A STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC ANALYSIS
OF CLASSICAL NAHUATL KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

BRANT GARDNER

Introduction

Interest in Nahuatl kinship terminology had an inauspicious beginning in Lewis Henry Morgan's classic *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity* (1871). Morgan speculated on the nature of the Nahuatl system, but never received data from any part of Mesoamerica. Adolf Bandelier (1877), a student of Morgan, soon filled the information gap and supplied the list of terms taken from Alonso de Molina's dictionary of Classical Nahuatl. Radin (1925) and Watkins (1930) gave lists based on Molina in their comparative works, and Molina also served as the basis for the first analytical discussion of Nahuatl kinship (Dietschy, 1951).

A significant advance in the understanding of the terminological system came with the expansion of the data base to include more than Molina's dictionary. Pedro Carrasco's work with three tribute books written in Nahuatl provided extensive information on kinship terms and organization (1964a, 1964b, 1966, 1972). In particular, his 1966 paper on terminology clarified a difficulty in the nature of the cousin terminology.

Helga Rammow's doctoral dissertation on the Aztec kinship system appeared in 1964 and remains the most comprehensive treatment of the subject in print. Her greatest contribution to the study of Nahuatl terminology was the addition of other dictionaries and many texts in order to corroborate the terms which were used in the system. Her work is extremely valuable for the range of variation in terms applied to the kinship structure. Unfortunately, she was unable to satisfactorily explain some of the variations she found in the terms for particular positions, nor some of the contradictions

the normal kinship definitions caused when the terms were seen in some context.

This paper is aimed at the elucidation of the variations as well as the contradictions which were brought into sharp focus in her work.

There are three primary difficulties encountered in any discussion of Nahuatl kinship terminology. The first is the lack of true phonetic renditions of the terms. Second is defining the nature of the system in the face of the variations given for the same genealogical position, and third is the problem of meaning and context. As these are essentially linguistic problems, I have applied linguistic methods for their solution.

The analysis of Nahuatl kinship terminology is taken in two parts. The first is the examination of the terminological system as a system. For this part I have employed the methods of componential analysis. The second part of the paper deals with the contextual appearance of the terms, for which I have borrowed methods from the field of ethnography of speaking (Tyler, 1969). This dual approach has suggested that the terms themselves operate in two semantic spheres, one of which is tied to the biological realities of kinship, and the other which is purely social in domain. I will first present the examination of the biological semantic sphere as it is the logical basis for the later examination of the social use of the terms.

BIOLOGICAL SEMANTIC SPHERE

The sources

The sources for the terms discussed in this section are primarily lexical. Textual sources have been used where they exhibit features not present in the dictionaries, but for the most part the terms from the texts are examined as they relate to the social semantic sphere. I have used as many early dictionaries and grammars as I could find in order to get as broad a data base as possible. Those sources include: Aldama y Guevara (1754), Cárceres (1905), Carochi (1645, 1759), De Olmos (n.d.), *Dictionarium ex-bismensi...* (n.d.), Molina (1880, 1970), Sahagún (1950-), Tapia Zenteno (1753), and the *Vocabulario Mexicano* (n.d.).

The terms are found in various configurations in these sources. Nahuatl kin terms are bound morphemes, that is, they always require a possessive prefix. While most sources do present the term with one of two possessive prefixes (either *no-* 'my' or *tee-* 'one's'), Molina standardizes them by removing the possessive prefix and adding the substantive suffix which would be required of morphemes which are not bound. For example, *nota* in one source would be *tatli* in Molina.

Regular suffixes which appear are *-ȼiin,* a reverential, and *-w,* a grammatically required suffix in certain instances which can be discerned by regular rules (Sullivan, 1976).

The ascripton of vowel length and the location of glottal stops in Classical Nahuatl is problematic as they are never marked in the sources with any consistency. The primary source for phonemic transcriptions in this paper is the grammar of Carochi (1645, 1759). The data from that grammar have been listed in dictionary form by Canger, *et al.* (1976) which provides an excellent index to one of the few sources which pays attention to vowel length and glottal stops. Even Carochi, however, varies in the marking of a single term in different parts of his work. The phonemic description of Nahuatl kin terms requires careful analysis.

Terms for lineal kin: younger siblings

Only one source clearly indicates a difference in terms which is governed by the sex of the speaker. Olmos (n.d.) divides his entire list into two columns, one labeled "dize el baro[n]" and the other "dice la muger" (De Olmos, n.d.: 228-9). Using his list as a key, any confusion in the other sources is easily remedied.

Olmos indicates that the male term is *noteycauh* and notes that it may refer to either a younger brother or sister. The corresponding term for the female speaker is *nicutzin* which likewise refers to a younger sibling of either gender. Molina is the only source which seems to disagree with this definition. He glosses *teiccauh* as 'younger brother' and *teicu* as 'younger sister'. As Molina never makes a distinction based on the sex of the speaker, these glosses must be a reflection of an attempt to correlate the speaker related

terms to his general conception of the system. The two terms are indeed distinct, but not on the basis of the glosses given in Molina.

The phonemic rendition of the female speaker's term follows a regular pattern. The term *nicutzin* from Olmos may be analyzed *n-ik^w-¢iin* the *n[o]*- being the possessive prefix and *-¢iin* the reverential suffix. Molina's terms would be *tee-ik^w*.

The male speaker's term is more problematic. The term in Molina is easily separated into the elements *tee-ikkaaw*, but Olmos' term would be *no-tee-ikkaaw*. The unusual feature of Olmos' term is the presence of two possessive prefixes, 'my-one's-younger sibling'. The *Vocabulario Mexicano* verifies that the dual possession is not an error. The term from that source is *teteicahu* (tee-tee-ikkaaw) 'one's-one's-younger sibling'. While it might be argued that Molina's term is the one in error since he usually standardizes his terms, in this case the substantive ending is missing so that it becomes a moot question whether an additional *tee-* had ever existed on his term. Because the other terms will be seen to exhibit the variation between single and dual possession, I suggest that both forms were valid options for the kinship term.

