

YALE UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS  
IN ANTHROPOLOGY  
NUMBER 3

CULTURAL RELATIONS OF THE GILA RIVER AND  
LOWER COLORADO TRIBES

LESLIE SPIER

NEW HAVEN

PUBLISHED FOR THE SECTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
DEPARTMENT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, YALE UNIVERSITY  
BY THE  
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press  
1936

EDWARD SAPIR  
LESLIE SPIER  
*Editors*

## CULTURAL RELATIONS OF THE GILA RIVER AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES

THE cultures of the Pima and Papago in southern Arizona have usually been viewed as distinct from those of the Yuman tribes located on the lower Colorado River. Recent investigation centering on the Maricopa and allied Yumans lying on the Gila between the Pima and the lower Colorado groups makes it clear that the Gila and the Colorado form one culture province. Maricopa culture is nearly identical with that of the Lower Colorado Yumans; Pima and Papago also are in large measure participants in the same culture. The purpose of this paper is to establish this relationship and in particular to show the cultural relations of the Maricopa to other Yumans to the west and to the Pimans to the east.

It is not generally known that during the last century a number of Yuman-speaking tribes were on the middle and lower Gila. In addition to the Maricopa, there were the Kaveltcadom, whose existence has been newly discovered, the Halchidhma, Kohuana, and Halyikwamai, all of whom have been members of the Maricopa community for a century. The Maricopa have inhabited the middle Gila above the great bend from time immemorial. The Kaveltcadom are a Halchidhma-speaking people who occupied the lower Gila below Gila Bend and are probably the Cocomaricopa-Opa of the eighteenth century Spanish explorers. The Halchidhma, Kohuana, and Halyikwamai were originally settled on the lower Colorado River, from whence they fled eastward to join the Maricopa in the period 1825-39. Since only scanty information is available on the non-Maricopa members of this group, it is possible to assign a place in the "cultural landscape" of southern Arizona to Maricopa culture alone.

Field investigations of the Maricopa were made by the writer for the University of Chicago in 1929-30. This resulted in a general ethnographic account, "Yuman Tribes of the Gila River," which has been published by that institution. Since it seemed desirable to undertake a comparative study of Maricopa culture, the writer returned to the field in 1931-32 under grant from the Institute of Human Relations, Yale University. The present paper represents the first fruits of this investigation.

It will simplify our task to state at once that Maricopa culture was set off sharply from the simpler cultures of the Arizona plateau to the north, those of Yavapai, Apache, Walapai, and Havasupai. It remains to define its relations to the cultures of the Lower Colorado Yumans to the west and those of the Pima and Papago east and south. Comparisons with northern Mexico are not profitable at the moment in view of our incomplete knowledge of that region.

The time-honored supposition has been that the Maricopa, having moved from the west to a position adjacent to the Pima, have been culturally as well as politically dominated by the Pima. This is far removed from the truth. I will attempt to show that not only was Maricopa culture of the historic period overwhelmingly one with that of the Yumans on

the Lower Colorado, but that the Pima, at least the Piman groups on the Gila, also affiliated strongly in the same direction. So far as Piman influence on the Maricopa goes, and it seems to have been relatively small, it was balanced by an equal counter-influence.

That Maricopa culture was essentially that of the Lower Colorado tribes in all its phases accords with their linguistic relationship, since Maricopa speech is identical with Halchidhoma, differs only slightly from Yuma, and hardly more from Mohave. But this cultural similarity need not have been, for the Yuman group as a whole was culturally segmented along lines that did not follow dialectic groupings. There is discernible a Lower Colorado Yuman culture, one of upland Arizona, a third in southern California, with that of the peninsula of Lower California a possible fourth. These are not dialectic divisions. Within the Colorado River group we find the upstream peoples (Mohave, Halchidhoma, and Yuma) sharing a culture with the dialectically distinct Cocopa, Kohuana, and Halyikwamai.

In general Maricopa material culture was that of the Colorado River tribes. The basis of subsistence was identical and only in part determined by the similar physical environment. The mainstays were wild products: mesquite beans and fish. Corn, beans, squash, and melons were cultivated on the inundated flood plains without further irrigation. How early the Maricopa added a system of irrigating ditches is not clear: this Pima-like trait may not date back of the last century. For the Maricopa, corn and other field crops were an auxiliary; important, but not primary staples. Cultivation was extensive on the lower Colorado, but by no means the whole reliance. Of the Mohave Kroeber remarks that agriculture "may have furnished half their subsistence;" the use of game appears to have been slight, of fish perhaps greater, and for the rest wild seeds, of which mesquite "formed an important part."<sup>1</sup> No adequate estimates are available for the down-river Yumans, but we may suppose that they were cultivators only to the same degree. There seems no adequate reason why the Gila-Colorado residents might not have maintained themselves wholly or largely on corn, so extensive are the flood plains, but such was not their habit. Hunting was minimal: if rabbits formed a larger ingredient of Maricopa diet, it may have been only because they were less abundant in the Colorado bottoms.

The material arts were noteworthy for the indifference displayed in their manufacture. Basketry was largely absent among both peoples: the preference was for securing them by trade from basket-producing neighbors. What were made were simple, crude, and largely without decorative finish. They were made wholly by coiling, in identical shapes, and given identical names. Curious and yet characteristic, that in view of the exaggerated value they placed on the baskets they bought, they made little effort to manufacture them. Pottery served most domestic purposes. Generically it was the same; a relatively crude product made by the paddle-and-anvil method. Again shapes and names were identical among Maricopa and the Lower Colorado tribes. But they differed somewhat in color scheme (River red-on-buff *versus* Maricopa black-on-red or -white), somewhat in design, and in the

<sup>1</sup> Kroeber, *Handbook*, 735, 737.

additional Maricopa technique of refiring the applied paint. Skin dressing was rudimentary, although this need not have followed from the infrequency with which they hunted big game. Dress, hair style, tattooing, and other personal ornamentation differed only in detail.

