

“What Must It Have Been Like!” Critical Considerations of Precontact Ohlone Cosmology as Interpreted through Central California Ethnohistory

Les W. Field and Alan Leventhal

In the summer months of 1992, an archaeological excavation took place south of San José, California, under the direction of Ohlone Families Consulting Services (OFCS), the archaeological consulting firm of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe. Members of the tribe unearthed the skeletal and artifactual remains of their ancestors, which were buried in two separate cemeteries that have been dated to 3000 and 1500 B.P., respectively. The Muwekma called the site (CA-SCL-732) *Kapban Umux* or Three Wolves site, because the remains of three wolves, in addition to a number of other animal remains, were ritually interred among the human burials.¹

The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe has documented itself as the contemporary revitalization of East and South Bay Ohlone-speaking peoples.² They have demonstrated an unbroken chain of ancestry from the precontact aboriginal peoples of this region, notwithstanding the severe impacts caused by Spanish missionization, Mexican control, and the admission of the state of California to the United States on their culture, society, and lands. Given these historical traumas, the tribe has demonstrated innovative and sophisticated approaches and analyses of their ancestral remains as a part of their overall effort to recapture their history and to reconstruct the present and future for their people (see Field, Leventhal, Sanchez, and Cambra 1992; and Leventhal, Field, Alvarez, and Cambra 1994 regarding the existence of

the Ohlone and the erasure of their ancestry by political, economic, and academic forces during the early and middle decades of the twentieth century).

OFCS and the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe consequently utilized the occasion of each archaeological project to simultaneously pursue two interwoven goals. One goal is to bring as many of the tribal members together to participate in the excavation as possible, which itself accomplishes two aims—reestablishing a very real link between the contemporary people and their ancestors, and doing so in an atmosphere of community and camaraderie that strengthens the links between the various Ohlone families through the pursuit of a common purpose. A second goal involves the writing of archaeological reports. While many non-Indian cultural resource management (CRM) firms submit reports about excavations that are pro forma and essentially repetitive (see Leventhal et al. 1994), OFCS takes each excavation as an opportunity to investigate precontact Ohlone civilization.

The work of interpretation has required that the Ohlone participants and coauthors master the techniques of archaeological analysis, as well as become reacquainted with the cosmologies, narratives, languages, and lifeways of their more recent ancestors that were recorded by ethnographers. The research of John P. Harrington, ethnolinguist of the Bureau of American Ethnology in the 1920s and 1930s, is of particular importance in this respect. In reading, translating, and interpreting the meaning of the stories told to Harrington by two key Ohlone informants, Maria de los Angeles Colos (known as Angela Colos) and José (Joe) Guzman, in light of the archaeological findings, the Ohlone contributors are afforded the opportunity to metaphorically exclaim, “*what it must have been like!*” This was the interjection Angela Colos professed during the telling of one mythic narrative recorded by Harrington. The work of interpretation for contemporary Ohlone is thus a creative process of bringing cultural history to life and remaking Indian identities in the present in a fashion that mirrors the process by which Angela Colos, José Guzman, and their families made vibrant Ohlone identities in their time.³

In keeping with the goals cited above, this article will discuss precontact Ohlone cosmology, focusing on the intriguing discovery of ritually buried animals among the human burials at *Kaphan Unix*. The animals buried at CA-SCL-732 included the whole bodies of three wolves interred in two graves. A sample of charcoal found in association with the single wolf burial and a sample of its bone generated dates of 1500 ± 30 and 2700 ± 80 B.P., indicating interment during Phase II of the Late Period. Two additional wolf skeletons were found in another grave with braided, uncharred yucca or soaproot fiber cordage around their necks. The estimated age for these wolves has been deter-

mined from the uncharred cordage as 4370 ± 90 B.P. In addition to the wolves, parts of the following animals were found in the graves of particular individuals: squirrel, deer, mountain lion, gray fox, elk, badger, grizzly bear, and blue goose.⁴ By "ritual burial," we mean the deliberate interment of deceased animals or their body parts, often (but not always) accompanied by nonperishable grave goods, such as shell beads and ornaments, and other symbols of status (e.g., exotic materials) used in central California cultural systems, or the placement of animal parts in conjunction with the human burials.

We will first discuss the processes of retention and loss of Ohlone cultural memory in the context of Spanish domination that informs the enormous rupture in Ohlone cultural history that renders our analysis of precontact Ohlone symbolism and ritual so difficult. Briefly, we compare the Ohlone experience first to the experience of another Indian people in California, the Kashaya Pomo, and then to the effects of Spanish domination on the Pueblo peoples of New Mexico. Having made plain the disjunctures in Ohlone cultural history, we then evaluate relevant source materials for interpreting animal burials, underscoring the value of Harrington's materials. Harrington's utility is illustrated by two versions of an animal story told by José Guzman that Harrington recorded, which is here translated by a group of Ohlone elders. On the basis of these source materials, we then unfold possible interpretations of animal burial suggested by the relevant sources, using an animal story told by Angela Colos, recorded by Harrington, and translated by the same group of Ohlone elders. To suppose that Ohlone culture or any culture has remained so unchanging that ethno-historic sources can straightforwardly explain twenty-five-hundred-year-old archaeological remains and mortuary patterns is ludicrous. Instead, we argue that cultural continuities in the histories of the Ohlone and other central Californian peoples are testimonies to both the long history of social, cultural, and ritual complexity in the region and the resilience of these societies under the impact of European and Euro-American conquest. Our goal is therefore not "the truth" about ritual animal burials, but rather a critical discourse about what *can* be said about Ohlone cosmology and cultural systems, the cultural-symbolic significance of ritual animal burial in those systems, and the transformation of those systems following the entry of European peoples into what is now California.

In conclusion, we emphasize the audacious courage of both contemporary Ohlones and their ancestor Angela Colos in their refusal, at different moments in this century, to simply forget, and their insistence on re-creating Ohlone cultural vibrancy. The transmission of culture is a deeply creative process realized at both the individual and collective levels, which we believe the life of Angela Colos exemplifies.

**ASSESSING THE RUPTURE OF
OHLONE CULTURAL MEMORY IN
COMPARATIVE CONTEXT**

While structures of kinship and family life sustained Ohlone identity into the late twentieth century (Field et al. 1992; Leventhal et al. 1994), making the current revitalization of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe possible, Ohlone languages and much of the dynamics of the aboriginal Ohlone worldview ceased to be transmitted from one generation to the next. This rupture occurred in the twentieth century rather than immediately or soon after missionization or the admission of California into the United States. The vitality of Ohlone language and culture, which persisted for more than one hundred years following the trauma of missionization, florescing in the Verona Band revival at the Alisal rancheria, which Harrington (1921–1939), Gifford (1926, 1927, and 1955), Kelly (1978, 1991), and others described, highlights the persistence of Ohlone cultural memory. The narratives that Harrington recorded from José Guzman and Angela Colos reveal that well into the twentieth century Ohlone descendants told stories about humans and animals that formed part of an indigenous worldview. We will argue that to *some* extent that worldview was historically related to both mission-period and pre-Hispanic indigenous cosmology.

On the other hand, the rupture of cultural memory underscores the ultimate effectiveness of colonial domination (such as racial inequality and assimilationist policies) in undermining the wellsprings of Ohlone identity. Ohlone cultural memory was ultimately disrupted in the mid–twentieth century, such that contemporary descendants do not tell these stories anymore or speak the indigenous languages in which they were originally expressed. Spanish colonization of coastal California is the proximate cause of the disruption of Ohlone society and cultural memory. Spain moved into California (A.D. 1769) very late in its imperial history, even though the Ohlone experience is not necessarily representative of Spanish colonialism's effects on native North Americans or of the fate of all native peoples in north-central coastal California under European colonialism. Spanish mariners had reconnoitered the coast in the late sixteenth century. The accession of the Bourbon dynasty toward the end of the eighteenth century revived imperial ambitions and the need to compete with British and Russian territorial ambitions in western North America (Weber 1992). The colonial occupation of California occurred primarily as a military-geopolitical venture, intended to hold the line on the Spanish Pacific frontier through the establishment of presidios at San Diego, Santa Barbara, Monterey, and San Francisco that made California "secure" from the other competing powers. Secondarily, the Spanish needed to control the native populations, a task secured by the Franciscans, whose

missions did so at the cost of almost obliterating those populations (Rawls 1984; Hurtado 1988; and Monroy 1990).

To control indigenous populations and render their missions productive in the European sense, late eighteenth-century Spanish missionization was obliged to destroy the productive, distributive, and ecological features of aboriginal Ohlone political economy, all of which were alien to the Spaniards (Leventhal et al. 1994). The missions were, in fact, highly successful economic ventures that produced significant agricultural surpluses, which were only partly consumed by the relatively few Spanish settlers and mostly exported back to Mexico (Weber 1992). That success hinged on the wholesale transformation of the coastal ecology of California that, working hand in hand with the violent destruction of native economies, polities, and cosmologies, rendered any return to indigenous lifeways virtually impossible (see Milliken 1991 for an alternative perspective). Given this colonial regime, indigenous cultural revivals were unlikely. But such a revival did occur, as we have noted, based on the meager economic base of seasonal ranch jobs on the estates of the Hispanic Californios. As discussed elsewhere, Alisal provided a land base for the revival of Ohlone cultural memory (Field et al. 1992; Davis 1992; Davis, Stewart, and Hitchcock 1994; Leventhal et al. 1994). When the fragile economic base of Alisal tottered and the land base folded, the processes initiated by Spanish missionization came to fruition, and cultural memory fragmented. Nevertheless, even the loss of Alisal could not destroy the indigenous social structure maintained by relations of kin, which sustained Ohlone identity until the tribal revitalization of the late twentieth century.

