Although the Chumash Indians seem to have engendered greater interest and respect among early explorers and missionaries than perhaps did any other group in California, they remain to this day a people shrouded in relative obscurity—an obscurity scarcely warranted by their obvious technological sophistication and general level of cultural complexity. Some forty-five years ago A. L. Kroeber lamented the paucity of data available for a reconstruction of Chumash culture, stating that "there is no group in the State that once held the importance of the Chumash concerning which we know so little" (Kroeber, 1953:550). In many ways the situation has changed little since Kroeber's *Handbook of the Indians of California* first appeared in 1925, at least in terms of published data; fortunately, however, future analysis of the wealth of information contained in the ethnographic and linguistic notes compiled by John P. Harrington (from which the narratives utilized for this study are derived) will surely result
in a remarkable expansion of our knowledge of many aboriginal California societies, including that of the Chumash.

The brief sketch of Chumash culture presented in this chapter does not, however, reflect the added insight afforded by the data in the Harrington notes, although these will be utilized to some extent in a later chapter to test the validity of the analysis. Since a primary objective of this study is to explore the feasibility of deriving important ethnographic data from oral narratives without prior reference to more conventional sources of information, I feel it best simply to present the kind of cultural sketch possible with the data now available. But since the purpose of this study is not a complete ethnographic description of the Chumash, nor is it the sorely needed analysis of all of Harrington’s notes on the group, the cultural sketch included here will perform be brief and sparingly documented. The interested reader who wishes a detailed or extensive treatment of the historic or standard ethnographic sources should consult Kroebier (1953), or the more recent descriptions of Landberg (1965) or Grant (1965), while Anderson’s “A Bibliography of the Chumash and Their Predecessors” (1964) is particularly valuable for bibliographic references.

Sources of Information

Sources of information on Chumash culture fall generally into four categories corresponding to major chronological periods: (1) the period of Spanish exploration (1542-1770); (2) the Mission period (1772-1834); (3) the period of initial ethnographic interest (1860-1900); and (4) the period of modern anthropological research (1900-present). Unfortunately, while these sources are voluminous, they are largely secondary—and the primary sources are all too brief or superficial. Only the future promise of Harrington’s material brightens an otherwise dismal situation.

The period of Spanish exploration opens with the voyage of Juan Cabrillo in 1542 and ends with the founding of the first mission in Chumash territory some 230 years later. The Cabrillo expedition spent several months in the Santa Barbara Channel area and presumably wintered on San Miguel Island, where Cabrillo died and is thought to be buried. This initial voyage was succeeded by those of Cermeno in 1595 and Vizcaino in 1602, both of which passed through the Channel, but
neither of them contributed more than brief observations to the sparse ethnographic data contained in the surviving records of the Cabrillo expedition. The accounts of these voyages are typical of most written by Spanish explorers and missionaries in that most of the information that can be derived from them concerns material culture items such as dress, housing, boats and utensils—in other words, those things most apparent to the superficial observer. Seldom does one find in the diaries any data on social organization, economic or political behavior, or religious beliefs or practices, a circumstance perhaps not unexpected in light of the fact that the Spanish as a rule considered aboriginal cultures to be of little interest or significance per se, and certainly unable to contribute substantively to scientific knowledge. The diaries kept by various members of the Portolá expedition of 1769-70 and the Anza expedition of 1775 represent some improvement over earlier accounts in that they are considerably more detailed, and are based on explorations by land with the consequent opportunities for closer observations of daily life, but there is still an ethnocentric bias to the observations that results in fleeting or impressionistic sketches of scenes recorded in passing, much like those one might expect from a passenger in a train who takes a few moments to jot down on paper the activities he can observe from his window during a brief stop. Again there is the same attention to material culture and the surface expression of daily life, but there is little interest in the deeper meanings beneath the surface.

With the establishment of the Franciscan missions of San Luis Obispo (1772), San Buenaventura (1782), Santa Barbara (1786), La Purísima (1787), and Santa Inés (1808), the Spanish had an unparalleled opportunity to observe and record Chumash culture as never before. Unfortunately, though, there was neither a Boscana nor an Arroyo de la Cuesta among the missionaries stationed in Chumash territory, and the accounts of native life stemming from this period of massive acculturation come primarily from sources external to the mission system itself. The extraordinary botanist José Longinos Martínez passed through Santa Barbara in 1792 and wrote a fascinating description of the local Indians, and the following year another botanist, Archibald Menzies, also made ethnographic observations while the Vancouver expedition was briefly
anchored at Santa Barbara. The only data from this period recorded by the missionaries themselves (with the exception of the mission books recording births, baptisms, marriages, and so on) were in the form of brief answers to the *Interragatorio of 1811*, a questionnaire sent to each of the missions by the civil authorities in Mexico, or in sparse comments in letters, or in such rare documents as the *confesionario* of José Señán (Beeler, 1967).

