

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

The Alliklik-Tataviam Problem

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/18q392zq>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 4(2)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Hudson, Travis

Publication Date

1982-12-01

Peer reviewed

The Alliklik-Tataviam Problem

TRAVIS HUDSON

There is nothing that will stimulate the flow of vital body juices, energize the enervator, activate the sale of obsolete topographical maps, or drive the town librarian balmy, quite so quickly as a lost mine.

—Charles Outland (1969:41)

SO begins Outland's description of "The Lost Padres' Mine," a story mixed with fact and fable of gold and silver deposits scattered about the rugged country from the junction of Piru and Lockwood creeks in Ventura County to well down San Emigdio Creek in Kern County. But this is not the only mystery to shroud this region, nor to "stimulate the flow of vital body juices," and "drive the town librarian balmy." One need only to ask: Who were the people that occupied the upper valley of the Santa Clara River and the rough country extending northward into the vicinity of Tejon Pass and to what language group or groups did they belong?

In recent years, three *Journal* articles have focused upon these very complex and frustrating questions of ethnic boundaries and linguistic identities (Bright 1975; Beeler and Klar 1977; Johnson 1978) that were, as one anonymous reviewer commented to an earlier draft of this paper, "canonized" in a *Handbook* article (King and Blackburn 1978). After reading these papers and listening to discussions in crowded hotel rooms during anthropological meetings, my conclusion is to simply paraphrase the late Winston Churchill:

Travis Hudson, Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History,
2559 Puesta del Sol Rd., Santa Barbara, CA 93105.

Never have so few written so much about so little to confuse so many.

Not wishing to see such confusion continue, it is my purpose here to attempt to clarify what is known from what is assumed, what is explicit from what is implicit, and what the limited data at hand currently support in the way of hypotheses on who these people were and what language they spoke. Since the nature of the problem focuses upon linguistic identities and ethnic boundaries, the organization of this paper will follow accordingly.

LINGUISTIC IDENTITIES

Ataplili'ish

There was a time when ignorance was bliss, and in the case of the Alliklik-Tataviam problem, that period was between 1912 and 1925. Collecting spotty data in 1912 and publishing it three years later, Kroeber (1915) came to the conclusion that an Uto-Aztecan language, which he called *Ataplili'ish*, was spoken from Piru to Soledad Canyon (Los Angeles County) and over much of the upper Santa Clara Valley. His information was based upon attributing two utterances to this language, given to him by his Kitanemuk-speaking consultant Juan José Fustero, and upon the statement made by his consultant that some of his grandparents had spoken this now-extinct language (Bright 1975:228).

The term, however, was found by Kroeber to be too general, since *Ataplili'ish* was not only the Ventureño Chumash name for the Gabrielino, but also for other Shoshoneans as

well (Kroeber 1925:621; Bright 1975:228). It is perhaps possible that Kroeber learned of the generalness of his term from Harrington sometime between 1915 and 1925, for the latter's early field notes refer to it. From Ventureño consultant Fernando Librado, Harrington recorded *'At'aplili'ish* as meaning "easterner" and referring to the Fernandeano, Gabrielino, and Kitanemuk, while from Chumash consultant José Juan Olivas, the name is said to refer only to the Fernandeano and Gabrielino. A Barbareño consultant, Luisa Ygnacio, used the term *'Aluplishlish* to denote Shoshoneans living to the east (Harrington n.d.). Regardless of how Kroeber came about the information, he elected to rename his Uto-Aztecan as Alliklik.

Alliklik

The new name was by far more specific and just what Kroeber wanted. Alliklik, he noted (1925:614), was the Ventureño name for a Shoshonean group occupying the upper Santa Clara River. Harrington may have been behind Kroeber's selection of this term, for we again find it in his early notes, the meaning given as "grunters," and in typical Harrington style, the request of his various consultants to translate "Pujadores" or "Grunters" into their own languages. Ineseño Chumash consultant María Solares came up with *'alliklikini*, while a Ventureño consultant (whose name was abbreviated Sil.) provided *'alakiwon*. Another consultant, perhaps Fernando Librado, said he had heard of a tribe at Newhall called Ararara; "they talked with 'r' but are now dead" (Harrington n.d.).

