

UC Merced

The Journal of California Anthropology

Title

The Alliklik Mystery

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1xw151z5>

Journal

The Journal of California Anthropology, 2(2)

Author

Bright, William

Publication Date

1975-12-01

Peer reviewed

The Alliklik Mystery

WILLIAM BRIGHT

The standard listing and classification of Californian Indian tribes and languages, as presented by Kroeber (1925), includes the term Alliklik, classified linguistically in the Southern California Shoshonean group—now more often called Takic—and located geographically in the upper Santa Clara Valley of Ventura and Los Angeles counties. However, published information on Alliklik culture or language is extremely slight. The first report is by Kroeber (1915), on the basis of information gathered in 1912 from an Indian named Juan José Fustero, then living near Piru (Ventura County). Fustero spoke Kitanemuk, but stated that some of his grandparents, born near Newhall (Los Angeles County), had spoken the language of a tribe called *Ataplili'ish* by the neighboring Chumash. Of this language, Fustero was able to give Kroeber only two utterances with Kitanemuk equivalences for each: *hami'kwa umi*, 'Where are you going?' (Kit. *haimukat mümi*) and the placename *pi'iðuku*, 'Piru' (Kit. *pīvuht*, lit. 'three-cornered reed'); other placenames recorded from Fustero by Kroeber are pure Kitanemuk, e.g., *a-kava-vi*, (lit. 'his ears,' a place near Piru). Fustero believed that the *Ataplili'ish* ranged from Piru to Soledad Canyon (Los Angeles County)—i.e., over much of the upper Santa Clara Valley.

On the basis of these two utterances, then, and their apparent similarity to Kitanemuk, Kroeber classified the *Ataplili'ish* language within the Southern Californian Shoshonean group. Later, however, Kroeber (1925:577, 613-614) used a different term (without explanation)—namely Alliklik, said to be the Ven-

tureño Chumash name for the group. A possible reason for Kroeber's change in name is his statement (1925:621) that "the Ventureño Chumash knew the Gabrielino, and perhaps all the Shoshoneans beyond, as *Ataplili'ish*"—i.e., he may have found that *Ataplili'ish* was too general a term for the group in the upper Santa Clara Valley.

After 1925, no further information was published about the Alliklik. However, two relevant bodies of manuscript material, by C. Hart Merriam and J. P. Harrington, respectively, have recently come to light. These data provide considerable new, though somewhat conflicting, evidence on the identity of the Alliklik.

The Merriam manuscript, reported by Beeler and Klar (1974), is a vocabulary headed "Alliklik Chumash"—unidentified as to source, place, or date, but presumably recorded in the early decades of this century. As Beeler and Klar show, this vocabulary clearly represents a Chumashan dialect very close to Ventureño, though with many borrowings from Kitanemuk. On this evidence, Beeler and Klar suggest that the Alliklik of the upper Santa Clara Valley were in fact a Chumashan rather than a Uto-Aztecan group, though they allow (p. 34) that "in such a region it is possible that Chumash and Uto-Aztecan villages alternated with each other." In this view, the name "Alliklik" would no longer be listed among Uto-Aztecan languages, and the two utterances which Kroeber recorded from Fustero would be most plausibly regarded as dialectal variants of Kitanemuk.

A different perspective, however, comes

from three sets of notes by Harrington, which I will now describe.

The first set of notes is from an interview with Juan José Fustero in 1913, after Kroeber's "discovery" of this consultant. Almost all the linguistic data recorded from Fustero are pure Kitanemuk, though Harrington does not label it as such (he did not work on Kitanemuk until 1916). The only non-Kitanemuk items here are these two: *pīdūk'ýŋ*, 'placename,' (Piru, the Kit. equivalent was given as *pīvut'ý*, (three-cornered reed)); *ha-ikwə*, 'que hay, amigo.' (The phrase *hami'kwa umi* 'where are you going?', recorded by Kroeber, is not in Harrington's notes.)

Fustero told Harrington that these were from his grandparents' language (as Kroeber also noted), which he also called the "Castec language," and which he claimed to be extinct. He also spoke of his grandfather's language as being of "Castec and Soledad," and said that "Newhall talked Soledad language"; thus Fustero's "*lengua de los abuelos*" is again located in the upper Santa Clara Valley. It should be noted, however, that the placename "Castec," of Chumash origin (modern spelling "Castaic"), is ambiguous, referring both to a town in the upper Santa Clara Valley and to "Castaic Lake" in the Tehachapi Mountains near Fort Tejon.

The second body of data is in Harrington's 1916 notes on Kitanemuk, gathered at Tejon. He apparently asked his consultants if they had heard of a tribe called the "Pujadores" (it is not clear where Harrington got the name); they were doubtful about that term, but decided it must refer to an extinct tribe which they called *tātāviam*, whose name they linked to *tāvijək*, 'sunny hillside' and *atāvihukwa?*, 'he is sunning himself.' They also gave a verb *nitāvia?*, 'I speak the Tataviam language.'

