1990

A history of the Ohlone Indians of Mission Santa Clara

Debra Kitsmiller Barth
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Barth, Debra Kitsmiller, "A history of the Ohlone Indians of Mission Santa Clara" (1990). *Master's Theses*. 3242.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.7gmv-apv6>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3242

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313 761-4700 800 521-0600

Order Number 1340495

A history of the Ohlone Indians of Mission Santa Clara

Barth, Debra Kitsmiller, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**A HISTORY OF THE OHLONE INDIANS
OF MISSION SANTA CLARA**

A Thesis

**Presented to the Faculty of the Department of Social Science
San Jose State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts**

By

Debra Kitsmiller Barth

May, 1990

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Dr. Stephen Payne,
History

Dr. Ted C. Hinckley,
History

Dr. James Freeman,
Anthropology

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

HISTORY OF THE OHLONE INDIANS OF MISSION SANTA CLARA

by Debra Kitsmiller Barth

This thesis presents the history of the Ohlone Indians who lived in and around the area of Mission Santa Clara. It briefly discusses Ohlone prehistory (i.e. before missionization) and then traces their decline under the Mission System, specifically those Ohlone who came into Mission Santa Clara.

For this thesis, many avenues of research are explored; archaeological investigations, linguistic analyses, and the journals and diaries of the Europeans and Americans who were contemporaries of the Mission Ohlone. Most important, though, is a thorough analysis of Mission Santa Clara's baptismal records which trace the Ohlone's history from their inception into the mission in 1777 until their eventual decline in the mid 1800s.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Stephen Payne, James Freeman, and Ted Hinckley for their words of criticism and encouragement in the formation of this thesis.

I would also like to thank Julia O'Keefe from the University of Santa Clara Archives. Her help in locating the baptismal records, marriage records, Informees, and other documents pertaining to Mission Santa Clara was invaluable.

Lastly, I would like to thank my husband, Rick, and my daughter, Julia. My husband offered me the needed encouragement during the many times when I wanted to give up on this project, and my daughter was the perfect child (with patience and wisdom beyond her years) when Mommy had to spend many hours on this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1 Introduction.....	1
Overview	
The name <i>Ohlone</i>	
Review of the literature	
2 Ohlone Prehistory	10
Archaeological evidence	
Population density	
Costanoan dialects	
Tribelet structure	
Habitation and clothing	
Food	
Religion	
3 Conversion of the Ohlone	27
Early Spanish exploration and contact	
The founding of Mission Santa Clara	
Factors in conversion	
The mission population	
4 The Rancherias of the Valley Floor	42
Rancheria San Francisco	
Rancheria San Juan Bautista	
Rancheria San Joseph	
Rancheria Santa Isabe ^l	
Rancheria San Francisco Solano	
Rancheria Santa Clara	
5 The Outlying Rancherias	60
Rancheria San Antonio	
Rancheria San Bernardino	
Rancheria Santa Agueda	
Rancheria San Carlos	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
6	Life at the Mission.....	75
	The Europeans' views of the Indians	
	The mission layout	
	Reasons for the decline of the	
	neophyte population	
	Attempts at "Civilization"	
	Conflicts with the pueblo	
7	Apostasy.....	92
	The beginning of conflict	
	Mission discipline	
	Increasing apostasy	
	The outlaws	
8	Secularization and the Final Demise	107
	Problems created by secularization	
	Indians and land grants	
	Moral decline in the neophyte population	
	The final demise	
	Epilogue	123
	References	125

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In 1869 the Franciscan Fathers established the first mission in Alta California, Mission San Diego de Alcalá. The Franciscans would establish 20 other missions in California, with the last established in 1823, Mission San Francisco Solano. At each mission the Fathers brought in the surrounding indigenous population in an attempt to convert these Indians and bring to them the benefits of Spanish Catholic civilization. Santa Clara de Asís, the eighth mission in this chain, was located at the base of San Francisco Bay, a site blessed with fertile soil, a mild climate, and a large indigenous population. The first indigenous people brought into Mission Santa Clara were the Ohlone and this is their story. However, this could also be the story of many of the indigenous peoples of California, because what happened to the Ohlone and their experience at this mission was repeated all along the California coast.

In books, journals and government documents the name *Ohlone* is used interchangeably with the name Costanoan, but neither name was used by the aboriginal tribes to whom these names apply. The name Costanoan is a distortion of the Spanish word *Costenos* meaning *Coast Dwellers* or *People of the Coast*, which Alfred Kroeber, who wrote extensively about the Indians of the California missions at the beginning of this century, deemed an inappropriate designation even though he used the name in his writing. Of the name *Costanoan* he said that it "labors under the double disadvantage of being Spanish -- corrupted at that -- and of geographic inappropriateness" (Kroeber, 1910, p. 263). By "geographical inappropriateness" Kroeber meant that while the Costanoans did inhabit some coastal areas, their territory also extended inland to the hills bordering the Central

Valley which adjoined the lands inhabited by the Yokuts as well as the Plains and Sierra Miwok.

Ethnographers and historians have applied the name *Costanoan* to a group of tribelets speaking a similar Penutian-based language in the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas. Father Francisco Palou, in his journey up the San Francisco peninsula in the early 1770s noted this similarity between the languages when he attempted to communicate with the natives in the villages he encountered in the San Francisco Bay area by using the language of the Indians found living in and around the Spanish settlement at Monterey (Bolton, 1930 2, p. 412, 416, and 449).

The name *Ohlone*, while currently used by many of the descendants of the above-mentioned aboriginal population, cannot be used without similar reservations to its appropriateness. In his book on the Costanoan Indians Robert Heizer says, "In recent years the term *Ohlone* has gained some currency as an alternative name for *Costanoan*. The label *Ohlone* does not seem preferable to the long-established one of *Costanoan*" (Heizer, 1974, p. 2). By this Heizer realized that both terms were inadequate to describe these people. The Spanish gave them the name Costanoan as a somewhat incorrect geographical description of these people's location, and Ohlone may have been the name of just one small tribelet of these people.

Even the name *Ohlone* is a misspelling of those names recorded earlier. It may, perhaps, have been copied from a mistaken rendering in the *Californian* of May 31, 1861 (Heizer, 1974, p. 3). Ohlone may have come from one of the villages that Father Palou visited in present-day San Mateo county. This village was most likely located on or near San Gregorio Creek. This Ohlone tribelet gave only 18 converts to Mission San Francisco and none of the individuals who currently call themselves Ohlone claim descent from this tribelet. References to this tribelet occur as early as 1826 with alternate spellings of *Olchone*, *Oljon*, and *Olhon*, all

describing a tribelet that was said to be located near the southernmost reach of Mission San Francisco's influence and at the northernmost end of Mission Santa Cruz's influence. Because it was one of the last tribelets to give converts to the mission system (as late as the 1820s the majority of these Ohlone were still in their tribelet villages), the name may have affixed itself in the memory of the other groups already at the mission with these newer arrivals, but was not necessarily used by these other Indians as a name for themselves. A more appropriate name would be *Tares* or *Tarish* which meant *man* or *human being* in the language of the Indians whom the Spanish were calling *Costanoan* (Brown, 1973, p. 4).

The name *Ohlone* first appeared in print with Captain Frederick Beechey's account in 1826 and, in retrospect, seems equally arbitrary in its distinction of those Indians now called by that same name (Levy, 1978, p. 494). No matter what its disputed origin, Ohlone has come to mean those Costanoan-speaking Indians who inhabited the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas. More importantly, the descendants of these aboriginal peoples themselves prefer to be called Ohlone (Galvan, 1968). For this reason, more than any other, the name Ohlone will be used in this paper to designate those aforementioned aboriginal inhabitants and their descendants, while, at the same time, acknowledging the lack of a more definitive or appropriate name.

Although much has been written about the Ohlone from an anthropological and ethnographic standpoint, very little has been written about the Ohlone from a historical perspective. Many references to the Ohlone are found in historical documents that survey the period of missionization, the early development of California, and the influx of American settlers into the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas, but there has not been any compilation of these references into a definitive history. The one book dealing solely with Mission Santa Clara, *The Five*

Mission Churches, by Father Arthur Spearman (1963), makes only scanty references to those inhabitants whose presence was the reason for the mission. Spearman writes about the Ohlone using their presence as background information for the mission's setting, but even then there are many inaccuracies in his chapter on the Ohlone such as placing the Ohlone within the wrong linguistic group.

No other publications have dealt solely with Mission Santa Clara, and only one book dealing completely with the Ohlone, *The Ohlone Way* (Margolin, 1978). Malcolm Margolin mentions the Ohlone's place in the historical period (i.e., the mission period and beyond) just in passing. Instead, he concentrates more on the pre-contact (i.e., pre-mission) aspects of Ohlone life. There are two major articles on the Ohlone, one by Robert Heizer (1974) and the other by Richard Levy (1978). These authors also give extensive anthropological information but only sketchy historical information.

The story of the Ohlone of Mission Santa Clara may be seen as a smaller part of the larger whole. The pattern of the introduction of Indians into the mission system and their subsequent decline was repeated throughout the mission system. In the study of these Ohlone who came to Mission Santa Clara, certain questions arise whose answers apply not only to the Ohlone and their history, but to all other native peoples of California who came into the mission system: How did the presence of Europeans, and most notably, the mission Fathers, change the lifestyle and culture of the Indians? Did these Indians come willingly into the missions, or were they coerced? And, once in, did the Indians stay willingly? What happened to the mission Indian population once the missions were broken up? And, ultimately, what happened to the Ohlone?

This study of the Ohlone of Mission Santa Clara is written as a historical narrative, even though most of the references cited are not of that nature. In

studying these Ohlone many and varied sources must be used. Historical references to the Ohlone begin with the writings of the Franciscan Fathers at the mission. They kept detailed record of the baptisms, marriages, and deaths of the mission's inhabitants. Up to now, the baptismal and marriage books (*Libro de Bautismos* and *Libro de Casamientos*) of Mission Santa Clara have not been reviewed in much more than a cursory fashion. This study, however, will analyze these books in depth in an attempt to answer some of the aforementioned questions. In the *Libro de Bautismos* the Fathers gave locational information for the Ohlone tribelets which came into the mission, and recorded relationships between neophytes (baptized Indians) and their relationships within the tribelet structure. This information not only provides needed clues to Ohlone relationships before European contact, but reveals in later records how European contact changed these relationships. Three chapters, Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, are devoted to the analysis of the *Libro de Bautismos*. In these three chapters the entry of the Ohlone into Mission Santa Clara and their subsequent decline will be chronicled.

Chapter 8 will take this information one step further in cross-referencing baptismal entries with marriages to achieve a more accurate account of the Ohlone. After conversion, the offspring of a neophyte (converted Indian) couple was not listed as Ohlone but as a neophyte of the mission, along with neophyte offspring from the other tribes introduced into the mission. Previous studies of Ohlone did not count these neophytes into the totals given for the Ohlone population. Now, a more complete count can be given along with a more definite time frame tracing the complete decline of the Ohlone of Mission Santa Clara.

In other mission records such as the *Informees* which were sent back yearly to Mexico, the Fathers recorded the varied languages spoken by the neophytes. Later linguistic studies use not only these records but also interview informants who were

descendants of the neophytes (Alphonse Pinart in 1878, H. W. Henshaw in 1884 - 1894, A. L. Kroeber in 1910, and M. S. Beeler in 1962). Although the focus of the Informees was on the mission and the routines of the Fathers, information such as Indian customs and language was recorded.

Much of the information regarding the pre-historical, i.e., pre-Mission era comes out of the research done by archaeological investigations. For the Santa Clara County area, two archaeological reports by Chester King (1978) and Joseph Winter (1978) shed light on the pre-historic (i.e., pre-mission) Ohlone's lifestyle. Other archaeological reports and compilations of reports, most notably those by Barbara Bocek (1984), Robert Heizer (1963, 1968, and 1971), and Sherburne Cook (1971) write about different aspects of Ohlone life, from dietary habits to burial practices, using the evidence found in various archaeological sites around San Francisco Bay. From these data, researchers may learn about trading patterns between coastal villages and inland tribelets, religious and burial practices, eating and hunting patterns, and other aspects of early culture. Researchers may gather further anthropological information from the writings of the mission fathers and early explorers in their letters and diaries. However, the Fathers' writings contain cultural biases against the Indians, frequently labeling the Indians "savages" and belittling their indigenous lifestyle.

Many non-Spanish explorers and traders such as A. Duhaut-Cilly, M. Peron, Jean Francois Galaup de la Perouse, Kirill T. Khlebnikov, Dmitry Zavalashin, August C. Mahr, and George Vancouver visited the missions and settlements around the central and northern California coasts and their observations of Indian life also add to the knowledge of the culture and way of life of the local inhabitants. These non-Hispanic visitors who came to the missions wrote very detailed accounts about the people and activities in California, but their viewpoints were no less

biased than those of the Fathers. They were men of their times whose opinions were shaped by the Enlightenment, and they frequently judged the missions to be incompatible with their ideas of equality, liberty, and justice (Rawls, 1984, p. 42). These visitors came from England, France, and Russia, countries which were rivals of imperial Spain and had claims to territories bordering the Spanish possessions. They saw California as an area rich in abundant resources and fertile land but viewed its inhabitants, both Indian and Spanish, as lazy and indolent. Also, many viewed the Fathers as inept administrators indifferent to the needs of their neophyte charges.

There was a wide spectrum of opinion by the visitors regarding the missions and the Fathers, and the details in each account varied according to the date of their visit to the area and the conditions under which the visit took place. By the time these visits commenced, a large percentage of the native population had already been assimilated into the Spanish culture and the mission system. The neophytes had adopted Spanish names, had learned the Spanish language, and had moved onto mission land living in conditions which differed greatly from the previous habitations. Their marriage patterns, burial practices, and other religious practices were replaced with those practices and rites of the Catholic Church. Some vestiges of the original Ohlone culture remained for the visitors to observe, but, before the earliest of these visits was undertaken, more than a generation had passed since the arrival of the Spaniards and the forced acculturation of these native peoples had taken its toll. At the time of the Spanish arrival, approximately 10,000 Ohlone occupied the state's central coast (Bocek, 1984, p. 240). However, during the period of missionization a sharp decline in the aboriginal population occurred and fewer than 2,000 Ohlone were left when the secularization of the missions took place in 1834, about half of these living at Mission Santa Clara.

After secularization, the missions were broken up, their native populations were dispersed, and the number of records where these natives were mentioned became fewer. Now many of the neophytes living at the missions and those Ohlone occupying lands formerly belonging to the missions found themselves in a hostile and changing society. The remaining Indians' status further declined in 1849 when California became part of the United States. These changes alienated the remaining Indians so much that the Federal Government made no mention of any Indians living in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay areas from 1860 to 1890, perhaps because the descendants of the mission neophytes were indifferent, or even hostile, toward those agencies responsible for the California Indian population (Cook, 1976, p. 64).

Personal accounts, biographies, and newspaper accounts written by Americans in the last half of the 19th century and the early 20th century give few glimpses into the lives of the remaining native inhabitants. But again, these accounts were written, not by Ohlone, but by observers of the Ohlone expressing their own personal biases. State and local histories such as those written by Hubert Bancroft (1885), Herbert Bolton (1926, 1939), Alan Brown (1969, 1973), Robert Heizer (1971), Frank Stanger (1963) and Oscar Winther (1935) make only occasional mention of local neophyte descendants who lived on the local ranchos that had been passed on to various owners at the time of secularization. Michael Galvan, an Ohlone Indian descended from the neophytes of Mission San Jose, expressed the despair of his people when he wrote in the *Indian Historian*,

And what of the Ohlones themselves, those who are living descendants?...They are a proud people. They have become accustomed to being ignored. No reservation has ever been set aside for them. No special emoluments, no federal funds or aid of any kind whatsoever has been given them at any time. They have still not been paid by the federal government for lands taken away from them during the Gold Rush. They are still waiting

for the justice due to them as the native people of this land, who owned the land and loved it and cared for it. (Galvan, 1968, p. 12)

At the turn of the 20th century the Ohlone were believed to be on their way to extinction as a clearly defined ethnic group with a heritage and traditions. The Ohlone held their last tribal dance in 1897 in the town of Pleasanton. By then fewer than a dozen individuals remained who spoke any of the tribal languages (Bocek, 1984, p. 240). By the middle of the 20th century, the burgeoning population of the San Francisco Bay area had encroached upon the ranchos, tract houses replaced herds of cattle, and the native population faded without a trace--- or did they? There are, perhaps, 200 individuals alive, and none full-blooded (Galvan, 1968, p. 12) who claim their descent from the original inhabitants of the the Bay area, and none currently, who claim descent from those Indians who were part of the flock at Mission Santa Clara.

In this chronicle the events leading up to the demise of these people and the reasons behind it will be analyzed. For purposes of organization, this thesis will be divided into chapters dealing with each important aspect of Ohlone history: their life before the arrival of the Europeans; the Spanish arrival, exploration, and the early impact of the Spanish upon the Ohlone; inception into and life at the mission; reaction and rebellion to mission life; life after the mission break-up, and the final slide into ignominy and anonymity. This chronicle will be an attempt to answer those questions posed earlier and to tell not only about those indigenous inhabitants of Santa Clara, but to show a model that was repeated up and down the El Camino Real where the mission Fathers, with their best intentions in converting a "savage" people to the Catholic faith and bestowing upon them the subsequent benefits of Spanish civilization, committed cultural genocide on a "proud people."

CHAPTER 2

Ohlone Pre-History

The story of the Ohlone begins with the arrival of the first Indians in the Bay area approximately 6,000 years ago. These people found an environment rich in the resources needed to sustain a sizable population. This land had marshlands teeming with game birds, grasslands abounding with small mammals, and the creeks, bay and ocean swimming with fish and shellfish. Seeds, acorns, and edible roots and plants grew in abundance. The hills and streams formed natural boundaries so that each small group, or tribelet, could settle in an area, use the abundant resources, and not trespass onto another group's area for food. One group of Indians could collect the fauna of the bayshore and marshlands, another the abundant animal and plant life of the coastal plains, while a different group would find sustenance in the forests and mountain streams. So accepted were these boundaries that it was possible for a group of Indians to live in peace and relative stability in one area for hundreds of years with minimal contact with other groups, and that contact usually in trade.

The territory of the Ohlone, ranged from the top of the San Francisco Peninsula and across to the Carquinez Strait, south to Monterey Bay; from the west along the coast inland to the Diablo Range foothills. One village site found on the flood plain of the Guadalupe River in the Santa Clara Valley showed evidence of settlement existing over a period of 1,200 years (Winter, 1978, p. 1). Another site in west Berkeley yielded Carbon 14 dates from approximately 2,000 B.C. to 500 B.C. Four large shellmounds in Coyote Hills Regional Park near Fremont had an occupation sequence of over 2,000 years, ending shortly before the arrival of the Spanish (Winter, p. 37). These shellmounds, along with many others like them, were prominent features in the landscape along the San Francisco Bay shores.

Made up of mussel and clam shells, along with other debris from human occupation, these mounds could measure hundreds of feet across and were 15 or more feet high (Brown, 1973, p. 2). These mounds, along with some burial sites, give good insights into the lives of the Ohlone before the arrival of the Spanish.

As previously stated, there may have been as many as 10,000 Ohlone along California's central coast at the time of Spanish arrival. Population estimates are drawn from the baptismal records of the missions which also include baptisms of Indians who were not Ohlone, especially those baptisms recorded after 1800 which include populations of Coast Miwok, Plains and Sierra Miwok, and Yokuts making an exact count of Ohlone difficult.

The baptisms of the Ohlone were carried out over a 20-year period during which the native population declined because of the introduction of Old World diseases and an interruption of their native lifestyle. However, the estimate of aboriginal population in the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas may be raised above the previous estimate to perhaps double. Though no hard evidence can support this number, early Spanish accounts can help substantiate the belief of a larger population.

When the Fages and Anza expeditions explored the area which is now Alameda and Contra Costa counties in 1772 and 1776, they estimated the total population of the villages they encountered between 2,450 and 2,150. This figure was, in all probability, low because neither Don Pedro Fages nor Juan Bautista de Anza could have seen all of the villages as some were only seasonally inhabited and the inhabitants would migrate to other areas for food gathering; nor could they possibly count all of the individuals in the inhabited villages they encountered. While keeping this in mind, Sherburne Cook estimates the population of the eastern side of San Francisco Bay to be more in the neighborhood of 3,800 to 4,500 (Cook,

1971, p. 70). Only 2,248 baptisms counted in the mission registers of San Francisco and San Jose can be attributed to this area or roughly 1/2 to 2/3 of the estimated total population at the time of the missions' founding. After applying the same ratio to the remainder of the baptisms at Missions San Francisco, Santa Clara and San Jose, a figure of 7,800 to 8,900 Ohlone residents in the Bay area at the time of Spanish arrival is not unbelievable. If the Ohlone populations at Missions Santa Cruz and San Carlos are included applying the same ratios then the new estimate for the entire Ohlone population from Monterey to San Francisco would be closer to 12,000. This larger estimate would make the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas, with their abundant resources and favorable climate, one of the most densely populated regions in aboriginal California.

When the Franciscan Fathers arrived in the San Francisco Bay area they found a relatively peaceful population speaking a, more or less, common language. Linguists have labeled this language *Costanoan*. Costanoan belonged to the Penutian superfamily of languages which consists of *Wintun*, *Maidu*, *Yokuts*, *Costanoan*, and *Miwok* (which can be further broken down into Coast, Plains, and Sierra Miwok) all of which were either in or bordered along California's great Central Valley and along the central coast of California. Although most of the population of Monterey and San Francisco Bay areas spoke Costanoan, the shores north of the Carquinez Strait and the land stretching from there to the Sierra foothills spoke Miwok. Not only were these two groups close geographically, but also the affinity between these languages was so close that linguists have grouped Miwok and Costanoan together into a sub-family, Utian, within the Penutian family (Kroeber, 1953, p. 347).

More divisions may be made within the Costanoan language than the eight dialects recorded. By the time the mission fathers wrote down the dialects spoken

by the Ohlone, many years, perhaps a generation or more, had passed and assimilation had taken place among the tribelets brought into the mission, with the most dominant tribelet's dialect becoming the represented tongue (the dominant tribelet was, most likely, the group in the area immediate to mission settlement). This assimilation was very complete. In 1816, two visitors to Mission San Francisco, Louis Choris and Albert von Chamisso, passengers aboard the Russian ship, the *Rurik*, noted that the majority of the neophytes at the mission spoke a similar language, even though these individuals represented many different tribelets within both the Ohlone and Miwok territories (Kroeber, 1957, p. 215). However, in a response to the *Interragatorio* of 1812 (a questionnaire sent out by the College of San Fernando in Mexico to the missions to collect information) Fathers Ramon Abella and Juan Saenz de Lucio of Mission San Francisco reported:

At the mission five languages are spoken. Those who join at 30 and over never learn another language other than their own...on passing from one arroyo to another a distinct language is encountered...languages so different from one another as Spanish is different from Mexican. (in Engelhardt, 1924, p. 147-148)

Perhaps the Fathers' familiarity with the situation helped them to discern the different dialects; however, they did see the similarity of the dialects belonging to the same family in the way that Castilian Spanish and Mexican Spanish are different yet sound similar to a person who is unfamiliar with either dialect. The settlement patterns had stabilized over the centuries to the point where each group, or tribelet, developed its own dialect closely related to the dialect of its neighbors. The similarities between the dialects can be likened to the words and phrases in a child's game of "post office," where the word changes gradually as it is passed down the line. The Ohlone's language changed over the years because of their isolation by distance and geographical boundaries. There were, perhaps, as many dialects as there were tribelets before the arrival of the Spanish.

The Ohlone lived in politically autonomous groups that are now called *tribelets*. The more common term *tribe* does not apply to the Ohlone except as an ethnic unit. In strict usage the word tribe denoted a group of people that acted together, felt themselves to be a unit, and were sovereign in a defined territory (Kroeber, 1974, p. 24). Yet the Ohlone, while a linguistic and ethnic unit, did not act together as a tribe. In fact, tribes did not exist in California in the same sense that the word has been applied to the Indians of the greater part of North America. For the Ohlone, as with the majority of California Indians, a common ethnicity did not mean political unity. Instead, the emphasis was more on a settlement or group of settlements. These tribelets were like the tribes in being a group that was politically independent and that owned a definable territory. In fact, this territory was so well-defined that harvesting seeds or hunting in another tribelet's area was the cause of war among groups (Priestley, 1937, p. 70).

With the advent of missionization these various tribelets began converging onto mission lands, willingly or unwillingly, either completely giving up their former village sites or returning periodically to their homelands. Assimilation between these groups took place at the missions and the individual dialects became less defined until one dialect predominated. It was this language that was recorded by the mission Fathers and the visitors to the missions. From these records, eight commonly accepted divisions have been made in the Costanoan language, with these divisions made mostly along mission lines. Beginning in the southern part of Ohlone territory at Mission La Soledad and continuing along the upper reaches of the Salinas River, the Ohlone spoke a dialect known as *Chalon*. Downriver, at Mission San Carlos Borromeo (now commonly known as Carmel Mission), the Ohlone spoke *Rumsen*, and to the northeast at Mission San Juan Bautista, *Mutsun*. These missions also brought in and converted tribes speaking other languages,

Esselen at Carmel and *Yokuts* at Soledad and San Juan Bautista, so, by the time the Fathers recorded these Ohlone dialects the other tribes may have had some influence upon the recorded languages. However, Santa Cruz, one of the later missions founded in Ohlone territory, only drew converts from the Costanoan-speaking group called *Awaswas* (Levy, 1978, p. 84). Richard Levy, in his studies of the Ohlone, believes that at the time of Spanish arrival *Awaswas* was spoken by about 600 persons living between modern-day Davenport and Aptos, Mutsun spoken by 700 persons living in the area drained by the Pajaro River and Rumsen by about 800 persons occupying the lower Salinas valley and Monterey Coast. The largest of the southern groups, Chalon, had about 900 persons on the east side of the Salinas River near present-day Chalone Creek. Both the Mutsun and the *Awaswas* served as bridges between the aforementioned southern dialects and the equally distinct northern Costanoan dialects.

