

UC Berkeley

Anthropology Faculty Publications

Title

Cultural Relations of the Gila River and Lower Colorado Tribes

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2j84s0m1>

Journal

American Anthropologist, 38(4)

Author

Gifford, Edward Winslow

Publication Date

1936-10-25

Peer reviewed

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

CULTURAL RELATIONS OF THE GILA RIVER AND LOWER COLORADO TRIBES

Included in the first issue of papers in the new series entitled Yale University Publications in Anthropology is the excellent presentation and discussion of data bearing on "Cultural Relations of the Gila River and Lower Colorado Tribes" by Professor Leslie Spier.¹ What he seeks to demonstrate as stated in his own words is the following:

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.

The first part of his thesis, viz. that Maricopa culture of the historic period is overwhelmingly one with that of the Yumans on the Lower Colorado he establishes beyond peradventure; in 1931, Professor A. L. Kroeber had already tacitly assumed this by including Maricopa among Colorado River Yuman tribes.² Had Professor Spier utilized Cocopa material also he could have made an even stronger case. The second part of his thesis seems to me to be far less firmly established by his evidence. Perhaps this is in part due to his having included Papago data with the Pima, for presumably Papago culture was less like the Maricopa culture than was the culture of the river Pima.

His data are presented in six columns as follows: (1) Elements common to Maricopa, Pima-Papago, and Lower Colorado Yumans. (2) Elements common to Maricopa and Lower Colorado Yumans. (3) Elements common to Maricopa and Pima-Papago. (4) Elements peculiar to Maricopa. (5) Elements peculiar to Lower Colorado Yumans. (6) Elements peculiar to Pima-Papago. To have achieved complete clarity of presentation there should have been a seventh column: Elements common to Lower Colorado Yumans and Pima-Papago. As it is he presents such elements in columns 5 and 6, though these elements are peculiar to neither Lower Colorado Yumans nor Pima-Papago. Since part of his plan was to prove that the Pimans should be grouped in the Lower Colorado province, it seems strange that "no attempt has been made here to list specific resemblances of Lower Colorado and Piman traits beyond what was common to the two and the Maricopa" (p. 14).

In spite of the clear presentation of the data and the preliminary discussion of them, the reader is unable to formulate precisely the interrelations of the three groups. Professor Spier modestly considered his marshalling of data as inadequate

¹ Yale University Publications in Anthropology, No. 3, 1936.

² The Seri (Southwest Museum Papers, No. 6), p. 40.

for a statistical expression of the inter-relations between the cultures (p. 14) because it does not "do full justice to the extent and the character of resemblances and dissimilarities." Nevertheless, as one peruses his tables it becomes obvious that he has set down the salient features of each culture, so that a statistical expression of the interrelations based upon this presentation is unlikely to be radically altered by additional data. I have attempted an analysis of his data only in what follows. Those elements which he limits to one or two groups are counted as absent in the remaining groups. His queried occurrences are not counted.³

The basic culture upon which the local elaborations have been erected comprises 100 positive elements shared by the three groups. (Universal negative elements, i.e. those lacking in the three groups, are not considered, since they are legion.)

The opposite side of the picture is presented by the unique traits of each of the three groups. In the following table negative as well as positive unique traits are enumerated. The unique negative traits seem as important as the positive ones. The positive occurrence of an element in two of the groups and its non-occurrence in the third group is undoubtedly of considerable cultural significance, in spite of the fact that some of the absences are environmentally determined.

TABLE 1. UNIQUE TRAITS

	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	<i>Total</i>
Maricopa	34	4	38
Pima-Papago	56	76	132
Colorado River	29	51	80

The preponderance of unique traits (132) in Pima-Papago culture indicates its aloofness from the culture of the Yuman tribes, even though it participates in the 100 positive elements which are basic to the three groups. The median position of Maricopa culture is proclaimed by the low number of unique traits (38). Colorado River Yuman culture has a relatively high number of peculiar elements (80) despite the fact that the inclusion of the Yuman Maricopa in the calculation lowers the number of peculiar elements very appreciably. The extent of this depressing Maricopa influence is indicated by the Colorado tribes sharing 235 elements (177 positive, 58 negative) with Maricopa, as against the sharing of only 181 (152 positive, 29 negative) by Maricopa and Pima-Papago. The situation is further emphasized by Maricopa having 110 positive elements and Lower Colorado tribes 121 positive elements lacking in Pima-Papago.

Leaving Maricopa out of consideration, the relative aloofness of Pima-Papago and Colorado River cultures is attested by their sharing only 104 positive elements (100 of these are the above-mentioned "universal positives") and 33 negative elements.

