home mission of a baptized father.

Field 28 MBAP (7 columns)

This field contains the father’s unique baptismal identification number, if the father has been identified as baptized. Some missionary priests entered the baptismal numbers of a mission-born ego’s parents, others
entered the parental names only. For most adult converts, the parents were never listed. However, the parents of many people, especially young people, can be identified through a variety of cross-references to subsequent entries, as noted under Field 29 below.

Special alphanumeric strings beginning with “H” are used to mark an unknown parent of two or more baptized siblings. The string “H2340” derives from the baptismal number of the last of a group of siblings with a common parent who has no baptismal number; it is used in the parent field of all of the siblings.

Field 29 MCFD (2 columns)

The Male Code Field marks the source of the father’s identification as well as the confidence with which the identification was made. See Table A4 for these codes, which are only partially comparable to the codes in fields 12 and 18.

Field 30 FMIS (2 columns)

This field uses the mission ID codes from Field 1 for the home mission of a baptized mother.

Field 31 FBAP (7 columns)

This field contains the mother’s unique baptismal identification number if the mother has been identified as baptized. Some missionary priests entered the baptismal numbers of a mission-born ego’s parents, others entered the parental names only. For most adult converts, the parents were never listed. However, the parents of many people, especially young people, can be identified through a variety of cross-references to subsequent entries, as noted under Field 32 below.

Special alphanumeric strings beginning with “H” are used to mark an unknown parent of two or more baptized siblings. The string “H2340” derives from the baptismal number of the last of a group of siblings with a common parent who has no baptismal number; it is used in the parent field of all of the siblings.

Field 32 FCFD (2 columns)

The Female Code Field marks the source of the mother’s identification as well as the confidence with which the identification was made. See Table A4 for these codes, which are only partially comparable to the codes in fields 12 and 18.

Field 33 FNAME (26 columns)

This column contains the name of the ego’s mother, if given. In a case where the mother is a non-Christian, it would be a native name (never given at San Antonio). The Christian names of Christianized parents are always provided.

This field can contain the name of the mother from a number of sources in addition to the ego’s baptismal record. If the name comes from some other source, however, it is followed by a “-M” (marriage record), “-N” (death record), “-I” (Index), “-T” (confirmation record), or some other source code.
Field 34 NOTES (memo field)

Important text information regarding the individual is put here. This includes all information about siblings and other relatives (excluding parents) found in a baptismal entry. It also includes information from death registers or any other important source mentioning this individual.
The logic of the Marriages table in the Northern format is somewhat different than the logic of the Births/Deaths table, in that each record contains information about two egos. The fields MBAP and FBAP are critical in the Marriage table, as they hold the key information that ties the egos of the Marriages table to the egos of the Births/Deaths table.

Field 1 CMISS (2 columns)
This is a code for the mission in which the marriage was recorded. Mission codes are listed in Baptisms/Deaths table, Field 1.

Field 2 CASNUM (5 columns)
This is the unique marriage number in the left margin of the marriage book.

Field 3 DATE (8 columns)
This is the date of final ceremony of marriage.

Field 4 MSURNAME (14 columns)
This is the surname of the male spouse, a standardized spelling of the name as written in the entry. Surnames are usually taken from Hispanic surnames, but are occasionally derived from the native name of an Indian father or grandfather.

Field 5 MNAME (24 columns)
This is the Spanish given name of the male spouse, a standardized spelling of the name as written in the entry.

Field 6 MSTATUS (2 columns)
The marital history of individuals placed them in one of three statuses relative to Roman Catholic marriage: married as pagans, widow/widower, or bachelor/bachelorette. The condition was usually stated by the entrant.

R = renovar (renewing marriage)
S = soltero (bachelor)
V = viudo (widower)

In some cases the information was not made explicit. When the marriage history of the person was determined on the basis of earlier mission register information, the letter "I" for "inferred" was added in the second column (RI, SI, VI).
Field 7 MMIS (2 columns)

This field uses the codes from the Baptisms/Deaths Format, Field 1 for the mission of the spouses.

