The Caddo

Edward R. Jelks

Timothy K. Perttula

Heritage Research Center, Stephen F. Austin State University, tkp4747@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ita

Part of the American Material Culture Commons, Archaeological Anthropology Commons, Environmental Studies Commons, Other American Studies Commons, Other Arts and Humanities Commons, Other History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons, and the United States History Commons

Tell us how this article helped you.

Cite this Record


ISSN: 2475-9333

Available at: https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ita/vol2002/iss1/20

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Regional Heritage Research at SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Index of Texas Archaeology: Open Access Gray Literature from the Lone Star State by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu.
The Caddo

Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

This article is available in Index of Texas Archaeology: Open Access Gray Literature from the Lone Star State: https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ita/vol2002/iss1/20
THE CADDO

Edward B. Jelks, with contributions by Timothy K. Perttula

This article was written in 1972 for inclusion in the Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 14, to have been published by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. For various reasons, neither the article nor the volume has appeared in print. The text of the article is essentially as originally written.

I am indebted to Tim Perttula for updating the article by making several changes in wording, by adding citations of relevant sources published since 1972, and by adding the end notes. I thank him too for arranging to have the article published in the Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology.

Ed Jelks, May 2002

SOURCES OF DATA

Knowledge of early Caddo culture comes from both archaeological and ethnographic sources. Enough archaeological research had been completed by the early 1970s to provide a fairly thorough chronology for the major pre-Columbian developments in the Caddoan area, and archaeological research has been extensive since that time (see recent general summaries in Early [2000a, n.d.] and Perttula [1996]).

Accounts of the De Soto expedition of 1541-1542 constitute the earliest source of ethnohistoric data on the Caddo. Translations of the De Soto documents may be found in Bourne (1904), Robertson (1933), Varner and Varner (1951), and more recently, Clayton et al. (1993). Some scholars think it likely that Coronado reached the edge of Caddo territory in 1541, but the consensus is strongly against that possibility (see Flint and Flint 1997). Swanton (1942:22-25) discusses the problem cogently and gives translations of pertinent excerpts from the Coronado documents. Essays in Young and Hoffman (1993) consider the route and travels of the De Soto expedition, and its effects on the Caddo groups, as does Hudson (1997).

The next descriptions of the Caddo were made by Joutel and Douay, members of La Salle’s short-lived Gulf Coast colony, in 1686 and 1687, and by Tonti, who came looking for La Salle in 1690 (Cox 1905; Foster 1998; Margry 1875-1886). Spanish efforts to establish missions among the Caddo tribes began in 1690 and continued intermittently until the 1770s. During that period, and in subsequent years prior to the Texas Revolution in 1836, many descriptions of Caddo customs and activities were recorded by mission priests, soldiers, and government officials of Spain and Mexico, the most notable being those of De Leon (Bolton 1916), Massanet (Bolton 1916), Teran de los Rios (Hatcher 1932), Casanas (1927), Espinosa (1927), Rubi (Heusinger 1936), Aguayo (Buckley 1911), Solis (1931), De Mezieres (Bolton 1914), Padilla (1919), Sanchez (1926), Berlandier (1969), and Miery Teran (Jackson 2000).

Shortly after the French settled Louisiana in 1699, they turned their attention to trading with the Caddo, and some of the traders left descriptions of them: La Harpe (Margry 1875-1886), St. Denis (Margry 1875-1886), and Gaignard (Bolton 1914). After Louisiana was ceded to Spain in 1762, the French documentation of the Caddo came to a halt.
The Anglo-American frontier, unleashed by the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, swept into Caddo territory immediately after the turn of the 19th century, and accounts of the Caddo penned by Anglo-Americans provide the major source of ethnohistoric data thereafter: Freeman and Custis (1806; see also Flores [1984]), Sibley (1832, 1922), the Austin Papers (Barker 1924), the Texas Indian Papers (Winfrey 1959-1960), Neighbors (1847), Roemer (1935), Cooper (1851), Marcy (1855), and Schoolcraft (1851-1857). In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, scholars recorded some data taken from Caddo informants (e.g., Dorsey 1905; Parsons 1941; Swanton 1942). Several major secondary sources relating to the Caddo had appeared by the mid-20th century, including Bolton (1908, 1912, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1987), Castaneda (1936-1939), Glover (1935), Griffith (1954), Koch (1925), Lesser and Weltfish (1932), Muckelroy (1923), Newcomb (1961), and Swanton (1942), and a number of more recent works have been published on the Caddo (see Carter 1995; Gregory 1973; Hickerson 1996; La Vere 1998; Lesser 1979; Newkumet and Meredith 1988; Perttula 1992; Perttula and Bruseth 1998; Sabo 1987; Smith 1995, 1996; Wedel 1978; Williams 1964; Wyckoff and Baugh 1980; see also Perttula et al. 1999 for a comprehensive bibliography on the Caddo Indians).

