The Proto-Mixteco kinship system

C. Henry Bradley
SIL-UND

The Proto-Mixteco Kinship System

C. Henry Bradley

Permanent records lasting generations, centuries, and millennia are seldom, if ever, kept by non-literate people. Because of this fact, anyone who is interested in the history of culture change is seriously handicapped. But this handicap can be overcome to some extent in certain areas. Sapir (1916) has very ably shown that in spite of the lack of documentary evidence valid inferences about earlier periods can be drawn from vestigial remains found in the life-ways and speech of any group of people. Prior to the time in which Sapir wrote, certain European scholars had suggested that some aspects of a previous stage of culture could be inferred from reconstructed linguistic forms. Thus the "Wörter-und-Sachen" technique was applied by Delbrück (1889) in the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European kinship system. Since that time our knowledge of the methods of linguistic reconstruction and our experience in reconstructing proto-kinship systems have increased. Kroeber (1937) was one of the first to apply this method to the problem of reconstructing the kinship system of an American Indian group. He has since been followed by Shimkin (1941), Hoijer (1956), and Matthews (1959).

Kroeber realized the importance of basing this kind of a study on linguistic evidence when he said, "To be sure, philologists mainly reconstruct the forms or sounds of words, and only secondarily their meanings; and we have in culture relatively little material so sharply formalized as to lend itself to comparisons as exact as that of language forms" (1937:607). His attempt to reconstruct the Proto-Athapaskan kinship system was really only a pilot study. It has since been modified and elaborated by Hoijer. Shimkin's study also was experimental in the sense that he reconstructed the lexical and conceptual categories of the Proto-Uto-Aztecan kinship system by building on the basic linguistic work of Sapir and Whorf. With Hoijer's elaboration of Kroeber's work and Matthew's Proto-Siouan reconstruction a method has become fairly well delineated by which proto-kinship systems can be reconstructed.

Recently Murdock (1949) has developed another theory which

leads to reconstructing earlier stages in the history of a given kin-
ship system by means of a theory of social change. He has traced the
development of a number of kinship systems and found them to follow
certain lines of development according to their type. This procedure
was tested with Southern Athapaskan material by Charles B. White
(1957). His conclusions differed from those of Kroeber and Hoijer,
and suggested that the application of the Murdock method yielded
results that were more in line with the social facts. However, this
position has been refuted by Hymes and Driver who believe that "the
role of culture contact greatly reduces the probability of any long-
range internal reconstruction of kinship systems, apart from linguistic
and other ethnological evidence" (1958:153).

In order to avoid the serious pitfall observed by Hymes and
Driver, I have here attempted to reconstruct the Proto-Mixteco (here-
after abbreviated PM) kinship system by using the first of these two
methods, viz. the comparative method of linguistic reconstruction.
This study, however, involves not only a reconstruction of the
linguistic forms of the kinship system but also a reconstruction of
the kin types which they represent. The procedures for attacking the
problem are two: first, the cognate kin terms from each of the daughter
languages are brought together in order to determine the form and
meaning of the original PM word for each set of cognates, and second,
a comparison of the kinship categories represented by each recon-
structed term in the daughter languages is made. Each comparison
suggests one or more hypotheses about the pattern of kin groups
characteristic for PM. In this way somewhat more precise information
is given on the PM kinship system than could be gained from the
cognate sets alone. (Hoijer 1956:308) The major criterion used for
determining the extent of the kinship categories represented by each
reconstructed form is the distribution of the form and the kinship
category or categories associated with the form in the daughter
languages. A restricted distribution suggests that the term is local
and the result of later developments.

The procedure adopted here is to divide the kinship terms into
two sets, first, on the basis of the distinction between consanguineal
and affinal terms and, then, on the basis of generation distinctions

(which is the most important single dimension of the system within the
consanguineal set); to present within each section, along with dis-
cussion, charts showing the distribution of the reconstructed terms
from the four dialects and the kin types signified by each of these
terms; to reconstruct the proto-terms along with their meanings for
each set; to trace the changes which have taken place between the proto-
system and the four contemporary daughter systems; and to describe
briefly the kinds of changes which have taken place; and to discuss
briefly some possible cause of these changes. (In the discussion which
follows I have used for the most part standard abbreviations to desig-
nate kin types, e.g. FaBr is paternal uncle, etc. But there are a few
cases where I may have departed from conventional usage and developed
a few special classificatory abbreviations for use here. They are
GrPa for grandparent, Co for cousin, -m for male, -f for female, Pa
for parent, Ch for child, and Sp for spouse. The -m and -f are suffixed
only to Co to indicate the sex of the cousin when it is significant.
When the sex of Co is obvious, as in CoWi, sex is not indicated.)