On the basis of parallels which will be presented later, I suggest that the difference between the male and female speaker's terms for younger siblings is the addition of the morpheme *-kaaw* in the male's term to a common root. The term for a male's younger siblings would be **-tee-ik^w-kaaw*, where /k^w/→/k/ /_k. A further separation of the *-w* might be suggested as a regular possessive suffix, but the universal retension of the *-w* in compounds indicates that it should be considered with the root.

Elder brother

For elder siblings a distinction is made on the basis of the sex of the sibling as well as the sex of the speaker. The sources list several orthographic and minor variants of the same term for the male speaker's elder brother. Olmos gives it as *noteachcauh*, Molina lists *teachcauh* and *tiachcauh,* and Sahagún has *teachcauh, teteachcauh,* *teach* and *tetiachcauh*. Like the terms for younger siblings, male speaker, these forms exhibit dual possession in some variations. An examination of the comparative contexts listed in Rammow's dissertation suggests that this dual possession may be an optional

means of distinguishing between the social and biological spheres of reference. The dually possessed forms appear in strictly kin oriented contexts with a very high frequency while they are relatively sparse in other contexts. This must have been optional, however, since singly possessed forms are also found in strictly kinship contexts.

The variation between *teachcauh* and *tiachcauh* arises from variable orthographic depictions of a phoneme /e/ which is rendered *e* or *i* in classical orthography (Sullivan, 1976: 23). Molina uses the morpheme *ti-* as the impersonal prefix *tee-* which confirms the dual possession rather than require a separate function for the *i* variant. The male speaker's term for elder brother may be analyzed as *-(tee)-aač-kaaw,* where the parenthesis indicate the optional morpheme.

Two options exist for the female speaker's term for elder brother. Carochi lists the term *noquichiuh* (n-okič-iw) and Sahagún gives *nachtzin* (n-ač-ȼiin). Olmos lists both terms as though they were one, *nachnoquichtiuh* (n-aač/n-okič-ti-iw), which suggests that both were given in response to the elicitation of the word for elder brother. The root *-aač* serves as the basis for the male speaker's term, and *-okič* is the generic term for 'male'. The *-aač* root of the male and female speaker's term are definately related. The use of *-okič,* unlike other terms which do not exclusively refer to the kinship domain, cannot be conceptually separated from the more kin-related term *-aač.* Both terms appear frequently in the texts and no conceptual distinction seems to govern their use in the biological sphere. Both terms are valid options for the female speaker.

Elder sister

The delineation of the terms for elder sister is less complicated. There is universal agreement that *-weltiw* may be translated as 'elder sister'. Olmos gives *-weltiw* as the male speaker's term and gives *nopi* and *nopitzin* as the corresponding female speaker's term. Carochi gives the root as *-pi7.* The glottal stop does not appear in the orthography used in the other sources. The only variation of this term is found in the *Vocabulario Mexicano* which renders it *pipi,* which may be the reduplicated form of *-pi7.*

First descending generation, G-1

The terms for the generation G-1 with those which have been presented for G:0 are the only categories where the sex of the speaker component is listed as part of the diagnostic criteria of the kin terms. On the level G-1 the clear distinction is between the male speaker's term -*pil* and the female speaker's term -*konee*. The sources clearly apply each of these terms to children of either sex, and the separation of the terms is based only on the sex of the speaker rather than any factor identifying the person to whom the term is applied.

While both Olmos and Molina list several terms which may be used to distinguish the relative order of birth among one's children, the terms are no closer to core lexemes than the corresponding terms such as 'middle child' would be in English. Nahuatl also used various suffixes to indicate the relative stage of growth, but those are regularly predictable and need not be analyzed in this paper. The tendency to refer to children by their relative stages of growth, however, accounts for the appearance of the terms -*teelpooč* 'young man' and -*icpooč* 'young woman' or 'virgin' as terms for 'son' and 'daughter'. Most scholars have given these forms as kinship terms. The primary reference of the terms is not 'son' or 'daughter', however, but rather a stage of maturity. Because the possessive prefix intimately bound the young man or woman to a particular person 'my-young man', etc., the terms could be and were used synonimously with those for 'child'. This process resulted in the standard definition of 'son' or 'daughter' for which the terms did serve, but which definitions give an innaccurate picture of the overall system.

Second descending generation, G-2

All sources agree that -*išwiw* refers to members of the generation G-2 regardless of gender. The only confusion related to the term is the presence of the term -*išwiw* in Molina's list of terms for cousins, which would require that the term apply to different generations. This question has been examined by Carrasco (1966: 149-155). He concludes that the confusion arose from the process of standardization which Molina applied to his kin terms and was not a part of the Nahuatl kinship terminology.

Third descending generation, G-3

This term is relatively infrequent in the sources. The *Vocabulario Mexicano* renders it *etetl ixhuiuh* (ete-λ i-išwiw) which means 'third grandchild'. It is a simple description rather than a term for the position.

When a specific term for the category is given, the sources are in accord. Molina and Olmos both give the term *teicuton*, or *teeik^w-toon*, *-toon* being a regular suffix.

First ascending generation, G+1

One of the most interesting problems of Nahuatl kinship terminology was discovered by Rammow. Her work with texts indicated that a son may refer to his father as 'my-son'. That anomaly exists only in the texts, and I will discuss the problem at length in the section on the social semantic sphere. In the lexical sources, there is no variation for the terms for father and mother. All speakers (male and female) refer to 'father' as *-ta7* and 'mother' as *-nan* or *-na*".