The Costanoan speakers of the San Francisco Bay area may be divided into four major groups also, but, unlike their southern counterparts, these dialects were not broken along mission lines. In fact, Mission Santa Clara and Mission San Jose shared one major dialect group, *Tamyen* (*Tamien*, *Thamien*). The reason for this may be because Mission San Jose, founded 20 years after the founding of Mission Santa Clara, drew heavily from much of the same Indian population located along the southeastern shore of San Francisco Bay. Even after the establishment of the newer mission, kinship, marriage, and trading relationships between the Indians of these two missions remained strong and, thus, could not help but have a steadying influence on the language patterns. Two other groups in the East Bay, the *Chochenyo* in Alameda County and *Karkin* along the Carquinez Strait, also came to Mission San Jose (and, earlier, to Mission San Francisco). Less is known about these two groups as only sketchy vocabulary lists were left and the subjugation of

these groups was never as complete as with the Indians living along the western and southern shores of the bay. Finally, across the bay at Mission San Francisco, the Fathers called the Costanoan dialect *Ramaytush*.

Common to all of these dialects are certain suffixes denoting place names commonly found in the mission records. One ending, "-n," found in many village names may mean "people of..." The plural suffixes for persons, "-mak," "-kan," and "-kma" are also found in village names. Other locations are identified by the related suffixes "-tak," "-tka," "-ta," "-te," and "-to" which signify "place of..." Similar in meaning are "-mo" and "-me." Lastly, "-tuc" or "-ruk" which is a plural for "house" designates "town" when applied as an ending (Kroeber, 1953, p. 465).

In their recordings of earlier travels just before the establishment of the missions the missionaries mentioned other dialects of tribelets which they encountered, the dialect and the tribelet usually bearing the same name. In these accounts the tribelets were either not part of the mission flock at that time, or were in the process of being converted. While no records of words from these dialects exist, the dialect's names and the tribelet's names remain. The following dialects were noted by the Fathers in their travels along the San Francisco peninsula, but were never recorded: the *Ssalson* of the present San Mateo area, *Kinote* of Los Altos, Mountain View and Palo Alto, and *Posolomi* of the northern Santa Clara Valley.

Dialect was not the only defining characteristic of a tribelet. It would be more proper to say that the defining characteristics, evolving over a period of hundreds of years, helped cause what may have been a more common and unified language to break into various dialects along tribelet lines. A tribelet would occupy a well-defined territory which could have for its boundaries any of several natural features, a stream, estuary, hill, or valley. Within this territory there could be

several settlements, some of which were inhabited only seasonally to take advantage of the resources, such as seeds and acorns, which could only be gathered at certain times of the year. Not all of a tribelet migrated to these settlements at any one time, nor was the principal settlement occupied at all times, but the tribelet maintained this location more permanently than other locations. The boundaries, however ill-defined in modern terms, remained static, and these boundaries, while infrequently overlapping those of another tribelet's, were recognized by other groups, thus conveying a sense of ownership by the tribelet (Kroeber, 1974, p. 47-48).

These settlements later became known as *rancherías* by the Fathers. But, as the natives found their settlements on favorable sites, so too did the Europeans and Americans who came later, and many of the village sites which had been located on level ground high enough to avoid flooding yet close to a source of water were sought out by the Europeans and Americans as locations for their homes and farms, often because the surrounding virgin land was likely to be fertile bottomland (Heizer, 1963, p. 94).

Tribelet population ranged, on the average, from 100 to 250, though there were reports of much larger groups. The missionaries called these larger tribelets *naciones* and the smaller groups *familias*. Though these terms appear in mission records they are misleading, because *familias* may be clans within a large tribelet group (or *Nacion*), or they may be politically independent units; and *naciones* frequently meant either the main, larger settlement or the entire defined territory (Brown, 1973, p. 41). The Indians inhabited many of these locations only seasonally, adding more to the confusion in the mission records where the Fathers attempted to give place names to the groups of people they converted.

Each of these tribelets was a politically autonomous unit headed by a chief, or "captain." While many tribelets recognized hereditary rights to the position,

family lineage was not as important among the Ohlone, or for that matter, among many California tribes, as it was in other native tribes outside California. Instead, the position of chief was secured by the appointment of a man among the more able-bodied men choosing, but rarely by a formal election. This person would be someone with a talent for leadership. However, the chief did not have true authority and his position was somewhat ornamental. He was expected to be an orator and counsel and admonish other members of his group. This all changed with the arrival of the Europeans. The position of chief (captain) then gained importance because of the need for an intermediary between the members of the tribelet and the Europeans. New problems arose for his people with this relationship and the tribelet needed a stronger leadership to deal with these new problems and assume added responsibilities (Kroeber, 1974, pp. 46-47).

Just as there was a lack of officiousness in the position of chief, societal structure among the Ohlone was equally informal. Tribelets were organized into clans, and members of these clans traced their descent and membership in the clan through their father and his father and so forth (Phillips, 1981, pp. 123-124). Members of the same clan could not intermarry, but marriage ties were loosely held. Marriages were not necessarily permanent nor were they monogamous. A man could have more than one wife, and would frequently marry all the sisters of a family (Stanger, 1963, p. 15).

The houses of the Ohlone were conical in shape and were made out of native materials that were readily available. When Captain George Vancouver visited San Francisco Bay in 1792, he wrote this description of an Ohlone village:

Their houses were of a conical form, about six or seven feet in diameter at their base (which is on the ground), and are constructed by a number of stakes, chiefly of the willow tribe, which are driven erect into the earth in a circular manner, the upper ends of which being small and pliable are brought nearly to join at the top, in the center of the circle; and these being securely

fastened, given the upper part or roof somewhat of a flattish appearance. Thinner twigs of the like species are horizontally interwoven between the uprights, forming a pice of basket work about 10 or 12 feet high, at the top of a small aperture is left, which allows the smoke of the fire made in the center of the hut to escape, and admits most of the light they receive; the entrance is by a small hole close to the ground, through which with difficulty one person at a time can gain admittance. The whole is covered with a thick hatch of dried grass and rushes. (Vancouver, 1935, p. 119)

After giving these objective remarks, though, he goes on to call the dwellings "...miserable habitations, each of which was allowed for the residence of a whole family,...were so abominably infested with every kind of filth and nastiness as to be rendered not less offensive than degrading to the human species."

Later, the Spanish attempted to move the Ohlone into more civilized habitations within the mission compound but the effort met with little success and only served to alienate the population. The Ohlone valued the openness and fresh air which the mission compound could not provide. Also, their homes had an additional advantage that a more permanent home could not give -- fleas were a troublesome annoyance, and, when the infestation became too great, their homes could be burned and new ones erected flea-free in less than two hours. This was an advantage that civilization could not provide (Wagner, 1936, p. 218).

The women were modestly dressed. They wore a skirt which could be more properly called a pair of panels, front and back. These could be made of deerskin, tule, or bark fiber. The women would also wear a mantle made of deerskin when the weather was cooler. However, this more modest covering was not able to please the Fathers' sensibilities and the sight of naked breasts may have been a bit too disconcerting because a "small corset with sleeves" was added to their apron of rushes and this all was now worn over another shirt of deerskin (p. 222).

Like their housing, the clothing of the Ohlone was well-suited to the environment. If the weather was warm enough the men would go naked, but in the mornings when it was cooler, they would cover themselves with mud, a good

insulator, and drape over themselves a mantle of rabbit or deerskin which could also serve as bedding. The Fathers found the men's nakedness offensive and supplied them with a simple piece of cloth in the form of a breechcloth to cover themselves, while the richer or higher-standing neophytes wore a similar garment made out of otter's skin.

The Spaniards considered the natives quite dirty, probably due to this unusual covering (Suggs, 1965, p. 124). This is rather ironic because the Europeans at the time of settlement were not known for their hygienic habits, shunning frequent bathing as unhealthy. The natives, on the other hand, employed the use of the steam bath for many reasons, and if hygiene was not an overt reason for the bath, it was a partial result. This steam bath, or sweathouse (in Costanoan, *temescal*), was a daily institution, providing both medicinal and ceremonial benefits.

Frequently men and women painted their bodies. Red was a favorite color and the dye for the paint came from cinnabar (mercury ore) which came from the New Almaden Mine south of San Jose. The Indians also used black body paint, but then, as now, it was a color associated with mourning (Wagner, 1936, p. 222).

The women used another body ornamentation, tattooing, as a means of clan identification (Heizer, 1974, p. 10). These were facial tattoos placed mainly on the chin. The tattoo designs were comprised of small dots or lines or a combination of both.

Both men and women kept their hair short by singeing the ends of their hair with lighted fire-brands. Ornaments made of shell or bird bones etched with geometric designs were worn in both the hair and the earlobes. Feather work adorned not only their clothing but was used extensively in headresses.

The skills of the Ohlone were not limited to feather ornamentation and tattooing. Although no remnants of basketry remain, there are written records of

the Ohlone's ability to weave baskets. The shapes and uses of these baskets were, most likely, uniform and utilitarian, but there may have been some local variation in the baskets (Kroeber, 1971, p. 17).

The Ohlone made rafts from balsa or rushes. They used these rafts for transportation across the bay, but the rafts were not used in the coastal waters. In the shallower bay waters the Indians used a long pole to push the raft, but in deeper waters they used a double bladed paddle similar to that used by the Indians in southern California. These rafts, or canoes, were double-ended. They were about 10 feet long and about three or four feet wide in the middle tapering to a point at the ends (Vancouver, 1935, p. 13). The canoes were fairly seaworthy but were not waterproof. When the Ohlone used the rafts the rafts became half-filled with water so that the seated or kneeling occupant found the water covering up the lower part of his legs (Mahr, 1932, p. 101).

The Ohlone used these boats primarily for transport. Boats were occasionally used for fishing which was conducted in both the boats and along the shore with nets. Stones were used as net weights and flat, rectangular pieces were used as mesh gauges for measuring the knots so the net mesh would be a uniform size. When there was fishing from the shore, lines were cast out with fish gorges attached. These fish gorges were made of bone and pointed at both ends to catch in the fish's mouth. Fish spears were also used (Suggs, 1965, p. 80).

Besides fish, shellfish formed a large part of the Ohlone diet as found by the evidence of large quantities of both mussel and clam shells found in the shellmounds along the bayshore. From the sea the coastal Ohlone fed on sea mammals. If a whale was stranded on the beach the Ohlone used the occasion to celebrate with a great feast. An equally fatty meat, that of the sea lion, was enjoyed with the same relish (Wharton, 1913, p. 209).

The more inland tribelets consumed other animals. So did the coastal tribelets when fish and shellfish were not available. The Ohlone trapped and ate small mammals such as rabbits, squirrels, gophers, kangaroo rats, badgers, skunks, and bobcats. Larger mammals were hunted for food, but some animals, such as grizzly bears required a cooperative effort among members of the tribelet to bring them down. Mission records tell of accidents and even deaths occurring from the hunting of grizzly bears. The grizzly bear, along with deer and tule elk, provided a dual purpose. Not only were these animals a good source of meat, but the Indians used the hides for coverings and their bones for tools.

The Ohlone did not practice any formal form of agriculture, but they did set fires to older growth so newer and younger plants would grow and give a better yield of seeds. The women ground a black seed into flour and shaped this into a ball which was called a tamal. These were given to the Spanish as they traveled up the peninsula and, while they found the taste savory, they also reported that the tamal was very greasy (Palou in Wharton, 1913, p. 209). The Ohlone gathered strawberries, blackberries and mulberries in the hills. They also gathered soap-root, also called *amole*, which was an onion-shaped plant that was baked for several days in the ground before eaten.

By far the most important food source for the Ohlone, as with many other California tribes, was the acorn. Without proper preparation the acorn was poisonous, but once the tannic acid was removed, the acorn became an essential food staple because of its widespread availability and easy storage. After the Indians shelled the acorns and ground them into meal, they placed the meal into either baskets or sand-lined pits and hot water was poured through the meal. This water filtered slowly through the meal and the process was repeated until the bitter tannin was leached. Then the meal was either roasted or baked before eaten.

One of the most unusual substances consumed by the Ohlone was tobacco. While it was smoked by almost every native group in California, the Ohlone and the neighboring Yokuts ate the tobacco. They mixed it with shell lime before consuming it to make it more palatable and, possibly, less toxic.

Other tribes in the west valued the cinnabar which the Ohlone used for the red body paint. Indians from as far away as the Columbia River basin came south to trade for and obtain this mineral. The Ohlone excavated the New Almaden Mine as late as 1800, and there is some record of limited use as late as 1841 or 1842 (Heizer & Traganza, 1971, p. 358).

In addition to trade in cinnabar with other tribes, the Ohlone traded other commodities among themselves and with other tribes. The coastal tribelets traded abalone, olivella and other ornamental shells used in beads and pendants in exchange for foodstuffs, hides, or other products produced by the more inland groups. Both the coastal Ohlone and the Ohlone living along San Francisco Bay supplied mussels and abalone shells, along with salt and dried abalone to the Yokuts and olivella shells to the Sierra Miwok. In exchange, they received pine nuts and, possibly, some basketry (Heizer, 1963, pp. 23, 37).

Besides a common language, the Ohlone had a common mythology. The eagle, coyote, and the hummingbird were prominent in this mythology and the Ohlone worshipped their presence with ceremonies consisting of dancing, whistle-blowing, and other noise-making. The coyote represented certain evils in their world, but, at the same time, he was a benefactor of man. From the Creator, a deity not represented in any animate form, Coyote stole fire and brought it to man. He was also responsible for teaching man many daily activities and industries. The Coyote was, above all, a culture hero, tricky, ridiculous, obscene, yet a friend (Kroeber, 1904, p. 97).

The Creator, who was frequently represented by the Sun, had a less defined personality and his interaction with man was seen as more distant but no less demanding of worship. Pedro Fages, who accompanied Father Palou in his journey up the San Francisco peninsula in 1776, witnessed an Ohlone sun-worshipping ceremony where "...they offered, with gesticulations and ceremonies, all that we gave them, and they are accustomed to make various demonstrations of joy every day before the planet rises, while yet the dawning of the morning is announcing his coming" (Fages in Priestley, 1937, p. 70).

Father Palou, though, was not as impressed with Ohlone ceremonies and religion and found only,

...some superstition and foolish observances, and among the old people some idle talk such as praying they can make it rain, that they cause the acorn to grow, etc., or that they cause the whales to the coast, or the fish, and so on. (Palou in Wharton, 1913, p. 209)

Again, it was easier to condemn and judge native ways than to see these ceremonies and superstitions as ways of the Indians explaining the universe around them. For the learning of "civilized man" at that time was not much further along than these native superstitions, with the Ptolemaic explanation of the universe still holding sway as evident by Fages's statement addressing the sun as a planet.

"They" (to whom Palou referred) may have been the priests or shamans who "controlled" the weather, "cured" diseases, and performed ceremonies to insure abundant food supplies. Shamans were hired when anyone was seriously ill, and they attempted to cure diseases by several methods -- using herbs, cutting the skin of the patient, and supposedly sucking out objects which may have caused the illness (showing these objects afterwards to any curious onlookers) (Winter, 1978, p. 30).

Prayers and offerings were given by the shaman or offered up by the individual. Tobacco was smoked in accompaniment to these prayers and the smoke was blown toward the sky. Elaborate feather wands or prayer plumes were

employed as charms for good luck. These wands were long sticks with single feathers or groups of small feathers placed at the ends or in one or two places (Kroeber, 1971, p. 53). Frequently tobacco leaves or strips of rabbit fur would adorn these prayer sticks, and feather would also adorn capes used in special ceremonies. Sprinklings of seeds and meal were another part of many ceremonies.

While the position of shaman was not hereditary, frequently his knowledge and position would pass on to a son or other close relative whose close relationship helped him acquire the necessary knowledge. In contrast, those men involved in the *Kuksu* dance cycle underwent a prolonged indoctrination followed by a series of initiations into the rites of what was a secret, communal society. There were two grades of initiates with the older, more knowledgeable men serving as directors. The purpose of the *Kuksu* cult's dances was to maintain balance and harmony in the world. If the ceremonies were improperly carried out, chaos and disharmony would result. The dancers, often impersonating spirits or mythical characters, would be heavily painted, possibly wearing face curtains of feathers or grasses. These elaborate headresses and disguises helped give the *Kuksu* cult its other name *Big Head*. The dancers would carry whistles made of bird bones which they would blow during the dances. These clowns, or *Moki*, would replace the shaman in ceremonies for rain, good harvest, or desire for other propitious circumstances. Some of the whistles made of the bones of birds and ornamental beads have been found in Ohlone burials. Bones of the ulnae, radii, and tibiae of birds, with their ends broken off were commonly used for making beads and whistles. The bones came from locally hunted birds, the canvasback duck, the cormorant and the pelican (Loud, 1928, p. 359).

Above all, the *Kuksu* cult was communal, all adult males could belong to it and membership does not seem to have been exclusive except for a few

circumstances. Its form was simple, but served as a unifying religion not only for the Ohlone but also for much of central California in the wake of the Catholic incursion, with the cults serving as distinct but parallel fraternal religious bodies (Kroeber, 1971, p. 46).

Ritual played an important part in the burial practices of the Ohlone. While there was no apparent belief in an afterlife, the Ohlone took great care with a corpse. Both cremation and complete internment took place, with the latter more popular before 900 A.D. and the former more popular after 900 A.D. (with exceptions in both time periods). Those buried (or partially cremated) were placed in a flexed position, generally facing south (Winter, 1978, p. 28) and a lump of red iron oxide scattered at the bottom of the grave. Grave offerings were more infrequent with the buried dead, but those cremated or partially cremated had beautiful pendants, beads, and whistles placed with them (Suggs, 1965, p. 106). Even with these seemingly ritualistic burials, there is no record of any yearly mourning service similar to those held by other California Indians. Instead, the dead not only ceased to exist, they were, literally, wiped from memory. A dead man's property was destroyed and even his name could not be mentioned. His spirit was believed to go to the west after death, to where the sun set, to an island across the Pacific Ocean (p. 73).

With the arrival of the Franciscan Fathers, a belief of an afterlife was introduced (but Coyote was not the benefactor of this gift), healing was not the practice of the shamans' but a gift of the new God, and all other ceremonies important to the Ohlone were either downgraded in importance or completely erased from memory. The process of acculturation would completely destroy the culture of a people whose traditions and way of life existed in harmony with nature for hundreds of years.

CHAPTER 3

Conversion of the Ohlone

On June 3, 1770, Fathers Junipero Serra and Juan Crespi founded Mission San Carlos Borromeo, the first of six missions to be established in the same territory inhabited by the Ohlone. The other six missions were (in order of founding) San Francisco de Asis (1776), Santa Clara (1777), Santa Cruz (1791), San Juan Bautista (1797), and San Jose (1797). These missions gave Spain its first footholds in the land along California's central coast.

Although Juan Cabrillo had explored the West Coast in 1542 and Vizcaino had reached the coast of California in 1602 and had then claimed the land for the Spanish Crown, it was not until the threat of a Russian presence along the coast that the Spanish deemed it necessary to further explore and, perhaps, colonize the land. The Russians along with the English were becoming active along the Pacific coast, and the Spanish realized that colonization gave them the strongest claim to the lands north of Mexico.

In 1769, a year before the founding of Mission San Carlos, an expedition led by Don Gaspar de Portola traveled up the coast of California in search of Monterey Bay. The expedition passed by the bay without recognizing it and continued up the San Francisco Peninsula to the Golden Gate. On October 4, 1769, they encountered the *Oljon* tribelet near the mouth of San Gregorio Creek. According to a member of that expedition they found an uninhabited village whose inhabitants were busy harvesting seeds nearby. The expedition encountered six or seven so employed who advised them that there was another more numerous village a little further on and that these people would present the expedition with whatever they should need (Stanger & Brown, 1964, p. 89).

Later, this help was more than welcomed by the Spaniards who found themselves short on supplies. Five days later, the expedition traded again with a local tribelet for food, some black seeds and crushed acorns, in exchange for glass beads which the Spaniards had brought (Engelhardt, 1912, p. 52).

After the founding of Mission San Carlos another expedition, this time led by Father Juan Palou and Captain Diego Rivera, traveling in search of a new site for a mission to the north of Monterey, traced the route taken by Portola five years earlier. They, too, found the native population hospitable and unafraid of the Spaniards. Even more so, Palou noted that the tribes he was now meeting were related linguistically to the Indians at Monterey:

At two o'clock in the afternoon six heathen came to visit us from the nearest village, all without arms, and have been with us all afternoon with the same confidence as if they were among their own people...I spoke to them in the language of Monte Rey a few words about God and Heaven, but, although they were attentive, I was not satisfied that they understood me, although when I talked to them about other things it seems that they did understand me and when they spoke I understood many words, although there were many differences. (Palou in Bolton, 1930, 2, pp. 412-413)

This meeting took place on November 24, 1774, near present-day Palo Alto. These people would later be identified by the mission Fathers as the *Puichon*, a Costanoan-speaking tribe. In the mission records of both Missions San Francisco and Santa Clara the Puichon tribelet is registered as San Bernardino on San Francisquito Creek. This Puichon tribelet was located at the southern end of Mission San Francisco's influence and as many as 90 converts came from here until the mission stopped accepting converts from this area. Mission Santa Clara was more active in drawing converts from San Bernardino. Anza, on his 1776 expedition counted 22 huts in a village in the area where San Francisquito Creek meets Middlefield Road on the present-day Menlo Park - Palo Alto border (Brown, 1973, p. 18).

A few days later, on November 29, Palou encountered a different group north of the Puichon. Again he noted not only the hospitality but the similarities in language:

In this valley we encountered four villages inhabited by numerous people of the same kind as those who were accompanying us. In each of them, because they were near the road, we halted a little while, in order to make friends with them and give them some beads. Their captains invited us to remain in their villages, but we thanked them and went forward, the number of our escorts increasing at each village. Among these people more than among the others I saw that they understood and speak many of the words of the language of Monte Rey. (Palou in Bolton, 1930, 2, p. 416)

These people, the *Lamchin*, had met Portola's expedition when it passed through the San Andreas Valley. However, Portola had not previously recorded the existence of the four villages which Palou had encountered. (Milliken 1983:209-210) The *Lamchin* were a large tribelet which inhabited the bayshore and interior valleys from Belmont south through Redwood City.

To the north of the *Lamchin* were the *Ssalson* (*Shalson*) villages in the area drained by San Mateo Creek. The *Ssalson* may have been in the valley which is now covered by the waters behind Crystal Springs Dam and represents the most heavily inhabited location in San Mateo County during pre-contact times (Brown, 1973, p. 9). Portola's first expedition encountered the *Ssalson* in 1768 when they were camped in an area west of modern-day Millbrae. Father Crespi, a member of the expedition related that the Indians there were "well-behaved" and presented them with food and an invitation to the village (Stanger & Brown, 1969, p. 51).

Later, while traveling to the new mission site (San Francisco), Father Palou came upon another tribelet speaking "the language of Monte Rey."

I again made them presents of beads and a little tobacco, and as soon as the saw it they called it by the same word as Monterey, *savans*. They began to smoke and I noticed in them the same ceremony of blowing the smoke upwards, repeating some words with each puff. I only understood one, *esmen*, which means *sun*. (Palou in Bolton, 1926, 3, p. 277)

This tribelet, situated in present-day San Bruno, was known in mission records by two village names, *Urebure* and *Siplichiquin* (*Chipisclin*, *Shiplishkin*), which were, at times, used interchangeably.

At the top of the Peninsula were the *Aguazio* tribelet occupying the area now within the present city of San Francisco. The name *Aguazio* may have been a corruption of the name *Awastos* (*Awashios*, *Ahwashtes*) reported by Father Palou to mean "northerners" in the dialect of the Ssalson native to the south. These tribelets, the Puichon, Lamchin, Ssalson, and Urebure, along with many other groups on the San Francisco Peninsula and Santa Clara Valley were related to the Rumsen speakers of Monterey both by language and customs, a fact noted by the Fathers and explorers on their journeys. These accounts written by the early explorers along with archaeological evidence reveal that the natives that Palou and Portola encountered were one major ethnic group, the Ohlone. Though these people may have been related linguistically and culturally, these people saw their tribelets as separate political entities. The Fathers, while recognizing the same linguistic similarities, also recognized each tribelet's autonomy, and recorded individuals under their tribelet affiliation.

On June 27, 1776, Father Palou arrived at the lagoon which Anza had named Laguna de Nuestra Senora de los Dolores. This name, Dolores, would later be synonymous with the mission that was founded on that site, the Mission of Our Seraphic Father Saint Francis of Assisi. This northern mission, along with its accompanying military post (presidio) would provide security from Russian incursion. This mission was the northernmost in Ohlone territory, and would baptize a total of 4,257 Indians; 1,087 Ohlone from San Francisco and San Mateo counties, 985 Ohlone from Alameda and Contra Costa counties, and 2,185 other Indians from the Coast Miwok, Pomo, Wappo and Patwin tribes (Cook, 1976, p. 28).

Six months after the founding of Mission San Francisco, Father Tomas de la Pena along with Captain Diego Rivera set out from Monterey to establish another mission. This mission, Santa Clara, would be approximately one day's journey (15 leagues) south of Mission San Francisco at the southern tip of the bay of the same name. This mission would also be two days' journey (27 leagues) from Mission San Carlos and the presidio at Monterey. This closeness in proximity of the missions was repeated up and down the coast for security and for the knowledge that this would facilitate the complete conversion of the Indians of Alta California.

The actual site of Mission Santa Clara, along the banks of the Guadalupe River, was discovered earlier in 1769 by Sargent Ortega and six men, who had come north from Monterey in search of San Francisco Bay. The Guadalupe flowed northeast through the Santa Clara Valley for many miles before emptying into the southern part of San Francisco Bay. The surrounding land was not only fertile but covered with many oak trees which would supply needed lumber for construction. Along the banks of this river, on January 7, 1777, the mission cross was raised and blessed, and a small altar was set up under a make-shift shelter. There Father Tomas de la Pena said the first mass on January 12, and, a few days later, Father Pena's associate, Father Jose Murguia, arrived bringing with him the first supplies for the new mission. Economically, this would be one of the most successful missions in Alta California, but in human terms, one of the most tragic, especially for the Ohlone, a people whose language and way of life existed for hundreds of years before Spanish arrival, but whose very existence as a distinct people was threatened by the arrival of the Fathers.