LINGUISTIC AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Today the Mixteco language is spoken by approximately 250,000
people, most of whom live in the state of Oaxaca, Mexico. The outlying
edges of the territory occupied by the Mixtecos reach into the
neighboring states of Puebla and Guerrero. Although my data do not
give as wide a cross-section of Mixtec kinship systems as I would like,
four mutually unintelligible dialects from different parts of the area
are represented. San Miguel (SM) is located in the
middle of the Mixtec area in the district of Tlaxiaco, Metlatonoc (M)
on the western fringe in Guerrero, Ayutla (A) in the southwestern
corner of the area in Guerrero, and Jicaltepec (J) on the southern
extremity just across the Guerrero border in Oaxaca. Dialect A is
separated from dialect J by the area occupied by the Amuzgo. [Mixtec,
Cuicatec, and Trique (the latter two also located in Oaxaca) form the
Mixtecan language family (Mc uown 1955:531); at an earlier horizon
Amuzgo split away from the common source to form a separate branch
of Macro-Mixtecan parallel with Mixtecan (Longacre 1957:1-3).] Unfor-
tunately, data from three other important dialects are not available
and until they are, the conclusions drawn in this paper are extremely

tentative. The missing dialects are: Peñoles on the eastern edge of the Mixtec region in Oaxaca, Tonahuixtla on the northern fringe in Puebla, and San Juan Coatzospan-Cuyamecalco isolated and completely surrounded by Mazatec speakers in the northeastern corner of Oaxaca. (This last mentioned dialect is extremely important since it has been isolated from the rest of the Mixteco-speaking people since before the time of the Spanish conquest. It could very well preserve evidence which has been lost in the other dialects since it has been unaffected by changes which have taken place in the Mixteco region itself. Of course, it is possible that other changes have obliterated any witness that this dialect could give.)

Mak and Longacre (1960) have worked out the sound correspondences in Proto-Mixteco ultimate syllables and I have based this study on their work. For the most part, information which they give about the reconstruction of ultimate syllables is valid also for a large number of penultimate and pre-tonic syllables and some of these syllables are reconstructed here. In a few cases, some doubt remains concerning the shape which these forms are to take but in no case is the reconstruction of the form itself questionable. Since the Mak-Longacre study does not include the reconstruction of tone, it is not marked here. Although all Mixteco kinship terms are obligatorily marked for possession in the daughter languages, usually by a post-posed possessive pronoun, I will cite the forms without their possessive marker. I have made no attempt to reconstruct terms of address, and ritual terms (which have been introduced through the influence of the Roman Catholic church since the time of the conquest).

Today the Mixtecos are organized into, at least, two kinds of territorial grouping--the village and the ranch. These two types are distinguished by the fact that the village is a compact socio-political and territorial unit (not part of any other larger indigenous unit) whereas the ranch is a relatively isolated territorial unit dependent on a socio-political center. The ranch type organization is found largely in the area from which groups showing the village type reputedly emigrated some six or seven centuries ago (Holland 1959:31).

On the ranch the play group is limited to the child, his

siblings, and the children of his paternal uncle (since residence is patrilocal). Only seldom does the child, then, come into contact with other children or adults not of his own ranch. On the other hand, in the village the play group has a somewhat broader base. The child plays principally with his own siblings and the children of any paternal uncle who happens to be living in patrilocal residence. Little difficulty is found in maintaining patrilocal residence on the ranch where there is a lot of room, but in the compact village younger brothers and now sons are often forced into neolocal residence, since there is no more room for new buildings around the father's house. The village child, as a result, plays first with his own relatives but quickly includes in his play group children of his nearest neighbors; he also has contact with a wider range of adults than does a ranch child. The difference in the socialization of the child may have been part of the cause for a difference in cousin terminology between the two areas (c.f. Change in Mixteco Kinship Systems).

The kinship terms reconstructed here hark back to roughly 1000 A.D. Undoubtedly the Mixtecos of that period shared some of the Meso-American traits elaborated by Steward (1955) for the incipient stages of the period of regional development and florescence, such as, the rise of multicommunity states, the development of a class-structured society, etc. But there are no kinship data available for that early period and what is available for later periods is random and scanty. Dahlgren's collation (1953) of the historical sources contains as much material as is found in them. Apparently very little information on the kin group aspects of the social life of the Mixtecos was recorded by the friars and early Spanish historians. Therefore, we know very little about the previous social organization of these people into family or other larger kin groups. At any rate a complement of kinship terms reconstructs which are not too different in form or kin type designation from some contemporary daughter systems even though during the intervening period of time a great number of social changes have taken place.