Van Valkenburgh (1935:3-4) had his own consultants and still another opinion. The inhabitants of Saugus, Newhall, and the Little Santa Clara River region were not, according to him, a distinctive Shoshonean group, but Fernandeanos. "Although known to the Ventureño as *I'at'apalliklik*, or 'grunters,' Juan José Fustero alias Lugo had mislead Kroeber."

Thus, with limited data, Kroeber, Harrington, and Van Valkenburgh had come to the conclusion that the eastern neighbors of the Ventureño Chumash were Uto-Aztecan in speech, though it remained impossible to determine much more than that.

But then came the discovery of an unpublished vocabulary collected by C. Hart Merriam with the heading "Santa Inez Chumash and Alliklik Chumash"; regrettably, however, this critical document lacked information as to source, date, or place. Working with the vocabulary presented, and under the assumption that the tribal identification as "Alliklik" was correct, Beeler and Klar (1977:296) concluded that "it was closely related to, if not identical with, the Ventureño [Chumash] branch of that family." Two other assumptions were made: (1) based upon loan words from other tribes, the language had to be spoken in the upper valley of the Santa Clara River as far north as Castac Lake, the valley of Pastoria Creek, and into the southern San Joaquin—a distance of nearly 100 miles (Beeler and Klar 1977:296, 299); and (2) that verification of the Alliklik as Chumashan speakers can be based upon the use of the term *Cuabajai* by Franciscan explorer-missionary Francisco Garcés for residents of the Tejon area which were similar in "dress," "cleanliness of the women," and were traders with those of the Santa Barbara Channel Chumash (Beeler and Klar 1977:300).

It is well at this point to look at the assumptions made behind this mysterious word list. First, one may ask who this consultant of Alliklik may have been, especially since their extremely important information was apparently missed by two careful scholars searching the same area, Kroeber and Harrington. Obviously, if the consultant's identity were known, it would help to resolve another question: Is the "Alliklik" vocabulary actually representative of speakers who once resided east of the Ventureño Chumash, or is

it a mislabeled Ventureño word list?

Perhaps some insight into answering this question can be gained by examining other Merriam materials which pertain to his research among the Chumash and their neighbors. For example, he does hint that he collected Chumash language and placename data from two different consultants while he was at Tejon in November of 1905. One consultant was named Nancy, and she provided data on San Emigdio, which Merriam noted was like that of Santa Barbara. The other language mentioned is that of Ventura, and in a discussion on the Kas-tak (Castac) Chumash, Merriam also recorded that they were nearly the same as at Ventura (Heizer 1966: 429-438). Since one of the two vocabularies published by Beeler and Klar (1977: 287-296) does correspond with Merriam's published reference to San Emigdio consultant "Nancy," it may very well be that the second vocabulary came from his Ventureño speaker, and specifically that of Castac Chumash. If this is the case, then it would be expected that the mysterious second vocabulary has a number of Ventureño Chumash words! Moreover, since the consultant was perhaps residing in the Tejon area, it would help to explain the loan words from other tribes in the region, a point which Beeler and Klar (1977: 296, 299) assumed as being a valid means to determine the territory over which the language was spoken, rather than the circumstances of the consultant's background and place of residence. This identification of consultant and location are important to evaluating the word list itself.

But there is yet another aspect of this word list which also requires attention, namely, how did it become identified with Alliklik? Perhaps some insight into this question can again come from a review of Merriam's work. We know, for example, that the term Alliklik replaced Kroeber's *Ataplili'ish* in 1925, and perhaps in his thinking even earlier.

But, it was not in use at the time Merriam was collecting data in the field from Tejon and Chumash consultants. This would suggest that Merriam picked up the term Alliklik some time after his fieldwork and perhaps as late as 1925, although it may have been as early as 1915 due to the possibility that he exchanged data with J. P. Harrington, with whom Merriam had a close relationship (Heizer 1966:4). Thus, it was probably added later. If the term was added before 1939, then one cannot help but wonder why Merriam did not include it in his map of California Indians. Although much in agreement with Kroeber's 1925 map, Merriam lists six Chumash groups, none of which is named Alliklik. In what would be Alliklik territory according to Kroeber, Merriam shows Shoshoneans, the westernmost being *Ketahn'-hah'-mwits* (Kitanemuk) (Heizer 1966:17, 21). Either Merriam had a rare and important Alliklik vocabulary which he had either forgotten or misplaced, or he had a vocabulary which he considered to be unrelated to the Alliklik problem at all.