Field 8 MBAP (7 columns)

This field follows the rules from the Baptisms/Deaths Format, Field 2, for the baptismal numbers of the spouses. At San Miguel, the spouse's baptismal number is usually provided. However, it is not provided at San Antonio.

Field 9 HCFD (2 columns)

The Husband Code Field marks the source of the husband's baptismal ID as listed in fields 7/8. The codes for this field are found in Table A5.

Field 10 WCFD (2 columns)

The Wife Code Field marks the source of the wife's baptismal ID as listed in fields 11/12. The codes for this field are found in Table A5.

Field 11 FMIS (2 columns)

This field uses the codes from the Baptisms/Deaths Format, Field 1 for the mission of the spouses.

Field 12 FBAP (7 columns)

This field follows the rules from the Baptisms/Deaths Format, Field 2, for the baptismal numbers of the spouses. At San Miguel, the spouse's baptismal number is usually provided. However, it is not provided at San Antonio.

Field 13 FSTATUS (2 columns)

The marital history of individuals placed them in one of three statuses relative to Roman Catholic marriage: married as pagans, widow/widower, or bachelor/bachelorette. The condition was usually stated by the entrant.

R = renovar (renewing marriage)
S = soltera (bachelorette)
V = viuda (widow)

In some cases the information was not made explicit. When the marriage history of the person was determined on the basis of earlier mission register information, the letter “I” for “inferred” was added in the second column (RI, SI, VI).
Field 14 FNAME (24 columns)
   This is the Spanish given name of the female spouse, a standardized spelling of the name as written in the entry.

Field 15 FSURNAME (14 columns)
   This is the surname of the female spouse, a standardized spelling of the name as written in the entry. Surnames are usually taken from Hispanic surnames, but are occasionally derived from the native name of an Indian father or grandfather.

Field 16 MPREV (16 columns)
   The Spanish name of a widower's previous spouse is placed in this field, if it is provided in the marriage book entry. Given name precedes surname, except for gente de razón (people of reason; i.e., rational beings).

Field 17 FPREV (16 columns)
   The Spanish name of a widow's previous spouse is placed in this field, if it is provided in the marriage book entry. Given name precedes surname, except for gente de razón.

Field 18 MGROUP (12 columns)
   The home village/group of the male spouse is placed here, as written in the marriage record. This information was seldom provided.

Field 19 FGROUP (12 columns)
   The home village/group of the female spouse is placed here, as written in the marriage record. This information was seldom provided.

Field 20 MAGE (3 columns)
   Age in years of the male spouse is placed here, if provided. Such information was given very rarely.

Field 21 FAGE (3 columns)
   Age in years of the female spouse are placed here, if provided. Such information was given very rarely.