To enumerate the whole of the material arts held in common would involve repeating here the material culture sections of the published Maricopa ethnography almost in their entirety. Items range from the non-cultivation of tobacco to cradles, from the cultivation of wild seeds to sandals and woven string bags. Overwhelmingly, the material cultures were one and differed but little in detail. Such larger differences as existed will be discussed below.

If technology and tools were largely similar, the social order was emphatically the same. Witness a strong national sense, shifting settlements, and hereditary chiefs whose social position was unimportant, especially in comparison with that of the shamans and song leaders. The meeting house ("council house" is too formal a designation) may have been a Maricopa institution alone. Yet I suspect inquiry would reveal it among the Colorado Yumans: there the informality of meetings may have obscured their existence, but the structure should be discoverable. Warfare was for both people a nationalized sport: national in that large numbers were involved; a sport in the sense of displaying both a formalized procedure and a willingness to stay in the fight to the finish. They shared massed fighting, challengers and single combat, leaders bearing feathered pikes ("war standards") under no-flight obligations, division of the combatants into club- and bow-men, primary dependence on the club as a weapon, the taking of scalps only by those who had dreamed the privilege, belief in the magical malevolence of scalps and captives, and purification for killer and scalper.

A single sib system prevailed. Both had not only patrilineal, exogamous, non-localized sibs (clans) with untranslatable names and multiple totems, but the sib names and associated totems were specifically the same. They shared the further curious trait that all the women of a sib (but not the men) bore the sib designation as a personal name. Here a difference of stress. Maricopa women (and some men) had names which referred to the characteristics of their totems and only after marriage were called solely by the sib name. The River Yumans reversed this, calling all women of a particular sib from birth by the sib name, and using a personal designation, also derived indirectly from the totem, only to differentiate them. But sib names and personal names rested on the same idea: they were thought of as connoting the totems; the first by an untranslatable word, the latter by describing the characteristics of the totems. Men's names had no relation to sib affiliation, with the exception just noted for the Maricopa.<sup>2</sup> Beyond their exogamous character the

<sup>2</sup> Forde writes of the Yuma: "The sibs are not nameless. . . . Women in addition to the sib name use also frequently another name derived from some characteristic feature or activity of the namesake [totem]." And again: "Women did not formerly use personal names but were identified by their sib names. As children they were given nicknames describing some feature of the 'totem' but these were not often used when they were

sibs of both groups were functionless, save that we note the impulse of the totemites to boast of their totems. The Maricopa further integrated the calendar with the sibs: the month names were sib names, and the totems those plants appropriate to the designated month. This was probably not true of the Lower Colorado Yumans, although it may be at least suspected of the Kamia.

Their kinship systems were of identical structure, with the same strong insistence on discriminations according to the relative ages of the connecting relatives. Again there was community in the principle, strange in these markedly patrilineal societies, that children were brothers and sisters only when they had the same mother, regardless of their paternity. That is, the blood bond overrode sib segmentation.

The identity with Lower Colorado culture is established perhaps more by the religious system and its adjunct song-cycles than by any other phase of Maricopa culture. Not that there was not a substantial difference in Maricopa phrasing of the dream by which power was acquired, but they shared with the Lower Colorado tribes a belief in the predominant influence of dreaming in all departments of life. Dreaming took the place of learning in the native view: all professional status and all success was achieved by dreams. In common, they dreamed of being taken from mountain top to mountain top, where the cures and special abilities were revealed. But a material difference lay in that while among the River tribes a man dreamed himself back into the mythological past, took part with the culture heroes in the establishment of the existing order and so acquired significant knowledge, the Maricopa dreamer was conducted by a spirit helper (an animal, bird, or anthropomorphic being) in a contemporary spirit world. We are in no position at the moment to say whether the Maricopa represents an older phrasing from which the Lower Colorado form has become specialized, or whether they have been influenced in this by the Pima. On the one hand, the Maricopa form resembles generalized North American beliefs; on the other, how a Pima acquires power is uncertain. At present I incline to the former possibility. All that is essential here is to recognize that the base and form of the power experience was the same among the Maricopa and the Lower Colorado Yumans.

Shamans cured in like manner by the knowledge they acquired: spirit helpers had no part in the cure itself. Soul loss as a cause of disease and recovery of the soul as its cure were beliefs shared by the two culture groups. While in the present state of our knowledge the Maricopa alone are to be credited with the belief that most illness was acquired from a

---

grown" (*Yuma Ethnography*, 143, 145, 149). This does not differ materially from the Maricopa situation. Kroeber wrote of the Mohave that "all the women born in a clan bear an identical name, although they may in addition be known by nicknames or other epithets. These clan names are of totemic import, though they are not the word which is in common use to denote the totemic object" (*Handbook*, 741). But if the Mohave sibs were nameless, the question arises how did they refer to a man's sib affiliation? A recent inquiry of the Mohave showed that it was quite possible for a man to refer to his sib by the woman's name for the group; this was his own "real name" but was never used as such; that women were indeed called by a single name, but for purposes of discrimination, personal names were used (the "nicknames" of Kroeber), and that these, like Yuma and Maricopa, were descriptive of the totems.

primal stock of sickness ever afloat in the world and of which one dreamed, there are implications in the Lower Colorado data that this was also the common belief there. Forde, for instance, states that to the Yuma intrusive sickness was not an object and that sickness was acquired by bad dreaming. Something of the sort must hold for the River Yumans generally since soul loss, the sole symptom of which was fainting, could hardly cover the majority of illnesses.

The long list of song-cycles which characterized both cultures are noteworthy not only for their similarity of form and content, but for identity of function. These songs were ostensibly dreamed, numbered perhaps hundreds in a single series, and purported to describe by allusion the experiences of the dreamer. In name or subject and probably in melody, we find them duplicated in the two groups. Herzog has pointed out that the music of the Lower Colorado Yumans is a very specialized type, set off sharply from that of other Southwestern peoples, and that Maricopa songs conform to this style at least in part.<sup>3</sup> The impression given by the informants is that similarly named songs found in the two groups were identical in melody. The difference in the content of the cycles of the two groups is consonant with the difference in the content of their dreams. Many Lower Colorado cycles, relating to the dreamer's excursions into the mythic past, were essentially myths told by allusion in song. Maricopa cycles, on the other hand, purported to relate the experiences of the dreamer as he moved from peak to peak under the guidance of his tutelary spirit. Actually the content of the songs was closer than this characterization suggests. Further, a few of the Maricopa songs were myth narratives like those of the Colorado River Yumans.

