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Article Summary: This is one of a series or articles based on presentations at a mini-symposium “Toward Plains Caddoan Origins: A Symposium” held at the Smithsonian Institution in November, 1976. This article uses carefully evaluated document sources which are studied from the viewpoint of one trained in anthropology in order to explain the Plains Caddoan Origins.
Unlike some but in accordance with many others, I define the term "ethnohistoric approach" as it was originally conceived in the 1950s at a gathering of anthropologists and historians (M. Wedel 1976:3-5) in the Ohio Valley region. To me the term indicates the use of carefully evaluated document sources which are studied from the viewpoint of one trained in anthropology. To the problem of Plains Caddoan origins, this procedure can contribute information on the location and settlement pattern of these people when they were first contacted by Europeans (Spaniards and Frenchmen), on population at that time albeit with many reservations as to correct interpretation of data, on the earliest named socio-political divisions, and finally on the physical appearance of these Indians as described by their European visitors. This discussion is limited to records before 1800. The Wichita and other possible Caddoans of the southern Plains will be considered first, then the Pawnee, and finally the Arikara who were the last of the Plains Caddoans to be documented. The term "Wichita" below indicates Wichita-speakers, whereas "Wichita proper" refers to the sub-division of that name.

The Wichita, as Quivirans, were first visited by Europeans in 1541 when the Vasquez de Coronado expedition entered their homeland. There is sound evidence (W. Wedel 1959:212, 585, 587) that this lay between the northeast side of the Great Bend of the Arkansas River and the Smoky Hill River to the northeast just upstream from Lindsborg, Kansas. Coronado and his party traversed this extent, in the course of which for four or five days they passed along or through (as Jaramillo remembered; Buckingham Smith 1857,1:160) six or seven populated areas (poblaciones) separated one from the other. It is implied that these extended settlements were located relative
to tributaries of the Arkansas, which the archeological picture indicates were probably (Wedel 1942:12) the Little Arkansas River and Cow Creek. The intervening land was said to be uninhabited. The most populous and important region of Quivira (Buckingham Smith 1857, 1:160) was at its northwestern border, which would place it just south of the Smoky Hill.

Accounts and testimonials of the 1601 Oñate expedition (Hammond and Rey 1953, Part 2) provide more information on the settlement pattern in Quivira, a pattern which from all indications was unchanged since the earlier Coronado entrada. Again the term población is used to express the populated area the Spaniards viewed, one estimated by Gutiérrez Bocanegra (Hammond and Rey 1953, Part 2:890) to be at least three leagues (9 miles more or less) in extent. Within these larger settlements, according to Baltasar Martínez (Ibid., 844) there were barrios of 30 to 40 houses each, about \( \frac{3}{4} \) mile apart. Such clusters or hamlets may be the unit also indicated by the more frequently used word pueblo, which would mean to the Spaniard a town or village. One 1541 account stated (Buckingham Smith 1857,1:152) that in some pueblos there were as many as 200 houses. Undoubtedly there was variation in size of these separate village or house clusters. In two leagues (ca. 6 miles) of a populated area or settlement, i.e., a series of hamlets, two members of the Oñate expedition claimed to have counted 1700 houses (Hammond and Rey 1953, Pt. 2:867, 883). Oñate himself wrote of seeing more than 1200 (Bolton 1916:260) in one settlement.

Such a pattern of dispersion accords with the gloss "gros, partagé," meaning "large" and "divided" or "scattered," that is associated with the name les panis a hundred years later (ca. 1700; Figure 1) on a French map (Tucker 1942:Pl. XVIII) attributed to Father Marc Bergier, S. J., stationed with the Illinois Tamaroa and Cahokia on the Mississippi River. On this basically diagrammatic map, the panis are located along a northern tributary of the Arkansas, south of the Kansas River, a region which could be reasonably interpreted as the Great Bend area. One would assume that the map may have been based on information brought back by intrepid voyageurs who are indicated by French sources (Nasatir 1952,1:5-7) to have been reaching west to the Wichita at that time, probably by way of the Missouri and Kansas Rivers.
Figure 1. Section of M. Bergier, S.J., map ca. 1699, Mississippi River to right, Arkansas River in center, Missouri River at top. Courtesy Le Seminaire de Québec.
Oñate, who visited only one Quivira settlement, which may have been on Walnut River above Arkansas City (W. Wedel 1942:18-20; 1959:22) was told of many larger populated areas to the north (Bolton 1916:261) referring, it would seem, to all or certain of those visited earlier by Coronado. Oñate was also informed of settlements to the east "down the river," presumably meaning the Arkansas. This suggests that Wichita bands had reached their farthest penetration north at the Smoky Hill and a movement to the south-southeast had begun. A distribution of this general nature is depicted a century later on the Bergier map of 1699-1700 mentioned above where downstream from the scattered *panis* are "*deux gros villages*" (two large villages) of *paniassas*, black Pawnee or Wichita, on a northern Arkansas tributary above another related group identified as *mento*, who may have been Tawakoni Wichita (M. Wedel 1979). The two latter glosses suggest more consolidated settlements than the one farthest north.