TERMS IN THE GRANDPARENT GENERATION

Two terms reconstruct in the grandparent generation as

attested by M and A. SM has borrowed terms, possibly from Aztec (<u>tata</u>
<u>ñuu</u> and <u>nana ñuu</u>, respectively); they cover the same area of semantic
space as the A terms. The attribute <u>ñuu</u> is of Mixtec origin. J, on
the other hand, has coined a completely new expression, <u>sutu čaʔnu</u>; both terms
reconstruct on the same early horizon as do the other reconstructed
kinship terms. They represent, therefore, either the use of two
dialectical variants in the early period or a subsequent coinage using
two words which date back to that early horizon. In addition, the
range of kin type designation is more restricted than in the other
dialects. <u>sutu čaʔnu</u> and <u>siʔi čaʔnu</u> mean only FaFa/MoFa and FaMo/
MoMo respectively; they are not extended to include GrPr siblings
and cousins.

Table 1. Distribution of Kinship Terms in Grandparent
Generation

Dialect	FaFa/MoFa	GrPaBr	GrPaCom	FaMo/MoMo	GrPaSi	GrPaCof
SM	tata ñuu	tata ñuu		nana ñuu	nana ñuu	
M	a	a	a	b	b	b
A	a	a		b	b	
J	sutu čaʔnu	e	e	d + čaʔnu	f	f

Table 1 indicates the range of meaning (kin type designation)
for each term in the four dialects. From it the meanings of the two
reconstructed terms are inferred. (A blank space in a table indicates
that the description of the particular daughter system is uncertain,
c.f. SM for GrPaCom. Silence on the part of the investigator seems
to indicate that the meaning of the term does not extend beyond that
given in the description. Lower case letters in a table refer to the
etymologies given at the end of the paper.)

The table shows that two inferences for the reconstruction of
meaning of the terms are possible. Either the proto-terms *Əii and
*Əitą meant only FaFa/MoFa and FaMo/MoMo, respectively, and GrPa
siblings and/or cousins were indicated by other terms as in J, or
*Əii and *Əitą had the wider range of meaning including GrPa siblings
and cousins which M suggests. (The intermediate possibility, limiting
the range of meaning of these terms to GrPa siblings excluding GrPa

cousins would be tenuous, since it would be based on silence--the
people reporting on those dialects did not tell us.) Since the
differences shown by J are restricted to this dialect alone and it
is on the southern fringe of the area, I assume that the differences
are innovations developed by this dialect alone. In contrast M (and
possibly A) are extremely conservative, maintaining the PM system
here without change.

TERMS IN THE PARENT GENERATION

Four terms reconstruct in the parent generation as attested
by M and A for *yuva, M, A, and J for *ɵiʔi, and all four dialects
for *ɵito and *ɵiɵi. In addition to the dimension of sex which was
the characteristic distinguishing the two terms found in the grand-
parent generation, a second dimension distinguishing lineal and non-
lineal relatives is found here. Again SM has borrowed, possibly
from Aztec, but this time without modification. Apparently the
borrowed naa and taa of SM are being extended to M and A but not to
J, c.f. the variants cited in etymologies c and d. sutu, the unmodi-
fied dialectical variant of *yuva, occurs in J.

Table 2 shows the distribution of these four terms with their
kin types in each of the dialects. In this case the reconstruction
of kin types is relatively straightforward, since there is no conflict
in any of the daughter dialects.

Table 2. Distribution of Kinship Terms in Parent Generation

Dialect	Fa	PaBr/PaCom	Mo	PaSi/PaCof
SM	taa	e	naa	f
M	c (~tata)	e	d (~nana)	f
A	c (~tata)	e	d (~nana)	f
J	sutu	e	d	f

Only one inference is possible for the meaning of each of the
four terms reconstructed in the parent generation; *yuva means Fa,
*ɵiʔi means Mo, *ɵito means PaBr/PaCom, and *ɵiɵi means PaSi/PaCof.
(The last two terms designate other kin types as well, but these are
not demonstrated until affinal terminology is discussed.) Therefore,

except for the SM and J form for Fa and the SM form for Mo, the daughter systems show no change from the parent PM system.

TERMS IN EGO'S GENERATION

Three terms reconstruct for ego's generation as attested by all four dialects for *yani and *k^Wa?a and by SM, M, and J for *ku?vi. A fourth term *ta̰?a̰ "companion" is reconstructed for PM but it is not to be considered within the universe of kinship terminology as present-day SM and J indicate. Two dimensions--distinct from the two which were found in the parent generation--operate on this level. They are sex of ego and sex of referent. (Stated another way, it could be called sex of ego relative to the sex of referent. But to be exact the sex of either ego or the sex of the referent would have to be explicitly stated in addition, with no resultant gain.) The proto-terms are arrayed in the following matrix table:

		Sex of Referent	
		male	female
Sex of Ego	male	*yani	*k^Wa?a
	female	*k^Wa?a	*ku?vi

The kin types to which these three types refer are established by a different configuration of the witnesses in all three cases. First, that *yani means Br(ms)/Com(ms) is established by SM, M, and A. Second, SM, M, and J witness to the establishment of *k^Wa?a as Br(ws)/Si(ms) and *ku?vi as Si(ws). Third, SM and M (with only the slightest inference from A) show that the meaning of these terms extends to cover Com(ws)/Cof(ms) and Cof(ws), respectively, as well. (Here ms indicates a male ego and ws a female ego.)