Both peoples were almost wholly devoid of ritual dancing, the singing of the cycles providing the central interest on a multitude of similar occasions. A few songs were the occasion for stereotyped, rudimentary dances; others had prescribed basket drum or rattle accompaniments; for some they stood, for others sat, and so on. So far as we know the identically named songs of the two groups were used in similar circumstances, with the same fixed adjuncts of dance and metrical accompaniment. The characteristic accompaniment in both groups was the scraping and pounding of an inverted basket.

Oratorical style was alike in both groups an abrupt, staccato, forced utterance.

Cremation was the uniform practice in both groups, with mourning even before death, with singing and orations. They shared the holding of mourning commemorations, marked by the singing of cycles and mimetic warfare; but here a difference, since the Colorado tribes, like those of southern California, added the burning of an image of the dead. The land of the dead was conceived alike as downriver in the desert, where the dead were reborn four times, finally becoming as nothing. Alike they held that twins were mere visitors in our world, reborn from a mythical village of their own. A host of minor beliefs and omens were also held in common.

Mythology, again, was much the same. Myths tell of a creation by a pair of heroes who

<sup>3</sup> Herzog, *The Yuman Musical Style*; also in Spier, *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River*, 271-79.

emerge from a primeval sea; of their quarrel, and of sickness let loose on the world; of the death and cremation of the surviving hero; of the theft of his heart by Coyote. The incidents that then follow in the Lower Colorado versions are the coming of a dispenser of the arts and the conquest of a sky-snake. Of these, the first was hardly integrated in the Maricopa origin tale; the second missing.

Despite this long list of resemblances between Lower Colorado and Maricopa cultures, there were differences which cannot be minimized. The Maricopa differed markedly in the form of their houses and in the presence of the cotton-weaving technique. We must also recognize that the Maricopa totemic names for women, dream experience with spirit guides, their abbreviated mourning rite, as well as a whole host of minor differences in other traits, are features that set them off more or less from the River Yumans. But none of these are fundamental differences: they are rather differences in the phrasing of the same basic cultural goods. There can be no doubt that Maricopa culture and that of the Lower Colorado Yumans was in large part a single entity.

In what, on the contrary, did the Maricopa more closely resemble the Pima and Papago? On the whole, the total of such elements does not bulk large. The dome-shaped house, loom weaving, the color, design, and refiring of pottery, and painted cradle hoods were among the principal elements of material culture. Identical stick annals; the cañute game and the prominence given the kicking stick race; the sahuaro brew and its formal drinking; the begging dance; probably elements of the Vikita-Navitco complex, with its masked clown, curing with images, dance forms, and enclosure; guardian spirits for shamans: these probably represent the whole range of Pima-Papago resemblances. For all that they are numerous, most of these elements rest lightly in Maricopa culture: subtract them and it is left with all its essentials and most of its details. The most obvious external difference would lie in house form. What was the significance for Maricopa culture of the occurrence of shamans' guardians among the Pimans, and indeed how far the resemblances in all traits went in detail, cannot now be answered because of the insufficiency of Piman accounts. If the caution be raised that further inquiry among the Pimans may show more extended resemblance, the implication is rather that Pima-Papago will be found to be even more closely allied to Lower Colorado culture than we now know, since the Maricopa are themselves one with the latter in all important phases of life.

It seems not to be generally recognized that the culture of the Pima and Papago was to a degree similar to that of the Lower Colorado Yumans. I refer here to the Piman groups of Arizona and northern Sonora, and perhaps should confine these remarks to the Pima resident on the Gila River. It is not altogether easy to make a correct appraisal of their culture, but an attempt in the light of our present knowledge is permissible. The existing data are incomplete. Russell's account of the Pima, which seems to pertain primarily to those of the Gila, is full of detail, but essential points are omitted and important relations obscured. For instance, he nowhere makes clear what was the source of shamanistic power nor the meaning and use of the orations and songs he recorded. Apparently the Navitco

cult was related to the Papago Vikita, but as Russell does not give any consecutive account of the Navitco rites and Parsons refers only to part of the Navitco activities, the extent of their similarity remains uncertain. The accounts of other writers on the Pima are wholly haphazard. For the same reason, the Papago are included with diffidence. Lumholtz's meager and amateurish account is all that is now available, with Mason's and Davis' records of the Vikita performance. Nevertheless I choose to interpret the evidence as showing a substantial identity of Pima and Papago cultures until it be proven otherwise. New, reasonably full reports on both tribes, with adequate attention to local differences, are sorely needed.

It is possible to show that a large part of Pima-Papago culture was the same as that of the Lower Colorado Yumans. How large was the non-Yuman ingredient, and whether its affiliations were primarily with Pueblo or northern Mexico, remains to be seen.

Pima-Papago material culture was largely that of the Colorado River peoples. This is clearly so in basic economy. The first impression derived from Russell's account of the Gila Pima is that they have been cultivators on a large scale since aboriginal days. This is reinforced by mid-nineteenth century descriptions of the huge quantities of wheat and other produce furnished the California-bound whites who made a halting place of the Pima villages. But a casual statement of Russell's is highly significant: "mesquite beans formed nearly if not quite the most important diet of the Pimas in primitive times." This is duplicated by Lloyd: "Until very recently, mesquite beans and the fruit of various cactus plants were staple articles of food. . . . The gathering of them [mesquite] was quite a tribal event, large parties going out." Whittemore also confirms mesquite as the principal foodstuff. The Papago situation is not known in any detail, but it is clear that they were even more dependent on wild products than the Pima.<sup>4</sup> The balance of the diet was largely from the usual field crops, fish, and rabbits: large game were hunted but little more than on the Colorado.

