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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 Jhorf. 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 kinship 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 (hereafter 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 reconstructed 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 discussion, 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 designate 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 (McKown 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).] Unfortunately, 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: Penoles 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 postposed 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 multicommmunity 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 (tata Ṇuu and nana Ṇuu, respectively); they cover the same area of semantic space as the A terms. The attribute Ṇuu is of Mixtec origin. J, on the other hand, has coined a completely new expression, sutu čaʔnu; 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. sutu čaʔnu and siʔi čaʔnu 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>FaFa/MoFa</th>
<th>GrPaBr</th>
<th>GrPaCom</th>
<th>FaMo/MoMo</th>
<th>GrPaSi</th>
<th>GrPaCof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>tata Ṇuu</td>
<td>tata Ṇuu</td>
<td>nana Ṇuu</td>
<td>nana Ṇuu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>sutu čaʔnu</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d + čaʔnu</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *Qiʔ and *Qiʔa meant only FaFa/MoFa and FaMo/MoMo, respectively, and GrPa siblings and/or cousins were indicated by other terms as in J, or *Qiʔ and *Qiʔa 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 *Qito, and all four dialects for *Qito and *QiQi. In addition to the dimension of sex which was the characteristic distinguishing the two terms found in the grandparent 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, cf. the variants cited in etymologies c and d. *satu, the unmodified 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Fa</th>
<th>PaBr/PaCom</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>PaSi/PaCof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>taa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>naa</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>c (~tata)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d (~nana)</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>c (~tata)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d (~nana)</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>sutu</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one inference is possible for the meaning of each of the four terms reconstructed in the parent generation; *yuva means Fa, *QiQi means Mo, *Qito means PaBr/PaCom, and *QiQi 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 *kwa?a and by SM, M, and J for *ku?vi. A fourth term *təʔə "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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Referent</th>
<th>Sex of Ego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>*yani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>*kwa?a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *kwa?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 *kwa?a replaced it assuming its kin types and in turn *təʔə, the replacement of *kwa?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 *Qahɪ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Br(ms)</th>
<th>Com(ms)</th>
<th>Br(ws)/Si(ms)</th>
<th>Com(ws)/Cof(ms)</th>
<th>Si(ws)</th>
<th>Cof(ws)</th>
<th>Co</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>i'</td>
<td>i'</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 usan 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 parentes mas cercanos como hermano, hermana, primo y prima hay distintos terminos, segun el sexo del que habla. De los hermanos se distinguia, ademas, entre primogénitos, mayores, menores, y bejamines" (1954:157). No report shows that present-day 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. *Qa?yu is lineal and makes no sex distinction whereas *Qahį refers to a male collateral and *Qiku to a female collateral. All four dialects testify to *Qa?yu and *Qahį but only SM, M, and A to *Qiku. Table 4 shows that *Qahį is consistently BrSo/SiSo/CoSo in SM, M, and A. It is paralleled by correlative feminine kin type referents for *Qiku giving a consistent
reconstruction of the kin types of these two terms.

Table 4. Distribution of Kinship Terms in Child Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>So/Da</th>
<th>BrSo/SiSo/CoSo</th>
<th>BrDa/SiDa/CoDa</th>
<th>BrCh/SiCh/CoCh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without a doubt SM, M, and A have come down from the PM system without a change. J, as before, contains the innovation. *Qiku disappeared and *Qahi developed the kin type referents of *Qiku. 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, *Qa?yu 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>ChCh</th>
<th>BrCh/SiCh/CoCh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terms Used for Affinal Relatives

