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PATRIARCHAL PROTESTERS, CULTURAL BROKERS, AND UNLIKELY BEDFELLOWS

A Lineage of Spanish-Mexican Women in Colonial Alta California

Jennifer A. Lucido and Scott E. Lydon

Introduction

Borderlands and frontiers impact identity, culture, and social organization. As such, most studies of 18th and 19th century California emphasize the role of the Franciscan missionaries, soldiers, and other settlers in their colonization of the Spanish frontier and the subsequent transformative impacts and reactions of Native Californians (Lucido 2014: 82). By contrast, scholarship that thoroughly examines gender and sexual politics of Alta California is inadequately represented. Even so, the dominant narrative of these studies focuses on how the frontier was utilized to heighten sexualized and engendered hierarchies among male colonists and indigenous women (Lucido 2014: 84; Voss 2008: 304). A microscale analysis of successive generations of women from one of Spanish California's earliest settler families, the Arballo (m. Lopez) lineage, provides a nuanced examination of colonial women in the frontier. More specifically, this paper interrogates how these women acted both as equally important partners in the colonization of Alta California but also as individual agents. The Spanish-Mexican women central to this paper include: María Feliciana Arballo, María Ignacia de la Candelaria López, María Antonia Natalia Elija “Josefa” Carrillo, and María Ramona la Luz Carrillo.

The Engendered Landscape

Borderland and frontier studies of colonial women can be further informed through the application of the historic landscape schema (Lucido 2015: 11). Historic landscape is a broad framework that can be applied to archaeological and documentary research in order to contribute to our understanding about past cultures (Clement 1999: 1).
The Arballo Lineage

Maria Feliciana Arballo
& Juan Francisco Lopez (1736-1800, b.Todos Santos, Baja California)
b. 1752, Culiacán, Mexico
d. ca 1.6.1800, San Diego, Alta California

Maria Ignacia de la Candelaria López
& Joaquin Victor Carrillo (1793-1836, b. San Jose, Baja California)
b. 1.31.1793, San Diego, Alta California
d. 2.28.1849, Sonoma, Alta California

Maria Antonia Natalia Elija “Josefa” Carrillo
& Henry Delano Fitch (1799-1849, b. Massachusetts, USA)
b. 12.29.1810, San Diego, Alta California
d. 1.26.1893, Healdsburg, Alta California

Maria Ramona la Luz Carrillo
& Jose Antonio Ronchoaldo Pacheco (1795-1831, b. Guanajuato, Mexico)
& John Wilson (1798-1861, b. Dundee, Scotland)
b. 7.23.1812, San Diego, Alta California
d. 12.16.1886, San Francisco, Alta California

Figure 1. The Arballo lineage reflecting the Spanish-Mexican women (and spouses) reviewed in this article (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 68; Burch 1993; ECPP 2006; Find A Grave 2018; McGinty 1957a-c; Mission 2000: 2006).

The landscape is in constant motion, shaped by dynamic processes and interfaces that interact with it. Therefore, historic landscape studies serve not only to document changes and interactions between humans with their physical environments over time, but also their sociocultural environments.

According to Tim Ingold (2010), landscapes, and thereby historic landscapes, are akin to paintings. Like a painting, the surface of the landscape does not necessarily illuminate the underlying processes or strokes of paint that occurred to produce it (Ingold 2010: 67; Lucido 2015: 17). Thus, by excorticating through the metaphoric layers of paint, new interrelationships may be revealed (Lucido 2015: 17). By applying this concept to the historic landscape of Alta California, there is greater potential to identify those hidden layers associated with colonial women and thereby presents a more holistic interpretation of the landscape.

Identifying these underlying layers in the historic landscape is even more critical given that the visible layers with respect to settler women are deceptive. Said visible layers identified with colonial (About the Authors, continued)
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women in California encompass two generalized categories by popular historians: Spanish and Mexican (Castañeda 1990a: 8). Antonia I. Castañeda documents that the general histories by Hubert Howe Bancroft, Theodore H. Hittell, and Zoeth Skinner, explicitly reflect inaccuracies and stereotypes of Spanish and Mexican women which have permeated into the historical narrative of Alta California (1990a: 8). For example, “Spanish” women were more commonly affiliated with the elite, land-owning families. Popular historians romanticize Spanish women with moral, sexual, and racial purity, whereas “Mexican” represent the opposite values (Castañeda 1990a: 9). Mexican women who recently arrived in Alta California, or were from non-elite families, were construed as immoral and sexually and/or racially impure (Castañeda 1990a: 9).