Therefore, SM and M reflect without change the form of the proto-system at this point. In A *ku?vi was lost and *k^Wa?a replaced it assuming its kin types and in turn *ta̰?a̰, the replacement of *k^Wa?a, took on the kin types to which it formerly referred. In J the three terms were restricted to their respective sibling referents alone and *θahḭ took over the classificatory kin type Co. These developments are cataloged in Table 3. (A hyphen in a table indicates that no term is used to represent the kinship category in question.)

Table 3. Distribution of Kinship Terms in Ego's Generation

Dialect	Br(ms)	Com(ms)	Br(ws)/Si(ms)	Com(ws)/Cof(ms)	Si(ws)	Cof(ws)	Co
SM	g	g	i	i	h	h	-
M	g	g	i	i	h	h	-
A	g	g	i'	i'	i	i	-
J	g	-	i	-	h	-	k

Catholic missionaries writing in the 16th century give brief but corroborative documentary evidence that the system described for PM, SM, and M was the system in use during their contacts with the Mixtecs. Fray Antonio de los Reyes observed that "pocas veces vsan los naturales de estos terminos de primos o primas segundas, su mas comun modo es llamarse todos hermanos aunque sean primos." (1593:87) On the other hand, the recent comment made by Dahlgren seems to be without basis. Although he says that "para algunos de los grados de parientes más cercanos como hermano, hermana, primo y prima hay distintos términos, según el sexo del que habla. De los hermanos se distinguía, además, entre primogénitos, mayores, menores, y bejamines" (1954:157). No report shows that present-d y dialects make such distinctions in ego's generation. Of course, what Dahlgren was aiming at in her first statement here is the sex of ego and the sex of referent described earlier in this section. Her second statement is not true for the dialects represented in this paper nor is there any inference of its being true for an earlier period. This is not to say that such a discrimination cannot be made, but if made, it is not with elementary kinship terms but rather is a construction whose "total equals the sum of its parts."

TERMS IN THE CHILD GENERATION

Again, three terms reconstruct in the child generation but they are distinguished along different dimensions. *Өa?yu is lineal and makes no sex distinction whereas *Өahi̧ refers to a male collateral and *Өiku to a female collateral. All four dialects testify to *Өa?yu and *Өahi̧ but only SM, M, and A to *Өiku. Table 4 shows that *Өahi̧ is consistently BrSo/SiSo/CoSo in SM, M, and A. It is paralleled by correlative feminine kin type referents for *Өiku giving a consistent

reconstruction of the kin types of these two terms.

Table 4. Distribution of Kinship Terms in Child Generation

Dialect	So/Da	BrSo/SiSo/CoSo	BrDa/SiDa/CoDa	BrCh/SiCh/CoCh
SM	j	k	l	-
M	j	k	l	-
A	j	k	l	-
J	j	-	-	k

Without a doubt SM, M, and A have come down from the PM system without a change. J, as before, contains the innovation. *Θiku disappeared and *Θahi̥ developed the kin type referents of *Θiku. In this way the dimension of sex was lost in J in the collateral dimension.

TERMS IN THE GRANDCHILD GENERATION

In the grandchild generation only one term reconstructs, or more precisely the phrase, *Θaʔyu hani. All four dialects attest this reconstruction. However, there is some disagreement as to what kin types are designated by it. Again, it is a question of J in disagreement with SM, M, and A. It is assumed therefore, that the three dialects in agreement reflect the original meaning of the term. To look at the coin from the other side, those three are conservative and show no change from the PM system at this point and J represents another innovation. Table 5 shows the distribution of the terms and kin types.

Table 5. Distribution of Kinship Terms in the Grandchild Generation

Dialect	ChCh	BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
SM	m	m
M	m	m
A	m	m
J	m	k

TERMS USED FOR AFFINAL RELATIVES

Only two terms reconstruct, *kaθa and *hanu. They are both attested in all four dialects. Consanguineal terms are used in some dialects to designate some affines of this class. By affinal relatives I am referring to that class of people who marry one of ego's consanguineal relatives. (Later I will discuss conjugal affines who are consanguineal relatives of ego's spouse.) The reconstruction of the kin type referents of these two complementary terms distinguished only by the dimension of sex of the referent is one of the most difficult and most tentative reconstructions of the paper. Table 6 shows how the two affinal terms belonging to this class are distributed among the dialects and how other terms are used to designate some of the affinal kin types of this class.