THE CADDIO TRIBES

The Indians known today (1976) as the Caddo are descendants of some 15 to 20 separate tribes of the 17th and 18th centuries (Figure 1). The name Caddo comprises the first two syllables of Kadohadacho, one of the original tribes, and is derived from the Caddo word ka'ede or caddi, meaning chief (Swanton 1942:5-6). Although there is considerable variation in the names of tribes ascribed to the Caddo by different 17th and 18th century observers, the records refer consistently to 14 tribes, which were then organized into three—maybe four in the beginning—separate confederacies¹, as follows:

Hasinai Confederacy (occupying the upper Neches and Angelina rivers)

- Hainai (leading tribe of the confederacy)
- Anadarko
- Nabedache
- Nacogdoche
- Nacono
- Namidish
- Nasoni
- Neche

Kadohadacho Confederacy (occupying the Great Bend area of Red River)

- Kadohadacho (leading tribe of the confederacy)
- Nanatsoho
- Nasoni
- Natchitoches

Natchitoches Confederacy (occupying the lower Red River in the vicinity of Present-day Natchitoches, Louisiana)

- Natchitoches (leading tribe of the confederacy)
- Doustoni

As indicated in the above list, there were two groups of Nasoni and two groups of Natchitoches, so that each of those tribes was divided between two of the confederacies.
These divisions were sometimes referred to respectively as Upper and Lower Nasoni and Upper and Lower Natchitoches.

Four related, but culturally divergent and more or less independent tribes were the Yatasi, Cahinnio, Hais (or Ais), and Adai. The Yatasi lived on Red River between the Kadohadacho and the Lower Natchitoches until 1717 when, after being attacked by the Chickasaw, they split into two groups, one joining the Kadohadacho Confederacy, the other the Natchitoches Confederacy. The Cahinnio, easternmost of the Caddo tribes, who lived on the upper Ouachita River in southwestern Arkansas, are linked by some reports to the Kadohadacho Confederacy.

Figure 1. Caddo settlement locations during historic times (from Derrick and Wilson 2001).
Between the Hais and the Lower Natchitoches lived the Hais in the vicinity of modern San Augustine, Texas. Home of the Adai was east of the Sabine River, between the Hais and the Lower Natchitoches. The Adai and Hais were the most culturally divergent of the Caddo tribes. The name Tejas, or Texas, was often used in reference to the Hais people, or sometimes to all the Caddo tribe collectively.

Other tribal names were identified in 16th, 17th, and 18th century documents as Caddo affiliates, but they are mentioned by only one or two observers, then are never heard of again. Just who these peoples were will probably never be known. Included among them were:

- Tula, Amaye or Maye, Guasco, Naquiscoca, Soacatino, Nacacahoz (De Soto documents)
- Daquio, Dotchetonne, Sacahaye, Chaye (Joutel)
- Capiche, Nada, Choye (Tonti)
- Guasco, Soacatino, Nechavi, Cataya, Tadivas, Nabeyeyxa, Nasayaya (Casanas)
- Nachoos (St. Denis).

ENVIRONMENT

The homeland of the historic Caddo and their prehistoric ancestors, from perhaps A.D. 700 or 800 until the end of the 18th century, was a territory of some 30,000 square miles encompassing contiguous parts of what are now eastern Texas, northern Louisiana, southwestern Arkansas, and southeastern Oklahoma (see Figure 1), in the drainages of the Red, Ouachita, Sabine, and Neches rivers. This is the extreme western edge of the southeastern forest, right at the fringe of the Plains: the western part of the Lower Austral Life Zone of the Coastal Plain Physiographic Province (Hunt 1967:100-103, 147-160).

The region is characterized by pines on the upland (mixed with oaks, sweetgum, hickory, and other broad-leafed trees in the northern part) and cypress, pecan, oaks, walnut, willow, and a variety of shrubs in lowland areas. Fauna include opossum, raccoon, deer, bear, skunk, foxes, gophers, and squirrels. Turkey, dove, quail, and migratory waterfowl are abundant and the streams carry many species of fish, turtle, and mussels. Elevation is less than 500 feet above sea level save at the northwestern edge where it rises somewhat higher, and in the Ouachita Mountains. Temperatures are moderate and annual rainfall is 40 to 60 inches in modern times. The sandy soil can be cultivated with relative ease, even with hand tools. The topography is moderately hilly. The Caddo lovingly called it “the beautiful country” (Webb 1960:35).