Martínez, a member of the 1601 expedition, reported (Hammond and Rey 1953, Pt. 2:844, 846) that within sight of each round house were fields where maize particularly and some beans and squash were raised. The dwellings were the same grass (*paja*) house type as observed in later Wichita villages. There were adjacent platform structures noted in 1541 (Winship 1892-93:591), and further described by Oñate's people (Hammond and Rey, Pt. 2:591, 844, 845, 857, 890), which evidently were of several types. The description of some suggests caches on stilts, as one sees in Mexico today, where De Leon (*Ibid.*, 857) said corn was stored and in the doorways of which (Bolton 1916:260) people were seen sitting. Access was by ladder to the platform about 6 feet high. Others may have been more like summer working areas (*ramadas*), unenclosed, but on top of which Indians were accustomed to recline. Drying racks are also a possibility. That horticulture was supplemented by extensive bison hunting is stated by Oñate (*Ibid.*, 261) and implied by others.

Oñate reported (*Ibid.*, 260) that 8-10 persons lived in a house, a figure similar to that given more than two centuries later by R. B. Marcy after observing Waco and Wichita villages (1854:77) in present day southwest Oklahoma. He described each grass lodge as housing two families of about ten persons altogether. This may be interpreted in the matrilocal society as basically the
parent nuclear group and the family of the elder daughter.

Both the settlement patterns and grass houses described above are like those of the historic Caddo proper who lived on the lower Red River and above its great southward bend (Figure 2) and also farther south on the Neches and Angelina Rivers in present-day Texas. As late as 1719 Bénard de La Harpe (Journal Du Voyage 1718-20:folios 13-13 vo.) was chiding the Kadohadacho, Upper Nasoni, and other Caddo living nearby on the Red for the sprawling nature of their settlements which rendered their individual villages less secure from attack.

It is with hesitancy that I approach the matter of population. Unquestionably both the Coronado and Oñate parties were impressed by the number of inhabitants of Quivira. They wrote of "thickly settled provinces," of "innumerable Indians," and the "large numbers of men" present in 1601 when the women did not appear. Montero de Castro estimated (Hammond and Rey 1953, Pt. 2:880-81) he saw 20,000 Indians in the one settlement Oñate visited. There have been attempts to figure Quivira population by manipulating various figures such as the number of occupants of a house (as given by Oñate), the number of houses reported in 1541 to compose such villages (Buckingham Smith 1857, 1:152), and Coronado’s estimates of 25 pueblos or villages (Pacheco y Cárdenas 1865, 3:366) of which he claimed to have heard or seen. Newcomb and Field (1967:341) estimated a population of 15,000 to 33,000 for all Quivira in the 1541-1601 period, after making certain adjustments for the recorded figures. However, it must be recognized, as Newcomb and Field did, that all computations are open to many "ifs" and "buts." For instance, settlement density undoubtedly varied considerably from house cluster to house cluster, and contemporary exaggerated estimates would not be unexpected. It may be questioned with reason that the claimed count of 1,700 houses was actually made house by house.

Were these Quivirans or Wichita-speakers already differentiated in the 16th century into the named socio-political units that are recorded in later historic times? At least two are recognizable. Jaramillo told of being taken to the "end of Quivira [probably just south of the Smoky Hill River] to which they took us saying that it was important (Buckingham Smith 1857;1:160), which they said meant that it was Teucarea." It has been suggested, with the approval of linguists (D. R. Parks,
Figure 2. Anonymous map of the Upper Nasoni settlement on Red River, 1691-1692. From photograph in Geography and Map Division, Library of Congress. Original in Archivo General de Indias, Seville.
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pers. com.) that the inhabitants of this specified settlement could have been Touacara, descendants of whom Bénard de La Harpe met in 1719 (Journal Du Voyage 1718-20:f. 19) on the Arkansas River: They were described to him as the principal Wichita band, whose chief was the most highly respected. The Wichita name for these people is tawa:khariw, according to David Rood and Douglas R. Parks (pers. com.). In the mid-eighteenth century they came to be called Tawakoni.