The Ohlone experience does not, however, represent Spanish colonialism's effects on all native North Americans it encountered, nor is it representative of the fate of all native peoples in north-central coastal California under European colonialism. The contrasting case of the Spanish colonization of New Mexico is instructive in underscoring the particular processes that led to the fragmentation of Ohlone cultural memory. New Mexico fell under Spanish imperial domination much earlier, during the first decades of the seventeenth century, and was spurred on less by imperial geopolitics than by the expulsion of the Moors from the Spanish homeland in Iberia a century earlier and the Spanish conquest of the fabulously wealthy and sophisticated Aztec Empire. The Spaniards reenacted the experience of both of these historical events in New Mexico, on the level of both real and symbolic conquests (see Gutierrez 1991). The colonial venture failed to attract large numbers of colonists, and the Franciscans became the dominant force, asserting power even over the military. However, in New Mexico the Franciscans confronted indigenous civilizations whose features fell within the parameters of European comprehension: the peoples who became known as the Pueblos farmed and lived in recognizable towns.

Their towns may have been both too densely populated and too distant from one another for Franciscan tastes, and their agriculture may have looked unfamiliar or primitive, but the Franciscans did not attempt to completely alienate the Pueblos from their lands and way of life, as they did later with California natives. When the Franciscans' efforts to convert the Pueblos to Catholicism and annihilate their traditional religions overstepped the boundaries of Pueblo patience, the Pueblos revolted and expelled the Spaniards from their towns and territories, many of which were still largely intact (Sando 1992).

After the Spaniards reconquered New Mexico in the late seventeenth century, Franciscan missionary effort and control was for the most part discredited, and the empire recognized limited but significant Pueblo rights over their lands and political autonomy (Weber 1992). This is not to say that the Pueblos did not suffer from constant depredations by the Spaniards, Mexicans, and ultimately the Americans against these limited rights and especially against their religions; nevertheless, the Pueblos have successfully struggled to maintain control over their homelands. Their success, which has provided a continuous base from which to transmit cultural memory, sharply contrasts with the experience of the coastal Californian native peoples such as the Ohlone, and seems intricately related, we argue, to a certain level of comprehension Europeans and Euro-Americans have displayed toward the fundamental outlines of Pueblo culture as a form of civilization.

Comparing the colonial experience of the Ohlones to that of the Pomo peoples in the region just north of San Francisco reveals very different outcomes of the encounter between Europeans and Native Californian civilizations, even though both the Ohlone and the Pomo constituted fundamentally alien civilizations in the eyes of all Europeans. In the early years of the nineteenth century, the Russian Empire, whose main North American locus of operations was located in the Aleutian Islands and southeast Alaska, established an area of control in the territories of speakers of Kashaya Pomo and Coast Miwok languages in what is now Sonoma County. Like the Spaniards, the Russians were engaged in an imperial geopolitical game in California, as well as exploiting a region of fertile soils and sea mammal furs (i.e., sea otter) in order to produce agricultural surpluses for export to the more important Alaskan colonies.

The Russians established Fort Ross on the Sonoma coast in the heart of the lands of the Kashaya Pomo. The Kashaya and people from other Pomo nations and neighboring Coast Miwok tribes were obliged at gunpoint to build the fort and to till its agricultural estates (Sarris 1993). However, the Russians neither forcibly converted the Kashayas and their neighbors to the Orthodox Church nor attempted to subvert

and destroy native social structures, symbolic systems, and languages. The effect of the Russians on the environment was mostly limited to the greater region immediately surrounding Fort Ross, rather than, as with the Spanish, spread over huge regions transformed by European-introduced grasses and livestock. While Sarris describes the labor tribute the Russians exacted from Kashaya as "virtually slavery," with the exception of the Aleuts, the Russians neither trafficked in human property nor sought to control every aspect of their native laborers' lives. As a result of the very different regime the Pomos experienced under Russian imperialism, these native peoples maintained a much stronger grip on land, language, and material culture than any of the missionized Indians, including the Ohlone. The sustained assault on Kashaya and other Pomo cultures took place some decades later, after California's admission to the United States, when all indigenous peoples in the state endured a period of genocidal policies pursued by the federal and state governments. The Pomos became reservation Indians, subjected to the various attempts by local and national authorities to annihilate their sociocultural heritage, which ultimately resulted in the corrosive social pathologies of alcoholism, fragmented families, and economic marginalization.

By the time the Pomo nations and other Native Californians were delivered into the hands of the BIA and other governmental bureaucracies intent on extinguishing indigenous peoples in California (Dorrington 1927; Stewart 1978; Slagle 1996), the Ohlone (Costanoan), declared "extinct for all practical purposes" by Kroeber (1925, 464) and nearly everyone who came after him, had already been left for dead, i.e., as politically inconsequential, invisible, and marginalized by the bureaucrats. They were completely disenfranchised, but did not endure the agony of the reservation system. Thus, the colonial histories of the Ohlone peoples and the Pomo peoples have taken very different trajectories of cultural memory. Pomo cultural memory is more intact and operates under the rubric of federal recognition of tribal status; it is therefore laden with the pain of reservation life, and might be symbolized, as Sarris has so eloquently described, by the Pomo basket, a cultural artifact still produced by Pomo women, greatly esteemed by the white art world, even while the Pomo basket makers live in poverty and cultural oppression. Ohlone cultural memory, by contrast, might be seen as a basket that has been hidden, whose contents have been robbed, and for which the art of manufacture has been stolen. Yet this basket is also a living entity, symbolizing continuities in Ohlone cosmology and symbolism that survived Spanish and American colonialism, even if those continuities, like a basket, must be visualized in the minds of its creators in order to be brought to life.

EVALUATING SOURCE MATERIALS FOR INTERPRETING RITUAL ANIMAL BURIALS

Let us now turn to a critical evaluation of the sources about central Californian native cosmology that we will use to discuss the significance of animals and animal burials in precontact Ohlone cosmology.

Professional ethnographers made their way into communities of native people living in the San Francisco Bay Area some eighty to one hundred years after the region had been incorporated into and decimated by the Spanish Empire. Ethnographic materials about Ohlone-speaking peoples reflect the profound dislocations and efforts to eradicate precontact native spiritual-religious systems pursued by Spanish colonialism, and then the Mexican and American occupations of what is now the state of California. Relevant information about the cosmologies of neighboring peoples who inhabited the Central Valley and Sierra Nevada foothills comes from areas that had not been as severely impacted by Europeans until the American occupation. We may use information about these peoples, mostly Yokuts and Miwok-speaking groups, only with caveats: what was recorded with respect to pre- and postcontact native groups can and must be considered suggestive rather than definitive, and argues for rather than conclusively demonstrates the links between the peoples of this greater central California region across time and space. In all cases, the information about the cosmologies of the native peoples of central California cannot be said to represent the precontact world but rather different ethnographers' understandings of a particular moment in time during the forced transformation of native peoples and their cultural systems. The descriptive and analytic frameworks of early ethnographers were imbued in part with the evolutionist criteria and ideologies pervasive in social science during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries against which Native Californians were always considered primitive and far less complex than tribal groups elsewhere in North America (Leventhal et al. 1994).

Important source materials include both primary sources (e.g., Gifford and Merriam), which are based on fieldwork carried out early in the twentieth century with central Californian peoples, and interpretive writers (e.g., Gayton 1935 and Applegate 1978) who have amassed primary data gathered by others from which they made broad descriptive and analytic points.⁵ In both types of source materials, we consider those writers who stress historically dynamic processes to be more valuable than those who do not. We also find more insightful those ethnographies that are clearly dialogic in approach than those in which the voices of individual informants are anonymous or muted. Finally, we are more in agreement with analyses that acknowledge and underscore the limitations of and alternatives to anthropological mod-

els than those that do not. These positionings certainly resonate with contemporary moves in anthropological research and writing, but derive just as much from grappling with the work of interpretation with the Ohlone materials.

An example of work we have found less useful is Richard Levy's (1978) entry on "Costanoans" in the *Handbook of North American Indians*, considered an essential source about the Ohlone. Levy uses languages to determine the sociocultural boundaries between Ohlone peoples. His model is impermeable to historical changes, migrations, and shifts between and among Ohlone and neighboring peoples speaking the same, similar, and radically different languages. Levy's assertion that speakers of Ohlone languages *themselves* used language differences to mark the sociocultural borders that divided them into bounded political units lacks ethnographic evidence (see Milliken 1983, 1991). Despite his own demonstration of significant borrowing of words between Ohlone speakers and neighboring Yokut-, Miwok-, Salinan-, and Esselen-speaking peoples *before* contact with Europeans, Levy concluded that "[a]nother profound change involved the commingling of the Costanoans with peoples of differing linguistic and cultural background during the mission period" (1978, 486). This conclusion limits the depth of Levy's representation of Ohlone cultures and their pre-European histories.