Second ascending generation, G+2

The term for grandfather is variously written as *col* or *cul*. The *o* varies with *u* as allophones of the phoneme which I write /o/. The term also appears in the "Vocabulario Mexicano" as *cohcolli* (-ko7kol-li). This is simply a reduplication of the root form.

The term for the female of G + 2 is *-si7* with the single exception in the classical sources of Olmos' *-ȼi7*. This variation is replicated in other parts of Olmos' list and reflects a dialectical variation. Interestingly, Law (1965) has found that the root *-si7* has not been retained in any of the dialects she surveyed, but both the dialects of Norte de Puebla and Topilejo have *-ȼi7*.

Third descending generation, G+3

The extreme proliferation and variation of terms on this level is unmatched in any other case in Nahuatl kinship terminology. The analysis of these terms is lengthy and depends upon material yet to be presented. At this point I will give the range of variation with brief comments, and reserve discussion to a later point.

The only sources which seem to agree are Molina and the *Dictionarium*. Both give *achtontli* (-aač-toon-λi) as the term for great grandfather. Molina has *piptontli* (-pip-toon-λi) for great grandmother and the *Dictionarium* renders the term *pitontli* (-pi-toon-λi).

The *Vocabulario Mexicano* gives *tlacpacohcol* (λakpa-ko7kol) for the male and *tlacpaçitzin* (λakpa-si7-¢iin) for the female. The terms are a description of the members of this generation rather than true kin terms. The word are formed by adding the prefix *λakpa-* to the standard terms for G+2. *λakpa* may be analyzed as *λa-ikpa* 'on top of', which makes an accurate description of G+3.

The terms found in Olmos and Sahagún compound the variations. They both agree that the term for the male is *-aač-ko7kol* but they differ greatly in the term for the female of G+3. In Sahagún she is *veltiuhtli* (-weltiw-λi) which is also the term for 'elder sister', male-speaking, on the generation G:0.

Olmos calls her *notziycocol*, which can be read in two ways. One reading would be *no-si7, i-ko7kol* 'the grandmother of the grandfather'. Because this reading would cause the term to refer to the fourth ascending generation rather than the third, the second reading is more probable. The problem is the *y* in Olmos orthography. In this case it must have entered as a compensation for the unmarked glottal stop, a process not unknown in early orthographies. The term would then read *no-si7-ko7kol* and would be a combination of terms from G+2 roughly analogous to the combination of terms from G:0 and G+2 which Olmos uses for the male in this generation.

Fourth ascending generation, G±4

Unlike the terms for G+3 there is remarkable uniformity in the sources concerning the term for G±4. All sources but one list *-min-toon* as the term which refers to all members of the generation which is four times removed from Ego in either the ascending or descending line. The only exception is the *Dictionarium* which does give a female term for G+4. That term, *iciteci*, is easily analyzed as *i-si7, tee-si7* 'one's grandmother's grandmother' which is an accurate description of a female four generations re-

moved from Ego, but which cannot be considered a root term. In all probability it was the response to a specific elicitation.

Fifth ascending and descending generations, $G^{\pm}5$

The existance of a term farther removed from Ego than *-min-toon* is seldom indicated in the sources. For most sources it is subsumed in the various terms for ancestors, a process which informants began as early as $G^{+}3$. Olmos is the only lexical source which explicitly documents the existence of a specific term for this generation. He ranks the terms of the generations in descending order and gives this entry: "teyptohuan, 5° grado" (Olmos n.d.: 228). A text from Alvarado Tezozomoc's *Crónica Mexicáyotl* corroborates the term which marks the generation $G^{\pm}5$. Tezozómoc makes two parallel statements which include the same basic series of terms: one in reference to ascending generations, and the other in reference to descending generations.

> tocihuan yn tocolhuan yntachtohuan yn tomintonhuan yntopiptonhuan yn tochichicahuan ... (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1949: 4-5).

> Our grandmothers, grandfathers, great-grandfathers, our great-great grandfathers, our great-great-great grand-fathers, our ancestors ...

> in tehuãtin yn titepilhuan yn titeyxhuihuan yn titeteyccatonhuan yn titemintotonhuan yn titepiptotonhuan yn titechichicahuan ... (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1949: 5).

> You our sons, grandsons, great grandson, great-great grandsons, great-great-great-grandsons, our descendents.

The translation of these passages is my own and admittedly differs from the standard definition of *-pip-toon* as 'great grandmother'. Given the hint from Olmos that a fifth degree existed, the parallel structure of the passages clearly requires the translation I have given. The only other structural possibility on the ascending generation is that *topiptonhuan* be paired with *tomintonhuan* in the same way that *tocihuan* and *yntocolhuan* (grandmother and grand-father) are paired. This would make *topiptonhuan* the female counterpart of *tomintonhuan*, a use which is entirely unsupported

7

by the sources. The very strict structure of the descending sequence
indicates that the rendition 'great grandmother' is completely inap-
propriate in that series. The only possibility is that -pip-toon is a
generational term for G+5.

I will return to this form later in this paper, but the data from
Alvarado Tezozómoc allows Olmos' term to be amended from -ip-
toon to -pip-toon.

Terms for collateral kin: the generation G+1

The only generations which exhibit unique terms for collateral
kin are G+1 and G—1. All other terms apply horizontally along
the generations regardless of lineal or collateral distinctions. In the
case of the terms for G:0, they retain the markings of relative age
even in the collateral kin.