Field 22 PRIEST (6 columns)
   This field is for the priest who signed the entry. It contains the priest's name or a six letter code that characterizes his name.
Table A1. Northern Format Baptisms/Deaths Table Fields, with information regarding fields which may contain secondarily-derived information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Only Direct Baptist/Death Data</th>
<th>Other Data Sources (Source Codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MSSN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Source mission for Ego's Baptism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BAPTNUM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baptismal entry number of Ego</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Date of Ego's baptism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Location of Ego's baptism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex of Ego</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age of Ego in years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AGELVL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Age context information</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SPANNAME</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spanish personal name of Ego</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INNNAME</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Native personal name of Ego</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H,N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Surname of Ego</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,H,I,N,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Village/Group of Ego</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M,N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CODEGP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Village/Group (standardized), often inferred</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,H,N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GCDEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confidence/Source code for village/group</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PRIEST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recording priest for baptism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Special notes to researchers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,H,I,M,N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DMSSN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mission of ego's death record</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DNUM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unique death record number</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DCFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Death entry link confidence/source code</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>DSITE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Site of death</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>DDATE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Date of death</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DENTRY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Date death recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>DAGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age at death (number)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>DALVL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Age scale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>DGROUP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Village/Group of Ego</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>DPRIEST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Priest of record</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MMIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male's (father's) mission of baptism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,I,N,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MBAP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male's (father's) baptismal entry number</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,I,N,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MCFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identity confidence/source code of male (father)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MNAME</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male's (father's) name in ego's baptism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I,N,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>FMIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female's (mother's) mission of baptism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,I,N,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>FBAP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female's (mother's) baptismal entry number</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F,G,I,N,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>FCFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identity confidence/source code of female (mother)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>FNAME</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female's (mother's) name in ego's baptism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I,N,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text field (expandable)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Codes in the right-hand field indicate potential for supplementary information derived from a parent’s baptismal entry (F), a sibling’s baptismal entry (G), a child’s baptismal entry (H), an Index entry (I), a Marriage record entry (M), a Death record entry (N), or a Confirmation entry (T).
Table A2. Code designations for the Group Confidence Field (GCFD; Field 13) in the Baptismal/Death Table, referring to information sources by which standardized Codegp (home group) designations were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Letter</th>
<th>Information Source with Implied Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Direct statement about ego in baptismal entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Direct statement that one parent is from this place, other parent from another group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Conflicting direct statements in various primary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Key alias of the group as it appeared in the direct baptismal statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Direct statement that ego is mission Indian, but lists parent original home group (inconsistently used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>CODEGP entry contradicts baptismal entry, based on overwhelming evidence in other sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Interpretation of a direct statement leads to lumping the “group” entry with this code group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Direct statement from some important Padrón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Direct statement in ego’s death record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Direct statement in ego’s marriage record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Statement in baptismal or death entry of ego’s child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Civil or military correspondence identifies ego’s group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Two or more siblings, parents, or children of ego identified with the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>One child identified with the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>One sibling identified with the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>One parent identified with the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Spouse identified with the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Indirect contradiction, two or more relatives identified from group, others with some other group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Indirect contradiction, one relative identified with this place, another with another group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Most others baptized the same day indirectly found to have been from the assigned group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Special, complex, or uncertain source of information not described above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3.  Death Record Confidence/Source Codes (DCFD; Field 18) for Baptisms/Deaths Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Letter</th>
<th>Information Source with Implied Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Death Record contains ego's baptismal number, as well as other confirming information (such as home group, parents, spouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Death Record contains ego's baptismal number, but not other information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Death Record contains confirming information (native name, home group, and/or parents), but not ego's baptismal number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Death Record contains spouse's name as weak confirming information, and there is only one available living person with this name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Death Record contains no confirming information, but there is only one available living child or adult with this name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Death Record contains an impossible baptismal number; this alternative is almost certainly the correct person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Death record name is somewhat different than this baptismal name, but it is certainly a mutation of this baptismal name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Death record name is not the same as this baptismal name at all, but this is the only possible child of this age from this set of parents identified in the death record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>This is the most likely of more than one alternative person, with a strong likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>This is the most likely of more than one alternative person, with a weak likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>This must be an incorrect death record, since the clearly identified person is already clearly listed as dead in an earlier record. No link made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>There is no way to make a link for this Death Record, since the listed person is unidentifiable to any baptism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A4. Male and Female Code Field (MCFD/FCFD; Fields 29 and 32) in the Baptisms/Deaths Table (Father and Mother identities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Letter</th>
<th>Information Source with Implied Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Direct statement in ego’s baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Information in this parent’s baptismal entry or spouse’s entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Some cross referenced sibling has this parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Some non-parent relative links this person to parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Direct data in confirmation register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Indian name listed in ego baptism, Indian name weakly inferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Indian name listed in ego baptism, strongly inferred (names of a known spouse set match Indian names listed in ego baptism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Direct statement in some Padrón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Relation indicated in death record (ego or this parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marriage record (ego’s or parents’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Spanish name listed in ego baptism, unique number inferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Spanish name listed in a presumed relative's baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Spouse of the identified parent (weak inference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Contextual (see memo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Special inference (see memo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5. Husband and Wife Baptismal Number Confidence/Source Codes (HCFD/WCFD; Fields 9 and 10) for Marriages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Letter</th>
<th>Information Source with Implied Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Ego's ID explicitly stated in the marriage record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ego's ID found, along with name and name of spouse, in the baptismal record of at least one of his/her children (seldom used, since there are quicker sources for ID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ego’s ID and name included in spouse’s baptismal record (for renovaron [tribal marriage renewed in the church] marriages only, very rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Ego’s baptismal record contains spouse’s name (for renovaron marriages only, very rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Through search of Baptisms/Deaths table, this is the only logical person available for this marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Through search of Baptisms/Deaths table, this is the only logical person available for this marriage, all other live people with the name being married or too young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Marriage tie explicit in ego’s Confirmation Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>No one with the marriage record name of ego is alive, but logic indicates that the ego is a person with a name that was significantly different at baptism (see MEMO for specific logic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Marriage tie explicit in ego’s death record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ID carried over for a widow/widower from an earlier marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>This is the most likely of more than one alternative possible person, with a strong likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>This is the most likely of more than one alternative possible person, with a weak likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Marriage tie explicit with ego’s name and ID in the Baptismal Padrón/Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Marriage tie of ego explicit in the baptismal information of a parent (rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Problem. Identified ego’s previous wife is not listed as dead, yet this seems the correct ego ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Problem. Identified ego has been linked to a death record, yet this seems the correct ego ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Problem. The person identified in this record cannot possibly be correct (priest must be mistaken), The basis for my alternative ID is explicated in the MEMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Problem. This person cannot be identified in any Baptisms/Deaths table entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FOR
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AND