Such narratives, or visible layers, diminish the role and influence of women in the frontier of Alta California. Spanish-Mexican women, like their male counterparts, were partners in the colonization process and contributed to the development of California's historic landscape (Reyes 2009: 3). Moreover, women acted with individual agency and pragmatism when confronted with a new frontier (Reyes 2009: 3). This is the thesis of Bárbara Reyes’ (2009) research on gender and the missions of both Alta and Baja California. Historically, women and their engendered labor often are associated with the domestic or private sphere of daily life (Reyes 2009: 3). Activities that traditionally define the domestic/private sphere include “women's everyday activities...confined to the kitchen or bedroom” as well as other related familial tasks (Reyes 2009: 8). In contrast, the public sphere is characterized by economic, political, legal, religious, and other such spaces (Reyes 2009: 5, 7-8). This paradigm would thereby suggest that the domestic/private sphere is one of the underlying layers of historic landscape of California that should be more thoroughly examined.

Given that frontiers and borderlands are transformative landscapes, Reyes argues that there were in fact no private spheres or spaces during the 18th and 19th centuries (2009: 9). By reexamining the public spheres, historians, archaeologists, and other scholars can reinterpret the historic landscape of California in search of new understandings. Therefore, the application of these combined theoretical approaches can further inform the historical narrative identified with the women in the Arballo lineages.
“He is doing the right thing”: Challenging Male Honor
on the Frontier

Prior to 1774, there were no female Spanish-Mexican colonists in Alta California (Mason 1998: 21). In Monterey, the absence of women was observed by a recently baptized Rumsen neophyte with whom Father Junípero Serra brought as his companion when he traveled to New Spain (Mexico) in 1774 (Serra 1955b: 87). Serra inquired about the Rumsen’s perceptions of the presidial company during their return to Monterey:

...[Serra] asked him if he or his fellow countrymen [the Rumsen], when they saw the officers and soldiers, had ever imagined a country where everybody wore clothes, etc.?

He answered no, that they thought all countries were like their own. As regards the soldiers and the Fathers, after carefully looking them over, they had come to the conclusion that they were the sons of the mules on which they rode [Serra 1955b: 87].

Considering this, Castañeda (1990b: 120-121) argues that the Franciscan missionaries believed that the mere presence of colonial women was therefore necessary to attract Native Californians to the missions. Furthermore, she contends that such would also assure prospective neophytes that the depredation of native women would discontinue.

Three recruitment efforts in the provinces of Sinaloa and Sonora were initiated following the founding of the first missions and presidios in California (Lucido 2014: 95). The first expedition in 1774 was led by Commander Fernando de Rivera y Moncada (Menchaca 2001: 135). Rivera y Moncada escorted a land party to Alta California from Baja California, consisting of the first women settlers (Menchaca 2001: 135). According to Castañeda:

single women were encouraged to find husbands among the soldiers who were starved for women of their own kind. The crown hoped that as marriage quelled their lustful behavior, the soldiers would choose to settle in the frontier once their military duty was completed. Thus, the colony would prosper and be increasingly populated by gente de razón [1990b: 121].
For the second expedition, Captain Juan Bautista de Anza of the Tubac Presidio in Arizona recruited and escorted a land party of some 200 soldiers, settlers, and their families in 1775-1776 (Hackel 2005: 56; Mason 1998: 29). In 1781, the third land expedition was led again by Rivera y Moncada (Mason 1998: 36).

The de Anza expedition provides documentation for one of the earliest instances of patriarchal protest in the Spanish-Mexican lineage in this study (Bouvier 2001: 66). The soldiers and settlers of the expedition departed the Presidio of Tubac on October 23, 1775, for Alta California (Font and Brown 2011: 82). On December 7th and 8th of 1775, while camping by the Paredones River, the expedition was organized into three parties to ration water supplies and rest the animals (Anza and Bolton 1930: 50; Font and Brown 2011: 142). The first division embarked while the remaining two set forth, each a day apart (Anza and Bolton 1930: 50, 228.) On December 17, 1775, the three divisions were reunited at San Sebastián (Anza and Bolton 1930: 230; Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 69; Font and Brown 2011: 142). Later in the evening, Father Pedro Font recounted the following event:

At nightfall, what with the joy of all the people's having arrived, some rather unruly partying broke out over there. A woman, widow who was traveling with the expedition, quite brazenly sang some glosas that were not so nice. Her singing was acknowledged by the applause and shouting from the rabble. Her companion, that is, the man with whom she was traveling, became angered at this and punished her. Our commander overheard this and it caused him to come out his tent and scold the man for punishing her. I said to him, “Let it be, sir, he is doing the right thing,” and he answered, “No Father, I must not allow these excesses in my presence.” He was strict about this excess and not the excess of the party!-which went on until quite late [Font and Brown 2011: 154].