I suspect the latter to have been the case, and speculate it would seem that around 1905 Merriam located two consultants in the Tejon who knew Chumashan languages. One of these was Nancy, who provided San Emigdio data, while the other was someone who knew Ventureño or Castac Chumash and provided the Alliklik portion of the second vocabulary. Could this mysterious consultant have been José Juan Olivas of the Tejon who spoke Castac Chumash? Whoever he or she was, Merriam treated the second vocabulary as being of no more importance than his other Chumash lists by his lack of considering it as a rare Alliklik vocabulary for a territory otherwise believed to be Uto-Aztecan in speech. Some time after 1939, he or someone else must have added the Alliklik identification, possibly because of a reference to Castac (Merriam's Kas-tak) and the belief that this was located within Alliklik territory.

This Castac Chumash connection relates in an interesting way with Beeler and Klar's third assumption, namely, that the Alliklik were Chumash based upon the historical reference by Francisco Garcés that the Cuabajai (or Quabajai) of the Tejon were similar to the people of the Santa Barbara Channel (Beeler and Klar 1977:300). Garcés had traveled through this now disputed ethnic territory in April, 1776. Although Kroeber (1907: 135-136; 1925:612) had rejected an extension of the term Cuabajai to the adjacent Chumash, Beeler and Klar (1977:300) suggested otherwise:

In the past some investigators (e.g., Kroeber) have questioned the equation of Cuabajai and Chumash; but in light of the evidence brought together in this paper, the notion that they were one and the same is all the more attractive.

Since the Garcés account, and the associated account of Pedro Font, are relevant to the Alliklik-Tataviam problem, it is well to go into them in some detail, especially in terms of the interesting changes in meaning and use the term Cuabajai received under the pens of these early missionary ethnographers.

Prior to de Anza's second expedition to California (1775-1776), the term Quabajai is unrecorded in the diaries of early explorers. It is also missing in the diaries and writings afterward. The term (with variant spellings Quabajay, Cuabajay, etc.) is restricted to the diaries of Pedro Font and Francisco Garcés who accompanied de Anza. To understand how the name came about, it is necessary to note certain points about the expedition and the subsequent relationship of these two priests.

After a long trek northward from Mexico, de Anza's party reached Yuma Junction on the Colorado River. Here, the two priests parted company, Font to continue on with de Anza to establish a colony at San Francisco, while Garcés moved off with his Mohave

Indian guides to find a possible route which could serve to link coastal California with far-off New Mexico and to identify and describe the native peoples with an eye turned toward their later conversion.

After nearly a year and several hundreds of miles of walking and riding, the two priests were once again reunited. The date was December 31, 1776, and the place was a Sonoran mission called Tabutama (Bolton 1933: viii-ix, 533-534). Garcés, who had already arrived, was busy with the long task of completing the diary of his travels, finishing in January, 1777 (Coues 1900:xiv, 58 n. 4). Font, however, needed time to convert the short diary kept during his trip into the much fuller account filled with "extension and clarification." He did not finish until May of that same year (Bolton 1933:533-534).

Having experienced so much in each other's absence, the two men had much to share. Recognizing their mutual responsibilities they set to work to produce a joint map of Alta California. Garcés described it as follows:

There accompanies this record a map made by Father Font with the greatest care and while I was at his side so that I might give him, in addition to the data herein, other information that should help to ensure its accuracy. [The map also includes] names of the Indian nations. . . . Some of these areal limits [for these nations] are *based only on the best judgement that could be made* [Galvin 1965:2; emphasis added].

The finished map is of importance here because it identified and located a "nation" known as the Quabajay in the region of present-day Santa Barbara. Another people, called the Benyeme, were placed in the Ventura area, while to the mountainous north still another group, the Cobaji are shown (Coues 1900:I: frontispiece, 251-252 n. 29; Bolton 1930:IV:534; Wagner 1937:II:344).

