



Nebraska History posts materials online for your personal use. Please remember that the contents of *Nebraska History* are copyrighted by the Nebraska State Historical Society (except for materials credited to other institutions). The NSHS retains its copyrights even to materials it posts on the web.

For permission to re-use materials or for photo ordering information, please see:

<http://www.nebraskahistory.org/magazine/permission.htm>

Nebraska State Historical Society members receive four issues of *Nebraska History* and four issues of *Nebraska History News* annually. For membership information, see:

<http://nebraskahistory.org/admin/members/index.htm>

Article Title: Caddoan Kinship Systems

Full Citation: Alexander Lesser, "Caddoan Kinship Systems," *Nebraska History* 60 (1979): 260-271.

URL of article: <http://www.nebraskahistory.org/publish/publicat/history/full-text/NH1979Kinship.pdf>

Date: 1/4/2012

Article Summary: This is one of a series of articles based on presentations at a mini-symposium "Toward Plains Caddoan Origins: A Symposium" held at the Smithsonian Institution in November, 1976.

CADDOAN KINSHIP SYSTEMS

Alexander Lesser
Hofstra University
(Professor Emeritus)

The Caddoan language family includes four major languages with some dialectic subdivisions. The four languages are Pawnee, Wichita, Kitsai, and Caddo. The Pawnee language is spoken in three dialects: Pawnee proper, the dialect of the three south bands of the Pawnee—Chawi, Pitahawirata, and Kitkahahki; the Skiri Pawnee, which is spoken by the Skiri band; and the Arikara, the dialect of the Arikara tribe. The Wichita language is spoken by eight of the nine bands of the Wichita; viz., all the bands save the Kitsai. This includes the following, which I believe as complete and accurate a list of former Wichita bands as can be obtained today: *tokáns*, *tawakarú^{w'}*, *wéku'*, *isí-s*, *tiwá'*, *itá*, *kí rik₂ris*, *akwi-ts*. Dialectic divergence, which has been hinted at for Waco and Tawakoni (viz., the *tawakarú^{w'}* and *wéku'* bands), seems on the basis of data which can be secured today to have been merely differences of idiomatic usage. Kitsai is the language of the *tikitsas* band of the Wichita. Caddo, as spoken today, is essentially the language of the *kado 'adátc^u* band of the Caddo. There were eight bands of the Caddo tribe: Hainai (with a large branch called *nabadaitcu*), *nadárko*, *nacidóc*, *yát'as*, *nak'ohodótsi*, *háic*, *kayamaíci*, and *kado 'adátc^u*. According to Caddo tradition, all bands differed dialectically from one another in their speech, except for the two branches of the Hainai, which are said to have spoken the same dialect. While it is impossible today to obtain systematic linguistic data on the band differences of the Caddo, occasional differentiations recalled by older natives indicate that at least in the case of

*Originally read at the annual joint meetings of the American Anthropological Association and the American Folk-Lore Society at Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, December 29, 1929. The material on which the paper is based was obtained in the field and includes kinship terminologies with related data from all known dialects of the Caddoan stock.

Hainai and Kadohadacho, traditional belief is accurate, and Hainai may prove the most divergent of the band dialects. In kinship, even where terms are phonetically identical, a difference of systematic usage is recalled and will be discussed briefly below.

Kinship material was obtained independently from all the major groups: the Arikara, Skiri, and South Band Pawnee; the Wichita; the Kitsai; and the Caddo and Hainai.

From a linguistic standpoint, the Caddoan terms of kinship can be characterized by the small number of kinship stems, and the generally meager development of distinctions of relative age, sex of relative, and sex of speaker. Superficially, the number of stems used amount to the following: Pawnee, Skiri, and Arikara each have 15; Kitsai, 17; Wichita, 15; Caddo, 18; and Hainai, 16. Analysis indicates that these numbers will be reduced, since some terms are differently inflected forms of the same verb stem.

From the standpoint of systematic usage, four systems are represented in the Caddoan terminologies. One system of usage may be said to include the kinship of Wichita and Kitsai, in spite of some differences in terms. Another system is identical throughout for the usage of the South Band Pawnee, the Skiri, and the Arikara. A third system, on present evidence, must be associated with usage of the Kadohadacho and Anadarko bands of the Caddo; while a fourth seems to have been in use among the Hainai. I shall speak of these systems as the Kitsai, the Pawnee, the Caddo, and the Hainai.

