

Appendix A.

J. P. Harrington Chochenyo Interview

Excerpts with Commentary

(By Randall Milliken)

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

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

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

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

Names Applied to People from Various Areas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Language and People of the East Bay

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

Lisjanis, ch. *tribu*. They said that S. José was an early mission. They called the Inds. here sometimes *los viejos cristianos* (Harrington 1921-29:62).

lisjanes were the San José – this name covered up as far as S. Lorenzo Angela thinks. Sing[ular]. Lisjan. *Yo soy lisján*. The Doloreños were not lisjanes, nor were the Clareños (Harrington 1921-29:95 [supplemental box 22]).

hásan, *mujer en la lengua de Lecianos*. Inf.s mother said that the Lecianos called women hásan (Harrington 1921-29:457).

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

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

Call the local Inds. (of S. Lorenzo) *los Nepes*. So called because they use *nép’e*, *este* = the Acuenas (Harrington 1921-29:184).

Népe, *este*. *nepe is no word in Choch. (Harrington 1921-29:293).

The Nepes say *kamnknish*, *Hombre*, instead of *tráesh*, *man*

Jose thinks miw is a helawali word. Angela that it was an Akwena word (Harrington 1921-29:301).

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

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

The Inds. & Span. Col.s used to speak of the Indians in fun as *los acuénas*. Borrowed from the Ind. ‘akwéna no hay, probably.

Inf. does not know origin of the *tribu*, but point out the resemblance.

José & inf. both heard the Inds. spoken of as *los acuénas*. Sing. Acuena José kept using the term in fun all the afternoon (Harrington 1921-29:358).

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

Ménem hishmetr múwékma, *tu eres buena gente* (Harrington 1921-29:247).

holshe wáka muwékma, *bonito es esa gente* (Harrington 1921-29:297).

‘rí’te muwékma jakájin, *hay mucha genta enfermos* (Harrington 1921-29:362).

San Francisco Peninsula People and Language

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

The Inds. of *Yerba Buena* said (the Doloreños): *pétlei* = *sientate*, but here at S. Jose the same word = *acuestate*! Once S. Jose Ind. entered and stood & that they would say *tshaurai* but they said *petlei*. And they had just put a big *sandia* there to eat. Why do they tell me to lie down? (Harrington 1921-29:30).

Francisco Solis was Doloreño, Angela volunteers!!! He once came here to *pasearse aque en un baile que hicieron aqui*. Angela met him here, but José did not. He came here from Mission Dolores, where he lived. He was not yet old, still well preserved, a widower & had 2 daughters who may be still living in S.F. Inf. heard he died, supposes he died at S.F. (Harrington 1921-29:95 [supplemental box 22]).

Uncle was good *fustero*. Went to live at San Mateo. Had plenty of money when he left. ... Uncle married a Span. Cal. Woman here & sold ranch and gave ½ money to *suegro* & ½ to *suegra* who were still living. He did not have hair white when he left here. Inf. once saw him dance once here at rancho of the Moragas ... He wore the red headdress, & all. Venima was uncle’s younger brother [sic]– she was married to a Russian man. Inf. once heard her father & others talking and joking in Russian. (Harrington 1921-29:23-24).

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

The S.F. voc.

trátresh himhen, un hombre or

Some said *himen* & other *himhen* –

Siempre le suben la palabra un poquito

hímen traesh, un hombre.

‘áitakishmak, 2 or more women

shiníshmin, muchachos Pl only

Never say ‘shiníshmak – no such word. Carefully obtained

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

Some of the material points to contrasts between the San Francisco and East Bay dialects:

Todo lo que hablan in Dol. has

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

nunca falta el ‘átre. Dol. ‘átré,

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

Nicht wahr).

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

= Choch. Júwa tem ki.

Choch. Júwatem jisha nómo,

no bailes aquí = Dol. ‘átretam jisha!

(Harrington 1921-29:198)

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

José heard Pedro Alcantara mentioned much as at S. Clara

when there were lots of people still at S. Clara

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

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

(Harrington 1921-29:211).

Tells story of going to S. Francisco (?) to baptize child. Bought watermelon for \$1.50.

Inf. was sick here for 2 weeks thereafter (Harrington 1921-29:238).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

People and Languages at Missions South of Mission San Jose

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

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

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

The Chocheños called the Juaneños 'uhráimas (Harrington 1921-29:57).

Inf.s padrasto went to S. Juan when *muchacho* & brot many Juaneño, Antoniano & other songs. He was good *cantor* & *bailador* (Harrington 1921-29:277)

San Juan Song (p. 452)

Were Juaneños married here, _ixed their songs (Harrington 1921-29:455).

[San Juan songs] (Harrington 1921-29:467-478).

All the Juaneño words sound as if they are *medio enojados*. Santiago Piña was inf.s *padrasto*. Was an Ind. who knew Juaneño songs. He was brot up by Piña family. Could read & pray. He died at Kaufman ranch ½ mile Nilesward of where inf. lives here (Harrington 1921-29:479).

Other People and Languages (Not Exhaustive)

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

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

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

Olhones = wolwolum evidently they were of the sierra Mount Diablo ward.

Nesc. Polya. Inf. says that the tribes along the coast all had names

(Harrington 1921-29:181).

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

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

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

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

Appendix B.

San Francisco Peninsula Local Tribes

(By Randall Milliken)

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

Peninsula Groups along San Francisco Bay

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

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

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

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

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

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

Peninsula Groups along the Coast

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

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

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

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

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

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

Groups of the Mission Dolores-Mission Santa Clara Overlap Region

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

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

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

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

Appendix C.

The Unique Social Formation of the Mission System

(By Laurence H. Shoup)

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

Colonial Strategy for Territorial Control

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Life and Death at the Missions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mission Social Formation: A Special Form of Peonage

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix D.

Race, Class, and Violence in the Early American Period

(By Laurence H. Shoup)

In the late 1840s, the ex-Mission Indians of west-central California were beginning to rebound from the demographic disaster caused by the disease-ridden mission system. Although they occupied a low rung in the Rancho Period caste system (tribal Indians were seen as a still lower class or caste), their recognized skills made them an integral part of rancho society. Little changed in the first two years of United States occupation, 1846-1847. But news of the gold discovery of early 1848 led to the world-wide migration to California in 1849-1850. By 1850 California's population was well over 100,000. By 1852 it was over 200,000. California became a state in 1850, part of a United States that was arguing about the future of slavery, but which had no doubts about the manifest destiny of white America.

The early American period was certainly the most difficult period for tribal Indians of northern and eastern California. And it may also have been the most difficult time for the family groups of the mission areas as well. This appendix augments and amplifies Chapter 9's analysis of the attitudes and behaviors of the new American rulers that pushed California Indians to the margins of society after 1847. (Citations to tables, figures, and references in this appendix refer to materials within the main report.)

Race and Racialization

The newly arrived and dominant Anglo-Americans brought with them assumptions of white male superiority, with reciprocal racist conceptions toward people of color generally and Indian people specifically. America in the 19th century had a white supremacist class system, a sociopolitical construction based on racial as well as economic hierarchies. Those defined as European-Americans ("whites") served as the elite or ruling class over all other people. Whereas whites were dominant, people of color were "racialized," seen as inferior, and denigrated, excluded, and exploited. They were outside the community and deprived of full social, economic and political rights. Those who were racialized, including American Indians, Asians, and Africans, had a different skin tone and culture than whites. Furthermore, the whites were, in general, socialized to feel and act superior, to control and even to terrorize non-white individuals and groups. One result was the rapid development after 1848 of a kind of double race/class structure in California (see Almaguer 1994, Heizer and Almquist 1971, Martinot 2003).

First, all whites were ranked above all people of color. Secondly, this double race/class structure also ranked people of color, with Indians at the bottom. Indians were, therefore, immediately categorized as inferiors outside of the new community the whites were creating. This ranking allowed any white to have control over and act with impunity toward any indigenous or other person of color. This created and reinforced an inner social cohesion and consensus in white society and opened the door to uncontrolled violence against any person of color (see Martinot 2003). Violence in effect became law and the racialized victims had no recourse since they were excluded both from the white community and full social, political and economic rights. Since whites were dominant, property, civil rights, security of the person, the right to have a family, and to have education and health care could be denied at the will of any white person with only one exception. This exception was if another powerful white person stood as a protector.

This new, highly racialized social structure of 1850s California can be contrasted with the earlier Mexican/Californio society. Indians in the 1840s, although they were peons and treated as inferiors and subordinates, were also accepted as a part of the community. They were members of the Catholic Church and were in relationships of reciprocity with those who ruled. The dominant socio-economic system of the 1840s Rancho Era can be called a “padrone” system, characterized by reciprocal obligations and relationships between padrone and peon within a very unequal but unitary community. In exchange for the peon’s labor, the padrone made sure each peon and his family had the minimum essentials of life. In the Mexican California of the 1830s and 1840s, color and genetic background played a subtle role, but all members of the community recognized mutual dependence within a single class structure. Race was not the central factor in people’s very survival that it was soon to become.

New Class System under the United States

At the same time that the new system of racialization was being imposed, a new economic system was also being established, along with a closely related class system. This economic and class system stressed accumulation of capital and other property as the supreme goal of life. The purpose of institutional racism was to internally solidify white society by giving some preferential treatment to even the poorest of whites, as well as to foster rapid capital accumulation at the expense of everyone else, especially people of color. In contrast, many cultures, including Native American and early Christian, led lives in which sufficiency in material goods—both shared and communal—was the norm. This was, to an extent, reflected in the California mission and later rancho society, where generosity toward strangers and leisure time activities like religious holidays and fiestas were an integral part of a shared locally centered life.

The new class system entered California with the Gold Rush. The dynamic, ever-expanding system called capitalism commodified everything in order to increase capital. The padrone system was overturned in favor of the cold consideration of profit and loss. Human relationships became largely an aspect of the market. The type of person who was born into or rose to the top of such a society had a certain mentality, one which by necessity turns away from human and ecological needs and focuses on the requirements of capital accumulation. The system imposed powerful norms of conduct upon the rich and those desiring to be rich, creating a moral universe within which behavior was shaped and given structure. The conduct of the “capitalists,” those who succeeded in the capitalist marketplace of the time was characterized by a ruthless willingness to reduce people to the profitable and unprofitable and jettison the latter. As one chronicler of 1850s San Francisco put it:

[San Francisco] ... is a place for work—real, useful, hard work... If lazy, or incapable of such work, the sooner the useless thing takes his departure, the better for himself and the place (Soule et al. 1855:423).

Those who got rich in California gradually coalesced into a class, a group of people with common relationships to each other and property. They also commonly perceived those outside their class as inferiors with fewer or, in the case of people of color, virtually no rights. Characteristic of the rising capitalist class of California was William Howard, who displaced San Mateo County Indians from lands that he claimed (see Chapter 9). Howard and many other white Californians used the ownership of property as a means of domination over other people, including Indians, disempowering and often destroying them. White supremacy and property shared a common conceptual framework—the right to exclude. Capitalist-based ownership of property allows the owner to exclude others from using it, and to employ the courts, police and military to enforce ownership rights, using violence if necessary.

Racialization and white supremacy also helped the rich neutralize the ongoing class conflict between landed and landless whites, since the confiscated lands of Indian peoples could be distributed to landless whites based on white skin privilege. This promoted a kind of class leveling and solidarity within white society at the expense of indigenous peoples. Racialization was thus fundamental to the organization of class in California and throughout the United States (see Martinot 2003).

Genocide and Enslavement

The specifics of the racialization system in California varied depending upon the marginalized group and its relationships with the powerful. The Chinese in California at this time were able to find work because they served as an efficient and inexpensive labor force for powerful combines like the Central Pacific/Southern Pacific Railroad and Pacific Mail Steamship Company. Despite having powerful protectors and defenders, they were subjected to all manner of discriminatory laws, random violence, exploitation, and expulsion from some areas. Chinese women were commonly bought and sold as servants and prostitutes in California during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

California Indians lacked powerful white defenders throughout the late nineteenth century. Their land was desired at the same time that their labor was not needed. This made them expendable. Yet at the beginning of the American Era, in 1848, Indians were still by far the largest non-white group in the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Areas. This made them the number one early target for racialization, discrimination, violence, enslavement and expropriation. White settlers had a strong economic interest in oppressing indigenous people, using violence to either enslave or exclude them, then seizing their land, resources and property. During roughly the same era, settler colonial systems worldwide carried out similar actions toward native people in places as diverse as Australia and South Africa, to cite but two prominent examples. The struggle over control of the land is a fundamental context for understanding Bay Area Indian history.

Throughout the 19th and well into the 20th century, the state and national governments facilitated this ongoing process against Indians through a series of laws and policies whose effect was to separate native people from their land and leave them landless, stateless, homeless, outside the larger community, and subject to the whim and caprice of the white population. California Governor Peter H. Burnett set the tone in January, 1851, when he said in his annual message: "... a war of extermination will continue to be waged between the two races until the Indian race becomes extinct..." (in Heizer and Almquist 1971:26).

Genocidal Attacks on Non-Mission Indians

The "war of extermination" that Governor Burnett spoke about had both extra-legal aspects (warfare and conquest), as well as legal aspects (discriminatory laws passed by legislatures and enforced by the courts and police). In parts of California to the north and east of the Bay Area, the

invasion of the European-Americans into tribal lands and the resulting destruction of Indian food sources and means of life frequently led to native resistance and conflict. Beginning in the 1850s and extending well into the 1860s and even 1870s, there were innumerable small but violent episodes of war and massacre between Native Americans and the newly arrived European Americans, with heavy losses on the Indian side (Forbes 1982:69).

The California state governments of the early 1850s officially encouraged settler wars of extermination against the tribal native peoples of northern and eastern California in order to seize their land. (The Mission Indians, who had already lost their lands, remained near their Mexican patrons in the towns and on the titled ranches of the south and central Coast Ranges.) In some areas federal appropriations were handed out to pay for mass murder of Indians (Gottesman 1999:79). Often pay was unnecessary. John S. Hittell described a common pattern in 1869:

The Indians were driven from their hunting grounds and fishing places by the whites, and they stole cattle for food; and to punish and prevent them from stealing, the whites made war on them...Such has been the origin of most of the Indian wars which have raged (Hittell 1869:388).

There was broad participation by the newly arrived population in this genocide, and government at all levels helped lead the attacks. As Jack Forbes points out, this

makes the sequence of events all the more distressing since it serves to indict not a group of cruel leaders, or a few squads of rough soldiers, but, in effect, an entire people; for the conquest of the Native Californian was above all else a popular, mass enterprise (Forbes 1982:69).

And as H. H. Bancroft observed:

The California valley cannot grace her annals with a single Indian war bordering on respectability. It can boast, however, a hundred or two of as brutal butcherings, on the part of our honest miners and brave pioneers, as any area of equal extent in our republic (Bancroft in Caughey 1940:381)

These wars of terror and massacre were usually small in scale because the tribal society of Northern California was local and decentralized. Due to the lack of large group cohesion inherent in their local tribe (tribelet) socio-political structure, and to a shortage of firearms, the Indians suffered from a consequent lack of numbers, firepower and mobility. These facts doomed their attempts to repel the invaders and protect their families, lands and rights. During the 1850s, they were killed by the thousands and had to flee either to remote and inhospitable places or accept life on a reservation.

Legalized Kidnapping and Enslavement

The racialized legal and political process, which promoted disempowerment, enslavement and genocide, included a series of 1850s and early 1860s laws passed by the California state legislature, backed up by court decisions. These laws resulted in the following impacts on California Indians:

- prevented Indians from testifying in court, becoming citizens, serving on juries or attending school
- gave whites the right to obtain and control Indian children as “servants”
- gave whites the right to contract with a county for the labor of any Indian convicted of a crime
- made a heavy monetary fine and up to 25 lashes the penalty for any Indian convicted of stealing a horse, cow or mule

- made the arrest and forced labor for the highest bidder for four months the penalty for any Indian found “strolling or loitering, begging or leading a profligate life”
- authorized the expenditure of the sum of \$1.51 million during the 1850s (a huge sum for the time) for the “suppression of Indian hostilities”
- prohibited the transfer of firearms or ammunition to Indians
- authorized the indenture to whites of any “vagrant” Indian for “employment and training” up to the age of 40 for men and 35 for women (Heizer and Almquist 1971:39-64; Almaguer 1994:132-138; Williams 1939:68)

These laws allowed the enslavement of Indians all over California during the 1850s and 1860s, a practice which also extended to children.