The Franciscan Fathers believed that they had a twofold mission -- to convert the Indians to Christianity and to change the Indians' pagan lifestyle by offering them the example of the superior European (i.e., Spanish) civilization. According to

Father Lausen, Father Serra's successor to the presidency of the missions:

Our basic work consists in the care of the native population of these possessions, in converting them to the bosom of the church, and in gathering into the missions the barbarous pagans scattered through the hills and beaches like animals, or living in a society far from civilized and scarcely human... (Letter from Father Lausen to Don Jacobo Agarte y Loyola in Kenneally, 1965, p. 211)

While this view of Father Lausen expressed the prevailing disdain held by the Fathers toward the Indians and their civilization (or lack thereof), this attitude did not interfere with the missionaries' success. During the Mission Period (1774 to 1836) the Fathers baptized nearly 54,000 souls, taking in virtually all of the Indians along the California coast south of San Francisco (Rawls, 1984, p. 14). However, in the first five months of Mission Santa Clara's existence, Fathers Pena and Murguia made little headway in converting the native population in the place that the Indians called Thamien. The Fathers had approached their task with much optimism, citing in their Informee of December 31, 1777 that there was a large population of Indians surrounding the mission site with at least 40 rancherias within a five league radius. However it was not until May, when an epidemic hit the children of Thamien, that the Indians began to respond to the Fathers. This was the first of many epidemics to hit the Indians in and around the mission. The Indians lacked any genetic immunity to the many diseases introduced by the Europeans such as influenza, measles, diptheria, scarlet fever, and smallpox (Stodder, 1986, p. 39). Diseases endemic to the local population before the arrival of Europeans, such as tetanus, trichinosis, tularemia, malarial-type fevers, and pinworms, could be just as deadly, but were diseases related more to diet (trichinosis and tularemia) or environment (pinworms and malarial-type fevers), and did not come in waves of epidemics.

The first two baptisms recorded in the Libro de Bautismos came from a rancheria named by the Franciscan Fathers for their patron saint, Saint Francis. Although it is difficult to determine under what conditions these children were

presented to the Fathers because the first few entries in the baptismal records are damaged and faded, other baptisms recorded on the same day and later in the same week from other rancherias showed that many of the children presented to the Fathers were ill, some dying. In fact, the Fathers baptized 54 sick and dying children in those first two weeks of conversion activity. These children came not only from the rancheria of San Francisco, but also from rancherias named San Juan Bautista, San Joseph, Santa Isabel, San Francisco Solano, Santa Clara, San Bernardino, and San Antonio. In the earliest baptisms the Fathers traveled out to the rancherias to conduct the baptisms. The first baptism conducted in the crude edifice that was the first mission church came later in that first week, Thomas of Rancheria San Francisco (Libro de Bautismos #34).

While many of these first children died, a significant percentage recovered from a plague (possibly influenza) with which the Indians may have had little previous experience and for which the traditional cures had little effect. Although it would seem that the presence of this new disease and its appearance coinciding with the arrival of the Spanish would be a deterrent to conversion, it seems, instead, that the few "miraculous" cures performed by these Spanish shamans when they sprinkled water, waved hands and murmured strange incantations saving a few children (or so it may have been perceived) provided an incentive for the Indians to bring more of their children to the Fathers.

For the year 1777, out of a total of 65 Ohlone baptisms, 40 were children two years old and under, 20 were young children ages 3 to 11. Four teenagers (ages 12 to 19) were baptized, two of whom had younger siblings previously baptized and one whose mother had died. There was only one baptism of an adult -- an elderly man from Rancheria San Francisco Solano who later died. Twenty-four of the newly-baptized neophytes also died that year and not all of the survivors stayed near the

mission (the young, unweaned children usually stayed out in the rancherias until they were older or their parents converted). According to the first Informee written on December 31, 1777, there were 13 Christians, seven adults and six children, who lived at the mission compound. The rest of the children were at the rancherias with their parents because they were still too young. There were also 30 catechumen adults who were receiving instruction. (Catechumens were those adults receiving instruction before baptism.) In most cases, these adults already had children baptized and some of these children were living in the mission compound. Visitors to the missions often accused the fathers of holding these children captive in order to coerce the adults into baptism.

The baptismal pattern begun in the first year continued through the first decade of Mission Santa Clara. Out of 895 Ohlone baptisms in the years 1777-1787, almost one-half, 433, were infants two years and under; one-half of those remaining, 264, were children ages 3 to 11. Out of the 198 remaining, 97 were teenagers, most of whom were siblings of children previously baptized. Only 101 of those remaining were adults over 20 with 17 of those over 50 years of age. Of these adults, 65 were parents of the baptized children (17 of whom were ill and/or dying) and another 10 adults were baptized that were very ill. For these baptisms, the Fathers went out to not only baptize but also to administer last rites. It was not until the second decade (1787 - 1796) that the Fathers began to baptize large numbers of catechumens. As previously mentioned, many of the visitors to the missions accused the fathers of holding the baptized children captive in order to coerce their parents into being baptized and, consequently, residing at the mission. While a small minority of adults did come without children or illness, the baptismal pattern established in that first decade helps support that accusation with the majority of the adults following their children into the mission.

The Fathers in their records had only three age designations -- *nino* and *nina* for infants and very young children, *parvulo* and *parvula* for those children and adolescents who had not reached puberty, and *adulto* and *adulta* for adults and those adolescents who had reached puberty. This somewhat arbitrary grouping can be very confusing when reviewing mission documents because a child of 10 may be classified as an adult, yet an older child of 12 may be classified as *parvulo*. The designations also varied among the Fathers who were making the entries. However, in all cases, a person's age, or the closest approximation given by the Fathers, was recorded. For a simple means of classification in this study, the neophyte population will be grouped accordingly: 0-2, 3-11, 12-19, 20-49, and 50 and above. This latter category includes those adults labeled *vecchio* (old) by the Fathers, the majority of whom were ill and/or close to death.

The Fathers were also somewhat arbitrary in entering exact ages, with many adults having their ages entered as 20, 30, 40, 50, etc., those 30 and less more likely to have an exact age listed. Whether this was due to a language barrier and the Fathers entering their best guess, or a lack of a sophisticated concept of time and age by the Ohlone is unknown. But those adults, especially females, listed 50 years of age or more did not bring with them any young or newborn children into the mission, and, when a relationship was listed with a mission neophyte, it was usually that of a parent with an adult child or a grandchild.

In the Informee of December 31, 1787, the Fathers reported the state of the mission at the beginning of its second decade. There was a total of 433 neophyte burials since the mission's inception, or more than one-third of the total of neophyte baptisms to that date. Of the 681 neophytes remaining 70 married neophyte couples and 507 other individuals (children and unmarried adults) "live in a community in a village of straw huts next to the church which they attend twice a day for prayers of

the Christian doctrine with one of the minister Fathers, and they also attend mass on Holy Days."

Yet even with this apparent success of maintaining a large number of converted Indians next to the mission, the Fathers were not happy with their progress in converting the local population. Visits to the more outlying rancherias required military escort which was not always at the disposal of the Fathers. In 1786 Father Pena wrote,

There are in the ranches around the mission many gentiles and we know the least of them which have been baptized. Help from the escort is denied to us to go out and invite them, to encourage them and attract them, without which we cannot expect the fruits that would follow as we have experienced by visiting the ranches from time to time; that is why we beg submissively to our superior that he may intercede in this issue so pleasing to God and convenient to the service of our Sovereign. (Informee, December 31, 1786)

As previously noted, most adults in the first decade were either parents of neophyte children or were ill/dying upon baptism. In the second decade the mission Fathers sought to reverse this pattern by being more aggressive in pursuing adult converts. Two factors helped them achieve this goal. The first was an increase in epidemics which helped bring those adults who were afflicted into the mission (if they survived their illness). The second factor was that the Fathers' wish for military escorts was granted more frequently allowing the Fathers to go to out and baptize those adult Indians who were afflicted with diseases and to encourage others to convert.

The epidemics came in waves, the first was in May-June 1777, which brought in the first converts, but another epidemic in late 1785-early 1786 brought the ratio of baptisms to burials to 2:1. Beginning in 1788, this ratio decreased with the next series of epidemics. In 1788 there were 119 Ohlone baptisms and 97 burials, the conversion rate barely keeping ahead of the death rate (Informee of December 31, 1788). From 1788 to 1793 this high death rate among the neophyte population

continued, never even reaching the 2:1 ratio, to that the growth rate of the mission population was just under 1%. However, the percentage of adults living at the mission increased because a larger percentage of those dying were children even while the parents of these children were being brought into the mission fold, some ill and dying themselves, but the rest very much alive.

The high death rate was not confined just to those Indians living at the mission. The baptismal registers indicate many children whose parents were ill and later died without the benefit of baptism. This is especially true of the age group 3 to 11 where there are many entries of orphans or children with one living parent. It would be interesting to speculate on many of those entries and the relationships of orphans and fatherless children in the tribelet structure. Were these children encouraged to become part of the mission because few or no provisions were made for them among their own tribelet and were, instead, treated as a liability? Whatever the reason, those children whose parent(s) recently died, whether having received the rite of baptism or not, were quickly incorporated into the mission.

The second factor which brought more adult converts was that the Fathers were granted their request for more escorts to the outlying rancherias. Along with this the Spanish military had become more aggressive in pursuing Indians who had either fled, stolen cattle and horses, or committed other infractions. Between this action and the Fathers' desires to bring in the surrounding heathen rancherias, a less gentle approach was used in conversion. In one instance in October 1794, Father Fernandez, accompanied by a soldier, went out to one of the fields where there were Indians working. Because one Indian did not come at once when the priest called, Father Fernandez took the lance of the soldier and impaled the Indian. This action, along with the other shows of force emphasized, for the Indians, the priests' threats to burn the Indians' rancherias if they did not become baptized (King, 1978, p. 444).

These actions were a far cry from the statement made by Father Palou in a letter to Father Serra that the Indians "can be converted solely through their interest in food and clothing, and only afterwards be gradually brought to comprehend spiritual good and evil" (Palou to Serra in McGarry, 1950, p. 338). This view was echoed by Father Pedro Font who traveled to the various missions in Ohlone territory. He stated, "The method observed by the Fathers is to force no one to become Christian. They admit only such as voluntarily offer themselves" (Font in Engelhardt, 1912, p. 252).

Yet those adults without baptized children rarely came voluntarily, and the large number of adults remaining in the surrounding rancherias posed a threat to the stability of the missions by providing enticement and offering sanctuary to those neophytes who chose to leave the mission (see Chapter 7). In the same correspondence Father Palou foresaw this dilemma when he wrote, "If they do not live together in communities according to a regular schedule but remain in their rancherias, they will neither give up their vicious pagan customs nor become civilized" (Palou to Serra in McGarry, 1950, p. 338).

The more aggressive policy on pursuing converts was the more successful one. The years 1794 and 1795 were the only years in the first two decades where there were more adults baptized than infants, children and teenagers combined. In 1794 there were 81 infants and 47 children and teens for a total of 128, while there were 265 adults ages 20 - 49 and 101 adults over 50 for a total of 366. Then in 1795 there were 91 infants and 47 children and teens for a total of 138 while there were 105 adults 20-49 and 46 adults over 50 for a total of 151. Unlike the previous years, the majority of these adults were brought in without being ill or having previously baptized children. In fact, the baptismal to death rate for 1794 was almost 4:1 and for 1795, 2:1. Even so, this surge in conversion of healthy adults did little to increase

the overall mission population. In 1794 the mission population did increase by 34% (Informe of December 31, 1794) but the following year the mission population increased by only 8% (Informe of December 31, 1795), and the increase in total population was less than half of the number of conversions that same year. In fact, after 1795 the mission population begins to decline and the conversion rate is never able to keep pace with the death rate and rate of apostasy.

The mission census of 1795 showed 1,541 individuals living at the mission, 633 adult males (over 10 years of age), 509 adult females, 207 young boys, and 192 young girls. The following year the mission population fell to 1,433, precipitating a slow but steady and continuous decline. In 1817, the year of the last recorded Ohlone baptism a total of 1,336 neophytes lived at the mission, and not all these were Ohlone. Even with the influx of newly-baptized Indians from the Central Valley the population continued to decline so that there were only about 1,100 neophytes residing at the mission at the time of the secularization order in 1834.

The rate of decline in the Ohlone population was reflected in the baptismal totals during the next two decades. While 1794 may represent the zenith of Ohlone conversion, 1817 represents the nadir. From 1797 to 1806 there were only 990 baptisms, this compared to 2,247 the previous decade. Only one year, 1802 with 174 baptisms had a significantly larger number of adults (146) than children and teens (28), with the majority of these adults (82) representing one rancheria, San Carlos, the most outlying Ohlone rancheria in Mission Santa Clara's influence. The baptismal records in the following years still showed a larger number of adults compared to infants, children and teens, even though the total number of converts was significantly fewer (82 in 1803, 68 in 1804, etc.). One reason for the lesser number of children recorded as Ohlone was the Fathers' method of entering neophytes. Those children who were born after their parents were baptized and

part of the mission population were entered not under their parents' rancheria but under "mission." By the turn of the century, some of those children first converted were producing children of their own. Only a few children of unconverted gentiles in some of the most outlying Ohlone rancherias were brought in to be baptized (many of the nearer rancherias already completely incorporated into the mission.).

The final decade of Ohlone conversion, 1807 - 1817 saw only 186 Ohlone brought into the mission. The years 1807 - 1810 had 123 of these baptisms, and, most of these were adults who had previously-baptized children. After 1810 there were no children brought in from the rancherias and only two outlying rancherias, San Carlos and San Antonio were introducing converts. In 1811 two teens were baptized, one boy who had a younger brother already baptized and one boy who was blind. The other baptisms were all of elderly individuals, six in 1811, and four in 1812, most of whom had older children already in the mission. It was five years after that until the next Ohlone baptism which was also the last Ohlone baptism -- an old woman from Rancheria San Carlos whose husband had been baptized 10 years previously.

After 4,423 baptisms, no more Ohlone were brought into the mission. Those neophytes living at the mission continued to produce offspring, but the rancherias were completely disbanded and the former village sites were now ranchos of Spanish Dons. Some of the villages and rancherias to the east of the mission continued to give converts to the more recently founded Mission San Jose, but the Ohlone as a distinct people in the Santa Clara Valley no longer existed. The influx of converts now came from the Central Valley and their presence at the mission further accelerated the process of acculturation for the Ohlone neophytes. While the descendants of the Ohlone may be traced through the latter baptismal records, no Ohlone, that is no Ohlone who lived in the ways of their fathers on their own

land, existed after 1817; there were only converted Indians being indoctrinated into the Catholic religion and Spanish way of life.

CHAPTER 4

The Rancherias of the Valley Floor

In 1777 the Franciscan Fathers of Mission Santa Clara baptized 65 individuals representing seven rancherias. The baptisms began on June 6th, and for that first week the Fathers traveled out to the rancherias to baptize; these first converts were mostly young and mostly ill. The first baptisms were, by no means, the Fathers' first visit to the rancherias surrounding the mission to proselytize. Frequently, the Indians would come to the mission to witness the activity. Gifts of food, clothing, and glass beads would be exchanged for the labor needed to clear the land and construct buildings. For the first six months of the year the Fathers continued to exchange gifts and labor with the Indians with no conversions.

Not all of the interactions between the Spaniards and the Indians were conducted calmly and with cooperation. The Indians, who had hunted animals for food and had never kept domesticated animals, may have been confused by the Spaniards' possession of horses, cattle and mules, because the the Indians frequently killed the Spanish livestock for food and the Spanish military, in turn, went out to punish the Indians. In one early incident, shortly after the founding of the mission,

...they [the Indians] killed some mules belonging to the soldiers. The corporal of the guard sent word to the lieutenant of the presidio who immediately took to the road with a detachment, and before entering the mission fell upon them in their villages at daylight and found them roasting the meat of the mules they had killed. He attempted to capture them, and they hid themselves in the brush of a grove. The soldiers followed them, and seeing that they were firing arrows, they had to kill three, and with this example they stopped. They took some of the leaders to the mission and flogged them, but they continued to commit the misdemeanor of stealing, especially in the cornfields. (Palou in Bolton, 1926, p. 161)

Events such as this did not lead to a very auspicious beginning.

Unfortunately, though, the Indians were able to catch something else from the

Spanish besides cattle -- European diseases. It was this exposure to contagion that brought in those first converts, children from the rancheria called San Francisco.

Rancheria San Francisco produced 86 converts from 1777 to 1796. This rancheria produced the first convert, Clara (Libro de Bautismos #1), who was baptized on June 6th, and the first baptism held at the mission church, Thomas (Libro de Bautismos #34) on June 13th. Only nine converts (seven infants and two children) came from Rancheria San Francisco that first year, and only two years, 1778 and 1780, produced more than nine converts, with 16 converts each of those two years. (For further expediency in clarification, references to individual entries in the Libro de Bautismos will now be identified by just their baptismal number.)

Rancheria San Francisco, although first, was one of the smallest rancherias. In fact, it may not have been a distinct rancheria but one of those seasonally-inhabited villages with, possibly, a small core of families who inhabited the site for longer periods of time. King (1978) places Rancheria San Francisco near the confluence of Los Gatos Creek with the Guadalupe River in present-day downtown San Jose. An excavation at this location has shown evidence of occupation before mission times. However, the evidence that this was, possibly, only a seasonally-inhabited place lies not in the archaeological evidence but in the statistical evidence presented in the baptismal register. Unlike many of the other rancherias, most of the infants from Rancheria San Francisco brought to the mission did not have their parents follow them later in conversion. Also, 23 out of the 41 infants baptized came during the months of June, July, and August (along with the majority of baptisms in other age group). The remaining baptisms were scattered throughout the rest of the year. Of the remaining 18 infants, all but two either had siblings in the mission or neophyte parents residing at the mission (this did not apply to the summer baptisms, most of whom came without prior relations).

Nine of the 19 adults who were baptized from Rancheria San Francisco did not fit the pattern of the other rancherias were baptized ill and/or at the point of death, and two of the three older adults were also baptized ill. Also, three of these ill adults, #1161, #1162, and #1826, were baptized not at Rancheria San Francisco but at Rancheria San Juan Bautista. The Fathers conducted the baptisms at Rancheria San Juan Bautista even though these adults were listed from Rancheria San Francisco. What is even more unusual is that two of these baptisms, #1161 and #1162 had no other ties to Rancheria San Francisco either through marriage or children. The other adult baptized at Rancheria San Juan Bautista (but listed from Rancheria San Francisco), Ynes Maria #1826, was the mother of the second child baptized from Rancheria San Francisco, and her husband was also from the Rancheria San Francisco (Pedro Regalado #1858).

The baptisms related to Rancheria San Juan Bautista did not take place during the summer, but during December and April. An explanation for this could be that those individuals baptized as part of Rancheria San Francisco were a nuclear group of families who migrated to the villages labeled Rancheria San Juan Bautista periodically. This would make Rancheria San Francisco not so much an individual, politically-autonomous rancheria as a village belonging to a larger group which included those individuals the Fathers labeled as being from Rancheria San Juan Bautista.

One other strong tie to San Juan Bautista remains. Miguel Antonio, the headman of the rancheria (and later, alcalde at the mission) had at least one wife, Maria Victoria #246, from San Juan Bautista by whom he had a child, Ambrosio Maria #253. However, this relationship may have been very informal, because two years later she had another child, Victoriano Bernardo #544, by another man, Bernardo #244 of Rancheria San Juan Bautista. Miguel Antonio, though, did not

have to look far for solace and comfort. He already had two wives at San Francisco, Maria Loreta, the mother of four of his children (#29, #99, #101, and #139) and Juana Josepha, the mother of three more (#97, #100, and #130). As a chieftain, and an obviously high-status adult, Miguel Antonio's conversion in 1780 was a bonus for the mission Fathers.

Of the 11 remaining adults that were baptized the following years, nine came in ill, and the other two had relations previously baptized. Whether this quick and complete conversion of the inhabitants of Rancheria San Francisco came about as a result of the example given by Miguel Antonio and his wives is unknown, but what is true is that by 1792 no more adults from this rancheria were baptized, and only three more baptisms, all of infants (one in 1795 and two in 1796) took place. One interesting note -- the last baptism recorded as San Francisco, Cayetano #3348, was the son of Bernabe #29, who was baptized as an infant in 1777. Cayetano's mother also came to the mission as an infant in 1782 (Cayetana Maria #420) and her parents, Maria Eulalia #225 and an Indian from Baja California, Joseph Rosario (who had traveled to Mission Santa Clara with the Franciscans), were already neophytes at the time of her birth.

The final ties of Rancheria San Francisco to Rancheria San Juan Bautista is noted in one other adult baptized from Rancheria San Francisco who had children baptized and listed as coming from Rancheria San Juan Bautista. Maria de la Ascencion #508 of Rancheria San Francisco was the mother of Maria Nieves #269 of Rancheria San Juan Bautista. Maria Nieves already had half-sisters (#212 and #213) by another mother in San Juan Bautista, bringing up the likelihood that their father, #2447 Mariano Jose of San Juan Bautista, was also the father of Maria Nieves.

From reviewing the baptisms attributed to Rancheria San Francisco, it is easy to believe that rancherias as recorded by the Fathers were not always distinct political entities, yet there were enough relationships within each group recorded as a rancheria, whether it was the main village or a seasonally-inhabited village, to place these groups in relationship to one another and to Mission Santa Clara.

The rancheria with which San Francisco had such numerous ties, San Juan Bautista, gave the mission its next five baptisms (#3 - #7) on June 6, 1777. Because these first baptisms were conducted at the rancherias, it would not be out of line to presume that these rancherias which recorded baptisms on that first day were not only in close proximity to the mission but to each other. Rancheria San Juan Bautista probably lay to the southwest and upstream from Rancheria San Francisco. A land grant recorded in 1844 named San Juan Bautista encompassed an area of San Jose stretching from Willow Glen to the Almaden Valley and included the area in question (Gudde, 1969, p. 28).

Rancheria San Juan Bautista gave 110 converts to the mission of whom over half, 56, were infants. Like Rancheria San Francisco, many of the adults who came into the mission were ill; out of 12 adults ages 20-49 five were ill (and all of them parents of neophyte children), and of the 11 adults age 50 and over, six were ill (and only one of those a parent). Fifteen converts (eight infants and seven children) came into the mission that first year. Only one other year, 1780 with 21 converts (eight infants, seven children, four teens, and two adults) topped that first year. Baptism from San Juan Bautista was sporadic in most years and non-existent in 1779 and 1797. No teenagers were baptized after 1787, and never more than two adults came in any one year. There were many years where only one infant or child was presented to the mission and no adults. The last year of Rancheria San Juan Bautista's recorded baptisms, 1803, had just one baptism, an adult, Roberto #4417.

Ties to Rancheria San Francisco can also be seen in Rancheria San Juan Bautista's records. #265 and #275 listed siblings at Rancheria San Francisco and #1770 lists as her husband #1162 of San Francisco. And, like Rancheria San Francisco, almost half of the baptism took place in the summer months. But, unlike San Francisco, less than half of the infants were baptized in the summer, with the infant baptisms remaining spread fairly evenly throughout the months. This may suggest that San Juan Bautista had a larger and more settled population.

Aside from San Francisco, the rancheria listed most frequently in the entries from San Juan Bautista was Rancheria San Joseph, the rancheria that was, most likely the main settlement of the three. Pedro Celestino #506, an infant, had two brothers, #295 and #311, listed as baptized from Rancheria San Joseph. One man, Andres #30, had two wives at San Joseph, Martha Francisca #18 from whom he had one child #666, and Maria de Jesus #104 from whom he had three children, #1136, #2019, and #2405. All of these children were listed as belonging to Rancheria San Juan Bautista, which helps prove that it was the father's family and lineage, and not the mother's, which determined the clan or rancheria to which the child belonged. In reverse, an adult from San Juan Bautista, Juana de la Cruz #507, had two children listed at Rancheria San Joseph, #379 and #380, because her husband was a gentile of that rancheria (Another woman, Guillermina #2934, was baptized ill at San Joseph, but no relationships to any individuals at that rancheria was recorded).

The only other baptisms recorded on June 6, 1777 came from Rancheria San Joseph. The Fathers had to travel to all three of these rancherias for these first baptisms; consequently, those baptisms taking place on the same day had to be a short distance from each other. Because of this needed proximity and the previously mentioned relationships with Rancheria San Juan Bautista, it would follow that this

rancheria was not only close to Rancheria San Juan Bautista but to Mission Santa Clara. On that first day of baptismal activity Father Murguia recorded,

On the sixth of this month of 1777, we have received information on many small children ill at the rancherias immediate to the Mission of Our Lady Santa Clara, about which one rancheria two leagues from this mission in a place called the Oaks [el Roblar] which we call Saint Joseph and privately baptize 13 children which are still ill. (Libro de Bautismos #8)

A Spanish league was just under three miles in length, so this description would place Rancheria San Joseph about six miles from the first mission site which was located along the Guadalupe River near present-day Agnews State Hospital. The Pueblo of San Jose was about four miles south of that first mission site along the same river, with Rancheria San Francisco lying next to the pueblo, Rancheria San Juan Bautista just below it, and Rancheria San Joseph to the south of it. Although Rancherias San Francisco and San Juan Bautista were quickly incorporated into the mission, San Joseph did not suffer this fate as readily because it was farther away.

According to mission records, Rancheria San Joseph was located on a plain of oaks between the Guadalupe River and the Coyote River near present - day Kelly Park. San Joseph was the largest of these three rancherias (San Francisco, San Juan Bautista, and San Joseph) with 303 baptisms recorded from 1777 to 1801.

San Joseph may have been the main rancheria of the three if the other two rancherias truly were satellite rancherias or villages. A number of facts point to this. One is the close interrelationships Rancheria San Joseph had with Rancherias San Juan Bautista and San Francisco. Not only were these relationships listed in baptisms recorded for the other rancherias, but Pedro de Alcantar #86 of San Joseph had both of his parents and his brother listed at San Juan Bautista (#475, #675, and #734), and Maria Francisca, a child, had listed as her mother #225 of San Francisco. Another item of interest which points to San Joseph as being the

main rancheria for this group is the baptismal pattern of San Joseph. San Joseph gave a large number of infants and children its first few years (15 in the first year alone). However, out of the 140 infants that were brought to baptism, 35 came in the months from January to March and 41 came in the summer months of June to August. The other months almost equally distributing the remaining 64 baptisms. This is in comparison to the overwhelming number of baptisms which took place in the summer months at the other two rancherias (26 out of 56 in San Juan Bautista and 22 out of 41 in San Francisco).