The effects of missionization on the California Indians have been amply documented (see Cook, 1943), and certainly the effects on the Chumash were no exception to the rule. The combination of repeated epidemics, deliberate abortion, and destructive acculturation during the Mission period, followed by dispossession of their lands and a general exodus upon the secularization of the missions in 1834, led to a massive decrease in population and a virtual end to Chumash culture as a living entity by the time scholars began to interest themselves in the reconstruction of California’s aboriginal past. Although some vestiges of Chumash political and economic organization may have survived as late as the 1860s (see Blackburn, 1974), only a few scattered survivors were still available for questioning by the time competent ethnographers began investigating aboriginal cultural patterns. The period of time between the secularization of the missions in 1834 and the initiation of ethnographic research in the 1870s still represents a major unfilled gap in our knowledge of Chumash acculturation and assimilation.

The beginnings of ethnographic research in California are clearly discernible in Alexander Taylor’s famous collection of journalistic miscellany, published between 1860 and 1863 as a series of newspaper articles under the rubric of “The Indianology of California,” although a real flowering of interest in aboriginal cultures does not occur for another decade. During the 1870s anthropological research in California proliferated, and much of it was centered upon the Chumash and their neighbors. The Wheeler Survey, for example, collected archaeological, ethnographic, and linguistic data in the Santa Barbara region, and men such as Paul Schumacher, Stephen Bowers, and Léon de Cessac vied with one another in accumulating vast quantities of archaeological materials. In addition, Cessac also apparently recorded a considerable amount of ethno-
graphic data from informants like Rafael Solares. Unfortunately, most of his ethnographic notes have been misplaced, although the archaeological materials have recently been discovered in Paris (see Reichler and Heizer, 1964). From 1880 to 1888 H. W. Henshaw collected linguistic and some ethnographic data from surviving Indians for the Bureau of American Ethnology, and it is interesting to note that one of his major Chumash informants was Juan Estévan Pico, a half-breed who seems in turn to have obtained much of his data from Fernando Librado, Harrington's most valuable Ventureño informant. Between 1887 and 1896, Lorenzo Yates published a series of articles on Chumash archaeological and ethnographic materials, using data derived in some cases from living informants.

Almost all of the data collected during this period of initial ethnographic research are either archaeological or linguistic, and are most useful in reconstructing aspects of Chumash material culture. The ethnographic data, for the most part, are sparse, isolated from context, and recorded by people whose primary interest was not the explication of Chumash social organization. Only the notes recorded by Cessac might have differed in this respect, and they have yet to be recovered. Few of the scholars who concerned themselves in one way or another with Chumash culture at this time had either the training or the inclination to exploit systematically the knowledge possessed by the elderly Indians still living who provided a direct link with an aboriginal way of life. By the time such a man did appear it was nearly too late.

John Peabody Harrington, ethnologist and linguist, was born on April 29, 1884, and died on October 21, 1961, after a career nearly as remarkable for eccentricity as for its productivity. After his death the Smithsonian Institution began the task of locating and assembling his scattered field notes, which were eventually to fill over 400 large boxes and provide significant data on virtually every aboriginal linguistic group in North America. Although this mass of material may very well represent the greatest collection of linguistic and ethnographic information about North American Indians ever compiled by one man, Harrington's predilection for privacy and his complete indifference to the rewards of scholarly recognition make it difficult even now to provide more than the merest outline of
his career, especially as the bulk of his collection has not as yet been adequately catalogued. It is to be hoped that a biography of this extraordinary man will some day be published, but until then Harrington’s few published writings, the recollections of others (see Stirling and Glemser, 1963), and the internal evidence in his notes will have to suffice as sources of information about his research.