The next day, Font condemned the party and the widow’s act in his sermon; he proclaimed that he was left with the impression that the people of the expedition were “thanking the Devil with that kind of festivity” as opposed to God (Font and Brown 2011: 154).

The widow in question was 25-year-old María Feliciana Arballo de Gutiérrez, a “mulata libre,” a free woman either black or of mixed African and Hispanic ancestry from Culiacan (Bond 2006: 1; Font and Brown 2011: 154n135; NPS 2006). Feliciana's husband, also
a mulato, Juan José Gutiérrez, died prior to the departure to the northern frontier of Alta California on February 16, 1774 (Bond 2006: 1; Bouvier 2001: 66; Font and Brown 2011: 334-335, 338; Eldredge 1912a: 305; NPS 2006). Despite this, Feliciana chose to continue with the expedition, taking with her two daughters, María Tomasa and María Eustaquia Gutiérrez, ages four and one month as per Anza’s rosters dated to October 20, 1775 and April 6, 1775 (Font and Brown 2011: 333-334, 338; Mason 1998: 32); however, other sources indicate ages six and four for Tomasa and Eustaquia (Eldredge 1912a: 305).

In the context of the expedition, maintaining the private and public spheres of late eighteenth century New Spanish society would have been challenging, therefore increasing potential for these spheres to become blurred. Font’s account of Feliciana presents an opportunity to examine the implications of her behavior in a public space defined by patriarchal parameters. Under such a paradigm, the role of the “honor/shame complex” was fundamental to governing proper social behavior or conduct (Gutiérrez 1991: 291; Pubols 2009: 8).

Figure 2. Map illustration of important locations mentioned in the text, overlaid atop present-day satellite imagery to highlight landscape conditions: (1) the general De Anza Expedition route of 1775-1776, starting in November; (2) Camp 49: San Sebastián; and (3) Casa de Carrillo, near Mission San Diego (Anza Trail Foundation 2018; Center for Advanced Technology in Education, University of Oregon 1998; Font and Brown 2011; McGinty 1957a-c; Stanley 1999). Cartography developed by Scott E. Lydon, 2018.
As noted by Ramón Gutiérrez (1991: 177), “honor was placed at the very center of [Spanish colonists’] moral system.” To cultivate power in a patriarchal system was in part to maintain honor. According to Pubols (2009: 8), this consists of “male honor ideally rested on a set of positive accomplishments.” Examples of male honor include demonstration of will and command over others, protection and providing for dependents, upholding hierarchy and respect for rank among other men (Pubols 2009: 8). This contrasts with female honor and virtue. Examples of female honor include “a more passive ability to show submission to husbands, fathers, and elders, strict adherence to sexual propriety, and respect for social decorum” (Pubols 2009: 8).

Feliciana’s behavior deviated from appropriate social decorum and female honor such that her male companion had to physically beat her into submission. This public assault was consistent with the honor/shame complex, and clearly endorsed by Font. Nevertheless, Anza’s anger toward the treatment of Feliciana and his unabashed objection to Font’s authority suggests the gender hierarchy and male domination that comprises the patriarchal system was vulnerable to change. This is further compounded considering that Feliciana was of a lower social and racial status, as per her casta or caste of “mulata” which is documented in her marriage record on July 25, 1768 in Culiacán, Mexico (See Event ID: 9156, NPS 2006). However, according to the Alta California census of 1790, her casta demonstrates significant upward mobility with the designation of “española” (Mason 1998: 78).

Prior to this episode, Feliciana and her two daughters travelled with soldier-settler Agustín Valenzuela and his family according to Anza’s 1775 list of recruits (Font and Brown 2011: 154n135, 338n32). As per Font’s roster of April 13, 1776, Feliciana and her daughters Tomasa and Eustaquia are listed independent of the Valenzuela family (Font and Brown 2011: 338n32). It is plausible that after December 17, Feliciana decided to travel separately given that Agustín, the Valenzuela patriarch, may have been the man who “punished” her, or was otherwise ostracized by her host family considering the dishonor and lack of virtue she represented (Font and Brown 2011: 343n65). Also of note is the fact that in Font’s roster, following the entry of Feliciana and her daughters, he added the statement of “The three have no husbands” (Font and Brown 2011: 343n65). Such may be perceived as a slight, or as Brown suggests, an “oblique insult,” considering that Feliciana’s daughters were still children (Font and Brown 2011: 343n65). Moreover, Font refers to others on his list who are not married simply as “unmarried,” or “bachelors” if male, but otherwise offers no comment on the marital status of female children.
Another important observation regarding this event is that unlike the most commonly cited English translations (see Anza and Bolton 1930: 230), Alan K Brown (2011) deliberately left “glosas” in his translation. Brown defines glosas as “song lyrics adapted to the occasion, and humorously ‘feeding into’ a set refrain,” not unlike a freestyle rap (Font and Brown 2011: 154n135). The incomplete English translation glosses over the probable subject of Feliciana’s glosas, Font himself (Font and Brown 2011: 39). To merely translate glosas as “lyrics” or “verses” discredits Feliciana’s ability to spontaneously compose original songs (Font and Brown 2011: 39). This is significant because while Brown’s study and translation of Font’s expedition diary reveal the priest’s religious and moral values more generally, in this instance, Feliciana not only morally offended Font, but also threatened his patriarchal position (Font and Brown 2011: 39).