Dress was the same among the Pimans and Maricopa, although differing somewhat in materials. That is, some use was made of skins, including poncho-like shirts and moccasins among the Pimans, and of cotton cloth, unknown to the west. Tools and utensils were largely the same. Pottery was frequently made in the same specialized shapes. Cradles were the Colorado type, differing only in the painting of the basketry hoods.

Against these and other similarities, we must set off irrigation ditches, cultivation of tobacco, houses, weaving, the netted carrying frame (*kiaba*), and especially the high development of basketry, coiled and plaited. Even these differences were tempered: there was some flood-plain planting among the Pima and the *kiaba* may be related to the rectangular netted frame of the Mohave and the string bags of other River tribes. Nevertheless, the list of differences is impressive.

Their social order shows the same combination of resemblances and dissimilarities. There

<sup>4</sup> Russell, *Pima Indians*, 74; Lloyd, *Aw-aw-tam Indian Nights*, 123; Whittemore, *Among the Pima*, 54; Gaillard, *Papago*, 293.

appears to have been but a single tribal chief like the Colorado River Yumans; uninfluential, and with quasi-hereditary succession. Orators were important; their speeches formalized. The meeting house was present.<sup>5</sup> As I have pointed out this was a Maricopa institution which may have existed on the Colorado. While Piman warfare involved raids rather than the formalized massed combat of the Lower Colorado tribes and the Maricopa, there were, nevertheless, common elements. There was the same specialization of clubmen and bowmen, formal speeches on the warpath, the taking of scalps by appointed men, the long rite of purification for slayer and scalper, the belief that scalps were maleficent, and their careful storage by a custodian. They differed from the Lower Colorado peoples in that the scalps were used to cure the very illness they caused and also for bringing rain. Pima-Papago kinship systems were entirely of the Yuman type.

The Pima and Papago had five patrilineal sibs (the Papago possibly only four), which were non-exogamous and functionless, save that a child called his father by the name of his sib, much in the manner that the Yumans use sib names as personal designations for women. It is not clear whether the Pima-Papago all addressed a man by the name of his sib, corresponding to the Yuman usage, or whether this was confined to address by the child. The "father-word" was also used, prefixed to the appropriate kinship term, for the father's older brother and sister, and apparently for the father's first cousins.<sup>6</sup> These sib names cannot be translated, just like the Yuman sib names. There was in addition a dual grouping by patrilineal descent, so that all persons were known as either Buzzard, Red People, Red Cow-killer ("Ant") or as Coyote, White People, White Cow-killer. Like the Yumans, they boasted of the totems and were concerned with them in no other way. These moieties were non-exogamous like the sibs and all members of a moiety were considered cross-cousins. Further, for the Papago at least, there is some evidence that sib and moiety groupings rested lightly on a system of village exogamy. It does not seem correct to say that the sibs were grouped in two moieties, because it is clear that no two authorities agree how the four

<sup>5</sup> Each Pima village possessed a council house, which so far as I can see, was identical with the Maricopa meeting house, despite Russell's efforts to picture formal councils (Russell, *Pima Indians*, 196). Lumholtz observed in certain Papago villages a large house which was not a residence, in charge of a keeper, in which sahuaro was set to ferment for their festivities, and in which were kept paraphernalia used in dances of the drinking festival (*New Trails*, 52, 102, 106, 360). Strong interprets this as a group house with its priest and fetish, like those of Southern California (*Analysis of Southwestern Society*, 38). The cue for this interpretation lay in Lumholtz calling the house a "medicine lodge," for which he offered no warrant. The Papago name means, as he clearly indicates, simply "big [house]." The whole complex he describes is strictly identical with the Maricopa meeting house as it was used at the time of sahuaro drinking. The house is a meeting house; the keeper apparently corresponds to the Maricopa custodian who is not a priest; sahuaro is brewed in it just as among the Maricopa, and I interpret the string of feathers used at the festival and stored in the house as no more than the comparable paraphernalia used in the Maricopa Mountain Killdeer singing, and in no sense a group fetish. It may eventually be shown that the Papago and perhaps the Pima actually had fetishes which were more than individual property, but until this is shown it would be wise to be cautious in accepting Lumholtz's evidence as indicative of their existence.

<sup>6</sup> Parsons, *Notes on the Pima*, 448, 450, 451, 455.

or five sibs were grouped, nor how the totemic ascription was made. It seems that we have here two disarticulate systems: the sibs with father designations and the moieties with totemic reference.<sup>7</sup>

The resemblances to the Yuman sib structure lie in patrilineal descent, untranslatable sib names, naming within the lineage by the sib name, and multiple totems of which they boasted. Further, the Piman totems are identical with those of the largest sibs among the several Yuman tribes. Against this is local exogamy rather than sib exogamy, the group name applied to men instead of women, and the division by moieties. The divergence is by no means as great as this formulation suggests, for the "moieties" were no more than groupings by totem affiliation. Put another way, an individual inherited a totem from his father and, in common with perhaps all others of his lineage, called his father and perhaps all older persons of his lineage by a single meaningless name. This clearly parallels the Yuman situation. The primary differences then were local exogamy and the lineage name for men rather than women.

It has been suggested that the Piman analogies were derived from the Yuman sib system. With this I concur. Certainty would be added if we were shown that these analogies occurred among the Piman groups adjacent to the Yumans but not among the Pimans farther south in Mexico. It is not necessary for our present purpose to demonstrate this derivation since we are concerned only with the extent of resemblance. It becomes significant when we realize that north of the Mexican border the resemblances hold only between the adjacent Pimans and Yumans; that there was nothing similar north and east of the Pima. The Yavapai proper to the north were sibless; the Western Apache and Southeastern Yavapai had exogamous, non-totemic, named, matrilineal sibs, localized by tradition.