Anthropologist and historian Sherburne Cook estimated that between three and four thousand Indian children were kidnapped and sold during the 1852-1867 years alone, along with an unknown number of Indian men seized for labor and Indian women taken for labor, concubinage and prostitution (Cook 1943b:61). It should be added that during the Rancho Era raiding had also taken place to kidnap Indians to use as servants/peons, but since demand was relatively low, sale was usually not the motivating force. Among the adults, women were especially at risk. As historian Tomas Almaguer points out:

In the early 1850s, Indian women were routinely captured and either held as concubines by their kidnapers or sold to other white men for their personal use. One Anglo pioneer in Trinity County reported that traffickers of Indian women had even devised a system which classified them into “fair, middling, inferior, [and] refuse” categories of merchandise (Almaguer 1994:120).

After detailed study of white settler kidnapping and rape of Indian women, Cook concluded :

There can be no question that crimes of violence perpetrated on Indian women by white men were numbered... very likely by thousands... indeed, it would not be overstating the situation to say that during the decade 1850-1860 no single squaw in northern California could consider herself absolutely safe from violence at the hands of white men (Cook 1943b:87).

The clear result of white attacks on Indian women was that by 1860 there were substantially fewer Indian women than men in every age group. As historian Albert Hurtado recently summed up:

The Gold Rush was a deadly period for California Indians, male and female alike. During the 1850s their population declined from about 150,000 to 30,000, but Indian women evidently died at a more rapid rate than men, a circumstance that limited the ability of Indian society to recover demographic losses. The deficit of Indian women intensified competition for potential wives in some Indian communities (Hurtado 1999:89-90).

Serial indenture, a form of semi-slavery, was another product of the racialized legal system. The Los Angeles Indian “slave” mart of the 1850s was reported by early settler Horace Bell:

These Indians were Christians, docile even to servility, and the best of laborers. Then came the Americans ... and the ruin of those once happy and useful people commenced. The cultivators of vineyards commenced paying their Indians with aguardiente, a veritable firewater and no mistake. The consequence was that on being paid off on Saturday evening, they would meet ... and pass the night in gambling, drunkenness and debauchery... By four o'clock on Sunday afternoon Los Angeles Street ... would be crowded with a mass of drunken Indians, yelling and fighting. Men and women, boys and girls, tooth and nail ... frequently with knives,

but always in a manner that would strike the beholder with awe and horror.

About sundown the pompous marshal, with his Indian special deputies, who had been kept in jail all day to keep them sober, would drive and drag the herd to a big corral in the rear of the Downey Block, where they would sleep away their intoxication, and in the morning they would be exposed for sale, as slaves for the week. Los Angeles had its slave mart...only the slave at Los Angeles was sold fifty-two times a year as long as he lived, which did not generally exceed one, two, or three years ... Those thousands of honest, useful people were absolutely destroyed in this way (Bell in Caughy and Caughy 1976:124-125).

Contemporary observers often conveniently claimed that this was not slavery but merely a kind of servitude, even though violence and murder were often involved in capturing the enslaved Indians, who were then sold. Thus government surveyor William H. Brewer could write in 1863 that:

It has for years been a regular business to steal Indian children and bring them down to the civilized parts of the state, even to San Francisco, and sell them—not as slaves, but as servants to be kept as long as possible. Mendocino County has been the scene of many of these stealings, and it is said that some of the kidnapers would often get the consent of the parents by shooting them to prevent opposition (Brewer [1863] 1966:493).

In 1861 Indian Agent W. P. Dole was more blunt in his description of the practice of enslavement of Indians in northwest California:

In the frontier portions of Humboldt and Mendocino Counties a band of desperate men have carried on a system of kidnapping for two years past. Indian children were seized and carried into the lower counties and sold into virtual slavery. These crimes against humanity so excited the Indians that they began to retaliate by killing the cattle of the whites. At once an order was issued to chastise the guilty.... A company of United States troops, attended by a considerable volunteer force, has been pursuing the poor creatures from one retreat to another. The kidnapers follow at the heels of the soldiers to seize the children, when their parents are murdered, and sell them to the best advantage (Dole [1861] in Cook 1943b:58-59).

When a relative few of these crimes reached the courts, the European-American perpetrators were invariably set free to prey on the innocent again (Cook 1943b:59-60).

Somewhat Improved Conditions after 1870

By the early 1870s there began to be some modifications of the 1850s and 1860s era system of oppressive and destructive racialization imposed on the Indian peoples. In 1872, for example, prior laws prohibiting Indians from testifying in court were repealed by omission from the newly codified set of California laws (Heizer and Almqvist 1971:48; Rawls 1984:203-218). In 1879 Indians were also technically granted the right to vote, but this right was usually refused in practice, since a high level of reading and writing of English was required. Indians had to go to court in the second decade of the twentieth century to try to enforce this supposed right. In spite of minor modifications, the basic system of disenfranchisement continued in place in California well into the twentieth century.

Appendix E.

Ohlone/Costanoan Groups and Federal Recognition Process (By Beverly R. Ortiz)

The following is a chronological list (by date of intent to petition) of all Ohlone/Costanoan groups known to have applied for Federal recognition as of June 21, 1998, when the information was copied from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) website. The pertinent section of the BIA website is no longer available, due to pending legal action.

Costanoan Band of Carmel Mission Indians, Petition 110

c/o Anthony Miranda

Letter of Intent to Petition: 9/16/1988

Note: This effort was based, at least in part, on the research of tribal members Johnny and Delia Casados. It has since been refiled as Costanoan-Rumsen Carmel Tribe, Petition 143, according to the tribe's website (see below).

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe, Petition 111

aka Costanoan Families of the San Francisco Bay; formerly
Ohlone/Costanoan Muwekma Tribe

c/o Rosemary Cambra

Letter of Intent to Petition: 5/9/1989

Documentation received: 10/1/1995

BIA letter of previous recognition: 5/24/1996

Technical Assistance (TA) Letter from
BIA Branch of Acknowledgement
and Recognition: 10/10/1996

Response received: 11/14/1996 and 3/28/1997

TA letter: 6/30/1997

Partial response received: 1/16/1998

Note: In Fall 1981 Rosemary Cambra approached a professor at De Anza College and "asked for help to research her family history and write a small publication for her, her mother and children in order to know and appreciate their Ohlone heritage, since little has been made available to the general public and

schools” (Olsen et.al. 1985:2). This marked the beginning of an effort to seek federal recognition for The Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe, funded partially from Ohlone Families Consulting Services profits. In December of 1999, to expedite their petition, which was expected to take up to 20 years to complete, the Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe sued the Department of Interior/BIA in federal court to expedite their petition. Muwekma won their case in 2002, and the court ordered their petition fast tracked. The petition was analyzed and on September 9, 2002, Neal McCaleb, a Department of Interior Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs, denied it. McCaleb stated that the tribe failed to meet 25 CFR Part 83.7(a), 38.7(b), and 83.7(c), i.e., that it hasn’t been identified as an Indian entity on a “substantially continuous” basis since 1927 (the year until it last had “unambiguous previous Federal Acknowledgment), and that it had not maintained a “continuous community” or “political influence or authority” over its members since 1927. McCaleb concluded that Muwekma “does not exist within the meaning of federal law.” Muwekma responded that this was an unlawful political decision, and filed a still-pending suit in U.S. District Court. Their attorney also argued that the entire federal recognition process is grossly unfair, since it requires all tribes to document a continuous community during periods of history when both governmental and society-wide economic, social and cultural policies were stifling and/or destroying tribal identity, preventing the maintenance of the tribe (Maddox 1996; Harper et.al. 2000; Urbina 2001; Indiantz.Com 2001; Darling 2002; *Oakland Tribune* 6/6/2002:Local 6; Reynolds 2005). For more about the tribe from its own perspective see electronic document www.muwekma.org.

Indian Canyon Band of Costanoan/Mutsun Indians, Petition 112

c/o Ann Marie Sayers

Letter of Intent to Petition: 6/9/1989

Documentation received: 7/27/1990

Obvious Deficiency (OD) Letter from
BIA Branch of Acknowledgement 8/23/1991
and Recognition:

Note: This petition has since been withdrawn. For more about this tribal organization from its own perspective see electronic document www.indiancanyon.org.

Amah/Mutsun Band of Ohlone/Costanoan Indians, Petition 120

c/o Irene Zwierlein

Letter of Intent to Petition: 9/18/1990

Note: The Amah/Mutsun Band received its impetus to form following a meeting about Indian housing programs attended by Irene Zwierlein and her brother in San Jose. Zwierlein’s sister had spent years researching the family’s genealogy. When Zwierlein and her brother’s heritage was questioned at the meeting, she subsequently produced these genealogical documents, she was encouraged to “get your people together and do something for them.” Zwierlein met with elder Joseph Mondragon, who organized a meeting with other elders from the San Juan Bautista vicinity, and the decision was made to develop a constitution and file a letter of intent to petition for recognition with the BIA (Zwierlein Interview 2003). In 2000, after new officers were elected by the Amah group at large, some tribal members (including Irene Zwierlein and Joseph Mondragon), chose to form a separate entity under the old officers, who retained the group’s non-profit organization status as its founding officers. The group with the newly elected officers (Charlie Higuera as chair, succeeded by Valentin Lopez) renamed themselves the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Costanoan/Ohlone Indians (Niekerk 2004:1A,6A; Tumgoren 2004a:1A,6A). For more information regarding the latter group from its own perspective, see www.amahmutsun.org. On August 31, 2003, Irene

Zwierlein (Interview 2003) submitted her tribe's petition for federal acknowledgement to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. On September 29, 2003, Zwierlein received a letter from R. Lee Flemming, Director of the Branch of Acknowledgement and Recognition, US Department of Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs, stating that the Amah Mutsun petition had been placed on the "Ready, Waiting for Active Consideration" list by the BIA. The letter noted that the Amah Mutsun would be notified when their petition got on the actual "active consideration" list (copy of letter courtesy Irene Zwierlein).

Esselen/Costanoan Tribe of Monterey County, Petition 131

c/o Ms. Joan P. Denys

Letter of Intent to Petition: 11/16/1992

Withdrawn: 11/15/1996 (merged with another petitioner)

Note: This petition has been merged with petition 132.

Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation, Petition 132

c/o Ms. Loretta Wyer

Letter of Intent to Petition: 2/3/1992

Documentation received: 8/23/1995

TA letter: 5/21/1996

Note: For more about this tribe from its own perspective see electronic document www.esselenation.com.

Costanoan-Rumsen Carmel Tribe, Petition 143

c/o Tony Cerda

Intent to Petition: 8/24/1994

Note: In 1995 this tribe achieved non-profit status (Cerda 2002). For more about this tribe from its own perspective see electronic document www.crc.nativeweb.org.

Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-Mutsen Tribe, Petition 147

c/o Patrick Orozco

Intent to Petition: 12/7/1994

Partial documentation received: 1/26/1995

Limited TA letter: 3/14/1995

Note: This petition is still active.

Appendix F:

Multi-Page Tables Documenting the Indian Experience at the Ohlone/Costanoan Missions and Adjacent Missions to the North (By Randall Milliken)

This appendix contains 17 complex tables which cover seven themes relevant to the understanding of Ohlone/Costanoan history.

- Table F-1 presents an overview of the changing population size of each relevant mission from its foundation up through 1834.
- Tables F-2 to F-5 track the years of mission absorption of the specific local tribes that went to Mission Dolores. The separate tables track distinct language groups.
- Tables F-6 to F-13 show the dramatic yearly changes in the numbers of people (and population proportions) from various geographic and language groups at Mission Dolores up through the year 1817.
- Table F-14 lists the viable Mission Indian nuclear family groups at Mission Dolores from the 1820s through the early 1850s, with information about the varied geographic and language backgrounds of the family members.
- Table F-15 tracks Mission Dolores San Francisco Bay Costanoan, Bay Miwok, and Coast Miwok descendents who moved to other missions before 1834, together with information about their families at those missions, where relevant.
- Table F-16 documents marriages between local Indian people and Hispanic immigrants at Ohlone/Costanoan missions during the Mission Period and initial Rancho Period (up through 1839). It includes comparative information showing how few such marriages occurred, relative to the large numbers of exclusive Indian and exclusive Hispanic marriages.
- Table F-17 portrays a reconstructed census of Indians who may have been alive at Mission Dolores at the outset of secularization at the end of 1834.

List of Appendix F Tables

- Table F1. Year-end Counts of Indian Residents from 1770 to 1834 at Missions that took in Ohlone/Costanoan Local Tribes.
- Table F2. Yearly Tribal Baptisms of Local Tribes from San Francisco and San Mateo Counties at Mission Dolores and Mission Santa Clara.
- Table F3. Yearly Tribal Baptisms of Costanoan and Bay Miwok-speaking Groups That Moved from the East Bay to Mission Dolores, and in Some Cases also to Mission San Jose (JO).
- Table F4. Yearly Tribal Baptisms from Coast Miwok Groups at Missions Dolores, San Jose, San Rafael, and San Francisco Solano.
- Table F5. Yearly Baptisms of Patwin and Wappo Local Tribes and Regional Groups at Missions Dolores, San Jose, and San Francisco Solano, 1810-1834
- Table F6. Change Over Time in the Yelamu population of San Francisco Bay Costanoans at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.
- Table F7. Change Over Time in the Bay Shore Peninsula Population of San Francisco Bay Costanoans (Urebure, Ssalson, Lamchin, Puichon, Olpen) at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.
- Table F8. Change Over Time in the San Mateo Coast Population of San Francisco Bay Costanoans (Aramai, Chiguan, Cotegen, Oljon, Quiroste) at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.
- Table F9. Change Over Time in the East Bay Population of San Francisco Bay and Karkin Costanoans (Huchiun, Huchiun-Aguasto, Carquin) at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.
- Table F10. Change Over Time in the Population of Bay Miwoks (Saclan, Tatcan, Volvon, Chupcan) at Mission Dolores, 1779-1817.
- Table F11. Change Over Time in the East Bay Population of Bilingual San Francisco Bay Costanoan/Bay Miwok Jalquins at Mission Dolores, 1778-1817.
- Table F12. Change Over Time in the North Bay Population of Coast Miwoks at Mission Dolores, 1779-1817.
- Table F13. Change Over Time in the Combined Patwins (Napa, Malacas, Suisun, Tolenas) and Wappo (Canicaymus) Populations at Mission Dolores, 1779-1817.
- Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.
- Table F15. Mission Dolores Costanoan and Bay Miwok Descendants who moved to other Missions, together with their Families, as of 1834.
- Table F16. Hispanic-California Indian Marriages at Central California Missions between 1773 and 1840.
- Table F17. Reconstructed Census of 202 Indian People Who May Have Been Alive at Mission Dolores in 1834.

Table F1. Year-end Counts of Indian Residents from 1770 to 1834 at Missions that took in Ohlone/Costanoan Local Tribes.
(Missions are listed south-to-north, from the left.)

	Soledad	Carmel	San Juan Bautista	Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	San Jose	Dolores	Total
1770		2						2
1771		21						21
1772		28						28
1773		154						154
1774		244						244
1775		250						250
1776		327						327
1777		440			41		32	513
1778		472			91		73	636
1779		457			111		126	694
1780		446			189		176	811
1781		412			243		204	859
1782		432			301		188	921
1783		614			338		215	1,167
1784		645			466		260	1,371
1785		711			475		250	1,436
1786		694			557		354	1,605
1787		707			647		426	1,780
1788		720			672		426	1,818
1789		732			787		429	1,948
1790		712			910		525	2,147
1791	9	770		86	957		590	2,403
1792	118	800		155	1,001		622	2,696
1793	213	835		233	1,062		711	3,054
1794	193	860		332	1,418		913	3,716
1795	240	876		507	1,541		872	4,036
1796	289	835		523	1,424		790	3,861
1797	322	832	86	491	1,360	33	710	3,834
1798	345	738	296	504	1,382	154	645	4,064
1799	444	720	347	478	1,343	189	603	4,124
1800	512	747	625	472	1,318	277	635	4,586
1801	565	705	766	442	1,322	460	778	5,038
1802	563	688	958	437	1,291	622	814	5,373
1803	627	591	1,017	437	1,271	729	1,051	5,723
1804	687	591	1,112	461	1,240	779	1,103	5,973
1805	688	587	1,112	481	1,469	809	1,139	6,285
1806	679	550	1,068	466	1,406	662	886	5,717
1807	651	562	1,072	474	1,401	637	828	5,625
1808	625	550	950	485	1,410	544	906	5,470
1809	595	533	902	442	1,398	571	1,010	5,451
1810	598	511	700	507	1,332	545	1,057	5,250
1811	575	485	666	462	1,371	961	1,214	5,734
1812	549	455	638	437	1,348	1,172	1,224	5,823
1813	547	448	633	398	1,347	1,151	1,205	5,729
1814	531	432	607	388	1,306	1,149	1,180	5,593
1815	500	423	580	368	1,306	1,298	1,113	5,588
1816	500	405	575	358	1,336	1,508	1,091	5,773
1817	527	402	608	408	1,336	1,576	1,060	5,917
1818	519	390	582	410	1,321	1,675	955 ^a	5,852

(continued)

Table F1. Year-end Counts of Indian Residents from 1770 to 1834 at Missions that took in Ohlone/Costanoan Local Tribes.
(Missions are listed south-to-north, from the left.)