So the question that remains, in challenging male hegemony, did Feliciana cause irreparable damage to not only her honor and virtue as a woman, but also that of her children? Examination of Feliciana’s descendants holds the answer.

The Anza expedition arrived at Mission San Gabriel in February 1776 to take a break before continuing northward to Monterey; ten soldiers and two settlers remained behind, among them Feliciana and her daughters (Font and Brown 2011: 211, 214). On March 6, 1776, Feliciana met and married Juan Francisco López in a ceremony officiated by Father Francisco Garcés (Bouvier 2001: 204n97; Font and Brown 2011: 154n135, 343n65). Francisco was a soldado de cuera or leather-jacket soldier of the San Diego garrison from Todos Santos, Baja California who accompanied Serra in an earlier expedition to Alta California (Bouvier 2001: 67; ECPP 2006; Mason 1978: 409-411, 1990: 78). The couple had seven children, of whom their youngest was María Ignacia de la Candelaria López (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 71; ECPP 2006; Mason 1998: 78).

**Like Mother, Like Daughter: María Ignacia de la Candelaria López**

María Ignacia was born on January 31, 1793 and baptized two days later in the Royal Presidio Chapel of San Diego (ECPP 2006: SD 01566). She later married Joaquin Victor Carrillo on September 3, 1809, at the Presidio Chapel of San Diego (Burch 1993; McGinty 1957a: 4). During the 1820’s and 1830’s, the couple resided at the Casa de Carrillo (aka the Fitch House), one of the only private houses
situated outside the Presidio prior to 1825 (Hayes 1874: 79 as cited in Farris 2018: 240; McGinty 1957a: 5-6). The house was constructed in 1821 by order of Comandante Francisco Ruiz, the godfather for three of Maria Ygnacia’s and Joaquin’s children (Farris 2018: 242; McGinty 1957a: 5). With its lush orchards of pear, olive, and pomegranate trees, the Casa de Carrillo served as the focal point for the pueblo of San Diego’s festivals and numerous processions of Spanish and Mexican dignitaries traveling to Alta California (McGinty 1957a: 6). María Ygnacia and her family were central figures in the social and aristocratic structure of San Diego during the early 19th century (McGinty 1957a: 6).

In 1835, Joaquin petitioned to sell the orchard which had been gifted to the Carrillo children from Comandante Ruiz without the consent of María Ignacia (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 71; McGinty 1957a: 7; Stanley 1999: 11). Mexican law dictated that marital property “belonged jointly to both spouses, and therefore could not be sold without the permission of both” (Pubols 2009: 37). However, given that the property was technically only entrusted to María Ignacia and Joaquin, neither spouse was permitted to sell the property (Burch 1993). Ruiz explicitly stated in the transfer document that the Carrillos were not on “...any pretext to sell, encumber, nor mortgage it; since it should... remain in trust in favor of my three godchildren..." (Burch 1993). Despite this, Joaquin evidently had no qualms in excluding his wife from his plans, thereby not only bringing into question the extent to which the law was enforced at that time, but perhaps also his personal regard for Ruiz.

Consequently, María Ignacia was forced to fight to maintain her familial property rights (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 71; McGinty 1957a: 7; Stanley 1999: 11-12). On May 19, 1835, María Ignacia appealed to Governor Figueroa against her husband’s request to sell the orchard (McGinty 1957a: 7). She argued that if her husband sold the orchard, her children (albeit adults at the time) would be left without their rightful inheritance (McGinty 1957a: 7; Stanley 1999: 11). With respect to María Ignacia’s complaint, Figueroa observed that:

Mrs. María Ignacia Lopez, wife of D. Joaquin Carrillo has informed me that he [Joaquin] wishes to sell the orchard they own in this town and the said orchard being the only patrimony they possess for the support of their family, it should not be sold: for the reason that it does not belong to them, it having been given as a present, by Captain Francisco Maria Ruiz to his godchildren, the children of M. Carrillo and
on this account she requested me to forbid its sale (Figueroa 1835; Stanley 1999: 11)

Figueroa ultimately ruled in María Ignacia’s favor and prohibited Juan from selling the orchard (McGinty 1957a: 7; Stanley 1999: 11-12). Therefore, if María Ignacia had not contested the dishonorable actions of her husband within the public sphere, then their children would have been divested of Ruiz’s bequest.