Table 6. Distribution of Kinship Terms Referring to
Affinal Relatives

Dialect	GrPaSiHu	PaSiHu/ PaCoHu	SiHu/CoHu	DaHu/ BrDaHu/etc.	ChDaHu/ BrChDaHu/etc.
SM	tata ñuu	e	n	se?e + n	-
M			(n)	n	-
A	a	e	g/i'	n	-
J	n	n	n	n	n

GrPaBrWi	PaBrWi/PaCoWi	BrWi/CoWi	SoWi/ BrSoWi/etc.	ChDaHu/ BrChSoWi/etc.
nana ñuu	f	o	se?e + o	-
		(o)	o	-
b	f	i/i'	o	-
o	o	o	o	o

In ego's and child's generation the picture for reconstructing kin types seems fairly clear. SM, M, and J agree in allocating the kin types SiHu/CoHu to *kaθa and BrWi/CoWi to *hanu. M, A, and J agree in allocating DaHu/BrDaHu/etc. to *kaθa and SoWi/BrSoWi/etc. to *hanu. SM differs only in preposing the word se?e. Affinal relatives in the grandparent generation and the parent generation are designated by the same terms as are consanguineals in SM and A.

M is mute at this point and J is in contrast. As in the preceding cases, the testimony of SM and A is given priority over that of J so that these kin types are designated by *Θii, *Θita̧, *yuva, *Θiˀɨ, *Θito, and *ΘiΘi, respectively. If this is the case, then SM and A are conservative and reflect the PM system without change, and the J system developes an extension of the usage of *kaΘa and *hanu to include affinal relatives in the ascending generations. This type of innovation is also found in A in ego's generation; the sibling-cousin terms are extended to include the spouses of these with the resultant loss of these kin types for the *kaΘa-*hanu set. Further, J extends the use of the two terms in this set to include affinal relatives in the second descending generation, whereas the other three dialects do not discriminate these kin types. Thus, again J proves to be the most innovating member of the four dialects. A unique innovation in both SM and M is the discrimination of HuBrWi/HuCoWi and WiSiHu/WiCoHu by the formation of specialized constructions with *kaΘa and *hanu, respectively, as the base, e.g. ta-kasa, kasa s̆iˀi̧, and ta-hanu, s̆anu s̆iˀi̧, c.f. Table 7.

TERMS FOR CONJUGAL AFFINES

Three terms reconstruct in PM which indicate, spouse (one male term and one female term) and any other consanguineal relative of spouse. Both the term and the kin type designation reconstruct systematically without question for *yɨɨ Hu and *n̆a Θiˀɨ Wi in all four dialects. They also attest to the form *tiΘo, and the kin types of *tiΘo reconstruct with relatively little difficulty as well. SM, M, and J give a consistent witness to the reconstruction of the following kin types: SpFa/SpMo/SpBr/SpSi/SpCo. These kin types are therefore reconstructed for *tiΘo. Table 7 shows their distribution.

Table 7. Distribution of Kinship Terms Referring to
Conjugal Affines

Dialect	Hu	Wi	SpFa	SpMo	SpBr/SpSi	SpCo	WiSiHu/WiCoHu	HuBrWi/HuCoWi
SM	p	q	(taa +)r	(naa +)	r		ta + n	ta + o
M	p	q (~ya-siˀi)	r	r	r	r	n + s̆i̧ˀi̧	o + s̆i̧ˀi̧
A	p	q	r	r	kuñero/kuñada		ta + n	ta + o
J	p	q	r	r	r	r	-	-

All four dialects preserve without change the terms for Hu and Wi, *yɨɨ and *ña θɨʔɨ, respectively. A has developed an alternate ya-siʔi for the latter. *tiθo, on the other hand, is preserved relatively unaltered in all four dialects. SM specializes it by preposing taa and naa to distinguish SpFa and SpMo, respectively. In A the kin type designation for SpBr/SpSi was lost, very likely under the influence of Spanish since today the kin type has split into SpBr kuñero and SpSi kuñada. The reports are silent on the point whether SM and A have these terms for the kin type SpCo; the usage is clearly preserved in M and J, however.

SM, M, and A have developed special constructions with *kaθa and *hanu as base to indicate affinal relatives of the spouse who are related to ego through the spouse, e.g. WiSiHu/WiCoHu and HuBrWi/HuCoWi. These kin types are not reconstructed for their respective terms even though attested by three dialects because two different constructions are used, e.g. kasa šiʔi and šanu šiʔi for M and ta-kasa and ta-hanu for the other two.

CHANGE IN MIXTECO KINSHIP SYSTEMS

Changes in kinship systems can be classified in, at least, three different ways, i.e. according to their kind, degree, or cause. In these data several kinds of change occur which are classified along three dimensions. The most important dimension distinguishes form and meaning (or kin type designation); the next--which cuts across the first--distinguishes replacement, gain, or loss of an element. Finally, borrowing (the source of the new element is outside of the indigenous system) and coining (the source of the new element is within the same system) operate as subdivisions of replacement and gain but not loss. Eggan recognized two of these dimensions some time ago when he said, "Kinship terminology and the kinship pattern may vary independently: the terms may change without affecting the pattern, as when a simple substitution occurs, or the pattern may change without affecting the terminology, or both" (1937: 49). The following table tabulates these types of change shown in the daughter systems of PM.