Another name for a place or people in Quivira was given by Domingo Martín when he was interrogated (Información 1544:22) during the trial of Coronado about the killing of an Indian called the “Turk,” who had been accused of misguiding the Spaniards. Martín said that the Turk was garroted and buried “in a pueblo called Tabas.” From other sources it is learned that this happening took place at the farthest point reached by the expedition in Quivira so it would seem that Tabas like Teucarea was near the Smoky Hill. Bolton (1949:293) considered this term to be a variant of La Harpe’s toajas, which Newcomb and others (1967:333) relate to the Taovayas of the eighteenth century. Linguists approve of this proposed relationship also. These are the Tawehash of today.

No similar leads to historic Wichita names are provided by French documents of the early 18th century. The Indians living along the Arkansas River some distance above the Quapaw or Arkansas are called les panis, les paniassa, and mentou. Often these seem to signify different contemporary Wichita-speakers. However, the names do not link continuously with people at one location who, for example, may be called mentou or at another time in a different source, paneassa. Later the term panipiqués (pricked Pawnee) came into use relating, as did paniassa (black Pawnee), to the Wichita custom of tattooing their bodies extensively, a feature especially apparent on the women. Not until Guillaume Delisle’s 1718 “Map of Louisiana and the Course of the Mississippi” (Tucker 1942:Pl. XV) did another band name appear, the Ouatchitas, the subdivision of Wichita proper. Through Bénard de La Harpe’s visit to the Arkansas River the next year (1718-1720 Journal Du Voyage:f. 19), the Yscanis were recognized. La Harpe named also the quirasquirit, as if they formed a separate band, but gives no location for them. Perhaps he misunderstood that kirikir?i:s was the name for all Wichita-speakers, a term used by members of
all groups to identify themselves as belonging to the larger category. The *adeco* and *honecho* are also mentioned. These groups evidently lost their identity soon after this time by merging and/or becoming known by another name. Might they have been precursors of the Wichita-speaking Waco? Two *Quidehais* (i.e. Kitsai Indians) were named as being guides for La Harpe.

Certain nomadic, bison-hunting groups of impressive size, some of whom have been labelled Caddoan speakers, were contacted by Coronado and by men sent out by Oñate onto the southern Plains south of Quivira. For instance, Schroeder (1962:8-9), John (1975:20,n5) and others have suggested that the presumably tattooed *Teyas* encountered by Coronado, were Caddoans, although Dolores Gunnerson (1974:20) has offered evidence for their having been Apache. Schroeder proposed that ancestors of the Teyas may have been inhabitants of the Antelope Creek sites in the Oklahoma-Texas panhandles, and that after 1541 they were called Jumanos, a term which Scholes (1940:275) found to be used collectively in these centuries for “tattooed Indians.” Schroeder suggested further that all nomadic Indians called Jumano who hunted in the Canadian River region were Caddoan-speakers. On the other hand, Rudolph C. Troike (pers. com.) and Carl O. Sauer (1934:68) believe all those called Jumano, except the Wichita, spoke Uto-Aztecan. Obviously this is a complex question that will long plague anthropologists.

There remain other related problems, such as: by what name did the New Mexico Spaniards recognize the Kitsai? It was probably these Indians who gave a name for themselves in 1719 to the associate of B. de La Harpe (*Journal Du Voyage* 1718-20:f. 16vo.) that was corrupted by the French to *Quidehais*. They spoke a Caddoan dialect when conversing with La Harpe’s interpreters. Durivage reported they were nomadic bison hunters when he found them associated with Tonkawa and Nабедаче Caddo on the upper Red River, but they may have been simply on a summer hunt. Hopefully further documentary study will provide clearer insights on this matter.