Like Mother, Like Daughter: María Antonia Natalia Elija Carrillo

The eldest daughter and firstborn child of María Ignacia and Juan was María Antonia Natalia Elija Carrillo, or “Josefa” (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 71). Josefa was born at San Diego on December 29, 1810 (McGinty 1957a: 7). In 1826, Captain Henry Delano Fitch of Massachusetts arrived in Alta California aboard the merchant ship María Ester (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 71; McGinty 1957a: 8). Fitch served as a trading liaison for San Diego during which he met Josefa (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 78). Over the next few years, Josefa and Fitch courted whenever he docked in San Diego (Miller 1973). Josefa was attracted to Fitch because of his “refined manners and handsome presence” (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 78).

In March of 1829, marriage arrangements were set into motion (Miller 1973). On April 14, 1829, Father Antonio Menéndez baptized Fitch in the Royal Presidio Chapel of San Diego with the intention of the wedding ceremony to follow the next day (McGinty 1957a: 8; Miller 1973). However, on the wedding day, Josefa’s uncle Domingo Carrillo and adjutant to Governor José María Echeandía intervened citing that the marriage would incur “the wrath of the civil, military, ecclesiastical authorities” (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 72, 78; Miller 1973). In her 1875 testimonio, Josefa contended that the governor was a lovelorn suitor hence the interference (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 78-79). To further complicate matters, Fitch was assigned to set sail on the brig Vulture to Valparaíso, Chile and Lima, Peru to transport a load of hides and tallow the day after the scheduled wedding date (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 81; Miller 1973). Consequently, aided and abetted by Pío Pico, Josefa and Fitch eloped to Valparaíso (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 78-79; Miller 1973). After 74 days at sea, Josefa and Fitch married on June 28, 1829 (Miller 1973).

In July of 1830, Josefa and Fitch returned to San Diego on the frigate, Lenora (Miller 1973). While the cargo was inspected, Josefa remained aboard the Lenora where she was visited by María Ignacia and her sisters (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 82; Miller 1973). It was at that
time that they informed Josefa of the scandal she had caused (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 82; Miller 1973). Not only did Josefa bring dishonor to the family by simply eloping, her marriage was still not considered to be legitimate by Catholic standards. Moreover, Josefa’s honor-virtue was brought into scrutiny within the public sphere of Californio society (Gutiérrez 1991: 209). Consequently, her actions directly threatened “her father’s sense of political honor” such that Joaquin “vowed to kill her the moment he laid eyes on her again” (Pubols 2009: 124-125). Despite this warning, Josefa sought reconciliation with her father. In her testimonio, Josefa recounted a rather dramatic scene in which she entered her father’s home and found him in the company of a shotgun (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 82; Miller 1973). In response, Josefa assumed a prostrate position and pleaded for his forgiveness (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 82; Miller 1973). Peace was ultimately restored between father and daughter, although the contestation of the marriage continued. The couple was arrested in Monterey and sent to Mission San Gabriel in order to receive the sacraments required in advance of marriage (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 83-84; McGinty 1957a: 10; Miller 1973).

Like that of Feliciana, María Ignacia, and Josefa represent examples of patriarchal protest through different generations and colonial settings. While Feliciana was silenced and ostracized for her boisterous glosas, María Ignacia was rewarded for speaking out against injustices. By challenging her husband, she subsequently challenged patriarchal responsibility to support his family. And although years prior, Josefa similarly offended her father’s honor with her elopement to Fitch, which perhaps was in part Joaquin’s retaliation against her in his efforts to disavow Josefa and her siblings from the Ruiz’ land.

**Cultural Brokers and Unlikely Bedfellows**

Within colonial contexts, women of both indigenous and settler origin, engaged in some form of agency as “cultural brokers” in their households (Voss 2010: 267). Cultural brokers served as facilitators between the indigenous and colonial spheres (Voss 2010: 267). Such racialized difference is reflected archaeologically in colonial households of the Royal Presidio of San Francisco. Barbara Voss’ microscale analysis of colonial households at the Presidio provides insight into the role of indigenous women within the broader empire scale; therefore, similar focus which can be applied to the study of Spanish-Mexican women in Alta California (Voss 2010: 265).
For this purpose, Serra recognized the immediate importance of recruiting colonial women to the frontier. Writing to the Viceroy on 8 January 1775, Serra proposed the following roles for frontier women:

The families which I suggested in my first Memorandum to Your Excellency might be brought from Sinaloa: soldiers from respectable stock, taking care that in their number there would be some who should bring their families with them; that two such families be placed in each mission, so that the wives of these soldiers should devote themselves to instructing the women of the missions—a piece of work that presents obvious difficulties to the Fathers [Serra 1955b: 203].