During the actual journey through the

Santa Barbara Channel in February of 1776, both Font and de Anza recorded their observations. Neither, however, mentioned a Quabajay, Benyeme, or Cobaji (Teggart 1913:53, 55; Bolton 1930:III: 106-110, 243-246). But when the expedition was completed and Font turned his attention to writing his expanded account, he added the following text under the date February 24, 1776 (Bolton 1933:250):

The Indians of the Channel are of the Quabajay tribe. They and the Beñeme have commerce with the Jamajab [Mohave] and others of the Colorado River, with their cuentas [shell money] or beads. . .

Taken at face value it would appear that the Indians of Santa Barbara were known as Quabajay. The statement, however, requires checking other sources for verification or clarification in order to remove unintentional human errors which confronted not only the original author but perhaps also a modern reader.

One obvious method of verification would be the discovery that the Chumash also called themselves Quabajay, but such is not the case. Making allowances for the absence of "b" or "v" sounds in Chumash (Quabajay), a search of the ethnic names presented in a number of sources on the Chumash (Heizer 1952, 1955; Kroeber 1925; Grant 1978; Harrington n.d.) reveal no correspondences.

Although we can find no Chumash counterpart for Font's Quabajay, it must be stressed that Font was a serious and dedicated scholar who would not intentionally have invented the term. To judge from its non-Chumash sound pattern, the name Quabajay could likely have originated from some other group and was applied by Font to the Chumash. In 1907 Kroeber (1907: 135-136; 1925:612) determined that this was indeed the case. The word Quabajay (or Quabajai, Cuabajai) comes from the Mohave term *Kuvahivima* (*Kuvahai* = Quabajai), the name given

by these Colorado River Indians to the Kitanemuk. Kroeber went on to add that the Mohave spoke of a *Kwiahta Hamakhava*, or "like Mohaves," as being somewhere within this region; they may have meant the Alliklik, although "there is no known fragment of evidence in favor of this belief." As for the other two names, Font's Benyeme (or Beñeme) was equated with the Mohave term for the Vanyume, while Cobaji applied perhaps to the Kawaiisu (Kroeber 1925:612).

Kroeber's findings bring up a most important question, how did Font come to apply a Mohave term for the Kitanemuk (or Castac Chumash?) to the Santa Barbara Channel people? The answer is found by tracing the association of Pedro Font and Francisco Garcés, and the diaries they produced.

When Garcés parted from Font and de Anza at the Colorado River, he picked up his Mohave guides for the long trek across California's eastern desert to San Gabriel, thence by way of the Tulare Valley back again to the river. The guides selected were well acquainted with much of the route, the Mohave having followed these trails in conducting trade—mentioned by Garcés—with the Chumash, Kitanemuk, and Gabrielino (Coues 1900: xiv, 243, 254, 257 n. 7, 265, 268). The Mohave connection to southern California is reasonably well known (Kroeber 1925:596; Forbes 1965:80-81; White 1974).

After leaving the river, Garcés encountered a group he called the Beñeme (Font's Benyeme and Kroeber's Vanyume) "nation," stating that "This nation is the same as that of San Gabriel, Santa Clara, and San Joseph" (Coues 1900:240). Santa Clara referred to the Santa Clara Valley located in Ventura County today, and within the territory which Kroeber assigned to his Shoshonean Alliklik (Kroeber 1925:613-614, 648).

Although anthropologists today recognize a number of ethnic groups speaking related

Uto-Aztecan languages within the region traveled by Garcés, he was himself faced with the unprecedented task of organizing information about these southern California peoples. Apparently, he relied upon similarities he observed in material culture, perhaps to some degree language and trade communication between groups, and upon what was told to him by his Mohave guides, who already had formulated a classification for their western neighbors.

After seeing such a variety of nations and learning about their friendships, wars, and trade . . . it seemed best to me . . . to give separate information about each of these nations, and joining together all the data that I have acquired, *to show the connection that some nations have with others* [Galvin 1965:2; emphasis added].

Garcés categorized these people as “nations” in the European sense of the meaning, and not upon the details of language and culture available to us today. In addition, to eliminate the problem of confusing and conflicting names already in use, he selected only a few—and as we have seen—Mohave ones.

Let it be borne in mind also that in the names I set down there may be variation, seeing that the Indians call by different names one and the same nation, as I have observed in the case of the Jamajabs [Mohaves] [Coues 1900:445].