A consultant named Eugenia Montes gave the following details: The Tataviam lived at *hwitahove*, 'La Liebre' (a Kitanemuk name—Fustero located this place as "camino Gorman's

station by the lake"). Their language "sounded when they talked like English. Not like Ventureño or Tejoneño—entirely different." In another session, Montes said the Tataviam lived "over this way (gesture indicating east of Piru region)," and again "at *tsawajuŋ* and all up this way" (*tsawajuŋ* is located by other sources at San Francisquito, near Newhall).

When Harrington read Fustero's *ha-ikwə*, 'Que hay, amigo?' to Montes, she said *ikwə* meant 'friend' in Tataviam.

Montes gave *pi'irukŋ* as the Kitanemuk name for Piru; no etymology was known to her. (The hook beneath vowels may stand for open quality.) She said it had nothing to do with *pīvuht*, 'three-cornered tule.'

Montes also "says positively that at *kaʃtək* they talked Ventureño but somewhat differentiated." This presumably refers to Castaic in the Santa Clara Valley.

A third set of notes is from Harrington's interviews with Magdalena Olivas, a Kitanemuk speaker, and José Juan, her Chumash husband. These consultants located the Tataviam not only at La Liebre and *tsawaju(?)ŋ*, but also at Elizabeth Lake and in Antelope Valley. Magdalena Olivas remembered a number of Tataviam expressions, as follows: *ikwə*, 'amigo' [the overbar is Harrington's symbol for length]; *kýl̄i*, 'perro'; *mətskə*, 'ven pacá' [= *ven para acá*, 'come here!']; *həl̄əkə*, 'sientate'; *hīutsāpa*, 'qué es ese?'; *ira'ə ɤa'məŋ*, 'tengo mucho miedo' [the dot below vowels may stand for close quality, and *ɤ* for a back-velar stop]; *ɤákávu aḡaḡai*, 'Tulareños'—i.e., Yokuts Indians: translated literally as 'su cabeza de rata'; *pat'*, 'water' [cf. Kitanemuk *pat*]; and *píkwaīarukū*, 'baby.'

Other information given by José Juan was: he spoke Castec Chumash, which was different from both Coast Ventureño and *taʃlipun* [Emigdiano Chumash?]. The Chumash name, '*at'aplili'i*', which Kroeber was given for Fustero's grandparents' people, "applies to the Fernandinos and Gabrielinos," and not to the

Kitanemuk. "The whole Piru region was Ventureño territory, inf. says without any hesitation and Magd. agrees."

What can we conclude from all this? On the evidence of the word for 'friend,' Fustero's grandparents' language was the same as that which the Kitanemuk call Tataviam. But it is not at all clear how the language should be classified: the utterances first recorded by Kroeber do indeed resemble Kitanemuk, but most of the other data do not—except for *pat'*, 'water,' which looks so *very* close to Kitanemuk that it suggests an error on the part of Harrington's Kitanemuk-speaking consultants. But nothing looks like Chumash either (M. S. Beeler, personal communication); nor can I identify anything resembling Yokuts, the neighboring language to the north.

It is also hard to come to any firm conclusions about Tataviam territory, since sources disagree. It apparently constituted at least part of the area assigned by Kroeber to the "Alliklik," but not necessarily all of it.

My tentative conclusions, then, are as follows. There were probably two types of speech in the upper Santa Clara Valley. One was a Chumashan dialect, related to Ventureño; the term "Alliklik" might be most appropriately applied to this dialect. The other was "Tataviam," a language showing some Takic affinities. Perhaps it represents a division of Takic separate from those recognized by Kroeber; or possibly it is the remnant, influenced by Takic, of a language family otherwise unknown in southern California. I cherish a hope that fellow scholars will be able to shed further light on the matter. But what a pity it is that, as Harrington notes, Juan José Fustero "never cared anything about old Indian things"!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my thanks to Geri Anderson and Tom Blackburn for calling my atten-

tion to Harrington's Tataviam materials; to Alice Anderton for Kitanemuk data, and for presenting an earlier version of this paper, on my behalf, at the Third Annual Friends of Uto-Aztecan Conference at Flagstaff, in June 1975; and to Madison Beeler for the Merriam data and for helpful discussion.

*University of California
Los Angeles*

REFERENCES

- Beeler, M. S., and Kathryn Klar
1974 Interior Chumash. Unpublished manuscript on file at the University of California, Los Angeles.
- Harrington, J. P.
1913 Notes from Juan José Fustero, Piru, California, 17 March. On file in the Smithsonian Archives, Washington, D.C.
- 1916 Notes from Kitanemuk speakers at Tejon. On file at the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.
- 1917(?) Notes from Magdalena (Kitanemuk) and José Juan (Chumash). On file at the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.
- Kroeber, A. L.
1915 A New Shoshonean Tribe in California. *American Anthropologist* 17:773-775.
- 1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78. [Reprinted, Berkeley: California Book Company, 1953.]