All sources agree that the term for any collateral male of the
generation G+1 is -λa. The only difficulty comes from Carochi
who lists the two possibilities of -λa7 and -λaa. No other sources
marks length and glottal stops so that the presence two versions of
the same term makes a phonemic rendition unclear. Based on the
Uto-Aztecan relation of this term with the -ta7 for 'father' (Lyle
Campbell, personal communication; see also Shimkin, 1941, and
Miller, 1967), I have opted for the form -aλ7 in this paper.

For the female, the only variation to the usual -awi 'aunt' is tepi,
which is found in the Dictionarium. As the root is not phonem-
ically rendered, it is impossible to say whether this term is related
to -pi7 'elder sister' from the generation G:0. While that is pos-
sible, the root pi occurs in many places in the kinship system where
a translation of 'elder sister' would be inappropriate. I will return
to this problem after the discussion of the social semantic sphere.

Collaterals of the generation G-1

As with other terms in the generation G-1, the collateral kin
terms are separated on the basis of the sex of the speaker. For a
male the term is -mač and for the female it is -pilo. Both of these
terms apply to the relative without regard to his gender.

Affinal relations

The social process of marriage unites two identical terminological systems which differ only in the shift of Ego. In Nahuatl the separations of those hierarchies of terms is accomplished by the addition of the prefix *-moon-* 'in-law' to the parallel term in the hierarchy of the affine. Thus father-in-laws is *-moon-ta7* and mother-in-law is *-moon-nan*. Sahagún gives the terms *-moon-kol* and *-moon-si7* 'grandfather-in-law' and 'grandmother-in-law'.

For the generation G-1 the term is *-moon-Ø* which is assumed to be male or may be disambiguated by the addition of *-siwaa-* (the generic term for female). The absence of the root *-pil* or *-konee* in this form has no clear explanation. It may be related to a youthful connotation of these two terms. When the youth is of marriageable age he is always referred to as *-teelpooč* 'male youth' or *-ičpooč* 'female youth' (Sahagún, 1905-7: 6: 145).

There are no recorded instances of *-moon* being applied to siblings of the affines in the generation G + 1, that is, there are no records of uncles- or aunts-in-law.

The affinal terminology is regular except for the terms on the level G:0. At this point the regularity of the system is disrupted by an unusual set of terms.

male referent:	'brother-in-law'	*-teeš*
	'sister-in-law'	*-wepol*
female referent:	'brother-in-law'	*-wepol*
	'sister-in-law'	*-wes-wi*

Co-parents-in-law are *tee-wepol,* or one's affines, and the abstract wepol-*loλ* is the term for a relationship of affinity. The reciprocal use of the term *-wepol* between affines of the opposite sex is more of a description of the relationship than a specific kin term. Affines of the same sex do, however, receive special terms. The variation of terms in this level of affinity has no specific linguistic explanation. They must be indicative of a special relationship between affines of the same sex and generation, but the ethnographic data to support such a conclusion are absent. The linguistically interesting point is that the regular affix *-moon-* is not added to the terms which refer to siblings of affines in the generation G:0. Since those sibling terms of the lineal and collateral systems inher-

ently denote a relative ranking, the separate terms for brother- and
sister-in-law seem to indicate that such a ranking was not extend-
able across affinal lines.

Linguistic features of kin terms: generation markers

In spite of the obvious variation of terms in the generation
G+3 which make it difficult to posit a final root form for that
generation, the set of generation terms as a whole show some inter-
esting regularities. The specific terms in question are: (G±5) *-pip-
toon*, (G±4) *-min-toon*, (G—3) *-ikʷ-toon*, and the various terms
from G + 3; ♂ *-aač-toon*, ♀ *-pip-toon*, ♂ *λakpa-ko7kol*, ♀ *λakpa-
si7 ȼiin*, ♂ *-aač-ko7kol*, ♀ *-si7 ko7kol*, and ♀ *-weltiw*.

The only generation which lists a term for a female member
is G+3 which is precisely the locus of the greatest contradiction in
terms. The forms *λakpa-ko7kol* and *λakpa-si7 ȼiin* have already been
discussed as terms which were created in response to an elicitation
by the compiler of the dictionary. On the strenth of the entire
system and the great variation on this level, I suggest that there is
no indigenous term which denotes a female on the generation G+3
and that all of the female terms appear as responses to specific
definition asked by the compilers. The *Dictionarium* is a ready
example of the methodology employed by the early lexicographers.
One column has the definitions printed neatly in one hand. The
second column in the native term written in a more hurried hand.
There are many Spanish terms for which no Nahuatl word is
listed. The variation in the Nahuatl terms for great grandmother
may have arisen from the inventive answers to questions asking for
the term for great grandmother.

Removing those forms which appear to be responses to a re-
quested translation and those which are descriptive only, a general
pattern of the generation markers can be extracted. The pejorative
diminutive *-toon* is the common element for the generations G—3.
G±4, and G±5, and it also makes an appearance in the form
-aač-toon for G+3. A reasonable hypothesis would be that the
construction of the generation markers consists of a root to which

is added an obligatory -*toon* as opposed to the optional -*toon* in the usual case of the pejorative diminutive.

The dual functions of the terms -*pip-toon* and -*min-toon* to mark a specific count of generations removed from Ego in either direction suggests such a possibility for G+3 and G−3. In fact, Cárceres does list the form -*ik^w-toon* (normally for the descending generation) on the ascending generation, though it is one generation off (Cárceres, 1905: 57). As his entire list is one generation off that listed in the majority of sources, his term may be corrected to read as the term for G+3.

Most sources do not have the terms for G+3 and G−3 serving dual functions, but they do show a strikingly parallel construction. Both -*aač* and -*ik^w* are roots which refer to members G:0. On that level they serve to separate elder and younger brothers. The ascription of -*aač* to G+3 and -*ik^w* to G−3 seems to borrow the elder-younger distinction from G:0 and uses it to indicate ascending or descending lines. Lourdes Arizpe describes the modern terminological system from Zacatipan which demonstrates a term for G±3 (Arizpe, 1972: 231). In that case the term is *pitoš* which is not genetically related to the classical Nahuatl terms for G±3, but the function of the term is comparable to that which I am suggesting.

