

Indigenous Artists, Ingenuity, and Resistance at the California Missions After 1769

Author: Yve Barthelemy Chavez

Source: UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations (author: Yve Chavez)

Original URL: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/355609rf>

Access: Open Access (American Indian Culture and Research Journal, UCLA American Indian Studies Center, via UC eScholarship)

Indigenous Artists, Ingenuity, and Resistance at the California Missions After 1769

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Art History

by Yve Barthelemy Chavez, 2017

Copyright by Yve Barthelemy Chavez, 2017

NOTE: This text is a partial capture of a very long (294-page) dissertation. Due to a hard size limit in the automated PDF-text extraction tool used to build this archive (which repeatedly and consistently truncated extraction at the same point regardless of retry method), only the front matter and the complete Introduction chapter (pages i-37 of the original document) could be captured. Chapters 1 through 6, the Figures section, Appendix A, and the Bibliography were not retrievable through the available tools and are not included below.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Indigenous Artists, Ingenuity, and Resistance at the California Missions After 1769, by Yve Barthelemy Chavez, Doctor of Philosophy in Art History, University of California, Los Angeles, 2017. Professor Charlene Villaseñor Black, Chair.

This dissertation aims to place California Indian agency and artistry at the forefront of California mission art studies through close analysis of Chumash and Tongva practices at four of Southern California's missions: San Gabriel, San Buenaventura, Santa Barbara, and Santa Inés. Although the mission churches and their decorations reflect European stylistic influences, all twenty-one mission sites are the products of California Indian ingenuity and resistance. By examining primary accounts and ethnographic sources, this dissertation presents an Indigenous reading of Chumash and Tongva dances, stone sculpting, basket weaving, and painting carried out under great adversity at the missions. After entering the missions, California Indians continued to practice their ancestors' traditions that pre-dated the Franciscan friars' 1769 arrival. California Indian artists also combined local materials with European and Mexican styles, which gave their art and the mission buildings a unique appearance. This dissertation draws upon decolonizing methodologies, rooted in interdisciplinary studies, to deconstruct Eurocentric biases in archival sources and romanticized misunderstandings in historical scholarship about mission art and California Indian contributions. The

traditional art historical tools of formal analysis and iconography bring to light the artistic talents of California's first peoples and dignify Indigenous art on its own terms. No end date is given in this dissertation's title because California Indian art survived and the descendants of the people who built the missions are continuing their legacy today. Readers will find a new perspective on the missions that seeks to honor the California Indian people who bravely expressed their beliefs and traditions through art in these contested spaces.

The dissertation of Yve Barthelemy Chavez is approved. Committee: Stella Nair, Dell Upton, Benjamin Madley, Charlene Villaseñor Black (Committee Chair). University of California, Los Angeles, 2017.

DEDICATION

In loving memory of my grandmother Vivian Barthelemy who taught me to appreciate our Tongva culture and to always remember our ancestors from the San Gabriel Mission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures (vii-xii); Acknowledgements (xiii-xiv); Vita/Biographical Sketch (xv-xvi); Introduction: Indigenous California and the European Invasion (1); Chapter 1: California's First Peoples (40); Chapter 2: An Indigenous Sense of Place within the Alta California Missions (67); Chapter 3: Chumash Basketry at Mission San Buenaventura (96); Chapter 4: Chumash Innovations in Sculpture and Architecture (126); Chapter 5: California Indian Identity and Mission Paintings (161); Chapter 6: Conclusion and Future Studies (195); Figures (214); Appendix A: Photographs of the Old Church at Mission Santa Inés (288); Bibliography (294).

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. California missions, forts, and towns, 1769-1823. Figure 2. California Indian tribes and language groups. Figure 3. Tabernacle, late eighteenth century. Shell, mirrors, wood, pigment, W 28 x H 36 x D 24 in. (71 x 91.5 x 61cm). Figure 4. Attributed to Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash), Hope, St. Barbara and Charity, reproductions of the originals sculpted in the early nineteenth century. Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 5. Attributed to Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash), Bear waterspout, 1815-1820. Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figures 6a-6n. First through fourteenth stations, Stations of the Cross, early nineteenth century. Oil on canvas. Mission San Gabriel, San Gabriel, California. Figure 7. Chumash, Padre's hat made of grass, late eighteenth century. Sedge root, bulrush root, H 2.76 x D 16.3 in. (7 x 40 cm). Collected by George Goodman Hewett, The British Museum, London, United Kingdom, Am,VAN.196. Figure 8. Tongva, Kiys (thatched hut), early twenty-first century. Tule. Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, Claremont, California. Figure 9. Chumash, Carved wooden bowl with shell inlay, ca. 1760s. Oak, shell, maximum D 5.9 in. (15 cm). Collected in the Santa Ynez Valley in 1878 by Léon de Cessac, Musée de l'Homme, Paris, France. Figure 10. Juana Maria (Tongva), Twined water bottle, 1840s or 1850s. Asphaltum, juncus (?). Figure 11. Basket, late eighteenth century (?). Grass (?), D 11.8 x H 2.8 in. (30 x 7 cm). Collected by George Goodman Hewett, The British Museum, London, United Kingdom, Am,VAN.188. Figure 12. Chumash, Bear effigy, sixteenth-seventeenth

century. Steatite, red cinnabar, shell, H 3.4 x W 2.25 x D 2.6 in. (8.6 x 5.7 x 6.5 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY, 1979.206.397. Figure 13. Georg Heinrich von Langsdorff, An Indian Dance at the Mission of San Jose, in New California, 1806. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California. Figure 14. Campbell Grant, Plan of the Hutash Fiesta on San Miguel Day. Figure 15. Taos Pueblo, San Gerónimo Church, built after 1847, photographed May 1939. Taos Pueblo, New Mexico. Figure 16. María Marta Zaputimeu (Chumash), Basket bowl, early nineteenth century. Juncus, sumac, approximately D 16.25 x H 6.5 in. (41.3 x 16.5 cm). Phoebe Hearst Museum, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California, 1-22478. Figure 17. María Sebastiana Suatimehue (Chumash), Basket, early nineteenth century. Juncus, sumac, flicker-feather quills, approximately D 15 x H 4.5 in. (38 x 11.4 cm). Private collection. Figure 18. Juana Basilia Sitmelelene (Chumash), Basket tray, ca. 1820. Juncus, deergrass, sumac, approximately D 24 x H 4 in. (61 x 10.2 cm). Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, California, NA-CA-CH-4F-3. Figure 19. Juana Basilia Sitmelelene (Chumash), Basket tray, ca. 1820. Juncus, dye, L 22.6 x W 18.4 x D 3.1 in. (57.5 x 46.8 x 7.8 cm). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 25/1. Figure 20. Juana Basilia Sitmelelene (Chumash), Basket tray, ca. 1825. Juncus, sumac, dye, D 19 x H 3.25 in. (48.26 x 8.26 cm). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 23/132. Figures 21a-21b. Pillar Dollar (obverse and reverse), 1771. Figure 22. Chumash, Basket, early nineteenth century. Juncus, sumac, approximately D 12.25 x H 4 in. (31.1 x 10.2 cm). Museo Franz Mayer, Mexico City, Mexico, GCE 0001. Figure 23. Chumash, Basket, early nineteenth century. Juncus, sumac, approximately D 19.5 x H 7 in. (47 x 17.8 cm). Private collection. Figure 24. Lavandería bear waterspout, reproduction of the original sculpted by Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash) between 1815 and 1820, twentieth century. Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 25. Mountain lion fountainhead, reproduction of the original sculpted by Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash) between 1815 and 1820, twentieth century. Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 26. Chumash, Church facade, originally constructed beginning 1815. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 27. Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash), Mountain lion fountainhead, early nineteenth century, and Hope and St. Barbara (both reproductions of the originals sculpted by Paciano Guilajahicet [Chumash] in the early nineteenth century). Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 28. Church pediment and statues. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 29. C. C. Pierce, Mission Santa Barbara, 1898. Photograph. The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, photCL Pierce 03364. Figure 30. Hope, reproduction of the original sculpted by Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash) in the early nineteenth century. Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 31. St. Barbara and Charity, reproductions of the originals sculpted by Paciano Guilajahicet (Chumash) in the early nineteenth century. Sandstone. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 32. Chumash (?), effigy, pre-1769 (?), collected before 1940. Steatite, H 3.25 x D 1.25 x L 5 in. (8.3 x 3.2 x 12.7 cm). Southwest Museum of the American Indian Collection, The Autry Museum of the American West, Los Angeles, California, 149.G.90. Figure 33. Dolphin-like effigy from Eel Point, pre-1769 (?). L 1.5 x W 0.6 in. (3.8 x 1.4 cm). Figure 34. Saint Barbara, late eighteenth century. Paint, wood. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 35. Church ceiling decoration, early nineteenth century. Paint, wood. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 36. Vitruvio Polion, Large representation of the same rays, first century BC. Figure 37. Tabernacle and Table, late eighteenth