Without doubt it was in religion and ritual that the Pima and Papago differed most from the Lower Colorado Yumans. Here I should like to reiterate that there is a real deficiency of data. The details of Piman religion, which alone have been recorded, contrast rather sharply with Yuman, but it may be that their fundamental formulations were more fully in accord. Here among the Pimans we note prayer plumes, offerings, shrines, color-direction symbolism, and rain-making as an objective, but we do not know whether these were minor elements of ritual or of fundamental importance. Possibly there were group fetishes, but we may be misled by Russell's designation "fetish," and I am doubtful of Strong's identification of these as part of a moiety-group (clan) house-priest-fetish complex.<sup>8</sup> As the data stand they seem to me rather to have been individual medicine objects. Shamans may have had guardian spirits in some fashion. In a shaman's experience recorded by Parsons, the dreaming occurred at home in childhood, and revelation was made by a mythical being who led the dreamer through the mountains. This is suggestive of Yuman dreaming. But they also got their powers through animals.<sup>9</sup> They cured by singing the songs of ani-

<sup>7</sup> Russell, *Pima Indians*, 197; Parsons, *op. cit.*, 455; Lloyd, *op. cit.*, 147, 163; Gifford, *Clans and Moieties*, 174; Strong, *Analysis of Southwestern Society*, 11, 23.

<sup>8</sup> Strong, *Analysis of Southwestern Society*, see especially 11, 23, 38, 45 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Parsons, *Notes on the Pima*, 458, 460.

mals diagnosed as causing the disease. Disease was intrusive, hence sucked out. This is non-Yuman. So is the Vikita-Navitco complex. The Vikita of the Papago was held within an enclosure, with masked dancers and the display of effigies, for curing the sick and bringing rain. Russell's tantalizing notes on the Navitco cult of the Pima and Parsons' more complete but partial record reveal similarly masked performers, possibly a curing fraternity, one of whose functions was to cure by means of effigies. How far the identity went remains unknown: the Pima themselves assert that Navitco was derived from the Papago.<sup>10</sup> Possibly there was other ritual dancing in the Piman groups, but it cannot have bulked large since it does not figure in such accounts as we have. In the comparative absence of ritual dancing they resemble the Yumans. The Papago salt gathering expeditions, with ritual purification, and in which the Pima participated, were non-Yuman. Taken as a whole, religion and ritual are distinctly suggestive of Pueblo and north Mexican affiliations.

With the Piman song series we are in doubt. Possibly their content was similar to that of the Yumans, but at least the melodic structure was different. Herzog wrote that "the Pima also have dreamt series but the connection with ceremonialism is stronger. In other respects, Pima [melodic] style is not comparable to Yuman, except for the absence in both styles of singing habits which are universal further north."<sup>11</sup> Some at least of the Yuman songcycles were known to the Pima, presumably in their Yuman form. There is evidence that all songs of the Pimans were derived from dreams, according to native theory, just as among the Yumans.

Piman mythology centered differently from that of the Colorado tribes. Piman creation myths emphasized emergence and the struggle to drive out the earlier occupants of the land. But many of the Yuman incidents were present in these myths and perhaps most of them in the body of Piman mythology. Taken in the large, Piman mythology, like their religion, faces differently from that of the Yumans.

It is not our purpose to maintain that Pima-Papago culture was so completely like that of the Yumans on the Lower Colorado as the Maricopa. But the common element bulks large, and even in the fields where our knowledge of Piman culture is equivocal, the chance is as great that they will be proven alike as otherwise. It is not unreasonable to insist that Pima-Papago be classed with the Lower Colorado culture, even if only as a borderline case.

There is nothing wholly novel in this view; rather in its emphasis. Kroeber has earlier noted the impressive number of isolatable traits which the Gila Pima and Colorado Yumans have in common, without however carrying the implication to its conclusion.<sup>12</sup> Nor did he apparently recognize that the Arizona Papago were perhaps equally participants in the same general culture.

The question still remains whether the Yuman ingredient of their culture was derived

<sup>10</sup> Russell, *Pima Indians*, 266; Parsons, *op. cit.*, 462.

<sup>11</sup> Herzog, *The Yuman Musical Style*, 200. See also his *Musical Styles in North America*, 457.

<sup>12</sup> Kroeber, *The Seri*, 50.

from Maricopa-Kaveltcadom, and perhaps from Papago contacts with the Cocopa, or directly from the more centrally located Colorado tribes, the Yuma and their neighbors. There is the further alternative of conceiving Piman and Yuman forms as local phrasings of a widespread culture centering to the south in Mexico. As the data stand, they suggest the material arts are part of an ancient common culture, and that those features of Yuman social organization and the few Yuman items of religious culture found among Pima-Papago were derived later from the Maricopa-Kaveltcadom and perhaps from the Cocopa.

A further decision whether the non-Yuman phases of their culture should be classed with Pueblo or northern Mexican cultures must depend on what is ultimately learned of the Sonora Pima and other tribes of northwestern and central northern Mexico.<sup>13</sup> Kroeber seems to assume that the non-Yuman elements were ancient Piman traits which will also be discovered among the Pimans to the south.

The trend of this long discussion has been to fix the cultural position of the Gila River tribes close to those of the Lower Colorado. Nine-tenths of Maricopa culture was Lower Colorado in type, despite the remodeling of the dream experience and the song-cycles. It was certainly not a reflection of Pima culture. Such Pima-like elements as they possess and which are not present among other Yumans—houses, weaving, features of pottery and basket making, elements of the Mountain Killdeer dance, sahuaro brewing, dancing at the girls' rites, and the like—are balanced by quite as many Yuman elements among the Pima and Papago, for which association with the Maricopa may be held responsible. Of the other Yuman residents on the Gila (Halchidhma, Kohuana, and Halyikwamai) we can only state that the few data obtained show full evidence of their earlier residence on the Colorado. What little is known of the Kaveltcadom is Maricopan. Piman culture seems to have been appreciably closer to that of the Colorado Yumans than is generally recognized, yet certainty must wait on more extended work among the Pimans.