Turning now to the Pawnee, the earliest mention of them, as with the Wichita, is found in documents related to the Coronado expedition. The *Arae* (Buckingham Smith 1857, 1:153) or *Harahedi* (Ibid., 160), evidently a Spanish corruption of *Awah:i*, the Pan-Caddoan term for the Pawnee, were said by
Jaramillo to live beyond the northern river of Quivira province so, it may be interpreted, beyond the Smoky Hill. They were further described as having "the same manner" or lifeway; "the same kind of settlements," that is poblaciones—extended settlements; and "the same size" as Quivira. In the Relacion del Suceso (Ibid., 153) it is added that their houses were "part of straw and the rest of skins" which was exactly the description the nomadic Teyas gave of Quiviran dwellings (Pacheco y Cárdenas, 3:365) when they meant grass houses and tipis. This interesting remark is worthy of thoughtful consideration by students of the Pawnee. A chief from Arahe came with 200 men to visit Coronado, but there is no hint as to how far he traveled. Casteñada had been told (Winship 1896:457) by "reliable sources" that the river of Espíritu Santo (meaning here the Mississippi) flowed through Arache. The Kansas or the Platte and their tributaries carry waters that join those of the Mississippi.

Not until the notable 1673 journey of Louis Jolliet and Jacques Marquette more than a century later did a record of more frequent contacts with the Pawnee begin. Even then, among the approximately 100 separate pre-1800 references I have to the central Pawnee or panis blancs (white Pawnee in contrast to the panis noirs or Wichita), there are no firsthand descriptions of them. The extant French and Spanish textual accounts and maps all represent secondhand information reported by missionaries, government officials, and cartographers. These persons presented facts obtained in part from French voyageurs, many of whom were probably illiterate, who were heading west bent on trade and exploration. Some were said (G. Delisle [1702]) to be living in 1700 with Pawnee of the Platte River region. A number of the French traders may have kept to the Missouri River mainstem instead of turning west up its tributaries. Sometimes information was obtained from Indian slaves, or in the case of the French, from Indians visiting eastward. As a result of this transference of information, both textual and cartographic, careful examination and interpretation are required because of communication misunderstandings, confusion regarding the geography of the upper Missouri, Kansas River, and Platte regions, and possibly careless reporting or copying.

The Spaniards, beginning in the 1680s, were using the name Panana for all Pawnee slaves indiscriminately, thus
distinguishing them from *Jumano*, the name which replaced “Quivirans” in the 1690s for the Wichita.

Not until 1701, and then rarely up to 1800, is there documentary recognition by the French of the presence in the central plains of two groups of Pawnee, aside from the Arikara. The terms applied to them, *Panimaha* and *Panis*, were taken by Frenchmen from Chiwere and Dhegiha Siouan speakers (as Quapaw, Osage, Missouri, etc.), among whom the former name sometimes indicated the Skiri Pawnee only, according to J. Owen Dorsey ([1883-1894]). However, the French and later the Spaniards often used each term collectively for both Skiri and South Bands. Even though one frequently does not know with certainty the intended meaning of *Panimaha* or *Panis*, there is no question but that there were Skiri and “other” Pawnee in the general Platte and/or Kansas-Republican region at the beginning of the 18th century. Not until 1775 is the Kitkehaki or Republican group named (Kinnaird 1946, Pt. 1:228) along with the Skiri and the *Panis* who were evidently those identified (*Ibid.*, 2:278) as the Chaui or Grand and Pitahauerat or Tappage in 1794.

There seems to be no reference to the Pawnee settlement pattern after Jaramillo’s statement in 1601 cited above until 1723. Then Philippe de La Renaudière (Margry 6:180) described—without seeing them—eight *Panis* villages on the Elkhorn River half a league (c. 1½ miles) apart. This is reminiscent of the Wichita-Quivira poblaciones. The reference is also of interest in that John B. Dunbar (1880:257) cited a tradition that the Pitahauerat had once lived on this stream.