Departing Mission San Gabriel with his Mohave and local Indian guides, Garcés headed northwest but skirted the eastern boundary of the Chumash and entered what he called Beñeme country in the Santa Clara Valley. On April 24th, while still in the valley, he wrote what might be expected in his developing tribal classifications:

The Indians were very affable, and the women cleaner and neater than any I had seen before of this same Beñeme nation. In the evening there came two Indians from the

north, *known to the Jamajabs* [Mohave] *by the name Cuabajay* [Coues 1900:269; Galvin 1965:44; emphasis added].

The text is important, for it not only tells us that the Cuabajay “nation” resided to the north of the Santa Clara Valley, but also that the name itself was given by his Mohave guides, just as Kroeber was able to determine more than a century and a half later. It might also be pointed out that Garcés considered the people of the Santa Clara Valley to belong to another of his groupings, the Beñeme, which also included the Vanyume and Gabrielino.

Garcés moved north out of the valley and soon reached the Tejon area, where he wrote:

I arrived at some rancherias of the Cuabajay nation. . . . There is much trading back and forth [between here and the Santa Barbara Channel Indians] *and perhaps these Indians belong to the same nation*; from what I hear, they are similar also in their dress and in the cleanliness of the women [Coues 1900:287; Galvin 1965:46-47; emphasis added].

On May 12th, Garcés began his descent out of the mountains heading toward the San Joaquin Valley, coming across another people which his Mohave guides called Cobaji (Kroeber’s Kawaiisu). These people, he wrote, spoke a different language from the Quabajais (= Cuabajay), as he now spelled the name (Coues 1900:271 n. 12, 304; Bolton 1930: I: 452).

In short, Garcés had recorded the names of Indian “nations” during his trek, while Font had not. Garcés had not traveled among the Santa Barbara Channel Chumash, but merely speculated that perhaps they also belonged to his Cuabajay “nation,” just as he had done in grouping together several Shoshonean groups under the term Beñeme. He reasoned connections and associations on the basis of material culture, and after his trip had ended and he began writing an expanded diary while staying at Tabutama, he wrote:

The same [connection] is related to me by those [probably Font] who had seen on the Canal [Santa Barbara Channel]. [They reported seeing] . . . people with the hair crisp and others who have it straight, that also have I seen myself; and the pointing out of their land toward the west would be for the island of Santa Cruz, which lies in this direction, though the discoverers could not discern this and others of the Canal, especially in a fog, as is now also the case. The tents which that relation [Font's diary] says they saw have connection with those which I saw of sewn tule among the Cobajais [Cuabajay or Cobaji?], of which I make mention in the Diary [Coues 1900:488-489].

Garcés doubtlessly wrote these words in January, 1777, when he was putting the finishing touches to his expanded diary and in the company of none other than Pedro Font, who was beginning his expanded diary and would not be finished for another five months (Coues 1900: xiv; Bolton 1933: 533-534). The two men exchanged valuable information; but from Garcés Font received the names and locations of Indian "nations" so that Font could add them to their joint map. Font also found time to read the completed diary of Garcés before he was to finish his; an example of this is an addition Font made to his diary of an event which ". . . is stated also by Father Garcés in his diary. . ." (Bolton 1933:469).

Can Beeler and Klar (1977:300) employ Garcés' use of the term Cuabajai as evidence that Alliklik was a Chumashan speech? The answer is no, unless we are willing to accept Mohave tribal classifications as being based on linguistic speech. As for the application of the term Cuabajai to the Santa Barbara Channel Chumash, Garcés wrote that "*perhaps* these Indians belong to the same nation." Months later when both priests worked together on their diaries and joint map, Font incorporated the names of Indian "nations" collected by Garcés, mapping them "on judgement." As would be expected, five months later when

Font completed his expanded diary, he also included the term Quabajay in his rewritten description on the Indians of the Santa Barbara Channel.

The Mohave identification of two peoples within the Santa Clara Valley area northward into the Tejon may, however, be valid, but it leaves us with yet another problem. If the Beñeme equate with Kroeber's Alliklik, who were the Cuabajai? Insight into this question requires examining two other tribal names proposed for this region, Tataviam and Castac Chumash.