The term -*min-toon* does not vary in the sources. The relative stability of this term as opposed to the instability of the terms elicited for G+3 might be explained in one of two ways, either by the less frequent elicitation of the term which would leave less room for variation, or, as Calneck suggests, the term was tied to a legal boundary of the kin group (Calneck, 1974: 200).

Dietschy has suggested that the form -*pip-toon* is the reduplicated root of the term of the elder sister in the generation: G:0 (Dietschy, 1951: 11). While this solution is tempting and seemingly plausible given the other reduplicated forms which have been presented, it cannot serve as the explanation in this case. The form from G:0 is -*pi7* which would retain the glottal stop in the process of reduplication. While it might be considered a regular phonetic shift to posit that pi → p /_te, such a sequence could not occur with an intervening glottal stop. The second *i* would be preserved. Since the sources always give some version which as a *pt* cluster, the reduplication of -*pi7* cannot explain the form -*pip-toon*.

Sex governed variation in kin terms

To this point in this paper lexical variation based on sex has been listed as 'sex of the speaker'. That designation is not accurate, although it has been used by all students of Nahuatl kin terms. If lexical choice were governed by the sex of the speaker, then it would be expected that those terms which require a distinction would be found only in the mouth of the speaker of the appropriate sex. The evidence in the texts does not support that contention.

In a play collected by Horcasitas, Abraham says to his wife: "in titenan in moconeuh" 'you are the mother of your child' (Horcasitas, 1974: 216). In another play Jesús says: "nichipochtli noconetzin" 'I am the son of the virgin' (Horcasitas, 1974: 354). In each case the term -konee, which has been consistently described as a term used by a female speaker, is found in the speech of a male. Further examples clarify the principle which governs the lexical choice.

In the same collection of plays the stage directions indicate: "in Abraham in ipiltzin" 'Abraham and his son', and "Agar ihuan iconeuh Ixmael" 'Hagar and her son Ismael' (Horcasitas, 1974: 218 and 226). The only variable which governs the different lexemes is the sex of the parent. Since Nahuatl kinship terms are inherently possessed, they inherenly mark both members of the social relationship, both the 'Ego' and his relative. The primary referent for Nahuatl kinship terms is the 'Ego', or the person marked by the possessive prefix. The secondary referent, or the relative, is marked with the specific kin term.

A passage from the Nahuatl material presented in Cárceres' Otomi grammar clarifies the relationship of lexical choice to the primary referent:

> Andres hermano de Cecilia se quiere casar, con Juana, la dizen
> *Andres yueltiuh yn Cecilia s.* Andres cuya hermana es Cecilia...
> y para decir: Cecilia hermana menor de Andres, dizen, *Cecilia
> yoquichtiuh yn Andres*... y si es hermana mayor, dizen *ychu
> yn Andres*... (Cárceres, 1905: 135).

In the first example, the term chosen for 'sister' was -weltiw, the so-called 'male-speaker' term. In this case there is no 'speaker', but the lexical choice is nevertheless governed by the male who serves as the primary referent of the kin term. When the female appears as

the primary referent, the lexical choices reflect the female 'speaker' terms.

The lexical variation by the sex of the primary referent explains the examples of the supposedly female speaker's term in the speech of males from the plays given as examples. In each case the term -*konee* appears as the child of a woman. Since a female is marked by the possessive prefix, she is the primary referent of the term and her gender governs the lexical choice.

Olmos' division of kin terms into two columns indicating a distinction by speaker rather than primary referent remains as the only problem with this analysis. The apparent contradiction is easily resolved by the particular prefix which is used in those lists. Rather than the impersonal *tee-* 'one's' Olmos uses *no-* 'my'. In all of Olmos' data the sex of the speaker and the sex of the primary referent are inherently identical. All of the distinctions in Olmos are therefore correct as they stand, but remain correct only when the terms are possessed by the first person marker.

This is not to say that there was no distinction based upon the sex of the speaker, but only that lexical variation in kin terms is governed by a different principle. The sex of the primary referent governs lexical variations and the sex of the speaker governs phonetic variations. The most well attested case of phonetic variation between the sexes is that of the vocative. The male speaker suffixes a final -*e* which receives primary stress. The female speaker adds no suffix, but places primary stress on the final syllable. Such phonetic variation applies regularly to all aspects of speech and is not related to the kinship system.

Inherent marking of the terms for G:0

One of the terms frequently elicited by the Spanish was simply 'brother'. The responses to that question yielded several different kinds of results. Most common was merely to give the terms for elder and younger siblings. Rammow goes to great length to indicate that there was no root term which indicated the category of 'brother' or 'sister' without also marking it for 'younger' or 'elder' (Rammow, 1964: 118-9). When such a meaning was required the language resorts to the phrase *nehuan eua* (newan ewa) which means "hermanos o hermanas que vienen de unos mismos padres"

(Carochi, 1759: 187). When Olmos elicites an unmarked form he receives the term *teciuapo* (tee-siwa-po7) 'woman like me' as the term for 'sister'. For the male he is given the term *tecauhtzin* (tee-kaaw-¢iin) which is similar to the male term for elder brother or younger brother but lacks the morphemes *-aač* or *ik^w* which elder or younger. While this might be argued as an unmarked form, none of the texts reflects such a usage. It can only be seen as a term created for the occasion.

Clarification of ambiguous terms

There are two affixes which serve to clarify terms which may be read in different ways. One distinguishes the sex of the kin and the other distinguishes between lineal and collateral kin.