Harrington seems to have begun his research with the Chumash sometime in 1912. At first he worked with the aid of an interpreter conversant with Spanish, but within a few months he had become fluent enough to dispense with an intermediary. He apparently spent almost all of his available time during the next four years with the few elderly Chumash still fluent in the language, and the data collected during this period are perhaps the most valuable that he obtained. On February 20, 1914, he formally joined the staff of the Smithsonian Institution (from which he had already received financial support) as Ethnologist, a position he was to hold until his retirement in 1954. He continued his work in the field until September, 1917, returning to his Chumash research from August, 1918, until May, 1919, and from July, 1921, until May, 1922. The deaths of key informants at this time may have discouraged him temporarily, for he turned his attention to archaeological research between 1923 and 1926, excavating a number of sites in Chumash territory, including that of Burton Mound or Syuxtun at Santa Barbara. The period from September, 1927, to March, 1928, was once again devoted to linguistic and ethnographic research, apparently with Lucrecia Garcia as informant, although most of his energy went into rechecking earlier transcriptions with his informants. Harrington does not seem to have ever again worked with a primary Chumash informant, although he did spend some time towards the end of his life checking the accuracy of earlier transcriptions with Lucrecia’s daughter, and he also seems to have attempted the monumental task of organizing his own material in order to write a history and ethnography of the Chumash.

It would appear that no group in North America held a greater fascination for Harrington than the Chumash, to whom his prodigious energies were turned so often throughout his life. Certainly no other group is represented as massively or as consistently in his notes. However, with the exception of brief
notices of ongoing field work in the Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Reports, Harrington’s only ethnographic publication on the Chumash was the Culture Element Distributions trait list (1942) that he filled out at the urging of Kroeber—probably with reluctance and under duress, in the belief that only in this way could he keep others from invading what he apparently felt to be his own private ethnographic preserve. Although the C.E.D. report is probably fairly accurate in most respects, it must be used and evaluated with certain qualifications clearly in mind. First, it is far removed in spirit and style from the research methodology that Harrington seems to have found most congenial, and it is quite probable that he had little real interest in the project from start to finish. Second, he was using notes that he himself had probably not glanced at for over twenty years, and there are occasional discrepancies between the C.E.D. list and the notes, which indicate an unfamiliarity with his own material that should come as no surprise to anyone aware of the state of monumental disorganization in which the collection was found after his death. Third, the necessity of fitting a great mass of often disjointed data into the rather procrustean form of the C.E.D. trail list occasionally seems to have resulted in an omission or distortion of essential facts. This seems to be especially true in the sensitive areas of social organization and religion. In sum, the C.E.D. report can best be likened to a block of ice perched upon the tip of the proverbial iceberg: far more exists than meets the eye.

Since Harrington’s death in 1961, improved access to his notes has resulted in the appearance of several papers based on some aspect or portion of the data that he collected on Chumash culture. Craig (1966 and 1967) has published papers on Ventureño basketry and related topics, drawing heavily on Harrington notes at Berkeley. Linda King (1969) has utilized similar materials in her report on excavations at Medea Creek, providing an ethnographic dimension to her archaeological data. Heizer (1970b) has published a brief Harrington notebook discovered among the Merriam papers, Chester King (1971) has combined historic and ethnographic data with extracts from the Harrington notes in order to describe Chumash economic interaction, and Blackburn (1974) has used similar materials to discuss social integration throughout Southern Califor-
nia. Thus an increasing number of scholars are becoming familiar with the potentialities inherent in Harrington’s linguistic and ethnographic notes, although what little has been published so far gives but the barest indication of the wealth of information available.

THE STATUS OF CHUMASH CULTURE

Aboriginally, of course, the Chumash were neither a cultural nor a linguistic entity per se. Rather, theirs was a large and probably diverse population occupying numerous relatively autonomous but contiguous settlements scattered irregularly across a rich and ecologically varied habitat. They shared many important cultural traits, and spoke a number of languages and dialects belonging to a single branch of the Hokan language family. The territory held by Chumash peoples extended along the California coast from Topanga Canyon in the south to Estero Bay in the north, and included the three islands of Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa and San Miguel. To the northeast it ranged as far inland as the edge of the San Joaquin Valley. Within this region of islands, coasts, foothills, valleys and mountains lived a population variously estimated to have numbered anywhere from 8,000 to over 20,000, although a figure of perhaps 15,000 seems most reasonable in view of the evidence (Brown, 1967). The largest portion of this population was clustered along the shores of the Santa Barbara Channel, where the combination of exceptionally rich marine fauna and a relatively sheltered coastline favored maritime adaptation and promoted a degree of cultural complexity which would be of interest to anyone attempting to delineate evolutionary mechanisms underlying indigenous cultural change.