The baptismal pattern of the adults at Rancheria San Joseph was different also. Both Rancheria San Francisco and Rancheria San Juan Bautista took in few adults, many of them ill. Even though there were ill adults baptized from San Joseph, the ill were a minority -- just 11 older adults out of 27, and only 5 out of the 46 adults. Nor was parenthood of previously-baptized neophyte children a major motivating factor in conversion, because in 1794, 31 adults of both age groups were baptized, and only two of those, both older women, had neophyte children. The following year, too, 10 more adults were baptized, and these adults did not have neophyte children (but the five children baptized that year all had neophyte parents). This surge in adult baptism was in response to the Fathers' threats (see Chapter 3) in their attempt to disband the rancherias closest to the pueblo and bring those inhabitants into the mission's sphere of influence. The Fathers were effective in this endeavor, because after 1795 only nine more adults were baptized from San Joseph, most of them parents of neophytes; the last baptism in the rancheria being an adult, Ynigo, in 1801. No more children came into the rancheria after 1797. (The Fathers baptized 10 children in 1796 and seven in 1797 all of whom had neophyte parents.)

While it would seem that logic would dictate the location of San Joseph near the pueblo and to the southeast of the mission, four entries point to the possibility of another location. Four entries, #2675, 2677, 2680, and 2731, were listed as being from "San Jose Cupertino." Only one of these entries, an older woman #2731, has a relation listed with Rancheria San Joseph, a husband #2708; the other three entries were elderly men with no relations. De Anza had named a creek on the western side of the valley after Saint Joseph Cupertino, but these men, most likely, were not from this area but from Rancheria San Joseph, and, as such, have been included in that rancheria's count. A more likely explanation is that a new Father, Father Sola, had begun labeling entries from San Joseph "San Jose," and these two labels were used interchangeably in 1794 when these men came in with the large number of other adults. This use of both labels may have led to some confusion. Another explanation may be that without any living relations previously recorded, the Fathers may have been uncertain about these men's origins.

The other fact pointing to the location of San Joseph was its relationship to one other rancheria, Santa Isabel, located on the other side of the Coyote River. One infant neophyte, Ana Francisca #580, had two sisters previously baptized (#116 and #236) with Rancheria Santa Isabel listed as their rancheria of origin. Later, in 1795, Pedro #3150, had listed as his mother Barbara #1313 from Santa Isabel. However, this may not be too strong of a tie because Barbara was a young, unmarried child at the time of her conversion and may have met her husband, a neophyte from Rancheria Santa Isabel, at the mission after her conversion. Taking all these facts into consideration then, the most logical placement of Rancheria San Joseph is southeast of the pueblo of San Jose on the western side of the Coyote River.

Rancheria Santa Isabel lay across the Coyote River from Rancheria San Joseph, stretching into the present-day Evergreen area of San Jose. Santa Isabel has 14 listings (out of 278) of individuals baptized ill at the "Rancheria of the Coyote." Other settlements, too, are mentioned within Rancheria Santa Isabel -- Otosmi for #2970, Socotach for #3290, and Atoc for #3667 -- where the Fathers had traveled to baptize ill and dying adults. This distinction is not made with the previous rancherias which may mean that several villages made up Rancheria Santa Isabel whereas the other rancherias (San Francisco, San Juan Bautista, and San Joseph) were, in themselves, villages belonging to a larger group.

On June 8, 1777, the Fathers traveled out to this area they named Santa Isabel to baptize two infants and three children. This rancheria did not contribute large numbers to the mission in the early years, which may be because of its further distance from the mission. When glancing briefly at the entries for Santa Isabel it is easy to see that many children had one parent whose origin was from another rancheria. However, after closer examination, these parents are seen as having been converted before they were married and/or were very young. Most likely, these parents met their spouses after conversion while under the influence of the mission. Only by looking at the few exceptions to this can Santa Isabel's true relationships to other rancherias be seen.

In 1781 a brother and sister, #254 and #255, had a full-blood sibling listed from Rancheria San Juan Bautista and two half-sibling from Rancheria San Joseph. Two elderly adults baptized in 1789, Agosto Antonio #1330 and Maria Martina #1491, listed children (#234 and #147, respectively) from Rancheria San Francisco. Then in 1797 Juana Maria #3376 listed a half sibling from Rancheria San Joseph. Several other relationships, too, can be traced to the rancheria lying to the northeast, San Antonio. Ygnacio #2172 who is listed as an orphan lists a half-

sibling #1074, in San Antonio and Clara #2318, had a half sister by way of her mother from San Antonio, #553. One teen, Antonio #71, entered the mission listing a brother #35 from Rancheria San Antonio (only one of two baptisms from San Antonio in that first year). Augustina #1325, an adult baptized in 1789 listed a child, #126, from Rancheria San Antonio. Lastly, in 1799, Manuel #3865, listed a sister, Bibiana #458, from San Antonio.

Rancheria San Antonio, which was located north of Rancheria Santa Isabel, has many locational references in its entries making it easy to place it above Santa Isabel along the Coyote River and extending into the hills on the eastern side of the Santa Clara Valley. Judging from the relationship Rancheria Santa Isabel had with Rancheria San Antonio and the other rancherias, Santa Isabel can now be placed confidently along the upper Coyote River reaching toward the foothills.

Baptisms from Rancheria Santa Isabel did not favor any one month or season, but were spread fairly evenly throughout the year. A total of 118 infants came to the mission from Santa Isabel. Although conversion was, at first, slow; from 1781 on a steady stream of infants entered the mission, anywhere from 5 to 10 per year. In 1799, though, the number of infants baptized falls to two for that year, the same for 1800, then no infants (or children or teens) came into the mission except for one infant in 1802. There were 37 children and 13 teens baptized, never coming in large numbers except for 1789 when seven children (and eight infants) entered the mission.

Adult conversion started off even more slowly at Rancheria Santa Isabel. The first adult came into the mission in 1778, but no other adult followed until 1782. The next six adults who came into the mission over the next six years were all baptized ill and/or at the point of death. From 1789 to 1793 baptisms of ill adults continued. Out of the next 11 baptized adults nine were ill, the remaining two were

parents of a young neophyte. Then in 1794 a surge of conversion activity in adults took place (paralleling the same surge across the river at Rancheria San Joseph). The Fathers baptized 15 adults in 1792 and in 1793 they baptized 18 more adults (four of whom were listed as ill). After 1795, a steady stream of adults continued to be baptized until the rancheria's demise in 1808. The numbers never reached the peak of 1794 and 1795, and many of the 51 remaining adults were either ill (20) or related to other neophytes by marriage or parenthood (26) with some in each category overlapping. This slower, steadier conversion rate may be attributed to Rancheria Santa Isabel's distance from the mission and pueblo. The Fathers' motivation for conversion was strongest with the nearest rancherias whose Indians could easily be influenced by the immorality of the town (which the Fathers constantly lamented) and whose land could most benefit the expanding town and mission population.

On June 8, 1777, the Fathers traveled out to Rancheria Santa Isabel to baptize four ill infants. Then, later in the day, the Fathers baptized an infant from the fifth rancheria to give converts to the mission, San Francisco Solano. The first baptism from Rancheria San Francisco Solano, Francisco #22, was an infant who was brought to the church ill. However, after Francisco was baptized the Fathers traveled out to the rancheria on the same day to baptize another ill infant, #23 (who was rebaptized at the church on August 12, 1777, a common practice for those baptized ill away from the church).

While these two rancherias may have been within a day's walk of the mission and each other, there are few ties between Rancheria Santa Isabel and Rancheria San Francisco Solano. Two young neophytes from Santa Isabel list as their mothers two women from San Francisco Solano, but both mothers came into the mission before marriage, possibly meeting their spouses after conversion. Rancheria San

Francisco Solano's ties to other rancherías are just as weak. Sixteen young neophytes list mothers from other rancherías, but their mothers' marriages, too, took place after conversion. Discounting these entries, then, the strongest links to other rancherías are those baptismal entries where a neophyte lists a sibling in another ranchería. One boy, #59, had a brother by way of his mother from Ranchería San Antonio, #35 (who had a previously-mentioned brother from Santa Isabel). This mother, Apolonia Angela #146, was not baptized until 1779 so she had had a relationship with men from both Ranchería San Antonio and Ranchería San Francisco Solano before her conversion. When she was baptized, though, no spouse was listed. One older woman, Estefania #3501, had a child, #1101, baptized as being from Ranchería San Bernardino, and Fernando #1208, had a brother, #946, in San Bernardino. Other entries in the baptismal records for Ranchería San Bernardino records link it with San Francisco Solano. Eugenio #1594, in 1790, was baptized privately at point of death at Ranchería San Francisco Solano, and a village called *de la Margen* is mentioned in both Ranchería San Francisco Solano's entries (#2383 Raymundo) and Ranchería San Bernardino's entries (#2465 Theodomiro). (Two other settlements are mentioned, *Tapon* for #373 and *del Chim* for #3940.)

Even though the locational clues for Ranchería San Francisco Solano are sketchy, it is possible to give San Francisco Solano a location in relation to the mission and other rancherías because of the relationships listed in the baptismal entries. First, the Fathers baptized at San Francisco Solano and Santa Isabel on the same day, which would mean that San Francisco Solano must be within easy walking distance of both Mission Santa Clara and Ranchería Santa Isabel. (Unfortunately, the first page of the baptismal books is in very poor condition and it is difficult to ascertain whether the same Father performed these baptisms.) Secondly, because

of the close ties to *Rancheria San Antonio* to the northeast and *Rancheria San Bernardina* to the northwest (both to be discussed in the next chapter), *Rancheria San Francisco Solano* was, most probably, just to the north of Mission Santa Clara, probably around present-day Sunnyvale.

The close proximity of *Rancheria San Francisco Solano* to Mission Santa Clara would also explain this rancheria's baptismal pattern. *San Francisco Solano* not only supplied converts in the first month of conversions, but was also one of the first rancherias to be liquidated. In that first year, 1777, the Fathers baptized nine converts from *San Francisco Solano* -- six infants, one child, one teen, and one elderly person -- almost all of whom were ill. During the next 10 years the rate of conversion stayed steady, never going below seven in one year, and rarely much more than that except for 1782 and 1783 with 18 converts each (mostly infant siblings of previous converts). Of the 22 adults baptized from *Rancheria San Francisco Solano* that first decade, three were ill and all but two of the remaining were parents of neophyte children. As with many other rancherias, the big push to convert adults came in 1794, but with *San Francisco Solano*'s small population that number of adults amounted to only 13 (out of a total of 16 baptisms that year). After 1794, the rate of conversion declined until the final year, 1800, when one infant, one adult, and four elderly adults were baptized bringing the total number of converts from *San Francisco Solano* to 222.

The fewest number of converts, though, came from *Rancheria Santa Clara*, with its first baptism recorded on June 20, 1777. King (1978) places Santa Clara as the rancheria nearest the mission, and gives as its last baptism November 16, 1781. While he may have been correct, or close to correct with the probable location of this rancheria just to the north and/or east of the mission, he was not correct about the last baptismal entry, which he listed as being in 1781 -- upon closer examination

there were 10 more baptisms from Rancheria Santa Clara, after 1781, and the last baptism was in 1794, an infant, Pedro Tolmo #2548.

This last baptism is of special interest because it lists the father as "Joseph Rosario of adjoining California" (de la contigua California). He is the same Joseph Rosar, a Baja California Indian, recorded as father of Maria de la Merced #444 from Rancheria San Francisco baptized in 1783. Her mother was Maria Clara from Rancheria Santa Isabel, Joseph Rosar's first wife. Likewise, Pedro Tolmo's mother was Joseph Rosar's second wife, Maria Candelaria. She came not from Rancheria Santa Clara but from San Joseph. One other entry from Santa Clara, Catharina de Boremia #472 listed as her father a Baja California Indian, Esteban, and her mother (Maria Andrea), too, was listed as being from another rancheria, San Francisco. While most children are listed according to their fathers' rancherias, these exceptions may mean that Santa Clara was not a true rancheria, but a location where a village of Indians with loose ties to the mission may have chosen to reside.

Three other entries listed as Rancheria Santa Clara cross rancheria lines. In one entry in November 1794, #2659 of Rancheria San Bernardino was baptized ill at Rancheria Santa Clara. This entry may mean that Rancheria Santa Clara was a settlement and not a true rancheria, because the last entry listed from Rancheria Santa Clara was in October of that same year, thus signaling the end to conversion from this rancheria. Secondly, Maria de los Reyes #134 of Rancheria Santa Clara was married to Juan Bautista #133 of Rancheria San Francisco Solano. They had three children, #214, #346, and #627, all listed under Rancheria San Francisco Solano. Maria de los Reyes and Juan Bautista were married at the time of their baptism, but it is unclear if they were married when they entered the mission as catechumens. One woman, Maria Martina #1481 baptized ill at Santa Clara in 1789, had a son #510 from Rancheria San Joseph. Another woman, Maria

Dorothea #255, married a man from Rancheria San Carlos. So, while there are a few ties to other rancherias, those ties are not as strong as other ties between other rancherias.

There were other differences between Rancheria Santa Clara and the other rancherias listed by the Fathers. At Rancheria Santa Clara all of the parents of the baptized infants and children entered the mission -- illness does not seem to be a major contributing factor in adult conversion. In fact, very few individuals (four) were baptized ill and in only one of these baptisms, an adult Melchor #373, did the Fathers travel out to the rancheria (which further supports the idea that Santa Clara was close to the mission, because all of the adults listed in the other rancherias were not baptized in the church at the time of their illness). Two other baptisms of ill individuals took place that day at the church, and Father Pena, who performed all three baptisms, would not have been able to travel to a rancheria and back if it was not so close by.

But "rancheria" seems too loose a term for this group of individuals the Fathers labeled "Santa Clara" who had only loose ties to the other rancherias along the Guadalupe and Coyote Rivers. What is more likely is what was stated earlier -- that this was a core group or migrating band which was made up of one or two nuclear families with a few others included in the group because they were living in the same vicinity, the mission, at the time of their baptism.

The largest family was headed by a matriarch, Maria Salome #1008, who was baptized at the age of 90, deaf and blind. She had two sons, Balthasar #298 and Camilo Antonio #193. Camilo Antonio had a wife, Maria del Carmen #195, by whom he had four children: #46, #84, #107, and #289. Balthasar and his wife, Hortulana Ines #299 had four children: #45, #108, #113, and #134. Balthasar had another wife, Maria Victoria from Rancheria San Juan Bautista by whom he had

one child, #717, and Hortulana Ines had one other husband while still a gentile with whom she had a son, Pedro Joseph #126. Pedro Joseph, in turn, had a daughter #137 and son #343 by a woman from Rancheria San Joseph, #152. One other son of Balthasar and Hortulana Ines, #113, also married a woman from San Joseph #226, with whom he had a daughter #325.

The other family group was headed by two adults, Melchor #304 and Dorothea #305. They had four children, #49, #65, #497, and #785. Melchor may have been the son of another man from Santa Clara bearing the same name, Melchor #73 (who was mentioned previously), because it was a common practice of the Fathers to name a child (or adult) after his or her parent if converted, and the difference in ages between the two Melchors would allow for that relationship.

Melchor (#73) and Maria Salome were the only two elderly individuals baptized from Santa Clara. Were they perhaps married at one time and all of the adults listed their offspring? Melchor (#73) was dead at the time of Maria Salome's conversion, so any relationship she had with him would not have been mentioned in the records. The five adults listed, Melchor (#304), Balthasar, Maria Reyes, Maria Martina, and Maria Dorothea were close enough in ages to be siblings. The Fathers rarely listed parents of adult converts, but if these were siblings, this would make Santa Clara one large family group, not two (with a few additional individuals who chose to live in the same vicinity). One other adult baptism recorded for Rancheria Santa Clara, Juana Maria #155, may be a sibling, too, but she died shortly after her baptism and no other relationship for her was given by the Fathers.

Besides Catharina de Boremia #472 and Pedro Tolma #2548 who had fathers from Baja California and mothers from other rancherias, only one other entry does not have any possible blood ties to this large family in Rancheria Santa Clara. The third entry is of an adolescent female, Maria de los Dolores, who came

to the mission in 1780 from the hills. About her the Fathers wrote:

It is not known from which rancheria, but in the month of April some [men] in the Pueblo of San Jose found her lost in the mountains to the north of the mission about ten leagues. And although we have tried to know where she was going, it is not possible to know more than that her land is far away, her father and his son are dead, and her mother was killed by the gentiles. She was imprisoned and wanted to leave to look for her brothers. She was running around lost when the Christians found her. (Libro de Bautismos #207)

In 1782 she married Juan Damazeno from Rancheria San Carlos, moving away from Rancheria Santa Clara.

Although these three previously mentioned entries had no recorded blood ties to Rancheria Santa Clara, their designation as such by the Fathers says more about Santa Clara's location than all of the other marriage and familial ties to the rancherias. If a large family group lived next to the mission, and other Indians came to the mission by marriage (#472 and #2548) or by other ways (#207, the young girl found lost in the hills), the Fathers may have chosen to place these catechumens before their conversion close to the mission, in the location the Fathers called Santa Clara. As now seen in this and previous rancherias, the Fathers' designations of rancherias were not so much designations of politically independent groups, but locational references for groups of villages. Some of these had close ties to other groups and may have been a part of a larger political unit such as those rancherias along the Guadalupe and Coyote Rivers, or, because of naturally occurring boundaries may have been more separate and politically defined such as the outlying rancherias.

CHAPTER 5

The Outlying Rancherias

Rancheria San Antonio was located the farthest east of all the rancherias listed at Mission Santa Clara. It was located on the eastern side of the Coyote river and north of Rancheria Santa Isabel (although some of San Antonio's territory may have extended to the hills behind Santa Isabel) and extended into the foothills as far away as the Livermore Valley. Like Rancheria Santa Isabel and Rancheria San Francisco Solano, Rancheria San Antonio's first baptism took place on June 8, 1777. Joseph Maria #21 is listed as being from "the rancheria of the Arroyo called Coyote, also called San Antonio." Other baptisms give the location of San Antonio as being in the hills on the eastern side of the valley as written in #468 from "San Antonio en la Sierra" (in the mountains), #476 from "San Antonio en las Sierras," and #889 from "de Sierra de San Antonio."

The Indians of Rancheria San Antonio may have had strong marriage and trade ties with the lowland rancherias in order to obtain mussels and beads made from shells and to trade, in turn, acorns and the plentiful pine nuts. An adult baptized ill in 1787, #1099, had two brothers, #196 and 225, from Rancheria San Francisco. Another adult listed from San Antonio, #1719, was baptized ill at Rancheria Santa Isabel. Later, in 1802, #4307 was the mother of a child from Santa Isabel. Only one other person, #3791, was baptized on the lowlands of the Coyote River, either at Santa Isabel or at the area of San Antonio bordering Santa Isabel. Perhaps in one of the trading ventures to the lowlands, one Indian, Luis #4367, fell ill, because in 1802 he was reported baptized in the cornfield (*milpa*) of Sergeant Castro, a soldier whose lands lay to the northwest of the pueblo.

Rancheria San Antonio produced 683 converts over a 37-year period. Previous analyses of the baptismal records have given higher totals for this rancheria, but after a careful review of the baptismal totals combined with current knowledge, those previous totals may have been too high. The Indians of Rancheria San Antonio had strong ties with their neighbors to the east, the Central Valley Yokuts, and many of these people who came into Mission Santa Clara were labeled as being from San Antonio. There are 120 of these entries labeled San Antonio which, when referenced to the later entries of Central Valley Indians, can be discounted.

Like Rancheria Santa Isabel, some individual villages within Rancheria San Antonio were listed -- *Alisal*, *Maynasc*, and *Palac*. The first settlement, *Alisal*, produced two married couples, #5153 and #5154, and #5155 and 5156, but no other relations were given for these couples. The name *Alisal* shows up in Mission San Jose's records as an Indian settlement near the present town of Pleasanton. The last village, *Palac* was also the name of the headman for that village, who was baptized as Jose Domingo on April 4, 1802. Before him were baptized four of his children (#453, #634 who was half-sister of #453 by Palac's second wife, #891, and #1223). Palac and his village had good relations with the military of both the pueblo of San Jose and the presidio of Monterey. The dying man, Luis, may have been from Palac's group -- laborers from Palac's village were sent out to the Pueblo and Presidio; in fact, dispatches issued in 1797 indicate that members of Palac's village were protected by an agreement with the Monterey Presidio whereby the settlers of the Pueblo would not encroach upon Palac's lands (which bordered the Coyote River) until such time that the members of his tribelet left their lands for the mission. In turn, Palac's village would provide laborers for the hemp fields and, possibly, other fields (King 1978:446). Palac's name stayed on long after he and his

people had left the area. Although misspelled, Rancheria de Pala is listed on the maps of Santa Clara County in 1877.

Rancheria San Antonio's distance from the Pueblo of San Jose and Mission Santa Clara may have been the reason why San Antonio was one of the last rancherias completely incorporated into the mission. Even though one child and one infant were baptized that first month (June 1777), other conversions from San Antonio came slowly. Those two baptisms were the only conversions from Rancheria San Antonio that first year, and only one infant was baptized that second year (1778). There were no baptisms from Rancheria San Antonio the third year. In 1780, the Fathers baptized the first adult from Rancheria San Antonio, Simeon, who was ill at the time. He was also the father of three recently - baptized neophyte children. It was not until three years later, in 1783, that another adult baptism would take place -- Maria del Espiritu, the wife of Simeon. This year, however, did have a large number of infant baptisms, 11 (seven of whom had neophyte siblings, one baptized at death, and one the child of Simeon and Maria) and 23 baptisms of children (nine of whom had neophyte siblings and three orphans). The following year, though, there was only one baptism, an infant, and no more adult baptisms until 1787; two adults, one of whom was ill (and had younger neophyte siblings from Rancheria San Francisco) and one woman whose spouse was baptized that same day but from another rancheria.

Infant and child baptisms continued steadily over the next few years, but baptisms of teens were sparse, and by 1800 only 20 teens were baptized over those previous 23 years, seven of whom were all baptized in one year, 1798.

There was not the great surge in adult baptisms in 1794 and 1795 as experienced by many of the other rancherias. Instead, by the turn of the century the Fathers had baptized only 48 adults (out of 248 baptisms), and of these 24, or half,

were baptized ill and/or at the point of death. The remaining, without exception, came in as either spouses of neophytes who had been baptized ill or they had neophyte children.

The great push to convert adults from San Antonio did not begin until 1801, with 21 adults that year, and 35 the following year. The push to convert adults probably did not come from a strong desire for the rancheria's land or a desire to convert Indians and take them away from the undesirable influence of the pueblo as in the closer rancherias. Instead, the impetus to bring in these adults came from elsewhere. One reason was that Mission San Jose was founded in 1797 and began drawing converts to the north of Rancheria San Antonio. Perhaps the presence of these unconverted Indians to the south posed a threat to this mission's success. What is certain is that apostasy began increasing at the turn of the century from both missions, and the hilly area the residents of San Antonio called home provided an easy place to hide many of these runaways (see Chapter 7).

The second reason was that the Spanish military began expeditions into the Central Valley at the turn of the century. Shortly thereafter baptisms of the Valley Yokuts began. With the villages of Rancheria San Antonio lying between these Valley Yokuts and Mission Santa Clara it would follow that in order to successfully bring these Indians into the missions, then those villages in between needed to be successfully assimilated into the mission. Between 1800 and 1812, 418 converts from San Antonio came into the mission, and 263 of them, more than half, were adults. The Fathers baptized large numbers of all ages up through 1810, then the frenetic pace of conversion slowed with seven baptisms in 1811 (six of whom were elderly) and four baptisms, all elderly individuals, in 1812. When San Antonio ceased to be a rancheria in 1812, large numbers of Valley Yokuts and Sierra Miwok were coming in to replace the dwindling Ohlone population.

Like Rancheria San Antonio, Rancheria San Bernardino, was both a locational reference (the northwestern edge of Mission Santa Clara's influence) and a political entity. From 1777 to 1804 the Fathers baptized 883 converts from Rancheria San Bernardino, the second largest group of converts to enter the mission.

On June 21, 1777, the Fathers set out to this rancheria to baptize three ill infants (#50, #51, and #52). No other baptisms took place from here until 1779 with the baptism of two teens, and only one baptism in 1780, a sibling of one of the first baptisms. Because of San Bernardino's isolation and distance from the mission, it, too, was not subject to the two strongest influences for conversion -- proximity to the mission and pueblo and their desire for lands, and, along with that proximity, exposure to European diseases.

After 1781 conversion steadily increased, but most of those individuals entering the mission were infants and children, many of whom were siblings of other neophytes. It was not until 1794 that the Fathers pushed conversion of adults, as they had in many of the other rancherias. Between 1777 and 1793 190 infants and 172 children were baptized along with 66 teens (36 of these had siblings, four were orphans, three were parents of neophytes, two were ill, and nine were married to another neophyte for a total of 54 out of 66). Only 58 adult converts (47 ages 20 - 49 and 11 elderly) came during that same time. Thirty-seven of these adults were parents of neophyte children and nine of the remaining were ill. Thus, the pattern set at many other rancherias was repeated in San Bernardino.

Then, in 1794, the Fathers baptized 178 adults (123 ages 20 - 49 and 52 elderly), more than three times the number of adults baptized the 17 previous years totaled. Like the other rancherias, very few of these adults were baptized ill (6) or

had neophyte children (19). Instead these adults came on their own or on the strong advice (i.e., threats) of the Fathers.

After 1794 the rate of conversion slowed. Few children (3) or teens (3) were baptized in the following 10 years, but there were 60 more infants (52 of those between 1795 and 1797) and 89 more adults (30 in 1795, 19 in 1798, and 20 in 1800, with the remainder scattered sparingly over the other years). Four of these adults were baptized in the last year of San Bernardino's conversion activity, 1804.

Rancheria San Bernardino's location at the northwestern end of Mission Santa Clara's territory affected not only its conversion rate to the mission but its relationships with the mission and other rancherias. Because of its location along the San Francisco Peninsula, San Bernardino had relations also with Mission San Francisco. San Bernardino was at the southern reach of Mission San Francisco's influence, and two villages from San Bernardino are listed in both missions' baptismal registers. For Mission Santa Clara, one of these groups, *Quiroste* (#2425), is also mentioned in the books of Mission Santa Cruz. If this village was accessible to all three missions, it would follow that it was close to being equidistant to all three, placing the rancheria's western edge near the Point Ano Nuevo area on the Pacific Coast (Milliken, 1983, p. 96). The other village of Olpen was further inland at either the headwaters of San Francisquito Creek or upper Pescadero Creek (p. 97). The baptismal records list three baptisms from this village, #2155, #2178, and #2429.