FAMILIES FROM COASTAL RANCHERIAS
Figure E-1. Key to Symbols and Codes Used for Geneological Charts.
Figure E-2. Consultant Chart: Family of Onesimo and Maria de Los Angeles Baylon.
Figure E.3. Consultant Chart: Partial Family of Eusebio, Pedro and Tito Encinales.
Figure E-4. Consultant Chart: Family of Pacífico Gallego.
Figure E-5. Consultant Chart: Family of Rosario Cooper.
Figure E-6. Consultant Chart: Possible Parental Families of Dave Mora.
Figure E-7. Selected Families with Quigui members.
Figure E-8. Lamaca Area: Fages, Islas, Agata Maria Families.
Figure E-9. Lamaca Area: Noceras, Campins, and Cota Families.
Figure E-10. Lamaca Area: Valenzuela and Tecchol Families.
Figure E-11. Lamaca Area: Lixjayya and Gali Families.
Figure E-12. Lamaca Area: Peña and Catanera Families.
Figure E-13. Lamaca Area: Aguilar and Aguilà Families.
Figure E-14. Lamaca Group: Chaleu, Quintana, and Reubelta Families.
Figure E-15. Lamaca Group: Clamne and Usson Families.
Figure E-16. Lamaca or Chaal: Pumed, Rubi, Saulay, and Sotelo Families.
Figure E-17. Chaal Area: Avellano, Gamarra, Pelon and part of Garva Families.
Figure E-18. Chaal Area: Amer, Garva, Molina and Soles Families.
Figure E-19. Cazz Links to Nacimiento Region: Canelas, Landa, Portillo and Solo Families.
Figure E-20. Cazz Area: Borica and Lagasca Families.
Figure E-21. Cazz Area: Gil and Marquina Families.
Figure E-22. Tay and Tissimasu Areas: Estudillo, Revilla, Revita, Torre and Ureta Families.
Figure E-23. Tissimasu Area: Gil and Rianjo Families.
Figure E.24. Nacimiento - Chepeux - Suajal Ties: Coach, Omaña, Saavedra, Valderas, and Zicol Families.
Figure E-25. Estero Point Region (Stjauay, Tsetacol, Zasalet Rancherias): Ceballos, Chumpa, Sanchez Families.
Figure E-26. Estero Point Region (Steleglamo, Tsetacol and Zizayotexja Rancherias): Sobrevia & Salvatierra Families.
Figure E-27. Estero Point Region (Tsetacol Rancheria): Lepiano, Patzat, Perez, Tejada and Yorba Families.
Figure E-28. Estero Point Region (Tsetacol Rancheria): Albero, Balbero, Bombico, Corcega, Peligero and Perez Families.
Figure E-29. Estero Point Region (Tsetacol and ZoacauZey Rancherias): Caucao, Compañy, Escollo, Fiol, Monforte, Monroy and Postame Families.
Figure E-30. Estero Point Region (More Tsetcol and Zoaca Zay Families): Erra, Gallardo, Manresa, and others.
Figure E-31. Estero Point and Morro Bay Regions: Espuy (Ibarra), Manrique, and Senra Families.
Figure E-32. Stajahuayo and Tuaya Families at San Luis Obispo (see also Lucía on E-33).
Figure E-33. Some Setjala, Chminu, Chotcagua Families at San Luis Obispo.
Figure E-34. Some Setjala, Chhimu, and Chano Families at San Luis Obispo.
Figure E-35. Some Chotcagua, Chiminu, Setjala Linked Families at San Luis Obispo.
Figure E-36. More Chotcagua, Chnimu and Setjala linked Families.
Figure E-37. Chotcagua, TsquieEU (Chiquieuga) and Chmimu Family Links.
Figure E-38. Morro Bay Region: Chano and Guejetimimu Family Links.
Figure E-39. Some Chano, Sepjato and Tsquieu Family Links.
Figure E-40. Selected Chano, Llemon:, Retpatso Families.
Figure E-41. Selected Families identified with Tskueu.
Figure E-42. Selected Sepjato/Chliquin Families, including Buchon’s Family.
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SOUTH COAST RANGE TRIBAL PERSONAL NAMES
AS EVIDENCE FOR LANGUAGE INFERENCE