Serra emphasizes the economic and social roles for colonial women rather than their reproductive capacities (Lucido 2014: 100). Moreover, by his own admission, Serra humorously notes that women have skill sets that the Franciscan fathers and soldiers do not. Such skills lay within the domestic sphere. Spanish-speaking women were expected to teach *neofítas* how to cook, clean, sew (Chávez-García 2004: 15). Serra’s perspectives thereby elevate the significance of female settlers in the colonization of Alta California.

According to Reyes (2009: 111), it was uncommon for *mestiza* women to have positions in the missions. And yet, Feliciana a *mulata*, served as head of Mission San Gabriel’s dormitory for Indian girls during the latter part of the 18th century, therefore predating the tenure (c. 1819) of *llavera* Eulalia Pérez (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 96; Bouvier 2001: 67). Therefore, Feliciana served as one of the earliest colonial cultural brokers on the frontier. In addition, Feliciana acted as *madrina* for an infant girl from the Indian village of Juyuvit (Bouvier 2001: 67). Like that of her mother, María Ygnacia also acted as a cultural broker in her capacity as a godmother. Their role as *madrinas* for *neofítas* and the domestic lessons they provided were instrumental to the Hispanicization and Christianization efforts of the Spanish empire (Bouvier 2001: 67; Mason 1998: 78; McGinty 1957a: 6; Serra 1955b: 203).

Returning to María Ygnacia, the daughter of Feliciana and Juan Francisco Lopez, she represented a person of “respectable stock” in accordance with Serra’s criteria for facilitating his vision for Spanish-speaking women in Alta California (Serra 1955b: 203). As
such, Joaquin and María Ygnacia were padrinos for at least seven neofítas from Mission San Diego, perhaps in large part due to María’s knowledge of the Diegueño language (i.e. Kumeyaay or Tipai-Ipai; Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 76; McGinty 1957a: 5). Presently, it remains uncertain how she learned Diegueño. However, it is reasonable to speculate that she possibly was taught by Feliciana (Bond 2006: 1; Bouvier 2001: 66; Font and Brown 2011: 154n135, 338; Eldredge 1912a: 305; NPS 2006).

Following the death of Joaquin in 1836, María Ygnacia and her unmarried children moved north to Sonoma (McGinty 1957b: 145). On January 19, 1838, she petitioned to the governor for the land grant Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa that lay between Manzas and Santa Rosa Creeks upon which the Carrillo Adobe was constructed (Burch 1993; McGinty 1957b: 146, 1957c: 374).

In circa 1838 to 1839, the trader and merchant William Heath Davis visited a host of ranches or cattle farms in northern California, including María Ygnacia and her rancho (Davis 1967: 18, 22-23). At the time, María Ygnacia owned some 3000 head of cattle, 1200-1500
horses and some sheep (Davis 1929: 32). In addition, María Ygnacia employed several hundred gentile or unbaptized Native Californian (Pomo) laborers (Davis 1967: 25). Davis frequently observed Pomo workers practicing the use of the temescal, or steam bath on the rancho (Davis 1929: 34; Stanley 1999: 25-26). Considering the number and apparent freedom of the laborers at the rancho, Davis once inquired if María Ygnacia:

was not afraid for the safety of her family with so many unchristianized Indians among her household. She said she had perfect confidence in her raw help because she treated them so well, giving them abundant food, beef, frijol and corn. She also learned their dialect and managed them with a uniform system in their labour and otherwise. It was the treatment and government of the early fathers she had adopted, and these Indians would do anything for her and perform it most cheerfully [Davis 1967: 25].

The fact that María Ygnacia spoke multiple indigenous languages cannot be understated. Such would have contributed to her ability to successfully broker Californio culture and lifeways with Native Californians outside of the mission setting while accommodating at least some of their cultural practices (Stanley 1999: 25-26). Future studies might investigate how many other women on the frontlines of the frontier were bilingual, or perhaps even multilingual, and to what extent were missionaries, soldiers, and other colonial authorities reliant on the linguistic skills of women such as María Ygnacia?