Only two terms reconstruct, *kaQa 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>GrPaSiHu</th>
<th>PaSiHu/ PaCoHu</th>
<th>SiHu/CoHu</th>
<th>DaHu/ BrDaHu/etc.</th>
<th>ChDaHu/ BrChDaHu/etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>tata  ꜅uu</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>se꜅e + n</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>g/i'</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrPaBrWi</th>
<th>PaBrWi/PaCoWi</th>
<th>BrWi/CoWi</th>
<th>SoWi/ BrSoWi/etc.</th>
<th>ChDaHu/ BrChSoWi/etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nana ꜅uu</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>se꜅e + o</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>i/i'</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *kaQa and BrWi/CoWi to *hanu. M, A, and J agree in allocating DaHu/BrDaHu/etc. to *kaQa 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 *Qii, *Qito, *yuva, *Qii, *Qito, and *Qii, respectively. If this is the case, then SM and A are conservative and reflect the PM system without change, and the J system develops an extension of the usage of *kaQa 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 *kaQa-*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 *kaQa and *hanu, respectively, as the base, e.g. ta-kasa, kasa *ji, and ta-hanu, *hanu *ji, 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 *yim Hu and *ma *Qii Wi in all four dialects. They also attest to the form *tiQo, and the kin types of *tiQo 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 *tiQo. Table 7 shows their distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Hu</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>SpFa</th>
<th>SpMo</th>
<th>SpBr/SpSi</th>
<th>SpCo</th>
<th>WiSiHu/WiCoHu</th>
<th>HuBrWi/HuCoWi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>(taa+)r</td>
<td>(naa+)</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ta + n</td>
<td>ta + o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>n + *ji</td>
<td>o + *ji</td>
<td>(*ya-si?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>rufero/kuufada</td>
<td>ta + n</td>
<td>ta + o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Distribution of Kinship Terms Referring to Conjugal Affines
All four dialects preserve without change the terms for Hu and Wi, *yíi and *Ma Gíi, respectively. A has developed an alternate ya-síi for the latter. *tiQo, 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 *kaQa 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 MIATECO 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tata DidAppear (SM)</td>
<td>GrPaBr (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sutu DidAppear'nu (J)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain</td>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>kuflero (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coining</td>
<td>t\textsuperscript{a} (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>*k\textsuperscript{w}a\textsuperscript{a} (A)</td>
<td>BrSo/SiSo (J)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table indicates, kin type replacements are not coined.

Change can be classified according to degree 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a b c d e f g h i i' j k l m n o p q r</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>x x x x x (x) x x x x x x x x x x x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>x x x x x x (x) x x x x x x x x 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a b c d e f g h i i' j k l m n o p q r</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM (x)(x) x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (x)(x) x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 generations 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd ascending</td>
<td>*Gii</td>
<td>*Gitâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ascending</td>
<td>*Gito</td>
<td>*GiGi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*yuva</td>
<td>*Qi?i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st descending</td>
<td>*Qahi</td>
<td>*Giku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd descending</td>
<td>*Qa?yu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Qa?yu hani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terms for affinal kinsmen were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediator is consanguineal</td>
<td>*ka?a</td>
<td>*hanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator is affinal</td>
<td>*yâi</td>
<td>*Na Qi?i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*tiGo</td>
<td>More than one link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COGNATE SETS OF KINSHIP TERMS

a  PM *Qii FaFa/MoFa/GrPaBr/GrPaSiHu/GrPaCom
   M  šii FaFa/MoFa/GrPaBr/GrPaCom
   A  šii FaFa/MoFa/GrPaBr/GrPaSiHu

b  PM *Qita FaMo/MoMo/GrPaSi/GrPaBrWi/GrPaCof
   M  šita FaMo/MoMo/GrPaSi/GrPaCof
   A  šita? (~štə?) FaMo/MoMo/GrPaSiHu/GrPaBrWi

c  PM *yuva Fa
   M  yuba (~tata) Fa
   A  yuba? (~tata) Fa

d  PM *Qi?i Mo
   M  siʔi (~nana) Mo
   A  siʔi? (~nana) Mo
   J  siʔi  Mo

e  PM *Qito PaBr/PaCom/PaSiHu/PaCoHu
   SM  šito  PaBr/PaCom/PaSiHu/PaCoHu
   M  šito  PaBr/PaCom
   A  šito (~sto) PaBr/PaCom/PaSiHu/PaCoHu
   J  šito  PaBr/PaCom/GrPaBr