century. Shell, mirrors, wood, pigment, canvas. Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California. Figure 38. Chumash, Ceremonial Wand, pre-1769. Whale bone, asphaltum, shell. The Autry Museum of the American West, Los Angeles, California, Southwest Museum of the American Indian, P.21267. Figure 39. Chumash (?), Steatite cup with shell inlay, pre-1769 (?). Steatite, shell. The Autry Museum of the American West, Los Angeles, California, Southwest Museum of the American Indian, P.21278. Figure 40. Saint Raphael Archangel, early nineteenth century. Oil on canvas. Mission Santa Inés, Solvang, California. Figure 41. Louis Choris, *Danse des habitants de Californie à la mission de San Francisco*, 1816. Drawing. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California. Figure 42. Léon de Cessac, Rafael Solares (Chumash), 1878. Photograph. Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California. Figure 43. Chumash, Chumash painted cave, pre-1769. Stone, pigment. Canaliño SB-21. Figure 44. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, St. Raphael/San Rafael Arcángel, 1780. Retablo, gesso and oil on wood, H 49.2 x W 23.6 in. (125 x 60 cm). Museum of Spanish Colonial Art, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1954.077. Figure 45. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, Saint Michael, ca. 1774-1776. Wood, gesso, paint, gilding, H 40.9 in x W 20 in. (104 x 51.8 cm). Zuni Pueblo Visitor's Center, Zuni, New Mexico. Figure 46. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, Saint Raphael, ca. 1774-1776. Wood, gesso, paint, gilding, H 42 x W 20 in. (107 x 50.8 cm). Made for the church of Our Lady of Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, Zuni, New Mexico. Figure 47. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, Altar Screen dedicated to Our Lady of Light, 1761. Volcanic stone, paint. Cristo Rey Church, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Figure 48. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, Saint Joseph and the Christ Child, detail from Altar Screen dedicated to Our Lady of Light, 1761. Volcanic stone, paint. Cristo Rey Church, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Figure 49. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, Saint Francis Solano, detail from Altar Screen dedicated to Our Lady of Light, 1761. Volcanic stone, paint. Cristo Rey Church, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Figure 50. Laguna Santero, Altar Screen, ca. 1800-1809. Gesso and water-based paint on wood, plastered side walls, leather ceiling canopy. San José de Gracia Mission Church, Laguna Pueblo, Laguna, New Mexico. Figure 51. Laguna Santero, Saint Joseph and Christ Child, detail from altar screen, ca. 1800-1809. San José de Gracia Mission Church, Laguna Pueblo, Laguna, New Mexico. Figure 52. Nuestra Señora de la Asunción de Santa María la Redonda, eighteenth century. Fred Harvey Collection of the International Folk Art Foundation at the Museum of International Folk Art, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Figure 53. C. C. Pierce, Interior view of the Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, looking down the center aisle towards the altar, San Gabriel, ca. 1900. Photograph. California Historical Society Collection, University of Southern California Libraries Special Collections, CHS5567. Figure 54. Sixth Station, ca. 1817. Oil on canvas. Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad, Soledad, California. Figure 55. Mexican, Our Lady Refuge of Sinners, late nineteenth century. Oil on tinplate. New Mexico State University Art Gallery, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Figure 56. Map of Otumba and nearby communities, Mexico, 1590. Color on European paper. Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City, Mexico. Figure 57. Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, Map of Nuevo México, ca. 1758. Oil on canvas, 42.5 x 39 in. (108 x 99 cm). New Mexico History Museum, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Figure 58. Dugan Aguilar (Maidu/Pit River/Northern Paiute), Tima with her basket at Heyday, 2012. Photograph. Figure 59. L. Frank (Tongva/Acjachemen), no really, please take my wife, 2012. Acrylic on board. Figure 60. L. Frank (Tongva/Acjachemen), stop the dance, 1999. Drawing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this dissertation would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of my dissertation committee. Art historian Charlene Villaseñor Black is an incredibly thoughtful, insightful, and powerful role model and mentor. Her passion for the arts of the Americas never fails to inspire me. I am extremely grateful for her generosity and encouragement. Art historian Stella Nair has guided me towards new avenues of exploration that helped to enrich my understanding of Indigenous spaces. Art historian Dell Upton's architectural history courses inspired me to think deeply about the built environment and human relationships to it. Historian Benjamin Madley's groundbreaking work on the California Indian experience gave me the courage to write critically about the missions and to fight for Indigenous visibility. To my committee, I thank you for your unwavering guidance and patience.

The University of California, Los Angeles has provided me with valuable assistance during my doctoral studies and research. I thank the Graduate Division for providing me with two years of the Eugene V. Cota-Robles Fellowship, a Graduate Research Mentorship Award, and the Graduate Summer Research Mentorship Award. I am extremely grateful to the Department of Art History at UCLA for granting me an Edward A. Dickson Fellowship to complete my field work and write my dissertation. The Fowler Museum's Sarah E. Gilfillan Award provided me with travel funds that allowed me to conduct investigations in the Archivo General de las Indias in Seville, Spain. Meanwhile, a travel grant from UCLA's Latin American Institute and the Mellon Foundation allowed me to visit missions and archives in Baja California Sur. A Bancroft Library Study Award from the University of California, Berkeley, gave me access to vital resources in the Bancroft Library's collection of California mission documents.

I am also grateful for the assistance of the staff at the archives and libraries I visited in California and abroad. I thank all the staff of the Getty Research Institute, UCLA Special Collections, University of Southern California Special Collections, Archivo de las Indias, and the Archivo Histórico Pablo L. Martínez for helping me locate sources on the California missions. Librarian Theresa Salazar was instrumental in guiding me towards documents in the Bancroft Collection. I am especially grateful to Monica Orozco, director of the Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, for tracking down obscure records in the archive's extensive collection.

I am grateful to my colleagues on the San Gabriel Mission Museum Board for sharing in my enthusiasm for preserving the mission's painting collection. My conversations with art historian Nancy Marie Mithlo have helped me to articulate my contributions to art history as a Native American scholar. To my friends, thank you for kindly providing feedback on my work and for patiently listening to my ideas.

Finally, I appreciate the generosity and love of my family, especially Mark. To my parents and sister, thank you for joining me on road trips to missions located off the beaten path. To the rest of my family, thank you for sharing your knowledge of our ancestral history and enduring connection to the San Gabriel Mission.

VITA/BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

EDUCATION: M.A., Division of Art History, University of Washington, Seattle, WA; B.A., Department of Art History, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT: Instructor, Native American Art in California and the Southwest, Department of Art History, University of California, Los Angeles, 2015; Teaching Assistant, Department of Art History, University of California, Los Angeles, 2013-2014; Teaching Assistant, César A. Chávez Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, 2013.

PUBLICATIONS: Book Review, Ralph Shanks, *Indian Baskets of Northern California and Oregon* (Novato: Costaño Books in association with the Miwok Archaeological Preserve of Marin, 2015), *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 40:3 (2016): 141-143. Co-author with Cynthia Neri Lewis, and John Macias. "Imagery, Materiality, and Evolving Histories at Mission San Gabriel." *Boletín: Journal of the California Mission Studies Association* 31:1 (2015): 88-102. Book Review, Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Junípero Serra: California, Indians, and the Transformation of a Missionary* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015), *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 39:3 (2015): 154-156. "Finding a Common Language at the California Missions," *Imagining the New World, Imaginings, Stories, and Histories: Invited Program Notes*, UCLA Early Music Ensemble, University of California, Los Angeles, March 7, 2015. "Maintaining Cultural Knowledge Through the Arts," *The Autry Blog*, November 20, 2014, <http://blog.theautry.org/2014/11/maintaining-cultural-knowledge-through-the-arts/>

CONFERENCE PAPERS/LECTURES: "Indigenizing Alta California Mission Spaces Through Basket Weaving," American Society for Ethnohistory Conference, Nashville, TN, November 10, 2016. "Indigenous Artistic Ingenuity and Asian Imports in the California Missions," Lecture, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, June 2, 2015. "Eighteenth-Century Accounts of Indigenous Art and Culture at the Alta California Missions," American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Conference, Los Angeles, CA, March 20, 2015. "Indigenous Art and Devotion in Nineteenth-Century Northern New Spain," University of California, Riverside Objects of Devotion/Objetos de Devoción Conference, Riverside, CA, December 13, 2014. "California Mission Art in the Historical Record," Fowler Museum Sarah E. Gilfillan Award Lecture, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, April 30, 2014. "Junípero Serra and Mission San Gabriel's Painting Collection," San Gabriel Mission History Forum, San Gabriel, CA, October 12, 2013. "Indigenizing Southern California Indian Basket Studies: Unpacking Issues of 'Mission' and 'Tradition'," Native American Graduate Research Symposium, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, November 14, 2012. "Constructing a Colonial Identity: Eighteenth-Century Paintings of Indigenous Families in New Spain," The Graduate Students of Art History at the University of Washington Symposium, Seattle, WA, April 12, 2012. "Revitalizing Cultural Knowledge: California 'Mission' Indian Basket Weaving," Burke Museum of Natural History and Culture Graduate Symposium, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, November 4, 2011. "Surviving Through Art: California 'Mission' Indian Basket Weaving in the Past and Present," Annual Native American Students in Advanced Academia Symposium, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, May 13, 2011.

INTRODUCTION

Indigenous California and the European Invasion

This dissertation raises new questions and considers alternative possibilities regarding the roles California Indian artists played in Southern California's missions. These missions are typically

associated with the Spanish influence brought to California in 1769, despite the fact that California Indians built these historical structures. While California's first peoples left evidence of their culture in the form of baskets, sculpture, rock paintings, and regalia, these materials have not been seriously considered as primary sources in research on the missions. A close study of artworks in the missions illuminates California Indian resistance to assimilation, as well as their appropriation of foreign ideas. Therefore, this dissertation suggests that we look at the missions as sites of acculturation, in which California Indians selectively borrowed Catholic ideas and European practices, which they incorporated into their existing traditions. Examples from the missions in the Chumash and Tongva regions are highlighted to exemplify Indigenous ingenuity.

This approach yields a number of new questions. Why did Chumash dancers perform traditional dances on Catholic feast days? Why did Chumash weavers at Mission San Buenaventura weave their names into baskets? Is there a connection between sculptures made at Mission Santa Barbara and pre-1769 Chumash stone charms? Is style a reflection of an artist's ethnicity? These questions guide this dissertation which argues that California Indian artists pursued new artistic avenues and that they responded to current artistic trends in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century New Spain. This study aims to place Indigenous agency and artistry at the forefront of California mission art studies. This dissertation provides the first close study of Southern California's mission art from a California Indian perspective and it shows that mission art and architecture is rooted in the heritage of California's first peoples. It brings together the traditional art historical tools of formal analysis and iconography with decolonizing methodologies in its study of California Indian art.

The twenty-one Franciscan missions impacted the lives of hundreds of thousands of California Indians. This dissertation does not attempt to cover all the tribes or missions in California. A project of such magnitude would not do justice to California's diverse Native populations. Therefore, I chose to focus on the missions within my ancestors' Tongva homeland as well as that of their Chumash neighbors. North of the Tongva homeland that encompasses present-day Los Angeles County and parts of northern Orange County, the Chumash peoples of what is now Santa Barbara County were instrumental in the construction of Mission San Buenaventura (Ventura, CA), Mission Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara, CA), and Mission Santa Inés (Solvang, CA) (Figures 1-2). I focus on these missions not only because of their rich artistic collections, but also because the Chumash are some of the most culturally relatable groups to the Tongva in California. The Chumash, Tongva, and their Acjachemen neighbors of Orange County believed that their primary deity, Chinigchinich, originated at the village of Puvungna in present-day Long Beach, CA.¹ They traded natural resources, including the shell beads they used as currency; they painted and carved pictographs and petroglyphs in local caves, and they wove baskets as gifts and for daily use.