	Solida	Carmel	San Juan Bautista	Santa Cruz	Santa Clara	San Jose	Dolores	Total
1819	417	397	660	381	1,313	1,670	898 ^a	5,736
1820	436	381	843	461	1,359	1,754	884 ^a	6,118
1821	450	374	1,098	479	1,388	1,754	1,228 ^b	6,771
1822	532	341	1,222	499	1,394	1,620	958	6,566
1823	506	317	1,248	474	1,395	1,746	208	5,894
1824	512	306	1,221	461	1,450	1,806	265	6,021
1825	454	295	1,166	429	1,403	1,796	238	5,781
1826	409	277	1,146	428	1,428	1,783	232	5,703
1827	373	275	1,108	410	1,462	1,800	241	5,669
1828	333	234	986	364	1,369	1,766	236	5,288
1829	327	233	969	333	1,269	1,641	229	5,001
1830	342	229	964	320	1,226	1,745	219	5,045
1831	336	209	928	298	1,184	1,886	210	5,051
1832	339	185	916	284	1,125	1,713	204	4,766
1833	348	183	888	235	1,096	1,456	138	4,344
1834	350	188	875	152	1,108	1,795	136	4,604

Note: ^a Milliken's database counts for Mission Dolores are presented here for the years 1818-1820, because the official year-end counts published by Bowman (1956) is artificially high through the inclusion of people also counted at Mission San Rafael;

^b Milliken's database count for Mission Dolores is presented here for 1821, because the official year-end count of 1106 published by Bowman (1956) is artificially low, possibly through a double subtraction of people transferred to Mission San Rafael.

Table F2. Yearly Tribal Baptisms of Local Tribes from San Francisco and San Mateo Counties at Mission Dolores (FR) and Mission Santa Clara (CL).

	Bay Shore Groups						Pacific Coast Groups						Groups West of Santa Clara									
	Yelamu		Urebure		Ssalson		Lamchin		Aramai		Chiguan		Cotegen		Oljon		Puichon		Olpen		Quiroste	
	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL	FR	CL
1777	27		4		1												3					
1778	38		3		1																	
1779	16		5		5		7		7		1						2					
1780	9		4		21				3								1				1	
1781	5		2		5		7		5								6	9		1		
1782	7		12		7		4		2			1					1	7				
1783	6		3		7				12		5						30		1			
1784	16		5		8		3		5		7		1				18					
1785	1		2		5		2		4		2						2	13				
1786	8				47		7		9		11		7		10		1	27	1			
1787	2				7		6				9		5		22		10	17	5		1	
1788					1		1						1		1		2	27	1		1	
1789					1	1	7						2	1	9		2	33		3	1	
1790					27		53	2			1		1	1	1	1	23	25	1	12		14
1791					3		7				8		21	1	23		4	4	2	11	21	1
1792					5		17	3							32	5	4	24	3	26	13	12
1793					20		40						2	3	16	9	36	21	36	26	12	20
1794					2		9	6						8	1	5	5	45	13	57		89
1795							7										9		22			
1796																		3				
1797							1											4		2		
1798																		3				1
1799																		6		2		
1800					1	1												18				
1801																		4		1		
1802																			1			
1803																		1				
1804																		3				
Subtotal	135		40		173	3	171	18	47		44		41	14	115	20	96	353	62	165	50	137
Total	135		40		176		189		47		44		55		135		449		227		187	

Note: People who were counted as "Unidentified Peninsula" in *Time of Little Choice* (Milliken 1995:270) have been tentatively assigned in this table to one local tribe or another through a variety of inferential techniques.

Table F3. Yearly Tribal Baptisms of Costanoan and Bay Miwok-speaking Groups That Moved from the East Bay to Mission Dolores (FR), and in Some Cases also to Mission San Jose (JO).

Year	Unknown	Chochenyo Costanoan		Bi-lingual		Bay Miwok						Karkin Costanoan		
	Probable Huchium FR	Huchium FR	Huchium- Aguasto FR	Jalquin/ Irgin FR	JO	Saclan		Tatcan		Volvon		Chupcan		Carquin FR
1779	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1	✓	✓
1780	8	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1781	4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1782	4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1783	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1784	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1785	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1786	9	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1787	1	10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1	✓	1
1788	✓	✓	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1789	✓	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1790	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1791	7	5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1792	2	33	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1793	✓	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1794	24	165	✓	✓	✓	65	✓	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1795	5	5	✓	✓	✓	78	✓	8	✓	✓	✓	2	✓	3
1796	✓	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1797	✓	2	✓	✓	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1798	✓	✓	✓	✓	2	8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1799	✓	✓	✓	✓	2	1	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1800	✓	14	✓	✓	6	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1801	✓	65	✓	✓	26	5	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1802	✓	5	✓	✓	46	66	1	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4
1803	✓	44	18	✓	5	49	✓	1	✓	2	✓	✓	✓	✓
1804	✓	5	✓	✓	14	1	✓	127	✓	2	6	12	1	7
1805	✓	22	43	✓	5	5	✓	5	✓	20	44	5	✓	1
1806	✓	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12	✓	32	✓	1	✓	✓
1807	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2	✓	1	✓	✓	✓
1808	✓	✓	3	✓	✓	1	✓	✓	2	✓	1	✓	✓	1
1809	✓	✓	23	✓	✓	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7	✓	99
1810	✓	✓	7	✓	✓	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	30	✓	33
1811	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	25	63	✓
1812	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1	1	✓
1813	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1814	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1815	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2	1	✓
Subtotal	70	384	95	77	152	168	3	157	4	54	54	87	66	149
Total	70	384	95	229		171		161		108		153		149

Table F4. Yearly Tribal Baptisms from Coast Miwok Groups at Missions Dolores (FR), San Jose (JO), San Rafael (RA), and San Francisco Solano (FS).

Community Region Year	San Francisco Bay Shore Communities				Pacific Coast Communities						Inland Sonoma County Communities						Yearly Count	Year
	Huimen	Tamal	Omiomi	Alaguali	Guaulen	Olema	Echatamal	Echacolom	Segloque	Geluatamal	Chocuyen	Olompali	Petaluma	Licatiut				
	Richardson Bay	Aguasto San Rafael	Novato Creek	Tolay Creek	Bolinas Bay	Olema Creek	Nicasio Creek	South Tomales Bay	North Tomales Bay	Bodega Bay	Sonoma Valley	San Antonio Creek	Petaluma	Bloomfield/ Cotati				
Year	FR	FR RA	FR JO RA	FR JO RA	FR	FR RA	FR RA	FR RA	FR RA	FR RA	FR JO RA FS	FR JO RA	FR JO RA FS	RA FS				
1783	2														2	1783		
1784	3														3	1784		
1785	0														0	1785		
1786	7														7	1786		
1787	5				1										6	1787		
1788	0				0										0	1788		
1789	1				0										1	1789		
1790	5				0										5	1790		
1791	3				0										3	1791		
1792	0				0										0	1792		
1793	0				0										0	1793		
1794	16	2			1										19	1794		
1795	30	11			0										41	1795		
1796	1	0			0										1	1796		
1797	0	0			0										0	1797		
1798	1	1			0										2	1798		
1799	0	0			0										0	1799		
1800	6	36			14										56	1800		
1801	46	15			21										82	1801		
1802	12	51	2		22	3									90	1802		
1803	13	96	8		41	56	21								235	1803		
1804	3	1	0		0	1	0								5	1804		
1805	0	4	0		7	44	0								55	1805		
1806	5	4	2		0	4	7								22	1806		
1807	0	0	0		0	33	0								33	1807		
1808	1	42	6		2	14	69	5							139	1808		
1809	0	5	1		0	39	10	10							65	1809		
1810	0	6	23		0	8	0	30		1					68	1810		
1811	1	1	170	2	0	1	0	4		0			1		180	1811		
1812	0	7	24	4	0		1	15		0			2		53	1812		
1813	0	0	32	2	0			29	1	0			23		87	1813		
1814	2	1	19	2	2			7	0	0			7	1	49	1814		
1815			2	3				1	0	0			4	2 2	122	1815		
1816			11 1	30 73				63	6	1			18	74 7	374	1816		
1817			26	14 18		3	2	15 12	3 9				0	44 112 2	299	1817		
1818		3		5		7	0	53	29	13			0 1	4 43	178	1818		
1819		1		2		0	1	37	60	10			0 0	11	129	1819		
1820		0		2		1	1	22	40	7			1 1	3	94	1820		
1821		1		3		0		1	45	8			0	4	131	1821		
1822				3		3		7	1	2			4	8	68	1822		
1823								2	9	2					16	1823		
1824								0	6	2			3		45	1824		
1825								0	0	0				1	5	1825		
1826								0	1	13					0	14	1826	
1827								0	0	12					0	12	1827	
1828								0	0	0					0	0	1828	
1829								0	0	0					0	0	1829	
1830								0	0	0					0	0	1830	
1831								0	1	23					1	25	1831	
1832								4		3					7	1832		
Total	163	283 5	326 1 15	57 91 3	111	203 14	108 4	179 138	10 201	2 95	42 93 6 3	155 123 71	55 82 66 5	107 11	2828			
	163	288	342	151	111	217	112	317	211	97	144	349	208	118	2828			

Table F5. Yearly Baptisms of Patwin and Wappo Local Tribes and Regional Groups at Missions Dolores (FR), San Jose (JO), and San Francisco Solano (FS), 1810-1834.

Year	Napa		Suisun			Malaca			Tolena			Ululato			Canicaymo ^a	
	FR	JO	FR	JO	FS	FR	JO	FS	FR	JO	FS	FR	JO	FS	FR	JO
1808																
1809	2															
1810			21													
1811	2		71	1												
1812	8		57						9							
1813	1		7						0							
1814	16	26	21						0						9	
1815	27	121	122			1			3	1		1			8	
1816		7	18			5			5	34		9			2	
1817		2	2			23				17		5				
1818		7	3			19				1		0				2
1819			3							15		0				
1820			2			8			1	63		3				8
1821			1			2				1		214			201	
1822												49			7	
1823										2						
1824								2			1			28		
1825										1			5	2		
1826					2		6						26	4		
1827							2	1			1		2	4		
1828														1		
1829														5		
1830											1					
1831										1						
1832					1			8			1			21		
1833																
1834													3			
Subtotal	56	163	328	1	3	58	8	11	18	136	4	281	36	65	227	10
Total	219		332			77			158			382			237	

Note: ^a The term Canicaymo was a blanket label for the four most southerly Wappo-speaking local tribes – Caymos, Canijolmano, Huiluc, and Mayacma – by the Mission Dolores scribes. Wappo speakers baptized at Mission San Francisco Solano were identified with their specific local tribe names.

Table F6. Change Over Time in the Yelamu Population of San Francisco Bay Costanoans at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	27	1	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	81.3%
1778	38	2	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	84.9%
1779	16	6	72	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	72.5	64.2%
1780	9	4	77	5	2	3	0.5	0	1	81	50.9%
1781	5	10	72	2	0	5	0	0.5	0.5	77.5	44.0%
1782	7	10	69	3	1	7	1	0	1.5	77.5	41.2%
1783	6	2	73	0	1	6	0.5	0.5	1.5	80.5	37.4%
1784	16	7	82	2	0	8	2	0	3.5	93.5	36.0%
1785	1	9	74	3	2	9	1	2.5	2	85	34.0%
1786	8	3	79	2	1	10	2.5	0.5	4	93	26.3%
1787	2	4	77	6	2	14	2	1.5	4.5	95.5	22.4%
1788	0	0	77	2	3	13	3	1.5	6	96	22.5%
1789	0	3	74	1	0	14	3	2.5	6.5	94.5	22.0%
1790	0	3	71	3	3	14	3.5	3	7	92	17.5%
1791	0	2	69	0	1	13	3	0.5	9.5	91.5	15.5%
1792	0	7	62	2	1	14	2.5	4	8	84	13.5%
1793	0	4	58	0	1	13	2.5	1.5	9	80	11.3%
1794	0	4	54	2	2	13	2	2	9	76	8.3%
1795	0	8	46	1	2	12	2.5	2.5	9	67	7.7%
1796	0	5	41	1	0	13	1.5	3.5	7	61	7.7%
1797	0	6	35	0	1	12	1.5	2	6.5	53.5	7.5%
1798	0	3	32	0	3	9	2.5	1	8	49	7.6%
1799	0	6	26	0	0	9	2	2.5	7.5	42.5	7.0%
1800	0	1	25	1	1	9	1	1.5	7	41	6.5%
1801	0	1	24	0	0	9	2	1	8	41	5.3%
1802	0	2	22	0	2	7	1	0.5	8.5	37.5	4.4%
1803	0	2	20	0	0	7	1	0.5	9	36	3.4%
1804	0	0	20	0	1	6	0.5	1	8.5	34.5	3.1%
1805	0	2	18	0	0	6	2.5	3	8	32	2.8%
1806	0	8	10	0	0	6	0	2.5	5.5	21.5	2.4%
1807	0	1	9	0	1	5	0.5	0.5	5.5	19.5	2.4%
1808	0	0	9	0	1	4	0.5	0	6	19	2.1%
1809	0	0	9	0	0	4	0.5	0.5	6	19	1.9%
1810	0	2	7	0	0	4	0	0.5	5.5	16.5	1.6%
1811	0	0	7	0	0	4	0	0.5	5	16	1.3%
1812	0	0	7	0	0	4	0.5	0.5	5	16	1.3%
1813	0	1	6	0	0	4	1	0.5	5.5	15.5	1.3%
1814	0	1	5	0	1	3	0.5	0	6	14	1.2%
1815	0	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	6	11	1.0%
1816	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	0.5	6.5	11.5	1.1%
1817	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0.5	6	11	1.0%
Total	135	133		36	33		52	46			

Note: ^a The birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group" count each individual mission-born child that has only one Yelamu parent as 0.5 persons;

^b The "Year-end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally-born" and "100% In-Group Mission Descendants" Year-end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In-group" Year-end counts.