The Chumash languages have been relatively unstudied compared to many other language families in California, at least by modern standards. In 1925 Kroeber distinguished at least eight Chumash “dialects”: Obispeño, Purismeño, Inezeneño, Barbareño, Ventureño, Island, Cuyama, and Emigdiano (1953:552). Recent studies have demonstrated that most of these were distinct languages rather than dialects, and that each in turn had a number of dialectical subdivisions. Obispeño and the Island dialects seem to have been the most divergent, while Barbareño and Inezeneño were quite similar to one another. Additional information from Harrington’s unpub-
lished notes indicates that there were two major Barbareño dialects (Dos Pueblos and Santa Barbara-Rincon), two island dialects (Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa-San Miguel), and several Ventureño dialects (Ventura, Mugu, Malibu, and Castaic Lake or *kaštek*). The dialect spoken at San Emigdio (corresponding to Kroeber's Cuyama dialect) was said to be very similar to Barbareño—what was spoken in the area labelled Emigdiano in Plate I of Kroeber's *Handbook* was actually *kaštek* Ventureño. There may also have been an Ojai dialect of Ventureño, and perhaps two major dialects of Inezeño, but a detailed analysis of Harrington's linguistic material must be carried out before any firm conclusions about the internal relationships of the Chumashan languages can be drawn.

Chumash villages varied considerably in population. A number of the pueblos or "towns" described by early explorers may have contained as many as a thousand people, although communities of one to two hundred were probably more typical. Each village consisted of a number of hemispherical or conical houses constructed of poles covered with thatching. In some of the larger pueblos the houses seem to have been arranged in orderly rows along streets, and there is some evidence along the northwestern part of the Santa Barbara Channel of a bipartite division of communities perhaps indicative of social institutions peculiar to that area (Brown, 1967:5). The typical house was approximately twenty feet in diameter and contained a single family, although some reached a diameter of over fifty feet and housed a number of apparently related families. These latter houses almost certainly belonged to chiefs or other distinguished men, and may have contained a single extended family consisting of a man, his wives and immature children, and his married sons and their families. In addition to houses, each village also contained one or more temescal of sweat houses, a gaming field for playing shinny or hoop—and—pole, a stockaded cemetery, and a shrine containing an offertory pole where sacrifices of food or money were made and ceremonies were held on ritual occasions.

The material culture of the Chumash, with the exception of specific technological items associated with a maritime adaptation, differed little from that of their neighbors to the north or east. Their most striking technological innovation, of course, was the *tomol* or plank canoe that so impressed the
Spanish explorers. This was made of fitted planks sewn together and then caulked with asphaltum. It was generally about twenty feet in length, carried three to four men, and was propelled by double-bladed paddles. The Chumash used the tomol for hunting sea mammals, fishing, and trading back and forth between the mainland and the islands. Sea mammals were hunted with tridents or harpoons, while fish were taken in nets, or caught on hooks of three different kinds, or speared. Hunting techniques on land were little different from those used by most California Indians. Both the self-bow and the sinew-backed bow were used, as well as a variety of traps, but it is uncertain whether the atlatl or the curved throwing stick were used, though it is possible. Freshwater fish were caught in traps or speared.

Chumash basketry was diverse and finely made, though not exceptionally so, and resembled that made by adjacent Uto-Aztecans (Dawson and Deetz, 1965). It was used for collecting, carrying, and storing the wide variety of vegetable foods utilized, and it was also used for the cooking, leaching, or other preparation of such foods. Most personal belongings, too, were stored in baskets. Exceptionally fine bowls and plates were carved from wood, and steatite from Santa Catalina Island was obtained through trade and used to make such objects as paint mortars, bowls, digging stick weights, comales, pipes, beads, and effigies. Many of these items were probably manufactured by full-time specialists, and were often traded as far away as the San Joaquin Valley.

The Chumash economic system was complex and involved intensive interaction over a wide geographic area (Chester King, 1971). Manufactured goods were produced primarily by occupational specialists who belonged to “brotherhoods” or gremios, sodality-like organizations that cross-cut localized affiliations and had a kinship-based charter. Most manufactured goods were produced on the islands (where resources were scarcer) and exported to the mainland, while the mainland exported food stuffs and goods manufactured from materials not present on the islands. Most exchange appears to have been based upon an individual profit motivation, and apparently operated according to the law of supply and demand. A form of currency based upon shell beads was widely used, and the Chumash appear to have been the pri-
mary source of currency for the southern half of the state. There were standards of measurement for both money and other goods, based either on length or on volume, and there were also standard rates of exchange for trading purposes. The Chumash thus had an essentially monetized market economy in which food, manufactured goods, and some services were exchanged or purchased. Fiestas and other ceremonial occasions seem to have been important contexts for economic exchange, and there is little doubt that there were significant interrelationships between the economic system of the Chumash and the political and religious hierarchy typified by the ōantap cult (Blackburn, 1974).