Heizer and Hewes's (1940) exploration of animal ceremonialism in precontact central California contrasts with Levy's. They focused on the interpretation of archaeological sites found in the north Central Valley, the area of ethnographically documented Ohlone (see Milliken 1995) and Yokut-speaking peoples. The authors explicitly criticized models of Native Californian history that presuppose a "simple, uniform culture assumed to have persisted in essentially the same form from earliest times to the present day . . . the background against which ethnographic culture was presented" (Heizer and Hewes 1940, 587). Instead, they described significant cultural transitions demonstrated in the archaeological record. Implicit in these authors' representation of precontact societies is a model of political alliance and bounding of political units based on kinship. That in turn informs their reading of the presence of ritually buried animals in precontact graves.

In the literature about Central Valley and foothill peoples, Gifford's unpublished "Yokuts Moieties" (1915) and "Central Miwok Shamans" (1914) are roughly hewn but valuable field notes of narratives recorded from conversations with reflective, articulate individuals among these central Californian peoples. Among the Chuckchansi Yokuts who lived on the north shore of the San Joaquin River (Madera County), Gifford interviewed Dick Neal, Levi Graham, Frank Banjo, Chicago Dick, Mary Jones, and Susan Georgely, all of varying ages; among the Gashowu Yokuts on the south side of the San Joaquin River

(Fresno County), Gifford found only one informant, the elderly Ellen Murphy; among the Tachi Yokuts, who lived at the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley (north shore of Tulare Lake), Gifford conversed with George Miguel, Sam Thomas, and Mary Fernando, all elderly. Among the Miwok people dwelling in the Sierra foothills of Tuolumne County, Gifford's informants were an older couple, Tom and Susie Williams. The tone of his notes preserves the grammar, syntax, and construction of these clearly bilingual individuals. In keeping with the anthropological disciplinary conventions of the time, Gifford cloaked his own presence in these interviews, and thus his relationship with each person remains hidden from view. Merriam's notes (1967), describing José Guzman and the other people living at Alisal, are similarly detached. Nonetheless, the richness of the materials each anthropologist recorded reveals the importance native "informants" attached to their dialogues with the anthropologists.

Kroeber (1925), in his monumental work on the California Indians, detailed the alignment of various animals, birds, fish, insects, plants, natural phenomena, and ceremonial objects within the totemic structure of the Miwoks. His interpretive treatment, presented in table 1, shows named animals, birds, insects, plants, fish, natural phenomena, and ceremonial objects belonging to either the Land Side or Water Side moieties. Such a marvelously detailed schematic practically demands that we draw direct parallels with the animal-related mortuary pattern encountered at CA-SCL-732. However, unlike the Gifford materials, Kroeber elides the sources for this information, the necessarily rich and probably contradictory narratives from multiple informants out of which he extracted the information presented so neatly in table 1. Therefore, when we inspect this list we should keep in mind a great deal of uncertainty about its derivation.

Anna Gayton's "Areal Affiliations of California Folktales" (1935) attempts to draw broad generalizations across large regions of what is now California once inhabited by linguistically, socially, and culturally diverse peoples. Such work offers potentially illuminating maps of Californian cultures that could inform this inquiry into Ohlone cosmology. Gayton utilized Kroeber's division of California into three "culture areas": northwestern, southern, and central. She sketched the common characteristics of each region according to the presence or absence of traits such as creation myths, culture heroes, and particular narratives about animals and other natural and supernatural forces. Her main point appears to have been that characteristics of the Californian culture areas are distributed beyond the current borders of the state, so that the cultures of northwestern California, for example, are actually closely related to the cultures of the Pacific Northwest (also see Goldschmidt 1951 for an independent perspective). At the same time, she found that the central California nations, including the Costanoans

Table 1.**Miwok Moiety Alignments and Symbols**

<i>Land Side</i>	<i>Water Side</i>	<i>Land Side</i>	<i>Water Side</i>
Bear	Deer	Katydid	Bee
Puma (mountain lion)	Antelope		Caterpillar
Wildcat			Cocoon
Dog	Coyote		Butterfly
Fox			Snail
Raccoon	Beaver		Haliotis, and other shells and bead money
Tree squirrel	Otter		
Badger			
Jackrabbit		Sugar pine	Jimsonweed
Eagle		Black oak	White oak
Condor	Buzzard	Pine nuts	Vetch
Raven		Manzanita	Oak gall
Magpie		Tobacco	Wild cabbage
Hawk	Falcon (probably)	Tule	(and other plants)
Chicken hawk		Salmonberry	
Great owl	Burrowing owl	(and other plants)	
Blue jay	Meadowlark		
Woodpecker	Killdeer		
Yellowhammer	Hummingbird	Sky	Cloud
Goldfinch	Kingbird	Sun, sunshine, sunrise	Rain
Creeper	Bluebird	Stars	Fog
	Dove	Night	Water, lake
	Goose	Fire	Ice
	Swan	Earth	Mud
	Crane	Salt	Lightning
	Jacksnipe		Rock
	Kingfisher, and no doubt other waterbirds	Bows, arrows, quiver (probably)	Sand
Lizard	Frog	Drum	Nose ornament of shell
	Salamander	Earplug	Feather apron
	Water snake	Feather	Football
	Turtle	headdress	Gambling bones
	Salmon, and various other fishes		
Yellow jacket	Ant		

Note: Those moiety symbols highlighted in bold were also found in mortuary contexts at CA-SCL-732. Those symbols highlighted in bold and italicized are found in the Muwekma stories.

(Ohlone) were "aloof" from the influences of surrounding regions. Her judgment on the Ohlone and other central California peoples seems hasty; these peoples were among the most heavily impacted by missionization. It might have been more accurate to write that she did not know what relationships may or may not have existed between them and their neighbors to the north, south, and east, rather than to dismiss such relationships as insignificant (also see Kroeber 1925; Gayton 1930, 1936; and DuBois 1939 about the 1870 religious revitalization at Pleasanton). As with Levy, Gayton's generalizations lack a sense of history and cultural change. Without a sense of the movement of ideas, especially ideas about cosmology, the ways ideas changed within and between areas, or the development of particular ideas and their dynamics, Gayton represented precontact spiritual systems as fixed at the point when Europeans arrived. This is a conventional anthropological characterization of indigenous peoples that Eric Wolf (1982) has called "people without history."

Applegate's (1978) analysis of the dream-helper complex offers a more potentially useful assessment of a widespread religious feature among Californian cultures, though his discussion also draws boundaries around "culture areas" in Native California. Applegate uncritically accepted the linguistic, religious, and social boundaries, parameters, and definitions anthropologists have been drawing around California Indian peoples for decades. His description of the rigid boundaries between areas of California where the Kuksu religion was practiced (north and north-central) versus areas where the dream-helper complex dominated (south-central and south) resembles European preoccupations and experiences with religious boundaries, as in the historical borders between Christendom and Islam. Using language to define sociocultural groups, in a manner identical to Levy, Applegate then reified those borders with religious differences, even when his own data demonstrated a gradient, not a boundary—for example, the presence of dream helpers in native cosmologies decreases gradually from south to north. The notion of religious boundaries as defined by Europeans and Euro-Americans is probably neither an adequate nor an accurate model for understanding the distribution of cultural and cosmological traits in Native California. Nevertheless, we have found Applegate's analysis useful, as the discussion in the following section makes evident.

Harrington's notes are an enormous, mostly unpublished, archival resource that composes the single largest source of information concerned with the descendants of the precontact Ohlone peoples. Harrington's obsession with preserving disappearing California Indian languages, his use of idiosyncratic orthographies and abbreviations, and his ongoing disputes with other anthropologists (particularly Kroeber) about vocabularies and linguistic structures all played a key role in shaping his research agenda and the ethnographic information he recorded.

Using information from Harrington's notes is thus anything but unproblematic, but recent anthropological introspection may help to recover the rich content of the Harrington materials.

In the last two decades, anthropologists have increasingly explored the relationship between "researcher" and informant: how social, political, and economic forces shape unequal relations of power between academics and the individuals constructed as "objects of study." Much of the reflexive turn in anthropology has been highly critical in nature, stressing the need to reorder unequal relations of power to render anthropologists more responsible to their "informants" in order to make the anthropologists' intentions toward and representations of ethnographic "data" more apparent to informants and readers alike. Sarris (1993), playing out themes that Clifford (1988) and Marcus and Fischer (1986) have elaborated on, has recently described a dialogic approach to interpreting anthropologists' work with Native American informants, particularly ethnographic texts that are constructed around life history interviews the anthropologist has conducted. Sarris critically interrogates one such text, Elizabeth Colson's *Autobiographies of Three Pomo Women* ([1956] 1974). Colson claimed to represent the Pomo worldview through the words of the native informants themselves, even as her anthropologist's hand in selecting particular parts of life histories to include or exclude, and in editing and rewording the "raw" interviews, remains mostly obscured from readers' consideration. Sarris, himself of Kashaya Pomo and Coast Miwok descent, wanted to read Colson's work to understand how the Pomo women decided what to tell Colson, how they strategically shaped their words to cloak confidential information about Pomo culture, and how, in turn, Colson reshaped them. He understands that there is no single "true" version of the Pomo women's words (much less their thoughts), but an infinitely mutable series of readings and rereadings of Colson's representation of her dialogues with the three women. Ultimately, however, by calling attention to this complexity, Sarris reestablishes the humanity of the women as complexly motivated individuals in the face of anthropological objectification by showing how they negotiated their relationship with the ethnographer, choosing how and what to reveal. The nature of anthropological truth after Sarris's exercise appears multifaceted and enmeshed in the relations of power at both the individual and social levels.