There is a curious resemblance of features between the Kitsai and Pawnee systems, which requires for purposes of presentation that they be considered together. Elsewhere I have commented several times on the fact that Pawnee kinship includes all those features which may be taken as characteristic of the Crow kinship type which occurs so widely in North America, and particularly in three areas reasonably contiguous to the Pawnee tribes, viz., among the Crow and Hidatsa, in the Southeast, and in the Southwest. There are, however, striking features of Pawnee kinship which are absent in the Crow type, and apparently are alien to it. If the Crow type be said to include features denominated *A*, the Pawnee system may be abstractly stated as *A plus B*, the divergent features being denominated *B*. The *B* features of the Pawnee system are all present in detail in

the Kitsai system (i.e., in the kinship of the Kitsai and the Wichita), while features *A* are absent. Thus from a conceptual point of view, we may say that Pawnee kinship is a combination of the Kitsai system and the Crow-type system.

To outline the features of the Kitsai and Pawnee systems, then, it will be well to call attention first to the complex summarized as *B* traits, which represent all essentials of the Kitsai system, and then to consider the traits summarized as *A*, which added to *B* constitute the Pawnee system.

To avoid needless repetition, it might be stated at the outset that in both the Kitsai and the Pawnee systems, as well as in the Caddo and the Hainai systems—that is, throughout the kinship usage of all Caddoan groups—the familiar principles of levirate and sororate kinship classification appear. Thus the father's brother and father are equated conceptually as 'fathers'; the mother's sister and mother are equated conceptually as 'mother'; and a man's brother's children are as his own and a woman's sister's children are as her own. Finally, children of siblings of like sex—that is, children of two brothers, or children of two sisters—are siblings to each other. These features are carried through the systems consistently for all collateral lines, and it may be assumed in the following discussion that usage with respect to parents, siblings, and children is always intended to apply also in these obvious classificatory extensions.

It may also be added, in connection with the above, that the levirate and sororate marriage customs, of which these kinship classifications are the correlate and the expression, are in one form or another universal for Caddoan peoples.

Kitsai System

The Kitsai type shares the classificatory features just mentioned with all Caddoan usage. In addition, while there are special terms for mother's brother and father's sister, the children of these are siblings to each other, making all cousins, cross as well as parallel, 'brothers' and 'sisters.' The Kitsai, exceptionally, preserves a nephew/niece term, evidently reciprocal to the mother's brother term, which, according to the memory of my oldest informants, is an isolated usage and does not function systematically. By this I mean that while an uncle-nephew/niece usage is present in Kitsai, but absent in

Wichita, it has no effect upon other usages. Children of nephew or niece in Kitsai are as children of others of the child generation, 'grandchildren.' Thus in both Wichita and Kitsai usage, one has the following as consanguinities: (a) grandparents; (b) fathers, mothers, uncles, and aunts; (c) siblings; (d) children; and (e) grandchildren. In consanguinities, the peculiar and characteristic features which I referred to as of *B* type are that parents of grandparents are addressed and spoken of by parent terms, and children of grandchildren are addressed and spoken of by child terms. Thus reading up from ego's generation of siblings, we have conceptually: parents, grandparents, parents, grandparents, and so on. Reading down, we have: children, grandchildren, children, grandchildren, and so on.

In affinal relationships five basic concepts summarize the Wichita and Kitsai systematic usage. These concepts are: (1) husband; (2) wife; (3) males married into the family; (4) spouses of males married out of the family; and (5) person of same sex as speaker married into same family as speaker. Inverting somewhat the order in which I have stated these concepts, I shall discuss first the last three (i.e., 3-5).

Wichita and Kitsai, as well as all the Pawnee groups, are basically matrilineal. Both the earth lodge of the Pawnee and the large grass houses of the Wichita accommodated extended families of many persons, and these families always included—if these generations were represented among the living members of the family—maternal grandparents, parents, married and unmarried daughters, and unmarried sons. Thus, from the standpoint of the individual family, one might say that the community consisted of in-marrying males, and that the males of the household might be called out-marrying males. Females are in all essentials rooted to the parental home, while males are migratory as regards permanent residence. In Pawnee two terms, *kustáwehtsu*[?] and *tskúrus*, differentiate and group all relatives-in-law who are affected by the principle of residence. Thus in-marrying males—designated by the term *kustáwehtsu*[?]—would include son-in-law, a man's sister's husband, and a man's niece's husband, a man's granddaughter's husband. These in-married males, in turn, use the same stem with different pronominal form for the reciprocal relations of wife's parents, wife's brother, wife's uncle and

wife's grandfather. The form *tskúrus*, on the other hand, includes the daughter-in-law, a woman's brother's wife, a man's nephew's wife, and a woman's grandson's wife; while these designated individuals use other pronominal forms for reciprocation to the husband's parents and husband's sister. It will be seen that one concept is applied always to males, the other always to females; but this is not because of any sex differentiation in the terms: *kustawehtsu*?, so far as it is translatable, refers merely to 'the one sitting among us', *tskúrus* to 'the outsider.' The grouping by sex is a reflex of the fact of strict unilocal residence usage.