Perhaps the least understood facet of Chumash culture involves their kinship and marriage patterns. In his C.E.D. paper (1942) Harrington notes that the Chumash had three types of kinship groups: (1) moieties, (2) nonlocalized "patri-clans," and (3) patrilineages. But Harrington's own field notes on the subject are brief, cryptic, and contradictory, and certainly open to differing interpretations. Practically all of the data were supplied by a single informant, María Solares, who had visited among the southern Yokuts and was partially of Yokuts descent, a fact that must be kept in mind when evaluating her information. The presence of moieties among most Chumash groups is highly unlikely, although the bipartite arrangement of villages along the northwest coast of the channel, referred to earlier, may indicate the presence of some kind of dichotomous organization in that area. The "clans," which were almost certainly Yokuts-like "totem groups" (see Kunkel, 1962), may very well have been differentially ranked either in terms of wealth and prestige or in terms of the purported power of the animal helper or totem, but there is good reason to believe that the Chumash did not have a moiety system in historic times such as those described for some other California groups.

Chumash social organization seems to have most closely resembled that of some of the Yokuts tribeslets of the San Joaquin Valley to the north. Harrington's "clans," as was mentioned above, were apparently composed of people sharing common animal helpers, and both group and helper were referred to as škalukš. An individual inherited the škalukš of both father and mother, though that of the father was con-
sidered the stronger. The škalukš does not seem to have been exogamous, and may not in fact have acted as a corporate group. The lineages reported by Harrington were probably equivalent to, or the basis for, virilocal extended families similar to those that among the Yokuts occupied either multi-family dwellings or nuclear family neighborhoods. Certainly, the available data suggest such a pattern for the Chumash. Most of the Chumash lived in houses suitable for nuclear families only, but chiefs and other influential or wealthy people apparently occupied houses large enough for six or seven related families. Marriage was probably regulated most by the general ban against marriage to a close relative of any kind. There have been some suggestions that village endogamy may have been practiced among some of the Chumash (see Landberg, 1965:29-33), but there is considerable evidence of intermarriage between villages in the Santa Monica Mountains in the mission records (Brown, 1967:7). The problem has yet to be resolved. Apparently only chiefs were allowed more than a single spouse at a time, with a majority of marriages being monogamous.

The political organization of the Chumash achieved a complexity surprising even for California. Although a situation involving multiple chiefs has been described by most authorities, there is a strong possibility that this may be an erroneous supposition resulting from attempts by the Spanish to explain indigenous patterns in ethnocentric terms, and from a general application of the word capitán to anyone occupying a political office. The primary political unit was the village, presided over by the wot or chief, whose duties included caring for visitors and the poor, furnishing ceremonial property and personnel for fiestas, arranging for fiestas and other ceremonies, and representing the village on such occasions. Chieftainship was hereditary and usually involved primogeniture, although a chief's younger son or a sister or daughter could be named to succeed him if the community felt it best. The chief was assisted by a paxa or ceremonial leader, and two ksen or messengers. The paxa was the most important political figure in the village after the wot. He made announcements and gave orations at fiestas, collected offerings and fines, and presided over ceremonies. He was probably also the major link between the
political hierarchy represented by the wot and the religious network of the Ṩantap cult.

Chumash villages were linked in a number of loose federations that might possibly have been coterminous with the dialect groupings mentioned earlier. These federations may have been based on kinship relationships between the wots of the component villages, on membership in the Ṩantap cult, or both. They seem to have been organized around a principal village (Malibu, Mugu, Santa Barbara, Dos Pueblos, etc.) whose wot was recognized as having some degree of authority over the villages in the federation. There is historic evidence that in some cases the son of the wot of the principal village was himself wot of another (Brown, 1967:48). Interaction also occurred in other contexts as well, and it is possible that much of the political integration observed between Chumash villages was based on mechanisms other than kinship:

Although the Chumash had the usual variety of herb and sucking doctors, rattlesnake, bear and weather shamans, and many individuals with limited powers derived from possession of an Ṩalíswin (a dreamhelper or tálísman), there was also a formal cult organization homologous to the Chingishnish cult as it probably existed among the Gabrielino and Luiseño. Members of this cult were referred to as Ṩantap, and their primary responsibility seems to have been the performance of dances and other rituals at large public ceremonies. Members were baptized into the cult as children, and through a period of apprenticeship learned the esoteric language, sacred songs and dances, and other aspects of ritual that characterized it. The parents of children who became members apparently had to pay a considerable sum of money for the privilege; presumably, only high-status families could afford this, and it is interesting to note that the chief and all members of his family were required to belong. There were apparently at least twelve Ṩantap in every major village, many of whom participated from time to time in ceremonies held in widely-scattered locations; since the chiefs, other important officers, and shamans were all members of what essentially was a ubiquitous, far-flung religious elitist society, the Ṩantap cult acted as an important integrative mechanism throughout the Chumash area (Blackburn, 1974:104-105).

In discussing Chumash religious beliefs and practices, it may be useful to distinguish between those that were essen-
tially private and those involving the community as a whole. Private ceremonies, primarily of interest to a few individuals or families, were performed on such occasions as birth, giving a child a name, adolescence, the taking of Datura, marriage, illness and recovery from illness, and wakes, while occasions calling for public observance included a chief's birthday, the appearance of rattlesnakes from hibernation, a mourning anniversary, completion of the summer harvest, and the summer and winter solstices. Perhaps the most significant ceremony as far as the individual was concerned was the drinking of Datura, for it was during the subsequent coma and hallucinatory state that the boy or girl established the special relationship with a dream helper (represented by the ḫatišwin or talisman) and received prognostications concerning his or her future from the alcuklaš or administering official. The great public ceremonies (the mourning anniversaries, the September harvest fiesta, and the winter solstice ceremony) involved performances by dancers and singers associated with the ḫantap cult, shamans' contests, the construction of a siliyik or sacred enclosure, and sacrifices of money, food or down to the sun and the earth (which is called either xutaš or šup) at the šawil or shrines. They also involved complex social, economic, and political interaction between villages over a wide geographical area (see Blackburn, 1974). Chumash religious beliefs have been summarized as follows:

Chumash religious beliefs, and their more important public (as opposed to private) rituals, revolved around the esoteric and metaphorical worship of two sacred celestial "bodies," earth and sun. The sun was regarded as perhaps supreme, a vivifying male force or entity that was also vaguely threatening, a possible bringer of death; the earth, on the other hand, was the generally maternal provider of food and other necessities of life, to be worshipped in her three aspects of wind, rain and fire. A fairly precise twelve-month lunar calendar, semi-annually adjusted by reference to the solar solstices, was employed in determining the proper times to observe a variety of occasions; the importance of such astronomical cycles to the Chumash is demonstrated by the fact that there was even a kind of astrologer called an alcuklaš whose duties included the naming of new-born children according to their birth-month, the administering of toloache, and the reporting of illnesses or other social problems to the chief. When two of the most important ceremonial occa-
sions, the late September harvest fiesta and the Winter Solstice ceremony, were held was directly determined by the phases of earth and sun (Blackburn, 1974:104).

Chumash cosmography and mythology will not be discussed here, since they are treated extensively elsewhere in this study, but it should be pointed out that no other facets of Chumash culture have been more shrouded in obscurity. Only two Chumash narratives (collected by Yates) have ever been published (Heizer, 1955b).

**The Harrington Papers**

As was previously mentioned, the Smithsonian Institution began the task of locating, organizing and cataloging Harrington's manuscripts and field notes shortly after his death, an undertaking that has yet to be completed. Of the several hundred boxes of materials now available, approximately sixty or so contain notes on the Chumash Indians of southern California. Unfortunately, somewhat less than half of these sixty boxes are presently in the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian, or have even been catalogued; the remainder are on loan to the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley. This has made the examination and use of the Chumash materials exceptionally difficult and has necessitated several trips to both Washington, D.C., and Berkeley, although the great helpfulness of various staff personnel, access to a Xerox copier and small grants from both the Smithsonian Institution and the UCLA Archaeological Survey have ensured a successful conclusion to the research that has culminated in this study.