As a California Indian (Gabrielino/Tongva) scholar I seek to change the study of California mission art and Native American cultures by contributing my Indigenous perspective. I employ the first-person voice because of my deep personal connection to the California missions, specifically the San Gabriel Mission where my Tongva ancestors were baptized beginning in the late eighteenth century. My ancestors, like California Indians throughout the current-day state of California, endured forced labor, violence, and cultural genocide at the missions. My goal is to honor my ancestors and other California Indians who were brave enough to express their views and traditions within the contested spaces of

the Franciscan missions. Until now, no Native American art historians have written about the artistic traditions of California's first peoples who lived during the Spanish incursion. I hope that my dissertation will initiate new, and much needed dialogue regarding California Indians' artistic reactions to foreign ideas at the missions. Thus, I try my best to make it clear whenever possible that I am expressing my own views by engaging the first-person voice. As Indigenous studies scholar Margaret Kovach (Plains Cree and Saulteaux) has written of her own work, using the first-person "has the additional benefit of keeping me grounded ... Using the first person honours the experiential while engaging the abstract and theoretical."² I draw from my experience as a member of the Gabrielino/Tongva community and descendant of Mission San Gabriel survivors to write about mission art as the embodiment of resistance.

Historian Devon Mihesuah (Choctaw) has pointed out that there is not one American Indian voice or perspective.³ Even within Native American communities individuals have unique views of their culture and history. The descendants of the California mission Indians have vastly different views of the missions, Spanish colonization, and Catholicism. Publications by California Indian scholars such as English professor and poet Deborah Miranda (Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation), anthropologist Deana Dartt (Chumash), Native American Studies professor Edward Castillo (Luiseño-Cahuilla), archaeologist Tsim Schneider (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria), sociologist Jonathan Cordero (Ohlone), and activist Rupert Costo (Cahuilla) reveal a spectrum of attitudes towards the missions.⁴ Ethnic Studies scholar Olivia Chilcote (Payómkowishum) and assistant curator of Mission Dolores, Vincent Medina (Chochenyo Ohlone) have also written and spoken out about California Indian identity in connection to the missions.⁵ Our ancestors who lived during the invasion that occurred almost 250 years ago also had differing perspectives. Yet, their insight offers valuable information regarding California Indian rituals, basket weaving, stone carving, and identity formation that occurred after the missionaries' arrival. I also engage the theoretical frameworks of Indigenous and decolonizing methodologies to emphasize that these were traditional California Indian practices.

Methodology

This dissertation is the product of focused research in international and local archives, investigations of museum collections, long drives up and down the coast of California visiting the missions (often multiple times), attendance at conferences and exhibitions related to California mission studies, conversations with colleagues about the missions and Native American art, and close reading of artworks. My master's thesis research on coastal Southern California Indian basketry also laid the foundation for the chapter on baskets at Mission San Buenaventura. My interviews with basket weavers and scholars were immensely insightful and I am grateful for the knowledge they shared with me.

As an art historian with training in Native American and Latin American art, I diligently read what my scholarly predecessors have written about California Indian art before and after 1769 as well as art from the missions of New Spain. I studied historical texts with vastly different portrayals of California history and consulted anthropological studies of California. I turned to interdisciplinary writings on decolonizing and Indigenous methodologies and sought out examples of their use in art historical scholarship. I found that these methods are not typically used in art history, and when they do appear,

scholars use them to explain twentieth-century and contemporary artistic practices.⁶ Scholarship that engages decolonial and Indigenous methods has been extremely useful as I strive to determine a methodology that works for this study of California Indian art. I am one of the first people to use this methodology in art history, especially on the art of the missions. Drawing inspiration from my predecessors, I define my method as a scholarly approach that deconstructs primitivizing narratives about Native American art and illuminates Indigenous agency through close study of art within the context of established Native American practices and ways of thinking. My historiographical critique is a decolonizing method because I assess Eurocentric biases in the scholarship on California mission art. This dissertation represents the ingenuity of artists working in different mediums and subject matters beyond what is typically associated with the missions. My work is original because it incorporates other art forms into the discussion of the missions, particularly regalia and dance. I look at other sources that record these California Indian practices, such as anthropological studies and ethnographic accounts, whereas other art historians have focused on European sources.

Decolonizing and Indigenizing methodologies support the argument that Native art-making at the California missions was subversive. Indigenous studies scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Maori) argued that, "decolonization is a process which engages with imperialism and colonialism at multiple levels."⁷ Borrowing from Smith's approach, I critically analyze the oppressive impacts Spanish and later Mexican colonization had on California's first peoples. I also draw inspiration from the work of Botswanan educational research scholar Bagele Chilisa, who argued that decolonizing research makes the voices of marginalized peoples heard on their own terms.⁸ My research focuses on the years of Spanish incursion in California beginning in 1769 through California's 1850 statehood, which is why I seek to subvert imperial narratives and liberate the oppressed voices of California Indians. The few publications that discuss Indigenous artists and art from the California missions use pejorative language to describe Native-made works as "primitive" or "crude."⁹ Such an approach dismisses the skills and artistic training California Indian men and women underwent before Spanish colonists landed on California's coast. Moreover, it sustains the outdated notion that European art is the standard by which all other art should be judged. Rather than attempting to equate California Indian art with art of the so-called west, I strive to bring Native American art from the California missions to visibility and to dignify it on its own terms.

I am not simply advocating for the inclusion of California Indian art in the fine art canon. Rather, I am pushing to increase the visibility of California Indian artworks, mainly from the Chumash and Tongva communities of coastal Southern California, as the embodiment of Indigenous worldviews and artistic creativity. The work of artist, activist, and scholar Dylan A. T. Miner (Wiisaakodewinini) on contemporary Native American visual culture is particularly helpful in articulating my analysis of Indigenous art from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century California. He called for an approach rooted in Indigenous ideologies and academic theoretical frameworks. He has stated, "To fully comprehend any creative expression, one must contextualize its production within correct cultural parameters."¹⁰ Like Miner, I seek to acknowledge Chumash and Tongva visual and material culture on its own terms. I also strive to underscore the ingenuity of California Indian artists whose lives were turned upside down in the face of European imperialism.

Artist and educator America Meredith (Cherokee Nation) traced the marginalization of Native American art to the late eighteenth century. She has written, "'Art for art's sake' -- that visual art should have no utilitarian purpose -- was proposed by Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant in his 1790 Critique of Judgment and echoed by many others in the following century."¹¹ Meredith pointed out that European Americans familiar with this concept typically devalued non-western objects, such as those made by Native Americans, by calling it "craft." Art historian Nancy Marie Mithlo (Chiricahua Apache) has explained that ethnic, or Native American artists' work is rarely taken seriously in the fine arts world. She argued, "In the Native American arts market, these tensions may be described as the fine arts/crafts divide. Native American crafts are assumed to be communally based, historically accurate, and tribally specific. If Native American artists wish to exhibit under fine arts imperatives, they must become white by rejection of their tribal status ('I'm an artist first, an Indian second')."¹² "Indigenous Arts, Ingenuity, and Resistance" challenges this assumption -- that the innate Native American-ness of the artists' work made it a craft, thus excluding it from canon of the fine arts. On the contrary, as Mithlo has shown in her study of contemporary Native American art, it is counterproductive to separate the artist's identity from his or her art all for the sake of meeting the fine arts criteria. The objects examined here are linked to the California Indian communities from which their makers came. The communities recognized these artists and treated their art with high regard. At the missions, California Indian artists appropriated foreign ideas into their art. So, why not appropriate the foreign (western) canon of fine art to include Native American art? Before doing so, other factors need to be considered. Meredith has insisted: "Let us define our art on our own terms."¹³ This approach is also challenging especially for communities that lack pre-existing terminology for art.

In her Art Journal article, "The Trouble with (the Term) Art," art historian Carolyn Dean questioned the meaning of the word art in non-European contexts. She suggested that scholars use Indigenous terms that are like art when describing the creative output of non-European (originally, non-English speaking) peoples.¹⁴ Individuals from multiple communities lived at each mission settlement, so it would not be fair to choose one group's language for this study. Mithlo, however, has pointed out that the act of not providing an alternative word for art is also problematic. "It also fosters a dangerous and inaccurate belief that Native artists are unreflective about their own art production or that they lack clear aesthetic criteria."¹⁵ We may never know which terms late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century California Indian artists used to describe their work. Yet, late nineteenth-century California Indian accounts provide some insights regarding the terms their ancestors used to name objects and ceremonies. Ethnographic studies can thus help to situate Chumash and Tongva artistic practices within an Indigenous framework. California Indian artists were not simply bowing to the commands of mission leaders. They actively subverted an oppressive power structure by creating art that embodied sacred traditional beliefs. Thus, the following chapters treat the dances, regalia, baskets, sculpture, architecture and paintings examined as art. Chumash and Tongva artists made objects and performed in Native spaces where they practiced traditional beliefs and values.

Spain attempted to acculturate and control Indigenous populations in the Americas, but Native American peoples continued to make art. As Mithlo has pointed out, western policies aimed at destroying Native American cultures failed. She cited art historian Margaret Archuleta (Tewa) and legal historian Rennard Strickland (Osage and Cherokee) who attributed the failed policies of cultural

genocide in America to the power of Native art. They argued that "the determined effort to destroy Indian culture and break Indian pride. And art – The Native American Fine Art Movement – was one of the reasons for the failure of this cultural genocide."¹⁶ By 1846 when the United States invaded California and effectively took it from Mexico, California's first peoples had spent seventy-seven years resisting Spanish, Mexican, and Russian policies, not including Spain's sojourn in the sixteenth century. California Indians decolonized sites of contact, mainly the missions, by performing traditional art practices within these contested spaces. I use the term 'contested' to subvert the one-sided narrative of the Spanish conquest.

California Indians comprised much of the population at each mission, and they constructed and decorated most of the buildings. The California Indian laborers built edifices using local materials often within the boundaries of pre-existing aboriginal villages. Before the Spanish invasion, California Indians relied upon environmental markers such as mountains and water to designate space. They also used local materials such as tule (a native rush) to build their homes. Place was not just defined by where people slept at night, but also by the physical landscape they inhabited. When the Spaniards arrived in California and other parts of the Americas, they asserted that American Indian land was available for them to claim as their own. Ethnoecologist M. Kat Anderson has pointed out colonists exploited the land that California Indians actively cultivated. "Through twelve thousand or more years of existence in what is now California, humans knit themselves to nature through their vast knowledge base and practical experience. In the process, they maintained, enhanced, and in part created a fertility that was eventually to be exploited by European and Asian farmers, ranchers, and entrepreneurs, who imagined themselves to have built civilization out of an unpeopled wilderness."¹⁷ Unlike Europeans who decimated natural resources, California Indians engaged in land management activities that stimulated new growth and resources. The groves of trees and fields of wildflowers that colonists saw were the product of California Indian stewardship, not simply unattended land. Yi Fu Tuan argued that open space "is like a blank sheet on which meaning may be imposed."¹⁸ The Spaniards treated California's landscape as wild, undeveloped space that they quickly exploited through the introduction of foreign plants and livestock. These foreign invaders compromised California Indian lifestyles and decimated the resources upon which they depended for food, currency, basketry materials, and body coverings. California Indians reacted by continuing to make baskets, sculpture, shell beads, and regalia in their villages and at the missions. They also led revolts, ran away, refused to work, and sought leadership roles all while suffering from disease and starvation.