The Caddo’s neighbors were (going clockwise): Osage and Missouri to the north; Quapaw, Tunica, and Natchez to the east; Atakapa, Karankawa, and Bidai to the south; and the Tonkawa and the Wichita tribes (Tawakoni, Taovayas, and Kichai) to the west (see Figure 1). Thus, they were adjacent to sedentary southeastern farmers in one direction, semi-nomadic foragers of the Gulf littoral in another, and hunting-farming Plainsmen in a third. And they shared culture traits with all three.
POPULATION

Caddo censuses and population estimates are summarized in the following list. The data are from Swanton (1942:16-25), Wright (1951:53), and U.S. Department of the Interior (1971).

### Hasinai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Warriors</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>600-700</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Ramon</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4000 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Aguayo</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1378+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>De Mezieres</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Burnet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>315+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Indian Office</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Indian Office</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kadohadacho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Warriors</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>500-600</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>La Harpe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>La Harpe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>De Mezieres</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Schoolcraft</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>235+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Indian Office</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Indian Office</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natchitoches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Warriors</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>400-450</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>La Harpe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>De Mezieres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Schoolcraft</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Warriors</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Warriors</td>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>French traders</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>De Mezieres</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Muckleroy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hais

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caddo (all tribes collectively)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>538 (139 men, 156 women, 123 boys, 120 girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>525 (256 males, 269 females, and including 121 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>708 (353 males, 355 females)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>967 (479 males, 488 females)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>est. 1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3000 (including Wichita)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the above lists show clearly that between 1700 and ca. 1870 there was a consistent decline in Caddo population. After that, the trend reversed, and total population has been increasing slowly since.

**SUMMARY OF CADDOK CULTURE HISTORY**

A basic Caddo culture—the archaeological Gibson Aspect of the Mississippian tradition—became entrenched in the lower Red-Sabine-Neches region by A.D. 700-800. Some Gibson Aspect culture traits can be traced through time to the Caddo of the historic period, including maize agriculture, a distinctive ceramic technology, fronto-occipital head deformation, and trade with peoples of the American Southwest and other distant areas. Gibson Aspect peoples also erected both burial and temple mounds at large religious centers and had a well-developed ceremonialism involving elaborate paraphernalia identified with the so-called “southern cult,” archeological evidence of which has been found all across the Southeastern states. The Fulton Aspect, which superseded the Gibson Aspect at roughly A.D. 1200, continued along much the same secular lines, but religious/ceremonial emphasis declined. Figure 2 shows the locations of post-A.D. 1400
Caddo groups and archaeological phases in the Caddo archaeological area, with notably dense settlements on the Red River, the Ouachita River, the Big Cypress Creek basin, and the Neches-Angelina river basins. By the late 17th century (and possibly before De Soto's entrada in 1541), the Caddo evidently were no longer building temple or burial mounds, although they may sometimes have used mounds built by their ancestors as burial spots or as bases for houses or other structures (Suhm et al. 1954:151-227; Webb 1960:42-53; Davis 1961b).4

![Map of Caddo phases](Image)

Figure 2. Post-A.D. 1400 Caddo phases: 1, Angelina; 2, Frankston; 3, Titus; 4, Belcher; 5, Texarkana; 6, McCurtain; 7, Mid-Ouachita and Social Hill; 8, Fort Coffee.

Following the somewhat sketchy accounts of the De Soto expedition (see Hudson 1997), there are no detailed descriptions of Caddoan culture until La Salle and his followers appeared on the scene almost 150 years later (see Foster 1998; Margry 1875-1886). By then the Caddo had acquired horses and goods of European manufacture through their long-established trade routes with the Southwest.
Once the French settlers in Louisiana had opened a brisk trade with the Caddo in the early 18th century, the acculturation which had begun decades before increased greatly. French and Spanish efforts to expand their respective colonial empires caught the Caddo squarely in the middle, and exerted intense pressures which accelerated even more their adoption of European tools, clothing, weapons, religion, values, and customs. By 1762 when France ceded Louisiana to Spain, Caddo culture and society had been irremediably disrupted, not only by French and Spanish influences but also by incursions of other Indian tribes who were being forced toward the Caddo by pressure from European colonies far to the north and east. By the end of the 18th century, cultural pressures from Europeans and Indians—combined with severe epidemics of smallpox, measles, and other European diseases (see Ewers 1973; Perttula 1992, 2001; Derrick and Wilson 2001)—had reduced what was once a populous, well-adapted society to a harassed, bewildered remnant, relentlessly being pushed out of their homeland and dependent on Europeans for weapons, tools, and other necessities of life. Their political structure was disintegrating, with most of the major 18th century tribes having totally disappeared by the 1820s, leaving only three: Kadohadacho, Anadarko, and Hainai (Swanton 1942:29-121; see also Smith 1995, 1996).