Since Harrington carried out research on the Chumash from time to time throughout his long career, his notes reflect varying stages of organization, ranging from rambling notes jotted down in pencil on odd scraps of paper to drafts of manuscripts that were never published. The original field notes were usually written in pen or pencil on both sides of letter-sized paper. These were then copied, either by hand or by typewriter, sometimes verbatim and sometimes in the form of brief extracts. Extracts were usually placed on small cards which were then filed according to an elaborate system apparently clear only to Harrington himself. The same data will thus appear in a variety of places, and it is often difficult to deter-
mine which informant supplied the data originally. Much of
the bulk that makes the materials so difficult to work with
stems from the fact that so many copies and extracts were
made and variously filed that one is practically overwhelmed
by the apparent mass of information. This, in fact, may explain
Harrington's own seeming inability to achieve an overview in
spite of the repeated attempts that are evidenced by the
various rough drafts of manuscripts scattered throughout his
papers.

The narratives and traditions presented here have been
drawn from this mass of materials after a careful examination
of all the relevant boxes at both Berkeley and Washington,
D.C. They probably represent well over ninety-five percent of
the narratives collected by Harrington from his Chumash
informants, although there is the obvious possibility that more
will be discovered in the future when the materials have been
adequately organized and catalogued. Harrington apparently
intended at one time to gather together all of the stories that he
had collected and publish them as part of a book of California
Indian folklore, for many of the narratives exist in the form of
neatly typed, translated, and rewritten copies needing little
subsequent attention. There is also a brief reference to such a
project in some of his early correspondence. But like so many
of Harrington's intentions, the book never materialized.

Although many of the narratives were put into semi-final
form by Harrington himself, the rest required varying degrees
of translation and editing. Some narratives appeared in the
form of Chumash texts with interlinear Spanish or English
translations, while many had been recorded in the rather
colloquial Spanish spoken by the informants. But even those
narratives rewritten by Harrington required partial editing of
incomplete, awkward, or extraneous sentences, as well as the
occasional translation of terms or reorganization of para-
graphs. In addition, a few of the "narratives" in Section A of
Part II were in a sense created by the editor, in that short com-
ments by an informant on a particular subject were brought
together in the form of a coherent statement, with a great deal
of extraneous material being deleted. However, during tran-
lation and editing, the primary objective was always faithful
adherence to the detail and flavor of the original without sacri-
ficing either readability or grammatical integrity. Such a proce-
dure is of course subject to criticism, because of the possible introduction of inaccuracies and an insensitivity to the nuances of Chumash narrative style, but the fact remains that that facet of Chumash oral literature will be illuminated only through a careful linguistic analysis of original texts—a project far beyond the scope of this study. In addition, many of the narratives were first recorded in Spanish rather than Chumash, so that a serious obfuscation of stylistic elements has already occurred. Most of the narratives presented few real problems in terms of translation from Spanish, although there were several that contained passages which were either obscure in meaning or which had not been translated from Chumash by Harrington (practically all of which were told by Fernando Librando). Some were recorded in English and must remain obscure, but future linguistic analysis may well clarify the rest. The informant, location, and original form of each narrative are listed in the Appendix.

The Informants

Perhaps nowhere was Harrington’s passion for privacy more evident than in the manner in which the identity of his informants was hidden. They were never referred to by name even in the field notes; instead, Harrington usually applied either a cryptic abbreviation of his own devising such as “qub.” “sa.” or “lc.” or else simply jotted down “inf. says” or “according to inf.” For this reason it has been difficult to determine the identities of his informants and to obtain biographical information on them, although a careful cross-checking of notes and examination of scattered references has made some progress possible. The data that follow are brief and should be considered tentative—a careful search of various mission records would probably turn up more data than are included here, although they are often disappointing in terms of permitting the identification of specific individuals, due in part to an unfortunate habit among the priests of using first names only when referring to the neophytes. The informants discussed here are only those that supplied narratives used in the study (although a full list of Harrington’s informants would be valuable and may someday be compiled and published elsewhere).
Fernando Librado

Fernando was probably born sometime in 1804, in the village of swaxil on Santa Cruz Island, and was brought to the mainland shortly thereafter. Most of his early years were spent in Ventura, but he later spent many years as a vaquero on ranches near Las Cruces. During the last twenty years of his life he was a handyman for the Loustalot family at the Las Cruces stage—station. He died in Santa Barbara on June 19, 1915, and was buried in the poor ground at Calvary Cemetery. He never married.