The concept of person of same sex as speaker; married into same family as speaker, is used with reference to two unrelated males married to sisters, or two unrelated females married to brothers. In Wichita and Kitsai, it may also be applied to a man and his granddaughter's husband, or a man and his wife's grandfather, or to a woman and her grandson's wife, or to a woman and her husband's grandmother. These last usages are in some cases in Wichita and Kitsai preferred to the distinctions based on the two preceding concepts, which in some cases overlap in application.

These three concepts are not carried through with the same rigid consistency in Wichita, Kitsai, and Pawnee. Pawnee is most consistent, in that it has no other usage for parents-in-law (except for the vocative use of 'old man' and 'old woman') than those based on the concepts of in-marrying males and wives of out-marrying males. Kitsai and Wichita, however, have special terms for parent-in-law, and have in addition other terms than those based on the above two concepts, which in some cases may be used optionally instead of these terms.

The affinity concepts of husband and wife are applied throughout Wichita, Kitsai, and Pawnee in the same manner. The Pawnee terms are merely different pronominal forms of the same stem. Thus, if the Pawnee term for 'wife' is said to mean 'I have or own you,' or 'the one I have or own,' the Pawnee term for husband would mean 'He has or owns me.' Wichita and Kitsai stems may be independent forms for husband and wife; based on present data they can be considered so, although further linguistic analysis may show them to be formed in a parallel manner to the Pawnee. Nevertheless, to repeat, the usage of these terms is fundamentally the same for all three groups.

The regular singular, subject pronoun forms for 'wife' are applied directly by a man to the wife's sister, the wife's grandmother, and the wife's granddaughter, as well as his own wife; the form for 'husband' is applied directly by a woman to the husband's brother, the husband's grandfather, and the husband's grandson, as well as her own husband. In addition, dual pronominal forms—viz., meaning 'our wife,' 'our husband'—are applied by a man to his brother's wife, his grandson's wife, and his grandfather's wife (not own grandmother), and by a woman to her sister's husband, her granddaughter's husband, and her grandmother's husband (not own grandfather).

These usages are not merely terminological. It was pointed out earlier that levirate and sororate customs are universal for Caddoan groups. For Wichita, Kitsai, and Pawnee, both levirate and sororate occurred during life as well as after death; that is, it was customary for a woman to consider her husband's brothers as her husbands, just as it was customary for a man to consider his wife's sisters as his wives. Thus a true fraternal polyandry existed here, as well as a true sororal polygyny. The sororate during life was very frequent, as genealogies vividly illustrate.

The levirate was not so openly considered a marriage. Nevertheless, it was a custom of Wichita, Kitsai, and Pawnee parents, in the course of their instruction of their sons, to teach younger brothers to love an older brother's wife as an own wife. It was, as well, the custom for the younger brother, while still immature, to go to live with his older married brother. A Wichita informant stressed that the older brother tells his younger brother, "This is our wife," and that he would permit the younger brother to live with her as such. The same informant stated as his positive knowledge a case of such fraternal polyandry existing today among the Wichita: two classificatory brothers (viz., through parallel cousinship) were living with the same woman as wife. A Chawi informant stated that the older brother offered the younger brother his wife when he had demonstrated his manhood by conspicuous bravery; and that he would tell his brother to go places with the wife. Pawnee informants agreed that this usage was true for several younger brothers as well as for only one. A Skiri informant said that when a married son has gone away for any length of time, his

younger brother is sent to live with the wife and take care of her. This custom is, incidentally, also present among the Comanche.

Thus the usage of spouse terms for spouses of siblings is not a mere joking relationship, although joking goes along with it. In addition to this form of joking, the most pronounced joking relationship among the Wichita, Kitsai, and Pawnee, is grandparent-grandchild joking, particularly with reference to marriage, and particularly with reference to each other's spouses. This joking is indiscriminate; that is, grandmothers as well as grandfathers joke with grandsons, grandfathers as well as grandmothers joke with granddaughters. The joking may be humorous, critical, and vulgar; and it is never resented, but taken in kind.