Because many Nahuatl kin terms are not inherently marked for gender, that function is supplied by either the assumption that an unmarked form represents a male, or the clarification of gender by the affixion of the generic term for male (okič-) or for female (siwaa-). Thus in Olmos' list the term for 'daughter' is rendered *nocihuapiltzin* (no-siwaa-pil-¢iin) where the ambiguous *-pil* is clearly defined as female by the addition of the affix *siwaa-*

Only the generations G+1 and G—1 make any terminological distinction between lineal and collateral relatives. All other terms, including those in G:0 are open to confusion. Cárceres indicates that the distinctions of elder and younger apply to cousins as well as brothers and were frequently used without clarification (Cárceres, 1905: 57). There was, however, an option which could disambiguate the terms when the situation required it. This was accomplished by the affixion of the term *wekapa-* 'distant' to the possessed kin term. In Olmos, for instance, the term for a male cousin is *uecapanoteachcauh* (wekapa-no-tee-aač-kaaw). Carrasco (1966: 161-163) discusses this modifier fully and indicates cases of the use of *wekapa-* on several generations.

Relationships through an intermediary: Step-relatives

There are two terms which distinguish biological kin from those who substitute for those kin. The first is λakpa- 'on top of'. In this

context it is prefixed to the term of the relative in the biological position for whom the non-biological relative is substituting. 'Step-father' is *λakpa-taʔ* and 'step-child' is *λakpa-pil*.

A second term defined in lexical sources as a 'step' relative does not as cleanly describe substitute kinsmen. Not only do the sources give *tee-čawa-na* as 'step-mother' and *tee-čawa-konee* as 'step child (of a woman)', but also *tee-čawa* 'one's concubine'. Several other words formed from the same stem refer to the man/woman context rather than that of substitute kinsman. These examples preclude the application of the term 'step' as a translation of *čawa*, yet the lexical sources all agree on this translation.

The solution lies in the only Nahua social context in which the woman stands in a secondary relationship to both her husband and to ther husband's children. That social context is polygyny. In that situation a woman is in a secondary role to the first wife of the husband (called *no-siwaa* 'my woman' or '*no-namik* 'my marriage partner'), hence the woman may be called one's *čawa* or 'concubine' as it appears in the Spanish translations. She also stands in a secondary relationship to the biological children of her husband and another wife, in which instance she is also a *čawa* relation. Since all of the *čawa* terms revolve around a female referent and since the term is not an inherently bound morpheme, it appears to have the basic meaning of a secondary female in the nuclear family. When it is used as a modifier it refers to a relationship which passes through such a secondary female. Thus the female referent's term *-konee* appears in the expression *-čawa-konee* (translated step-child in the sources) because the relationship is traced through a female. The secondary male relationship would always be marked with *λakpa-* as indicated above.

Relationship through a deceased relative

In the same way that *čawa* can indicate the nature of the connecting link between relatives, the term *mikka-* 'deceased' can be affixed to any genealogical position where the speaker deems it necessary to indicate that a certain biological link passes through a deceased relative. This application is found in connection with several kin terms in the documentary sources (Carrasco, 1966: 163-4).

The Nahuatl terminological system

Based on this analysis, the terminological system can be depicted as seen on the following chart of semantic space.

Semantic space for the biological semantic sphere

		lineal	collateral	affinal
G±5			−piip−toon	
G±4			−min−toon	
G+3			−aač−toon	
G−3			−ikᵂ−toon	
G−2			−išwiw	
G+2	M	−kol		(−moon−kol)
	F	−si7		(−moon−si7)
G+1	M	−ta7	−ta7	−moon−ta7
	F	−nan	−awi	−moon−nan
G−1	δ	−pil	−mač	−moon−∅
	♀	−konee	−pilo	
G:0	δEM	(−tee)−aač−kaaw		δM −tees
	δEF	−weltiw		♀F −wes
	δY	(−tee)−ikᵂ−kaaw		
	♀EM	−aač		
	♀EF	−pi7		
	♀Y	−ikᵂ		

M: male secondary referent (the relative)
F: female secondary referent
δ: male primary referent (indicated in possessive prefix)
♀: female primary referent
E: elder
Y: younger

SOCIAL SEMANTIC SPHERE

One of the most enigmatic passages relative to Nahuatl kinship terminology is found in Sahagún's *Memorial con Escolia*. Given the terminological system which has just been described, the following passage appears to have children using terms from G−1 to refer to relatives in G+1.

El hijo del señor dize a su padre Nopiltzintzin. Nopiltzintzine. la hija dizele. Noconetzin. Notecu. totecu. Notecuiyo.

El hijo del principal, mercader, o oficial dize a su padre, Niccauhtzin. Niccauhtzine. La hija dizele Noconetzin.

El hijo del labrador dize a su pº. Notatzin. Notecutzin. Notecutze. tecutze, tahitze tacietze. la hija dizele Notecutzin. tecutzin. tachitzin.

El hijo del labrador dize a su pº. Notatzin. Notecutzin. Notecutze. la hija dizele noconetzin, notecu, totecu.

El hijo del pilli, mercader, o oficial dize a su madre, niccauhtzin, niccauhtzine, la hija dizele noconetzin, notecutzin.

El hijo del labrador dize a su madre nonãtzine, nonãtze, pitze, pitzine, pitzetzine, pitzetze, tecitzetze, tecitzine, notecitze, la hija dizele nonantzin. pitzin. (Sahagún, 1905-7: 6: 199-200).

Self-reciprocal terms are well-known in anthropological literature, but never between members of G+1 and G—1. Rammow had a difficult time explaining this anomaly. Fortunately, the very text from Sahagún which delineates the problem also provides the key to its solution.