Hybridity

The few studies on the Indigenous-made art of the California missions focus on works that reflect the intersection of California Indian and European ideas and materials. In colonial Latin American studies, scholars have proposed multiple terms to describe these types of artworks, including mestizo, tequitqui, Indo-Christian, and hybrid. Art historian Charlene Villaseñor Black's thought-provoking essay on "Race and the Historiography of Colonial Art" called for a shift away from using these words to describe colonial-period art.¹⁹ Similarly, this dissertation explains why race-based terms are challenging and proposes alternative approaches to discussing Native-made art.

In 1942, Mexican art scholar José Moreno Villa first used the Nahuatl term *tequitqui* to describe colonial architecture and sculpture in Mexico. He argued that the proportions of *tequitqui* sculpture are primitive because of their Native influences.²⁰ Thus, *tequitqui* implies that European art was superior to the Native arts of Mexico. *Tequitqui* is also inadequate because it dismisses the cultural diversity of Mexico's Indigenous populations, which spoke other languages beside the Aztec language, Nahuatl. While current-day scholars rarely use *tequitqui*, with a few important exceptions, that are discussed shortly, some continue to use the equally problematic term *mestizo*.

Historically, *mestizo* referred to people of mixed racial ancestry in Latin America. However, by the twentieth-century art historians Alfred Neumeyer and George Kubler used *mestizo* in their descriptions of sixteenth-century architecture and ornament in New Spain. According to Neumeyer, the *mestizo* style of architecture was characterized by flattened ornamentation. Neumeyer asserted that Indigenous craftsmen denigrated European architecture by adding flat and reductive ornamentation to Baroque and Renaissance-style churches. Neumeyer acknowledged the presence of Native influences in sixteenth-century architecture, but he did not categorize it as Indigenous art. Instead, he saw it as the intersection of two cultural styles, which he labeled "Mestizo or Criollo or Indio-Hispanic."²¹ In his work on Mexican colonial architecture, George Kubler pushed this idea further by arguing that European styles replaced Indigenous designs.

Kubler would be one of the first art historians to question the utility of these terms, specifically, *mestizo*, in his 1959 study of colonial Latin American art. He suggested using the term 'provincial highland' to describe architecture.²² Though not a racially based concept, "provincial highland" does not encompass all the groups that *mestizo* excludes, especially those outside the Andes. Thus, scholars proposed Indo-Christian as an alternative category.

In 1999, art historian José Manuel Aguilar Moreno briefly addressed the concept of Indo-Christian *mestizo* art, which he described as the "product of a new rising identity based on the fusion of Indian and Spanish bloods."²³ Aguilar Moreno based his definition on the concept that colonial art represents the artist's mixed identity rather than the meeting of two artistic styles. Mexican scholar Constantino Reyes-Valerio, however, suggested that Indo-Christian art represents the changes Indigenous art underwent after Christianity arrived in the Americas.²⁴ Moreno Villa argued that the presence of Native influence in sixteenth-century art was anachronistic, but Reyes-Valerio believed that it was natural for artists to include Indigenous elements. The term Indo-Christian references Indigenous agency and ingenuity, yet "Christian" reinforces European hegemony in the early modern Americas. In addition, some artworks that represent Native American materials and ideas, but which are not Christian, would not fit into the Indo-Christian category. Indo-Christian, like *tequitqui* and *mestizo* is a racialized term that, when used to describe art, implies that style reflects the artist's racial identity. This approach is problematic for it assumes that an artist's race dictated how his or her art would appear. Villaseñor Black has argued that using race-based terms to describe colonial art is "antiquated, prejudicial, and patronizing."²⁵ She criticized early scholars for "likening *mestizo* art to *mestizo* children," for doing so suggests that "colonial art history is the bastard child of the discipline."²⁶ By conflating art with racial mixings that resulted from colonial intermarriage perpetuates racist hierarchies in which pureblooded Europeans ranked at the top. Scholars have questioned the implications of hybrid and hybridity for similar reasons.

In 2006 art historians Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn highlighted the problematic nature of hybridity, which perpetuates a hegemonic relationship between European colonizers and Indigenous colonial subjects.²⁷ Their discussion of colonial mindsets is particularly insightful when one considers the reception of art in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century New Spain. Dean and Leibsohn asserted that the so-called hybridities or ethnic mixings we see in art from the years of Spain's imperial expansion were not viewed as particularly remarkable at that time. People and materials circulated with frequency throughout the Spanish viceroyalties. As a result, artists embraced new approaches to making art, which resulted in objects that diverged from European conventions. Dean and Leibsohn pointed out that "hybridity" is a term that first appeared in sub-altern studies and it "emphasize[s] structures of power that center and marginalize."²⁸ They saw hybrid as a term that deals with issues of race rather than culture. Meanwhile, English and American literature scholar Homi Bhabha defined hybridity as a signifier of cultural difference, but within hybridized spaces culture is not hierarchical. Bhabha wrote, "This interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy."²⁹ Bhabha's cultural space is a site where practices are shared instead of separated. Hybridized spaces represent the emergence of new identities that are not authentically one or the other. Mimicry, unlike hybridity implies colonial hegemony.

Bhabha's mimicry theory reflects the influence of Caribbean scholar Frantz Fanon and author V. S. Naipaul. Bhabha writes, "What I have called mimicry is not the familiar exercise of dependent colonial relations through narcissistic identification so that, as Fanon has observed, the black man stops being an actional person for only the white man can represent his self-esteem."³⁰ Fanon argued that in the twentieth century white men imposed an identity of Otherness or inferiority upon black men. He wrote, "For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man."³¹ Fanon explained that a black man's consciousness of his own body is based on an awareness of how he is different from white men. Likewise, the main character of V. S. Naipaul's novel, *Mimic Men*, sees himself as one of the mimic men of the New World.

A mimic man is not only someone who copies or emulates the mannerisms of others, but he is also someone who bases his identity upon that of other people. Naipaul's protagonist, Ralph Singh, a man of West Indian origin who was born in the Caribbean and lives in London, shapes his identity after the London dandy. The character Singh states, "It was up to me to choose my character, and I chose the character that was easiest and most attractive. I was the dandy, the extravagant, the colonial, indifferent to scholarship."³² Here, Singh actively chose to mimic the dandy; no one forced him to do so. Naipaul has ascribed agency to Singh who attempted to be someone he was not, both socially and ethnically. Bhabha expanded upon this notion of mimicry by describing it as a symptom of colonialism. He wrote, "colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference."³³ Mimicry is about making the colonial subject follow the colonizer as a model. Yet, while mimicking the colonizer, the colonial subject cannot be the same or equal to the colonist. Thus, mimicry opens space in which colonized people have agency.

Art historian Angélica Afanador-Pujol pushed the concept of mimicry further in her investigations of the Uanacaze family tree in the *Relación de Michoacán*. The *Relación de Michoacán* is a sixteenth-century manuscript that documented the customs of the P'urhépecha-speaking nobility of what is now Michoacán, Mexico.³⁴ "The Uanacaze were the leaders of a group ... who had allegedly migrated to Michoacán and conquered its local population."³⁵ One of the artists responsible for illustrating the "*Relación de Michoacán*" modeled his or her depiction of the Uanacaze royal lineage after the Tree of Jesse, replacing Christ's lineage with Uanacaze leaders. Afanador-Pujol has argued that the unknown, "indigenous colonized" artist who made the image of the family tree appropriated the European image of the Tree of Jesse and created something new -- "an indigenous sign."³⁶ Building upon Bhabha's approach, Afanador-Pujol ascribed agency to the colonized artist who did not simply copy an imported European model. California Indians, likewise, appropriated European motifs and ideas at the California missions. However, their approach was not mimicry. Instead, they selectively borrowed and appropriated European ideas which they incorporated into art they made for the missions. Chumash and Tongva artists rooted these new art forms in their communities' ideologies. This Indigenous characteristic of mission paintings, sculpture and architectural ornament sets these works apart from their imported counterparts. They cannot be called hybrids.

Some Latin Americanists continue to use hybrid in their work, yet others are reconsidering its repercussions. Art historian and curator Ilona Katzew, for instance, has critiqued the term and its implications for the Native peoples of the Americas. "Their relationship to the conquerors cannot be reduced to one of victors and vanquished; it entailed a delicate process of cultural negotiation, mutual accommodation, and exchange (rather than syncretism and hybridity), a dynamic that gave rise to vital works of art rich in interpretive possibilities."³⁷ With this in mind, neither hybridity nor hybrid are appropriate terms with which to describe the California mission art under discussion. Doing so would deny the California Indian values and ideologies that inspired the artworks' creation.

In his work on contemporary Native American art, Miner deconstructed hybridity, which he described as "an empty signifier."³⁸ He argued that hybridity is not a useful term for studies of Indigenous art for it perpetuates the negative impacts of globalization. Instead, he called for scholars to engage Native art through an Indigenous discourse. Though focused on contemporary practices, the issues Miner raised are relevant to California Indian art in the missions. California Indian art existed before European colonization. Therefore, it would not make sense to call it by a new name, especially one that privileges an outdated conception of European progress. Hybridity implies that non-western art, in this case, Native art, improved through contact with European art. This dissertation examines Indigenous-made art from the missions as the continuation of pre-existing artistic traditions, which Spaniards saw as early as the sixteenth century.