In 1835 the Caddo withdrew completely from United States territory, in accordance with a treaty signed that year between the United States and several Indian tribes, and regrouped west of the Sabine River in country that had become a temporary sanctuary for refugee Choctaw, Cherokee, Alabama, Koasati (Coushatta), Biloxi, Delaware, Kickapoo, Shawnee, and other Indians from over most of eastern North America (see Everett 1990; Jurney 2001; Perttula 1993). By 1839 the Kadohadacho, Hainai, and Anadarko had moved westward to the central course of the Brazos River where they formed a close association with remnants of their old Wichita allies, the Tawakoni, Waco, and Kichai (see recent discussions on these groups by Newcomb [2001] and Parks [2001]). About 1850, keeping ahead of the White frontier, they retreated some 125 miles farther up the Brazos (Neighbors 1847; Cooper 1851; Marcy 1855; Roemer 1935:197-203; Swanton 1942:89-102).

The three Caddo tribes were put on a reservation on the upper Brazos in 1855 along with the Waco, Tawakoni, Kichai, Tonkawa, and a few Delaware (see discussion in Smith 1996); then in 1859 all the Indians on the Brazos reservation were removed to reservations in what is now western Oklahoma. The Caddo have remained there ever since except for a temporary dispersal of a small number of Caddo that relocated to southern Kansas during the American Civil War. For a while some tribal distinctions between Kadohadacho, Anadarko, and Hainai were maintained on the reservation, but by the beginning of the 20th century the distinctions had disappeared and all were known simply as Caddo.

In the middle 20th century most Caddo were Americanized ranchers and farmers, with well over half of them having mixed Indian-White blood. They lived on the Wichita-Caddo Reservation, and later allotment and trust lands when the reservation was terminated, under administration of the Anadarko Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and their children attended the local public schools along with White children.

The Caddo Indian Tribe of Oklahoma was chartered under the Indian Welfare Act of 1936, and their tribal constitution and by-laws were ratified in 1938. The principal governing body is the Caddo Tribal Council. They no longer have a chief, and are led by the tribal chairperson; in 2002 the tribal chair is LaRue Parker. The Caddo have shown keen interest in preserving their traditions and have participated for many years in the dances and ceremonies of the annual exposition at Anadarko (Swanton 1942:102-113; Wright 1951:33-34, 51-53, 156; see also Meredith 2001).
SKETCH OF CADDY CULTURE

In their general cultural pattern the Caddo were typical of the aboriginal farmers of the southeastern United States region, but they also shared in some typical Plains traits, for example: intensive bison hunting, grass-thatched houses like those of the Wichita, the use of skin tents while on the hunt, bison scapula hoes, and snub-nosed end scrapers of chipped stone. Their linguistic affinities lay with the Plains area too.

Settlement Pattern

Most Caddos lived in tiny hamlets scattered a quarter of a mile to a mile apart, one hamlet having perhaps 10 to 12 dwellings, each housing several nuclear families. Each hamlet farmed its surrounding fields. The hamlets of a particular tribe occupied, on the average, an area some 10 to 30 miles across, within which was a central town that served as a ceremonial center and wherein dwelled the tribal chief (Bolton 1908:270-271; Cox 1905, Vol. 1:232; Hidalgo 1927:56).

Language

The language spoken by the Caddo was included by Powell (1891:45-46, 58-62) in the Caddoan linguistic stock, along with the languages of the Kichai, Wichita, Tawakoni, Waco, Pawnee, and Arikara. Caddoan has continued to be recognized as a major North Americans linguistic stock or family by specialists (e.g., Lesser and Weltfish 1932; Voegelin 1941:26; Driver 1969:44), all of whom include the languages of the Wichita, Pawnee, and Arikara in the stock along with that of the Caddo (see also Goddard 1996).

There were dialectic differences between the different Caddo tribes but they were minor; consequently a member of one tribe usually had no difficulty talking to a member of another, save for the Adai and the Hais, each of which spoke a language mutually unintelligible to any of the other tribes. The Caddo were adept at sign language which they used for communicating with non-Caddos such as their Wichita friends. They also are reported to have used smoke signals with great effectiveness for transmitting messages quickly from tribe to tribe across long distances (Swanton 1942:176, 190).

Political Organization

Each tribe had its own chief or caddi, and each of the confederacies had a grand chief or xinesi. The latter, who inherited his office through direct line of descent from father to eldest son, was greatly revered and feared but had little real political power. Seemingly his primary function was ceremonial: to keep a perpetual fire going in the central temple of the confederacy, to act as an oracle, and to perform other priestly duties on behalf of all the confederates tribes.

The tribal chiefs, whose office was also hereditary, settled disputes, scheduled ceremonies, and handled other intra-tribal matters, often after counseling with sub-chiefs and tribal elders. War chiefs were elected popularly.