Tataviam

In 1916, Harrington asked his Kitanemuk consultants if they had heard of a tribe called the "Pujadores," as he had done with other consultants which resulted in the term Alliklik. Though doubtful about it, they decided that the term must have referred to an extinct tribe which they called Tataviam, whose language was said to be entirely different from Ventureño Chumash or Kitanemuk. Harrington then provided Fustero's Alliklik words, and the consultants identified them as being Tataviam (Bright 1975:229). It is evident from this that the group east of the Ventureño Chumash and identified by Kroeber as Uto-Aztecan Alliklik were considered by Harrington's Kitanemuk consultants to have been the Tataviam (King and Blackburn 1978:537). Harrington (n.d.) linked the terms Alliklik and Tataviam together from his Ineseño Chumash consultant, María Solares, who translated Pujadores into Ineseño '*alliklikini*. Bright (1975:23) came to the tentative conclusion that the Tataviam were possibly a division of Takic speakers, "or perhaps it is the remnant, influenced by Takic, of a language family otherwise unknown in southern California."

A simple name change from Alliklik to Tataviam would seem to be in order, but such

was not to happen. While recognizing the term Tataviam as being applicable to a non-Chumashan group, Bright (1975:230) extended the term Alliklik to reflect a group of Chumashan speakers, obviously accepting Merriam's mysterious second vocabulary as indeed being representative of Alliklik speech. To make matters even more confusing, King and Blackburn (1978:537) assigned Merriam's Alliklik vocabulary as being that of Castac Chumash. Beeler and Klar (1977:301), however, rejected the notion that the term Alliklik should be replaced with Castac (or Castaceño or Kashtek) Chumash.

If it were not enough to encounter confusion over these various tribal identities, a similar situation is present with the problem of equating the Mohave names given to Garcés (and other sources) for these various peoples. For example, the term Cuabajay was equated with the Kitanemuk by Kroeber (1925) and Hudson (1982), with the Alliklik by Beeler and Klar (1977), and with the Castac Chumash by King and Blackburn (1978). According to sources summarized by King and Blackburn (1978:537), the Mohave may have called the Tataviam by the term *Gwalinyuokosmachi*, though it was also used for "Tehachapi Indians" residing just north of the Kitanemuk. Yet another Mohave term which may have been applicable to the Tataviam is Beñeme. Obviously, there is less certainty in equating any of these names to specific peoples and thus specific language groupings when we cannot even be sure of the geographical locations referred to, nor upon what criteria (language?) was being used by the Mohave to separate these various "tribes."

Scholars, however, have attempted to make some sense out of all of this by examining placename data and references made by consultants as to where a specific group may have resided. This takes us to the second part of the discussion, ethnic boundaries.

ETHNIC BOUNDARIES

Kroeber (1925: 613-614) assigned his Uto-Aztecan Alliklik to the upper Santa Clara River area, from a point between Sespe and Piru, most of Piru Creek, Castac Creek, and northward toward the San Joaquin Valley to include Pastoria Creek. Harrington's consultants, who equated Alliklik with Tataviam, were in agreement that the Tataviam held the Piru region, and to some extent also the territory included La Liebre, Elizabeth Lake, and up into the Antelope Valley (Bright 1975:229; King and Blackburn 1978:535). Using ethnohistorical sources, Johnson (1978:194) came to a similar conclusion for the upper Santa Clara River Valley, focusing particularly upon previous misunderstandings over the difference between Castaic Creek within Tataviam territory and Castac Lake within Chumash territory. Confusion over these placenames had misled Beeler and Klar (1977:303) into falsely assuming that since Castaic (Creek) was a Chumash placename, it indicated that Chumash speakers must have resided in the upper Santa Clara River Valley as well. Aware of the problem of two places named Castaic and the ambiguity they created in dealing with ethnohistoric sources, Bright (1975:229) also fell victim by presuming "Castaic in the Santa Clara Valley" was what was meant by a Kitanemuk statement that "at *Ka tek* they talked Ventureño but somewhat differentiated."

Some of this confusion was taken care of by Johnson (1978) when he pointed out that the Chumash village of Castac (*Kashtiq*) was located at Castac Lake, near modern Fort Tejon. There is little doubt that Chumash was spoken there. Merriam noted himself that *Kas-tak* was Chumash and that they were "nearly the same as at Ventura" (Heizer 1966:435). King and Blackburn (1978:537), adding additional source data from Harrington, also recognized the Castac Chumash,

considering them as long-time residents of the area and perhaps as the Cuabajay named by Garcés' Mohave guides.