In this appendix we describe our effort to discern language differences between the South Coast Range rancheria groups from patterns of terminal sounds on native personal names. The technique, which has been successful in central California, is based upon the premise that suffixes on personal names of one language group are often distinct from those of neighboring language groups. For instance, sound patterns common in Irish personal names are different than those common in Russian personal names; the meaning of those sound patterns need not be understood to differentiate Irish from Russian on the basis of their personal names.

Personal name analysis was first applied in California by James Bennyhoff who identified the languages spoken for many central California tribelets by comparing suffix patterns on female personal names as listed in central California mission records; the suffixes “-mayen” and “-maye” were typical of Plains Miwok groups, “-me” and “-te” were common among Northern Valley Yokuts groups, and “-pi” was common only among Wappo-speaking groups (1977:38-41). Later, Milliken (1994) found that differences in personal name patterns were helpful in identifying clinal boundaries between Ohlone (Costanoan) and Yokuts groups along the eastern edge of the Coast Range.

Gibson (1983:80-82, 174) applied analysis of female personal names to the problem of differentiating Salinan local groups from Northern Chumash local groups. Below we will show that his results were inconclusive because he had small sample sizes for some critical groups. We wish we could report that our own results with male personal names were more useful, but they were, in fact, disappointing.

FEMALE PERSONAL NAMES

Gibson reported that one-third to one-half of the women’s names recorded from Salinan rancherias at and east of Mission San Miguel, such as Cholam, Etsmal, Joyuclac, and Pel, ended with three-letter suffixes consisting of “[consonant] + ‘at’ or ‘et’”; typical names with such suffixes included Ancheget, Hielat, Tayemat, and Ztheyeyat (Gibson 1983:174). None of the women from groups south and west of Mission San Miguel, groups Gibson considered to have been Northern Chumash (such as Cazz, Lehuege, and Pachac), had native names with such endings. Gibson concluded: “If no other locational information were available, a rancheria at San Miguel Mission could be identified as Migueleño Salinan… by the characteristic… female suffixes” (Gibson 1983:82).