The first point is that this text indicates terms of address rather than terms of reference. Secondly, the terms of address vary from one example to the next. Since the relative marked by the terms does not vary nor does the primary referent change, the only factor which varies in each set (and hence provides the context of lexical change) is the social class of the primary referent. The only possible conclusion is that social rank is the component which governs the lexical selection of the terms of address applied to the parents.

Given this hypothesis based on the passage in Sahagún, ı examined several sources for social situations involving kin terms (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944, 1959; Durán, 1967; Horcasitas, 1974; Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52; Sahagún, 1950; and others to a lesser extent). Each occasion was recorded for speaker, the person addressed, the social circumstances, and the resultant kin term. This process yielded over four hundred specific examples of the social settings of kinship terms, and this figure is lower than the actual number of examples reviewed since only the interesting variations were recorded after a pattern had become apparent. That body of data suggests three ways in which the kinship terms function in the social sphere: 1) as a metaphorical borrowing of the structured biological seman-

tic field to a nonbiological hierarchy; 2) marking relative deferance in a social situation, and 3) marking inherent social rank. I will discuss each of these in turn.

Metaphorical borrowing

Perhaps the most logical use of kin terms outside of a strictly genealogical sense in the assimilation of non-kinship relationships to a kinship model. This process occurs in a couple of variations.

A formal use of the kinship system could be accomplished by a ceremony which produced fictive kin who received the terms -λa7 'uncle' and -awi 'aunt'. Since these ritual kin were assimilated directly into the kinship system with a particular set of duties, they are only of marginal interest as examples of metaphorical borrowing. They are, in essence 'true' kin.

A more notable use of the kinship semantics appears in the relationship of a man to his gods. That relationship is always expressed by the formulaic pair *intonan, in tota7* followed by the name of the deity. The application of the formulaic pair occurs without reference to the number of gender of the gods named:

Mictlan tecutli, Tzontemoc, Cueçalli... in tonan, in tota...
in monan, in mota mjtlan tecutli...
in monan, in mota in quetzalcoatl...
in tonan, in tota in tlaltecutli
in tonan, in tota tonatiuh...
(Sahagún, 1950: 6: 21, 31, 36, 164).

The formulaic occurrance and invariability of this pair of terms suggests that it is the same usage which Garibay documents for that pair. In many circumstances the two take on an unstated meaning of "mi sostén", or 'my sustenance' (Garibay, 1970: 116). In this case the point of borrowing is not an organizational principle, but rather the extension of the duties of a father and mother into a metaphorical meaning. This type of extension also seems to operate in the cases where a group of women is referred to as the 'mothers' (Sahagún, 1950: 2: 54).

In contrast to a borrowing of the role models is the extensive

borrowing of the organization of the kinship system found in Ruiz de Alarcón. This collection of shamanistic incantations makes reference to various deities, and does so with terms indicating a kinship relation:

> nonan tlatecuintli, nota cetochtli tezcatl... nohueltiuh cenmalinalli, nonan tlatecuintli... yn tlamacazqui chicomexochitl, yn nohueltiuh yn mizcoacihuatl... (Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52: 77).

> my mother tlatecuintli, my father ce tochtli tezcatl, my elder sister cenmalinalli, my mother tlatecuintli... the priest chicomexochitl, my elder sister mizcoacihuatl...

The tlamacazqui (priests) are consistently called 'uncles'.

There is one reference in the texts to brothers:

> Ea, ya ven sacerdote o demonio (tlamacazqui) un pedernal, ve a sauer si duerme mi hermana (nohueltiuh), que ya voy a sacarla para que no cudicien a mi mancebo, para que no me cudicie ninguno de sus hermanos (ioquichtihuan)... (Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52: 64).

The genealogical distinctions of the different members of the pantheon are consistent throughout the text. Those who are called 'sister' once are 'sister' always.

The basis for the assimilation of the kinship system appears to be that the officiator in the incantation becomes one of the pantheon himself and thus may appear in a kin relation of Ego to the rest of the marked members of the system:

> Yo mismo el dios Quetzalcoatl o la culebra con cresta; yo el dios llamado Metl. Yo que soy la misma guerra, y me burlo de todo, que no temo, ni debo. ahora a de ser ello, que e de burlar de mis hermanas (nohueltihuan)... (Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52).

The ascription of the particular kin terms to the deities appears to reflect a relative ranking of the members of the pantheon. In reference to the *-weltiw* deities Ruiz de Alarcón uses the label "diosas menores" (Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52: 60). The principle upon which the borrowing took place is obviously the ability of the kinship system to order a hierarchy.

Relative social deference

In the biological semantic field kin terms inherently mark a relationship rather than a single individual. One cannot be an uncle without being someone's uncle, nor be a mother without having a child. This capacity to mark two members of a relationship is used in Classical Nahuatl to mark the relative social deference afforded to participants in particular social situations. In a given occasion which requires deference, the generational distance from Ego in the kin terms is used to point out the relative position of the participants. Terms of the descending generation, G-1 and G-2 indicate address or reference to the social focal point of the occasion. Terms of the ascending generations G+1 and G+2 are the appropriate response of the social focal point. The degree of social distance appears to increase for the terms marking the generations G+2 and G—2. This principle may be seen to operate in several structured social events.

The huehuetlatolli

The intricacies of Nahua social expectations were spelled out in formal occasions where time-honored orations were delivered. These ritual speeches have been labeled *huehuetlatolli* 'ancient word'. The *huehuetlatolli* were, in effect, a large body of orations which were delivered only on formal occasions in the setting of the home or educational institution, and which dealt with every aspect of one's social life. Each of these ritual occasions focused on different people as the address of the oration shifted. The use of kin terms in these contexts follows the regular pattern of marking the social focal point and establishing the relative social distance of the participants. The social focal point is addressed in terms of descending generations, G—1 or G—2, and often by both terms in the same phrase, which may serve to emphasize the direction of the deference.