Interestingly, Harrington was not insensitive to the dialogic nature of ethnography. Peppered throughout his voluminous word lists and discourses concerning pronunciation and proper orthography, readers find short anecdotes, sequences of related conversational expressions, songs, and longer narratives. Among South and East Bay Ohlone people, Harrington conducted his interviews with several individuals, José Guzman and Angela Colos, Francisca Guzman, Susanna Nichols, and Catherina Peralta Marine (one of José Guzman's granddaughters,

then married to Lucas Marine, another Ohlone), all of whom at one time lived at Alisal Rancheria (Gifford 1926, 1927; Harrington 1921–1934; Field et al. 1992; Davis et al. 1994). Born near the San Ramon rancho, José Guzman came from mixed Central Valley Yokut families from Lacquisamne (or Julpun) and Tamcan villages long allied through kinship, trade, and religious rituals with the East Bay Ohlones. One of his wives, Francisca Nonessi (John Guzman's grandmother), however, was descended from Jalquin and Carquin Ohlones. Thus it is hardly surprising that José Guzman lived at Alisal, which during this period was inhabited by a mixture of intermarried and culturally syncretic central Californian peoples speaking different Yokut, Miwok, and Ohlone dialects, a situation that also reflected precontact social relations (see Field et al. 1992).

The ancestry of Angela Colos, and how she became a Chochenyo-speaking teller of Ohlone stories who lived on the Alisal rancheria, is an equally complex tale of the cultural and linguistic syncretism in the San Francisco Bay Area during the nineteenth century. According to the Mission San José baptism register, she was born and baptized in San Ramon in the East Bay, the daughter of two Indians named Zenon and Joaquina. These two were married at Mission Santa Clara, and our research strongly suggests that Zenon came from San Rafael and had been baptized at Mission Dolores in San Francisco. Zenon thus appears to have been a Coast Miwok man. Joaquina was likely baptized in Mission San José in the Chochenyo heartland and she lived in the East Bay, but her parents seem to have been Miwoks from a rancheria called Ochejamnes.⁶ Given these origins, neither José nor Angela should be understood as "traditional storytellers" if by that term these two remarkable individuals are seen as somehow passively receiving and repeating a rigidly defined narrative tradition. Rather, both brought a narrative tradition to life by exercising their own choices to creatively dialogue with Ohlone identity in the Bay Area during their lifetimes.

AN OHLONE STORY IN THREE VERSIONS

Layered onto the dialogues with Ohlone identity that José and Angela's lives embody, Harrington, as ethnographer, obviously edited and shaped his own dialogues with José, Angela, and other informants on which his ethnographic texts were based. This is evident in the excerpts from his notes written while visiting Pleasanton. In the actual transcription, readers can note the admixtures of English and Ohlone words in a basically Californio Spanish text, which appears more faithful to the speech of Harrington's consultants than his own remembered text, which is primarily in English. By recounting two different versions of José Guzman's narrative, Harrington enables readers to appreciate the role of the ethnographer in shaping our view of native cosmology. At the same

time, the access Harrington has afforded to Guzman's words allows the reader to begin to appreciate how animals could appear in the Ohlone worldview of the early twentieth century, a worldview in which bees and wasps were heavily anthropomorphized as they engaged in the outraged feelings that led them to discuss and plan their revenge on the marauding human. In Harrington's first version of the story, taken from his memory, he reconstructs Guzman's sprawling narrative to fit Western conventions—where to begin a story and where to end it, how to describe the progression of events, how to introduce characters, and so forth. Moreover, Harrington's first version deleted the dialogic aspects of the actual storytelling—Angela's comments, José's demonstrations, and Harrington's own comments and interjections. While in the first version Harrington's hand is omnipotent but invisible, he is truly present as a participant in the second version. It is both Harrington's acknowledgment of what an anthropologist's mind does to native narratives and his appreciation for recording and representing the dialogues out of which such narratives emerge that makes this excerpt so valuable—in addition, of course, to the window José Guzman's story opens into the complex, multilayered, and, above all, intimate relationship between animal and human peoples that was still shaping the Ohlone worldview. Harrington's notes enable us to approach such relationships between humans and animals in Ohlone culture as a many-faceted dialogue. The third version of the story is a contemporary translation by Muwekma elders.⁷

"Story by José Guzman (This first version is the erroneous one written from memory)"

A man used to go to an avispa nest (in the ground) and stamp and sing and take all the larvae. And go to another and do the same and also to jicote nests and do the same. He brought them and honey home and thus sustained his wife and two children. The avispas and jicotes were already acabandose, only old ones were left.

So they met and decided to dig a big hole so as to trap this man who was acabando them. They worked and worked, and they are great workers, and dug a great pit, and when pretty large made it still larger, and then covered it over so as to conceal it. (evidently like a N.M. deer pitfall). And the man fell in. They told him he was ending them, that only they few old ones were left, that [they] could not let him do that and go free. They ate all the meat off of him, leaving only bones and sinews, and in his breast heart and lungs, so that he would stay alive. Then they brought fine feather down (*putr ca* Angela says) and filled out his form with that so he had form of full body, but was of course light, like animal (non-human) pues. Then they told him to go home, have wood brought and dance.

He jumped out of the pit and went home going far at each step, sort of jumping along, he was so light. He told his plight to his wife and two children and told her to gather wood. Along in the light he danced and toward morning he rose up on high and tronó (there was a single clap like thunder and he exploded) and vanished. That was the end of him. (Harrington 1921, reel 37: 466–67)

“This is the good version taken down from José’s dictation”

He told the people to gather wood, that he was to sweat and dance the last time. He started to dance (Inf. nesc. at what hours of the night) and in the early morning he rose up and se reventó into wind.

He was feeding the two children (nesc whether male or female). He was feeding his family by getting honey and larvae thus. He would reach the home of avispas and stamped two or three times and then the avispas empezaron a cantar inside and he was glad. “Que hay mucha gente,” decia, “hay muchos aqui, esta bueno.” And he killed the viejos with humo and took the honey and gozando of them. And the jicote, he killed with palo one by one as they came out until they were killed (José saw people kill jicotes thus but saw them kill avispas with humo). Rubbed dry estafiate between hands into bolas (size of potato) (Inf. showed how by gestures). Lighting these, they smoked well and had fans made by attaching gavilan tail to a palito seven inches long (as manguito) to use as abanico. The opening of the nest of avispas is one inch across. Put bola inside and lit it and fanned. Called estafiate *bifen* in Ind., Angela says.

Cuando ya se enfadaron las avispas and jicotes began to echar menos their young ones and their adults, for the man killed them not leaving one alive, and began to juntarse. “Como vamos hacer?” Le tenemos que agarrar, logramos, tiene que venir con nosotros. “Se empezaron a juntar de onde quiera para hacer onde iban a agarrarlo, onde iban a poner la trampa,” trabajaban de dia y de noche, dicen, para hacer el ollo. When they finished le dijeron el patron: Y acabamos. Entonces le dijeron á dos, son mandaderos, son parditos, muy feitos, les decian coyote a esos, were like criados (these trabajadorcitos were medio pardos while the others were black). They were looking (as they had been told by the chief to see if venía aquel, el maton esos).

“Pongan cuidado cuando venga, vengam (Uds.) pronto,” he told those two trabajadores el. En la mañana los cazaba el—ese muton did y luego miraron que venia andando. The two at once entered and reported to the capt. that he came ya. Then a certain few others (not all the rest and not the two trabajadores) kept going out and entrando, going out and entrando to make a show so as to attract the attention of the killer. Capt. told them avispas to go out and in this while the jicotes

kept inside (all those not killed from far parts had gathered there and had been digging the pit).

When the man saw them he came contento and they were also contentos for they saw him coming.

Luego que llegó, luego le tiro dos patadas a la casa, y luego se fue, se sambutió. y luego lo agarraron adentro, luego le dijeron "Ya venitis, lo estabamos esperando." Luego le pusieron un tendido "Sientate alli!" entre todo el animalero. *What must it have been like!* [emphasis added] Angela ejaculates, and the jicotes all cantando hmmm. Cantando aquellos aquí. Luego empezaron a preguntar, "Tu sabes que estás matandonos? No podemos cria hijos." Que iba a decir, el? Entonces le dijeron: Tienes que venir con nosotros ahora aquí con nosotros vas a venir. Pus que tenía a decir" Tenia que ir. Luego dijeron á nosotros y empezaron a trabajar, empezaron a comer, le sacaban toda la carne, le dejaron puros huesos y cuero no más, lo limpiaron toda la carne.