While it may seem an extreme statement, this grandparent-grandchild joking is no more a mere joking relationship than the sibling-in-law customs. A Wichita informant stated that a man could marry a grandson's wife or a brother's granddaughter, or a grandfather's wife who was not an own grandmother. Naturally these customs are not practiced today as they were in earlier times, so that it is futile to expect genealogical substantiation in records of contemporary families. An aged Kitsai informant stated the following possibilities: a grandson could marry a grandfather's widow, depending on considerations of age and absence of close blood-relationship; with the consent of the girl, a grandfather could have intercourse with his grandson's wife; and among both Kitsai and Wichita, a man could marry either his sister's or his brother's granddaughter.

The Pawnee evidence is more conclusive, though it is here tied up with other complications of Pawnee kinship to be discussed later. Statements include general agreement among a very large number of old Pawnee that in former times marriages of those who called each other by grandparent-grandchild terms are very frequent, though not obligatory. Statements bearing on this particular point are that a grandfather's wife, who was not an own grandmother, joked and had sex relations with the husband's grandson. It was said that a woman could marry her sister's grandson and that a woman joked with her husband's grandfather as if she were his wife, and could live with him. Also mentioned was a specific case in which a man married his brother's granddaughter. In connection with the latter case, the

informant added that this situation was common in the old days.

This freedom of discussion and action between relatives of alternate generations is reflected in another curious fact. When the question of marrying a son or daughter is considered in a household, it is the boy's grandfather and the girl's grandmother who not only deal for the young people to be married, but who are the ones to talk it over with them and get their views. A Kitsai informant explained this fact by the statement that parents never discussed such things with their children, but that grandparents, who joked with the children, did, so that when the girl had to be asked about her acceptance of a certain boy, it was the grandmother who talked to her about it.

Up to this point I have discussed those features of Kitsai and Wichita kinship (and their parallel forms in Pawnee) which I refer to as *B* features. In summary, they include the peculiar alternation of parent-grandparent and child-grandchild terms above and below the ego's generation respectively, and the differentiation of affinity relationships under five concepts. I have added comments on the sociological status of these usages. These features, called *B*, are common to Wichita, Kitsai, and Pawnee.

Pawnee System

Pawnee kinship, to repeat, adds to features *B*, features denominated *A*, by which are meant the features of the Crow-type system. These are briefly as follows:

Cross-cousins are not siblings. On the mother's brother's side they are children and on the father's sister's side they are mother and father. In other connections, I have tried to show that these shifts flow from a kinship identification of the mother's brother and the sister's son as 'brothers.' All extensions of usage of Pawnee kinship follow the Crow-type in these features consistently, with several added features. Thus, wherever in extensions of usage, a grandchild term appears, the children of such are as own children, and the parents of grandparents, in ascending generations, are as mothers and mother's brothers. In affinal usage, the special marriage to be associated with the Crow-type—namely, a marriage of a man to his mother's brother's wife, or conversely of a woman to her husband's

sister's son—is one of the most general customs of the Pawnee. James R. Murie early pointed out that the uncle's wife was the one who instructed a youth in things sexual, and that when the uncle died, if the nephew was unmarried, he married the widow. It might be added that among the Pawnee, the custom of sending a younger brother to live with an older married brother is extended to include a boy's mother's brother—a custom which is further sociological substantiation of the point of view I have taken, that is, that the mother's brother and sister's son are in Crow-type usage equated conceptually as 'brothers.'

Caddo and Hainai Systems

The other two types of Caddoan usage, the Caddo and the Hainai, can be discussed here only briefly. They agree in certain negative characteristics, as opposed to both the Kitsai and the Pawnee types; viz., there is no alternation of terms in ascending and descending generations; there is no complicated extension of usage of the spouse terms; and there is no grandparent-grandchild joking.

Fundamentally the same terms and usages are employed by both the Caddo and Hainai, with one striking exception, which seems to me to give a different slant to the Caddo.

The Hainai is the simpler. In the speaker's generation it merges all collateral relatives, including cross and parallel cousins, in the concept of siblings; and it groups all relatives of generations beyond grandparents, and beyond grandchildren, in the concepts of grandparents and grandchildren respectively. One complicated usage stands out: it is the existence of special terms for the mother's brother, and for a man's sister's child, whether boy or girl. The terms themselves must be very old, as they are undoubtedly related to the stems for these concepts in all other Caddoan dialects. Usage requires that the children of either nephew or niece be grouped as nepotic relatives with their parents. That is, the term *pa'hatisi* refers not only to a man's sister's son and daughter, but to a man's sister's grandson and granddaughter. Thus it follows that for a man or woman the father's or mother's mother's brother is as a mother's brother. So far as can be found out today from the only living Hainai with any memory of the language or usage, there are no indications in the rest of the kinship usage which might clarify this peculiar concept of uncle and nephew/niece. The uncle's



Pawnee children, Loup Fork Village, Nebraska. Photo by William H. Jackson.

spouse as well as the spouses of nephew and niece are grouped with sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, terms which imply for the Hainai respectful conduct mutually, so that any possibility of husband's sister's son marriage and the like is out of the question. As it stands on present evidence, the usage is isolated.