Political bonds between the tribes of a confederacy were quite loose, and apparently there were none at all between the three confederacies. Most matters of governance were resolved at the tribal level by the chief, by lesser officials, or often, no doubt, by heads of kin groups (Casanas 1927:215-216, 218, 286; Espinosa 1927:160, 175-176; Swanton 1942:170-173; Griffith 1954:59-67; Newcomb 1961:303-304).
Food

The Caddo subsisted primarily on agricultural products: two varieties of maize (early and late maturing), pumpkins, sunflower seeds, and five or six kinds of beans. Men and women collaborated in preparing the fields for planting, but the planting, cultivating, and harvesting were done entirely by women. Hoes with wooden or bison scapula blades were the principal agricultural tool.

Bison and deer provided most of their meat, but other mammals were also eaten, including bear and rabbit. After horses had been acquired the men went on at least one hunting expedition every year into bison country to the west, usually in winter, and brought home sun-dried meat and hides in large quantities. In earlier times they presumably conducted bison hunts on foot. Deer may have furnished as much meat as bison, especially in pre-horse days. Fish were a staple item of diet, as were prairie chicken, ducks, geese, turkeys, cranes, and various small birds.

Large game was hunted with the bow and arrow, fish were caught on trotlines, and though there is little ethnohistoric data about them, snares, traps, and nets must have been utilized for catching fish, birds, and small game. Women seasonally collected such wild vegetal foods as acorns, nuts, seeds, grapes, berries, roots, and fruits, often in large quantities.

Fresh maize was roasted or boiled. Dried maize and acorns were reduced to meal by pounding in deep wooden mortars made from hollowed-out tree trunks and the meal made into bread and porridge. Meat was boiled and roasted. Tamales made from whole or ground maize were a favorite, as was succotash compounded of maize, beans, and other vegetables. Salt and bear fat were added to many dishes for seasoning.

Most food was cooked in earthenware vessels. Diners were served individually in earthenware bowls and shallow baskets from which they ate with the fingers.

While occasional crop failures from droughts or other crises inevitably must have put them on short rations at times, the Caddo generally had an abundant food supply. Farm produce, acorns, nuts, and the like were stored in large reed baskets, and a two-year supply of seeds for planting was carefully preserved, even through times of famine (Mangry 1875-1886, Vol. 3:367, 394-395, 466-469; Casanas 1927:211, 217; Espinosa 1927:152-157; Hidalgo 1927:56; Solis 1931:43; Morfi 1932:44; Swanton 1942:127; Griffith 1954:107-120; Newcomb 1961:292-294).

Domesticated Animals

The Caddo’s only domesticated animal was a kind of sharp-nosed dog that was used for hunting, although his role in the hunt was not explained. Apparently dogs were eaten rarely on ceremonial occasions or in times of famine (Griffith 1954:108; Swanton 1942:134). In prehistoric Caddo archaeological sites, dogs were sometimes placed in their own graves, but other evidence suggests they were occasionally eaten for food.

Dress and Appearance

Clothing, mostly of deerskin, was typically Southeastern. Men wore breech clouts and went barefoot in warm weather, and donned shirts, leggings, moccasins, or occasionally bison-skin cloaks in winter. Women wore grass breech clouts under deer skin skirts and poncho-like blouses. Clothing was heavily ornamented with painted designs,
fringes, feathers, and beads. Textiles and mulberry-bark cloth probably were used for clothing despite the lack of references to either.

Both sexes tattooed their faces, breasts, and shoulders by rubbing charcoal into pricked designs, each tribe having its own design motifs. Hair styles varied from tribe to tribe. Fronto-occipital head deformation was practiced (see Derrick and Wilson 1997), and body hair was commonly removed. The body was decorated profusely with hair feathers, fur strips, bracelets, necklaces, gorgets, nose ornaments, ear plugs, and the like (Casanas 1927:213-214, 285; Espinosa 1927:176-177; Solis 1931:42, 60; Margry 1875-1886:349; Swanton 1942:140-148; Griffith 1954:97-98; Newcomb 1961:289-290; Jackson 2000:77).

Manufactures, Crafts, and Arts

Archaeological studies have shown that before trade with Europeans began, the Caddo knapped knives, scraping tools, arrow points, and other cutting and piercing tools from siliceous stones, shaped celts (probably for hewing wood) from various hard stones by pecking and grinding, and sharpened splinters of bone into awl-like tools that evidently were used for sewing skins and weaving baskets and mats. Mussel shells served as spoons and hoe blades. Bison scapulas were also used for hoe blades, and deer ulnas were shaped into spatulate flint knapping tools. Flat slabs of sandstone became nether stones on which maize and other seeds were ground into meal with loaf-shaped hand stones or manos.