Acabaron a limpiarlo, decían a los otros: anden, traen pluma y metanle todo onde habia carne, metando alli. Toda la carne sacaron, no dejaron ni un pedacito adentro. "Te vas á ir," luego que acabaron a limpiarle y echar pluma. Te vas á ir, go tell your family, á tu gente, a todos digas que ya no vas á vivir mas, despídete and tell them que ya no te van a mirar mas. He did so and he go there and told them to gather wood. He was dancing and others too, and in the morning he told them: Ya me voy. He brincó para arriba, ya no pensaba, he was puras plumas. Dijo que ya era tiempo de irse, tenia que ir, se le lleo el tiempo.

Se le lleo el tiempo de entregar la vida. No mas brincó para arriba y tronó, se reventó pues, ya muerto seria, tirando los huesos por alli, yo no sé, pero el se reventó. (Harrington 1921, reel 37: 468–71)

Translation

He told the people to gather wood, that he was to sweat and dance the last time. He started to dance ([José] does not know at what hours of the night), and in the morning he rose up and exploded into the wind.

He was feeding the two children (does not know whether male or female). He was feeding his family by getting honey and larvae thus. He would reach the home of the bees and stamped two or three times and then the bees started to buzz and sing inside the hive and he was happy. "There are plenty of folks in here," he said, "there are plenty, and that's good." And then he killed the old ones with smoke, and took the honey, enjoying what he got from them. And the queen bee, he killed with a stick, one by one as they came out, until they were killed. (José saw people kill queen bees thus, but saw them kill the other bees with smoke. He rubbed dry *estafiate* between his hands into balls [size of potato]. [He showed how by gestures.]) Lighting these, they smoked

well, and had fans made by attaching a hawk's tail to a stick seven inches long, as a handle, to use as a fan. The opening of the bees' nest is one inch across. Put the ball inside it and lit it and fanned. They called *estafiate bifén* in the Indian language, Angela says.

When the bees had got already good and angry, and the queen bees had begun to miss their young ones and their adults, for the man killed them not leaving one alive, they began to swarm. "What are we going to do? We have to seize him, we must succeed, he must come with us!" So they began to swarm where they planned to grab him, where they were going to place the trap, and they worked night and day, they say, to make the hole. When they finished they told their Master: we will do away with him. So they told two, who were messengers, they were dark, very ugly, they called them coyotes, they were like servants (these drone bees were pretty dark while the others were black). They were looking as they had been told to do by their Captain, to see if the man had come, that bully, the bee killer.

"Take care when you come, come back soon," their chief told the two drones. In the morning they hunted for the man, the bee killer, and then they saw him coming, walking along. The two at once entered the hive and reported to the Captain that the man was coming soon. Then a certain few others (not all the rest and not the two drones) kept going out and entering, going out and entering, to make a show to attract the attention of the killer. Their Captain told them bees to go out and during this while the queen bees kept inside (all those not killed from far parts had gathered there and had been digging the pit).

When the man saw them, he came happily, and they were also happy for they saw him coming.

Then he arrived, then he kicked the hive two times, and then he went ahead, he plunged in. And then they grabbed him inside, then they said to him, "He has come, we've been waiting for you!" Then they put a chair out for him, shouting "Sit here!" amongst all the insects. What must it have been like! Angela ejaculates, and the queen bees all buzzing hmmmmm. Buzzing like that here. Then they began to question him: "Do you know that you've been killing us? We can't raise our children anymore." What was he to say? Then they said to him: "You must come with us now, with us now you are going to come." What could he say? He had to go. Then they said to us, then they began to work, they began to eat, they stripped off all his flesh, they left him just bones and skin, they cleaned off all the flesh.

They finished cleaning him off, they said to the others: "Go, bring feathers, and put it where there had been flesh; put it there." All of the flesh they took off, they didn't leave a single bit inside. "You will go now," they said to him, after they finished cleaning him up, and putting on the feathers. "Go, and tell your family, to your people go now, and tell them you are not going to live anymore, hurry up, tell

them they will not see you anymore." He did so, and he went there and told them to gather wood. He was dancing and the others too, and in the morning he told them, "now I'm going." He jumped up, he wasn't thinking, he was pure feathers. He said now was the time to leave, he had to go, the time had come.

The time had come to leave this life. He did nothing more than jump up and bang! he exploded; then he was dead, his bones thrown about—I don't know, he exploded.

THE KINSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN AND ANIMAL PEOPLES: A HYPOTHESIS

After reviewing the literature discussed above, we conclude that references to animals in Ohlone and other central California tribal cosmologies fall into three categories. These animal categories are as follows:

- 1 animals (as well as plants, supernatural beings, and, in some cases, geographical features and places; see Davis 1992) as the totems used by precontact native kin groups, such as moieties, clans, lineages, families, and so on (see Gifford 1916, *Miwok Societies*, 1916, *Dichotomous Social Organization*, 1917; Kroeber 1925; Goldschmidt 1948)
- 2 animals (and other beings in some cases) as the personal spirit allies, or "dream helpers" (Applegate 1978), for individuals, shamans, and non-shamans alike, who successfully conducted vision quests and other rites-of-passage rituals
- 3 animals living in the present as representations of sacred deity-like figures who, according to narratives told by precontact central California natives, had been people in animal form during a remote antiquity; they had lived and conversed much like human beings and maintained relationships, including kinship, with human beings (Kroeber 1907)

We contextualize all of these symbolic systems as aspects of a socially, economically, and linguistically complex precontact Native California. Like the authors in Bean and Blackburn (1976), we understand the territories of precontact Native Californians as multilingual regions integrated by shared and variably manifested symbols and rituals, as well as monetary and trading systems (see Chase-Dunn and Mann 1998 for a world systems analysis of the form of integration). Integration between peoples was accomplished by ties of marriage and kinship or by ideologies derivative of kinship. Human territories intersected

and partially overlapped with the territories of animals, also conceived of as peoples because of their role in sacred narratives (see category 3 above). Relationships of alliance (and sometimes of hostility) between human and animal peoples were also created and maintained through kinship. Human villages acted as the spaces where all of these kinship ties were ritually enacted and renewed, and human cemeteries functioned as the spaces where kinship between and among human and animal peoples were cemented through the burial of the dead (see Blackburn 1976).

Early on, Heizer and Hewes concluded that

the Central California animal burials which we have been discussing are, in all probability, reflections of special status of one sort or another. An emphasis on certain animals in the moiety system and as eponyms of the lineages easily might have led to their requiring, under particular circumstances, mortuary treatment resembling that accorded humans. (1940, 602)

This passage suggests that ritual animal burials reflect the affiliation of particular animals with specific human kin groups in the relationship of totemism. Along the same lines, Levy (1978) suggested that “[t]he Costanoan were grouped in clans and divided into deer and bear moieties,” and cites Harrington as a source for that information. In his “Culture Element Distributions XIX: Central California Coast” (1942), Harrington reported moieties for “Southern Costanoans” (the San Juan Bautista, Gilroy, and Hollister peoples, whose descendants have regrouped as the Amah-Mutsun Ohlone Tribe), but was noncommittal about the presence of moieties among “Northern Costanoans,” (i.e., the people of the San Francisco Bay region).

Let us hypothesize that deer-bear moieties, or something parallel to that binary system, existed for all of the Ohlone-speaking peoples (see Harrington 1942; Bennyhoff 1977; Bean and Vane 1978; Ortiz 1994), and also employ Gifford’s (1915) description of moieties among Central Valley Yokuts in order to construct a useful model of how the moiety system connected humans with animals. In his fieldwork, Gifford found land and water moieties for all the Yokut and Miwok-speaking people with whom he worked (see also Kroeber [1925, 455] for the Miwok, and Kelly [1978, 1991] for a similar moiety structure among the Coast Miwok on the Marin Peninsula). Each moiety featured not one but clusters, or, better put, family trees, of totem animals of varying cultural significance. An individual’s totem animal depended on his/her social, economic, and ritual status. For the Yokuts, the land (in Yokut *toxelyuwic*, in Miwok *tunuk*) moiety was “the eagle and bear side” and also the “west side” and “downstream” people; the water moiety was

"the coyote side," the "east side," the "upstream" people. A land person of high rank might have bear or bald eagle for her/his totem, while the totem of an individual of lower status could be jackrabbit, fox, crow, California jay, roadrunner, raven, beaver, antelope, or wildcat. Similarly for the water (in Yokut *nutuwic*, in Miwok *kikua*) people, among whom high-status persons claimed coyote or prairie falcon as their totem, others of lower status might be affiliated with deer, different owl species, skunk, different hawk species, or various water-dwelling creatures, California partridge, or turkey vultures. Each moiety was responsible for redeeming its totem animals captured or killed by the other moiety and then for burying those animals with the proper respect and ceremony.