Such "fixed" geographic territories for the Tataviam and Castac Chumash bring up a most important question raised by Beeler and Klar (1977: 302-303), namely, how is it that Castac and Ventureño Chumash are essentially identical languages when they are separated from one another by a totally alien Tataviam group?

There is no simple answer to this question, for the data are spotty at best. Perhaps if I may speculate here, an explanation can be posited on the basis of population relocation during early historic times. Consider, if you will, the reliance which has been placed upon Garcés' assumption that his Mohave-named Cuabajay were Chumash. In actuality, this assumption is not founded upon linguistic evidence, any more than it can be based upon culture. For as King and Blackburn (1978:536) point out for the Tataviam, there were "major similarities among Tataviam, Chumash, and Gabrielino ritual organization," and although warfare between the Cuabajay and the Beñeme might equally be advanced to demonstrate a north-south enmity, this explanation could equally be applied between the Kitanemuk and the Tataviam.

Moreover, it is known that coastal peoples did relocate into this interior region in early historic times. The Emigdiano Chumash, for example, spoke Barbareño Chumash, although they too were separated from their coastal cousins by intervening groups (Beeler and Klar 1977:296). Merriam noted the presence of Gabrielino groups within the Tejon region during his fieldwork (Heizer 1966:430).

If Ventureño Chumash did relocate into the Castac Lake area, displacing perhaps Kitanemuk or Tataviam groups, it would most certainly have occurred sometime prior to 1790, for in that year Indians from the village of "Castec" attacked soldiers near San Emig-

dio Canyon (Johnson 1978:189). What perhaps connects this village with Ventureño Chumash is the statement by Presidio Comandante Felipe de Goycochea (1790) that among the attackers was a Christian fugitive from Mission San Buenaventura named Domingo. It is known from other historic sources that a number of fugitives from the missions had fled into the interior (cf. Cook 1960: 256-257), and among them most certainly were Indians from Mission San Buena Ventura.

CONCLUSIONS

With spotty and conflicting data at hand, it is difficult to arrive at any final conclusion to the Alliklik-Tataviam problem. I can only speculate here as to how some of this confusion can be removed, and offer possible explanations to account for some of the historic and ethnohistoric data.

First, I think it is evident that Kroeber's Alliklik equate with Harrington's Tataviam, and that they were most likely speakers of some sort of Uto-Aztecan language, perhaps as Bright suggests, Takic. They may have been linguistically similar to their Fernandeano neighbors, as Van Valkenburgh noted, or they could have been related to the Kitanemuk. Regardless, it is also evident that they occupied the upper Santa Clara River Valley, such as the Piru area, and extended perhaps to as far as the Antelope Valley. As for what to call them, given the current confusion of Alliklik with Chumash, I would suggest that we call them Tataviam.

Second, I think there is enough evidence to support the view that Merriam's Alliklik vocabulary probably relates to Castac Chumash. The inability to determine the consultant, date, place, attribution of Alliklik to the document, and other such data which have suggested that Merriam may have collected the material while in the Tejon from a Castac speaker, argues against full acceptance of this

mysterious vocabulary as being Alliklik without additional, supportive evidence.

Third, given the confusion over the difference between Castaic (Creek) and Castac Lake, it is evident that separate ethnic identities were present between Tataviam occupying Castaic Creek and Castac Chumash occupying Castac Lake. I agree that some mixture between these peoples must have occurred, perhaps along territorial boundaries in late precontact-historic times, and on a much larger scale during the historic period when disruption of traditional culture patterns was most severe. King and Blackburn (1978:536), for example, note that during the American period Tataviam and Castac Chumash were evidently living together at Pastoria Creek, within Castac territory.

Fourth, on the basis of linguistic data it would appear that Castac Chumash were Ventureño Chumash who relocated during the very early historic period into the Castac Lake region, much as is evident for other coastal groups such as Barbareño Chumash into the San Emidio region, and Gabrielino groups into the Tejon. Their initial penetration or intrusion may have been the result of fleeing the mission system, and as "Christian fugitives," perhaps several mixed communities were established in an otherwise remote area. This would serve to explain why dialectal differences between Castac and Ventureño are not evident, and why these groups became separated by the alien Tataviam; and, it historically and linguistically matches a similar pattern between Emidgiano and Barbareño.