		Form	Meaning
Replacement	Borrowing	tata ñuu (SM)	GrPaBr (J)
	Coining	sutu ča?nu (J)	xxx
Gain	Borrowing	kuñero (A)	SpBrSp/SpSiSp (A)
	Coining	ta?a (A)	Co (J)
Loss		*k^wa?a (A)	BrSo/SiSo (J)

As the table indicates kin type replacements are not coined.

Change can be classified according to <u>degree</u> of change as well. Table 8 shows the amount of agreement (marked by x) between PM and the four dialects in the forms of the kin terms and the percentage of their divergence from PM (scored in the last column of the table).

Table 8. Agreement and Divergence of PM Kinship Terms with SM, M, A, and J Terms

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	i'	j	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	Percent
SM					x	x	x	x	x	(x)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	21
M	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0
A	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	5
J				x	x	x	x	x	x	(x)	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	21

Table 9 shows the amount of agreement between PM and the four dialects in the kin type designation of the terms and the percentage of divergence from PM.

Table 9. Agreement and Divergence in Kin Type Designation between PM and SM, M, A, and J

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	i'	j	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	Percent
SM	(x)	(x)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	–	x	x	x	x			x	x		17
M			x	x			x	x	x	–	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	33
A	(x)	(x)	x	x	x	x				–	x	x	x	x			x	x		33
J			x	x						–	x						x	x	x	67

In form, M reflects PM completely; A has only one change (h > i'); and SM and J show the most change. In kin type designation SM modified the PM system in only three places, M and A modified it in six places and J modified it in twelve (67%) places. (The computation of percentage of divergence for kin type designation gives only a gross measurement since the change of several kin types for a given term is given the same value as the change of a single kin type. A more refined measure needs to be used here.) Taken as a whole SM, M, and A cluster together with relatively few changes in form and meaning from PM; J, on the other hand, proves to be quite innovative.

The reason for J's flexibility may lie in two different directions. First, the area in which J is located was the most recently settled (still in pre-conquest times) by emigrants probably from somewhere in the mountain area which is now the district of Tlaxiaco (Holland, Longacre). In this move from the mountains to the coast a number of changes took place among which was the development of a new pattern of residence--village rather than ranch--which, in turn, may have been the cause for the change in sibling and cousin terminology observed in J. As I mentioned earlier, the constituency of the play group in the village very likely changed to include more than the child's siblings and cousins. It probably included the children of neighbors as well. But more important, the village child probably played with fewer of his cousins who, with their father, lived in neolocal residence.

Second, not only did these Mixteco emigrants develop new social patterns in a new environment but they also had new neighbors to the south and east, the Zapotecs. From them they may have learned to distinguish lineal from collateral relatives in second ascending and descending generations. This distinction, found only in J, is also a characteristic of the kinship system of Miahuatlan Zapotec, the closest Zapotec dialect for which I have data.

In both cases of change in J, the distinction between lineal and collateral relative was extended to new levels--either ego's generation or second ascending and descending generations. Although these two changes were likely from different sources, they were mutually reinforcing and yielded a system making this distinction

in all generations rather than merely in alternate ones only like
the other Mixtec dialects.

SUMMARY

The PM kinship system consisted of eighteen terms; thirteen
indicated consanguineal kinsmen and five affinal kinsmen. The
consanguineal terms were distributed unequally through five generations
with alternate generations showing first Hawaiian and then Eskimo
characteristics. That is to say, lineal kinsmen were not distinguished
from collateral kinsmen in the second ascending and descending gener-
ations and ego's generation whereas in the first ascending and descending
generations they were so distinguished. The affinal terms fell into
two classes, one of which contained terms for affinal relatives related
to ego through a consanguineal kinsman and the other of which contained
terms for affinal relatives related to ego through an affinal kinsman
(namely, a spouse). Other relevant dimensions in the PM system were
sex of referent, sex of referent relative to ego, affiliation of
mediator, and degree of affinity.