Table F7. Change Over Time in the Bay Shore Peninsula Population of San Francisco Bay Costanoans
(Urebure, Ssalson, Lamchin, Puichon, Olpen) at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15.6%
1778	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12.3%
1779	17	0	26	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	26.5	23.5%
1780	25	2	49	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	49.5	31.1%
1781	20	6	63	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	63	35.8%
1782	24	8	79	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	79.5	42.3%
1783	10	7	82	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	82.5	38.4%
1784	16	8	90	4	1	3	3	0	3.5	96.5	37.1%
1785	11	12	89	3	1	5	1.5	2.5	2.5	96.5	38.6%
1786	56	12	133	0	0	5	1.5	1.5	2.5	140.5	39.7%
1787	26	12	147	3	2	6	2	1.5	3	156	36.6%
1788	5	10	142	6	3	9	3	0.5	5.5	156.5	36.7%
1789	12	7	147	4	3	10	3	2.5	6	163	38.0%
1790	105	9	243	3	1	12	2	3.5	4.5	259.5	49.4%
1791	15	20	238	3	5	10	4.5	1.5	7.5	255.5	43.3%
1792	33	27	244	3	2	11	2	2.5	7	262	42.1%
1793	99	35	308	12	11	12	2.5	2.5	7	327	46.0%
1794	29	42	295	6	4	14	2	3	6	315	34.5%
1795	0	58	237	4	8	10	3.5	2.5	7	254	29.1%
1796	0	32	205	1	4	7	0.5	2.5	5	217	27.5%
1797	0	19	186	7	6	8	4.5	3	6.5	200.5	28.2%
1798	0	21	165	7	3	12	3	2	7.5	184.5	28.6%
1799	0	13	152	6	8	10	4	4.5	7	169	28.0%
1800	1	8	145	7	5	12	4	4.5	6.5	163.5	25.7%
1801	0	6	139	2	5	9	4.5	3.5	7.5	155.5	20.0%
1802	0	32	107	3	6	6	3	1.5	9	122	14.4%
1803	0	6	101	2	2	6	2	1.5	9.5	116.5	11.1%
1804	0	10	91	2	3	5	2	2.5	9	105	9.5%
1805	0	6	85	2	2	5	3	3	9	99	8.7%
1806	0	14	71	0	1	4	1.5	5	5.5	80.5	9.1%
1807	0	11	60	2	1	5	2.5	1.5	6.5	71.5	8.6%
1808	0	2	58	1	1	5	2	1.5	7	70	7.7%
1809	0	5	53	0		5	0	1	6	64	6.3%
1810	0	2	51	0	1	4	1	1	6	61	5.8%
1811	0	2	49	0	1	3	0.5	0.5	6	58	4.8%
1812	0	3	46	0	1	2	1	1.5	5.5	53.5	4.4%
1813	0	0	46	0	0	2	1.5	2.5	4.5	52.5	4.4%
1814	0	2	44	0	0	2	2.5	1.5	5.5	51.5	4.4%
1815	0	5	39	0	0	2	1	1	5.5	46.5	4.2%
1816	0	5	34	0	0	2	0	1	4.5	40.5	3.7%
1817	0	3	31	0	0	2	2.5	1.5	5.5	38.5	3.6%
Total	513	482		93	91		79	73.5			

Note: ^aThe birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group count" each individual mission-born child that has only one bay shore Peninsula parent as 0.5 persons. ^bThe "Year-end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In-Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In-Group" year end counts.

Table F8. Change Over Time in the San Mateo Coast Population of San Francisco Bay Costanoans (Aramai, Chiguan, Cotegen, Oljon, Quiroste) at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
1778	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
1779	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7.1%
1780	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7.5%
1781	5	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	9.1%
1782	3	2	17	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	17	9.0%
1783	17	2	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	14.9%
1784	13	4	41	0	0	0	1.5	0	1.5	42.5	16.3%
1785	6	10	37	3	2	1	1	0	2.5	40.5	16.2%
1786	37	4	70	2	0	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	75.5	21.3%
1787	39	6	103	3	1	5	1.5	1.5	2.5	110.5	25.9%
1788	3	10	96	2	1	6	1	0	3.5	105.5	24.8%
1789	12	9	99	1	3	4	1.5	2	3	106	24.7%
1790	4	7	96	3	2	5	2	1.5	3.5	104.5	19.9%
1791	74	15	155	1	2	4	2.5	1	5	164	27.8%
1792	44	39	160	2	4	2	1	2	4	166	26.7%
1793	64	35	189	2	0	4	1	1.5	3.5	196.5	27.6%
1794	1	49	141	5	4	5	1.5	2	3	149	16.3%
1795	0	24	117	1	2	4	3	2	4	125	14.3%
1796	0	13	104	0	1	3	0.5	2	2.5	109.5	13.9%
1797	0	15	89	3	0	6	1	1.5	2	97	13.7%
1798	0	9	80	2	1	7	1	1	2	89	13.8%
1799	0	6	74	0	0	7	0.5	1	1.5	82.5	13.7%
1800	0	3	71	1	0	8	1	1	1.5	80.5	12.7%
1801	0	1	70	1	1	8	0.5	0.5	1.5	79.5	10.2%
1802	0	14	56	1	1	8	0.5	0	2	66	7.8%
1803	0	2	54	1	0	9	0.5	0	2.5	65.5	6.2%
1804	0	4	50	0	1	8	0	0.5	2	60	5.4%
1805	0	5	45	2	2	8	0.5	1	1.5	54.5	4.8%
1806	0	6	39	0	1	7	0.5	1	1	47	5.3%
1807	0	10	29	0	0	7	1.5	1	1.5	37.5	4.5%
1808	0	0	29	0	0	7	1.5	0.5	2.5	38.5	4.2%
1809	0	0	29	0	0	7	0	1	1.5	37.5	3.7%
1810	0	0	29	0	0	7	0	0	1.5	37.5	3.5%
1811	0	1	28	0	1	6	0.5	0	2	36	3.0%
1812	0	1	27	0	0	6	0	0	2	35	2.9%
1813	0	0	27	0	0	6	0.5	0	2.5	35.5	2.9%
1814	0	2	25	0	0	6	0	0	2.5	33.5	2.8%
1815	0	2	23	0	0	6	0	0	2.5	31.5	2.8%
1816	0	2	21	0	1	5	0.5	0.5	2.5	28.5	2.6%
1817	0	2	19	0	0	5	1	1	2.5	26.5	2.5%
Total	334	315		36	31		31.5	29			

Note: ^a The birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group" count each individual mission-born child that has only one San Mateo Coast parent as 0.5

persons; ^b The "Year-end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total half persons from the "50% In-group" year end counts.

Table F9. Change Over Time in the East Bay Population of San Francisco Bay and Karkin Costanoans (Huchiun, Huchiun-Aguasto, Carquin) at Mission Dolores, 1777-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
1778	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
1779	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.8%
1780	10	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6.9%
1781	4	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8.0%
1782	4	0	18	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	18.5	9.8%
1783	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	19.5	9.1%
1784	3	1	21	2	2	0	0.5	0	1	22	8.5%
1785	1	4	18	0	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	19.5	7.8%
1786	10	0	28	0	0	0	1.5	1	2	30	8.5%
1787	12	2	38	1	0	1	1.5	1.5	2	41	9.6%
1788	1	0	39	0	0	1	2	1	3	43	10.1%
1789	1	0	40	2	1	2	0.5	2	1.5	43.5	10.1%
1790	0	0	40	0	0	2	4	2.5	3	45	8.6%
1791	12	2	50	0	0	2	2	1.5	3.5	55.5	9.4%
1792	35	4	81	1	0	3	2.5	3	3	87	14.0%
1793	1	7	75	2	1	4	2.5	0.5	5	84	11.8%
1794	187	5	257	4	1	7	2.5	3	4.5	268.5	29.4%
1795	11	63	205	1	7	1	2.5	2	5	211	24.2%
1796	2	10	197	3	1	3	1.5	2	4.5	204.5	25.9%
1797	2	23	176	5	4	4	2	1.5	5	185	26.1%
1798	0	17	159	7	5	6	3	1	7	172	26.7%
1799	0	7	152	4	3	7	3.5	4.5	6	165	27.4%
1800	14	13	153	5	3	9	3.5	3.5	6	168	26.5%
1801	69	16	206	7	5	11	4.5	2.5	8	225	28.9%
1802	9	20	195	7	4	14	3.5	4	7.5	216.5	25.6%
1803	64	20	239	5	5	14	2	2	7.5	260.5	24.8%
1804	16	19	236	7	5	16	2	2	7.5	259.5	23.5%
1805	66	30	272	6	8	14	2	2	7.5	293.5	25.8%
1806	3	85	190	0	6	8	0.5	3	5	203	22.9%
1807	0	20	170	3	3	8	1.5	1.5	5	183	22.1%
1808	11	17	164	2	2	8	2	1.5	5.5	177.5	19.6%
1809	124	24	264	2	0	10	2	1	6.5	280.5	27.8%
1810	39	38	265	8	4	14	5	2.5	9	288	27.2%
1811	2	28	239	9	6	17	2.5	2.5	9	265	21.8%
1812	3	34	208	10	6	21	6	4	11	240	19.6%
1813	2	11	199	3	3	21	3.5	3.5	11	231	19.2%
1814	1	12	188	6	8	19	3.5	3.5	11	218	18.5%
1815	0	22	166	7	13	13	3	2	12	191	17.2%
1816	0	27	139	5	8	10	2.5	4	10.5	159.5	14.6%
1817	0	16	123	5	4	11	1.5	2.5	9.5	143.5	13.5%
Total	722	599		129	118		84	74.5			

Note: ^aThe birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group" count each individual mission-born child that has only one East Bay Costanoan parent as 0.5 persons; ^bThe "Year end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In group" year end counts.

Table F10. Change Over Time in the Population of Bay Miwoks (Saclan, Tatcan, Chupcan, Volvon) at Mission Dolores, 1779-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year end Count	100% In-group		Year end	50% In-group ^a		Year end	Year end	% of Mission
				Baptisms	Deaths	Count	Baptisms	Deaths	Count	Total ^b	Population
1777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1778	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1779	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.9%
1780	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1781	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1782	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1783	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1784	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1785	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1786	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1787	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1788	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1789	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1790	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1791	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1792	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1793	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.1%
1794	66	0	67	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	67.5	7.4%
1795	89	26	130	2	2	0	0	0.5	0	130.0	14.9%
1796	0	13	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	117.0	14.8%
1797	0	5	112	1	1	0	0	0	0	112.0	15.8%
1798	8	8	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	112.0	17.4%
1799	1	5	108	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	108.0	17.9%
1800	3	13	98	2	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	99.0	15.6%
1801	2	5	95	5	5	1	1.5	1	0.5	96.5	12.4%
1802	4	12	87	1	0	2	1	0.5	1	90.0	10.6%
1803	1	5	83	3	3	2	1	0.5	1.5	86.5	8.2%
1804	141	21	203	4	3	3	2	0	3.5	209.5	19.0%
1805	35	22	216	6	2	7	2.5	2.5	3.5	226.5	19.9%
1806	47	58	205	4	5	6	2.5	3.5	2.5	213.5	24.1%
1807	0	27	178	5	4	7	2	2	2.5	187.5	22.6%
1808	1	27	152	7	7	7	2.5	0.5	4.5	163.5	18.0%
1809	11	17	146	5	3	9	0	0.5	4	159.0	15.7%
1810	34	18	162	3	2	10	3.5	1	6.5	178.5	16.9%
1811	28	22	168	0	2	8	1	2	5.5	181.5	15.0%
1812	1	16	153	7	8	7	3	2.5	6	166.0	13.6%
1813	0	17	136	5	2	10	2.5	2	6.5	152.5	12.7%
1814	0	16	120	2	8	4	3	1.5	8	132.0	11.2%
1815	1	24	97	5	3	6	2.5	4	6.5	109.5	9.8%
1816	0	16	81	5	7	4	2	0.5	8	93.0	8.5%
1817	1	10	72	2	2	4	1.5	1.5	8	84.0	7.9%
Total	476	404		74	70		35.5	27.5			

Note: ^a The birth and death columns labeled "50% in group" count each individual mission born child that has only one Bay Miwok parent as 0.5 persons; ^b The "Year end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In group" year end counts.

Table F11. Change Over Time in the East Bay Population of Bilingual San Francisco Bay Costanoan/Bay Miwok Jalquins at Mission Dolores, 1778-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1778	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	1.4%
1779	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.9%
1780	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	1.5	0.9%
1781	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	1.5	0.9%
1782	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	1.0	0.5%
1783	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0.9%
1784	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0.8%
1785	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0.8%
1786	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0.6%
1787	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1788	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1789	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1790	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1791	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.2%
1792	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1793	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1795	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1796	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1797	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1798	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1799	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1801	26	0	26	1	1	0	0	0	0	26.0	3.3%
1802	46	5	67	1	0	1	0.5	0	0.5	68.5	8.1%
1803	5	8	64	2	2	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	65.5	6.2%
1804	0	11	53	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	54.5	4.9%
1805	0	7	46	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	46.0	4.0%
1806	0	8	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	38.0	4.3%
1807	0	6	32	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	32.0	3.9%
1808	0	4	28	2	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	29.5	3.3%
1809	0	1	27	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	27.0	2.7%
1810	0	2	25	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	25.0	2.4%
1811	0	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	23.0	1.9%
1812	0	2	21	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	21.5	1.8%
1813	0	1	20	0	0	0	1.5	1	1	21.0	1.7%
1814	0	0	20	0	0	0	0.5	1.5	0	20.0	1.7%
1815	0	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.0	1.3%
1816	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.0	0.9%
1817	0	1	9	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	9.0	0.8%
Total	79	70		7	7		7.5	7.5			

Note: ^aThe birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group" count each individual mission-born child that has only one Jalquin parent as 0.5 persons;

^bThe "Year end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In group" year end counts.

Table F12. Change Over Time in the Population of Coast Miwoks at Mission Dolores, 1779-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1778	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1779	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1780	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1781	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1782	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1783	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0.9%
1784	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	1.5%
1785	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	1.6%
1786	7	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.0	3.1%
1787	6	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.0	4.0%
1788	0	1	16	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	16.5	3.9%
1789	1	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	16.5	3.8%
1790	5	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	21.5	4.1%
1791	3	0	24	2	1	1	0	0.5	0	25.0	4.2%
1792	0	1	23	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	24.5	3.9%
1793	0	0	23	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	24.5	3.4%
1794	19	2	40	0	0	1	0	0.5	0	41.0	4.5%
1795	42	14	68	3	3	1	0	0	0	69.0	7.9%
1796	1	12	57	1	1	1	0	0	0	58.0	7.3%
1797	0	11	46	2	1	2	0	0	0	48.0	6.8%
1798	2	5	43	2	1	3	0.5	0.5	0	46.0	7.1%
1799	0	0	43	1	2	2	1	1	0	45.0	7.5%
1800	56	8	91	2	3	1	0.5	0	0.5	92.5	14.6%
1801	82	8	165	7	4	4	1	1.5	0	169.0	21.7%
1802	90	20	235	14	6	12	2	2	0	247.0	29.2%
1803	236	49	422	7	5	14	1.5	1	0.5	436.5	41.5%
1804	5	46	381	15	18	11	1.5	1	1	393.0	35.6%
1805	55	47	389	17	13	15	1.5	1	1.5	405.5	35.6%
1806	22	130	281	10	20	5	0.5	2	0	286.0	32.3%
1807	33	23	291	7	3	4	0.5	0	0.5	295.5	35.7%
1808	139	31	399	9	4	10	0.5	0.5	0.5	409.5	45.2%
1809	65	49	415	12	13	3	1	0.5	1	419.0	41.5%
1810	68	63	420	14	9	15	1.5	1	1.5	436.5	41.3%
1811	180	77	523	23	14	24	1	0.5	2	549.0	45.2%
1812	53	55	521	22	21	25	2.5	1	3.5	549.5	44.9%
1813	87	79	529	22	21	26	1	2	2.5	557.5	46.3%
1814	49	61	517	17	18	25	2.5	2	3	545.0	46.2%
1815	45	114	448	19	22	22	1	1.5	2.5	472.5	42.5%
1816	228	161	515	18	23	17	2.5	3.5	1.5	533.5	48.9%
1817	113	128	500	15	17	15	1.5	1.5	1.5	516.5	48.7%
Total	1,697	1,197		263	245		26.5	25			

Note: ^a The birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group" count each individual mission-born child that has only one Coast Miwok parent as 0.5 persons; ^b The "Year end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In group" year end counts.

Table F13. Change Over Time in the Combined Patwins (Napa, Malacas, Suisun, Tolenas) and Wappo (Canicaymus) Populations at Mission Dolores, 1779-1817.