Other villages recorded as being part of Rancheria San Bernardino give good locational clues for the extent of the lands covered by this rancheria. In June 1789, three ill individuals were baptized at the "rancheria de los Yambloquis," listed as two leagues (about six miles) to the northwest of Mission Santa Clara (two of the individuals recuperated and were rebaptized at the mission one month later). By

this year, the mission had moved to its third location, several miles to the southeast of its first location (but only a few blocks away from its fifth and final location on what is now the Santa Clara University Campus). Given this, *Yambloquis* could be located near present-day downtown Mountain View.

Five baptisms recorded listed a "rancheria at the arroyo of San Francisquito" (#1463, #1464, #1486, #2046, and #3991), but one of these, #1486, also says that this rancheria was to the north of the Camino Real → the road between Mission Santa Clara and Mission San Francisco which closely parallels its modern namesake. This would place these individuals as, possibly, belonging to the same group of individuals met by Father Palou and Captain Rivera on November 24, 1774. (See Chapter 3.)

There are other village names given in the Rancheria San Bernardino entries, but no locational references given. They are *Las Salcigesnas* (31775), *Muyso* (#2337 and #2426), *Ssolchegnis* (#2334, #2335, #2336, and #2342), *Lamayto* (#2339 and #2340), *Paltrastach* (#2525), *Noptach* (#3417) and *del Chato* (#4359). Mentioned previously in relation to Rancheria San Francisco Solano was #2465 from the *rancheria de la Margen*. Lastly, #2524, an older woman, was baptized at the *rancheria del Corte Madera* -- "the wood cutting." The hills to the west of the mission had abundant lumber, and the Fathers frequently sent workers, both Indian and Spanish, into these hills.

Many of those Indians listed above came in either the year 1793 (#2218 - #2414) and had the second largest number of total converts (98) or 1794 (#2415 - #2681) which had not only the large push of adult converts, but the most converts total (225). Perhaps this large listing of individual "rancherias" in these two years signifies the Fathers' ability and willingness to draw in converts from the smallest and/or most distant groups to the west and northwest of the mission. So thorough

were the Fathers in this endeavor that even one neophyte, Prima #2540, listed as her mother Gregoria of Mission Santa Cruz.

The villages of Rancheria San Bernardino ranged from the San Francisco Bay on the east to the Pacific Coast on the west, from San Francisquito Creek on the north to the estuary of the Guadalupe River to the south. While these Indians of Rancheria San Bernardino, because of its many villages, may not have thought of themselves in this larger context of "rancheria," they were isolated enough geographically to have few relationships with the other rancherias (many of those relationships possibly undertaken after conversion). The majority of the relationships listed for Rancheria San Bernardino with other rancherias were with Rancheria Santa Agueda, a rancheria stretching along the southern shore of San Francisco Bay to the eastern foothills.

Rancheria Santa Agueda did not record its first baptism until 1780. All of those neophytes in Rancheria San Bernardino who had relationships to individuals in Rancheria Santa Agueda (three infants with fathers in Santa Agueda and six infants with mothers in Santa Agueda) were born after 1780, with their parents among the first converts from Rancheria Santa Agueda. However, those infants from Rancheria San Bernardino with fathers from Santa Agueda (#310, #353, #668) had mothers from other rancherias who were baptized at about the same time as the fathers, so, the marriages, or at least courtships, could have taken place when these individuals were catechumens. Then, why were their offspring listed as San Bernardino? This pattern differs from the other rancherias where at least one parent came from the rancheria listed in the entry. If Rancheria San Bernardino was a locational reference instead of political reference (i.e., specific tribelets), then it would follow that these parents may have been among the more trusted neophytes of the mission who went up to these broad plains of San Bernardino to work on the

Spanish ranchos in that area. And, while there, these individuals could have lived with, or at least fraternized with the local gentile population. Another explanation may be that Rancheria Santa Agueda may have had trading and other ties to Rancheria San Bernardino to the west, and these individuals now listed as living at Rancheria San Bernardino may have been familiar with the gentiles of San Bernardino before conversion.

Four baptismal entries from Rancheria San Bernardino list weak links to Rancheria San Carlos. Two baptisms of teens from Rancheria San Bernardino (#2311 and #2326) list younger siblings from Rancheria San Carlos. These baptisms came during the rush from adult converts, and their parents may have been catechumens who met and remarried producing the much younger siblings. The other two baptisms, infants (#2179 and #2488), came from adults who met their spouses from Rancheria San Carlos while they were catechumens (#2311 and #2326) or children (#2179 and #2488) in Rancheria San Carlos. Thus, the only strong ties Rancheria San Bernardino had with any other rancheria were with Rancheria Santa Agueda.

Rancheria Santa Agueda was the designation given by the Fathers for those Indians living along the southern end of the San Francisco Bay between present - day Moffet Field to the foothills of the lower East Bay, and across the mouth of the Coyote and Guadalupe Rivers. There are no locational references given in any entries listed from Rancheria Santa Agueda. Randy Milliken (1983) placed this rancheria to the east of the Coyote River by cross-referencing individuals listed as being from Rancheria Santa Agueda at Mission San Jose with Mission Santa Clara and finding 27 (out of 34) converts from Mission Santa Clara who later moved to the newer mission of San Jose. Two elderly men who entered Mission Santa Clara, #357 in 1796 and #3751 in 1799, were both baptized ill at a rancheria named *de*

Alaquis. They may have been from the rancheria listed as *Alson* in Mission San Jose's books (Milliken, 1978, p. 101). One other baptism places this rancheria in this general vicinity, #4102, a 40-year old woman, who was baptized ill at the "rancheria del Coyote." This baptism confirms Santa Agueda's southern border reaching to the Coyote River.

But King (1978) places Santa Agueda to the west of the Coyote River. Evidence in the baptismal record also confirms this possible location. Not only were there those six references in the Rancheria San Bernardino entries previously cited, but there are 16 references to San Bernardino in the Santa Agueda entries. The first, #782, an infant, has listed as her father Buenaventura #746 from Rancheria San Bernardino. Buenaventura had two wives, #749 from Rancheria San Bernardino and #751 from Rancheria Santa Agueda. He had one other child, #372 by wife #751 before either of their conversions, establishing this relationship before mission interference.

In the second reference, Feliciano #983 from Rancheria Santa Agueda, had a brother, Joseph Protario #569, from Rancheria San Bernardino. In both baptisms the parents are the same unbaptized gentiles which establishes the relationship before the parents were catechumens. A similar scenario occurred for Maria Beata #1178, an infant from Rancheria Santa Agueda. She had a sister #963 from Rancheria San Bernardino. However, their gentile father was never baptized and the mother, #2377 from Rancheria Santa Agueda, was not baptized until 1796 and then at the point of death. Another child, Maria Florentin #1216, #1216, had half siblings (by her mother) listed from Rancheria San Bernardino (#374 and #382). There is no record of the parents' baptisms, so their rancheria affiliation is unknown.

In 1788 four children (#1154, #1285, and #2057) were the offspring of Maria Pulcheria #560 from Rancheria San Bernardino, and Miguel Maria #619 from Rancheria Santa Agueda. However, Maria Pulcheria and Miguel Maria were single teenagers at the time of their conversion in late 1783 and early 1784, and they were not married until 1788. Likewise, the mother of two brothers, #1206 and #1637, Maria Benvenuto #478, came from Rancheria San Bernardino, and her marriage occurred after her conversion.

The next reference to Rancheria San Bernardino in the baptismal entries of Rancheria Santa Agueda are the last weak indications of a link between Rancheria Santa Agueda and Rancheria San Bernardino. Fulgencia #4015, was baptized along with the husband Patriccio #4014 in 1800. He was from San Bernardino and she from Santa Agueda. They may have met when catechumens.

There are other relationships listed in the baptismal records of Rancheria Santa Agueda that link this rancheria to other rancherias, though in all cases but one the relationship can be traced to ties that occurred after a child's parents' conversion or their own conversion. That one baptism, Cayetana Maria #548, lists a sibling #120 from Rancheria San Francisco Solano which lay just to the south of Rancheria Santa Agueda. Both entries list the same Gentile parents, *Lachac* and *Muyam*. In 1785, the father, Lachac, was baptized as #745 Ybaldo of San Francisco Solano. He was 64 years old and dying at the time, and the mother apparently was never baptized, so her rancheria of origin is unknown.

If Rancheria Santa Agueda did stretch along the entirety of San Francisco Bay's southern shores, then why did Santa Agueda give converts to the new mission of San Jose to the northeast? One reason may be that the main villages of Rancheria Santa Agueda were located along the bayshore, and their primary food source would be shellfish and seeds, neither of which are available year round.

However, acorns were a source which could be harvested during many of the times when other food supplies were available or in scarce supply. Perhaps the inhabitants of these low - lying villages traveled to the foothills where the new mission was located to harvest the acorns which would be there in abundance. The inhabitants of Rancheria Santa Agueda could not travel to the south or east because of an apparent lack of friendly trade or marriage ties to these villages. (If these ties existed, then they would have emerged in cross references to those rancherias -- San Antonio, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Santa Isabel and San Juan Bautista, but the few references mentioned were late and superficial).

Like Rancheria San Antonio and Rancheria San Bernardino, Santa Agueda, now seems to be more of a locational reference than political reference. In the baptismal records for Rancheria Santa Agueda the Fathers list six other villages -- *de Quisnate* (#2056), *de la Calera* (#1612), *de Molcas* (#3141), *de Slaslach* (#3146), *de Terentach* (#3201), and *de Aloc* (#4037 and #5173) -- but no locational references are given for them.

Rancheria Santa Agueda's baptismal pattern also echoed that of Rancheria San Bernardino and neighboring Rancheria San Francisco Solano. Six hundred-fourteen neophytes came to Mission Santa Clara from Rancheria Santa Agueda, but the first three years of conversion from this rancheria showed few converts. Between 1780 and 1782 the Fathers baptized only seven converts. Then in 1783, the Fathers baptized 25 individuals, 16 of these children. Conversion remained steady after that, with a major surge in 1790 when the Fathers baptized 19 infants (most of whom had neophyte siblings), 16 children (eight of whom had neophyte siblings) four teens (two sibling neophytes) and 18 adults.

There were fewer baptisms the next three years and these were mostly infants. Then in 1794, there were 102 baptisms, 66 of these adults. This year, and

the following year (37 adults out of 77 baptisms) showed the great push for adult conversions that was paralleled in other rancherias, and, like the other rancherias, the majority of these adults came in without prior relationships. However, unlike the other rancherias, large numbers of adults continued to enter the mission after 1795; in fact, in all of the following years (except 1798), the number of adults baptized outnumbered infants and children by at least 2:1 and very few of these adults were ill (12 out of 93). Santa Agueda was one of the healthiest rancherias in terms of converts being baptized ill. Also, only 16 of these adults had neophyte children. During this same time 52 infants, 28 children, and 17 teens came into the mission fold, but the majority of these converts had either neophyte siblings or neophyte parents. In the last year of Santa Agueda's existence, 1807, one infant and three adults were baptized, all of whom had relations in the mission.

The explanation for the large number of adult conversions may lie in the founding of Mission San Jose in 1797. If both Mission San Jose and Mission Santa Clara drew converts from this same group of villages, then, accordingly, the pressure to convert increased. Without the presence of Mission San Jose, the residents of Santa Agueda may have taken longer to be incorporated into Mission Santa Clara because their lands were not coveted by the distant pueblo of San Jose nor did their residents present a threat to the success of incorporating other rancherias. Only Rancheria San Antonio and Rancheria San Carlos, the most isolated of the rancherias, had conversions later than 1807.

As a locational reference, Rancheria San Carlos represented those villages farthest south of the mission. San Carlos also has the distinction of giving the most converts to the mission. From 1781 to 1817, 1,209 converts came to the mission from its villages -- 401 infants, 274 children, 117 teens, 295 adults ages 20-49, and 122 elderly adults.

Like Rancheria San Bernardino, Rancheria San Carlos covered a large area, and, like Rancheria Santa Agueda, many villages are named, but only a few give locational references. (When a rancheria or village is listed within a baptismal entry, it is usually because one of the Fathers had to travel to that location to baptize someone who was so ill, perhaps dying; there was urgent need to travel out to the rancheria to administer this rite of the church.) The Fathers recorded the names of eight rancherias for Rancheria San Carlos in the baptismal books: *Laguna Seca* (#1399, #1630, #1714, #3463, #3478, #4458), *Tatami* (#3264, #3287, #3334, #3338), *Tarjanas* (#5157, #5158), *Huchitca* (#2564), *Sitepe* (#3243), *Auysanes* (#4406), *Quarto* (#5762) and *Timoy* (#6553), but it is only Laguna Seca which can be placed on a map. Within those six entries for Laguna Seca, two entries, #1630 and #1394, also say *Laguna Seca de los Matalanes*. In the baptismal books of Mission San Carlos, there is a reference to the "rancheria of Matlan at the Laguna" (#2116). This would place this portion of Rancheria San Carlos adjoining the northern reaches of Mission San Carlos. Also, near the present town of Coyote there was, in the late 1800s, a "Rancho Refugio de la Laguna Seca" (Gudde, 1969, p. 169).

Rancheria San Carlos' western border also adjoined the eastern border of Mission Santa Cruz, but below that area which adjoined Rancheria San Bernardino. The heading above #479 says that the "Following five adult gentiles are from the rancheria of San Carlos in the mountains" and one of those adults, Pomposa #4109, was married to Octaviano, a neophyte from Santa Cruz. Secondly, Clara de la Cruz #1897, who came to the mission under the heading of Rancheria San Carlos had parents from the village of Uypi which is listed in the records of Mission Santa Cruz.

San Carlos had few, if any, relations with its northern neighbors. As in many other rancherias, those neophytes from other rancherias listed spouses who married after conversion took place. One puzzling entry, though, #2089 has both parents #1060 and #1054 entered as being from Rancheria San Joseph. Also one child, #3945, lists a sister, #3914, from Rancheria San Antonio (to the east). These are the only two cross references to other rancherias listed for Rancheria San Carlos. There were the four previously mentioned entries in Rancheria San Bernardino with ties to Rancheria San Carlos, and no substantive relationships mentioned in the entries of any of San Carlos' other neighbors. This isolation from its neighbors and other rancherias can be blamed only partially on distance -- the other rancherias did not lack ties to each other; instead, San Carlos, unlike other rancherias, may have been a political designation -- political in the sense of a self-contained and self-sustaining unit or true "tribelet," for if San Carlos had trade or intercourse with its neighbors the results would be revealed in the baptismal records.

The last Ohlone baptism, #6553, an elderly woman from the "Rancheria de Tomoy," was from Rancheria San Carlos. Her baptism in 1817 closes the books on Ohlone conversion from the rancherias. Now the only baptisms recorded were those offspring of the faithful neophytes who stayed with the Fathers and accepted "civilization."

CHAPTER 6

Life at the Mission

The type of mission established in California by the Franciscan Fathers was the "reduccion," whereby the Fathers gathered the local indigenous population from the outlying villages into the central mission site. As seen in the previous chapter, the Fathers of Mission Santa Clara were very effective in bringing in the local Ohlone population from the outlying rancherias. And, while the last Ohlone baptism from a rancheria was recorded in 1817, the Ohlone who had come into the mission continued to reproduce.

Even with these births and the addition of incoming Indians from the Central Valley and Sierra Foothills, the mission population continued to decline. This decline was a result of many factors, most of which came about as a result of the mission system and, thus, could not be avoided.

Foremost among these factors was the Spanish and other European attitudes toward the native inhabitants of the New World. While this was an indirect factor at best, these attitudes directed the Indians' lives at the mission and their eventual social status in the community. Captain George Vancouver, when visiting San Francisco Bay in 1792 commented upon the Indians of Mission San Francisco, reflecting an attitude of condescension towards the Indians:

They [the Indians of Mission San Francisco] seemed to have treated with most perfect indifference the precepts and laborious example of their truly worthy and benevolent pastors, whose object has been to allure them from their life of indolence and raise in them a spirit of industry, which, by securing to them plenty of food and the common conveniences of life, would necessarily augment their comforts, and encourage them to seek and embrace the blessings of civilized society. Deaf to the important lessons, and insensible to the promised advantages, they still remained in the most abject state of uncivilization...they are certainly a race of the most miserable beings I ever saw, possessing the faculty of human reason. Their persons, generally speaking, were under the middle size, and very ill made; their faces ugly,

presenting a dull, heavy, and stupid countenance, devoid of sensibility or the least expression (Vancouver, 1935, p. 119).

These sentiments were echoed by Jean Francois Galoup de la Perouse, a visitor to Monterey when he, too, spoke about the seeming lack of gratitude towards the Fathers hard work in bringing to them the gifts of civilization. He wrote, "The food of the Indians is secured to them, and they have, therefore, no other want than that of giving life to beings who are sure to be as stupid as themselves" (la Perouse in Wagner, 1936, p. 221).

Later visitors to the San Francisco Bay area and its missions were equally uncomplimentary, one saying that "These natives of California present an exterior which preposses little in their favor...the ensemble of their roughly fashioned features proclaim stupidity: this is the most general character of their physiognomy. (Carter, 1929, p. 313). Another visitor proclaimed, "The physiognomy of these Indians is ugly, stupid and savage." (Kotzebue in Mahr, 1932, p. 61)

K.T. Khlebnikov, a Russian officer, tried to rationalize the European view of the Indians with the Indians' way of life. According to Khlebnikov,

Many travelers have compared the Albion and California Indians with chattel because of their marked stupidity. It seems to me that circumstances do not necessitate their being intelligent; first...they do not lead a social life, and their intelligence and form of expression are stunted by sheer lack of exercise. In the second place, climate and environment produce enough means for a livelihood....In the third place, they have no homes, no settled places, but find refuge in hollows of big trees, in mountain clefts, or in tents made of twigs, which are not difficult to abandon when the time comes to change places. (Khlebnikov in Mazour, 1940, p. 332)

Thus Khlebnikov attempted to reconcile the Indians' apparent ignorance and stupidity (in European eyes) with the apparent lack of challenges in their environment. He believed that without sufficient challenge, the Indians could not improve their faculties and become truly "civilized."

What of the Fathers' views of Indians' apparent lack of intelligence or civilization? While in their writings the Fathers were not as derogatory as the

visitors to the missions, their writings did reveal an attitude of parental authority toward a people they viewed as child-like and in need of guidance. Yet two visitors aboard the *Rurik*, a Russian ship which traveled to the San Francisco Bay in 1816 and traded with both Mission San Francisco and Mission Santa Clara, observed the Father's attitudes toward their charges. According to Otto Von Kotzebue,

The Missionaries assured us that it was difficult to instruct them [the Indians] on account of their stupidity; but I believe that these gentlemen do not give themselves much trouble about it. (Kotzebue in Mahr, 1932, p. 61)

Albert Chamisso, also aboard the *Rurik*, noted,

The contempt which the missionaries have for the people, to whom they are sent, seems to us, considering their pious occupation, a very unfortunate circumstance. None of them appear to have troubled themselves about their [the Indians] history, customs, religions, or languages: "They are irrational savages, and nothing more can be said of them. Who would trouble himself with their stupidity? Who would spend his time on it?" (Chamisso in Mahr, 1932, p. 83)

Thus the Fathers did not look upon their charges as equals or as intelligent beings, but as lesser, ignorant peoples who needed careful guidance in order to reap the benefits of "civilization." The mission system and its treatment of the Indians was just as damning as the Fathers attitudes toward them. Despite romantic interpretations found in literature and history, the California missions were coercive authoritarian institutions. Few Indians came into the mission willingly, and those brought into the mission were not free to leave at will. The Indians were under the absolute control of the Fathers and the soldiers, who enforced Catholic moral codes while instructing "these stupid ignorant savages" in the ways of European civilization (in Levy, 1978, p. 101). As Albert Chamisso stated, "The church has an inalienable right to her children and exercises this right with vigor" (Chamisso in Mahr, 1932, p. 81).

Every aspect of mission life assisted the Fathers in exercising this "right." The layout of the mission encouraged complete obedience: while an adult Indian

was receiving instruction before baptism, he/she was required to reside at the mission. After baptism, those neophytes who were married could live outside the mission compound, but "within the sound of the mission bell" (Kenneally, 1965, p. xxvii). However, these married couples had to pay a price for this little freedom. All of their children, and all children of unbaptized gentiles over the age of 10 were removed from their parent's care and placed in barracks in the mission compound. The children were placed in one of two large barracks, separating the boys from the girls. Here the children were placed under the care of an *alcalde*, a trusted older Indian man who was given positions of responsibility by the Fathers.

However, children were not the only Indians residing at the mission; single women (including widows) and the wives of men who were away from the mission stayed in a separate building. These women were virtual prisoners. At night, the doors to the barracks were locked from the outside, and the *alcalde* in charge would deliver the keys to the Fathers. In the morning the doors would be unlocked, but the "prisoners" were still not free; the girls and the single women were not allowed out of the mission compound unaccompanied, and remained as hostages as such until their marriage (Engelhardt, 1929, pp. 249-250). The building which housed the women, the *Monjeria*, was described by a visitor to Mission Santa Clara thus:

We were struck by the appearance of a large quadrangular building, which having no windows on the outside, and only one carefully secured door, resembled a prison for state criminals. It proved to be the residence appropriated by the monks, the severe guardians of chastity, to the young unmarried women whom they kept under their particular superintendence...These dungeons are opened two or three times a day, but only to allow the prisoners to pass to and from the church. I have occasionally seen the poor girls rushing out eagerly to breathe the fresh air, and driven immediately into the church...by a ragged old Spaniard armed with a stick. After mass, they are in the same manner hurried back into their prisons. (Margolin, 1978, p. 161)

By maintaining tight control over the lives and activities of the single women the Fathers were able, indirectly, to control the lives of the men. It would be easy to

conjecture that those women would only be released for marriage to baptized males who had proven their faithfulness to the Fathers. George Vancouver noted the hold that the Fathers had on the entire mission flock by controlling these women. He observed that these women, while under the Fathers' care, performed the important mission industries such as the spinning and weaving of wool which provided cloth not only for the local clothing but for trade. They were also instructed

...in a variety of necessary, useful, and beneficial employments, until they marry, which is greatly encouraged, when they retire from the tuition of the Fathers to the hut of their husband. By these means it is expected that their doctrines will be firmly established and rapidly propagated, and the trouble they now have with their present untaught flock will be hereafter recompensed by having fewer prejudices to combat in the rising generation. (Vancouver, 1935, p. 117)

Those men who did not become baptized and trustworthy neophytes would find a shortage of female companionship and/or suitable mates. Thus the neophyte population was able to reproduce, but the outlying gentile population continued to decrease due to a shortage of females and to the Fathers' aggressive efforts at recruitment (See Chapter 3).

The close confines of the barracks helped spread diseases previously unknown to the indigenous population, which the Europeans introduced to the New World. Married neophytes, too, lived in tightly packed quarters outside the mission which were unhealthy habitations. Otto von Kotzebue, when visiting Mission San Francisco, was appalled by the living conditions of the neophytes. He noted, "The uncleanness of these barracks baffles description, and this is perhaps, the cause of the great mortality; for of a thousand Indians at San Francisco, 300 die every year" (Kotzebue in Mahr, 1932, p. 59).

This high mortality rate among the neophytes was repeated at Santa Clara and the other missions which required the Indians to live in such accommodations.

Their habitations of "twig tents" may have aroused criticism, but they were well-ventilated.

Before European contact, the native population had diseases, but, unlike the post-contact time, those diseases were a result of conditions in the Indians' natural environment or food supply. Those diseases spread by mouth or fecal contact, or those viruses passed easily in closely confined spaces were of minor importance or unknown before the mission period. When the Indians were moved into close quarters surrounding the mission or in the mission compound many diseases such as smallpox and measles, which were introduced by the Europeans found fertile ground for contagion in the filth and squalor of this new imposed lifestyle.

But it was not only the high population density that contributed to the neophytes' high mortality rate. Sherburne Cook (1967) lists five major reasons for the decline of the neophyte population in the missions of California:

- 1) Direct personal shock of conflict which included early exploration and conversion but later forced conversion and slavery;
- 2) Dislocation and disturbance of the finely adjusted native life, meaning not only the displacement of the native population but reduction in the natural food supply either by disturbances in the local ecological balance or by lack of access to the natural food supply;
- 3) Dietary effects which came about as a result of a change in food leading to malnutrition and, at times, partial or complete starvation;
- 4) Social factors which included the forced labor of the neophyte, the harsh punishments inflicted by the Fathers, vagrancy, alcohol and sexual delinquencies (the latter two came about not as a result of missionization but the close proximity of the pueblos to the missions) and, finally;

5) The genetic factors of inbreeding of the shrinking mission population and the resultant character of the offspring.

So it was not just the introduction of civilized dwelling places (and the subsequent easy spread of disease, which contributed to the Indians' decline), but many factors including the introduction of a diet foreign to the native population. The land around Mission Santa Clara was generous and the food supply abundant, but in order to gather shellfish or acorns, or to hunt the many small mammals in the area the Indians needed permission to leave the mission lands, and that permission was seldom granted. The abundance of food sources outside the mission created a dichotomy within the mission system: to the Spaniards the Indians appeared lazy, indeed their lives were too easy. According to Khlebnikov,

Since the Native in his primitive condition readily finds his chief needs, food and shelter, everywhere, there is consequently no reason for exerting his intellectual capacities in improving his state. (Khlebnikov in Mazour, 1940, p. 333)

By "improving his state" Khlebnikov (and others) meant bestowing the benefits of civilization, among these benefits the introduction of farming and European foods. This in itself need not have been detrimental to the native population if their original food sources had remained available; in fact, the addition of grain and meat would have complimented their existing diet when some food sources became scarce due to seasonal changes. However, the mission Fathers were opposed to the Indians' utilization of existing food sources. The Fathers felt that the material and spiritual welfare of the newly converted savages could be monitored more efficiently within the confines of the mission and its influence, not allowing any temptation, such as gathering former food, which would cause them to revert to their old habits and way of life (Cook, 1976, p. 45-46).

Accustomed to a varied diet of acorns, seeds, fish and shellfish, and small mammals, the neophytes' diet now consisted of a daily ration of a starchy cereal

soup called *Atole*, supplemented at times with other grains and, infrequently, some meat. This monotonous and unhealthy diet, unfortunately, helped lower the neophytes' resistance to the diseases which were running rampant in the mission compound.