In fact, Gibson did not demonstrate that some villages of San Miguel converts spoke Salinan, while other groups spoke Northern Chumash. His data were inadequate to meet that task. He had good-sized samples of female personal names ending in “[consonant] + ‘at’ or ‘et’” for groups he believed to have spoken Salinan, such as Etsmal and Cholam. But he never established an expected contrasting pattern for Northern Chumash female personal names; such names were not reported at Mission San Luis Obispo where he might have expected to find them. A few groups at San Miguel lacked high percentages of “[consonant] + ‘at’ or ‘et’” female name endings, and were thus suggested by Gibson to have been Chumash groups. However, the sample sizes for those groups were too small to be meaningful for discovering any pattern at all; his sample from Cazz was zero, that for Lehuege was five, and that for Pachac was nine (Gibson 1983:174).

It is conceivable that large samples of female names from Cazz and Pachac in the lower Nacimiento River basin would have provided many names ending with “[consonant] + ‘at’ or ‘et.’” But how would we explain it if we...
female personal names from south and west of Mission San Miguel that were divergent from those east of Mission San Miguel? It might be an indication of Northern Chumash, or it might be an indication of a divergent Playano dialect or language. A good set of known Northern Chumash female names is necessary to compare terminal name sound distributions on a regional basis, and such names are not available.

Chumash female names along the Santa Barbara Channel have terminations quite distinctive from those of the core Salinan villages. For example, typical female names listed in the Mission San Buenaventura baptismal register from the village of Sapue are “Alichalaliy eulelene,” “Cushtalmelelene,” “Alishatapmenahuan,” “Suatalmenahuan,” “Aljultimehue,” and “Saliehue” (McLendon and Johnson 1999, Appendix X111:39). At Sapue “-hue,” “-lelene,” and “-huan” account for 55 percent, 30 percent, and 12 percent of the female name terminal forms, respectively. Northern Chumash female personal names may or may not have ended in sound patterns similar to these Ventureño Chumash personal names. It seems that we will never know, because virtually all of the native personal names associated with women in the Mission San Luis Obispo registers have turned out to be the names of their fathers.

We find no evidence from female personal names that aids us in identifying the boundary between Salinan and Chumash village locations. Table F1 shows the results of our independent female personal name-ending analysis and illustrates the problem. We agree with Gibson (1983) that core area Salinan names commonly end in “-t.” Also, we find that common core Chumash female name suffixes, “-hue,” “-lelene,” and “-huan,” are not found at Mission San Miguel. Unfortunately, however, the female name samples from controversial village locations south and west of Mission San Miguel are too small to provide meaningful patterns of personal name endings.

MALE PERSONAL NAMES

Since female personal name analysis failed to help identify language distributions in the study area, we decided to try a study of male names. Men’s names, unlike women’s names, are available for all the villages in the region, because most of the priests at San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo wrote them down at the time of baptism. Gibson (1983:274) had not explicitly attempted such a study, although his Table 12 did list percentages of male names ending in “-at” or “-et” at various villages.

We knew initially that we may find problems in uncovering statistically valid patterns of variation among men’s names from neighboring language groups. Bennyhoff (1977:41) had found no consistent patterns of repeated suffixes on male names among central California groups. Milliken’s data bases show a far wider array of name-endings among male names in central California than among female names. Examination of a few central California name lists suggests the reason: among the Wappo and the Southeast Pomo near Clear Lake, many female names contain gender-marked suffixes, while men’s names do not include such suffixes (Driver 1936; Gifford 1926).