Year	Tribally-born People			Mission Descendants						Total Group	
	Baptisms	Deaths	Year-end Count	100% In-group		Year-end Count	50% In-group ^a		Year-end Count	Year-end Total ^b	% of Mission Population
1777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1778	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1779	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1780	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1781	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1782	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1783	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1784	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1785	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1786	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1787	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1788	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1789	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1790	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1791	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1792	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1793	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1794	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1795	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1796	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1797	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1798	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1799	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1801	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1802	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1803	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1805	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1806	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1807	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1808	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0%
1809	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	1.5	0.1%
1810	20	1	20	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	20.0	1.9%
1811	71	3	88	1	1	0	1	0	1	89.0	7.3%
1812	79	24	143	8	3	5	0.5	1	0.5	148.5	12.1%
1813	9	14	138	2	4	3	3	0.5	3	144.0	12.0%
1814	51	24	165	5	4	4	3.5	3	3.5	172.5	14.6%
1815	168	85	248	5	7	2	1.5	3	2	252.0	22.6%
1816	43	62	229	5	3	4	2	2.5	1.5	234.5	21.5%
1817	35	45	219	3	3	4	1	1.5	1	224.0	21.1%
Total	477	258		29	25		13	12			

Note: ^a The birth and death columns labeled "50% in-group" count each individual mission-born child that has only one Wappo or Patwin parent as 0.5

persons; ^b The "Year end total" column includes whole persons from the "Tribally born" and "100% In Group Mission Descendants" year end counts, along with total "half persons" from the "50% In group" year end counts.

Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.

Marriage # and Date	Status	Baptismal #	Date of Baptism	Sex	Spanish Personal Name	Date of Death	Parent's Group and Language
Family 1							
FR-M 1257 06/02/1810	husband	FR-B 3211	10/11/1805		Barsabas	-	Huchium Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 3833	12/12/1809		Maria Guadalupe	03/10/1834	Carquin Karkin Costanoan
	child	FR-B 4412	08/15/1811	M	Mariano de la Asuncion	09/15/1813	
	child	FR-B 4850	07/21/1814	M	Barsabas	07/09/1816	
	child	FR-B 5690	06/09/1817	F	Columba	09/19/1818	
	child	FR-B 5841	12/11/1819	F	Mercuria	06/18/1822	
	child	FR-B 6484x	03/01/1825	M	Antonio	03/07/1825	
	child	FR-B 6488	01/24/1826	F	Antonia	-	
	child	FR-B 6529	04/26/1830	M	Juan de la Cruz	-	
Family 2							
FR-M 1276 10/01/1810	husband	FR-B 2175	03/03/1801		Pantaleon	-	Huchium Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 3830	12/12/1809		Caridad	-	Carquin Karkin Costanoan
	child	FR-B 4422	09/23/1811	F	Tecla	01/19/1814	
	child	FR-B 4746	06/13/1813	F	Antonia de Padua	06/16/1813	
	child	FR-B 4897	10/15/1814	M	Calixto	03/16/1816	
	child	FR-B 5698	07/21/1817	F	Liberata	-	
	child	FR-B 5871	04/17/1820	M	Feliciano [alias Felix]	11/08/1836	
	child	FR-B 6463	02/28/1823	M	Tomas	-	
	child	FR-B 6485	03/07/1825	M	Domingo	-	
	child	FR-B 6499	03/20/1827	F	Andrea	10/26/1850	
	child	FR-B *	-	F	Josefa	04/14/1831	
Family 3							
FR-M 1514 09/07/1813	husband	FR-B 3102	02/28/1805		Tiberio	-	Guaulen Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 4272	04/13/1811		Toribia	05/12/1829	Omiomi Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 5678	05/03/1817	F	Josefa de la Cruz	05/09/1817	
	child	RA-B 205	10/25/1818	M	Fruto	-	
	child	RA-B 326	10/27/1819	M	Serafino	07/21/1821	
	child	FR-B 6393	04/06/1822	M	Francisco Antonio	-	
	child	FR-B 6482	08/01/1824	M	Bernardo	08/14/1824	
Family 4							
FR-M 1604 07/13/1815	husband	FR-B 189	10/22/1780		Miguel Jacobo	-	Huchium Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 3840	12/12/1809		Columba	11/26/1833	Carquin Karkin Costanoan
	child	FR-B 5715	09/11/1817	F	Jacinta	11/20/1817	
	child	FR-B 5828	10/14/1819	M	Juan Nepomuceno	10/20/1819	
	child	FR-B 5917	05/18/1821	M	Crispin	-	
	child	FR-B 6484	01/14/1825	M	Francisco Solano	10/16/1826	
Family 5							
FR-M 1685 01/09/1817	husband	FR-B 3072	11/10/1804		Faustino	10/08/1826	Huchium Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 2697	03/05/1803		Saula	-	Olema Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 5768	05/26/1818	F	Urbana	05/31/1818	
	child	FR-B 5844	12/29/1819	M	Juan Evangelista	-	
	child	FR-B 6331	11/21/1821	F	Maria Eulalia	11/30/1821	
	child	FR-B 6474	07/22/1823	F	Antonia	08/14/1823	
	child	FR-B 6490	03/23/1826	M	Benito Carranza	11/20/1827	
Family 6							
FR-M 1698 02/08/1817	husband	FR-B 4482	04/03/1812		Paulino	07/05/1837	Omiomi Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 3409	07/14/1807		Lucia	-	Olemolouque Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 5795	11/26/1818	M	Pedro de Alexandria	11/27/1818	
	child	FR-B 5887	06/24/1820	F	Wilibrorda	-	
	child	FR-B 6479	02/04/1824	M	Jose Antonio	-	

(continued)

Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.

Marriage # and Date	Status	Baptismal #	Date of Baptism	Sex	Spanish Personal Name	Date of Death	Parent's Group and Language
Family 7							
FR-M 1729	husband	FR-B 3172	09/23/1805		Zoylo Guaica	-	Huchiun Bay Costanoan
03/11/1817	wife	FR-B 4267	04/13/1811		Lamberta Joboc	-	Omiomi Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 5894	10/03/1820	F	Francisca	10/03/1820	
	child	FR-B 6389	03/05/1822	F	Maria Antonia	03/09/1822	
	child	FR-B 6465	03/26/1823	M	Teodorico	03/26/1823	
	child	FR-B 6512x	06/06/1828	M	Fernandino	04/22/1828	
	child	FR-B 6532x	06/06/1831	M	Jose	04/19/1834	
	child	FR-B 7058	12/25/1836	F	Maria Francisca	-	
Family 8							
FR-M 1768	husband	FR-B 3747	07/03/1809		Evoelio	-	Carquin Karkin Costanoan
04/27/1818	wife	JO-B 0218	10/12/1799		Maria del Pilar	-	Saclan Bay Miwok
	child	FR-B 6451	09/12/1822	F	Manuela	09/19/1822	
	child	FR-B 6483	11/15/1824	F	Francisca	-	
	child	FR-B 6506	01/10/1828	M	Francisco Solano	05/16/1829	
	child	FR-B 7014	07/26/1834	F	Maria Cristina	10/23/1830	
	child	FR-B 7052	09/17/1836	M	Crescenciano	07/31/1834	
	child	FR-B 7123	04/07/1840	M	Jose Florentino	-	
Family 9							
FR-M 1769	husband	FR-B 1292	05/02/1793		Francisco de las Llagas	-	Accsagis Bay Costanoan
04/27/1818	wife	FR-B 3839	12/12/1809		Benita	03/15/1842	Huchiun-Aguasto Bay Costanoan
	child	FR-B 5808	03/18/1819	F	Salvadora	09/13/1819	
	child	FR-B 5885	06/12/1820	F	Antonia de Padua	-	
	child	FR-B 6458	10/26/1822	F	Francisca	07/01/1828	
	child	FR-B 6501	05/14/1827	M	Jose de los Reyes	-	
	child	FR-B 6522	06/05/1829	M	Jose Antonio	-	
	child	FR-B 6533	06/07/1831	F	Maria Presentación Carmen	-	
Family 10							
FR-M 1775	husband	FR-B 2661	02/22/1803		Nestor	-	Olema Coast Miwok
05/09/1818	wife	FR-B 3988	05/15/1810		Maxima	11/12/1838	[unknown] Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 5867	03/16/1820	F	Maria Manuela	-	
	child	FR-B 6470	06/10/1823	M	Felipe Santiago	-	
	child	FR-B 6493	08/08/1826	F	Maria Antonia	-	
Family 11							
FR-M 1789	husband	FR-B 2135	02/13/1801		Juan Nepomuceno	05/30/1841	Huchiun Bay Costanoan
11/13/1818	wife	FR-B 3674	02/18/1809		Carlota	-	West Marin Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 5839	12/02/1819	M	Tomas	12/07/1819	
	child	FR-B 5904	01/04/1821	M	Jose Oriol	01/09/1821	
	child	FR-B 6400	07/15/1822	F	Maria Encarnacion	07/23/1822	
	child	FR-B 6477	01/18/1824	M	Francisco Antonio	-	
	child	FR-B 6495	12/06/1826	F	Maria Teresa Jesus	-	
	child	FR-B 6515	12/01/1828	M	Miguel	08/21/1832	
	child	FR-B 6993	07/31/1833	M	Jose Ygnacio Refugio	-	
	child	FR-B 7111	01/26/1839	F	Paula	01/29/1839	
Family 12							
FR-M 1792	husband	FR-B 3847	12/23/1809		Ranulfo	-	Carquin Karkin Costanoan
11/13/1818	wife	FR-B 3823	12/09/1809		Magna	-	Carquin Karkin Costanoan
	child	FR-B 5836	11/29/1819	M	Diego	07/20/1841	
	child	FR-B 6466	03/27/1823	F	Antonia	-	
	child	FR-B 6525	03/14/1830	F	Margarita de Cortona	10/02/1835	
	child	FR-B 7007	04/14/1834	F	Maria Tiburcia	04/19/1834	
	child	FR-B 7050	06/24/1836	F	Margarita	07/04/1836	

(continued)

Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.

Marriage # and Date	Status	Baptismal #	Date of Baptism	Sex	Spanish Personal Name	Date of Death	Parent's Group and Language
Family 13							
FR-M 1796 01/19/1819	husband	FR-B 410	01/30/1785		Pablo Ramos	-	Baja Calif./Yelamu Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 4051	10/22/1810		Barbara	-	
	child	FR-B 5897	11/05/1820	F	Catarina Eulalia	11/11/1820	
	child	FR-B 6471	07/06/1823	F	Maria Basilia Carmen	11/09/1824	
	child	FR-B *		F	Engracia	06/12/1826	
	child	FR-B 6500	04/28/1827	M	Jose Trinidad	-	
	child	FR-B 6523	06/12/1829	M	Jose Antonio Ramon	-	
Family 14							
FR-M 1799 01/19/1819	husband	FR-B 0340	01/14/1784		Hilario	11/09/1830	Yelamu Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 4265	04/13/1811		Antusa	-	
	child	FR-B 5878	05/17/1820	M	Pasqual	09/20/1820	
	child	FR-B 6327	12/11/1821	M	Francisco	-	
	child	FR-B 6482	09/03/1824	F	Dominga	-	
	child	FR-B 6508	01/20/1828	F	Juana Valesia	03/11/1846	
	child	FR-B 6517	05/07/1829	M	Luis	05/05/1829	
	child	FR-B 6527	06/24/1830	M	Juan Bautista [alias Pedro]	06/30/1830	
	child	FR-B 6528	06/24/1830	F	Rosalia [alias Paula]	06/24/1830	
Family 15							
FR-M 1807 06/09/1819	husband	FR-B 4017	06/30/1810		Juan de Prado	-	Huchiun-Aguasto Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 3737	06/29/1809		Paulina	07/13/1834	
	child	FR-B 5880	05/26/1820	M	Ysidro	08/28/1820	
	child	FR-B *		M	Jose Antonio	04/30/1828	
	child	FR-B 6502	05/28/1827	M	Salvador de Horta	-	
	child	FR-B 6521	05/08/1829	M	Salvador	05/18/1829	
	child	FR-B *		F	Maria Benvenuta	08/18/1834	
Family 16							
FR-M 1815 08/17/1819	husband	FR-B 2729	05/31/1803		Sabel	-	Aguasto Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 4169	03/07/1811		Tomasa de Aquino	08/23/1838	
	child	FR-B 6475	07/25/1823	F	Francisca Paula	-	
	child	FR-B 6497	01/14/1827	M	Agapito	02/20/1828	
Family 17							
FR-M 1821 01/22/1820	husband	FR-B 5852	01/22/1820		Genobio	12/05/1830	Ululato Patwin
	wife	FR-B 5855	01/22/1820		Genobia	04/01/1832	
	child	FR-B 6461	11/05/1822	F	Venancia	-	
	child	FR-B 6494	11/04/1826	M	Jose Antonio	-	
Family 18							
FR-M 1828 05/18/1820	husband	FR-B 3310	02/22/1806		Teodorico [at RA in 1830s]	-	Huimen Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 4166	03/02/1811		Aloia	-	
	child	FR-B 5902	12/18/1820	F	Maria Expectacion	04/21/1823	
	child	FR-B *		F	Francisca	12/01/1824	
	child	FR-B 6481	03/06/1824	F	Catarina	-	
Family 19							
FR-M 1848 11/13/1820	husband	FR-B 0553	09/25/1786		Pedro Alcantara	-	Cotegen Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 5025	03/02/1815		Crisanta	04/26/1843	
	child	FR-B *		M	Antonio	12/18/1825	
	child	FR-B *		F	Feliciana Valois	03/16/1830	
	child	FR-B 6504	05/30/1827	M	Fernandino [Bernardino]	-	
	child	FR-B 6524	03/14/1830	F	Maria de la Cruz	-	
Family 20							
FR-M 1963 10/15/1821	husband	FR-B 861	10/31/1790		Elisio	-	Puichon Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 3319	03/04/1806		Sincretica	12/31/1838	
	child	FR-B 6401	07/17/1822	M	Francisco Antonio	11/17/1822	
	child	FR-B 6482	10/01/1824	M	Alexandro	10/12/1824	
	child	FR-B 6496	12/02/1826	F	Maria de la Concepcion	-	
	child	FR-B 6503	05/20/1827	F	Maria Josefa	-	

(continued)

Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.

Marriage # and Date	Status	Baptismal #	Date of Baptism	Sex	Spanish Personal Name	Date of Death	Parent's Group and Language
Family 21							
FR-M 2001 06/22/1823	husband	FR-B 1434	11/15/1794		Celso	08/14/1844	Huchiun Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 4805	03/27/1814		Petronila	12/08/1842	Tolenas Patwin
	child	FR-B 6489	02/13/1826	M	Leandro	04/04/1826	
	child	FR-B 6511	02/20/1828	F	Petra Alexandrina	05/04/1829	
	child	FR-B 6516	05/01/1829	F	[name missing in entry]	-	
	child	FR-B 7042	11/24/1835	M	Ponsiano Clemente	-	
	child	FR-B 7121	07/02/1839	F	Ysabel de la Visitacion	10/20/1840	
Family 22							
FR-M 2004 02/09/1824	husband	FR-B 4900	12/09/1814		Ambrosio	-	Chucuyen Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 4625	12/21/1812		Cirila	04/03/1831	Chucuyen Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 6486	07/04/1825	M	Rafael	07/14/1825	
	child	FR-B 6498	02/04/1827	F	Antonia	-	
Family 23							
FR-M 2005 02/24/1824	husband	FR-B 0518	03/17/1786		Aniceto	-	Yelamu Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 4453	01/26/1812		Agustina [alias Justina]	-	Suisun Patwin
	child	FR-B 6510	02/04/1828	F	Rafaela	-	
	child	FR-B 6518	05/08/1829	F	Perpetua	05/08/1829	
	child	FR-B *-*		M	Tomas	01/30/1832	
	child	FR-B 6991	06/08/1832	F	Maria Trinidad Refugio	-	
	child	FR-B 7045	01/09/1836	M	Apolinario	01/13/1836	
	child	FR-B *-*		F	Ygnacia	02/19/1837	
	child	FR-B 7077	01/08/1838	M	Julian	01/12/1838	
Family 24							
No record abt 1825	husband	FR-B 3432	08/12/1807		Teofilo	08/16/1844	Olema Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 3766	07/04/1809		Teotima	-	Chupcan Bay Miwok
	child	FR-B 6487	01/15/1826	M	Jose Salvador	-	
	child	FR-B 6512	04/04/1828	M	Jose Guadalupe	-	
Family 25							
No record abt 1826	husband	FR-B 0853	10/31/1790		Evencio	-	Puichon Bay Costanoan
	wife	FR-B 2076	06/25/1800		Geronima	-	Saclan Bay Miwok
	child	FR-no entry	abt 1826	M	Pedro [20 at marriage in 1846]	-	
	child	FR-B 6509	01/21/1828	F	Manuela	-	
	child	FR-B 6520	05/13/1829	M	Francisco Solano	-	
	child	FR-B 6526	03/16/1830	F	Maria Ygnacia	-	
	child	FR-B 7028	02/12/1835	M	Felipe de Jesus	-	
	child	FR-B 7091	06/07/1838	M	Bonifacio	-	
	child	FR-B 7131	11/15/1840	M	Lucas	02/24/1844	
	child	FR-B 7169	03/02/1844	M	Jose de Jesus	-	
Family 26							
FR-M 2022 08/01/1827	husband	FR-B 1817	03/16/1795		Domiciano	11/23/1838	Huimen Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 4487	04/03/1812		Tecla	-	West Marin Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 6513	06/20/1828	M	Francisco de Paula	-	
	child	FR-B 6534	03/14/1832	F	Maria Gertrudis	-	
	child	FR-B 7093	06/14/1838	M	Feliciano	-	
Family 27							
FR-M 2028 06/14/1830	husband	FR-B 5003	03/01/1815		Remigio	12/04/1842	Suisun Patwin
	wife	FR-B 4068	12/02/1810		Estefana [alias Luisa]	-	Chupcan Bay Mwk/Suisun Patwin
	child	FR-B 6530	04/28/1831	F	Maria de Jesus	-	
	child	FR-B 6535	06/01/1832	F	Maria del Rosario	-	
Family 28							
No record abt 1831	husband	FR-B 2535	12/17/1802		Eloy	11/28/1838	Huimen Coast Miwok
	wife	FR-B 4265	04/13/1811		Antusa	-	Omioni Coast Miwok
	child	FR-B 6998	10/06/1833	F	Maria Francisca	10/12/1833	
	child	FR-B 7092	06/14/1838	F	Emiliana	07/04/1841	

(continued)

Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.