f  PM *QiQi PaSi/PaCof/PaBrWi/PaCoWi
   SM  šiʔi  PaSi/PaCof/PaBrWi/PaCoWi
   M  šiʔi  PaSi/PaCof
   A  šiʔi (~šiʔ) PaSi/PaCof/PaBrWi/PaCoWi
   J  čiʔi  PaSi/PaCof/GrPaSi

g  PM *yani Br(ms)/Com(ms)
   SM  Šani Br(ms)/Com(ms)
   M  yani Br(ms)/Com(ms)
   A  Šani Br(ms)/Com(ms)/SiHu(ms)/CoHu(ms)
   J  yani Br(ms)

h  PM *kuʔvi Si(ws)/Cof(ws)
   SM  kuʔu  Si(ws)/Cof(ws)
   M  kuʔvi Si(ws)/Cof(ws)
   J  kuʔvi Si(ws)

i  PM *kwaʔa Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)
SM  kwa?a Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)
M   ku?va Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)
A   ku?va Si(ws)/Cof(ws)/BrWi(ws)/Cowi(ws)
J   ku?va Br(ws)/Si(ms)

i' PM *t'aa
SM  t'aa 'companion'
A   t'aa Br(ws)/Si(ms)/Com(ws)/Cof(ms)/BrWi(ms)/Cowi(ms)/SiHu(ws)/CoHu(ws)
J   t'aa 'companion'

j PM *Qa?yu So/Da
SM  se'e So/Da
M   se'e So/Da
A   si'e So/Da
J   se'e So/Da
(Tonahuixtla de'e, Estetla da?yu, Tidaa da?a, all meaning So/Da; Santiago Mitlantongo la? Da and la?a So, San Juan Tamazola da?ya So, and Tilangtongo da Da ((Mak and Longacre 1960:39)).)

k PM *Qah?i BrSo/SiSo/CoSo
SM  sahi BrSo/SiSo/CoSo
M   sa?i BrSo/SiSo/CoSo
A   sa?i BrSo/SiSo/CoSo
J   sa?i BrSo/SiSo/CoSo/BrDa/SiDa/CoDa/Co/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh

l PM *Qiku BrDa/SiDa/CoDa
SM  siku BrDa/SiDa/CoDa
M   siku BrDa/SiDa/CoDa
A   siku BrDa/SiDa/CoDa

m PM *Qa?yu hani ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
SM  se'e t'e-hani ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
M   se'e yani ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
A   si yani ChCh/BrChCh/SiChCh/CoChCh
J   se(?) yani ChCh

n PM *kaQa SiHu/DaHu/ChDaHu/BrDaHu/SiDaHu/BrChDaHu/SiChDaHu/(CoHu/etc.)/
     (WiSiHu/CoHu)
SM kasa SiHu/CoHu (se°e kasa DaHu/BrDaHu/SiDaHu, ta-kasa WiSiHu/wiCoHu)
M kasa DaHu/SiHu (kasa šiʔi WiSiHu/wiCoHu)
A kasa? DaHu
J kasa GrPaSiHu/PaSiHu/SiHu/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 šiʔi HuBrWi/HuCoWi)
A šanu SoWi
J čanu GrPaBrWi/PaBrWi/BrWi/SoWi/ChSoWi/CoWi

p PM *yii Hu
   SM ĺii Hu
   M ii Hu
   A ii Hu
   J ii Hu

q PM *ma Oiʔi Wi
   SM Ma-siʔi Wi
   M Ma-siʔi (~ya-siʔi) Wi
   A Ma-siʔi Wi
   J Ma-siʔi Wi

r PM *tiGo 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
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