Fernando’s father was José Antonio Mamerto, son of Ambrosio, captain of the village of swaxil. His paternal uncles were Andrés and Baltazar sulupsiauset. Fernando’s father, paternal grandfather, and great-grandfather were all born at swaxil, and all had the Indian name kitsepawit, as did Fernando. Fernando’s mother was Juana María Alifonsio, daughter of José Raymundo tiʔmi of simoʔmo and a Santa Cruz Island woman. Fernando’s father died in Santa Barbara and his mother in Ventura.

Fernando’s primary language was Ventureño, but he was also familiar with Cruzeño (the Santa Cruz Island dialect), Inezeńo, and some Purismeño. He was Harrington’s most important Ventureño informant, and supplied perhaps the best data on aboriginal political organization and ritual that Harrington ever obtained. He apparently supplied Juan Estévan Pico, Henshaw’s informant, with much of his data also. Harrington usually used the abbreviation “F.” when referring to Fernando, and he may also have used either “quc.” or “quic.” when Fernando supplied Purismeño data.

María Solares

María’s date of birth has not been determined, although she was born at Mission Santa Ynez and lived in the Santa Ynez Valley most of her life. In 1868, after her mother’s death, she visited relatives at tinliw on the Tejon Ranch, at a time when that village contained people of diverse origins. María married several times, and her daughter Clara Miranda was born in 1875. María died in 1922 at Santa Ynez, at an advanced age.

María’s father was Bienvenuto and her paternal grandfather Estévan qiliqutayiwit, both of kalawašaq village in the
Santa Ynez Valley. Estevan was married to Eularia, and was the uncle of Ignacio tilinawit of kalawašaq. Maria’s mother was Brigida, who was born at tinliw and was half Yokuts. Her maternal grandfather was Ygnacio, a Chumash from sxenen or La Paleta, who was married to a Yokuts woman. Brigida’s half-brother was Juan Moynal, a Tachi Yokuts who at one time was captain of tinliw.

Maria was Harrington’s primary Inezeño informant, and appears to have been the informant most knowledgeable on the subject of mythology. Her relationship to Rafael Solares, Cessac’s informant and the ňantap whose photograph was published by Reichler and Heizer (1964), is uncertain, but he was apparently her father-in-law. Harrington used the abbreviations “qu.” or “qub.” to designate María.

Luisa Ygnacio

Luisa was born at Mission Santa Barbara, probably in 1830, and lived in the Santa Barbara area all her life. She died on December 7, 1922, and was buried at Calvary Cemetery.

Luisa’s father was Antonino, who was baptized and raised at Santa Barbara although all of his relatives were from kuyam near Dos Pueblos. Her mother was María Joaquina. Luisa had the Indian name nut’u (a species of bird). She married Policarpio in 1851, and then after his death married José Ygnacio tumyaltatset in 1856. Her daughter Lucrecia was born in Santa Barbara in 1877, and José Ygnacio died in 1880.

Luisa was probably Harrington’s best Barbareño informant, and was the mother and grandmother of two other Harrington informants. Harrington used the abbreviations “la.,” “sa.,” or “λ” when referring to her.

Lucrecia García

Lucrecia was born in Santa Barbara on June 29, 1877, and died on May 5, 1937. She was the daughter of José Ygnacio and Harrington’s informant Luisa Ygnacio. She married a Yaqui Indian by the name of Florentín García. Her daughter María or Mary acted as an informant for both Harrington and Madison Beeler.

Lucrecia was a Barbareño informant and was most valuable in supplying linguistic data. Harrington used the abbreviations “lc.” or “luc.” to designate her.
Juan de Jesús Justo

Juan Justo was born in Santa Barbara on November 16, 1858, and lived in the Santa Barbara area all his life. He was a well-known character and seems to have supplied information to a number of early ethnographers at one time or another. He died on May 5, 1941, and was buried at Calvary Cemetery.

Juan Justo's father was Justo, chief of mikiw or Dos Pueblos, and son of Andrés and Sevarina. Justo died in Santa Barbara in 1895. Juan Justo's mother was Cecilia, daughter of Segundo and Petra, who died in Santa Barbara in 1903.

Juan Justo was a Barbareño informant and a noted raconteur. Most of the narratives having a Latin American source were told by him. Harrington used the abbreviations "ju." or "J.J.J." when referring to him.

Simplicio Pico

Simplicio was born in Ventura in May, 1839, and died in Ventura on February 12, 1918. His father was Vicente Pico, and he was probably related to Juan Estévan Pico, Henshaw's informant. Little else is known about him. He was an important Ventureño informant, but does not seem to have known many narratives. Harrington used the abbreviations "Sp." or "pama" to designate him.