Marriage # and Date	Status	Baptismal #	Date of Baptism	Sex	Spanish Personal Name	Date of Death	Parent's Group and Language
Family 29							
CR-M 786 04/12/1833	husband wife	CR-B 1837 CR-B 1640	10/11/1820 12/14/1816		Francisco Borja [al. Llagas] Maria Concepcion		Tomoi Mutsun Uypi Awaswas Cst Tejey Yokuts
	child	CR-B 2222	06/08/1834	M	Jose Felix		
	child	CL-B 10294	03/25/1843	M	Jose Encarnacion		
	child	CR-B 2706	06/12/1844	M	Joaquin de la Cruz		
	child	FR-B 7227	08/23/1847	F	Maria Jesus de Gracia		
	child	CL-B 11055	07/27/1851	M	Jose de Refugio		
	child	FR-B 7362	12/19/1853	F	Maria Manuela	01/11/1853	
	child	FR-B 7396	03/26/1855	F	Maria Estefana		
Family 30							
FR-M 2137 01/23/1838	husband wife	FR-B 4999? FR-B 5861	03/01/1815 02/07/1820		Samuel [at SFS in 1820s] Siriaca [at SFS in 1820s]		Suisun Patwin Saclan Bay Miwok
	child	FR-B 7095	07/22/1838	F	Maria Magdalena		
	child	JO-B 7756	11/22/1839	F	Maria Regina Ludovina		
	child	FR-B 7142	06/03/1841	M	Andres		
Family 31							
FR-M 2143 03/12/1840	husband wife	FR-B 2437 FR-B 4453	05/19/1802 01/26/1812		Prudencio Faustina [Agustina]	05/03/1850	Huchium Bay Costanoan Suisun Patwin
	child	CL-B 10238	06/28/1842	F	Juana Rita		
	child	FR-B 7230	08/31/1847	M	Jose Crisanto		
Family 32							
FR-M 2147 02/17/1841	husband wife	FR-B 2729 JO-B not identified	05/31/1803		Sabel Bernarda		Habasto Coast Miwok [unknown]
	child	FR-B 7162	02/12/1843	F	Maria Hilaria	10/01/1844	
	child	FR-B *		M	Cipriano	10/01/1844	
Family 33							
FR-M 2148 04/17/1841	husband wife	FR-B 5844 FR-B 6499	12/29/1819 03/20/1827		Juan Evangelista of Family 5 Andrea of Family 2	10/26/1850	Huch. Bay Cost./Olema C. Miwok Huch. Bay Cost./Carq. Karkin Cst
	child	FR-B 7166	03/22/1843	F	Maria Benventura		
	child	FR-B 7209	06/13/1846	M	Jose Domingo	04/11/1855	
Family 34							
CL-M 2797 04/18/1843	husband wife	FR-B 6504 CL-B 8599?	05/30/1827 12/28/1833		Bernardino Alcantara-Fam. 1 Mariana [alias Maria]		Cotegen Bay Cost./Suisun Patwin "Tulares" (Albisu household)
	child	CL-B 10361	11/13/1843	F	Juana	11/16/1843	
	child	FR-B 7231	09/19/1847	M	Jose Francisco		
	child	CL-B 11071	11/16/1851	F	Maria Crisanta		
	child	FR-B 7371	03/17/1854	F	Maria Refugio Aniceta	12/20/1854	
	child	FR-B -	04/05/1858	M	Espiridion		
	child	FR-B -	04/22/1862	F	Maria		
Family 35							
Not found in 1840s	husband wife	not identified not identified			Jose Raymundo Maria Ignacia		[unknown] [unknown]
	child	FR-B 7203	06/07/1846	M	Jose de los Santos		
	child	FR-B 7261	10/25/1849	M	Jose Silvestre		
Family 36							
CL-M 2874 02/12/1846	husband wife	FR-B 6477 FS-B 1324	01/18/1824 06/14/1835		Francisco Antonio of Fam. 11 Marina		Huchium Bay Cost./Coast Miwok Ollatoy [Patwin or Nisenan]
	child	FR-B 7255	03/04/1849	M	Jose Francisco		
	child	FR-B 7316	04/14/1852	M	Jose Francisco		
Family 37							
FR-M 2157 06/20/1846	husband wife	FR-B 6507 RA-B 1924	01/12/1828 03/04/1840		Juan Agustin Maria Raymunda Guadalupe		Saclan/Chupcan Bay Miwok Satiyomi [Pomo]
	child	FR-B 7228	08/23/1847	M	Juan Bautista		
	child	FR-B 7300	10/07/1851	M	Felipe Jesus Isidro	10/02/1852	
	child	FR-B 7380	07/19/1854	M	Jose Antonio Guadalupe		
	child	FR-B -	01/07/1857	M	Juan Agustin		

(continued)

Table F14. Mission Dolores Nuclear Families with Two or More Children during the 1820s through 1850s.

Marriage # and Date	Status	Baptismal #	Date of Baptism	Sex	Spanish Personal Name	Date of Death	Parent's Group and Language
Family 38							
FR-M 2162 12/17/1846	husband wife	FR-no entry FS-B 1166	abt 1826 06/13/1834		Pedro Evencio of Family 25 Pastora		Puichon Bay Cost./Saclan Miwok Churuptoy Patwin
	child	FR-B 7310	05/25/1852	F	Maria Benita		
	child	FR-B 7425	02/23/1856	F	Maria Jesus Brigida		
	child	FR-B *	07/04/1858	M	Pedro Domingo		
	child	FR-B *	08/03/1862	F	Catarina Angelisum		
Family 39							
Not found in 1840s	husband wife	not identified not identified			Jose Isidro Maria del Refugio		[unknown] [unknown]
	child	FR-B 7236	11/22/1847	F	Maria Diluvina Trinidad		
	child	FR-B 7290	04/20/1851	F	Ysidora		
Family #0							
Not found in 1840s	husband wife	FR-B 1946? FR-B 6532?	05/04/1798 05/01/1832		Juan Diego Maria del Rosario of Fam. 27		Saclan Bay Miwok Suisun Patwin/Chupcan Miwok
	child	FR-B 7248	10/14/1848	F	Maria Fortunata		
	child	FR-B 7263	04/15/1850	F	Maria Francisca Teresa		
	child	FR-B 7315	04/14/1852	M	Maria de Dolores	03/28/1853	
	child	FR-B 7368	03/10/1854	F	Maria Dolores		
Family #1							
FR-M 2178 02/23/1849	husband wife	CR-B 1998 CR-B not identified	04/28/1822		Jose Juvenal Maria Bernarda		Partacsi Bay Costanoan [unknown]
	child	CL-B 10938	09/04/1849	M	Jose Francisco		
	child	FR-B 7299	10/06/1851	M	*		

Note: *Asterisk indicates an infant recorded in the Mission Dolores death register without having been recorded in any baptismal register.

Table F15. Mission Dolores Costanoan and Bay Miwok Descendants who moved to other Missions, together with their Families, as of 1834 (in age order by family head).

Family Member Name	Relationship	Age	Baptism #	Baptism Date	Local Tribe and Language	Date of Recorded Death
AT MISSION CARMEL						
Respicio	husband	46	SFR-B 985	11-11-1791	Quiroste SF Bay Costanoan parents	no info
Ynes Socosta	wife	52	SCA-B 664	1-30-1782	Rumsen Rumsen parents	no info
Tiburcio	husband	27	SFR-B 3996	5/29/1810	Chupcan Bay Miwok father/Suisun Patwin mother	
Maria Rosario Liberata	wife	15	SCA-B 3146	11/9/1819	Rumsen Rumsen parents	
AT MISSION SANTA CRUZ						
David Santana	husband	48	SCR-B 0413	2-16-1795	Sayanta Awaswas	Not checked
Josefa Patrocinio	wife (2nd marriage)	23	SFR-B 4307	5-5-1811	Aramai SF Bay Costanoan father/Huchiun SF Bay Cost. mother	None
Eulogio	son by 1st husband	8	SCR-B 2096	3-9-1826	Mision Cotoni Awaswas father	Not checked
Benito Abad	son by 1st husband	6	SCR-B 2134	3-21-1828	Mision Cotoni Awaswas father	Not checked
Gaudiosa	dgthtr by 1st husband	4	SCR-B 2163	3-8-1830	Mision Cotoni Awaswas father	Not checked
Juan Diego	son by 1st husband	2	SCR-B 2192	11-12-1832	Mision Cotoni Awaswas father	Not checked
Juan	son of this couple	0	SCR-B 2227	10-23-1834	Mision	Not checked
AT MISSION SAN JOSE						
Crispin	widower	52	SFR-B 3324	3-7-1806	Julpun Bay Miwok	SJO-D 4-26-1837
Anastacia	daughter	20	SJO-B 3645	12-23-1817	Mission	Not found
Moyses	dgthtr's husband	23	SJO-B 3613	11-24-1817	Passasime Yokuts	SJO-D 12-17-1840
Bruno	widower	51	SFR-B 3151	8-22-1805	Volvon Bay Miwok	SJO-D 9-13-1838
Pedro Antonio	son	12	SFR-B 6398	6-3-1822	Mission	Not found
Peregrino	husband	41	SFR-B 4354	5-22-1811	Chupcan Bay Miwok	SJO-D 1-10-1837
Gelasia	wife	48	SJO-B 5445	1-10-1826	Ululato Patwin	SJO-D 3-23-1837
Yvon	husband	47	SJO-B 0327	8-22-1800	Tuibun SF Bay Costanoan	None
Efrena	wife (2nd marriage)	37	SJO-B 2842	01-15-1815	Napa Patwin	None
Liberato	son by 1st husband	15	SJO-B 4084	12-11-1819	Mision - Jalquin bilingual father [SFR-B 2322]	None
Efrena	dgthtr by 1st husbd	2	SJO-B 6658	6-17-1832	Mision - Jalquin bilingual father [SFR-B 2322]	None
Nicolas	husband ^a	45	SFR-B 4355	5-22-1811	Chupcan Bay Miwok father/Suisun Patwin mother	Not found
Agueda	wife ^a	30	SFS-B 45	4-17-1824	Ululato Patwin	Not found
Zenobio	husband	38	SFR-B 3144	7-2-1805	Volvon Bay Miwok	Not found
Eudocia	wife	29	SJO-B 1607	3/13/1808	Cholbon Yokuts	Not found
Francisco	son	11	SJO-B 4635	9/22/1823	Mission	
Placida	daughter	5	SJO-B 6027	4/6/1829	Mission	
Pastor	husband	38	SJO-B 1237	10-4-1804	Ssaoan SF Bay Costanoan	none
Gertrudis	wife	28	SFR-B 3763	7-3-1809	Carquin Karkin	12-9-1838 at JO
Jacome	husband	37	SFR-B 3249	11/4/1805	Chupcan Bay Miwok	
Lucia	wife	30	SFR-B 6207	6/16/1821	Suisun Patwin	
Coleto	husband	32	SJO-B 3694	1/24/1818	Julpun Bay Miwok	Not found
Maria Rosario	wife	19	SFR-B 5190	10/1/1815	Tatcan Bay Miwok	SJO-D 9-23-1845 (Sn. Lorenzo)
Rosalia	daughter	2	SJO-B 6698	5/29/1833	Mission	
Maximo	husband	32	SFR-B 3993	5/29/1810	Chupcan Bay Miwok	Not found
Nabora	wife	22	SJO-B 6281	12/30/1830	Ochejamne Plains Miwok	SJO-D 3-18-1835
Roberto	husband	30	SFR-B 4209	3/28/1811	Chupcan Bay Miwok father/Suisun Patwin mother	
Norberta	wife	21	SJO-B 6262	12/29/1830	Ochejamne Plains Miwok	

(continued)

Table F15. Mission Dolores Costanoan and Bay Miwok Descendants who moved to other Missions, together with their Families, as of 1834 (in age order by family head).

Family Member Name	Relationship	Age	Baptism #	Baptism Date	Local Tribe and Language	Date of Recorded Death
Enrique	husband	25	SFR-B 4022	7/16/1810	Saclan Bay Miwok	Not found
Eufasia	wife	20	SJO-B 2739	9/12/1814	Tuibun SF Bay Costanoan father/Josmite Yokuts mother	SJO-D 10-12-1838
Tadeo	son	4	SJO-B 6175	10/28/1830	Mision	SJO-D 8-5-1835
Eufasia	daughter	2	SJO-B 6681	3/23/1833	Mision	SJO-D 8-11-1836
Salvio	widower	73	SFR-B 2319	11-28-1801	Jalquin SF Bay Costanoan/Bay Miwok	
Pelagio	widower	60	SFR-B 2940	2/13/1804	Tatcan Bay Miwok	SJO-D 8-30-1841
Benigno	widower	58	SFR-B 2312	11-28-1801	Seunen SF Bay Costanoan father, Jalquin bilingual mother	
Segundo ^b	widower	54	SFR-B 2927	2/8/1804	Tatcan Bay Miwok	SFR-D 12-14-1838 ^a
Cancio	widower	52	SFR-B 2376	2-12-1802	Jalquin SF Bay Costanoan/Bay Miwok	None
Jacinto	widower	47	SFR-B 4104	1/12/1811	Chupcan Bay Miwok	SJO-D 12-13-1836
Maria Asencion	orphan	13	SFR-B 6322	8-16-1821	Mission-Jalquin bilingual father, Chupcan Bay Miwok mother	None
AT MISSION SAN FRANCISCO SOLANO						
Odorico	husband	61	SFR-B 2317	11-28-1801	Jalquin SF Bay Costanoan/Bay Miwok	None
Maria Rosario	wife	39	SFR-B 5962	6-15-1821	Ululato Patwin	None
Joaquin	husband	48	SFR-B 5516	9-23-1816	Alaguali Coast Miwok	Not found
Sebastiana	wife (3rd marriage)	51	SFR-B 3804	12-1-1809	Saclan Bay Miwok	Not found
Francisca Xavieria	dgtr by 1st husband	19	SFR-B 5032	3-11-1815	Mission - Carquin Karkin Costanoan father [SFR-B 3803]	Not found
Francisco Pule	dgtr's husband	21	SFS-B 133	8-14-1825	Libayto Patwin	Not found
Juan Pablo	grandson	3	SFS-B 820	9-3-1831	Mission	Not found
Ciriaca	dgtr by 2nd husb.	14	SFR-B 5861	2-7-1820	Mission - Saclan Bay Miwok father [SFR-B 1555]	Not found
Adriano	dgtr's husband	26	SFR-B 3775	8/28/1809	Carquin Karkin Costanoan	1-1-1836 at FS
Petronio	husband	35	SFR-B 5099	4-25-1815	Suisun Patwin	
Emerenciana	wife (2rd marriage)	42	SFR-B 4475	4-3-1812	Tolena Patwin	
Petra Regalada	dgtr by 1st husband	19	SFR-B 5114	5-13-1815	Mission - Carquin Karkin Costanoan father [SFR-B 3895]	
Delfino	son by 1st husband	7	SFS-B 377	11-14-1827	Mission - Carquin Karkin Costanoan father [SFR-B 3895]	
Emerencia	dgtr by 1st husband	4	SFS-B 628	1-12-1830	Mission - Carquin Karkin Costanoan father [SFR-B 3895]	
Cesario	husband	49	SFR-B 1835	4-8-1795	Huchiun SF Bay Costanoan father/Carquin Karkin mother	to be researched
Germana	wife	26	SRA-B 0679	5-10-1822	Huiluc Wappo	to be researched
Pablo	husband	31	SFR-B 3735	6/29/1809	Huchiun Agosto SF Bay Costanoan	to be researched
Josefa	wife	14	SFS-B 009	4/4/1824	Malaca Patwin	
Felipe Benicio	husband	26	SFR-B 4871	8/22/1814	Carquin Karkin Costanoan	
Magna	wife	25	SFS-B 261	11/11/1826	Aloquiome Wappo/Lake Miwok	
Cira	widow ^c	49	SFR-B 3812	12/1/1809	Carquin Karkin Costanoan	

Note: ^a Nicolas and Agueda married at Mission San Jose on May 16, 1831 [SJO-M 1917]; ^b Segundo's child died at Mission San Jose in 1829 and his wife died at at Mission San Jose in 1830; ^c Cira's Mission Dolores second husband, Cayetano [SFR-B 3849] died at San Francisco Solano in 1824 and her daughter Petra Bautista [SFR-B 5214] died at San Francisco Solano in 1828, after which time no more is known about Cira.