Chronology

In 1542, Seville-born explorer Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo led an exploratory expedition that sailed along the coast of present-day southern California (Figure 1).³⁹ Since they did not discover gold, this group of Spanish explorers left California in 1543 in anticipation of finding resources in other lands.⁴⁰ In 1697, Jesuit missionaries established the first Catholic mission of sixteen in peninsular California, which is also known as Baja or Antigua California.⁴¹ Then, in 1767, Spain expelled the Jesuits from

its territories.⁴² Historian David J. Weber explained that "Carlos III had charged the Jesuits with sedition, but this appears to have been a pretext to eliminate the privileged and wealthy religious order that the king's ministers regarded as a powerful obstacle to urgent secular reforms."⁴³ The following year, Franciscan friar Junípero Serra of Mallorca, Spain and fifteen additional Franciscan friars arrived in Loreto to oversee the Jesuit missions. The Franciscans only established one mission in Baja California, Misión San Fernando de Velicatá, before they moved north to claim Alta, or Nueva California.⁴⁴ In 1768, the Spanish government ordered visitador (inspector) José de Gálvez to occupy Alta California and defend it against Russian invaders.⁴⁵ By January of 1769, an expedition consisting of three ships and two land excursions, overseen by captain Gaspar de Portolá embarked northward from Baja California.⁴⁶

On July 16, 1769 Fray Junípero Serra established Mission San Diego de Alcalá. This was the first of nine Alta California missions Serra oversaw in his role as father president of the California missions. The other eight missions include: Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo (1770), Mission San Antonio de Padua (1771), Mission San Gabriel Arcángel (1771), Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa (1772), Mission San Francisco de Asís (1776), Mission San Juan Capistrano (1776), Mission Santa Clara de Asís (1777) and Mission San Buenaventura (1782).⁴⁷ After his death in 1784, Serra's successors established eleven missions in California under Spanish control. These include: Mission Santa Barbara Virgen y Mártir (1786), Mission la Purísima Concepción de María Santísima (1787), Mission Santa Cruz and Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad (1791), Mission San José de Guadalupe, Mission San Juan Bautista, Mission San Miguel Arcángel, and Mission San Fernando Rey de España (1797), Mission San Luis Rey de Francia (1798), Mission Santa Inés Virgen y Mártir (1804), and Mission San Rafael Arcángel (1817). Father José Altimira founded the twenty-first and northernmost mission, San Francisco de Solano in the Pueblo of Sonoma in 1823 after Mexico gained control of California.⁴⁸ By 1821 Mexico won independence from Spain, and Mexican authorities gained control over California. Subsequently, the governor of California, José María de Echeandía, initiated the legal emancipation of California Indians in the missions in 1826.⁴⁹ California Indians either petitioned for their emancipation or used the decree as leverage against the abusive priests.

In 1829, the Mexican government expelled the Spanish missionaries from California and replaced them with Mexican-born priests.⁵⁰ However, the missions did not become parishes until after 1834 when the new governor José Figueroa implemented the plan for secularization that lasted through the 1840s.⁵¹ Secularization sought to turn the mission churches into parishes overseen by lay priests in place of the Franciscan mendicant friars. Then, in 1846, the United States declared war on Mexico and invaded California.⁵² In 1848 Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which made California a United States possession. In 1850 California became the thirty-first state in the union. James Wilson Marshall's 1848 discovery of gold in California's American River brought a new group of colonists to northern California who contributed to the California Indian population decline.⁵³ By the early twentieth century, California's Indigenous populations had not only endured forced religious conversion and assimilation, as well as a drastic population decline. Before 1769, the California Indian population was perhaps 310,000 and by 1845 the population had fallen to roughly 150,000.⁵⁴

Biologist Sherburne F. Cook conducted one of the most extensive studies of historic California Indian population numbers in the 1970s.⁵⁵ He estimated that the population of California Indians was about 310,000 before Spanish contact in 1769.⁵⁶ Previous scholars had proposed more conservative numbers. For instance, in 1905 ethnographer C. Hart Merriam suggested that the population before the Spanish incursion was about 260,000.⁵⁷ In 1925, anthropologist Alfred Kroeber proposed that the pre-contact population consisted of about 133,000.⁵⁸ Cook set out to disprove these numbers. Though Cook's estimates remain debatable, his study of California Indian populations underscored the inconsistencies in the historical record that prevent modern scholars from gaining a clear picture of Indigenous life in California under Spanish and Mexican rule. Cook observed that the mission baptism books only recorded the names of individuals who were baptized, so it is challenging to determine how many Indians remained unconverted.⁵⁹ Even though death records, like baptismal books, did not account for unconverted Indians, it is clear that the California Indian population declined. The baptized people were almost exclusively from the coastal region.

Scholars also disagree about the size of the population after California became a state in 1850. Anthropologist Russell Thornton (Cherokee) argued that the number decreased to about 85,000 in 1852, two years after statehood.⁶⁰ Historian Albert L. Hurtado, however, noted that "the population fell by 80 percent to about 30,000."⁶¹ While scholars continue to disagree about the rate at which California's Indigenous population declined, California Indians are still here because our ancestors fought to survive.

Today, Southern California Indian communities follow current-day tribal political structures. In the eyes of the federal government, a group is a "tribe" when it has been recognized in federal courts or by an act of the United States Congress.⁶² This approach not only sustains the federal government's hegemonic relationship over Native American peoples, but it also dismisses the cultural complexity of Indigenous groups. Legal scholar L. R. Weatherhead has eloquently explained this attitude: "Once recognition is established, it is not necessary to inquire further. It is clear, therefore, that in the case of recognized tribes the legal label 'tribe' when applied to them does not necessarily contain any ethnohistorically valid meaning."⁶³ Moreover, the federal government does not account for the groups that remain unrecognized. Today, there are 109 federally recognized tribes and another seventy-eight groups petitioning for recognition in California.⁶⁴ Native groups, regardless of their federal status, have adopted modern tribal systems of governing to represent their members. Therefore, when discussing current-day groups, such as the Tongva and Chumash, I refer to them as tribes. These modern-day groups represent the descendants of multiple pre-1769 villages who shared common languages or who lived at the same missions. Much of what we know about pre-1769 California Indian society comes from early explorers' journals.

Historiography

Accounts by early visitors should not be overlooked in a study of California and the missions: English sea captain Francis Drake (1569), Spanish explorer Sebastián Vizcaíno (1602), Jesuit administrator and historian Miguel Venegas (1767), Mexican soldier José Velásquez (1785), American trader Harrison Rogers (1826-27), German poet and botanist Adelbert von Chamisso (1816), French naturalist and explorer Eugène Duflot de Mofras (1840s), American lawyer and politician Richard

Henry Dana (1859-60), British naval officer Edward Belcher (1839), and California statesman Benjamin David Wilson (1840s-70s). Indeed, most written information on California before the twentieth century was told from a non-Native perspective. This dissertation attempts to acknowledge the main primary sources on California through the nineteenth century, but mission researchers will find that this is not an exhaustive historiography.

Historians working in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, as well as modern-day scholars, have written extensive studies of primary sources. One of the earliest historiographies can be found in Hubert Howe Bancroft's seven volume series on *The History of California*, published in 1886.⁶⁵ Bancroft's series offers a detailed history of the foreign invasion, colonization and policies established in California through the end of the nineteenth century that set the stage for future investigations of California history.

Between the 1890s and 1920s, Zephyrin Engelhardt, O. F. M., a Catholic priest and historian of the Franciscan Order published a series of books on sixteen of the twenty-one California missions as well as a four-volume series on the Franciscan missionaries who served in lower and upper California.⁶⁶ In the latter series, Engelhardt consulted friars' and administrators' letters, archives, reports, early settlers' accounts, as well as Bancroft's early publications.

In the 1960s, another Catholic priest of the Franciscan order, Maynard J. Geiger, published extensively on the missions. For his biographical dictionary of the Franciscan missionaries, Geiger consulted the main archives of California materials for information on the lives of the friars who served in the missions.⁶⁷ Although the records of some friars are missing from the archives, Geiger tried to present as comprehensive a study as possible. Whereas Geiger and Engelhardt focused on the Franciscans' accomplishments, other scholars addressed the California Indian experience at the missions.

In 1943 Cook published one of the first anti-mission histories in his study on California Indian populations.⁶⁸ Cook's work influenced journalist and lawyer Carey McWilliams who, in 1946, published a critical study of Southern California in which he compared the Franciscans' treatment of California Indians to that of the Nazis who operated death camps.⁶⁹ Author William E. Coffey (Choctaw/Cherokee) stated in 1977 that when the Franciscans established the California missions they "instituted a new system of genocide."⁷⁰ In 1984, historian James J. Rawls also penned a critique of the California missions that he supported with first-hand written accounts of European explorers who described the Franciscans' harsh and slave-like treatment of California Indians.⁷¹ Three years later, Native American scholars, Rupert Costo (Cahuilla) and Jeannette Henry Costo (Cherokee) took a similar approach in their critical recounting of California mission history in which they argued that the missions were sites of genocide.⁷²

In 1995, historian Robert H. Jackson and California Indian scholar Edward D. Castillo (Luiseño/Cahuilla) published a study on the impacts of the missions on California Indians in response to the Vatican's early attempts to canonize Junípero Serra.⁷³ Also in 1995, historian Lisbeth Haas published a study of identity in southern California beginning in 1769.⁷⁴ Focusing on Southern California, Haas argued that "Violence toward the Acâgchemem and other indigenous peoples was a constant element of this society from the conquest forward. The missionaries came with soldiers, who

used force to put down any overt resistance to their presence."⁷⁵ Supported with evidence from friars' and government officials' letters, California Indian and early female colonists' accounts, Haas presented a nuanced perspective of identity politics in California.

Primary accounts are the focus of Spanish language scholar Rose Marie Beebe and historian Robert M. Senkewicz's work on California history. In 2001, Beebe and Senkewicz translated a series of firsthand accounts told from the perspectives of both European/Mexican and California Indian men and women.⁷⁶ Then, in 2006, they published the translated testimonies of women who lived in California between 1815 and 1848.⁷⁷ By summarizing the lives of these historical figures and translating their accounts, which were typically recorded in Spanish, Beebe and Senkewicz helped bring to light the sources that are often overlooked in studies of early California. Meanwhile, historian James A. Sandos's 2004 publication considered the relationship between California Indians and Franciscans and incorporated ethnographic sources.⁷⁸ The following year, anthropologist and archaeologist, Kent G. Lightfoot published a monograph on the Spanish and Russian incursion into early California.⁷⁹ Lightfoot examined the impacts of cross-cultural contact on California Indians by turning to Native and non-Native sources and archaeological evidence. Lightfoot's interdisciplinary approach has been a valuable guide for this dissertation's investigations of Chumash and Tongva art and material culture.