A variety of personal ornaments—beads, pendants, gorgets, and ear plugs—was fashioned from marine shells, freshwater mussel shells, bone, quartz, ochre, native copper (imported from the Great Lakes region), and other materials. Tobacco pipes were made of both stone and earthenware. Earthenware vessels were made in many shapes and sizes, most of them beautifully decorated with pleasing designs executed by incising, punctating, applique, engraving, excising, or modeling. Ceramic art of the Southeastern Indians surely reached its peak among the Caddo (see Suhm et al. 1954:151-227; Webb 1960:48-53; a few of the more recent summary studies of Caddo Indian ceramics include Schambach and Miller 1984; Early 1988, 1993; Perttula et al. 1995; Kelley 1997).

Manufactures, crafts, and arts documented by historical accounts include: wooden hoes, boxes, benches, statues, drums, mortars and pestles, fire drills, fire tongs, bows, dugout canoes, and notched musical rasps; clothing and robes made of deer and bison skin and woven cloth; a great variety of baskets and mats woven from reeds and fibers; bark cordage; gourd musical rattles; bird bone flageolets; artistic feather work both for personal adornment and for embellishing ceremonial paraphernalia; painted designs on clothing and mats; and body painting and tattooing. The Caddo were renowned among Europeans for the colorful decorations with which they adorned their clothing, utensils, tools, and accouterments (Bolton 1916:378; Casanas 1927:212-217, 291; Espinosa 1927:151, 160-169, 173-174, 177; Hidalgo 1927:56; Margry 1875-1886, Vol. 3:353, Vol. 5:467-469; Swanton 1942:154-159; Griffith 1954:103-107; Newcomb 1961:297-298).

Architecture

Caddo houses typically were tall, circular, grass-thatched structures with the door facing east, virtually identical to those of the Wichita tribes. They were framed by first implanting the butts of slender, trimmed tree trunks in the ground one to three feet apart to form a circle some 40 to 60 feet in diameter, then bending their tops inward to the center of the circle and binding them together.8 Horizontal laths were then tied onto the upright poles and a heavy layer of grass thatch lashed to them. The completed houses were some 40 to 50 feet high. Smoke from a centrally located fireplace either diffused through the thatch or exited through a smokehole in the roof. Archaeological evidence indicates that the walls of
some prehistoric Caddo houses were plastered with mud (see Early 2000b; Jelks and Tunnell 1959; Webb 1959), a construction method also employed between 1868 and 1872 (see Swanton 1942:Plate 14). Plastering is not mentioned, however, in documentary sources.

Beds were arranged around part of the interior house wall, separated from one another with skin curtains. Robes of deer or bison skin served as mattresses and coverings. Shelves along the rest of the wall space held large baskets and pottery vessels in which maize, beans, acorns, and other comestibles were stored. Seed maize in the shuck was strong on poles above the fireplace where smoke safeguarded it from vermin.

Outbuildings were grouped around the dwellings: high platforms for storing grain and open-sided sheds with a raised floor two or three feet off the ground. Public buildings included temples built like dwellings, but larger, and assembly houses where warriors lived while preparing for military expeditions (Margry 1875-1886:345, 393-394; Cox 1905; Bolton 1916:378; Espinosa 1927:154-155, 160; Hidalgo 1927:52; Roemer 1935:200; Webb 1940; Swanton 1942:148-154; Griffith 1954:99-102; Suhm et al. 1954:187-213; Newcomb 1961:294-297; Wilmsen 1961).

Trade

The prehistoric Caddo had artifacts made of copper, turquoise, obsidian, marine shells, and other exotic materials, the sources of which were hundreds of miles distant (see Brown 1983, 1996; Schambach 2000). Because of the pre-existing trade system, the Caddo acquired horses and manufactured goods from Spanish settlements in Mexico and New Mexico well before the end of the 17th century. In the 17th and 18th centuries they were trading bows made of highly prized bois d’arc wood, which grew locally, to both the east and the west; they were also engaged in trading salt (see Early 1993; Schambach 2000; Kenmotsu 2001).

Throughout the 18th century intensive trade was carried on with the French of Louisiana, from whom the Caddo obtained guns, metal tools, glass beads, and other goods in exchange for horses and animal hides (Cox 1905, Vol. 1:48, 232-235; Bolton 1914, Vol. 1:132-136, 139-140, 143-146, 149-150; Casanas 1927:285; Solis 1931:61, 67; Swanton 1942:192-203; Griffith 1954:122-123, 146-151; Suhm et al. 1954:161-227).

Warfare

Before Europeans appeared the Caddo evidently were on peaceful terms with most of their neighbors but carried on warfare with some traditional enemies, primarily for gaining personal prestige through the taking of scalps, heads, and prisoners. They later turned to stealing horses from the Spanish settlements and from various Indian tribes to trade for guns, iron tools, and other commodities with the French.