Arrayed diagrammatically the terms for consanguineal kinsmen were:

	male	female	
2nd ascending	*Θii	*Θitạ	
1st ascending	*Θito	*ΘiΘi	collateral
	*yuva	*Θɨ?ɨ	lineal
0	male to male *yani	female to female *ku?vi	
	*kᵂa?a male to female; female to male		
	*Θahį	*Θiku	collateral
1st descending	*Θa?yu		lineal
2nd descending	*Θa?yu hani		

The terms for affinal kinsmen were:

	male	female	
Mediator is consanguineal	*kaΘa	*hanu	
Mediator is affinal	*yɨɨ	*ɲa Θɨ?ɨ	One link
	*tiΘo		More than one link

COGNATE SETS OF KINSHIP TERMS

a   PM   *Θii   FaFa/MoFa/GrPaBr/GrPaSiHu/ GrPaCom

        M   šii   FaFa/MoFa/GrPaBr/GrPaCom

        A   šii   FaFa/MoFa/GrPaBr/   /GrPaSiHu

b   PM   *Θitą   FaMo/MoMo/GrPaSi/GrPaBrWi/GrPaCof

        M   šitą   FaMo/MoMo/GrPaSi/GrPaCof

        A   šitą? (~štą?) FaMo/MoMo/GrPaSi/   /GrPaBrWi

c   PM   *yuva   Fa

        M   yuba   (~tata)   Fa

        A   yuba? (~tata)   Fa

d   PM   *Θi?ɨ   Mo

        M   si?i   (~nana)   Mo

        A   si?i?   (~nana)   Mo

        J   si?i   Mo

e   PM   *Θito   PaBr/PaCom/PaSiHu/PaCoHu

       SM   stoo   PaBr/PaCom/PaSiHu/PaCoHu

        M   šito   PaBr/PaCom

        A   šito (~što)   PaBr/PaCom/PaSiHu/PaCoHu

        J   šito   PaBr/PaCom/   /GrPaBr

f   PM   *ΘiΘi   PaSi/PaCof/PaBrWi/PaCoWi

       SM   šii   PaSi/PaCof/PaBrWi/PaCoWi

        M   šiši   PaSi/PaCof

        A   šiši (~šii)   PaSi/PaCof/PaBrWi/PaCoWi

        J   čiši   PaSi/PaCof/   /GrPaSi

g   PM   *yani   Br(ms)/Com(ms)

       SM   ñani   Br(ms)/Com(ms)

        M   yani   Br(ms)/Com(ms)

        A   ñani   Br(ms)/Com(ms)/SiHu(ms)/CoHu(ms)

        J   yani   Br(ms)

h   PM   *ku?vi   Si(ws)/Cof(ws)

       SM   ku?u   Si(ws)/Cof(ws)

        M   ku?vi   Si(ws)/Cof(ws)

        J   ku?vi   Si(ws)

i   PM   *kʷa?a   Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)

```
        SM  kʷaʔa  Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)

        M   kuʔva  Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)

        A   kuʔva  Si(ws)/Cof(ws)/BrWi(ws)/CoWi(ws)

        J   kuʔva  Br(ws)/Si(ms)
```

i' PM *tạʔạ
```
        SM  tạʔạ  'companion'

        A   tạʔạ  Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)/BrWi(ms)/CoWi(ms)/
                        SiHu(ws)/CoHu(ws)

        J   tạʔạ  'companion'
```

j PM *Θaʔyu So/Da
```
        SM  seʔe  So/Da

        M   seʔe  So/Da

        A   siʔe  So/Da

        J   seʔe  So/Da
```
        (Tonahuixtla deʔe, Estetla daʔyu, Tidaa daʔa, all meaning
        So/Da; Santiago Mitlantongo laʔ Da and laʔa So, San Juan
        Tamazola daʔya So, and Tilangtongo da Da ((Mak and Longacre
        1960:39)).)

k PM *Θahị̣ BrSo/SiSo/CoSo
```
        SM  sahị̣  BrSo/SiSo/CoSo

        M   sašị̣  BrSo/SiSo/CoSo

        A   sašị̣  BrSo/SiSo/CoSo

        J   sačị̣  BrSo/SiSo/CoSo/BrDa/SiDa/CoDa/Co/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
```

l PM *Θiku BrDa/SiDa/CoDa
```
        SM  šiku  BrDa/SiDa/CoDa

        M   šiku  BrDa/SiDa/CoDa

        A   šiku  BrDa/SiDa/CoDa
```

m PM *Θaʔyu hani ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
```
        SM  seʔe tɨ-hani  ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh

        M   seʔe    yani  ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh

        A   si      yani  ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh

        J   se(ʔe)  yani  ChCh
```