From this description, it can be supposed that a varied number of totem animals might end up in the graves of humans or be ritually interred in their own graves. Gifford made clear that a person's totem animal had nothing to do with the spirit familiars, or dream helpers as Applegate has called them, with whom shamans and other individuals might ally through visions. For example, a *nutuwic* shaman might have a grizzly bear dream helper, and even transform himself/herself into a bear. Applegate painted a much more complex picture of the relationship between dream helpers and totem animals in his regional study of the dream helper in south-central and central coastal California. Animal dream helpers, in Applegate's discussion, are the First People of California native peoples' narratives. When "real" time began, according to these narratives, the First People became animals, yet they continued to exist as deity-like beings in ongoing mythic time, encapsulated in and parallel to "real" time. These same animals, who were and continue to be the First People remembered in stories, are also totem animals. Merriam confirmed these relationships, writing that the Miwok of the Cosumnes River believed that "all people were once animals. . . . a boy at puberty goes to the woods and wanders about. . . . By and by, when asleep, he sees (or dreams he sees) the animal he came from and that animal feeds him then and throughout his life" (1967, 359). The Harrington notes illustrate the presence of helper animals, if not dream helpers, at least among the Ohlone leaders referred to as "captains"⁸ of the East Bay rancheria at Alisal:

A captain had tame bears. No one else entered. Only the dueños [owners] of the house entered there—no one else entered except the acquaintances for the bears were like dogs to guard the house. . . . Bear white from old age and goes where the Captain sends him. Pet bear of captain.
(Reel 36: 199)

Applegate contended that there was an overlap between the totem animals corresponding to particular kin groups and the different dream

helpers with whom individuals ally through visions. And, in fact, an individual behaved in much the same way toward his/her totem and her/his dream helper, never killing or eating the flesh of either. Nevertheless, Applegate cited important differences between the two types of animal beings in native cosmology. Totem animals formed a part of social knowledge and are inherited mostly, but not always, patrilineally throughout California. They were linked to broadly understood and fixed political, ceremonial, and professional rights and duties derived from the precedents established by each totem animal in First People narratives. By contrast, Applegate described the dream helper as a much more personal, indeed deeply private, matter, operating under far less formalized relationships, and subject to a great deal of individual variation. Again, Applegate illustrated how the two cosmological concepts were twined about one another, citing examples of south-central native peoples, such as the Tachi Yokuts, among whom individuals were more likely to ally with a dream helper that was part of their moiety's animal family tree. For other peoples, such as the Wukchumni Yokuts, those who were bear dancers *must* also have had bear for a totem *and* a dream helper. Finally, for the Chumash, the chiefs of the canoemen's guild (*Tomol*) had to claim peregrine falcon for both totem and dream helper.

Applegate's analysis leaves open the possibility that ritually buried animals might have had significance as the dream helpers of individuals with whom they were buried, even though he stressed that most people never revealed the identity of their dream helpers during their lives. The possibility seems most salient for shamans, who were described by Gifford (1914) among the Central Miwok. In conversations with Gifford, Susie and Tom Williams detailed the varieties of shamans and their special powers and abilities, speaking pointedly about the kinship between shamans and their animal allies who seem to have been both their dream helpers and totems. However, the American occupation of the territories of the Sierra Miwoks disrupted kin networks, the socialization of children, and the transmission of complex oral traditions and ceremonies between generations. These circumstances could easily have led to a blurring of the distinctions between dream helper and totem for early twentieth-century Miwok shamans. Nevertheless, Tom Williams made clear, in no uncertain terms, that his cousin, a rattlesnake shaman (*wakilmé*), would bleed from the nose and declaim "my friend got killed" if someone nearby killed a rattlesnake (26).

These ethnographic accounts and analyses certainly suggest that the meaning of ritual animal burials relates to a kin-based totemism, as well as the cult of animal dream helpers, while at the same time underscoring the transformation of these complex precontact cosmological and social systems. To tie this knot ever more tightly, this section presents another narrative, this one about Kaknú,⁹ the prairie falcon culture hero, recorded by Harrington in 1921 and told by Angela Colos. In this

story, the alliances between humans and animal peoples are set in a time that seems more recent than the time of the First People, but features a malevolent being, the *wíwe*^(c), with whom humans only feign alliance.

Kaknú Tale

The small pintito gabilan that mata patos and cosas grandes, pajaros grandes is called kaknú. Es muy mentado ese gabilan, not everybody can shoot it. The gabilan fought with the cuerpo de piedra called *wíwe*^(c). He was a hombre cuerpo de piedra. He was woundable only in his neck above breastbone and ombligo. The kaknú shot once at each of these places and killed him. The peñascos of all the earth are the stones that went from his body when killed (now the whites call them peñascos). The kaknú is the encantado in all the mundo.

Se estaban reventandose in all directions.

The lord of the earth under the earth (the cuerpo de piedra) had two criados negros under the earth and when he killed a person he gave the blood to these two to drink. The kaknú was liviano with the bow, a fine peleador. . . . after killing the *wíwe*^(c) he . . .

The people after he killed him, the people kneeling asked him what he wanted them to do and he said for [them] to stay there.

[Ind.s had two kinds of arrows—poison pointed (just touch the point to you and you die)]

He went down to the lowest dueño in the earth.

At last he married and she turned water and is the water—water was her body. He la regaña and she said she did not like it that he treated her so strong. And he mojado told her que ella tenia que volverse agua. Hasta ahora es agua.

Al ultimo cuando ya no quiso pelear mas con nadie he turned into a form like the paloma and entered debajo de la tierra—he made earth reventar y sambutió. Siempre con un arco. He dived down. He had lots of people down there.

The kaknú dove into the sweathouse through the smokehole (la ventana en medio del techo) when he embocó the two jarazos but not a wing was injured. Then after killing he took the two criados negros by the legs and swung their brains against the post of the temescal, and the temescal and *wíwe*^(c) and the criados burnt up together and the kaknú left.

They were negros de la sangre que comían, no mas pura sangre comían. They were not sons, they were only esclavos, criados, that he had for the purpose of commanding. There were many people there too. But he left them all—only killed the three. He had been a feared man, quien lo iba matar, tenia cuerpo de piedra.

Only young children did not enter sweathouse. Men and women did. Se le araba el resuello with the calor de la lumbre.

Wíwe^(c) killed all the people that reached his home, and the negros drank the blood. Puro huesamento there—from the people he had eaten. Kaknú said he would see how he fared there, and he killed him and the two criados. But he did not kill the other people there. He told them que se ve vieron bien.

When kaknú wanted to sambutir, anywhere, he was no mas doblaba las alas (gesture of shrugging shoulders) and he entered anywhere out of sight.

He llegó con el dueño de la sal ([Ch] 'awéf = sal, kaknú named it thus). The name of the dueño de la sal was hi wíf and kaknú killed him.

Se murio se quedo alli reventandose—all the lomas etc. flew asunder.

Cuerpo de piedra had two criados negros. Kaknú was a tall lean man, wíwe^(c) was a short stout man. After killing, kaknú agarró the wíwe^(c)'s wife, nesc. where wíwe^(c) lived. People that reached there never returned. Por eso, kaknú said he would see if they would eat his body too—they'll not eat me! Dueño de la sal lived in another part.

Coyote his abuelo.

And there he saw Doña Vibora, a careciaba and she said no le dentara.

He asked her con que mataba: Looking into the face en que esa mujer, he acted as if she was of no consequence. "Con que matas?" looking into her face. He took her arm and tras! she mordió him and he died. They burnt the body and under the earth.

Says there are songs for killing but forgets them. It is a long song—every jarazo—there were five jarazos and the fifth pierced his throat, and then seizing all the rest of the arrows in the quiver he plunged them with his hand into wíwe^(c)'s ombligo. Wíwe^(c) perdió la rancheria thus, perdió la vida. Inf. nesc. then sings. Cada jarazo tiene un canto—kaknú mienta wíwe^(c) and wíwe^(c) mienta kaknú. As kaknú shouts at wíwe^(c) "Me va matar el kaknú" "Me va matar el wíwe^(c)." Each has song that mentions name of other.

When kaknú entered the smokehole, the people were all standing like estacas looking on. Wíwe^(c) told them to add fuel so kaknú would get burnt, but instead they pulled the fire down. The people were under wíwe^(c), but they were friends of kaknú really. It was the other people who arrived whom he ate.

Ay was the vida que tenia wíwe^(c)—en el tragadero and the ombligo. Each home—shot. He made a groaning sound. (Harrington 1921, reel 36: 614–21)

Translation

The small speckled hawk that kills ducks and bigger things, bigger birds, is called kaknú. He is very famous, this hawk, and not everybody can

shoot it. The hawk fought with the body of stone called wíwe^(c). He was a man whose body was made of stone. He was woundable only in his neck above the breastbone and in his navel. The kaknú shot once at each of these places and killed him. The rocky crags of all the earth are the stones that went from his body when he was killed (now the whites call them peñascos). The kaknú is the most enchanted bird in the world.

He was bursting out in all directions.

The lord of the earth under the earth (the body of stone) had two black creatures under the earth, and when he killed a person he gave the blood to these two to drink. The kaknú was handy with the bow, a fine hunter. . . . after killing the wíwe^(c) he . . .