The Caddo were highly respected as fighting men by Europeans, who reported them to be experts with bow and arrow, musket, dagger, sword, and lance. For protection in battle they wore helmets and jackets of leather and carried shields of the same material. They fought under the leadership of popularly elected captains (Margry 1875-1886, Vol. 3:354-355, 374-381; Casanas 1927:217; Espinosa 1927:174; Hidalgo 1927:57; Solis 1931:42-43; Morfi 1932:50, 53; Swanton 1942:184-192; Griffith 1954:125-133; Newcomb 1961:306-308).
Religion

Few details about Caddo religious beliefs have been recorded and preserved, but it is known that they believed in a supreme being, the "chief in the sky," and in an afterlife. The focus of religious activity was a temple administered by the grand chief where a perpetual fire was kept burning, the source of all household fires in the community (see a recent consideration by Sabo 1998).

Ceremonies and rituals—most of them partly religious, partly social in function—were associated with many activities: hunting, warfare, planting and harvesting crops, greeting visitors, burying the dead, and consecrating houses and agricultural tools. Most ceremonies were conducted by shamans and chiefs. Tobacco and peyote were used in some of them (Margry 1875-1886:400-401; Casanas 1927:284, 301-302; Espinosa 1927:158-164, 168-175, 290-292; Hidalgo 1927:52; Swanton 1942:203-219, 226-234; Griffith 1954:69-87; Newcomb 1961:308-313).

Social Status

The bulk of Caddo society was essentially egalitarian. However, there was some stratification—chiefs, subchiefs, petty officials, shamans, and perhaps renowned warriors having special statuses. Chiefs were exalted and clearly were thought to possess some measure of divinity (Griffith 1954:67-68).

Marriage

Marriage of a previously unwed woman was effected by her family's acceptance of gifts left at the door by the prospective groom. There was no formal ceremony. If a man and a previously married woman wished to be married they simply began living together. Marriages were usually monogamous, though both polygyny and polyandry were known. Marriages tended to be unstable as either spouse could terminate a marriage at will by just moving out (Casanas 1927:283-284; Espinosa 1927:164-165; Morfi 1932:44-45; Swanton 1942:160-162; Griffith 1954:92-93; Newcomb 1961:300-301).

Division of Labor


Kinship

The original kinship system of the Caddo was not recorded, but some of its features can be reconstructed confidently. The Kadohadacho of the 17th and 18th centuries had four social groupings identified respectively with the totem animals beaver, otter, wolf, and lion (Morfi 1932:6). In the late 19th century Mooney (1896:1093) reported 10 totems—eagle, raccoon, crow, thunder, panther, bear, wolf, buffalo, beaver, and sun—remembered by informants as having formerly been associated with clan-like social divisions. There is no proof that they were exogamous.

Descent seems to have been reckoned matrilineally, and a married couple apparently lived with the bride's family, at least temporarily. The several nuclear families reported to have occupied each house in the 17th and 18th centuries probably constituted extended
families, and each hamlet made up of several houses may have been the locus of a related group (Spier 1924; Swanton 1931, 1942:163-169; Morris 1932:6, 26; Newcomb 1961:304-306).

SUMMARY

The Caddo lived in their "beautiful country" for a thousand years or more. Throughout their millennium of independence they maintained a highly developed, stable culture—one with a sound economic base, an efficient technology, a sophisticated art, and a rich ceremonialsim. Then, suddenly, they found themselves caught up as a pawn in the machinations of Spain and France as those two nations vied for control of the Texas-Louisiana region, and they saw the fabric of their society sundered by the irresistible forces of international politics. But though decimated, they have survived tenaciously (see Carter 1995).

In the end Caddo, French, and Spanish culture alike gave way to modern American culture—a hybrid culture synthesized largely from European, Indian, and African constituents which developed its own distinctive configuration. As the first quarter of the 21st century begins, the Caddo—an integral part of that American culture—continue in their efforts to improve their social and economic status within it, while, at the same time, strengthening consciousness of their Indian heritage.

END NOTES

1. The general consensus by Caddo scholars today is that the term "confederacy" is not an appropriate term for the relationship of tribes within each of the larger Kadohadacho, Hasinai, and Natchitoches groups. Instead, it may be more appropriate to refer to these relationships as "alliances," based on kin relations. Lee (2001:15-16) suggests that a model of daughter communities affiliated with core groups, the latter known by the terms Kadohadacho and Haisai, and the daughter Caddo groups are not "individual, autonomous groups, these east/west daughter communities maintain relations to each other, and seem to be affiliated with one core or the other. But, they are kin, not confederates."