**Two of a Kind: Josefa and Ramona Carrillo**

Returning to Josefa, much attention (this paper notwithstanding) is given to her controversial partnership with an unlikely bedfellow. However, there is less consideration given to her role as a cultural broker within the context of her marriage to a foreigner. As noted in the work of Maria Raquél Casas (2007), the intermarriage of Spanish-Mexican women with foreigners provided a public space to engage in both cultural exchange and resistance (Casas 2007: 13; Washburn 2014: 16). And likewise, for foreigners, to marry one of the “daughters of the land” afforded them access to the fruits of land (Casas 2007: 8; Washburn 2014: 16). Despite the mutual benefits of a Spanish-Mexican and Euro-American marriage, Casas challenges historical narratives that present “Eurocentric beliefs about Mexican women being overwhelmingly drawn to white men for sexual or economic reasons” (Casas 2007: 13; Washburn 2014: 16). Rather, feminist
studies examine the union of Spanish-Mexican women with Euro-American men as a form of insight into a concept of “in-betweenness” (Casas 2007; Pascoe 1991: 15; Washburn 2014: 17). This space of in-betweenness provided Spanish-Mexican women with the opportunity to express individual agency (Casas 2007: 49: Washburn 2014: 17).

Census data provides further documentation against the romanticization and exaggeration of intermarriages in Alta California (Casas 2007: 135; Washburn 2014: 17). For example, at the Royal Presidio of Santa Barbara, the intermarriage between Spanish-Mexican/Californio women and Euro-Americans accounted for only 8.3% of the total marriages between 1821-1829 (Pubols 2009: 127). Between 1831-1839, such intermarriages in Santa Barbara rose to 14.7%, and then fell to 6.9% from 1840-1846 (Pubols 2009: 127). Additional demographic studies suggest that “only half of the Euro-American trappers who entered California actually married Mexican women” (Casas 2007: 135; Washburn 2014: 17). As such, the marriage of Josefa and Fitch, as well as the marriage of her sister Ramona to Wilson, truly embody partnerships of unlikely bedfellows and thereby exemplified their role as cultural brokers of Californio and Euro-American culture.

![Figure 4. The number of recorded intermarriages with foreigners at the Royal Presidio of Santa Barbara compared with the total number of marriages between 1821 and 1846. Adapted from Pubols (2009: 127). Bar chart by Jennifer A. Lucido, 2018.]
To marry a daughter of the land required conversion to Catholicism, which included the adoption of a Christian name. During the 1829 baptism, Fitch was christened with the new Spanish name of Enrique Domingo Fitch (McGinty 1957a: 8). After receiving formal recognition of their marriage in 1830 following the scandal of their elopement, Josefa and Fitch settled in San Diego; Fitch then became a naturalized Mexican citizen in 1833 (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 73). Fitch was then able to obtain land grants (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 74). On September 28, 1841 Fitch applied for the Rancho Satiyomi (also Sotoyome) located near Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 74; McGinty 1957a: 11). Fitch also acquired land in San Francisco on July 24, 1846; the property was known as Paraje del Arroyo (McGinty 1957a: 11). The couple’s assets were further expanded when Josefa became a joint owner of a land grant in Baja California (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 74). When not engaged in trading ventures, Fitch held different public office positions in San Diego, including síndico and juez de paz (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 74). The couple owned a store which Josefa managed (Beebe and Senkewicz 2006: 73-74). Therefore, the marriage provided an opportunity for a “mutual dependency that advanced cultural exchange along with trade relations” (Washburn 2014: 12).

As mentioned above, Ramona Carrillo, younger sister of Josefa, in turn served as cultural broker for that of her second husband. María Ramona la Luz Carrillo was born at the Casa de Carrillo in San Diego on July 23, 1812 (Los Californianos 2017). In 1827, she married Jose Antonio Romualdo Pacheco, an engineering officer of the Mexican Republic Army, and aide-de-camp to Governor Encheadia (then to Governor Victoria) in a well-documented and festive double ceremony alongside Agustín Zamorano (later Governor of Alta California) and Luisa Argüello (Angel 1883: 55; Bean and Mason 1962: 67-69; McGinty 1957b: 128). After the wedding, the couple established their home in Santa Bárbara (Los Californianos 2017; McGinty 1957b: 129). On December
5. 1831 Pacheco was killed by Avila at the Battle of Cahuenga Pass (Cahuenga Pass 2016). Following the death of her husband, the widowed Ramona and her two young boys Mariano Martín and José Antonio Romualdo found the course of their lives significantly altered. Ramona then moved in with José de la Guerra, padrino of her son Romualdo, and his wife María Antonia Carrillo (prima [female cousin] of Ramona), at their house in Santa Barbara (McGinty 1957c: 377-378).

Thus, whether Ramona was motivated by love, financial well-being, the security of her children, or inspired by her sister Josefa, she married again. Like Fitch, Ramona’s second husband was an unlikely bedfellow, the Scotch sea captain John Wilson in circa 1837 (McGinty 1957c: 378). The Carrillo-Wilson wedding lacked the drama and controversy that surrounded the elopement of Josefa and Fitch, especially considering the cultural similarities between the two marriages: both men were foreigners and Protestant (Angel 1883: 55; McGinty 1957b: 130; Miller 1973). This may be attributed to a variety of factors, including: 1) the patriarchal honor of Joaquin Carrillo no longer provided a source of conflict by the time of Ramona’s second marriage; 2) she had two young children whose financial security she was likely attempting to secure; and 3) Ramona and Wilson did not elope, adhering to socio-cultural norms in Alta California at the time.