Even though Cook mentions disruption in the natural food supply and dietary effects as a reason for population decreases at the missions, these reasons would not, on the surface, seem significant factors at Mission Santa Clara. Santa Clara was declared second only to Mission San Gabriel to the south in agricultural advantage (Bancroft, 1963:477). The Indians, though, unaccustomed to agricultural work, could be indifferent to the Fathers' wishes that they become farmers. After all, why should they slave away at a pursuit which brings little reward, when an abundant food supply was so close at hand? The answer was forced labor and punishments meted out to achieve the desired result of turning the neophytes into farmers. To compound the problem of an unwilling labor supply, the Fathers themselves had little or no agricultural experience, and only those fields closest to the mission (where the Fathers could keep a watchful eye) were cultivated, many further and more fertile fields being allowed to lie fallow. Much of what little was produced was used by the Fathers in trade to receive other supplies for the mission, with the Indians receiving precious little of what was left.

Yet the Fathers did not seemingly intend to deprive the Indians but found themselves caught up in a much larger bureaucracy upon which they depended.

According to one Father at Santa Clara:

From the harvest of the previous year [1785], we gave to the paymaster of the presidio of San Francisco 127 fanegas of corn, 48 of wheat, 12 of beans. Their cost plus 93 pesos which the paymaster owed from last year were paid with only 300 pesos which were given to this mission for the factor of the presidios in Mexico, and what was left was given in fabrics or items of little use for the poor Indians, because the paymaster did not order them from Mexico. Therefore the wretched neophytes are deprived of their grain, and

suffer because of late pay, and are charged freight. (Informe of December 31, 1786)

Even though the Indians farmed with primitive tools under the guidance of inexperienced Fathers, visitors to the mission sung praises about the fruits, grains and vegetables produced there, noting the "abundant produce and high quality" (Malaspina in Galbraith, 1924, p. 223). This praise, though, may have been premature, because as the Fathers began to lose their control over the Indians, the Indians interest in agriculture also waned. When Duhaut-Cilly visited the missions in the San Francisco Bay and Monterey Bay areas in 1827 he observed,

In several missions some of the most intelligent of the Indians were selected and were settled, with their wives and children, upon lands more than sufficient for each family. They were supplied with herds, agricultural instruments, and food for that first year, nothing, in short, wanting to their needs, and even to their fortune which they could have increased rapidly; but the contrary has occurred. They have let themselves drift into sloth, indolence, and vice, they have let their herds perish, or have sold them in order to dissipate the revenue in gambling; grass has choked the plants in their gardens, their houses are fallen into ruins... (Duhaut-Cilly in Carter, 1929, p. 316)

Yet with this observation he does not blame the Indians so much as justifies their sorry plight by saying,

What must one conclude from this? That these people are not born for an agricultural life. Living as savages, they lead a precarious life, it is true, but which suits their disposition; as husbandmen they pine away and die in indulgence (p. 316).

Were all attempts at civilizing the "savage" Indians failures? The Indians brought into the mission either as infants or young children were more likely to adopt the Spanish role models and, frequently, these individuals were taught various trades besides agriculture in order to make the mission more self-sufficient and less reliant upon supplies shipped in. In fact, the Fathers were adamant that the missions become economic and civil communities as well as religious institutions, and argued for this principle against the Governor of California and the Viceroy of Mexico (McGarry, 1950, p. 337).

To further this economic independence, the mission Fathers brought in specialized artisans such as blacksmiths and carpenters to train the Indians. Another occupation popular at Mission Santa Clara (practiced mostly by the women) was weaving. The Indians made cloth not only for their own use, but also for blankets, riding apparel for the vaqueros and carpets for the sanctuary. Such was the quality of the cloth that George Vancouver, in his visit to Mission Santa Clara in 1792, had words of praise for the cloth produced there (Kenneally, 1965, p. xxxi).

By far the most successful endeavor at the mission was the tanning of, and subsequent trade in, hides. This profitable trade in hides and tallow to the American and English ships became even more important after Mexico achieved its independence from Spain. Up until 1811 the Viceroy of New Spain had sent an annual stipend of 400 pesos for each missionary, along with other supplies and monies. During and after the Mexican War for Independence all support was cut off, and the new Mexican government suffered financial troubles and was unable to offer any support to the missions. The money brought in from the trade in hides helped to make up this deficit.

The hides were taken down the rivers by launches and into the Bay to meet the ships. These launches were manned by Indians and were capable of carrying 500 to 600 hides apiece (Dana, 1946, p. 189). So successful was this trade that by 1827 there were some 14,500 head of cattle and 15,500 head of sheep under the care of the Indian Vaqueros of Mission Santa Clara (Spearman, 1963, p. 62).

This trade, while successful, brought criticism from the officials in Mexico, who were concerned about the freedom given to these Indian vaqueros who were responsible for the mission's herds. Father Lausen sought to calm any misgivings with a letter to the officials where he stated:

A charge was brought against me by the governor that in some missions an abuse is permitted, for more Indians are permitted to ride on horseback than are absolutely necessary to look after and round up the cattle. I satisfied his lordship by pointing out the limited number of saddles and cowboys which each mission maintains, and by advertising the vigilance of the missionaries who are more concerned than anyone else that the Indians should not become adept in the use and management of the horses....without some mounted men, who have to be Indians in this place, the missions would lack an indispensable means for looking after, and making the most of what is raised on the farm. (Lausen in letter to Don Jacobo Ugarte y Loyola in Kenneally, 1965, p. 168)

The attempt at civil government within the mission system came with the election of Indian alcaldes. In 1779 the governor of California decreed that the neophytes at each mission elect two alcaldes from their ranks. The first alcalde elected at Mission Santa Clara was Miguel Antonio (Baptism #195) of Rancheria San Francisco. He was a chief of his rancheria before his baptism, had two wives (one of whom died shortly after baptism) and had eight children. By all accounts he was an eager and willing convert; he served as a sponsor (godparent) at many neophyte baptisms.

While Miguel Antonio was an effective alcalde, many others were not. One of the Fathers at Mission San Carlos Borromeo (Carmel), in his yearly letter to the Spanish government complained that the Indians would not show as much respect to the elected alcaldes as to their former chiefs; and, if the chiefs were not elected alcalde they still were able to control the members of their rancheria. Because the Indians' commitment depended largely on their happiness the Fathers would strive to humor these chiefs and the would further undermine the alcaldes' authority (Geiger, 1950, p. 484).

In reality, there was not much authority wielded by the alcaldes. The elections were considered to be more of an object lesson to prepare and instruct the natives in citizenship; yet allowing the missions to be governed by the Indians was out of the question. Father Lausen, president of the missions after Father Serra's

death, spoke out adamantly against the practice of electing *alcaldes* when he wrote to the Commandant General of the Internal Provinces of New Spain:

It seems to me that the institution of *alcaldes* in the mission was untimely and unduly legalistic, for it makes such persons independent of the missionaries as regards punishment and dismissal from office when they deserve it, and it makes these officials lazy and haughty, connivers at wrongdoing and partners in it. (Lausen in Kenneally, 1965, pp. 168-169)

Punishment became the prominent means of control of the population at the missions. Agriculture was only a limited success, and the disruption of the Indians' society by the aforementioned housing policy at the missions could only serve to alienate the Indians. But the Fathers primary task, proselytizing and conversion (along with the introduction of European mores) provoked the strongest resentment (and, thus, the harshest and most frequent punishments). While the Indian may have entered the mission because of the food and clothing offered, the Fathers' religion and way of life did not offer any material benefits.

The Indians were taught the Catholic religion, not by the Fathers, but by other Indians who had been trained by the Fathers. With the various dialects and languages spoken at each mission this method may have been the most expedient, but it was not the wisest choice. These newly converted neophytes served as instructors and were taught Spanish and the *Doctrina* and, they, in turn, served as translators. The visitors to the mission criticized the Fathers for this system of education because the little knowledge the Indians' received was very diluted.

...the purity of the dogma can only be much altered, continued in this way by means of ignorant men, and in a language having no expressions for rendering our metaphysical ideas, in this way they preserve a large part of their native superstitions. (Duhaut-Cilly in Carter, 1929, p. 316)

While the Indians may have been instructed in their native language, they still understood little or no Spanish or Latin, the language of the Catholic Mass, the observance of which they were not allowed to absent themselves. Kotzebue echoed the sentiments of Duhaut-Cilly when he observe mass at Mission San Francisco:

Precisely at 10 we entered the church...where we found several hundred half-naked Indians kneeling, who, though they understood neither Spanish or Latin, are never permitted after their conversion to absent themselves from Mass. As the missionaries do not trouble themselves to learn the language of the Indians, I cannot conceive in what manner they have been instructed in the Christian religion; and there is probably but little light in the heads and hearts of these poor creatures, who can do nothing but imitate the external ceremonies which they observe by the eye. (Kotzebue in Mahr, 1932, p. 59)

The Indians were allowed little time off between their chores and their religious obligations. This time off usually came on religious holidays, and at that time the Indians were able to indulge in activities to their liking. On these special days extra allowances of food and meat were given out. Even though the Fathers did not condone gambling, games of chance were played using shells instead of money. One particular game consisted of throwing little pieces of wood on the ground and guessing whether the number was odd or even; another guessing whether sticks would fall on a flat or rounded side. The Fathers would also humor the Indians by allowing them to participate in their native dances, which would be performed for the amusement of the civilian population or any visitors. Louis Choris, who visited both Mission San Francisco and Mission Santa Clara in 1816, left the description of one such dance:

On Sunday, when the service is ended, the Indians gather in the cemetery, which is in front of the mission house, and dance. Half of the men adorn themselves with feathers and with girdles ornamented with feathers and with bits of shell that pass for money among them, or they just paint their bodies with regular lines of black, red and white. Some have half their bodies (from the head downward) daubed with black, the other half red, and the whole crossed with white lines. Others sift down from birds on their hair. The men commonly dance six or eight together, all making the same movements and all armed with spears. Their music consists of clapping the hands, singing, the sound made by striking split sticks together which has a charm for their ears; this is finally followed by a horrible yell that greatly resembles the sound of a cough accompanied by a whistling noise. The women dance among themselves, but without making violent movements. (Choris in Mahr, 1932, p. 97)

Later, in 1831, another visitor to Santa Clara, Alfred Robinson (an American who later settled in San Francisco), observed a similar dance performed after a dinner for the benefit of the visitors:

At a signal from the "capitan," or chief, several Indians presented themselves at the corner of one of the streets of the "Rancheria" and gradually approached towards us. They were dressed with feathers, and painted red and black paint looking like so many demons. There were several women amongst them. Soon they formed a circle, and commenced what they call dancing, which was one of the most ludicrous specimens of grotesque performance I had ever seen. It did not appear to me that they had any change of figure whatever; but fixed to one spot, they beat time with their feet to the singing of half a dozen persons who were seated upon the ground. (Robinson, 1970, pp. 80-81)

The biggest threat, though, to the Indians' religious discipline was not the occasional pagan dance or game, but the close proximity of the Pueblo of San Jose de Guadalupe. The town was founded in November of 1779 and situated upstream about half a league southeast from the first mission site. Along with the mission, the establishment of the Pueblo marked the beginning of the Spanish effort to colonize the Santa Clara Valley and lower San Francisco Peninsula.

The establishment of the Pueblo was not without opposition by the religious authorities. Father Serra, the president of the missions, believed that the government should postpone settlement until the missions were more developed. This would help the missions to develop their own lands so they could provide produce for the presidios, and more land would be available for the settlers by reason of the gathering in of the local indigenous population into the mission (Servin, 1965, p. 136). Father Serra's concerns were well-founded. Much of the correspondence between the Fathers of Santa Clara and the authorities back in Mexico concerns problems with the Pueblo. These problems ranged from disputes over land and water use to the settlers' bad influence upon the mission neophytes. After a disastrous flood in early 1789, the Fathers found themselves moving the locations of both the mission church and many of the cultivated fields. This action

necessitated using river water for irrigation, but a conflict arose with the Pueblo which had claimed that portion of the river for irrigation of its own fields.

According to Father Murguia,

...this water has been diverted by the neighboring inhabitants of San Jose...The water was used to irrigate land which they have cultivated on the other side of the river. If we bleed the river (which belongs to the neophytes according to the law) we could experience difficulties, besides the ones that we have with the proximity of these inhabitants because of the great spiritual damages which other inhabitants cause, and the temporal backwardness, and because of their cattle that frequently has to be chased out of the mission's corn fields after doing considerable damage; their cattle also mixes with that of the Indians, causing loss to the latter. Since the right of the Indians to the land and the water prevails, according to the law, it will be necessary to use the law to protect their rights, against the laws. We have taken preventative measures for what a protest might cause. (Informee of June 30, 1784)

Father Murguia does not elaborate what "preventative measures" were taken, but the rivalry for both the water and the souls of the Indians continued. In order to obtain workers for the Pueblo and its surrounding ranchos, the colonists used conscript Indian labor obtained from the mission. While the Fathers were loathe to loan out "their" Indians, they were able to obtain payment from their services -- money, badly needed by the mission. When the mission economy improved, the Fathers became more reluctant to loan out the Indian laborers. However, the Pueblo, ranchos, and even the Presidio became more reliant upon the Indian labor. Thus, the undeclared war escalated and the tactics on both sides became more subversive. If an Indian committed an offense, such as the theft of cattle (a charge easily trumped up because of the constant wandering of the settlers' cattle), he was condemned to work for the presidio for an unspecified amount of time. Father Lausen railed against this practice to the government citing that the punishment of the Indians from any offense should rest with the Fathers, and the presidio only viewed levying punishment as a way to get free laborers (Bancroft, 1885, I, p. 406).

The citizens of the Pueblo went one step further in undermining the Fathers' authority. They were able to entice gentiles (unconverted Indians) to come and

work for them and live in the pueblo. Furthermore, the citizens persuaded these Indians not to become Christians out of fear of losing the Indians' services. In an appeal to the government, Father Noboa of Santa Clara wrote,

There is much sin in the area which troubles the houses and town where many persons of both sexes live together employed by the neighbors [townspeople of San Jose] and since these let them live in their old freedom and gentile customs and participate in themselves and teach them unworthy vices, because there is work and food they refuse to submit to the bond of the gospel and the laws of Christianity. (Informee of December 31, 1787)

From the beginning the town and the mission were at odds. The Fathers would blame the townspeople for providing bad moral examples, and the townspeople blamed the Fathers for not only monopolizing a cheap labor supply but also reserving too much of the land (in the townspeople's opinion) for the mission and the Indians. The townspeople were critical of the Fathers' treatment of their Indian wards, yet their own treatment of the gentiles they employed garnered equal criticism. In one instance, in 1784, two boys at the pueblo drowned an Indian to amuse themselves, but "in consideration of their tender years" charges were dismissed with only a punishment of 25 lashes administered in the presence of other Indians (Bancroft, 1885, 1, p. 480).

In the eyes of the visitors to the area, the townspeople were the subject of as much scorn as the indigenous inhabitants. The Californians were viewed as lazy and indolent people who employed the Indians as a kind of slaves while "vigorous youths pass their life in horse racing or in squandering in gambling the little they have" (Duhaut-Cilly in Carter, 1929, p. 37).

While Duhaut-Cilly goes on later to praise the equestrian abilities of the settlers, K. T. Khlebnikov was even harsher in his criticism, finding no redeeming qualities in the Spanish inhabitants of the San Francisco Bay Area:

The Californians are, in general, a lazy, untidy people of limited capacity, and their simple humor evidences their seemingly infantile state...The men do practically nothing and, if they can get the Indians from the mission to

work, walk around with their arms folded, telling the Indians what to do; there is hardly a skilled mechanic among them. (Khlebnikov in Mazour, 1940, pp. 323, 325)

These Californians and their opposition to the mission did little to encourage the Indians to adhere to the Catholic faith, and Christianity was not a force sufficiently powerful to hold the converts. As previously mentioned, when the Mexicans gained their independence from Spain, supplies and monies to the mission were either lessened or discontinued. For Mission Santa Clara, this could not have happened at a worse time. For the previous decade the Fathers, along with soldier escort from the Presidio, had ventured into California's Central Valley to bring in, willingly or unwillingly, more converts. These new Indian converts, Valley Yokuts and Plains and Sierra Miwok, came not only from the valley but as far away as the Sierra foothills. These Indians came with new languages and customs, and a strong desire to return to their homeland; not that the Ohlone did not wish to escape from the mission confines, but it was more a case of opportunity. The Ohlone villages were in close proximity to the missions of the San Francisco Bay area and central California coast. If the Ohlone had chosen to flee, where would they go? To the South? There stood Missions San Juan Bautista and San Carlos. To the West? There was Mission Santa Cruz and the Pacific Ocean. To the northwest lay Mission San Francisco, to the north the bay, and to the northeast Mission San Jose. The logical direction was to the west, the land of the Indians who were now being brought into the mission. with there introduction came the largest threat to the mission's stability and to the growth of the mission population -- apostasy.

CHAPTER 7

Apostasy

The savage comes unthinkingly into the mission, receives the food which is willingly offered him, and listens to the instructions: he is still free. But as soon as he is baptized, he belongs to the church, and hence he looks with pain and longing to his native mountains. The church has an inalienable right to her children, and exercises this right with vigor. (Chamisso in Mahr, 1932, p. 81)

Thus spoke Albert von Chamisso, a visitor to the San Francisco Bay area in 1816. He accurately observed the dichotomy in the mission system, the Indians were thought to be a possession of the missions, but the Indians themselves thought the "possession" to be, at best, temporary, or at worst, non-existent. The conflicts between the "possessor," i.e., the mission system, and the "possessee," i.e., the Indians, began almost at mission inception and continued until secularization and the breakup of the missions. This difference in cultures combined with a difference in expectations on both sides gave rise to various forms of rebellion ranging from simple fleeing of the mission to murder. Each flight from the mission by the natives resulted in more stringent restrictions which resulted in a stronger desire for freedom and escape, which resulted in virtual imprisonment. The final result of this escalation became not a spiritual conquest of a race as intended but a physical conquest ending in complete subjugation of a people and destruction of an indigenous way of life.

The Fathers could not see, or apparently chose not to see this conflict arising from taking an indigenous people and imposing another culture upon them. Father Juan Carlos of Mission San Carlos wrote, in a letter to the Spanish government in 1812, an opinion about the apparent submissiveness of the native inhabitants of the land, an opinion that was reiterated by other Franciscan Priests serving the California missions:

The conquest has made them [the Indians] recognize the superiority of the gente de razon; they make no distinction between European and American. They respect, honor and serve all alike. Because they are timid and pusillanimous, when treated sympathetically and tenderly, as one would a child or afflicted person, they prove themselves useful in many ways. (Geiger, 1950, p. 478)

The Spanish government shared this view. They, too, viewed the Indians as childlike and of great use to the colonization movement. The Spanish colonial system, set up to regulate control over the native inhabitants in California and Mexico was called the "encomienda system" which called for the "giving of Indians." This meant that the Indians "were given" by the land for labor either at the missions or for the Spanish citizens. The Spanish believed that this encomienda system along with Christianization would ultimately absorb the Indian into the Spanish colonial society, albeit at its lowest level, and would help consolidate Spanish control over the newly colonized territory (Levy, 1978, p. 100)

Much of the conventional wisdom then presumed that the native inhabitants would be willing to join this system and reap the "benefits" of Spanish civilization. For the first decade of Mission Santa Clara's existence the converts apparently came willingly and stayed willingly. Even so, signs of unrest and discontent in the form of rebellion and apostasy began to surface during this first decade. This unrest arose because of many factors, but the two major motivating reasons behind the discontent were fear of punishment and lack of food.

At the end of Mission Santa Clara's first decade, 70 families of married neophytes and 507 other individuals (for a total of 647 persons) lived in and around the mission compound. If the total number of neophyte deaths during than time, 434, is subtracted from the total number of neophyte baptism, 1,090, the figure is 656. Only nine individuals were unaccounted for, (and whose absence could be explained to possible apostasy, but more likely to a transfer to another mission, or to

work in the pueblo or in an outlying rancho) showing that the Fathers were able to maintain tight control over their neophyte population.

Between 1788 and 1796 there were 2,207 Indian baptisms and 1,252 deaths, giving a total since inception of 3,297 baptisms and 1,686 deaths. The difference between these two numbers, 1,611, is the total number of neophytes who, in 1796, would be living. Yet, the mission population recorded that same year in the Informee of 1796 was only 1,433. Now 178 individuals were unaccounted for. During the last three years of this time period, 1794, 1795, and 1796, the Fathers pushed to bring in large numbers of adult gentiles for baptism. However, these conversion, somewhat forced, had an adverse effect -- the beginning of large numbers of runaways and a greater move toward apostasy. Many Indians moved to the pueblo of San Jose to work as servants, or, in many cases, became vagrants.

Mission Santa Clara, had its largest Indian population in 1796, and even though baptismal rates declined after this year, they still stayed ahead of the death rate. However, apostasy began to take its toll. By 1832, two years before the secularization order, the mission population totaled only 1,125, even though the Fathers brought in and converted large numbers of Central Valley and Sierra Indian throughout the previous three decades.

When Governor Borica, the seventh governor of California, visited the Monterey and San Francisco Bay areas at the time when large numbers of neophytes began leaving the missions, he was appalled by the deplorable living conditions of the Indians at the missions, particularly Mission San Francisco, where he found that the neophytes were often treated with cruelty and even brutality by the mission priests. Borica was so concerned about this that he wrote a letter to the commandant of the Presidio of San Francisco asking that the commandante conduct an investigation among the troops who would know how the neophytes were being

treated at the missions to "determine the reasons why there are now some 200 fugitives" (Borica in Heizer, 1971, p. 6). Borica quickly acknowledged the factors which contributed to the neophytes' discontent and resultant apostasy: 1) loss of liberty, 2) forced labor, 3) the great filth at the missions, and, 4) their bad living arrangements. It is no wonder that these factors, combined with the harsh treatment and severe punishments inflicted by the Fathers, resulted in large numbers of neophytes leaving the mission. The cruelty and harsh punishments became a constant theme in correspondence between the missions and presidios and the Spanish (and later, Mexican) government.

The visitors to the mission also remarked how strict the discipline was at the missions, noting that many offenses which would be lightly remonstrated against in civilized society were severely punished. Some visitors compared the missions to the West Indian plantations which were known for their harshness. One visitor to Monterey in 1786 wrote:

We have seen both men and women in irons, and others in the stocks; and, lastly, the noise of the whip might have struck our ears... Women are never whipped in public, but in an enclosed and somewhat distant place, that their cries may not excite too lively compassion, which might cause the men to revolt. The latter, on the contrary, are exposed to the view of all their fellow citizens, that their punishment may serve as an example. They usually ask pardon for their fault, in which case the executioner diminishes the force of the lashes, but the number is always irrevocable. (de la Perouse in Wagner, 1936, pp. 218, 221)

These harsh disciplinary measures were the major contributor to neophytes fleeing the mission. Punishments such as the kind administered by the Fathers were unknown in the natives' society, and not administered in the Fathers' homeland for such minor infractions. When questioned why they fled the missions, punishment came up as the most frequent reason.

After one of the first major exoduses from Missions San Francisco and Santa Clara in 1794, the commandante of the presidio of San Francisco who recaptured

the neophytes asked the neophytes why they had left the mission. Here are some of their answers as recorded at Mission San Francisco:

- He had been flogged for leaving without permission.
- The same reason; also, he ran away because he was hungry.
- He had been put in jail for getting drunk.
- He had run away previously and had been flogged three times.
- He was hungry. He had absconded previously and when he returned voluntarily he was given 25 lashes.
- He was frightened at seeing how his friends were always being flogged.
- When he wept over the death of his wife and children, he was ordered whipped five times by Father Danti.
- He was put in the stocks while sick (in Heizer, 1971, p. 9).

Other frequent complaints dealt with food. If for any reason a native could not do his assigned work at the mission, whether for his own illness or tending a loved one who was ill, he did not receive his ration of food. Any attempts to go out and collect the types of food which the Indians had previously eaten in their pagan state, such as clams or acorns, was also a punishable offense.

Later, Indians were allowed to return to their native lands twice a year to visit their friends (and, hopefully, bring in more converts). If however, these neophytes did not return, the Fathers would send out troops to bring back the escaped neophytes. While the neophytes greeted this allowance of freedom with much rejoicing, and as such, was a morale booster among the mission population, the journeys served another purpose. The Fathers noted that these journeys seemed to benefit the Indians' health by allowing them this short time to gather and consume their native foods, thus supplementing their meager mission diet (Geiger, 1950, p. 480).

The rising number of apostates was brought to the attention of Father Fermin de Lausen, the president of the missions after the death of Father Serra, but he declared that the charges of cruelty were unfounded, citing the large numbers of conversions. He felt that the natives fled, not because of flogging, hunger, or being overworked, but because of the fears brought about by the ravages of an epidemic (Bancroft, 1885, *1*, pp. 711-712). This cynicism towards punishments and the resultant fleeing was repeated by Fathers Gonzalez and Carroza of Mission Santa Cruz who reported to Governor Borica that the Indians fled because of "...the ungovernable passion for other women. Those at the mission cannot entirely gratify their lust, because of the vigilance of the missionaries. Hence they run away in order to give full sway to their carnal desires" (in Engelhardt, 1913, *1*, pp. 506-507).

Also, visitors to the missions were equally cynical about the Indians' charges of cruelty. Louis Choris stated:

In winter, bands of Indians come from the mountains to be admitted to the mission, but the greater part of them leave in the spring. They do not like the life at the mission. They find it irksome to work continually and to have everything supplied to them in abundance. In their mountains they live a free and independent, albeit a miserable existence. Rats, insects and snakes---all these serve them for food; roots, also, although there are few that are edible, so that at every step they are almost certain to find something to appease their hunger. (Choris in Mahr, 1932, p. 95)

Thus, the benevolence of the Fathers, the benefits of civilization, and the power of religion were not enough to hold the converts. Surely, the mission founders did not foresee this widespread apostasy. Yet, physical punishments and restraint, and abuses of the part of both the clergy and the soldiers became part of mission life in order to convert the Indians to the Spaniards' religion and way of life.

There were many debates between the religious and secular authorities over punishments. While both the lower ranks of the secular and religious population were guilty in the practice of excesses, it was the policies of the authorities that were

in debate. Felipe de Neve, commander of the interior provinces of Mexico at the beginning of the mission period:

...remonstrated against the practice [recapturing runaways]. He thought the progress of faith would be more rapid, and the prayers of Indians more agreeable to the supreme being if they were not constrained. He was desirous of a constitution less monastic, affording more civil liberties to the Indians, and less despotism in the executive power of the presidios, the government of which might be entrusted to cruel and avaricious men (de la Perouse in Wagner, 1936, p. 219)

But his successor, Governor Fages, found himself being less restrained and taking a more active role in Indian affairs. In 1783 he commanded troops to go against some gentiles of the region around the pueblo of San Jose who had stolen some horses from the settlers. The troops killed two Indians and the rest were captured. This quick and decisive action frightened the Indian population into submission for several years. But later in 1788, Fages had to arrest three chiefs and 15 natives for horse stealing (Bancroft, 1963, pp. 479, 480).