³ It is impossible to present the details of my count of Spier's elements here. Some of his elements were split into two or more; e.g., "bow: D-shaped; self-bow" became the elements D-shaped bow and self-bow; "breech-clout for men, kilt for women, of willowbark" became willowbark breech-clout for men, willowbark kilt for women.

Table 2 presents the details of the analysis of the data. Positive traits or presences are represented by +, negative traits or absences by -. The 100 universal positive traits are omitted. Note how the relation of shared to non-shared traits reverses in proceeding from A (Colorado, Maricopa) to C (Colorado, Pima-Papago). C bespeaks the discreteness of Lower Colorado and Pima-Papago cultures.

TABLE 2. RELATION OF PAIRS OF CULTURE GROUPS

A. Colorado, Maricopa		B. Maricopa, Pima-Papago		C. Colorado, Pima-Papago	
C + M + *	77	M + P + *	52	C + P + *	4
M + C -	89	P + M -	63	P + C -	109
C + M -	33	M + P -	110	C + P -	121
C - M -	58	M - P -	29	C - P -	33
Total shared	135	Total shared	81	Total shared	37
Total not shared	122	Total not shared	173	Total not shared	230

* Exclusive of 100 universals.

Expressing the interrelations of each pair of cultures by a percentage coefficient, the different relations are more readily perceivable. Dividing the total shared traits (positive and negative) by the total of all traits (shared and not shared), the following percentage coefficients are obtained.

Colorado, Maricopa	52.5
Maricopa, Pima-Papago	31.9
Colorado, Pima-Papago	13.9

When the 100 universal positive elements are included, the percentage coefficients, although higher, have the same ranking. Thus:

Colorado, Maricopa	65.8
Maricopa, Pima-Papago	51.1
Colorado, Pima-Papago	37.1

These percentage coefficients substantiate Professor Spier's judgment that "Maricopa culture of the historic period [was] overwhelmingly one with that of the Yumans on the Lower Colorado," but seem to negate his attempt to show that "the Pima groups on the Gila also affiliated strongly in the same direction."

Instead of a single Lower Colorado, Pima-Papago culture there would seem to be two separate cultures which abut upon one another and consequently share elements in some degree, as do adjoining cultures the world over. Pima-Papago appears to be the northern edge of a culture probably extending southward well into Mexico. Professor Spier suggests (p. 13) that "the Lower Colorado culture province should thus be expanded to include the Gila River tribes, Yuman and Piman." The analysis gives warrant for including the Gila River Yumans, but apparently not the Pimans.

Speaking of impressions, apart from statistical analyses of cultures, Professor Spier writes (pp. 13-14).

A more careful reading of the accounts of the Pimans, especially in light of my fuller understanding of Lower Colorado culture [no doubt in connection with his Maricopa work], makes it clear . . . that the Pimans should rather be grouped in the Lower Colorado province.

Focusing his work on the Maricopa he was impressed by the resemblances of Maricopa culture to both Lower Colorado and Pima-Papago cultures. What more natural then than to assume that Pima-Papago and Lower Colorado cultures constitute a single province?

My impression in working with the Papago, having earlier studied the Cocopa and Kamia of the Lower Colorado, was that Papago culture was something quite different from the River culture. Indeed, it suggested central Californian culture in certain respects. Evidently one's fields of earlier work influence the judgments formed when one works with new cultures. Well, so much for impressions.

E. W. GIFFORD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

FURTHER NOTES ON THE CULTURAL AFFILIATIONS OF NORTHERN MEXICAN NOMADS

In the *AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST* (Vol. 37, pp. 702-706, 1935) Dr M. E. Opler presents data regarding traits which he has found existing among the Apache. Although he does not specify, it is to be inferred that he refers primarily to the Chiricahua and Mescalero groups. Comment by the writer on his communication is called for only because Opler utilizes the traits he mentions to call in question suggestions contained in a recent publication on "The Comparative Ethnology of Northern Mexico before 1750."¹

Dr Opler's first point is a criticism of the north Mexican study for not including the data which he presents. If I am not mistaken, the "Ethnology of Northern Mexico" was written before Dr Opler even began his work among the Apache. Such data was nowhere available in print, I believe.

Of greater importance is Dr Opler's point that the nomadic peoples, of which he considers the Apache to have been typical for all northern Mexico, have been much more influenced by southern factors than is indicated in the "Ethnology of Northern Mexico." As he has found more traits of this character than are mentioned in the documentary evidences dating before 1750, he questions the hypothesis that cultural connections between the Southwest and Mexico were largely by way of the agricultural peoples occupying the western corridors.

Unquestionably the nomadic peoples had many more traits than are shown in "The Comparative Ethnology of Northern Mexico." Further, an attempt to draw

¹ *Ibero-Americana*: 2, Berkeley, 1932.