Table F16. Hispanic-California Indian Marriages at Central California Missions between 1773 and 1840.

Marriage Record	Marriage Date	Husband			Wife			Comment on Progeny	
		Baptismal Record	Name	Home Group	Baptismal Record	Name	Home Group		
<u>Mission San Francisco Solano [also 351 Indian-only and 6 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
FS-M 0018	01/09/1825	CR-B	unknown	Robles, Jose Rafael	Razon-Branciforte	FR-B 4179	Leandra	Baja/Saclan Miwok Parents	not followed
<u>Mission San Rafael [also 592 Indian-only and 6 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
No Hispanic-Indian marriages									
<u>Mission Dolores [also 1,978 Indian-only and 83 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
FR-M 0014	04/08/1779	no data		Olbera, Diego	Razon Queretero, Mex.	FR-B 0063	Josefa Maria	Yelamu SF Bay Costanoan	No children
FR-M 0065	10/31/1783	no data		Ramos, Jose	Razon-Tulancingo, Mex.	FR-B 0095	Francisca Xaviera	Aramai SF Bay Costanoan	1 chld, gndchldn
FR-M 0102	01/05/1786	no data		Valencia, Jose Manuel	Razon	FR-B 0061	Maria Rosa	Jalquin SF Bay Cost./Miwok	No children
FR-M 0508	06/25/1795	no data		Higuera, Ygnacio	Razon	FR-B 0102	Maria Soledad	Ureburi SF Bay Costanoan	No children
FR-M 0999	11/06/1805	no data		Barbosa, Jose Anacleto	Razon	FR-B 0102	Maria Soledad	Ureburi SF Bay Costanoan	No children
FR-M 1047	09/29/1806	no data		Aguilar, Jose Antonio	Razon	FR-B 0102	Maria Soledad	Ureburi SF Bay Costanoan	No children
FR-M 1506	07/08/1813	CA-B 659		Garcia, Felipe	Razon-Sinaloa parents	JO-B 0897	Maria Ygnacia	Ssouyen SF Bay Costanoan	3 children, gndchldn
<u>Mission San Jose [also 2,401 Indian-only and 18 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
JO-M 2379	01/07/1840	no data		Benites, Francisco	Razon-Jalisco	JO-B 7495	Fabiana Ortega	Sicomne Nisenan	not followed
<u>Mission Santa Clara [also 2,486 Indian-only and 222 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
CL-M 1713	05/17/1815	CL-B 3870		Atanasio	Matalan SF Bay Costanoan	FR-B 0262	Amesquita, Maria Petra	Razon-widow with childrn	1 chld, died young
CL-M 1860	02/09/1819	CL-B 0498		Miguel	Tamien SF Bay Costanoan	CA-B 0674	Saens, Felipa	Razon	2 chld, died young
CL-M 1917	07/17/1820	CL-B 4101		Alexandro	Matalan SF Bay Costanoan	BU-B unk.	Vasquez, Mariana	Razon-SF Bay Cstnn mother	1 chld, died young
CL-M 1931	10/18/1820	CL-B 3036		Apelio	Matalan SF Bay Costanoan	CL-B 3927	Gonzalez, Maria Dolores	Razon-Rumsen Cstnn gmthr	1 chld, died young
CL-M 1932	10/18/1820	CL-B 4221		Miguel Antonio	Matalan SF Bay Cost.	CL-B 5332	Gonzales, Ramona	Razon-Rumsen Cstnn gmthr	no children
CL-M 2660	11/21/1836	no data		Garcia, Jose Higinio	Razon-Guadalajara	CL-B 8442?	Maria Pantaleon	India Adoptiva	not followed
CL-M 2730	05/25/1839	CL-B 6530		Vasquez, Juan Cristobal	Razon Tamien mother	JO-B unknown	Magdalena	India Adoptiva	not followed
<u>Mission Santa Cruz [also 826 Indian-only and 19 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
CR-M 0061	03/03/1794	no data		Azebes, Jose	Razon	CR-B 0140	Feliciana Savedra	Uypi Awaswas Costanoan	not followed
CR-M 0062	03/03/1794	no data		Vizcarra, Jose Cruz	Razon	CR-B 0073	Columba	Uypi Awaswas Costanoan	not followed
<u>Mission San Juan Bautista [also 1,144 Indian-only and 66 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
JB-M 1075	02/16/1836	no data		Gonzalez, Francisco	Razon Mexico	JB-B 2633	Agueda	Mutsun Costanoan	1 child at SJB
JB-M 1088	01/30/1837	no data		Arellano, Francisco	probably Mexico	JB-B unknown	Maria Refugio	not found	not followed
JB-M 1109	04/06/1838	no data		Vargas, Jose	Razon Mexico	JB-B 1204	Felipa	Mutsun Costanoan	1 child at SJB
<u>Mission Carmel [also 871 Indian-only and 216 Razon-only marriages]</u>									
CA-M 180 ^a	05/20/1773	no data		Butron, Manuel	Razon	CA-B 0032	Margarita Dominguez	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	many chldn, gndchldn
CA-M 181 ^a	05/20/1773	no data		Arus, Domingo	Razon	CA-B 0069	Maria Serafina Verdugo	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	3 children, not flwed
CA-M 182 ^a	05/20/1773	no data		Yorba, Antonio	Razon	CA-B 0099	Maria Gracia Feliz	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	3 children, at least
CA-M 183 ^a	05/20/1773	no data		Camacho, Tomas Maria	Razon	CA-B 0082	Tecla Maria	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	2 children, at least
CA-M 0049	02/28/1775	no data		Altamirano, Jose Tiburcio	Razon-Guadalaxara	CA-B 0301	Agueda Josefa	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	no children
CA-M 0050	02/28/1775	no data		Gonzalez, Jose Maria	Razon-Europe/Baja	CA-B 0287	Antonina Josefa	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	1 child, not followed

(continued)

Table F16. Hispanic-California Indian Marriages at Central California Missions between 1773 and 1840.

Marriage Record	Marriage Date	Husband			Wife			Comment on Progeny
		Baptismal Record	Name	Home Group	Baptismal Record	Name	Home Group	
CA-M 0089	09/10/1776	no data	Lopez, Cosme	Razon-California	CA-B 0143	Escolastica Maria	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	no children
CA-M 0154	05/08/1780	no data	Espinosa, Jose Joaquin	Razon-Sinaloa	CA-B 0029	Catalina Maria Islas	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	1 child, died young
CA-M 0197	09/30/1782	no data	Alegre, Antonio Maria	Razon Genova	CA-B 0029	Catalina Maria Islas	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	1 child, not followed
CA-M 0290	03/02/1785	no data	Ybarra, Ramon	Razon-Rio Alamo	no data	Maria del Carmen	Yuma India ^b	none in Nor. Calif.
CA-M 0334	04/25/1786	no data	Villela, Marcos	Razon-Tecuache	CA-B 0173	Viridiana Maria Carrillo	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	chldn, many gndchldn
CA-M 0387	07/26/1789	no data	Montero, Manuel	Razon-Presidio	GA-B unknwn	Regina Toipurina	Japshim Tongva ^c	not followed
CA-M 0405	12/01/1790	no data	Caribay, Jose Vcnte Gnz	Razon	CA-B 0063	Maria Beatriz	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	3 chldn, not followed
CA-M 0528	04/01/1796	BA-B unknwn	Vasquez, Jose Antonio	Razon-Presidio	CL-B 338	Maria Leocadia	Ritocsi SF Bay Costanoan	many chldn, gndchldn
CA-M 0529	05/03/1796	no data	Tapia, Jose Francisco	Razon-Presidio	CA-B 2088	Maria Jesus	Nutka [Canada] ^d	not followed
CA-M 0563	04/24/1798	no data	Lugo, Jose Loreto	Razon-Presidio	CA-B 0764	Veneranda Maria	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	not followed
CA-M 0927	09/07/1824	no data	Mendoza, Demetrio	Razon-Guadalajara	CA-B 2753	Estefana	Ensen+ Rumsen Rmsn Cstnn.	not followed
CA-M 1001	11/26/1830	no data	Garcia, Jose Dolores	Razon-Rumsen gmthr	JB-B 2035?	Ysidora	Ausaima Mutsun Costanoan	not followed
CA-M 1044	08/15/1833	no data	Rodrigues, Santiago	Razon Zacatecas	CA-B 3175	Maria Jesus Felicidad	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	not followed
CA-M 1105	11/02/1839	no data	Tapia, Eduardo	not found	SO-B unknwn	Maria Gracia	Soledad-not found	not followed
<u>Mission Soledad [also 701 Indian-only and 6 Razon-only marriages]</u>								
SO-M 50	03/03/1795	no data	Flores, Jose Bernardino	Razon	SO-B 0129	Luisa Isquis	Immunajan Esselen	not followed
SO-M 153	07/27/1800	no data	Morales, Francisco	Razon-Tepic	CA-B 1110	Maria Rosa	Rumsen Rumsen Costanoan	not followed
SO-M 399	04/06/1838	no data	Olivera, Martin	Razon-Los Angeles	SO-B 0128	Josefa Carpintero	Chalon Cstnn/Eslenajan Essln	not followed

Note: (Mission register citations have been shortened by removal of the initial "S" in the interests of saving space in this table). ^a Four Hispanic-Indian marriages at Mission San Carlos in 1773 were added to the Marriage Register out-of-order in 1782; ^b Maria del Carmen in SCA-M 290 immigrated from the Colorado River; ^c Regina Toipurina in SCA-M 387 had been a resistance leader at Mission San Gabriel; ^d Maria Jesus of SCA-M 529 was the only person who married in California among a number of Nootka people brought down from Vancouver Island.

Table F17. Reconstructed Census of 202 Indian People Who May Have Been Alive at Mission Dolores in 1834
(sorted by geographical area, language, tribal versus mission, and local tribe).

Ego's Group	Unique I.D.	Birth Year	Spanish Name	Father's I.D.	Father's Group	Mother's I.D.	Mother's Group
SAN FRANCISCO BAY COSTANOAN – PENINSULA HOMELAND							
Tribally-born Person							
Accsagis	FR1024	1786	Simon				
Cotegen	FR1023	1784	Felipe Jesus de	FR1278	Cotegen	FR1279	Cotegen
Oljon	FR0565	1776	Eladio	FR0595	Oljon	FR0679	Quiroste
Oljon	FR0728	1782	Rosendo Alexos				
Lamchin	FR0906	1782	Proceso				
Lamchin	FR0892	1784	Liborio	FR1233	Lamchin	FR1250	Lamchin
Lamchin	FR0825	1786	Constantino				
Lamchin	FR0798	1787	Facundo	FR0801	Lamchin	FR0802	Lamchin
Puichon	FR0896	1781	Daniel				
Puichon	FR0897	1783	Donato				
Puichon	FR0861	1785	Elisio	FR1175	Puichon	FR1256	Puichon
Ssalson	FR0199	1760	Mariano			FR0480	Ssalson
Ssalson	FR0493	1782	Yreneo [Ynes-M]	FR1174	Ssalson	FR0807	Ssalson
Yelamu	FR0242	1781	Dionisio	FR0348	Yelamu	FR0354	Yelamu
(Peninsula-Bay)	FR0853	1786	Evencio	FR1231	Ssalson	FR1248	Ssalson
(Penins-Coast)	FR1292	1789	Francisco Llagas de	FR1308	Penins-Coast	FR1321	Penins-Coast
San Francisco Bay Costanoan – both parents from the Peninsula							
Mision	FR0518	1786	Aniceto	FR0371	Yelamu	FR0372	Yelamu
Mision	FR0553	1786	Pedro Alcantara	FR0534	Cotegen	FR0535	Yelamu
Mision	FR1172	1793	Dimas	FR0505	Ssalson	FR0647	Ssalson
Mision	FR1922	1797	Jose Saturnino	FR0596	Oljon	FR0964	Oljon
Mision	FR2076B	1800	Maria Carmen de	FR1290	Penins-Coast	FR0359	Mision
Mision	FR3218	1805	Juan Santos de los	FR0734	Oljon	FR0919	Penins-Coast
San Francisco Bay Costanoan Descendent – Peninsula on father's side							
Mision	FR5340	1816	Andrea Espiritu de	FR0093	Aramai	FR0191	Huchiun
Mision	FR5672	1817	Basilisa	FR0853	Penins-Bay	FR2747	Huchiun
Mision	FR5666	1817	Apolonia	FR0728	Oljon	FR4689	Costa
Mision	FR5754	1818	Manuel Assencion de	CL2159	S. Bernardino	FR2499	Carquin
Mision	FR5869	1820	Matea	FR0853	Penins-Bay	FR2747	Huchiun
Mision	FR5885	1820	Antonia Padua de	FR1292	Penins-Coast	FR3839	Huch.-Aguasto
Mision	FR5859	1820	Maria Carmen de	FR0906	Lamchin	FR2503	Olema
Mision	FR6327	1821	Francisco	FR0340	Mision [Yelamu]	FR4265	Costa
Mision	FR6482	1824	Dominga	FR0340	Mision [Yelamu]	FR4265	Costa
Mision	FR6496	1826	Maria Concepcion de	FR0861	Puichon	FR3319	Tatcan
Mision	FR6503	1827	Maria Josefa	FR0861	Puichon	FR3319	Tatcan
Mision	FR6501	1827	Jose Reyes de los	FR1292	Penins-Coast	FR3839	Huch.-Aguasto
Mision	FR6509	1828	Manuela	FR0853	Penins-Bay	FR2076A	Mision [Saclan]
Mision	FR6520	1829	Francisco Solano	FR0853	Penins-Bay	FR2076A	Mision [Saclan]
Mision	FR6522	1829	Jose Antonio	FR1292	Penins-Coast	FR3839	Huch.-Aguasto
Mision	FR6526	1830	Maria Ygnacia	FR0853	Penins-Bay	FR2076A	Mision [Saclan]
Mision	FR6533	1831	Maria Presentacin Crmn	FR1292	Penins-Coast	FR3839	Huch.-Aguasto
SAN FRANCISCO BAY COSTANOAN – EAST BAY HOMELAND							
Tribally-born Person							
Huchiun	FR2197	1771	Venerando				
Huchiun	FR1448	1776	Crispiniano				
Huchiun	FR1637	1776	Serapion				
Huchiun	FR0189	1778	Miguel Jacobo	FR1048	Huchiun-Sth	FR0482	Huchiun-Sth
Huchiun	FR1417	1784	Andres Avelino	FR1501	Huchiun-Sth	FR1512	Huchiun-Sth
Huchiun	FR1426	1784	Ceciliano				
Huchiun	FR1069	1787	Juan Damaceno	FR1108	Huchiun-Sth	FR1109	Huchiun-Sth
Huchiun	FR1434	1787	Celso				
Huchiun	FR2175	1787	Pantaleon	FR2205	Huchiun-Nth	FR2217	Huchiun-Nth
Huchiun	FR1070	1789	Remigia	FR1108	Huchiun-Sth	FR1109	Huchiun-Sth
Huchiun	FR1429	1790	Manuel Yguira	FR1066	Huchiun-Sth	FR1521	Huchiun-Sth

(continued)

Table F17. Reconstructed Census of 202 Indian People Who May Have Been Alive at Mission Dolores in 1834 (sorted by geographical area, language, tribal versus mission, and local tribe).