We sorted male names from all three missions in an attempt to identify repetitive terminal sounds. It was impossible to find significant numbers of male names that ended with any particular set of vowels and consonants at any village location at San Antonio, San Miguel, or San Luis Obispo, with the exception of “-chet” and “-huit” among the southernmost villages that went to San Luis Obispo (suffixes also common further south on the Santa Barbara Channel). Suffixes such as “-elka” and “-zoaca” did occur only among known Salinan samples, but in such small numbers that no statistical pattern could be argued from their distribution.

Table F2 suggests a subtle pattern of change in male name endings from north to south. That pattern appears only because we lumped sound sequences together on the basis of vowel/consonant patterns, without
regard to meaningful rules regarding phonemes and morphemes. Male name samples among probable Salinan groups, unlike Chumash groups south of San Luis Obispo, often included the terminal configurations “[vowel]+ ‘l’,” or “[vowel]+ ‘y’,” with or without an additional terminal vowel. Examples of the former are “Chumiel,” “Zaiiquil,” “Odechola,” and “Zzkeale,” and for the latter “Guezcoy,” “Thujthuy,” “Tehacaye,” and “Zzunu’ya.” The southerly Chumash samples, unlike probable Salinan samples, were well represented with the suffixes “-chet,” “huiti,” and “-uit.” Examples are “Matianahuit,” “Sicsacuachet,” “Tomahuit,” and “Uacuguiti.”

We must conclude that the male name-ending patterns do not allow us to differentiate specific Salinan groups from specific Chumash groups because the personal name samples from the controversial areas between missions San Miguel and San Luis Obispo are too small to identify name patterns that place them overwhelmingly with one or the other group. It remains for linguists to attempt alternative analyses of personal names that might tease out indications of language differences among the villages of the south Coast Ranges.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our personal name study did not yield the hoped for results. The female personal name study failed because the priests at Mission San Luis Obispo did not write down the names of women from known Northern Chumash villages. The male personal name study was not hampered in that way, but its results were ambiguous because there was such a wide variety of male personal name endings that no significant pattern of Chumash and Salinan names could be discerned.

A breakthrough in marking differences between Salinan and Northern Chumash male names remains possible, but only through a rigorous linguistic approach. Such an approach would entail parallel studies of mission register name lists by Salinan and Chumash scholars to identify meaningful suffixes or at the very least to identify name endings that follow phonemic rules exclusive to one or the other language. Working together, the scholars could then apply their results to the still-open question of language along San Luis Obispo coast north of Morro Bay and in the interior Salinas River drainage east of San Luis Obispo.
Table F1. Terminal Sounds on the Personal Names of Indian Females from Various South Coast Range Rancherias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>-hue</th>
<th>-lene</th>
<th>-huan</th>
<th>-t</th>
<th>-j</th>
<th>-g</th>
<th>-c</th>
<th>-s</th>
<th>-tan</th>
<th>-a</th>
<th>-e</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-o</th>
<th>-u</th>
<th>m/n</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventureño Chumash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapue</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugú</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Salinan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyuclac</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholame</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisagues</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Valley Yokuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chunut</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wowol</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auyamne</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esselen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imunajan</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelen</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumsen</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendaruc</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagsin</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sample - Probable Salinan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azzil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyne</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachac</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicpats</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stauquel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaltrap</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisja</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sample - Probable Obispeño Chumash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehuege</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sample - Unidentified Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazz</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsetacol</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parentheses (n) indicate counts rather than percentages which would be misleading with such small samples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sample size (n)</th>
<th>chet uit</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>+v</th>
<th>+t</th>
<th>+c</th>
<th>+k</th>
<th>+{ m }</th>
<th>+{ n }</th>
<th>v +{ m }</th>
<th>v +{ n }</th>
<th>/v</th>
<th>/y</th>
<th>+v</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Chumash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapue</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxpil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajuaps</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemectatimi</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Luis Obispo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepjato</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chano</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chmixmu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paso Robles Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sataoyo</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallinas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsctael</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazz/Tissimasu</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamaca</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Salinan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etsmal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinau</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atnel/Ajole</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: +v = all vowels