Historian Steven W. Hackel's study of Costanoan and Esselen peoples at Mission San Carlos Borromeo is another useful model for studying specific culture groups and missions.⁸⁰ Hackel cited primary accounts such as those written by Georg Heinrich von Langsdorff, Pedro Fages, and Jean François de la Pérouse to highlight the continuity of Costanoan and Esselen cultures in the Monterey Bay region during the mission era. Similarly, historian George Harwood Phillips examined the history of foreign colonization amongst Southern California's first peoples between 1771 and 1877. He used primary sources, such as Harrison Rogers's diary from 1827, to underscore Tongva agency as well as the violence Southern California Indians faced.⁸¹ In his recent book, historian Benjamin Madley reaffirmed the violent reality California Indians faced at the missions and during the Gold Rush. Madley's extensive investigations of primary sources and twentieth-century publications yielded a much-needed exposé of the genocide inflicted upon California's first peoples between 1846 and 1873.⁸² His examination of population statistics is a valuable resource for highlighting the obstacles Indigenous peoples faced in maintaining their cultures.⁸³ Most recently, historian Kelly Lytle Hernández addressed the California missions in her 2017 publication that characterized the San Gabriel mission as "the first experiment in human caging in Tongva territory."⁸⁴ These recent publications demonstrate a shift towards critical mission studies, an approach that influenced this dissertation.

Understanding the history of the missions is vital to any study of their art. However, I am not attempting to rewrite California mission history, but rather to provide a new perspective on the art that illuminates the contributions California Indians made. Thus, I turned to archival materials and original documents in an attempt to find references to California Indian art. I found that such references are almost non-existent. This dissertation incorporates primary sources, including non-Native and California Indian accounts, anthropological and archaeological evidence to contextualize its analysis of Chumash and Tongva art.⁸⁵

Chumash and Tongva art in the historical record

Members of the 1769-1770 Portolá Expedition recorded some of the first written accounts of California Indian art and architecture. These descriptions appear in the diaries of Lieutenant Pedro Fages, engineer Miguel Costansó, Fray Juan Crespí, and Fray Juan Vizcaíno.⁸⁶ All four accounts embody Eurocentric views of California Indian peoples. For instance, neither Crespí nor Costansó recorded the names of the weavers who made the baskets they described. Instead of trying to find out what the people called themselves, Fages referred to all of California's first peoples as "Indians."⁸⁷ By treating the California Indian inhabitants of each mission as members of one homogeneous group, Fages dismissed the cultural and linguistic diversity of California's Indigenous populations.

Although not as descriptive, Fray Luis Jayme and Fray Francisco Garces also mentioned California Indian practices like basket weaving and canoe-building.⁸⁸ Meanwhile, Fray Pedro Font, who served as chaplain during Don Juan Bautista de Anza's second expedition through California from 1775 to 1776, wrote about the Chumash people of Mission San Luis Obispo.⁸⁹ Font's diary as well as later accounts recorded by European explorers Archibald Menzies (1794) and Georg Heinrich von Langsdorff (1806) provide some of the richest descriptions of California Indian artistic practices witnessed at the missions.⁹⁰

Nineteenth-century accounts like Louis Choris's 1822 diary of his travels confirm that California Indians continued to perform some traditional customs, such as basket weaving and dancing in the nineteenth century.⁹¹ By the 1830s, while studying at the Urban College of Rome, Luiseño scholar Pablo Tac wrote the first known Indigenous account of California's Native people.⁹² In his notes, Tac described the Acjachemen dances and language that he knew while growing up at Mission San Luis Rey de Francia, where he was born in 1822. Then, in the 1870s a team of researchers interviewed elders for Hubert Howe Bancroft's publications. For instance, Thomas Savage interviewed Ohlone elder Lorenzo Asisara in 1877 about life at Mission Santa Cruz.⁹³ In 1878, Julio César (Luiseño/Acjachemen) recounted his life at Mission San Luis Rey de Francia for Savage.⁹⁴ In the late nineteenth century, anthropologist John Peabody Harrington interviewed María Solares (Chumash), Fernando Librado Kitsepawit (Chumash), Lucrecia García (Chumash), Juan de Jesús Justo (Chumash), Simplicio Pico (Chumash), Juan Meléndrez (Tongva), and José de los Santos Juncos (Tongva). Scholars have attempted to decipher Harrington's complicated and extensive notes, which are stored in the National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C. In 1979 and 1981, anthropologist Travis Hudson produced two publications based on Harrington's notes from his discussions with Chumash elder Fernando Librado who provided the richest explanation of Chumash artistic customs.⁹⁵ Fernando Librado was born sometime between 1804 and 1820 on Santa Cruz Island and lived until 1915, which meant he saw nearly a century of the changes Chumash culture underwent.⁹⁶ During his childhood he lived in Ventura and spent time at both Mission San Buenaventura and Mission Santa Barbara.⁹⁷ Librado shared his memories of life at these missions in an interview J. P. Harrington conducted between 1912 and 1915. Librado, who is a frequent source of information on Chumash culture for this dissertation, confirmed the names of the Chumash artists who worked at Mission Santa Barbara. This has not been the case for artists associated with other missions. Some studies, however, have attributed artworks in the missions to California Indian artists.

In 1955, Swiss scholar and artist Kurt Baer wrote the first art historical publication on a California mission.⁹⁸ Baer identified imported and locally made artworks in Mission Santa Barbara's collection. Baer ascribed six objects there to California Indian artists: the so-called "Indian" tabernacle (Figure 3), three sandstone statues (Figure 4), an "Indian" picture frame, and a bear's head waterspout (Figure 5).⁹⁹ In 1977, Hudson revisited Mission Santa Barbara's art collection in an article focused on Chumash stone masons.¹⁰⁰ Hudson identified the pages within Harrington's field notes in which Fernando Librado recounted the names of the Chumash stonemasons who carved statues at Missions Santa Barbara and San Buenaventura.

Hudson and astronomer Ernest Underhay drew upon Harrington's interviews with Fernando Librado and Maria Solares, as well as archaeological evidence, to explain the Chumash belief system in a separate publication.¹⁰¹ They identified instances in which Chumash and other Southern California Indians continued to make and perform ritual art (rock paintings, feather poles, sand paintings, regalia, and dances) after the Spanish invasion.¹⁰² Around the time anthropologists were publishing on California Indian art and material culture historians and art historians were searching for examples of Indigenous survivals in ecclesiastical art.

Francis J. Weber, a historian of the missions, wrote an article in 1965 on the Via Crucis, or Stations of the Cross paintings, at Mission San Gabriel. George Harwood Phillips also wrote about the paintings in 1976. Phillips argued that a Native American artist painted the fourteen Stations of the Cross paintings that are currently housed at Mission San Gabriel (Figures 6a-n).¹⁰³ Art historian Norman Neuerburg raised new arguments about the paintings in 1997.¹⁰⁴ Neuerburg examined baptismal records in his attempt to identify the artist who may have painted the fourteen canvases. In his iconographical analysis of the paintings, Neuerburg asserted that more than one California Indian artist painted the scenes.¹⁰⁵ These artists, he believed, would have received training from one of the priests or a visiting artist.

The Stations of the Cross paintings are not the only works that Neuerburg attributed to California Indian artists. He also suggested that California Indian artists must have played a role in making murals, paintings, and sculptures found at the missions.¹⁰⁶ In 1989, Neuerburg and his co-author, archaeologist Georgia Lee, identified additional examples of artworks at the missions, which they asserted are extensions of pre-Hispanic California Indian artistic customs.¹⁰⁷ These examples include the Chumash sombrero hat-shaped basket (Figure 7), Mission Santa Barbara's statues (Figure 4) and fountainheads (Figure 5), and the shell-inlay tabernacle (Figure 3) at that mission. Some of these objects reappeared in late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century publications.

In 1994 archaeologist and anthropologist Mardith K. Schuetz-Miller linked specific California Indian artists to objects and architecture at the missions.¹⁰⁸ Her research utilized primary source evidence, such as baptismal and marriage records, and twentieth-century California Indian accounts. Schuetz-Miller only identified the names of sculptors and carpenters, so her publication did not cover all the artworks attributed to Indigenous artists. Her findings also reinforced the fact that only the names of California Indian *artesanos* or artisans, not fine artists, appear in the historical record. Such instances of California Indian names appearing in mission-period letters are rare.

In 2009, architectural conservator and historian Edna E. Kimbro and archaeologist Julia G. Costello wrote a study of the twenty-one Alta California missions and their art.¹⁰⁹ In the same year, art historians Clara Bargellini and Michael K. Komanecky co-edited a catalog for the exhibition, *The Arts of the Missions of Northern New Spain, 1600-1821* that seriously considered some California Indian artworks made at the California missions.¹¹⁰ The catalog includes an entry that Komanecky wrote on Mission Santa Barbara's shell-inlay tabernacle, which is considered to be a piece that a California Indian made at the mission.¹¹¹ Anthropologist Janice Timbrook also contributed an essay on the provenance of the Chumash "presentation" baskets and the British Museum's padre hat.¹¹² Timbrook published an updated article in 2014 that revisited the baskets.¹¹³ Another contributor to the catalogue, art historian Pamela Huckins, filed her dissertation in 2011, providing a much-needed overview of ecclesiastical art in the twenty-one Alta California missions.¹¹⁴ In the same year, historian Joanne Mancini published an article on Fray Pedro Cambón, which touched upon California's place in the Manila galleon trade.¹¹⁵ A close study of imports from Asia through the Manila Galleon trade remains to be done. This dissertation aims to fill in the gaps in California mission scholarship through its case studies of Chumash and Tongva artistic practices.

Chapter Overview

Chapter One examines Tongva and Chumash material culture before missionization while advocating for an Indigenous history of California mission art. It consults ethnographic sources, mainly Native accounts recorded by non-Native anthropologists, to underscore California Indian perspectives on the mission experience as well as ancestral beliefs. These sources include Fernando Librado's accounts of Chumash culture in the Santa Barbara and Ventura regions and Pablo Tac's descriptions of Payomkowishum traditions which are closely related to Tongva practices. Previous publications looked for examples of Indigenous survivals at the missions without placing them into the context of pre-1769 California Indian practices.