n PM *kaΘa SiHu/DaHu/ChDaHu/BrDaHu/SiDaHu/BrChDaHu/SiChDaHu/(CoHu/etc.)/
                    (WiSiHu/WiCoHu)

```
      SM   kasa   SiHu/CoHu   (se?e kasa DaHu/BrDaHu/SiDaHu, ta-kasa
                    WiSiHu/WiCoHu)

      M    kasa   DaHu/SiHu   (kasa ši̧?į̧ WiSiHu/WiCoHu)

      A    kasa?  DaHu

      J    kasa   GrPaSiHu/PaSiHu/SiHu/DaHu/ChDaHu/CoHu


o  PM *hanu  BrWi/SoWi/ChSoWi/BrSoWi/SiSoWi/BrChSoWi/SiChSoWi/
                    (CoWi/etc.) (HuBrWi/HuCoWi)

      SM   hanu   BrWi/CoWi   (se?e hanu SoWi/BrSoWi/SiSoHu,
                    ta-hanu HuBrWi/HuCoWi)

      M    šanu   BrWi/SoWi   (šanu ši̧?į HuBrWi/HuCoWi)

      A    šanu   SoWi

      J    čanu   GrPaBrWi/PaBrWi/BrWi/SoWi/ChSoWi/CoWi


p  PM *yɨɨ  Hu

      SM   žii    Hu

      M    ii     Hu

      A    ii     Hu

      J    ii     Hu


q  PM *ña  Ɵɨ?ɨ   Wi

      SM   ña-sɨ?ɨ   Wi

      M    ña-si?i  (~ya-si?i)  Wi

      A    ña-si?i   Wi

      J    ña-si?i   wi


r  PM *tiƟo  SpFa/SpMo/SpBr/SpSi/SpCo

      SM   čiso   SpFa/SpMo/SpBr/SpSi  (taa čiso SpFa, naa čiso SpMo)

      M    siso   SpFa/SpMo/SpBr/SpSi/(SpCo)

      A    tiso   SpFa/SpMo

      J    čiso   SpFa/SpMo/SpBr/SpSi/SpCo
```

References Cited

Arana Osnaya, Evangelina
      1960   Relaciones internas del Mixteco-Trique. Mexico, Instituto
             Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

Dahlgren de Jordan, Barbro
      1954   La Mixteca: Su cultura e·historia prehispanicas. Mexico,
             Imprenta Universitaria.

Delbrück, B.
      1889   Die Indogermanische Verwandtschaftsnamen: Ein Beitrag zur
             Vergleichenden Altertumskunde.
             Abhandlungen der Sächsische Academie de Wissenschaften
             11:381.

Eggan, Fred
      1937   Historical changes in the Choctaw kinship system.
             American Anthropologist 39:34-52.

Hoijer, Harry
      1956   Athapaskan kinship systems.
             American Anthropologist 58:306-333.

Holland, William R.
      1959   Dialect Variations of the Mixtec and Cuicatec Areas of
             Oaxaca, Mexico. Anthropological Linguistics 2:25-31.

Hymes, D.H. and Harold E. Driver
      1958   Concerning the Proto-Athapaskan kinship system.
             American Anthropologist 60:152-5.

Kroeber, A.L.
      1937   Athapaskan kin term systems.
             American Anthropologist 39:602-8.

Longacre, Robert E.
      1957   Proto-Mixtecan. Bloomington,
             Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology,
             Folklore, and Linguistics.

      1961   Swadesh's Macro-Mixtecan hypothesis.
             International Journal of American Linguistics 27:9-29.

Longacre, R.E. and René Millon
      1960   Proto-Mixtecan and Proto-Amuzgo-Mixtecan vocabularies.
             Anthropological Linguistics 2:1-44.

Mak, Cornelia and Robert E. Longacre
      1960   Proto-Mixtec phonology.
             International Journal of American Linguistics 26:23-40.

Matthews, G.H.
      1959   Proto-Siouan kinship terminology. American Anthropologist
             61:252-278.

McQuown, N.
      1955   The indigenous languages of Latin America.
             American Anthropologist 57:501-70.

Merrifield, William R.
      1962   Ms. San Miguel Mixtec kinship.

Murdock, G.P.
      1949   Social Structure. New York, The Macmillan Company.

Overholt, W. Edward
      1962   Ms. Metlatonoc Mixtec kinship.

Pankratz, Leo and William R. Merrifield
      1962   Ms. Ayutla Mixtec kinship.

de los Reyes, Fray Antonio
      1593   Arte en la lengua Mixteca. Mexico. (Reprinted in 1890,
             Paris, Charencey.)

Sapir, Edward
      1916   Time perspective in aboriginal American culture: A study
             in method. Reprinted in Selected Writings of Edward Sapir
             in Language, Culture, and Personality, Edited by David G.
             Mandelbaum, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Shimkin, D.B.
      1941   The Uto-Aztecan system of kinship terminology.
             American Anthropologist 43:223-245.

Steward, Julian
      1955   Theory of Culture Change. Urbana, The University of
             Illinois Press.

Swadesh, Morris
      1960   The Oto-Manguean hypothesis and Macro-Mixtecan.
             International Journal of American Linguistics 26:79-111.

White, Charles B.
      1957   A comparison of theories on Southern Athapaskan kinship
             systems. American Anthropologist 59:434-448.

      1958   Rejoinder to Hymes and Driver. American Anthropologist
             60:155-6.