The Lower Colorado culture province should thus be expanded to include the Gila River tribes, Yuman and Piman. This stands in contrast to the culture of the Arizona plateau, at bottom a Great Basin culture, participated in by Havasupai, Walapai, Yavapai, Tonto, and with a heavy gloss of Pueblo features, by Navaho and Western Apache. In an earlier formulation of this cultural distinction,<sup>14</sup> I included Pima and Papago with this upland group. A more careful reading of the accounts of the Pimans, especially in light of my fuller understanding of Lower Colorado culture, makes it clear that this was an error; that

<sup>13</sup> Parsons has made a case for Pueblo affiliation of Pima religion, particularly with the western Pueblos. Yet it is pointed out that the ceremonial systems were radically different, the conspicuous similarities lying in details of ritual. Parsons does not seem to appreciate, however, that some of the similarities cited do not show specific Pueblo-Pima connection, but are equally Yuman or quite widespread (such as four as a pattern number, color-direction association, spitting in exorcising, sucking out disease, tabu on salt, beliefs concerning scalps). The connection of the Navitco cult with the Papago Vikita is not recognized. While the Navitco certainly resembles Pueblo curing cults, it has also northern Mexican affiliations like many other features of ritual. We may note also that Parsons recognizes a great difference from Pueblo in the Pima social organization (Parsons, *Notes on the Pima*, 457 ff.).

<sup>14</sup> Spier, *Problems Arising from the Cultural Position of the Havasupai*, 214.

the Pimans should rather be grouped in the Lower Colorado province. In a frankly programmatic paper,<sup>15</sup> Kroeber views just such an expanded Lower Colorado province as forming with its imperfectly known north Mexican affiliates a larger Gila-Sonoran culture area.

A detailed tabular statement of Maricopa relations with Lower Colorado and Piman cultures is appended. This incorporates and materially expands an earlier comparison of Lower Colorado and Gila Pima published by Kroeber.<sup>16</sup> After the list was drawn up, all points in which the Maricopa resembled or differed from the others were checked with Maricopa informants. It may well be that inquiry among the other tribes would show that traits listed here as peculiar to the Maricopa were also present among them. No check of this was made. Further, no attempt has been made here to list specific resemblance of Lower Colorado and Piman traits beyond what was common to the two and the Maricopa (as listed in the first column).<sup>17</sup>

In basing judgments on these tabular statements it must be understood that no such presentation is capable of including every item. Nor does it do full justice to the extent and character of resemblances and dissimilarities. For instance, the single entry "Song-cycles" includes a whole host of items that are similar, while the very real difference in content is barely suggested. I would like to add that it is for this reason that a statistical expression of the interrelations between the cultures based on these tables would have little value.

The extent to which the mythologies of the three groups agree has been tested by comparing their creation tales. This may not be a fair sampling. Harrington's Yuma creation myth was chosen as the only available full record from the Lower Colorado. I have heard a version practically identical among the Mohave. Similarly, Russell's Pima myth is the fullest now available.<sup>18</sup> A number of incidents of the Yuma and Pima tales were known to the Maricopa in stories other than the creation myth, namely, those I have called "Kwistamxo" and "Coyote." It is not feasible to present a detailed comparison of the tales here, hence a summary statement must serve. I have been able to isolate sixty-nine incidents in the Yuma origin tale, fifty-six in the three Maricopa tales, and forty-nine in the Pima creation myth. Of the fifty-six Maricopa incidents, thirty-one are duplicated in the Yuma origin tale and twenty-five in the Pima creation myth, with three appearing in the Pima tale of Coyote. That is, the count shows that the Maricopa share about half of the Pima incidents and half of the Yuma, with the resemblance slightly favoring the Yuma.

But this bald count is wholly inadequate to show wherein the resemblance really lies. The Yuma origin tale is duplicated in the Maricopa tales of creation and of Kwistamxo, and covers somewhat more ground than these Maricopa tales. This is the story of two heroes who emerge from a primeval flood; one is blinded; they create clay figures; one

<sup>15</sup> Kroeber, *Native Culture of the Southwest*, especially 378-81.

<sup>16</sup> Kroeber, *The Seri*, 44-47.

<sup>17</sup> Numbers which appear in the table are page references; without initial to Russell's work, prefixed by K to Kroeber's *Handbook*, L to Lumholtz, Ll to Lloyd, P to Parsons' *Notes on the Pima*.

<sup>18</sup> Harrington, *Yuma Account of Origins*; Russell, *Pima Indians*, 206-30.

sinks under the earth. The survivor allows Rattlesnake to kill, whereon the people are enraged, his daughter Frog swallows his excrements, and he dies. Coyote is excluded from the cremation and flees with the dead hero's heart. The hero's successor, Kwistamxo, causes the Colorado to flow and from a mountain instructs the people in the arts. In a somewhat different and abbreviated form much of this appears in the Pima creation tale, with the emergence and Kwistamxo incidents missing. The Pima tale then proceeds with Coyote as a marplot: first he involves his brothers in a seduction, then he liberates deer they have impounded. This is duplicated in the Maricopa tale of Coyote. The Pima creation tale then takes a wholly different turn, depicting a series of struggles to drive out earlier occupants of the land. None of this appears in either Maricopa or Yuma origin tales. In short, the Maricopa origin tale proper is a duplicate of the Yuma version; the middle segment of the Pima tale appears as a separate tale among the Maricopa; and on the whole the phrasing of the Pima origin is quite different from the homologous Yuman stories.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- FORDE, C. DARYLL. *Ethnography of the Yuma Indians* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 28, no. 4: 83-278, 1931).
- GAILLARD, D. D. *The Papago of Arizona and Sonora* (American Anthropologist, vol. 7: 293-96, 1894).
- GIFFORD, EDWARD WINSLOW. *Clans and Moieties in Southern California* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 14, no. 2: 155-219, 1918).
- HARRINGTON, JOHN PEABODY. *Yuma Account of Origins* (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. 21: 324-48, 1908).
- HERZOG, GEORGE. *The Yuman Musical Style* (Journal of American Folk-Lore, vol. 41: 183-231, 1928). *Musical Styles in North America* (Proceedings, Twenty-Third International Congress of Americanists, New York, 1930: 455-58).
- KROEBER, A. L. *Handbook of the Indians of California* (Bulletin, Bureau of American Ethnology, 78, 1925). *Native Culture of the Southwest* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 23, no. 9: 375-98, 1928). *The Seri* (Southwest Museum Papers, No. 6, 1931).
- LLOYD, J. WILLIAM. *Aw-aw-tam Indian Nights* (Westfield, N. J., 1911).
- LUMHOLTZ, CARL. *New Trails in Mexico* (New York, 1912).
- PARSONS, ELSIE CLEWS. *Notes on the Pima*, 1926 (American Anthropologist, vol. 30: 445-64, 1928).
- RUSSELL, FRANK. *The Pima Indians* (Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, 26: 3-389, 1908).
- SPIER, LESLIE. *Problems Arising from the Cultural Position of the Havasupai* (American Anthropologist, vol. 31: 213-22, 1929). *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River* (Chicago, 1933).
- STRONG, WILLIAM DUNCAN. *An Analysis of Southwestern Society* (American Anthropologist, vol. 29: 1-61, 1927).
- WHITTEMORE, ISAAC T. in *Among the Pimas or the Mission to the Pima and Maricopa Indians* (Albany, N. Y., 1893).