Chapter Two presents a case study of Chumash body adornment and performances within Mission San Buenaventura and Mission Santa Barbara. It examines these mission spaces in light of geographer Yi Fu Tuan's theories on place. The Chumash and Tongva peoples celebrated their religious beliefs through performances, which the missionaries, administrators and explorers witnessed in villages and at the missions. Non-Native accounts indicate, however, that these witnesses did not necessarily understand the significance of California Indian dances, nor did they attempt to learn about them. Ethnographic accounts from California Indian informants offer specific explanations of the dances and why they were performed. These sources also included descriptions of the regalia dancers wore, which can be seen in explorers' drawings as well as artifacts. Though used at the missions, dance regalia and instruments rarely appear in publications on the missions. Feathers, animal bone, cordage, and other ephemeral materials likely disintegrated and were unavailable to capture the attention of art historians. Moreover, California Indian musical instruments and regalia that did survive were seen as remnants of California's pre-Hispanic past. We know they were used, and likely made at the missions, so why should we not talk about them within the context of the missions? Ceremonial materials were central to the California Indian experience of the missions because they facilitated conversion. Chapter Two provides the first art historical examination of California Indian [text cut off in source at this point; the remainder of Chapter Two and Chapters

Three through Six, the Figures section, Appendix A, and the Bibliography were not retrievable due to the PDF-text extraction limit encountered]

Notes

1. William McCawley, *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles* (Banning: Malki Museum Press, 1996), 143; and Victor Golla, *California Indian Languages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011), 179-180.
2. Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).
3. Devon A. Mihesuah, *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 3.
4. These scholars have published a range of studies on the missions and the California Indian experience. Deborah A. Miranda, *Bad Indians: A Tribal Memoir* (Berkeley: Heyday, 2012); Deana Dartt, "California's Sites of Conscience: An Analysis of the State's Historic Mission Museums," *Museum Anthropology* 34:2 (2011): 97-108; Deana Dartt, "Negotiating the Master Narrative: Museums and the Indian/Californio Community of California's Central Coast" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 2009); Deana Dartt-Newton and Jon Erlandson, "Little Choice for the Chumash: Colonialism, Cattle, and Coercion in the Mission Period California," *American Indian Quarterly* 30:3/4 (Summer/Fall 2006): 416-430; Edward D. Castillo, "An Indian Account of the Decline and Collapse of Mexico's Hegemony over the Missionized Indians of California," *The American Indian Quarterly* 13:4 (1989): 391-408; Edward D. Castillo, "Blood Came from Their Mouths: Tongva and Chumash Responses to the Pandemic of 1801," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 23:3 (1999): 47-61; Edward D. Castillo, "The Native Response to the Colonization of Alta California (1989)," in *Native American Perspectives on the Hispanic Colonization of Alta California*, Spanish Borderlands Sourcebooks, 26, ed. Edward D. Castillo, 423-440 (New York: Garland, 1991); Tsim Schneider, "Envisioning Colonial Landscapes Using Mission Registers, Radiocarbon, and Stable Isotopes: An Experimental Approach from San Francisco Bay," *American Antiquity* 80:3 (2015): 511-529; Lee M. Panich and Tsim D. Schneider, "Expanding mission archaeology: A landscape approach to indigenous autonomy in colonial California," *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 40 (2015): 48-58; Lee M. Panich and Tsim D. Schneider, *Indigenous Landscapes and Spanish Missions: New Perspectives from Archaeology and Ethnohistory* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014); Jonathan Cordero, "Missionized California Indian Futures," *News from Native California* (Winter 2014/2015): 63; and Rupert Costo and Jeannette Henry Costo, *The Missions of California: A Legacy of Genocide* (San Francisco: Published by The Indian Historian Press for the American Indian Historical Society, 1987).
5. Olivia Chilcote, "Education as Self-Determination," *News from Native California* 27:2 (Winter 2013/2014): 22; and Vincent Medina, "In Our Languages. Voices on Missions," *News from Native California* blog, January 28, 2015.

6. Kency Cornejo, "'Does That Come with a Hyphen? A Space?' The Question of Central American—Americans in Latino Art and Pedagogy," *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 40:1 (Spring 2015): 189-210; Nancy Marie Mithlo, *Manifestations: New Native Art Criticism* (Santa Fe: Museum of Contemporary Native Arts, 2012); and Jarrett Martineau and Eric Ritskes, "Fugitive indigeneity: Reclaiming the terrain of decolonial struggle through Indigenous art," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 3:1 (2014): i-xii.
7. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999), 20.
8. Bagele Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies* (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2012), 14.
9. When describing California Indian art, Swiss art historian Kurt Baer stated that "their arts were unusually primitive." Kurt Baer, "California Indian Art," *The Americas* 16:1 (July 1959): 23. American independent scholar Mamie Goulet Abbot described the painting of Saint Raphael at Mission Santa Inés as "a very crude painting done by an early Mission Indian." See Mamie Goulet Abbot, *Santa Inés Hermosa* (Santa Barbara: The Sunwise Press, 1951), 67. Mary Gordon Holway also used "crude" throughout her discussion of California Indian mission art in *Mary Gordon Holway, Art of the Old World in New Spain and the Mission Days of Alta California* (San Francisco: A. M. Robertson, 1922).
10. Dylan A. T. Miner, "'When They Awaken': Indigeneity, Miscegenation, and Anticolonial Visuality," in *Rhetorics of the Americas: 3114 BCE to 2012 CE*, ed. Damián Baca and Víctor Villanueva (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 178.
11. America Meredith, "Editor's Greetings," *First American Art* 11 (Summer 2016): 10.
12. Nancy Marie Mithlo, "Our Indian Princess": *Subverting the Stereotype* (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research, 2008), 76.
13. Meredith, "Editor's Greetings," 10.
14. Carolyn Dean, "The Trouble with (the Term) Art," *Art Journal* (2006): 31-32.
15. Nancy Marie Mithlo, "No Word for Art in Our Language?: Old Questions, New Paradigms," *Wicazo Sa Review* 27:1 (Spring 2012): 115.
16. Mithlo, "No Word for Art in Our Language?" 111; and Margaret Archuleta and Rennard Strickland, *Shared Visions: Native American Painters and Sculptors in the Twentieth Century* (New York: The New Press, 1991), 8.
17. M. Kat Anderson, *Tending the Wild: Native American Knowledge and the Management of California's Natural Resources* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005), 2.
18. Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 54.

19. Charlene Villaseñor Black, "Race and the Historiography of Colonial Art," in *Envisioning Others: Race, Color, and the Visual in Iberia and Latin America*, ed. Pamela A. Patton (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015), 310.
20. José Moreno Villa, *La escultura colonial mexicana* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1942).
21. Alfred Neumeyer, "The Indian Contribution to Architectural Decoration in Spanish Colonial America," *Art Bulletin* 2 (June 1948): 104-121.
22. George Kubler, and Martin Soria, *Art and Architecture in Spain and Portugal and their American Dominions, 1500 to 1800* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959), 92.
23. José Manuel Aguilar Moreno, "Tequitqui art of sixteenth-century Mexico: an expression of transculturation" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1999), 113.
24. Constantino Reyes-Valerio, *Arte indocristiano: escultura del siglo XVI en México* (Mexico City: Escuela Nacional de Conservación, Restauración y Museografía, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1978).
25. Villaseñor Black, "Race and the Historiography of Colonial Art," 310.
26. Ibid.
27. Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn, "Hybridity and Its Discontents: Considering Visual Culture in Colonial Spanish America," *Colonial Latin American Review* 12:1 (June 2003): 5-35.
28. Dean and Leibsohn, "Hybridity and Its Discontents," 6.
29. Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 2004), 5.
30. Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 126.
31. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967), 110.
32. V. S. Naipaul, *The Mimic Men* (London: Andre Deutsch Limited, 1967), 24.
33. Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 122.
34. Angélica Afanador-Pujol, "The Tree of Jesse and the 'Relación de Michoacán': Mimicry in Colonial Mexico," *The Art Bulletin* 92:4 (December 2010): 293.
35. Afanador-Pujol, "The Tree of Jesse," 293.
36. Afanador-Pujol, "The Tree of Jesse," 302.
37. Ilona Katzew, ed. *Contested Visions in the Spanish Colonial World* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012), 12.

38. Dylan A. T. Miner, "Against Hybridity, Against Globalization: An Indigenist Provocation on/as Contemporary Art" (paper presented at Essentially Indigenous?: Contemporary Native Arts Symposium, May 2011), 6; and Mithlo, "No Word for Art in Our Language?" 123.
39. Two other explorers that came after Cabrillo also chose not to colonize the region: Sir Francis Drake (1579) and Sebastián Vizcaíno (1602). For more information on early exploration of California, see Benjamin Madley, *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe: 1846-1873* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016), 18; Hubert Howe Bancroft, *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft. History of California, 7 vols.* (San Francisco: The History Company, 1884-1890).
40. Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair: Chronicles of Early California, 1535-1846* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2001), 32.
41. Brian A. Aviles and Robert L. Hoover, "Two Californias, Three Religious Orders and Fifty Missions: A Comparison of the Missionary Systems of Baja and Alta California," *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 33:3 (1997): 1-28.
42. James J. Rawls, *Indians of California: The Changing Image* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984), 6.
43. David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 242.
44. From this point forward, I refer to the mainland region (and current-day state) as California and the peninsular region as Baja California. Today, the peninsula is divided into two Mexican states: Baja California (Norte) and Baja California Sur.
45. Beebe and Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair*, 108-109.
46. Beebe and Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair*, 114-115. On January 9, the ships departed. On March 24, the land expedition departed. By July 16 the friars established Mission San Diego.
47. From this point forward I use the shortened names of the missions as they are commonly known today. I retain, however, the Spanish accent marks used in the formal mission names, except when noted.
48. Robert A. Bellezza, *Missions of San Francisco Bay* (Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 2014), 8.
49. Madley, *American Genocide*, 35; Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California: 1769-1850* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 376; and Kent G. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontier* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 67.
50. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 384.

51. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 388; Carey McWilliams, *Southern California Country: An Island on the Land* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1946), 37; and Madley, *American Genocide*, 35.
52. Madley, *American Genocide*, 1, 42-51.
53. Madley, *American Genocide*, 67.
54. For more information on population statistics, see Madley, *American Genocide*, 555-556n2. Not all historians agree with Madley's assessment of the California Indian population after secularization in 1836. See Gary Clayton Anderson, "The Native Peoples of the American West: Genocide or Ethnic Cleansing?" *Western Historical Quarterly* 47:4 (Winter 2016): 418-422. Madley provided a powerful response to Anderson's study, calling attention to biologist Sherburne F. Cook's groundbreaking research on California Indian populations. Benjamin Madley, "Understanding Genocide in California under United States Rule, 1846-1873," *Western Historical Quarterly* 47:4 (Winter 2016): 449-461.
55. Sherburne Friend Cook, *The Population of the California Indians, 1769-1970* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976); and Sherburne F. Cook, "Historical Demography," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8, California, ed. Robert F. Heizer, 91-98 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).
56. Cook, *Population of the California Indians*, 43; and Madley, *American Genocide*, 555n2.
57. C. Hart Merriam, "The Indian Population of California," *American Anthropologist* 7:4 (Oct-Dec 1905): 598; Cook, *Population of California Indians*, 1.
58. Cook, *Population of California Indians*, 1.
59. Cook, *The Population of California Indians*, 22.
60. Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 109.
61. Albert L. Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988).
62. L. R. Weatherhead, "What is an 'Indian Tribe'? The Question of Tribal Existence," *American Indian Law Review* 8:1 (1980): 8.
63. Weatherhead, "What is an 'Indian Tribe'?" 8.
64. "Federal and State Recognized Tribes," National Conference of State Legislatures, accessed January 12, 2016; "California Tribal Communities," California Courts, accessed July 24, 2016.
65. Bancroft, *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*.
66. Zephyrin Engelhardt published a series of books on sixteen of the twenty-one California missions, including works on Mission La Concepción Purísima de María Santísima, Mission Nuestra Señora de la Soledad, Mission San Carlos Borromeo (Carmelo), Mission San Juan Bautista, Mission San Luis

Obispo, Mission Santa Inés, San Antonio de Padua, San Buenaventura, San Diego Mission, San Fernando Rey, San Francisco or Mission Dolores, San Gabriel Mission and the Beginnings of Los Angeles, San Juan Capistrano Mission, San Luis Rey Mission, San Miguel Arcángel, and Santa Barbara Mission (Santa Barbara and San Francisco: Mission Santa Barbara / The James H. Barry Company / Franciscan Herald Press, various dates 1920-1933), and his four-volume *The Missions and Missionaries of California* (San Francisco: James H. Barry, 1908-1915).

67. Maynard J. Geiger, *Franciscan Missionaries in Hispanic California, 1769-1848: A Biographical Dictionary* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1969).

68. Sherburne Friend Cook, *The Conflict Between the California Indian and White Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976); Cook originally published this study in 1943.

69. McWilliams, *Southern California Country*, 29; Madley, *American Genocide*, 3.

70. William E. Coffey, "Genocide Among the California Indians," *The Indian Historian* 10:2 (Spring 1977): 11.

71. Rawls, *Indians of California*, 25-43.

72. Costo and Costo, *The Missions of California*; and Madley, *American Genocide*, 3.

73. Robert H. Jackson and Edward D. Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995).

74. Lisbeth Haas, *Conquests and Historical Identities in California: 1769-1936* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995).

75. Haas, *Conquests and Historical Identities*, 14.

76. Beebe and Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair*.

77. Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Testimonios: Early California Through the Eyes of Women, 1815-1848* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2006).

78. James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004).

79. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*.

80. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*.

81. George Harwood Phillips, *Vineyards and Vaqueros: Indian Labor and the Economic Expansion of Southern California, 1771-1877* (Norman: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 2010), 146-147.

82. Madley, *American Genocide*.

83. Madley, *American Genocide*, 12-13, 39.

84. Kelly Lytle Hernández, *City of Inmates: Conquest, Rebellion, and the Rise of Human Caging in Los Angeles, 1771-1965* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017), 25.
85. Other primary accounts mentioned California Indian art and architecture from missions, but they are not cited here since their authors did not visit the sites covered in this study. For instance, George Peard visited Mission San José in 1826 and Abel du Petit-Thouars travelled through Monterey and stopped at Mission San Carlos in 1836; Pedro Fages, *A Historical, Political, and Natural Description of California*, trans. Herbert Ingram Priestley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937); Miguel Costansó, *The Portolá Expedition of 1769-1770, Diary of Miguel Costansó*, ed. Frederick John Teggart and translated by Manuel Carpio (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1911); and Juan Crespí, *A Description of Distant Roads: Original Journals of the First Expedition into California, 1769-1770*, ed. and trans. Alan K. Brown (San Diego: San Diego State University Press, 2001).
86. Costansó, *The Portolá Expedition of 1769-1770*; Crespí, *A Description of Distant Roads*; and Juan Vizcaíno, *The Sea Diary of Fr. Juan Vizcaíno in Alta California 1769*, trans. Arthur Woodward (Los Angeles: G. Dawson, 1959).
87. Fages, *Description of California*.
88. Luís Jayme, Letter of Luís Jayme, O.F.M., San Diego, October 17, 1772, trans. and ed. Maynard J. Geiger (Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1970); and Francisco Garces, *Diario de exploraciones en Arizona y California, 1775-1776* (Malaga: Algazara, 1996).
89. Pedro Font, *Font's Complete Diary: A Chronicle of the Founding of San Francisco*, trans. Herbert Eugene Bolton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933). It is unclear why Font referred to the local peoples as the "Nochi." Future investigations may uncover more information regarding this term.
90. Archibald Menzies, *Journal of Archibald Menzies, surgeon and botanist on board Discovery (1790-1794, British Library Add. Ms. 32641; Marlborough, England: Adam Matthew Digital, 2007)*; and Georg Heinrich von Langsdorff, *Remarks and Observations on a Voyage Around the World From 1803 to 1807*, trans. and ann. Victoria Joan Moesser, ed. Richard A. Pierce (Kingston and Fairbanks: The Limestone Press, 1993).
91. Louis Choris, *San Francisco One Hundred Years Ago*, trans. Porter Garnett (San Francisco: A.M. Robertson, 1913).
92. Pablo Tac, *Indian Life and Customs at Mission San Luis Rey: A Record of California Mission Life* (San Luis Rey, CA: Old Mission, 1958). This is the first known account written by an Indigenous Californian. Tongva shaman, Toyupurina (1760-1799), gave one of the earliest accounts recorded during her 1785 trial for organizing a revolt against Mission San Gabriel; this is an example of an Indigenous account recorded through the lens of non-Native scribes.
93. José Mariá Amador and Lorenzo Asisara, *Californio Voices: The Oral Memoirs of José María Amador and Lorenzo Asisara*, trans. and ed. Gregorio Mora-Torres (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2005), 78-199; and Hubert Howe Bancroft, *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, Volume XXXIV, California Pastoral 1769-1848* (San Francisco: The History Company, 1888),

594-599.

94. Julio César, "Recollections of My Youth at San Luis Rey Mission," in *Native American Perspectives on the Hispanic Colonization of Alta California*, Spanish Borderlands Sourcebooks, 26, ed. Edward Castillo, 13-15 (New York: Garland, 1991); and Beebe and Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair*, 468-475.

95. Travis Hudson, ed., *Breath of the Sun: Life in Early California As Told by a Chumash Indian*, Fernando Librado to John P. Harrington (Banning: Malki Museum Press, 1979) and Travis Hudson, Thomas Blackburn, Rosario Curletti, and Janice Timbrook, eds., *The Eye of the Flute: Chumash Traditional History and Ritual as Told by Fernando Librado Kitsepawit to John P. Harrington* (Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, 1981).

96. Hudson et al., *Eye of the Flute*, 3; Hudson, *Breath of the Sun*, x. Librado's place of baptism is unknown: "Fernando's place of baptism could be at Mission Purísima, Santa Bárbara, Santa Inés, San Buenaventura or even San Fernando." Hudson, *Eye of the Flute*, 121.

97. Hudson points out that most of Librado's recollections only tell of the years before secularization even though he lived until 1915. Hudson, *Breath of the Sun*, x.

98. Kurt Baer, *Painting and Sculpture at Mission Santa Barbara* (Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1955).

99. Baer, *Painting and Sculpture*, 139, 146-147, 206, 209.

100. Travis Hudson, "Some John P. Harrington Notes Regarding Chumash Masons at Mission Santa Barbara and San Buenaventura," *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 13:3 (July 1977): 15-21.

101. Travis Hudson and Ernest Underhay, *Crystals in the Sky: An Intellectual Odyssey Involving Chumash Astronomy, Cosmology and Rock Art* (Socorro: Ballena Press, 1978), 19, 47-48, 85.

102. Hudson and Underhay, *Crystals in the Sky*, 15, 22-24, 36, 47-48, 51-54, 66-67, 73, 85, 91-94, 130-131.

103. George Harwood Phillips, "Indian Paintings from the Mission San Fernando: An Historical Interpretation," *The Journal of California Anthropology* 3 (Summer 1976): 96-100. Phillips repeated his arguments in 2007 and 2010. George Harwood Phillips, "The Stations of the Cross Revisited, Reconsidered, and Revised (sort of)," *Boletín: The Journal of the California Mission Studies Association* 24:2 (2007): 76-87; and Phillips, *Vineyards and Vaqueros*, 101-104.

104. Norman Neuerburg, "The Indian Via Crucis from Mission San Fernando: An Historical Exposition," *Southern California Quarterly* 79 (Fall 1997): 329-382.

105. Neuerburg, "Indian Via Crucis," 353.

106. Norman Neuerburg, *Painting in the California Missions* (Los Angeles: Kellaway Publishing, 1977).
107. Georgia Lee and Norman Neuerburg, "The Alta California Indians as Artists Before and After Contact," in *Columbian Consequences, Volume 1, Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands*, ed. David Hurst Thomas, 467-480 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989).
108. Mardith K. Schuetz-Miller, *Building and Builders in Hispanic California, 1769-1850* (Tucson: Southwestern Mission Research Center, 1994).
109. Edna Kimbro and Julia G. Costello, *The California Missions: History, Art and Preservation* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2009).
110. Clara Bargellini and Michael K. Komanecky, *The Arts of the Missions of Northern New Spain, 1600-1821* (Mexico City: Antigua Colegio de San Ildefonso, 2009).
111. Michael K. Komanecky, "Tabernacle," in *The Arts of the Missions of Northern New Spain 1600-1821*, ed. Clara Bargellini and Michael K. Komanecky (Mexico City: Antigua Colegio de San Ildefonso, 2009), 325-326.
112. Janice Timbrook, "Native American Arts in the Spanish Missions: Chumash Basketry," in *The Arts of the Missions of Northern New Spain 1600-1821*, ed. Clara Bargellini and Michael K. Komanecky (Mexico City: Antigua Colegio de San Ildefonso, 2009), 327-332.
113. Jan Timbrook, "Six Chumash Presentation Baskets," *American Indian Art Magazine* 39:3 (Summer 2014): 50-57.
114. Pamela J. Huckins, "Art in the Alta California Mission Churches, 1769-ca. 1834" (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 2011).
115. J. M. Mancini, "Pedro Cambon's Asian Objects: A Transpacific Approach to Eighteenth-Century California," *American Art* 2:1 (Spring 2011): 8-51.