The administrators of the missions made some attempts to determine the truth behind the rumors and charges of excessive punishment. Between the 26th and 31st of May, 1786, Father Lausen investigated the charges made against Father Pena of Mission Santa Clara. Gabriela Peralta, commander of the Presidio of San Francisco testified that:

...he had never seen or heard that His Reverence had struck anyone, even with a rod, or that he had disciplined anyone except after the manner of a parent, nor did he know of any discontent, or restlessness, or evidence of mutiny among the Indians. He further stated that until Lieutenant Don Diego called to his house the Indian known as Placido, and others also, he had never heard any of the things later attributed to Father Pena. (Lausen in Kenneally, 1965, p. 120)

After hearing this and other testimony Father Lausen came to the conclusion that most of the rumors were false and the charges exaggerated:

...I may take the due and fitting means to bring to an end the very serious difficulties and incalculable drawbacks that are certain to result from listening with an avid and vengeful ear to the charges that Indians make

against missionaries (who impose on them merely what is just) and, what is more serious still, from suggesting similar falsehoods to them, inducing them to testify to such falsehoods in court, and from flattering them by giving a sympathetic ear to their complaints as if they were genuine. (Lausen in Kenneally, 1965, p. 124)

Rumors and falsehoods aside, there were as many reasons for the Indians not to leave the missions as to escape. The very young and/or very old, and infirm were not able to make what could be an arduous journey into the hills. Some justly feared punishment and others did feel some loyalty toward the Fathers, or at least loyalty to a system which gave out material rewards and inducements to the faithful. But inducements and fear were not able to hold very many Indians, and the escapes continued into the next decade.

Duhaut-Cilly sided with the Fathers and believed the natives were being ungrateful and disrespectful to the Fathers in their lack of desire to obtain the benefits of mission life:

What do the padres demand from the Indians of Upper California? A little labor in exchange for abundant nourishment, good clothing and the benefits of civilization. In spite of these advantages, the instinct of liberty is crying to them to prefer to this quiet, though monotonous, state, the poor and uncertain life of their woods and marshes. (Duhaut-Cilly in Carter, 1929, p. 319)

But these "woods and Marshes" beckoned strongly. Twenty-one individuals left from Mission San Francisco in 1793. The group that left in 1793 was led by a neophyte named Charquin who was from one of the East Bay Ohlone tribelets. For months he waged war, not with the Spaniards, but on those Indians who were faithful to the mission Fathers. At one time he held 200 women and children from the mission captive in the mountains (Bancroft, 1885, I, p. 709). This group which left in 1793 represented only 3% of the mission population, but two years later a much larger group, 200 individuals, or 32% of the neophyte population, fled. Few of these individuals returned willingly, and none of the rest were caught. The following year, Indians fled both Missions San Francisco and Santa Clara. The first group, 21

individuals from San Francisco, were all caught and brought back to the mission, but in three other groups, 150 individuals from San Francisco and 41 from Santa Clara and then another 200 from San Francisco -- a full one-fourth of that mission's population -- left, never to be recaptured (Cook, 1976, p. 60).

The Indians who left both missions fled to the shores of the eastern side of San Francisco Bay where large numbers of unconverted Indians still resided. Recovering these runaways presented a certain amount of danger and difficulty, yet Father Danti of Mission San Francisco was determined to retrieve these members of his flock. Father Danti had been previously chastised for his overly-zealous discipline, tight rationing of food, and severe punishments. Possibly afraid of further criticism and interference from the Spanish authorities he sent 14 trusted neophytes to persuade these prodigals to return. However, these neophytes were attacked instead by both gentiles and escaped Christians who killed seven of the neophytes. When the news reached Governor Borica, he cautioned against further retaliation against East Bay Indians who continued to be troublesome, and instead admonished the Fathers for sending out such a party. In the presence of the missionaries and the commandante of the Presidio of San Francisco he assembled the neophytes and instructed them to not cross the bay after runaways, even if the Fathers demanded it (Engelhardt, 1912, p. 505).

Even with the explicit instructions given by Governor Borica, the Fathers ignored the warnings and sent out another group of mission Indians in June 1797 to bring back some neophytes who had fled to the eastern side of San Francisco Bay north of Mission San Jose. The leader of the expedition was Raimundo, a lower California Indian entrusted by the Fathers. He and 30 neophytes crossed the Bay on balsa rafts and discovered the deserters in three gentile rancherias. At first, it seemed, Raimundo convinced the deserters to come back, but then they changed

their mind (with the help of some other non-mission Indians who appeared at the scene) (Kenneally, 1912, p. 503). Raimundo returned unharmed, but the Fathers got in trouble from the presidio for the fiasco; the Fathers insisted that the expedition was Raimundo's idea.

This episode made the escaped Indians from the eastern shores more bold and they began threatening Mission San Jose. Because of these threats Governor Borica sent out Sergeant Amador and 20 soldiers to collect the fugitives, but to avoid bloodshed if possible. On July 15, 1797, the troops reached the rancheria of the deserters and found the Indians unrepentant, recalcitrant, and ready to defend themselves. The Indians had dug pits, forcing the Spaniards to dismount and fight on the ground. Two soldiers and seven natives were killed, many others fleeing the scene. But the Indians were sufficiently humbled, and Amador returned to San Jose with 83 Christians and nine gentiles including five who were implicated in the disastrous affair of 1795 and three who had attacked Raimundo. Of these, 79 returned to San Francisco where they were put to work at the Presidio.

In May 1800, Sergeant Amador again made a raid to recapture escaped runaways, this time from Mission Santa Clara. He captured not only the runaways, but also the local chief and other gentile captives and their weapons. In 1801 another expedition set out resulting in a fight in which five natives were killed. Emboldened (and ignoring previous mistakes) the Fathers of Santa Clara sent out 20 neophytes to bring in some fugitives, but the excursion was unsuccessful with one neophyte killed and the rest retreating rapidly without bringing back an escapee.

The events continued to escalate until 1805 with two major conflicts involving escaped neophytes at Missions San Jose and Santa Clara. First, in January, some neophytes who had left Mission San Jose to visit relatives a rancheria about five leagues away became ill. Father Tapes went to visit these neophytes with an escort

of two soldiers, the majordomo and some neophytes from the same rancherias. However, one of these same neophytes, instead of guiding the party to the correct rancheria led them astray to another rancheria where they were ambushed. The party retreated quickly, barely escaping with their lives. Shortly thereafter, Sergeant Luis Peralta set out with a company of 18 soldiers and 15 settlers from the pueblo of San Jose to punish the rancheria and capture the escaped neophytes. Upon arrival, they found the rancheria abandoned, but later came upon the Indians at another rancheria and a battle ensued. The soldiers killed 30 Indians, and 30 neophytes, mostly women, were captured and returned to the mission (Engelhardt, 1912, pp. 612-613)

Then in May, 1805, a neophyte at Mission Santa Clara from one of the Central Valley tribelets was caught on the roof of the Fathers' house as part of an apparent conspiracy whereby the mission buildings were to be burned and the Fathers killed. This neophyte, along with five other accomplices, was arrested, but the fear caused by such a conspiracy was so great that available troops from San Francisco and Monterey were sent to Mission Santa Clara to help the Fathers and assure them that the conspiracy would not grow. Later, the conspiracy and all the rumors associated with it were proven unfounded and came about because some discontented neophytes, fearing certain floggings and punishments, threatened the Fathers in order to frighten them (Bancroft, 1885, 2, p. 136).

The last mass exodus took place in 1819 when all able-bodied Indians left the mission going to the east and out toward the Central Valley, many of these people coming originally from this area and returning to their homeland. The beginnings of these mass escapes coincided with the recent arrival of East Bay, Central Valley and Sierra foothill Indians (Cook, 1976, p. 82).

All of the previous episodes of fugitivism and crime had perpetrated by those Indians who had been brought into the mission system as juveniles or adults. These individuals had memories of a previous, freer life. However, many of those who had been brought into the mission at birth knew no other life except the mission. These Indians, according to Dmitry Zavalashin, a Russian Officer, could be divided into two groups, those "dispirited by a rather inquisitorial political system of upbringing, proved to be obtuse, as if having been deprived of natural and even common sense" and the "brave and clever vaqueros devoted to the missionaries" (in Gibson, 1973, p. 383).

But even with these vaqueros loyalty was not constant. In 1812, the vaqueros on Mission Santa Cruz brutally murdered Father Quintana, whose murder was disguised by the Indians so that the perpetrators were not apprehended for many years. (Murders of the priests were not that uncommon. Previously, in 1801, priests at both Mission San Miguel and Mission San Antonio were poisoned.) The most famous Indian outlaws in the Bay area, Pomponio, Narciso, Estanislao, Ambrosio, and Yozcolo, were of this trusted group of Indians that had been raised in the missions, the latter two being alcaldes, elected leaders of the mission Indians. Pomponio was from Mission San Francisco, but his crimes of robbery and murder (of not only a soldier but also of fellow Indians) ranged from San Rafael to Santa Cruz. He conducted most of his raids on local ranchos from a hideout near present-day Skyline Boulevard. In 1824, after several years of notoriety, he was captured. An Indian woman whom he had abducted escaped and reported Pomponio's whereabouts to the authorities. He first eluded capture, but was captured later above San Rafael and taken to Monterey where he was tried and shot.

Dmitry Zavalashin wrote this account of Pomponio after his capture while Pomponio was held in San Francisco:

Once in the Presidio of San Francisco I...passed the prison where the Indian Pomponio, who had terrorized all California before our arrival, was then held under close guard in dreadful irons; he was one of those people who are called marauders (as the Spaniards call him) by the conquerors but who in the eyes of the conquered people or tribe are important as national heroes in the manner of Robin Hood and the like. This sympathy on the part of the population explained Pomponio's successes and the difficulty of catching him, since he had connections everywhere and obtained news and warnings from every quarter. (in Gibson, 1973, p. 376)

Zavalashin met with Pomponio during his imprisonment at the presidio.

Some time before, Zavalashin, along with a guide, had chanced upon Pomponio while traveling along the San Francisco Peninsula. Pomponio's reputation preceded him, and Zavalashin, at this later meeting, asked Pomponio why his life had been spared when so many other men had been murdered. Pomponio answered,

Because you alone have always been affectionate and kind to the poor Indian; why you are fairly well-known everywhere, including this mission and the rancherias. But in addition, we know that you came to take this land from the accursed Spaniards and to free the poor Indians! Then the Indians will be all right! (p. 377)

It seems that not only "marauders" like Pomponio heroes to their own people, but these people, in turn, pinned their hopes on the Russians, the enemies of the Spanish who were colonizing and laying claim to the land north of the San Francisco Bay. It would not be unreasonable to presume that the Indians, even with limited knowledge of the situation, might look upon these rivals for the land as possible liberators.

Across San Francisco Bay two other heroes emerged, Narciso and Estanislao. In 1827, Narciso, an alcalde from Mission San Jose, fled the mission with 400 followers and apparently attempted to attract followers from the other missions.

The following year, Estanislao, another alcalde from Mission San Jose, led a similar flight. Leaving the mission for a routine visit to his homeland on the Stanislaus River, where his group resided, he refused to return and sent back word to the Indians of the Mission that he was rising in revolt. He recruited Indians not

only from Mission San Jose, but also from Missions Santa Clara, San Juan Bautista and Santa Cruz. From his outpost in the San Joaquin Valley, he and his followers conducted raids of the ranchos and mission estates, usually taking large numbers of horses (Phillips, 1981, p. 28).

In November 1828, Father Duran of Mission San Jose asked Commandante Martinez, the commander of the Presidio of San Francisco, to assist in bringing back Estanislao and these neophytes. In order to get a quick and sure response from the Mexican civil and military authorities, who did not always cooperate with the religious authorities, Father Duran stated that the Indians were mocking the Mexican military by saying that the soldiers were lazy and incapable of using their firearms correctly. And, because of this lack of respect for the authority of the Mexican soldiers, more Indians were fleeing the mission (Neri, 1977, p. 413).

Martinez ordered Sergeant Antonio Soto to take 15 of his men, destroy Estanislao's stronghold, and bring back the fugitives. However, this excursion was doomed. The Indians, in order to defend themselves, had chosen a spot concealed by brambles and willow trees where they were able to ambush Soto and his men. Soto was killed, several of his soldiers wounded, and the soldiers retreated back to the mission with Estanislao and his band victorious. News of his victory spread to the surrounding rancherias and the Spaniards feared a general uprising (Winther, 1935, p. 22).

On May 29, 1829, a new expedition was formed by the commandante of the Monterey Presidio who sent Mariano Vallejo with 100 men to route Estanislao and his followers out of their stronghold. The Indians, armed with only bows and arrows, were no match for the army's muskets and cannon. Many Indians tried to flee but many more died or were captured. Estanislao fled the scene and took refuge with the same Father Duran of Mission San Jose whose flock he left the

previous year. Father Duran hid a penitent Estanislao, and later obtained a pardon for him.

A few years later, across the bay at Mission Santa Clara, Ambrosio, the chief of a rancheria near the Pueblo of San Jose, succeeded in persuading 40 Indians to attack Mission Santa Clara, but he was captured before his plan succeeded and Ambrosio was killed along with a few members of his band (Winther, 1935, p. 22).

Another neophyte at Mission Santa Clara from the Central Valley, Yozcolo, conducted many stock raids of the surrounding ranchos throughout the 1830s. For many years he eluded the Spanish authorities. Then, in 1839, after a raid on Rancho Encino Coposo (near Los Gatos) Yozcolo, along with about 100 of his followers, was captured after an all-day battle that included some fierce hand-to-hand combat. But, unlike Ambrosio, Yozcolo met a more ignoble end--he was killed by a soldier who cut off his head and displayed it when riding triumphantly back to Santa Clara (Levy, 1978, p. 106).

In the last decade of the missions' control, raids like Yozcolo's became more and more frequent. Both the Monterey Bay area and San Francisco Bay area missions experienced accelerating violence--several rancheros were killed in raids in the Monterey district, and the Indians attacked the grain storehouse at Santa Clara (Cook, 1976, p. 231). When the control of the Fathers was removed by secularization, widespread apostasy became the norm as the mission system rapidly fell apart.

CHAPTER 8

Secularization and the Final Demise

On August 9, 1834, the Mexican government issued the "Provisional Regulations for the Secularization of the Missions of Upper California." That month the governor began to convert 10 of the missions into parish centers for surrounding pueblos. The other 11 missions including Mission Santa Clara, would be secularized over the next three years. A law regarding secularization of the missions of California had been on the books since 1821, but it was not put into effect until 1834 because of a lack of the number of diocesan priests needed to replace the Franciscan Fathers. Under this secularization decree half of the mission lands were to be reserved for those Indians who wished to remain at the missions, the rest of the land was to be granted to private citizens by the Mexican government, mainly to the members of the military which up until then protected the missions.

Secularization brought with it a whole new set of problems concerning the Indians and these new parishes; the most pressing of these problems was that Christianity was no longer a sufficiently powerful force to hold the neophytes. As seen in the previous chapters, apostasy increased even as the Fathers attempted to exert more control over the neophytes through punishment and military interventions. With the removal of the mission administration came the removal of the protectors of Indian rights; so, while the Indians may have been given land at the time of the missions' breakup, not many were able to hold on to that land and make a living from that land without the Fathers' guidance and protection.

Those Indians who had either lost their land or had never received any found themselves at the mercy of the citizens of the Pueblo in whose social order the Indians occupied the lowest rung. Also, the presence of these idle and impoverished

Indians created social problems among the troops and settlers. Many of the Indians turned to gambling and prostitution, and those Indians who were employed by the settlers worked in conditions little better than slavery. The Indians were valued as an abundant, cheap labor supply, and the settlers were not above exploiting this labor supply, to the point where many of the missions' visitors criticized the Californians, calling them "lazy" and "indolent" (Mazour, 1940, pp. 323, 325). With the Mexican Californians as overlords and the Indians as their serfs, the rancho society was, essentially, a feudal society (Rawls, 1984, p. 20).

Those Indians who wished to remain at the mission after secularization were to be given mission land. The Fathers, however much they championed native rights, had mixed feelings over the apparent unilateral freedom given to the mission Indians. The standard position of the Fathers was that the Indians were the absolute owners of the soil and all the mission property, but they also believed the Indians to be child-like, requiring parental control, and the Fathers alone were qualified to exercise that control. This dichotomy, along with the greed of the secular authorities who paid only lip service to native rights, worked against whatever rights and freedom the Indians may have received in 1834.

Before 1834, missionization had taken its severe toll on the Indians' population. Of the 53,600 Indians baptized in California between 1769 and 1834, only 15,000 survived (Levy, 1978, p. 105). Of these, approximately 1,100 lived at Mission Santa Clara (the last Informee giving an accurate population count was the Informee of 1832, which listed 1,125 neophytes residing at the mission, down from 1,184 the previous year). Over the years the Fathers began to accept the fact that, perhaps, their presence, along with that of the other Europeans, may have been detrimental to the Indians. Faxton Dean Atherton, an American who visited both Missions Santa Clara and San Jose (and eventually settled in the area) noted in his

diary that the major effect of the missions on the Indian population seemed to be the introduction of new diseases. Because of this he believed that the Indians were "dying off like rotten sheep, literally, not figuratively." In a conversation with one of the Fathers about the Indians' demise Atherton concluded that even the Fathers accepted the Indians' decline and "that they must and will die off and disappear before the more morally educated white man" (Atherton in Rawls, 1984, p. 61).

As seen in the last chapter, though, apostasy also played a major role in the decline of the missions' population. With the breakup of the missions, the disease rate may have gone down because the neophytes were no longer required to live in the close unhealthy quarters by the mission; but the strong desire to flee turned into complete forfeiture of any ties with the mission for many neophytes. Ten years after the secularization order fewer than 400 Indians were tied to the former Mission of Santa Clara, and most of these were not working the mission lands as owners but as laborers for the Mexican settlers who took over the land.

Yet all was not so grim. In fact, Santa Clara and its inhabitants fared better than many of the other missions. If there was no pueblo successfully established at or near a former mission site, the mission church, now a parish church, slowly declined in attendance and fell into disuse and ruin. Santa Clara, though, had the double benefit of being beside a thriving pueblo, San Jose, and remaining under the fathers' control much longer than many other missions, with a smooth transition between the parish priests assigned there. Mission Santa Clara received its Decree of Secularization on December 27, 1836. However, Mission Santa Clara never changed to a diocesan parish. Father Rafael Moreno resided as the mission's priest from 1834 to 1839, and the mission remained in the hands of the Franciscans until 1851 when the Jesuits took over the mission church and its remaining buildings. When visiting Mission Santa Clara in May, 1836, Atherton noted:

This is one of the missions, the very few, that remain under the hands of the priests and.... I should say the administradors [sic] are the ruin of a mission, while under the hands of the priests, they flourish and increase not very fast it may be, but still are daily becoming better.... The houses of the Indians are generally in very good order and the men are all comfortably clothed in good blankets made in the Mission and the women and girls very prettily dressed in fancy calico gowns, and some one or two even sported muslim and silk dresses. (Atherton in Nunis, 1964, p. 8)

While Atherton may have been overly optimistic in assessing Mission Santa Clara's growth, Santa Clara did present a striking contrast to its neighbor to the north, San Francisco, where in the same year Atherton found this mission in a much sorrier state.

...arrived in sight of the wreck of the Mission of San Francisco, although it never could have been a Mission of any great note as the land around it is not capable of supporting a large population. Still it has been a small but well conducted mission until it was placed under the charge of an administrator, since which time it has been going to ruins and is now literally a wreck and not an Indian to be seen. (pp. 10-11)

Life at Santa Clara for those Indians who remained changed very little. They still worked at many of the former mission industries under the guidance of the priests, and were still "loaned out" to the ranchos for labor. Native dances still took place on occasion and the traditional games were played on days of leisure. But other activities entered their lives that were more related to the culture of their overlords, the Mexicans -- bear-baiting and bull-fighting. These sports were popular with both the Indians and the Mexicans, providing an activity where the participants were equals, not overlord and serf. Bear-baiting continued into the time of statehood and, while there were no human participants in the sport, the Indians familiar with the countryside procured many of the bears for this sport. While many of these forays to capture bears resulted in injury and/or death, one humorous story was recorded by William Dane Phelps, Master of the ship *Albert* which was visiting San Francisco in 1841.

The Majordomo of Santa Clara told us a little bear story which I thought worthy of being recorded at the Mission above mentioned. About a year

since some of the Indians belonging to the establishment caught a young bear in the woods and carried it home with them to their huts, when one of the women who had just lost her infant and wanting to draw her breasts, took the cub to her bosom, and after a while becoming attached to it, continued her care of [it] until it grew large and began to exhibit his bear-like propensities by hugging and biting his kind nurse, throwing her down tearing open her gown and making free with her breasts in spite of her struggles, and in short treating his foster-mother with so much ingratitude that the priests gave orders to shoot him. (Phelps, 1983, pp. 115-116)

Even though the Indians were given their freedom, citizenship, and land, "civilization" still came slowly to these people. As early as 1793, Father Serra, then president of the missions, promoted marriage between the Indians and the gente de razon as a way of integrating the Indian into white civilization. He even went as far as proposing a reward for those Spaniards who married Christianized Indians (McGarry, 1950, p. 338). The ability to assimilate the Indians in this manner may have been a promising idea, but in reality, at least at Santa Clara, it was rarely practiced.

Another method of assimilation was adoption of Indian children by Mexican citizens, although there was no records of any of these adoptions until 1840. These first adoptions (#10,000, #10,011, and #10,033) were girls ages 18, 12 and 6 whose gentile parents were dead. These girls were all Indians from the Central Valley, as were the other seven adoptees, five girls and two boys, all but one of whom were ages six or seven. While little information is given about the Indian parents of the six older children, the records indicate that the children were all given up for adoption willingly.

The allotment of land to the neophytes provided the best opportunity for the Indians to become "civilized" and integrated into Mexican society. Yet few Indians received land and even fewer were able to hold on to their parcels of land for any length of time. There was much corruption among the secular authorities who distributed the land. This alarmed Father Duran, president of the missions at the

time of secularization, who appealed to Governor Pico asking him to "provide registered agents of the government who were officially empowered to investigate the activities of renters and buyers of mission lands in order to deter any exploitation of the Indians" (Neri, 1977, p. 428). But any safeguards instituted only were as good as the Indians' desire to retain their land. When the missions were disbanded, the Indians' support system was also removed. Haphazard agrarians at best, the Indians' desire to continue this way of life that was alien to their culture was lessened when secularization dissolved the Fathers' control. Only three large allotments of land from Mission Santa Clara made it into Indian hands.

The first allotment, *Rancho La Purisima Concepcion*, was given to two Indians, Jose Gorgonio and Jose Ramon, on June 30, 1840. This rancho consisted of 4,400 acres and was situated on the border of present-day Los Altos and Palo Alto. However, these Indians only held on to their land for 10 years before selling it all to Dona Juana Briones de Miranda, whose home still stands on Old Adobe Road in Palo Alto.

The second allotment was given to another Indian, Ynigo, by Governor Micheltorena in 1844. According to the baptismal records, Ynigo came to the mission in 1789 (#1501), a youth of eight from Rancheria San Bernardino. Ynigo was granted 1695.9 acres in a grant named *Posolomi y Pozitas de las Animas*, "Little Well of Souls" (Arbuckle, 1968, p. 28).

Like Jose Gorgonio and Jose Ramon, Ynigo was unable to hold on to his land for any length of time. Surveys of land at that time were either inaccurate at best, non-existent at worst. Often the descriptions of property boundaries included streams, trees and hills -- if a stream changed course or a tree was cut down a boundary might be in dispute. Boundaries were measured by two men on horseback, each holding one end of a 50-yard "cordel" or rawhide rope. Each man

alternately stood still while his companion galloped past him at full speed to the end of the rope, then, the first rider galloped his turn while his companion waited (Stanger, 1946, p. 21) The reason for Ynigo's boundary dispute with Mariano Castro is unclear, but he did lose some land to this neighbor, a former Mexican military officer, in 1848. The following year he sold approximately half of the remaining land to a Scots immigrant, Robert Walkinshaw. A few years later the remainder of Ynigo's land came in dispute and went for review before the United States Land Commission of 1852 (land Case 410). Mr. Thomas Campbell claimed that he had purchased the land from M. M. Wambaugh who purchased the land in June, 1847. Even though many dispositions were made on Ynigo's behalf by local citizens, the land (800 acres) was divided between Ynigo and Campbell, with Walkinshaw retaining his 800 acres.

Ynigo died on March 2, 1864 at the reported age of 104 (Weker, 1980, p. 21). The remainder of his rancho was sold by his sons to Walkinshaw's descendants. This land changed many hands before Lockheed purchased the land in the 1940's. Parts of Moffett NAS and the Ames Research Center now sit on the land which was once cultivated with corn, beans and other vegetables by the last completely documented Santa Clara Ohlone.

Ynigo had a run-in with the one other Indian who had acquired land, Marcello. It seems that Ynigo stole Marcello's fourth wife, but Marcello, a large man standing 6'2" and weighing 250 lbs., marched to Ynigo's ranch with his club and retrieved his wife.

According to legend, Marcello was not an Ohlone, nor was he from the Central Valley or Sierras. He came to the mission in 1780 as a laborer and was, from all accounts, an Indian from the lower Colorado river Valley. (The presence of Indian laborers from the south was not unusual at the mission. In the Libro de

Casamiento -- the Marriage Book -- four marriages, #6, #7, #21, and #22, were between lower California Indians and Ohlone women.)

Marcello was the third Indian recipient of land, the *Rancho Ulistac* which bordered Ynigo's farm near present-day Alviso, a grant of one league and a half given to him by Governor Pico, but he eventually lost his land, claiming he was cheated out of it by a man named Hoope. Marcello lived a long life, by many accounts 100 years of age. He died at his one-time rancho under the care of its current owner, and was buried at the mission -- the last mission Indian (although not Ohlone) whose life was recorded in history.

As the other Indians, Ohlone, Yokut and Miwok, gradually left the mission, their lives became harder to record and they gradually slipped into oblivion. The last Informee, written in 1842, paints a bleak picture.