Again I am brought to a pause as I view the confusing records of Pawnee village numbers and size. As with the Wichita in Quivira, the impression given to early visitors was of a large population. It would seem from the J.-B. L. Franquelin 1684 map that in the years immediately preceding its appearance when Robert Cavelier de La Salle was in the Illinois country, he was told of 19 villages he called *Panimaha*; no other Pawnee group was distinguished. Is this an exaggeration or does it refer to small hamlets, or include other Caddoan speakers than the Skiri? Twenty years later, Father Bergier (1702) reported that two voyageurs had described the *panimaha* as the most numerous people in the Platte River region. If this meant the Skiri only, it agrees with secondhand information furnished by
Véniard de Bourgmont (Giraud 1958:16) in 1714 which noted nine Skiri villages and one of South Band panis. Guillaume Delisle portrayed twelve villages for each of these groups on his important 1718 map cited above (Tucker 1942:Pl. XV). His source for these figures is unknown so they cannot be accepted without question. Beyond this, the village numbers up to 1800 that are known to me come from dubious sources, are impossible to interpret with any degree of assurance, or are simply unacceptable, as the “60 to 70” panis villages near the Platte noted by John Mitchell on his 1755 map. There seem to be no extant figures on numbers of dwellings in villages which are reliable enough to be worthy of repeating. The figures for 600 to 800 warriors that are given for the Panismaha between 1750 and 1777 raise questions as to accuracy and the definition of panismaha. Nevertheless, it is evident that the French continued to think of the Pawnee—South Bands and Skiri together—as impressively large in size.

Earlier the fact was stated that the names given the Wichita by both the French and Spaniards in the seventeenth century related to their appearance. Although George A. Dorsey in 1904 (p. 2) wrote of the Wichita as somewhat darker in skin color than the Apache, Kiowa and other neighboring Plains Indians, it seems very likely that the Spanish term Jumano and the French name Paneassa, a corruption of Chiwere and Dhegiha Siouan Pani-sewe or Pani-sa meaning Black Pawnee, referred to profuse body tattooing. This was a cultural trait of the Wichita that impressed a number of members of the Coronado and Oñate expeditions. Coronado described the Quiviran women (Pacheco y Cárdenas 3:366) as having “faces more in the manner of the Moors.”

Siouan-speaking neighbors to the east of the Wichita had regarded tattooing both as a descriptive and distinguishing trait since apparently it was largely if not entirely absent among the Skiri/South Bands Pawnee and the Arikara. At times Frenchmen differentiated between the Pawnee/Arikara and Wichita by using the names panis blancs (white Pawnee) and panis noirs (black Pawnee).

Pre-1800 documents yield little information regarding the origin of the Arikara who were evidently first contacted by Frenchmen at the end of the seventeenth century. Under the Chiwere and Dhegiha Siouan names of p’anyi pútha or pátipiza,
rendered *panibousa* or *panigoucha* and so on by the French (G. Delisle 1701; Tucker 1942:Pl. XIII), they were described by Bergier (Ibid., Pl. XVIII) and the Delisles (1701) as having four large villages. Henri Tonti in 1700 (Delanglez 1939:232) heard they were more numerous than the *panimaha*. Later, V. de Bourgmont in 1714 reported three Arikara villages (Giraud 1958:17) along the Missouri perhaps above the Niobrara. George E. Hyde (1951) believed these to be the "Arikara proper." Higher up the Missouri, Bourgmont introduced the *Caricara* with "40 villages," a figure which appeared on successive maps applied in the 1720s to "*les panis* or Ricara" (Wheat 1957#101), *les panis* (Vermale 1717), and in 1718 to *prairie panis* (Tucker 1942:Pl. XV) before being laid to rest after 1720. B. de La Harpe learned from the Wichita (Journal Du Voyage:f. 20) of seven important Arikara villages. Then in 1723 La Renaudière reported that a trader on the Missouri described the Arikara as a "wandering" people (Margry 6:395) evidently comparable to the wandering *Maha* or Omaha who possibly may be identified as proto-Ponca. This would seem to reflect some instability of residence in the 1700s and perhaps a pattern of small hamlets.

To conclude, the ethnohistoric approach reveals that the Wichita and Pawnee, possibly the Arikara, may have had similar lifeways with an economy based on horticulture and hunting when they were first seen and described by Europeans. Their diffuse settlement patterns were evidently similar and like that of the Hasinai Caddo. The Wichita and Caddo proper shared also the possession of grass houses. These dwellings, sheltering one or two families each, were erected in the so-called "permanent" villages. Similar structures made of grass by the Pawnee in 1541 may have represented a construction type that was perpetuated from pre-earthlodge times. Perhaps it came to be used for specialized purposes only. Near each dwelling of the Wichita was the family garden in the manner of the Caddo proper. The cultural relationship between the Wichita, Pawnee (South Band and Skiri), and Arikara was readily recognized by Europeans upon contact, but they did not express perception of divisions within the South Band group until the last quarter of the 18th century. Through the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, Europeans considered the population number of Plains Caddoans as imposing.
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