*September, 1932*



## ELEMENTS OF CULTURE AMONG THE MARICOPA, PIMAN, AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES (Continued)

	<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Pima-Papago</i>
<b>HABITS</b>					
Women carry burdens on head; head ring (86, 113, 116, L 70ff.)	A lively humor Obscenity freely used	?	?	Carry torches to warm selves	(Also in netted frame)
Smoking: cane tubes				Tear salutation (?) (200) Smoking in circuit (P 459)	
<b>POTTERY</b>					
Same character: sand temper: paddle and anvil (r24f.)	Pottery used rather than basketry Identity of shapes and names	Some shapes in common Patterns after firing: re-fired: similar designs: colored black on red or white	No design names	Designs named Colored red on buff	
<b>BASKETRY</b>					
Coiled baskets: jar-shaped storage basket (143)	Baskets traded rather than manufactured Identity of shapes and names	Similar designs (?)	Oval sifter of parallel rods (146)	Twined baskets	Coiled basketry highly developed: designs names Plaited baskets with lids (r30) (r45)
<b>Nest-like coiled granaries</b>					
<b>WEAVING</b>					
		Weaving of cotton blankets and bands: similar loom and fabrics: cotton plucking bow (r48f.) Patching by weaving: no sewing		Sleeping mats (93, 134, 147)	(Occasionally by Yuma)
<b>VARIOUS UTENSILS</b>					
Rectangular, unboxed metate: long mano (r100) Wooden mortar: long wooden or stone pestle (75)	General crudity of all manufactures Woven string bags	Metates dressed with stone axes	Coiled burden basket	Netted rectangular carrying frame	Netted tripod carrying frame (kiaha) Carrying net (as saddle bag?) (r13, L 331)
Little skin dressing: seeds for tanning (r13, L 331) Cradle: U-frame, ladder, bassinet hood: carried on head or hip (103-4)	Sex of child indicated by designs of band (K 536)	Sahuaro hook (r103) Sahuaro seeds for tanning	Conical travelling mortar of twined sticks	Tule rafts and large pots for ferries	
		Cradle hood painted (104, 164) Cloth swing (r156)			Sex indicated by designs on hood

ELEMENTS OF CULTURE AMONG THE MARICOPA, PIMAN, AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES ( <i>Continued</i> )					
	<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Pima-Papago</i>
WEAPONS					
Bow: D-shaped; self-bow (95)	Some use of reed arrows	Arrow-straightener lacking (111)	Sinew-backed bow	Grooved arrow-straightener Long clubs (?)	
Arrows of arrowweed; usually lack heads (96, 111)					
Clubs: "potato-masher" type (96)					
Stone axe lacking (106)					
Armor lacking					
Circular shield	Lance (pike); little used	Identical decoration (120)		Little used	
GAMES					
Ball (not stick) for kicking race	Kicking-ball racing favored (173)		Hoop and pole favored		
Ring and pin game (find rings) (180)	Relay race		Ring and pin: no score board		
	Hidden ball game	Women's double-ball shinny (172)			
		Dice with scoring circuit ("quince")			
		Catuhé hiding game (176)			
MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS					
Reeded flageolet (166)			Open flute		
Drum: basket beaten and scraped (167)			Trench drum		
Gourd rattle (168, 315)			Deerhoof rattle		
			Deerhoof and cocoon rattles (169, 170)		
			Notched rasp (167, 266)		
SOCIAL ORGANIZATION					
Tribal solidarity			(Papago ?)		
Freely moving settlements (88)			Disputes settled by pushing match and stick fight		
Farm lands owned			Distributed by allotment (?)		
Patrilineal sibs: untranslatable names (197)		Sib names in common			
Totemism: multiple totems; indirect reference, same totems, boasting of totems		Applied to sibs			
Men's names (after marriage) frequently of sexual reference to women (188)		Sib exogamy	Mourning for intra-sib marriages		
Strong reluctance to use names of living and dead		Women bear sib names			
"Human type" kinship system (P 445)			Some men bear names of totemic reference		
			Naming rite (wholly Spanish?)		
			Children may not use own names (188)		

ELEMENTS OF CULTURE AMONG THE MARICOPA, PIMAN, AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES (*Continued*)