2. Corbin et al. (1980, 1990) summarizes extensive archaeological investigations at Mission Dolores de los Ais in San Augustine, built by Spanish missionaries in the second decade of the 18th century for the Ais or Hais tribe.

3. Thomas N. Campbell has prepared numerous summaries for the 1996 New Handbook of Texas (published by the Texas State Historical Association) on many other Caddo tribal names and associated ethnographic and historical information on them (see listing in Perttula et al. 1999:47-48).

4. The terms Gibson Aspect and Fulton Aspect are no longer employed by Caddo archaeological researchers. In Northeast Texas, the chronological framework proposed by Story (1990) is most commonly used, namely: Formative Caddoan (A.D. 800-1000); Early Caddoan (A.D. 1000-1200); Middle Caddoan (A.D. 1200-1400); Late Caddoan (ca. A.D. 1400-1680); and Historic Caddoan (A.D. 1680-1860+). The Formative, Early, and Middle Caddoan periods of Story (1990) are roughly coeval with the older Gibson Aspect, and the Late Caddoan period is generally the same chronologically as sites that were identified as Fulton Aspect in the 1950s and 1960s.
5. Unless otherwise indicated, the culture elements described in this section are traditional ones that survived into the 18th century. Most source material is based on observations of the Hasinai and, to a lesser extent, the Kadohadacho, by Spaniards and Frenchmen; primary data on the Natchitoches Confederacy are meager. This account is generalized for all the Caddoan tribes, although most contemporary observations were on specific tribes [this end note accompanied the original 1972 MS prepared by Jelks].

6. Archaeological evidence for the cultivation of maize, beans, and squash, sunflowers, and other weedy annuals is relatively abundant in sites investigated across the Caddoan archaeological area. However, maize is poorly represented in the archaeological record before ca. A.D. 700-900, and it appears to be the case that although maize is present among prehistoric Caddo groups, it did not become the most important and primary plant food resource until after ca. A.D. 1200-1300 (Perttula 1996:314-322).

7. The archaeological record also suggests that a wide variety of animals were procured and eaten by the Caddo groups. Deer, turkey, and aquatic species were the most important resources, although riverine and aquatic species (especially catfish, gar, and freshwater drum) were more abundant and commonly used by Caddo groups living in the Red River valley. Caddo sites found outside of the major southeastern floodplain habitats are characterized by woodland and forest-edge terrestrial species, with little use of aquatic resources (Perttula 1996:318). Bison is rarely represented in Caddo archaeological sites outside of the Arkansas River basin in eastern Oklahoma, and in that area, the relative abundance of bison increased fourfold between A.D. 1200-1450 and A.D. 1450-1600 (Wyckoff 1980).

8. In archaeological contexts, most prehistoric and early historic Caddo house structures may be only 6-9 m (20-30 feet) in diameter, although they almost always have a central hearth with an underlying posthole. They also do not always face east, as in historic times. One 18 m structure has been reported from underneath Mound B at the George C. Davis site (Story 1997:72), and others of similar size have been documented under Mound A at the same site (Story 1997, 1998). Structures in the village were considerably smaller than those under the mounds, suggesting the mound structures were special-purpose or public buildings. Prehistoric Caddo structures were not always circular, as rectangular and square structures have been reported from various archaeological sites across the Caddo archaeological area (see Early 2000b).

9. There is archaeological evidence to suggest that the Caddo were engaged in long-distance exchange of items such as salt and bois d'arc, and many other items, as early as ca. A.D. 1000. The period between A.D. 1000-1300 may have been the epogee of the Caddo long-distance trade network. Salt production and salt trade became common among certain prehistoric Caddo groups between A.D. 1200-1600 (see Early 1993; Kenmotsu 2001).

10. There is almost no concrete evidence in the archaeological record for warfare or violent conflict between the Caddos and other peoples. Obviously in historic times there were conflicts between the Caddo peoples and their neighbors. These conflicts were rarely battles with large numbers of casualties on either side.

11. To date, no Caddo archaeological sites have been found where tobacco was definitely being grown and used, despite the fact that almost all prehistoric and early historic Caddo sites have clay pipe and pipe sherd fragments. Charred tobacco seeds are very small, and quite difficult to recover in soil samples, however, without the use of very fine mesh and extensive flotation recovery. Peyote also has not been found in Caddo archaeological contexts, but circular scroll stylistic motifs on certain Ripley Engraved
vessels (Thurmond 1990:Figure 6c, e) closely resemble peyote buttons (see Tunnell 2000:Figure 1) and peyote symbolism (Curtis Tunnell, July 6, 2000, personal communication via e-mail with Timothy K. Perttula). This information suggests that Late Caddoan Titus phase groups may have been using peyote as early as ca. A.D. 1400-1450.
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