The 344 neophytes that exist these years, many are absent in their nearby ranches and garrisons, and others have fled and we don't know where. Those which are in the mission go with the bells to the church mornings and afternoons to Christian instruction of prayer, although not all attend because some are sick or busy.

It was just not the Indians who were ignoring the mission. The Informee continues:

In the town of San Jose of Guadalupe and the ranchos which belong to it, the census of this parish consists of 835 neighbors (486 men, 349 women) very few of them attend mass on holidays to fulfill their duty to hear mass.

After 50 years of Franciscan control, the mission rapidly declined when the Fathers' authority was removed. In 1846 Father Jose Maria del Suarez de Real, the last Franciscan in Northern California, was authorized by the Mexican government to sell any remaining Mission Santa Clara lands in order to pay debts and support himself. After doing this, Father Real was left with just the mission church and the two rooms immediately adjoining in which he resided. Many of the remaining

buildings were very dilapidated, but the few habitable ones were taken over by recent immigrants to the area.

California became part of the United States in 1849, and the Indians were guaranteed equal rights under the new law. Because the previous Mexican government recognized the Indians as citizens, the United States government, under treaty, was also so obligated (a right not given to the Indians of the other states until many years later). Yet the American citizens of the new state did not deem the Indians to be equal in all ways, in fact, one of the strongest arguments presented in the controversy of whether or not to allow slavery in the new state was that the Indian was seen as a barely-civilized source of cheap labor. Others expressed fears that fugitive slaves would escape to Indian settlements causing problems similar to those already surfacing in Florida.

An editorial in the *Alta Californian* on February 22, 1849, discussed the slavery question in light of the Indian population.

.... Whereas there are numerous bodies of Indians in California, many of whom at the missions or elsewhere, have become more or less acquainted with the customs of civilized life; and are willing for a moderate remuneration to perform as free labor, all the services that could be reasonably expected to result from other institutions, and the more these natives of the soil are employed in connection with the settled inhabitants, in the same proportion are the bounds of civilization enlarged, and one cause that prevents the extension of permanent settlements obviated; and Whereas the introduction of slavery would deprive the Indian inhabitants of the opportunities of civilization, and they retiring to the mountain fastnesses, and their numbers and stratagems increased by fugitive slaves, might be a source of continual annoyance to our frontier settlements.

Platitudes aside, few Indians remained in contact with the mission church. Most resided on the large ranchos with only minimal contact with the mission living in conditions little better than slavery.

These large ranchos, too, had their problems with the arrival of statehood. Many grantees did not have title papers recorded in the provincial archives, and some holdings were based on oral rather than written transfers (Lounsbury, 1974,

p. 206). While the Mexican government recognized many of these loosely held claims given under the Spanish law, many of these claims were reconfirmed under Mexican law. But when the claims, both those granted under Spanish law and Mexican law, came before the California Land Commission confusion reigned. When accurate surveys were attempted many old grants were found to interfere with one another while some included much greater quantities of land than had been applied for (p. 213). As a result of this confusion, the newly arrived settlers were able to take advantage of these unclear, incoherent titles and obtain land, where some grants were subject to retrocession or forfeiture by not holding clear title, or where obligations regarding title were not fulfilled under Anglo-Saxon law (Gates, 1958, p. 172).

For the Indians living on these lands, these changes meant a different taskmaster, more than a different government. Their status in society did not change, but through the confusion many more Indians chose to leave the lands which they labored and disappear into anonymity.

As stated previously, one decade after secularization there were fewer than 400 neophytes living in and around the former mission. This number seems so small when considering the numbers who came into the mission before secularization: 4,423 Ohlone baptized from the rancherias, 2,168 Indians baptized who came from the Central Valley and Sierra (including 120 who were listed under the Rancheria San Antonio) and the 1,250 infants, Ohlone, Miwok and Yokut, baptized under "Mission."

Out of this 1,250 baptisms listed as *Mission*, 805 were of Ohlone descent. Of these, five listed fathers from Baja California and Ohlone mothers. One baptism listed an Ohlone father and a mother from Mission Santa Cruz, and two baptisms listed Ohlone mothers and fathers from Mission San Jose. Another six listed

Ohlone fathers and mothers who were *Razon*, the name given by the Fathers to the Europeans and Americans, the "people of reason." (Those with Razon fathers and Indian mothers were listed as "Razon.") Also, beginning in 1816 the intermarriage of Ohlone with those Indians from the Central Valley shows up in the baptismal records. Between 1816 and 1836 there are 31 baptisms of children from these mixed marriages which are included in the Ohlone count. It was from this "Mission" group that, theoretically, the most faithful neophytes would come because they were the children of the faithful neophytes who lived at the mission (and some of them second generation faithful). The final figures, though, show that their faith lasted only as long as the Fathers maintained effective control.

After 1836 fewer Indians were brought in from the east, all but 11 of whom were not listed under rancheria of origin but by the all-encompassing term *Indigena*. Between 1837 and 1841, 131 infants were baptized and listed as "Mission," showing that some faithful neophytes from that core group were still at the mission, but at a greatly reduced rate. Only 24 of these were of Ohlone descent, one of whom had a mother from Mission San Jose, and 10 of whom had one parent as a Central Valley Indian. Two hundred ten more infants were baptized as *Indigena* beginning in 1842, but only 21 of these were of Ohlone descent, over half of whom (12) had a parent that was a Central Valley Indian. One hundred forty-eight other adults and older children were baptized as *Indigena* in the years after secularization -- a far cry from the time when more converts than that total came into the mission in one year.

Out of the 210 *Indigena* infants, only seven were born of gentile parents, the rest were born of neophyte parents, i.e., their parents had been baptized just before the infant's birth or were long-term converts. Fifty-one children were born of parents who came to Mission Santa Clara from other missions. While the majority of these parents came from missions close to Santa Clara, some neophytes came as

far away as San Diego. The breakdown of these baptisms is as follows (listing the missions from south to north):

San Diego - one

San Juan Capistrano - one

San Gabriel - two

San Fernando - two (siblings)

San Buenaventura - two

Santa Barbara - one

San Antonio - seven (with two sets of two siblings)

La Soledad - one

San Juan Bautista - nine (one set of twins)

Santa Cruz - one

San Jose - seventeen (one set of two siblings and one set of three siblings)

San Francisco - four

Six of these parents (including the mother of the two siblings from San Luis Rey) were single women; the fathers were listed on the baptismal record as "unknown." These were not the only illegitimate births listed after secularization; there were 11 other illegitimate births among the mission population.

The statistics on illegitimate births for the "people of reason" is much grimmer, perhaps giving some legitimacy to the Fathers' fear of the Pueblo's immoral influence on the Indians. Between 1776 and 1836 there were 989 baptisms of "Razon" yet 32 of these births listed the father as "unknown" and two of these births, #8485 and #8726, were abandoned children with both parents listed as unknown. Three of the women who produced children out of wedlock were widows -- and their children were not by their deceased husband. This gives rise to the speculation that while remarriages among widows and widowers were frequent

among the Indians (at the Fathers' encouragement) in order to take care of the needs of the neophyte population, the same encouragement and support may not have been in the Pueblo community over which the Fathers had less control. Thus, many of the women may have had to exchange "favors" for basic necessities because no other system was provided for their needs. In one instance one woman, Maria Francisca Linares, had one illegitimate birth but the following year proceeded to get married and have more children. Perhaps her then unknown lover became her husband? Many of these women were, undoubtedly, prostitutes, this belief substantiated by the many repeated illegitimate births: Josefa Garcia - three children, Maria Petra Basques - four children (one set of twins) and Ysidro Galindo, two children.

The proportion of illegitimate births to legitimate births among the Razon also increased after secularization. Between 1837 and 1849 there were 723 razon baptisms and 55 of these were illegitimate births. And like before, many of the same women continued to have illegitimate children. But, unlike the previous years, unmarried couples were producing children. The father is now listed in the baptismal records, but these children are recorded as illegitimate. In these two births the couples were residing at one of the outlying ranchos. Perhaps what little moral influence the church exerted was weakest in the outlying areas. Also, there was one abandoned baby baptized during that time frame.

The Indians, however lax their morals may have become during these years of transition, never abandoned a child. This may have been due to a cultural prohibition or because of mores instilled by the Fathers. Whatever the case, there were neither abandoned Indian children nor were there any children born from couples living without the benefits of marriage. Widows and widowers remarried

with frequency, and, with a few exceptions, the Fathers' influence seemed to have lasted through the first major transitional time of secularization.

The next major transition in the lives of the Indians and the other Californians was the achievement of statehood in 1849. This was unsettling more for the landowners than for the Indians who worked the land. Except for the aforementioned Indians who managed to hold onto land grants, the neophyte population continued to decrease and disappear into oblivion. In 1851 Jesuit priests took over the old mission church and its few remaining buildings. Santa Clara did not suffer the fate of many of the missions which had difficulty during the transition from missions into parish churches, many of those becoming abandoned. The fairly smooth transition from Franciscan priest to Jesuit priest gave some continuity not only to the Indians' lives but to the records that document these lives. Unfortunately, due to a cruel twist of fate, these mission records end in 1861. In a certain note of irony, in 1906 a priest from the archdiocese of San Francisco borrowed the records dating from 1862. While these records were in his possession, San Francisco experienced the Great Quake, and the records perished in the subsequent fire.

Even so, it is possible to trace the continued decline of the native population with the records remaining from the years 1851 to 1861. Under the Jesuits, the church flourished for the Californians of Mexican and Spanish descent and for the more recent Anglo-Americans who were moving into the area. During these years the priests baptized 532 Razon. Some of the same patterns from before statehood remained. There was one abandoned razon child and seven women had children for whom there was no recorded father. There was an increase, however, in the number of couples having children out of wedlock, 16.

This increase in unmarried couples was reflected also in the Indian population. Six children out of the 75 Indian baptisms during those same years had

parents who were not married. While it is easy to blame lessening controls and relaxing morals for this increase in both populations, another explanation may be the wide distribution of the population. No longer was the population centered in the pueblo, mission and nearby ranchos. Ranchos had sprung up along the San Francisco Peninsula and down below Gilroy. This was a large territory for priests to cover, and, shown in the baptismal record, many children were not baptized for many months after their birth. It would follow that people would live together before a marriage could be performed by a priest who made it to the rancho only infrequently.

Another disturbing trend, though, shows up in these last Indian baptisms. In 1852 two children, one three and one four, were abandoned and taken in by rancho families. Two more infants, one in 1855 and one in 1856 were also abandoned and taken in by rancho families. This previously unseen pattern may coincide with the rapidly declining Indian population and, thus, the breakdown of whatever structure there may have remained in Indian society. The continuing decline of baptisms among the Indians in the last decade reflects this also. In 1850 there were 16 baptisms, 1851 - six, 1852 - 11, 1853 - 12, 1854 - six, 1855 - eight. But in 1856 there were only two baptisms -- the abandoned infant and the child of an unmarried mother and unknown father. Then in 1857 there were six baptisms, 1858 - three, 1859 - four, and none in 1860. The final year, 1861, there was only one baptism, an infant son of two neophytes Guadalupe Habher and Maria Ruiz. The last recorded Ohlone baptism, however, took place much sooner. In 1849 the Father baptized Camilo #10,923. His parents were themselves Ohlone who had been brought to the mission as infants (Juan Santos and Elena) and he had two older siblings already baptized. No other baptisms can be traced back to the Ohlone after 1849. If there

were any other Ohlone born after that date, their names were never entered into the mission records.

If the records had continued there would be no reason to believe that there would be any increase in Indian baptisms. There are no more records of any Indian baptisms at Mission Santa Clara. The Ohlone Indians of Mission Santa Clara disappeared from history by disease, death, or their own design. Ohlone from other missions have come forward to claim their heritage, but the Indians of Mission Santa Clara are relegated to little more than a footnote in the history of California, obliteration of a people in the name of "civilization."

EPILOGUE

At the beginning of this thesis certain questions were posed: How did the presence of Europeans, and most notably, the mission Fathers, change the lifestyle and culture of the Indians? Did these Indians come willingly into the missions, or were they coerced? And, once in, did the Indians stay willingly? What happened to the mission Indian population once the missions were broken up? And, ultimately, what happened to the Ohlone?

As seen in this thesis, the Fathers attempted to change the Indians' lifestyle, and these attempts were met with resistance. The Fathers had to use coercion (in the form of holding the women and children hostage) to obtain many of their adult converts. Because of this, the Indians may have stayed at the mission and become converted, but their hearts were never far away from their native homelands or lifestyle. Those who could leave the mission, did leave at every opportunity, as shown by the increasing rate of apostasy that grew even as the mission population continued to shrink. With secularization, the Fathers' control over the Indian population was removed, and the number of willing converts greatly decreased; within two decades of secularization, all records of the Ohlone ceased.

If there were any people left of Ohlone descent, they had disappeared, blending into the local population. No longer were there Ohlone who practiced their native lifestyle -- they were ranch hands on the local ranches or workers in the town of San Jose. Infrequently, an "Indian" would be mentioned in the local press when he/she committed a crime, but they would remain nameless, no identity would be given for them. The Ohlone of Santa Clara, along with much of the Indian population of California, became non-entities. They would become a hidden minority, living without a voice and without a history. Up and down the California coast, the missions fell into ruin; their native inhabitants fell into ignominy. It hasn't

been until the past few decades that an interest has arisen about these native inhabitants of California. This thesis attempted to tell the story of just one group of Indians at one particular mission. Hopefully, in future years, the histories of other Indians brought into the mission system may be told so that this chapter in California history will be completely told. Then no longer will the Indians of California be a silent minority; their proud heritage will become a part of California's past along with the lore from the Spanish ranchos, the tales from the Gold Rush, and the stories of California's rise to prominence in agriculture, aerospace, and the high-technology industries.

REFERENCES

- Arbuckle, C. (1968). *Santa Clara Ranchos*. Berkeley: Harlan Young Press.
- Bancroft, H. H. (1885). *History of California* (Volumes 1-3). San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Company.
- Beggs, B. (1963). The diary of Rafael Gomez; Monterey in 1836. *Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly*, 45(3), 265-269.
- Beeler, M. S. (1972). An extension of San Francisco Bay Costanoan *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 38(1), 49-54.
- Bocek, B. R. (1984). Ethnobotany of Costanoan Indians, California, based on collections by John. P. Harrington, *Economic Botany*, 38, 240-255.
- Bolton, H.E. (1926). *Historic Memoirs of New California*, (Volumes 1-4). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bolton, H.E. (1930). *Anza's California Expeditions*, (Volumes 1-3). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bowman, J. N. (1958). The resident neophytes of the California missions, 1769-1834. *The Historical Society of Southern California*, 40(2) 138-148.
- Brown, A. K. (1966). *Sawpits in the Spanish Redwoods, 1787-1849*. San Mateo: San Mateo County Historical Association.
- Brown, A. K. (1973). San Francisco Bay Costanoan. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 39(3), 184-189.
- Brown, A. K. (1974). Indians of San Mateo County. *La Peninsula, The Journal of the San Mateo County Historical Association*, 8(4).
- Calhoun, M. (1973). *Early Days of the Livermore-Amador Valley*. Hayward: Alameda County School Department.
- Carter, C. F. (1929). Duhaut-Cilly's account of California in the years 1827-1828. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 8(2), 131-152.
- Chapman, C. A. (1959). Early days at Mission Santa Clara -- Recollections of Nasario Galindo. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 38(2), 101-111.
- Cook, S. F. (1971). Aboriginal population of upper California. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 660-72. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cook, S. F. (1971). Antiquity of San Francisco Bay shellmounds. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 144-157. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Cook, S. F. (1976). *The Conflict between the California Indian and White Civilization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cook S. F. (1976). *The Population of the California Indians, 1769-1970*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cooper, B. B. (Ed.) (1983). *The Journal and Observations of William Dane Phelps*. Glendale: The Arthur H. Clark Company.
- Cresap, B. (1952). Early California as described by Edward C. Ord. *Pacific Historical Review*, 31(4), 329-340.
- Dana, R. H., Jr., (1946). *Two Years before the Mast*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Davis, J. T. (1963). Exchange among the Indians of California. In R. F. Heizer (Ed.). *Aboriginal Culture -- Three Studies in Culture History* (pp. 1-80). Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility.
- District Courts of the United States (1859). *Claims for Mission Lands -- Brief for the United States*. San Francisco.
- Dixon, R. B. and Kroeber, A. L. (1971). Linguistic families of California. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 105-111. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Editorial, *The Alta Californian*, Thursday, February 22, 1849.
- Ellison, W. H. (1949). *The Indians of the Southwest; a Century of Development under the United States*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Engelhardt, Z. (1913). *The Missions and Missionaries of California* (Volumes 1-3). San Francisco: James H. Barry Company.
- Engelhardt, Z. (1942). *San Francisco or Mission Dolores*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press.
- Engelhardt, Z. (1972). *Mission San Carlos Borromeo, the Father of the Missions*. Ramona: Ballena Press.
- Fages, P. (1937). *A Historical, Political and Natural Description of California*. (H. B. Priestley, trans.) Berkeley: University of California Press (original work written in 1775).
- Galbraith, E. C. (1924). Malaspina's voyage around the world. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 3(3), 215-237.
- Galvan, P. M. (1968). The Ohlone Story. *Indian Historian*, 1(2), 9-13.
- Garner, V. H. (1976). The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the California Indians. *The Indian Historian*, 9(1), 10-1.

- Gates, P. W. (1958). Adjudication of Spanish and Mexican Land Claims in California. *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 3.
- Geiger, M. (Ed.) (1950). Reply of Mission San Carlos Borromeo to the questionnaire of the Spanish government in 1812 concerning the native cultures of the California mission Indians. *The Americas, a Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, 6(4), 467-468.
- Gibson, J. R. (1972). California in 1824 by Dmitry Zavalishin. *Southern California Quarterly*, 55(4), 369-412.
- Gilmore, R. and Gilmore, G. (1966). *Readings in California History*. New York: Thomas J. Crowell Company.
- Goldschmidt, W. R. (1948). Social organization in native California and the origin of clans. *American Anthropologist*, 50, 44-456.
- Gudde, E. G. (1967). *California Place Names*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Guest, F. (1962). The establishment of Villa de Branciforte. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 41(1), 29-50.
- Halley, W. (1876). *The Centennial Yearbook of Alameda County, California*. Oakland: Author.
- Heizer, R. F. (1966). *Languages, Territories and Names of California Indian Tribes*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heizer, R. F. (1972). *The Eighteen Unratified Treaties of 1851-1852 between the California Indians and the United States Government*. United States Government Archaeological Research Facility.
- Heizer, R. F. (Ed.) (1973). Federal concern about condition of California Indians, 1853 to 1913: Eight Documents. *Balena Press Publications in Archaeology, Ethnology and History*, 13.
- Heizer, R. F. (1974). *The Costanoan Indians*. Local History Studies Volume 18. Cupertino: De Anza College California History Center.
- Heizer, R. F. (1974). *The Destruction of the California Indians*. Santa Barbara: Peregrine Smith, Inc.
- Heizer, R. F. and Almquist, A. F. (1971). *The Other Californians: Prejudice and Discrimination Under Spain, Mexico, and the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heizer, R. F. and Traganza, A. E. (1971). Mines and quarries of the Indians of California. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 346-359. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Hervas, J. (1950). Fray Junipero and Spain. *The Americas - a Quarterly Review of Interamerican Cultural History*, 7(3), 265-277.
- History of Washington Township*. (1904). Alameda County: the Women's Club of Washington Township.
- Historical Atlas of Alameda County, California (1878)*. Oakland: Thompson and West.
- Hutchinson, C. A. (1965). The Mexican government and the mission Indians of upper California, 1821-1835. *The Americas, a Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, 21(4), 335-362.
- Informeers, 1778-1842*. Unpublished manuscripts. University of Santa Clara Archives.
- Jackson, H. H. (1927). *Glimpses of California and the Missions*. Boston: Little Brown and Company.
- James, G. W. (1913). *The Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junipero Serra*. Pasadena: Author.
- Jones, S. J. (1971). Some regional aspects of native California. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 84-96. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kelsey, C. E. (1971). Census of non-reservation California Indians 1905-1906. *University of California Archaeological Facility Contributions*, 10.
- Kenneally, F. (Ed.) (1965). *Writings of Fermin Francisco de Lausen*, Volumes 1 and 2, Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History.
- King, C. (1978). Historic Indian settlements in the vicinity of the Holiday Inn site. In J. C. Winter (Ed.). *Archaeological Investigations at CA-SCC-128; The Holiday Inn Site*. Unpublished manuscript, San Jose State University Department of Anthropology.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1904). The languages of the coast of California south of San Francisco. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and ethnology*, 2(2).
- Kroeber, A. L. (1904). Types of Indian culture in California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, 2(3).
- Kroeber, A. L. (1908). A mission record of the California Indians. *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology*, 8(1).
- Kroeber, A. L. (1910). The Chumash and Costanoan languages. *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology*, 9(2).
- Kroeber, A. L. (1953). *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Berkeley: California Book Company, Ltd.

- Kroeber, A. L. (1963). The nature of land-holding groups in aboriginal California. In R. F. Heizer (Ed.). *Aboriginal California -- Three Studies in Culture History* (pp. 81-120). Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1971). Elements of culture in native California. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 3-65. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1971). The tribe in California. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 367-374. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1971). Principal local types of the Kuksu cult. In R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 485-495. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1974). Basic report on California Indian landholdings. In *California Indians*, Volume 4 (pp. -68). New York: Garland Series on American Indian Ethnohistory.
- Kroeber, A. L. and Heizer, R. F. (1970). Continuity of Indian population in California from 1770/1845 to 1955. *University of California Archaeological Facility Contributions*, 9.
- Levy, R. (1978). Costanoan. *Handbook of North American Indians* (Volume 8, California, Chapter 45). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Libro de Bautismos*. (1777-1874). Unpublished manuscript. University of Santa Clara Archives.
- Libro de Casamientos*. (1777-1874). Unpublished manuscript. University of Santa Clara Archives.
- Loud, L. L. The stege mounds at Richmond, California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, 17(6), 355-372.
- Lounsbury, R. G. (1974). Mexican land claims in California. In *California Indians*, Volume 4 (pp. 201-297). New York: Garland Series on American Indian Ethnology.
- Lurie, N. O. (1957). The Indian Claims and Commission Act. *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, 3(11), 56-70.
- Lyman, C. S. (1925). *Around the Horn to the Sandwich Islands and California, 1845-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mahr, A. C. (1932). The Visit of the *Rurik* to San Francisco in 1816. *University Series in History, Economics, and Political Science*, 12(2). Stanford University Press.
- Margolin, M. (1978). *The Ohlone Way - Indian Life in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.

- Mazour, A. G. (1940). Memoirs of California by K. T. Khlebnikov. *Pacific Historical Review*, 9(3), 307-336.
- McCarthy, F. F. (1958). *The History of Mission San Jose, California 1797-1835*. Fresno: Academy Library Guild.
- McGarry, D. D. (1950). Educational methods of the Franciscans in Spanish California. *The Americas, a Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, 6(3), 335-358.
- Merriam, C. H. (1968). Reports of the University of California Archaeological Survey No. 74, Village names in twelve California mission records. *University of California Archaeological Research Facility*.
- Merriam, C. H. (1962). *Studies of California Indians*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Milliken, R. T. (1983). *A Spatial Organization of Human Population on Central California's San Francisco Peninsula at the Spanish Arrival*. Unpublished master's thesis, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California.
- Nelson, R. C. (1971). San Francisco Bay settlements in R. F. Heizer and M. A. Whipple (Eds.). *The California Indians; a Source Book*, pp. 144-157. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Neri, M. C. (1973). Narcisco Duran and the secularization of the California missions. *The Americas, a Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, 33(3), 411.
- Nunis, D. B., Jr. (1964). *The California Dairy of Faxon Dean Atherton, 1836-1839*. San Francisco: California Historical Society,
- Phillips, G. H. (1981). *The Enduring Struggle -- Indians in California History*. San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publishing Company.
- Powers, S. (1976). *Tribes of California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rawls, J. J. (1984). *Indians of California, the Changing Image*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Robinson, A. (1970). *Life in California*. Santa Barbara: Peregrine Publishers.
- Robinson, W. W. (1948). *Land in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Servin, M. P. (1965). The secularization of the California missions: a reappraisal. *Southern California Quarterly*, 47(2), 133-149.
- Spearman, A. D. (1963). *The Five Franciscan Churches of Mission Santa Clara*. Palo Alto: The National Press.

- Stanger, F. M. (1963). *South from San Francisco: San Mateo County, California; It's History and Heritage*. San Mateo: San Mateo County Historical Association.
- Stanger, F. M. and Brown, A. K. (1969). Who discovered the Golden Gate? The explorer's own accounts. *La Peninsula, the Journal of the San Mateo County Historical Association*.
- Stodder, L. (1986). Mechanisms and trends in the decline of the Costanoan Indian population of central California. *Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory*, 10.
- Suggs, R. C. (1965). *The Archaeology of San Francisco*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- U. S. Congress House of Representatives (1937). *California Indians Jurisdictional Act. Hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs*. 75th Congress, 1st Session.
- United States Land Commission, Index to Land Grants (1852). *United States General Land Office, Posolomi 125, Land Casse 410*. Manuscript at the Bancroft Library, Berkeley.
- Vancouver, G. (1935). San Francisco in 1792 - Yerba Buena Cove, the Mission, and the Presidio of San Francisco as described by Captain George Vancouver, the first Englishman to enter the bay of San Francisco which he did Wednesday, November 14, 1792. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 14(2), 111-120.
- Van Coerner, T. (1933). *The Story of Mission Santa Cruz*. San Francisco: Paul Edder and Company.
- Wagner, H. R. (1936). A visit to Monterey in 1786 and a description of the Indians of California, by Jean Francois Galaup de la Perouse. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 15(3), 216-223.
- Webb, E. (1944). Pigments used by the mission Indians of California. *The Americas, a Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, 2(2), 137-150.
- Webb, E. (1952). *Indian Life at the Old Mission*. Los Angeles: Warren F. Lewis.
- Weber, F. J. (1968). The California missions and their visitors. *The Americas, a Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, 24(4), 319-336.
- Weber, F. J. (Ed.) (1980). *The Laurelwood Mission; a documentary history of Santa Clara de Asis*. Hong Kong: Libra Press.
- Wildeson, L. E. (1969). Ohlone Indian pre-history. *Indian Historian*, 2(1), 25-28.
- Winter, O. O. (1935). The story of San Jose, 1779-1869. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 14(1), 3-24.