Ego's Group	Unique I.D.	Birth Year	Spanish Name	Father's I.D.	Father's Group	Mother's I.D.	Mother's Group
Huchiun	FR1408	1791	Agrito	FR1480	Huchiun-Sth	FR1493	Huchiun-Sth
Huchiun	FR2769	1794	Neofito	FR2849	Huchiun-Nth	FR2851	Huchiun-Nth
Huchiun	FR1912	1796	Melquias	FR1642	Huchiun-Sth	FR1667	Huchiun-Sth
Huchiun	FR2135	1797	Juan Nepomuceno	FR2201	Huchiun-Nth	FR2213	Huchiun-Nth
Huch-Aguasto	FR3254	1771	Paterno	FR1631	Huchiun-Sth		
Huch-Aguasto	FR3921	1775	Barbea				
Huch-Aguasto	FR3655	1779	Guillermo			FR3942	Abasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR3211	1789	Barsabas	FR3197	Huch-Aguasto	FR3198	Huch-Aguasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR4017	1790	Juan Prado de			FR3815	Huch-Aguasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR3807	1793	Concordio				
Huch-Aguasto	FR3839	1793	Benita	FR3855	Huch-Aguasto	FR3921	Huch-Aguasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR2788	1795	Senen	FR2829	Huch-Aguasto	FR2839	Huch-Aguasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR3171	1796	Barbato	FR3203	Huch-Aguasto	FR3204	Huch-Aguasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR3172	1797	Zoylo	FR3240	Huch-Aguasto	FR3241	Huch-Aguasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR2768	1799	Lulo	FR2832	Huch-Aguasto	FR2842	Abasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR3733	1805	Protasio	FR1647	Huchiun-Sth		
Huch-Aguasto	FR3612	1807	Adriano	FR3254	Huch-Aguasto	FR3633	Abasto
Huch-Aguasto	FR3734	1807	Prudencio	FR3654	Huch-Aguasto		
Huch-Aguasto	FR4143	1807	Teodosio	FR2829	Huch-Aguasto	FR4262	Napa
Huch-Aguasto	FR4144	1809	Tadeo	FR2829	Huch-Aguasto	FR4262	Napa
San Francisco Bay Costanoan – both parents from the Easy Bay							
Mision	FR2268	1801	Clara		[incognito]	FR2130	Huchiun-Nth
Mision	FR2346	1802	Guido	FR1396	Huchiun-Sth	FR1527	Huchiun-Sth
Mision	FR2437	1802	Prudencio	FR1158	Huchiun-Sth	FR1161	Huchiun-Sth
Mision	FR5680	1817	Pedro Antonio	FR1426	Huchiun-Sth	FR2150	Huchiun-Nth
Mision	FR6375	1822	Pablo	FR1426	Huchiun-Sth	FR2150	Huchiun-Nth
Mision	FR5886	1820	Eutropia	FR2788	Huch-Aguasto	FR2268	Mision
Mision	FR6480	1824	Jose	FR2788	Huch-Aguasto	FR2268	Mision
San Francisco Bay Costanoan Descendent – East Bay on father's side							
Mision	FR4413	1811	Luisa Epimenia	FR3654	Huch-Aguasto	FR3869	Carquin
Mision	FR4832	1814	Manuel	FR2769	Huchiun-Nth	FR1353	Mision [Yelamu]
Mision	FR5521	1816	Gregorio Taumaturgo	FR3654	Huch-Aguasto	FR3869	Carquin
Mision	FR5698	1817	Liberata	FR2175	Huchiun-Nth	FR3830	Carquin
Mision	FR5844	1819	Juan Evangelista	FR3072	Huchiun-Nth	FR2697	Olema
Mision	FR5827	1819	Maria Egipciana	FR1290	Penins-Coast	FR4099	Suisun
Mision	FR5892	1820	Rutilio	FR0611	Huchiun-Sth	FR3626	Omiomi
Mision	FR5871	1820	Feliciano [Felix*]	FR2175	Huchiun-Nth	FR3830	Carquin
Mision	FR5917	1821	Crispin	FR0189	Huchiun-Sth	FR3840	Carquin
Mision	FR6463B	1823	Tomas	FR2175	Huchiun-Nth	FR3830	Carquin
Mision	FR6477	1824	Francisco Antonio	FR2135	Huchiun-Nth	FR3674	Costa
Mision	FR6485	1825	Domingo	FR2175	Huchiun-Nth	FR3830	Carquin
Mision	FR6495	1826	Maria Teresa Jesus	FR2135	Huchiun-Nth	FR3674	Costa
Mision	FR6488	1826	Antonia	FR3211	Huch-Aguasto	FR3833	Carquin
Mision	FR6499	1827	Andrea	FR2175	Huchiun-Nth	FR3830	Carquin
Mision	FR6502	1827	Salvador Horta	FR4017	Huch-Aguasto	FR3737	Carquin
Mision	FR6504	1827	Fernandino	FR0553	Mision	FR5025	Suisun
Mision	FR6510	1828	Rafaela	FR0518	Mision	FR4453	Suisun
Mision	FR6508	1828	Juana Valesia	FR0340	Mision	FR4265	Costa
Mision	FR6523	1829	Jose Antonio Ramon	FR0410	Baja Mision	FR4051	Omiomi
Mision	FR6529	1830	Juan Cruz de la	FR3211	Huch-Aguasto	FR3833	Carquin
Mision	FR6531	1831	Maria Jesus de	FR2437	Mision [Huchiun]	FR5991	Ululato
Mision	FR6532	1831	Antonia	FR1408	Huchiun-Sth	FR3840	Carquin
Mision	FR6991	1833	Maria Trinidad Rfgo	FR0518	Mision	FR4453	Suisun
Mision	FR6993	1833	Jose Ygnacio Refugio	FR2135	Huchiun-Nth	FR3674	Costa

(continued)

Table F17. Reconstructed Census of 202 Indian People Who May Have Been Alive at Mission Dolores in 1834
(sorted by geographical area, language, tribal versus mission, and local tribe).

Ego's Group	Unique I.D.	Birth Year	Spanish Name	Father's I.D.	Father's Group	Mother's I.D.	Mother's Group
KARKIN COSTANOAN							
Tribally-born Person							
Carquin	FR3869	1779	Laurentina			FR3881	Carquin
Carquin	FR3830	1783	Caridad	FR3856	Carquin	FR3866	Carquin
Carquin	FR3806	1784	Magina				
Carquin	FR3821	1785	Maura	FR3913	Carquin	FR3914	Carquin
Carquin	FR3847	1785	Ranulfo				
Carquin	FR3823	1787	Magna	FR3918	Carquin		
Carquin	FR3747	1802	Evoio	FR3911	Carquin	FR3912	Carquin
Carquin	FR3742	1806	Luciana				
Karkin Costanoan Descendants – both sides							
Mision	FR5836	1819	Diego	FR3847	Carquin	FR3823	Carquin
Mision	FR6466	1823	Antonia	FR3847	Carquin	FR3823	Carquin
Mision	FR6525	1830	Margarita Cortona	FR3847	Carquin	FR3823	Carquin
Karkin Costanoan Descendants – father's side							
Mision	FR6394	1822	Josefa	FR3887	Carquin	FR4953	Caymos
Mision	FR6483	1824	Francisca	FR3747	Carquin	JO0218	Saclan
COAST MIWOK							
Tribally-born Person							
Abasto	FR2816	1785	Pacomia			FR2815	Abasto
Abasto	FR3633	1786	Micaelina				
Abasto	FR2038	1789	Quintino	FR2735	Abasto	FR2738	Abasto
Abasto	FR2557	1792	Rufina	FR2600	Abasto	FR2605	Abasto
Abasto	FR2534	1794	Ajuto	FR2550	Abasto	FR2554	Abasto
Abasto	FR2729	1795	Sabel	FR2735	Abasto	FR2738	Abasto
Abasto	FR2760	1795	Parmenas	FR2824	Abasto	FR2834	Abasto
Alaguali	FR5442	1796	Lugarda				
Chocoayco	FR5563	1812	Eustaquio	FR5614	Chocoayco	FR5626	Chocoayco
Costa	FR4265	1789	Antusa				
Costa	FR4487	1796	Tecla			FR4730	Costa
Costa	FR3674	1803	Carlota	FR3711	Costa	FR3712	Costa
Costa	FR3988	1803	Maxima				
Costa	FR3670	1806	Albaro	FR3689	Olemoloque	FR3690	Olemoloque
Echatamal	RA0015	1813	Juan Evangelista	RA0442	Echatamal	RA0443	Echajutti
Guaulen	FR2580	1778	Melitona			FR3549	Guaulen
Guaulen	FR3236	1799	Romualda	FR2826	Abasto	FR3125	Guaulen
Huimen	FR1817	1788	Domiciano	FR4859	Huimen	FR1834	Huimen
Huimen	FR2535	1796	Eloy	FR2550	Abasto	FR2554	Abasto
Libantone	FR3425	1767	Revocata				
Libantone	FR3432	1795	Teofilo			FR3430	Libantone
Olema	FR2697	1790	Saula	FR2517	Abasto	FR2520	Marin
Olema	FR2661	1799	Nestor	FR2699	Guaulen	FR2706	Olema
Olemoloque	FR3702	1779	Atanasia	FR3684	Olemoloque	FR3685	Olemoloque
Olemoloque	FR3409	1801	Lucia	FR3424	Libantone	FR3425	Libantone
Olemoloque	FR3906	1804	Marino Jose	FR3684	Olemoloque	FR3685	Olemoloque
Olompali	FR5250	1813	Juan Mata	JO3519	Olombali	JO3443	Olombali
Omiomi	FR4234	1775	Fabian				
Omiomi	FR4288	1781	Zacarias				
Omiomi	FR4240	1783	Pacomio				
Omiomi	FR4267	1789	Lamberta	FR4323	Omiomi	FR4333	
Omiomi	FR4482	1798	Paulino			FR4481	Omiomi
Omiomi	FR4051	1803	Barbara	FR4883	Omiomi	FR4088	Omiomi
Omiomi	FR4169	1807	Tomasa Aquino	FR4158	Omiomi		
Xotoncohui	RA0101	1798	Juana Nepomucena				

(continued)

Table F17. Reconstructed Census of 202 Indian People Who May Have Been Alive at Mission Dolores in 1834
(sorted by geographical area, language, tribal versus mission, and local tribe).

Ego's Group	Unique I.D.	Birth Year	Spanish Name	Father's I.D.	Father's Group	Mother's I.D.	Mother's Group
Coast Miwok Descendent – both parents							
Mision	FR2427	1802	Francisco	FR2100	Huimen	FR2102A	Huimen
Mision	FR5735	1818	Policarpo	FR2486	Huimen	FR3229	Olema
Mision	FR5887	1820	Wilibronda	FR4482	Omiomi	FR3409	Olemoloque
Mision	FR6454	1822	Jose Antonio	FR2633	Abasto	FR2740	Abasto
Mision	FR6475	1823	Francisca Paula de	FR2729	Abasto	FR4169	Omiomi
Mision	FR6479	1824	Jose Antonio	FR4482	Omiomi	FR3409	Olemoloque
Mision	FR6491	1826	Victorino	FR2535	Huimen	JO3253	Alaguali
Mision	FR6493	1826	Maria Antonia	FR2661	Olema	FR3988	Costa
Mision	FR6514	1828	Ysabel	FR4113	Omiomi	FR2697	Olema
Coast Miwok Descendent – father's side							
Mision	FR6487	1826	Jose Salvador	FR3432	Libantone	FR3766	Chupcan
Mision	FR6512	1828	Jose Guadalupe	FR3432	Libantone	FR3766	Chupcan
BAY MIWOK							
Tribally-born Person							
Chupcan	FR3928	1770	Gabriel				
Chupcan	FR4013	1774	Yndalecio				
Chupcan	FR3934	1776	Arsenia				
Chupcan	FR3249	1797	Jacome	FR3078	Chupcan	FR3080	Chupcan
Chupcan	FR3766	1801	Teotima	FR3930	Chupcan	FR3931	Chupcan
Chupcan	FR4010	1804	Juan Bautista	FR2993	Carquin	FR3934	Chupcan
Chupcan	FR4068	1808	Estefania	FR4100	Chupcan	FR4101	Suisun
Saclan	FR1559	1754	Heliodoro				
Saclan	FR1729	1782	Troyana				
Saclan	FR1538	1793	Crispin [Crispo at M]	FR1557	Saclan	FR1575	Saclan
Saclan	FR1946	1795	Juan Diego	FR1548	Saclan	FR1566	Saclan
Saclan	JO0218	1799	Maria Pilar del			FR?	
Saclan	FR2067	1800	Torquata	FR1558	Saclan	FR1576	Saclan
Tatcan	FR2927	1780	Segundo				
Tatcan	FR3319	1797	Sinletica	FR3369	Tatcan	FR3370	Tatcan
Volvon	FR3339	1788	Afra	FR3356	Volvon	FR3357	Volvon
Bay Miwok Descendent – both parents							
Mision	FR2076A	1800	Geronima	FR1548	Saclan	FR1566	Saclan
Mision	FR5213	1816	Juliana	FR2926	Tatcan	FR1758	Saclan
Mision	FR5716	1817	Mariano Natividad	FR1531	Saclan	FR3319	Tatcan
Mision	FR6467	1823	Maria Josefa	FR1721	Saclan	FR1729	Saclan
Mision	FR6507	1828	Juan Agustin	FR1649	Saclan	FR4068	Chupcan
PATWIN							
Tribally-born Person							
Suisun	FR4099	1785	Susana				
Suisun	FR5025	1804	Crisanta			FR5156	Suisun
Suisun	FR4927	1808	Maria Expectacion	FR4343	Suisun	FR5101	Suisun
Suisun	FR4453	1810	Agustina	FR4510	Tolenas	FR4511	Suisun
Suisun	FR5003	1811	Remigio	FR5120	Suisun	FR5121	Suisun
Suisun	FR4923	1812	Columbano	FR4343	Suisun	FR5101	Suisun
Ululato	FR5991	1803	Josefa Calasans				
Ululato	FR6207	1804	Lucia				
Ululato	FR6263	1814	Antonia	FRH6263		FS0057	Ululato
Ululato	FR6428	1817	Lorenza				
Ululato	FR6437	1817	Eulalia				
Ululato	FR6225	1819	Francisca	FS0044	Ululato	FS0045	Ululato
Patwin Descendent – both parents							
Mision	FR6373	1822	Afra	FR5944	Ululato	FR5984	Ululato

(continued)

Table F17. Reconstructed Census of 202 Indian People Who May Have Been Alive at Mission Dolores in 1834 (sorted by geographical area, language, tribal versus mission, and local tribe).

Ego's Group	Unique I.D.	Birth Year	Spanish Name	Father's I.D.	Father's Group	Mother's I.D.	Mother's Group
<i>Patwin Descendent – father's side</i>							
Mision	FR6530	1831	Maria Jesus de	FR5003	Suisun	FR4068	Chupcan
Mision	FR6535	1832	Maria Rosario de	FR5003	Suisun	FR4068	Chupcan
<i>WAPPO – All Tribally Born</i>							
Caymos	FR4805	1808	Petronila			FR4953	Caymos
Caymos	FR6042	1810	Andrea	FR6098	Caymos	FR6163	Caymos
Huiluc	FR6051	1811	Hilario	FR6082	Huiluc	FR6147	Huiluc
<i>POMO – All Tribally Born</i>							
Gualomi	RA0761	1813	Maria Cruz de			RA0806	Gualomi
Gualomi	RA0873	1814	Maria Angeles de	RA0880	Gualomi	RA0881	Lupuyomi