The people after he killed him, the people kneeling asked him what he wanted them to do and he said for him to stay there.

(Indians had two kinds of arrows—poison pointed: just touch the point to you and you die.)

He went down to the lowest owner of the earth.

At last he married and she turned into water and is the water—water was her body. He fooled her and she did not like it that he treated her so strong. And he wet her and told her that she had to turn back into water. Until this day, she is water.

At last, when he no longer wanted to fight any more with anybody, he turned into a form like the pigeon and he entered under the earth—he made the earth burst and he jumped. Always with a bow. He dived down. He had lots of people down there.

The kaknú dove into the sweathouse through the smokehole (the window in the middle of the roof) when he was hit by the two arrows, but not a wing was injured. Then after killing, he took the two black creatures by the legs and swung their brains against the post of the sweathouse, and the sweathouse lodge and the wíwe^(c) and the critters burnt up together and the kaknú left.

They were black from the blood they ate, just pure blood is what they ate. They were not sons, they were only slaves, creatures, that he had for the purpose of commanding. There were many people there too. But he left them all—only killed the three. He had been a feared man, the one he had killed, who had the body of stone.

Only the young children did not enter the sweathouse. Men and women did. They made themselves pant from the heat of the fire.

Wíwe^(c) killed all the people that reached his home, and the black ones drank the blood. It was all bones there, from the people he had eaten. Kaknú said he would see how he fared there, and he killed him and the two critters, but he did not kill the other people there. He told them that it was clear that they looked just fine.

When kaknú wanted to jump anywhere, he did no more than pull in his wings (makes gesture of shrugging shoulders), and he entered anywhere out of sight.

He arrived where the owner of salt lived ([Chi] ' = al, *kaknú* named it thus). The name of the owner of salt was *hi wif* and *kaknú* killed him.

He died and stayed there bursting apart—all the hills etc. flew asunder.

The body of stone had two black creatures. *Kaknú* was a tall lean man, *wíwe^(c)* was a short stout man. After killing, *kaknú* captured the *wíwe^(c)'s* wife (Angela doesn't know where *wíwe^(c)* lived). People that reached there never returned. Because of this, *kaknú* said he would see if they would eat his body too—they'll not eat me! The owner of salt lived in another part.

Coyote was his grandfather.

And there he saw Mrs. Rattlesnake, coiled up, and she said I won't bite.

He asked her how she killed: Looking into the face of this woman, he acted as if she was of no consequence. "With what do you kill?" looking into her face. He took her arm and so then she bit him and he died. They burnt the body and under the earth.

Says there are songs for killing but forgets them. It is a long song—every arrow—there were five arrows and the fifth pierced his throat, and then seizing all the rest of the arrows in the quiver he plunged them with his hand into *wíwe^(c)'s* navel. *Wíwe^(c)* lost his place, lost his life. Angela doesn't know, then sings. Every arrow has a song^(c), *kaknú* is lying to *wíwe^(c)*, and *wíwe^(c)* is lying to *kaknú*. As *kaknú* shouts at *wíwe^(c)*, "I am going to kill the *kaknú*." "I am going to kill the *wíwe^(c)*." Each has a song that mentions the name of other.

When *kaknú* entered the smokehouse, the people were all standing like sticks in the ground, looking on. *Wíwe^(c)* told them to add fuel so *kaknú* would get burnt, but instead they pulled the fire down. The people were under *wíwe^(c)*, but they were friends of *kaknú* really. It was the other people who arrived whom he ate.

So that was the life that *wíwe^(c)* had—in the throat and the navel. Each home—shot. He made a groaning sound.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Anthropological theory and ethnographic practice progresses fitfully. Often, and perhaps by chance, certain areas of the world receive the attention of the most advanced theoreticians, and benefit from the cutting edge of ethnographic practice much more than other areas. Unfortunately, the ethnography and analysis of California native peoples is an area that until very recently has lagged. Iconic and uncritical citation of older work pervades archaeological reports in particular,¹⁰ and even one recent historical collection apparently refuses to move beyond the terminologies and analytic positionings of the past (see Simmons

1998). Such work underplays both the sociocultural complexity of pre-contact peoples and the historical survival of these peoples notwithstanding painful processes of cultural loss and social fragmentation. Much of the literature about Native Californians has not yet come to terms with the movement by many anthropologists away from ahistorical, bounded, and trait-derived frameworks for culture and cultural history (see Alonso 1994; Williams 1989).

This article has treated Ohlone history, ancient and recent, as a dynamic process of complex continuity and change, in the context of colonialism's rupture of cultural memory. Individuals, such as José Guzman, Angela Colos, and the Muwekma elders who excavated the Three Wolves site and helped to bring about this article, have historically played key roles in reestablishing the vibrancy of narrative and tradition. The interpretations pursued in this article by the Muwekma Tribe in conjunction with anthropologists are intended to abet the re-empowerment of a people who had been disempowered by the bureaucratic deployment of anthropological knowledge over this past century (see Field 1999). The revision of Ohlone history, ancient and recent, cannot resurrect symbols and practices; but the process of reclaiming their history has fueled the revitalization movement associated with the struggle for federal acknowledgment. In effect, a new Ohlone basket is being woven, using old materials uncovered by the Ohlone descendants themselves through archaeology, the interpretation of older ethnography, and a growing appreciation for the creative cultural work of individuals such as Angela Colos. This study thus forms a part of the process of reweaving the Ohlone basket. But as with any cultural process, the results are unpredictable, liable to produce new and unforeseen patterns, and incorporate new materials that the ancestors could not possibly have foreseen.

N O T E S

With genealogical research by Lorraine Escobar and translations and cultural interpretations by John Guzman, Dolores Galvan Lameria, Concha Rodriguez, Kathy Perez, and Rosemary Cambra.

- 1 The site was discovered as a consequence of the completion of the highway link between Interstate 101 and Highway 85, during the construction of a flood management catchment basin mandated by the Army Corps of Engineers as a part of the project. OFCS won the contract to carry out the excavation because of its relationships of partnership with the city of San José, Santa Clara County, and the California Department of Transportation, relationships that are based on OFCS's record of previous excavations carried out in a responsible and professional manner.
- 2 Merriam was the first to use the expression "Ohlonean" languages, which Levy (1978), using Kroeber's (1925) suggestions, embellished into a seven-branch Ohlone language tree. In this study, we do not view language as a defining feature of precontact Native Californian cultures, but rather as one

of several important factors underlying regionalization and the integration of regions before the arrival of Europeans.

- 3 Archaeological work has been an essential economic vehicle for the tribe, which makes such work a very concrete aspect of the contemporary process of tribal revitalization. As such, OFCS's work has provided the fuel for the tribe's protracted relationship with the Bureau of Indian Affairs Branch of Acknowledgement Research, which in 1996 at last affirmed that the Muwekma Ohlone were a "previously unambiguously recognized tribe," putting the Ohlone on "ready status." In 1998 the status was upgraded to "waiting for active consideration." See Field, in this issue, for an assessment of the current status of the Ohlone petition for federal acknowledgment.
- 4 This article is an attempt to go beyond the mere description and listing of animal remains recovered. While other studies have merely alluded to possible generalized "ceremonial," "ritual," or "religious" uses of artifacts or activities at archaeological sites (e.g., see Cartier, Bass, and Ortman 1993; Samuelson and Self 1995), as well as ignored evidence that the human remains recovered from respective Bay Area sites are the result of ritualized activities that centered around formal cemeteries, this article attempts to interweave a host of complex processes that cross-cut archaeological, ethnohistoric, and ethnographic boundaries.
- 5 The ethnographic literature utilized herein is by no means an exhaustive review of all written sources but a sampling of what we consider relevant.
- 6 Escobar's (1998) genealogical research decisively refutes several aspects of another version of Angela Colos's ancestry that Ortiz (1994) has asserted. Angela's surname "Colos" was her stepfather's not her biological father's; Mission San José records leave no doubt that her father was Zenon, an Indian from either San Rafael or Mission Dolores. Joaquina's ancestry cannot be established beyond any doubt, but we agree that she resided in the East Bay and likely came from Miwok heritage. Angela was not born on the Bernal ranch, which was the site of Alisal, but rather at Rancho San Ramon. Far from minor details, the complexity of Angela Colos's (and José Guzman's, and other informants') ancestry are a vital part of coming to terms with these individuals' remarkable exercise of will in creating Ohlone lives in early twentieth-century California.
- 7 On October 10, 1986, Muwekma Elder Dolores Sanchez read over and offered a translation to the Guzman stories (videotape on file in Muwekma tribal office). As part of the review process of these stories and the translation offered by Dolores Sanchez in 1986, Muwekma elders Dottie Galvan Lameira, Concha Rodriguez, and Hank Alvarez, along with family members, also worked on these translations at a tribal gathering a few days after New Year's 1995.
- 8 "Captain," or *capitán* in Spanish, was the word used to refer to Ohlone leaders in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. José Antonio, whose name was Hú'ská in Chochenyo, was the last captain of the Alisal rancheria. He died in 1900. José Antonio was the great-great granduncle of the current Muwekma Ohlone chair, Rosemary Cambra.
- 9 In an interview with the descendants of Erolinda Corral, Kathy Perez (Erolinda's granddaughter) remembered that her grandmother would call her the nickname *Kaknutc*, and when Erolinda was

excited she called Kathy *Kakmuté*. Mission record research conducted by Milliken (1991) demonstrates that the *Kakmu* (*Cacnu*) name or stem was given to both males and females from Chochenyo-speaking Ohlone tribes of the East Bay and Tamien-speaking Ohlone tribes of the Santa Clara Valley as personal names.