In the Caddo, this usage is retained, but to it is added a concept of cross-cousins on the father's sister's side. This term, *câhat*, has no parallel in the kinship stems of other Caddoan languages. Informants of Kadohadacho and Anadarko bands, as well as my Hainai informant, agree independently in stating that this term was not in use among the Hainai, but was used by

the other two bands. Essentially, then, ego applies the term *cáhat* to those who are addressed by ego's father as *pahtsi* (the Caddo equivalent of the Hainai *pa'hatisi*, the nephew/niece term). The result is a complete shift, from Hainai to Caddo, in usage as applied to cross-cousins. Where in Hainai they are all siblings, in Caddo, on the father's sister's side, both male and female cross-cousins are called *cáhat*; on the mother's brother's side they are classed with 'children.' Children of *cáhat* are merged in the concept of *cáhat* as *cáhatiti* (viz., little *cáhat*), which follows from the merging of *pahtsi* and the children of *pahtsi* in a single usage. Here again, any possible solution of this usage on the basis of the system it most closely resembles, the Crow-type, is negated by the fact that the mother's brother's wife is classed with the daughter-in-law in a relationship of mutual respect. Furthermore, a particularly aware Caddo informant who understood the implications of the marriage, denied that marriage to the mother's brother's wife had ever or could occur among the Caddo, and his remarks were substantiated independently by other informants. There is, however, another possible explanation of this usage. Ego male or female calls cross-cousins on the father's sister's side *cáhat* and their children *cáhatiti*, or according to informants, they may call the children of *cáhat* or *cáhatiti* 'siblings.' Furthermore, the wife of a male *cáhat* is called *íkwi*, which is a step-mother term, applied also to the father's brother's wife. Thus if a man could marry secondarily the wife of his nephew, the children of that nephew, who would be *cáhat* to the man's own children, would then become siblings to those children, for the mother would now become the step-mother of the latter. On the question of the actual occurrence of this marriage, I cannot make a definite statement for lack of information.

Today, the tendency among the Caddo is to drop the special complications of their usage, and to use terms in the same way as the Hainai. Old informants explain that either is possible, but from their statements I am led to believe that in earlier times the Caddo system as I have outlined it was in use.

In general the usage of the Caddo and Hainai may be said to be most divergent from probable Caddoan kinship prototypes, and to show evidence of influence from the west. For example, in the usage for grandchildren, the Caddo or Hainai grandmother applies to her grandson and granddaughter what is

probably a diminutive construction based on the term for grandmother; while the Caddo or Hainai grandfather in the same way uses a term for both his grandson and granddaughter which is a diminutive construction based on the grandfather term. This usage, with its trend toward reciprocity, and particularly in the manner of the linguistic formation of terms, is foreign to the Caddoan languages and kinship systems except in this isolated case, and is definitely like such usage further west, as among the Tonkawa and in the Pueblos.

Summary

From a descriptive standpoint there are four kinship systems present among the Caddoan tribes: the Kitsai, Pawnee, Caddo, and Hainai. Kitsai and Pawnee usage are related in such a way that all of the characteristic features of Kitsai usage are present in Pawnee usage, in addition to those features which characterize the widely distributed Crow-type of usage. Caddo and Hainai kinship usage show traces of influence from the west.

In the Pawnee and Kitsai systems we found a striking interrelation of conceptual categories within the systems and behavior distinctions in the life of the people; these included not only familiar joking relationships and marriages, but the unique and strong development of grandchild-grandparent joking with its corresponding marriages, and furthermore, a striking interrelation of the concepts of relatives by affinity and the principles of residence usage among these tribes.

The historical inference suggested by the Pawnee and Kitsai kinship systems and usage is that the Kitsai, with its parallels in Wichita, represents the older Caddoan system and usage, and that the Pawnee "Crow-type" features are later additions or changes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Lesser, Alexander
1929 Kinship Origins in the Light of Some Distributions. *American Anthropologist*
31: 710-730.
1930 Levirate and Fraternal Polyandry Among the Pawnee. *Man* 30:98-101.