Although admittedly flimsy, this "fugitive" hypothesis might also serve to account for the ethnic mixtures evident in the Tejon region, as well as for the confusion by various consultants as to the location of original, tribal boundaries. For example, the report of Tataviam peoples living on Pastoria Creek during the American period could also be

interpreted from the point of view that they were the original inhabitants, and that Castac Chumash residing among them were the intrusive group who had arrived several generations earlier. Could this possibility explain Juan José Fustero's ethnic origins too? In addition, although the village of *Kashtiq* is noted by Johnson (1978:188) as being Chumash, the identification is associated with the historic period—it is impossible to say whether or not this placename also applied to whatever prehistoric components there may be. Moreover, the "fugitive" theory does not conflict with Kroeber's findings that the term Cuabajai applied to the Kitanemuk.

In conclusion, I share with Bill Bright (1975:230) a hope that fellow scholars will be able to shed further light on the matter.

REFERENCES

- Beeler, Madison, and Kathryn Klar
1977 Interior Chumash. *Journal of California Anthropology* 4(2):287-305.
- Bolton, Herbert
1930 *Anza's California Expeditions* (5 Vols.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
1933 *Font's Complete Diary: A Chronicle of the Founding of San Francisco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bright, William
1975 The Alliklik Mystery. *Journal of California Anthropology* 2(2):228-230.
- Cook, Sherburne F.
1960 *Colonial Expeditions to the Interior of California, Central Valley, 1800-1820*. Berkeley: University of California Anthropological Records 16(6).
- Coues, Elliott, ed.
1900 *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer: The Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés* (2 Vols.). New York: Francis P. Harper.
- Forbes, Jack
1965 *Warriors of the Colorado*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Galvin, John, ed.
1965 *A Record of Travels in Arizona and Califor-*

- nia 1775-1776: Fr. Francisco Garcés. San Francisco: John Howell.
- Goycochea, Felipe de
1790 Letter to Pedro Fages, dated 2 September, 1790. Translated by Geraldine Sahyun for the Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation. Copy on file at the Department of Anthropology, Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara.
- Grant, Campell
1978 Chumash: Introduction. In: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California, Robert Heizer, ed., pp. 505-508. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Harrington, John P.
n.d. Miscellaneous Chumash and Kitanemuk Ethnographic Notes on file at the United States National Anthropological Archives, Washington D.C.
- Heizer, Robert, ed.
1952 California Indian Linguistic Records: The Mission Indian Vocabularies of Alphonse Pinart. Berkeley: University of California Anthropological Records 15(1).
1955 California Indian Linguistic Records: The Mission Indian Vocabularies of H. W. Henshaw. Berkeley: University of California Anthropological Records 15(2).
1966 Ethnographic Notes on California Indian Tribes, by C. Hart Merriam. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports No. 68, Pt. 1.
- Hudson, Travis
1982 Were They Once Called Quabajai? Santa Barbara Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin, Noticias 28(1):1-6.
- Johnson, John
1978 The Trail to Kashtiq. Journal of California Anthropology 5(2):188-198.
- King, Chester, and Thomas Blackburn
1978 Tataviam. In: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California, Robert Heizer, ed., pp. 535-537. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Kroeber, Alfred
1907 Shoshonean Dialects of California. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnography 4(3):65-166.
1915 A New Shoshonean Tribe in California. American Anthropologist 17:773-775.
1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 78.
- Outland, Charles
1969 Mines, Murders and Grizzlies: Tales of California's Ventura Back Country. Ventura: Ventura County Historical Society.
- Teggart, Fredrick, ed.
1913 The Anza Expedition of 1775-1776: Diary of Pedro Font. Berkeley: Academy of Pacific Coast History Publications 3(1).
- Van Valkenburgh, Richard
1935 Notes on the Ethnography and Archaeology of the Ventureño Chumash Indians. Microfilm on file, No. 6042, Archaeology of California, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Wagner, Henry
1937 The Cartography of the Northwest Coast of America to the Year 1800 (2 Vols.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- White, Chris
1974 Lower Colorado River Area Aboriginal Warfare and Alliance Dynamics. In: 'Antap: California Indian Political and Economic Organization, Lowell Bean and Thomas King, eds. Ramona: Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 2:111-136.