In 1837 Governor Alvarado granted Ramona 48,000 acres of Rancho Suey near Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa, which was later confirmed by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California in 1858 (See California Land Claims in the Los Angeles Star, 1858; McGinty 1957b: 130). In 1845, Ramona and Wilson added more property to their San Luis Obispo County holdings, acquiring first the 32,000 acres of Rancho Cañada de los Osos y Pecho e Islay, and then 3,000 acres of Cañada del Chorro (McGinty 1957b: 130-131). Later they purchased 117 acres from “an Indian named Romualdo,” renaming it Huerta de Romualdo (i.e. Romualdo’s Garden; McGinty 1957b: 131). The more than 80,000 acres that Ramona and Wilson owned resulted in their being among the wealthiest landowners in Alta California during the 1840s (Angel 1883: 55; McGinty 1957b: 130-131; Sullivan 1993b).

Furthermore, in her capacity as an experienced cultural broker, Ramona was more adept to negotiate with other foreigners that she encountered. Captain John C. Fremont’s California Battalion invaded Alta California in 1846 (Fremont 2016; McGinty 1957b: 131; Sullivan 1993c). That December, Fremont and his militiamen captured San Luis Obispo (McGinty 1957b: 131; Sullivan 1993c). After
establishing headquarters inside the mission, Fremont learned that José “Totoi” de Jesús Pico, a primo or male cousin of Ramona, whom a month prior fought against Fremont at the Battle of Natividad (San Juan Bautista), was nearby at his Piedra Blanca rancho (Egan 1985: 397; McGinty 1957b: 131; Sullivan 1993c). Totoi Pico served under Andrés Pico, the commander of the lancers that fought against General Stephen Watts Kearny’s Army of the West at the Battle of San Pasqual just days before (Egan 1985: 397). The Americans captured Totoi, and after a short trial, Fremont ordered his execution, sentencing him as a “symbol of the invisible enemy... [and as a] scapegoat” (Egan 1985: 398). The morning of the execution, Ramona alongside several women and children, entered Fremont’s headquarters at the mission and pleaded for José’s life (McGinty 1957b: 131; Sullivan 1993c). Fremont was evidently swayed by the plea and he released Totoi.

Figure 6. Map illustration of the Plat of the Rancho de Suey in Santa Barbara County, California. The map confirms the land granted and petitioned by Ramona Carrillo de Wilson. The land was surveyed by George H. Thompson under the instruction of the U.S. Surveyor General in April 1863 (official survey map filed on June 28th, 1864). Courtesy of the Santa Barbara County Public Works Department - Surveyor Division, Miscellaneous Maps: MM1_40. Redrawn and adapted by Jennifer A. Lucido, 2018.

Conclusion

The major life events of Feliciana, María Ignacia, Josefa and Ramona reviewed in this paper provide only a partial glimpse into life in colonial California. As noted by Miroslava Chávez-García, in remembering the Spanish-Mexican women of Alta California, “let us not romanticize the sacrifices they made nor neglect to appreciate the challenges they endured, survived, and resisted on a daily basis” (2004: 178). These patriarchal protestors, cultural brokers, and unlikely bedfellows used their agency to navigate through gender hierarchy and colonial authorities but also to build bonds that enabled them to adapt to an oscillating frontier. Future studies might continue to examine the public spheres in which Spanish-Mexican and Native Californian women lived in order to reinterpret the historic landscape of California in search of new understanding.
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Endnotes

1. The campsite was labeled as “49” in Font’s map of the Anza expedition of 1775-1776. The site is also referred to as “San Sebastián Marsh/San Felipe Creek and Expedition Camp #49” by the National Park Service.

2. Researchers and Anza expedition descendants Martha Vallejo McGettigan, Dr. Greg P. Smestad, among others have challenged this translation of this account, particularly regarding the expedition “companion” of María Feliciana Arballo (personal communication with authors, February 17, 2018). This is further compounded by the fact that at least three versions of Font’s journal exist: 1) the field text or draft written through the course of the Anza expedition (Franciscan Historical Archive, Curia Generalizia dei Frati Minor, Rome; 2) the shortened version of the diary (The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley); and 3) the expanded text (John Carter Brown Library, Providence, Rhode Island). The translation cited in this paper is the result of Alan K. Brown’s research and analysis of the three texts noted. For a more in-depth discussion of the three versions and Brown’s synthesis, see Font and Brown 2011: 65-71.
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