	<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado Yumans</i>
<b>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION (<i>Continued</i>)</b>					
Chiefly liberality (?) War leader selected	(199) (196)	Single (?) hereditary chief: little influence: ability dreamed			Chief selected: hereditary bias (?) (196, P 447)
Meeting (in meeting house)	(L 52, 106, 360)				
<b>MARRIAGE</b>					
Patrilocal residence Test of housewifery at marriage		Continenace at marriage (184)	Sororate Woman takes initiative in divorce (?)	Levirate (184) (184)	Ceremonial induction of male transvestites
Male transvestites	(L 353)	Female transvestites Change of sex caused by (over)-dreaming			
<b>BIRTH</b>					
Limited couvade	(185)	Conception due (?) to dreaming Twins merely visitors (re-born)	Birth in menstrual lodge (Pima?)	First-born twin called the younger	Birth in dwelling (?)
			Preference for male children (185)		Purification rite for child (Spanish?) (187, L 351)
<b>PUBERTY</b>					
Girls' rite; four or eight days; repeated at subsequent menstruations		Girl "roasted" in sand Girl tattooed	Dance with girl		(Not repeated?) (188, P 464)
				Bee-stinging ordeal for boys	Youths trained four days in tribal legends (191)
<b>DEATH CUSTOMS</b>					
		Mourning before death: singing or orations Cremation: orations		Heart believed last consumed Mourning commemoration with singing and sham battle	Burial: occasional cremation on warpath (193, 194, 202)
					Image burning in mourning rite
<b>WARFARE</b>					
		War as sport: massed combat, challenges, championships; dependence on club		Fortays: dependence on bows	Shaman's paraphernalia cached (256)

ELEMENTS OF CULTURE AMONG THE MARICOPA, PIMAN, AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES ( <i>Continued</i> )					
<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Pima-Papago</i>
WARFARE ( <i>Continued</i> )					
Specialization of clubmen and bowmen (120, 202)	Leaders with feathered pikes; no-flight obligation (116)				
War headdress (116)					
Clairvoyance by shaman on war-path (202)					
Scalp malefict: scalp custodian: stored in meeting (?) house (P 461)	Scalps taken only by those who dream. Scalped leaders only (?) Scalps forecast warfare				
Captives cause disease (265)					
Purification for scalpers: isolation, fasting, bathing: 16 days duration					
Captives sold	Young women	Children	(197)		
CALENDAR	Year begins with (early) spring	Six month names repeated: associated with sib names (Colorado Yumans?)	Stick annals (identical details)	Identical names for some local mountains (e.g. 216-7, 278)	Year begins with sahu-a-ro harvest (35) Twelve or thirteen month names (36, L 76)
	Four-fold division of the night	Orion's Belt called "mountain sheep"		Thunder and lightning anthropomorphized	
SONG CYCLES	All songs theoretically acquired in dreams	Song cycles: similar names, musical style, and melodies "Destruction" of songs at death	Content: guardian spirit experience	Content: self-projective into myth narrative	Songs in series (possibly similar) (271, 285)
SHAMANISM	Shaman's dreams involuntary (no quest)	Hereditary tendency (257) Guardian spirits for shamans	Some quest for spirit helpers	No private spirit allies	Shamanistic novices also instructed (?) (25, P 458)
			Spirit escorts dreamer between peaks on cord		

ELEMENTS OF CULTURE AMONG THE MARICOPA, PIMAN, AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES (Continued)

<i>Peculiar to Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado-Yumaans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado-Yumaans</i>
<i>Common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado-Yumaans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>
<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado-Yumaans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>
<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado-Yumaans</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>

SHAMANISM (Continued)

Mountains as spirits  
Dreaming replaces learning  
for professions

Dream patterned on four-fold division of night

No women shamans (?)	Curing by effigy	shamans killed for failure to cure (?)	er-control (?) (P 461) Woman shamans cure only abdominal dis- orders	Curing by masked Na- vico (266, P 462) Sickness due to intru- sion; sucked out	Curing by songs of ani-
-------------------------	------------------	---	---	---	-------------------------

Shamanic brush and straw (1960)

Land of dead downstream:  
rebirth four times; finally  
becomes beetle or charcoal

<b>Heart (soul) becomes owl</b> (252)	Pulses (souls) screech owls Whirlwind is soul (ghost)	become - Orations with abrupt, force- able delivery Datura taken individually to-forecast future
<b>RIOTOUS RITUAL ELEMENTS</b> Orations of fixed content and occasions		

## VARIOUS RITUAL ELEMENTS Orations of fixed content and so

Frequent use of four as ritual number

spirits	No special ritual tabu on salt	Ritual restriction on salt	Frequent color-direction symbolism
			Ritual restriction on salt (266) Prayer-plumes: shrines; meal spitting (106, 254, L 101, 108, P 106)

ELEMENTS OF CULTURE AMONG THE MARICOPA, PIMAN, AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES (*Concluded*)

<i>Common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, Common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado Yumans, and Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa and Pima-Papago</i>	<i>Peculiar to Maricopa</i>	<i>Peculiar to Lower Colorado Yumans</i>	<i>Peculiar to Pima-Papago</i>
VARIOUS RITUAL ELEMENTS ( <i>Continued</i> )				
Tabu on game killed by young man	All game tabu	Bull-roarer	Bull-roarer a toy	(Occurs among Yuma)
	Noise of inanimate objects ill-onened		Eagle feathers "poisonous,"	Tabu on deer and moun-tain sheep permanent
				Bull-roarer for rain: call audience
				First deer Tabu (191)
RITUAL AND DANCE				
Dance form: opposed lines of men and women moving to and fro; rare occurrence of circling dance (170, 183, 205, 289)	No ritual dancing	Harvest dance alone called "dance,"	Name song (begging dance) (171)	With rain-making (347)
			Saharo brewing and cele-bration (70, L 51, 93, 119, 148)	Rain-making (347) Vikita-Navito: masked singers; corn symbol-ism; rain-making; sun and moon; curing by touching effigies (91, 108, 168, 175, 266,
			Elements of Vikita-Navito dance	Audience of village groups oriented
			Killdeer butterfly per-formance and dance (in war dance); masked clown (de-rived from Vikita-Navito?)	(In Halcidhma mourning rite)
				"Moving-the-king," dance
				Prediction by swal-lowing dirt piles and by smoking
				Salt gathering expedi-tion, with purification (94, L 269)