- 10 In the case of the Three Wolves site, the antiquity of the human

and animal remains uncovered makes a strong argument for a long history of sociocultural complexity among central California native peoples, a time depth that has been generally discounted by both older and more recent archaeological analysis (e.g., see Bard and Busby 1985; Samuelson and Self 1995 for their generalities on Ohlonean culture).

W O R K S C I T E D

Alonso, Ana María. "The Politics of Space, Time, and Substance: State Formation, Nationalism, and Ethnicity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23 (1994): 379–405.

Applegate, Richard B. *Atishwin: The Dream Helper in South-Central California*. Socorro, N.M.: Ballena Press, 1978.

Bard, James C., and Colin Busby. *Cultural Resources Report on the Wade Ranch Orchard Properties, Inc. Parcels 611 and 612 San José, CA*. On file, California Archaeological Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California, 1985.

Bean, Lowell J., and Thomas Blackburn, eds. *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*. Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1976.

Bean, Lowell J., and Sylvia B. Vane. "Cults and Their Transformations." In *Handbook of North American Indians: California*, vol. 8, ed. Robert F. Heizer, 37–57. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.

Bennyhoff, James A. *Ethnogeography of the Plains Miwok*. Center for Archaeological Research at Davis Publication 5. University of California, Davis. 1977.

Blackburn, Thomas C. "Ceremonial Integration and Social Interaction in Aboriginal California." In *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, ed. Lowell J. Bean and Thomas Blackburn, 225–43. Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1976.

Cartier, Robert, Jason Bass, and Scott Ortman. *The Archaeology of the Guadalupe Corridor*. Santa Clara, Calif.: Santa Clara County Archaeological Society, 1993.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher, and Kelly M. Mann. *The Wintu and Their Neighbors: A Very Small World-System in Northern California*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1998.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Colson, Elizabeth, ed. *Autobiographies of Three Pomo Women*. 1956; reprinted, Berkeley: University of California, Department of Anthropology, Archaeological Research Facility, 1974.

Davis, Lee. "Mt. Diablo: Captain of Central California." Paper presented at the Scholar's Conference, "The Ohlone Indians of the Bay Area: A Continuing Tradition," C. E. Smith Museum of Anthropology, California State University, Hayward, November 14, 1992.

Davis, Lee, Suzanne Stewart, and Richard Hitchcock. *Native American History of the Los Vaqueros Project Area, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, California*. Report prepared for the Contra Costa Water District, Concord, California, 1994.

Dorrington, Lafayette A. Letter written to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, June 23, 1927. Roseburg File,

- 1907–1939, Bureau of Indian Affairs Classified Files, National Archives, Washington, D.C.
- DuBois, Cora. *The 1870 Ghost Dance*. Anthropological Records 3, no. 1. Berkeley: University of California, 1939. 1–157.
- Escobar, Lorraine. "The Lineage of Angela Colos." Unpublished manuscript, 1998.
- Field, Les. "Complicities and Collaborations: Anthropologists and the 'Unacknowledged Tribes' of California." *Current Anthropology* 40, no. 2 (1999): 193–209.
- Field, Les, Alan Leventhal, Dolores Sanchez, and Rosemary Cambra. "A Contemporary Ohlone Tribal Revitalization Movement: A Perspective from the Muwékma Costanoan/Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area." *California History* 71, no. 3 (1992): 412–31.
- Gayton, Anna H. *The Ghost Dance of 1870 in South Central California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, 28, no. 3. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1930. 57–82.
- . "Areal Affiliations of California Folktales." *American Anthropologist* 37, no. 4 (1935): 582–99.
- . "Estudillo among the Yokuts: 1819." In *Essays in Honor of Alfred Louis Kroeber*, 67–85. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.
- Gifford, Edward W. "Central Miwok Shamans." Ethnological Documents Collection, University Archives, University of California, Berkeley. CU-23.1, no. 179, 1914.
- . "Yokuts Moieties." Ethnological Documents Collection, University Archives, University of California, Berkeley. CU-23.1, no. 178, 1915.
- . *Miwok Moieties*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 12, no. 4. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1916. 139–94.
- . *Dichotomous Social Organization in South Central California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 11, no. 5. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1916. 291–96.
- . *Miwok Myths*. University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology 12, no. 8. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1917. 283–388.
- . *Miwok Cults*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 18, no. 3. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1926. 392–408.
- . "Southern Maidu Religious Ceremonies." *American Anthropologist* 29, no. 3 (1927): 214–57.
- . "Central Miwok Ceremonies," *University of California Anthropological Records* 14, no. 4 (1955): 261–318.
- Goldschmidt, Walter. "Social Organization in Native California and the Origin of Clans," *American Anthropologist* 50 (1948): 444–56.
- . *Nomlaki Ethnography*. University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology 42. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951. 303–436.
- Gutiérrez, Ramón A. *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1540–1846*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Harrington, John P. "Costanoan Field Notes: Chochenyo Linguistics." On microfilm at San José State University Library. New York: Kraus International Publications, 1921–1939.
- . "Cultural Element Distributions, XIX: Central California Coast." *Anthropological Records* 7, no. 1 (1942): 1–44.

- Heizer, Robert F., and Gordon Hewes. "Animal Ceremonialism in Central California in the Light of Archaeology," *American Anthropologist* 42 (1940): 587–603.
- Hurtado, Albert. *Indian Survival on the California Frontier*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Kelly, Isabel, ed. "Coast Miwok." In *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 8, ed. Robert Heizer, 414–25. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.
- . *Interviews with Tom Smith and Maria Copa: Isabel Kelly's Ethnographic Notes on the Coast Miwok Indians of Marin and Southern Sonoma Counties, California*. Ed. Mary E. T. Collier and Sylvia Barker Thalman. MAPOM Occasional Papers, no. 6. San Rafael, Calif.: Miwok Archaeological Preserve of Marin, 1991.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. *Indian Myths of South Central California*. University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnology 4, no. 4. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1907. 169–249.
- . *Handbook of the Indians of California*. New York: Dover, 1925.
- Leventhal, Alan, Les Field, Hank Alvarez, and Rosemary Cambra. "The Ohlone: Back from Extinction." In *The Ohlone Past and Present: Native Americans of the San Francisco Bay Region*, ed. Lowell J. Bean, 297–336. Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1994.
- Levy, Richard. "Costanoan." In *Handbook of North American Indians: California*, vol. 8, ed. Robert F. Heizer, 485–95. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.
- Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer, eds. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Merriam, C. Hart. *Ethnographic Notes on California Indian Tribes: Central California Indian Tribes*, ed. Robert F. Heizer. University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 68, no. 3. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility, 1967.
- Milliken, Randall. "The Spatial Organization of Human Population on Central California's San Francisco Peninsula at the Spanish Arrival." Master's thesis, Sonoma State University, 1983.
- . "An Ethnohistory of the Indian People of the San Francisco Bay Area from 1770 to 1810." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1991.
- . *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769–1810*. Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1995.
- Monroy, Douglas. *Thrown among Strangers: The Making of Mexican Culture in Frontier California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Ortiz, Beverly O. "Chocheño and Rumsen Narratives: A Comparison." In *The Ohlone Past and Present: Native Americans of the San Francisco Bay Region*, ed. Lowell J. Bean, 99–163. Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1994.
- Rawls, James J. *Indians of California: The Changing Image*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984.
- Samuelson, Ann E., and William Self. *Archaeological Testing Report Site CA-SCL-12 Tasman Corridor Light Rail Project, Santa Clara County, California*. Vol. 1. *Results and Recommendations*. Report prepared for Woodward-Clyde Consultants for the Santa Clara County Transportation Agency, 1995.
- Sando, Joe S. *Pueblo Nations: Eight Centuries of Pueblo Indian History*. Santa Fe, N.M.: Clear Light, 1992.
- Sarris, Greg. *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Simmons, William. "Indian Peoples of California." In *Contested Eden: California before the Gold Rush*, ed. R. A. Gutierrez and R. J. Orsi, 48–77. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

- Slagle, Allogan (with assistance by Alan Leventhal). *Unfinished Justice II: A Study of Common and Particular California Indian Historical Factors and Conditions*. Report submitted to the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy, Sacramento, 1996.
- Stewart, Omer C. "Litigation and Its Effects." In *Handbook of North American Indians: California*, vol. 8, ed. Robert F. Heizer, 705–12. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.
- Weber, David. *The Spanish Frontier in North America*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Williams, Brackette. "A Class Act: Anthropology and the Race to Nation across Ethnic Terrain." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18 (1989): 401–44.
- Wolf, Eric. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.