During the course of one of these occasions a *ticitl* or midwife refers to the aged women relatives of the young new parents as *"nopilhoantzitzin totecujiooan, tlaçotitlaca, noxviuhtzinoan ..."* (Sahagún, 1950: 6: 154). As the direction of the speech is to those who are specifically mentioned as aged, the terms 'sons' and 'grandchildren' cannot be a general reference to those younger than the speaker.

The presence of the paired address *nopilhoantzitzin, noxviuhtzinoan* (pil, išwiw) would also create an unwarranted division in an otherwise equivalent body of women if the terms are seen only in the context of the biological semantic sphere. These terms serve to mark that group as the recipients of this particular discourse and therefore the social focal point for the moment.

The same paired address occurs when some elder relative addresses a male youth about to enter the *calmecac* (a center of higher priestly learning for the upper class) a *nopiltze, noxiuhtze* 'my son, my grandson' (Sahagún, 1950: 6: 213). The same man cannot be both father and grandfather to the same young man, and these terms serve to mark social rather than biological relations. In the same manner the appropriate response of the social focal point is the use of terms from G+1 and G+2.

Relative deference in religious address

Although the terms *no-nan, no-ta7* might describe the gods when used as a formulaic pair, the kinship term which is used in address is based on the root *-pil* (Sahagún, 150: 6: 4). In response the god addresses his priests as *no-ta7-wan* 'my fathers' (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1949: 30, 32, 49, 55, and Durán, 1967: 2: 39). These terms do not stem from a borrowing of the terminological system as a system, nor of extending the role of a father into a metaphor. The terms indicate that the god is the more important *persona* of the occasion by addressing him with a term from G—1, according to the regular rule.

Relative deference in political affairs

The relative marking of social deference in politics is more complex than at any other level, but is also a more stable system since the deference is given to real rank rather than to the focal point of a given social interaction, as is the case during the *huehuetlatolli*. According to the general pattern, the person of higher rank is called *-išwiw* (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 20; Sahagún, 1950: 8: 15; 6: 189), or is addressed with the pair *-pil, -išwiw*. These terms serve to mark the relationship even when there is no occasion of address:

traigamos a vuestro Chimalpopoca, que es nuestro nieto, y quedese en este nuestro pueblo, pues es nuestro hijo y nieto. Otros que alli estaban dijeron: no es bien que venga aca, sino la mujer que es nuestra nieta e hija rey Tezozomoctli ... (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 24).

The reciprocal set of terms *no-ta7-wan, no-kol-wan* is used by the principal *persona* to designate those of lesser rank, such as the mayordomos, who along with the court poets, receive the paired set "padres y abuelos" (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 515, 500).

When the terms for G+1 are used without the corresponding term from G+2 there seems to be a slight shift in meaning. The term *-ta7* is found in reference to the *pipiltin* who install a new ruler (Sahagún, 1959: 6: 67), the counselor of the ruler (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 183, 202), another important but lesser ruler (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 499), and a man heralded as a "gran sabio" (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 529). Cárceres indicates: "llama el señor o gouernador del pueblo, a los viejos, que tiene en su compañia, por consejeros, s. mis padres, *notauan*" (Cárceres, 1905: 56).

The general principle of lesser social distance being indicated by the term of the more proximate generation holds up, but there is a specific connotation of 'counselor' which is added in these cases which does not occur when *-ta7* and *-kol* are used together.

A third division of the terms according to social rank occurs only with reference to the *pochteca* (professional merchants). This group is always called 'uncles' (λa7-wan) in their dealings with the ruler (Sahagún, 1950: 9: 6). Though it is exclusive to the *pochteca*, the term seems to function in the same manner as the more universally applicable terms. The *pochteca* may be addressed as *no-λa7-wan* 'my uncles' by the ruler and they may refer to themselves as *mo-λa7-wan* 'your uncles', but they do not address the ruler with the reciprocal *-mač* 'nephew'. In the sources surveyed they only use titles or the term *-pil*. Rammow has collected a text which hints that *-mač* also operated as a term of relative social deference, but the point requires greater documentation (Rammow, 1964: 105).

The use of a collateral term from G+1 instead of the more common lineal term might be explained by the marginal nature of the rank of the *pochteca:*

Estos mercaderes eran ya como caballeros, y tenían divisas particulares por sus hazañas; si se hacía alguna fiesta entre año, no se componían con aquellas divisas, sino con mantas de maguey

bien tejidas. Pero la gente noble, que se llama pipiltin en todas las fiestas del año, se adornaban con sus mantas ricas y con todos sus plumajes ... (Sahagún, 1969: 3: 20).

The *pochteca* were the *nouveau riche* of Aztec society, the newcomers. As such they were not accorded the same rank as the pilli. The use of the term 'uncles' may have been a symbolic recognition of the peculiar nature of their status.

The general rules of social deference allow a further explication of the rules governing the occurrance of the term -*pil*. The widespread use of the term outside the kinship context led Carochi to suggest that the root formed two different words, 'son' and 'lord' (Carochi, 1759: 20), which were distinguished only by the inherent possession of the kin term. The data gathered from the texts do not support that conclusion. Each case of the occurrance of the term may be explained by some aspect of the rules for the social semantic sphere of the Nahuatl kin terms.

The application of the root -*pil* to a social class is paralleled by a class called *tee-išwi-wan* which was of a lesser rank than the *pilli* (Anguiano, 1976: 150). This use of the term is not explicable by the rules of social deference, but rather with the borrowing of the structural principles of the biological order to another ranked hierarchy.

Polite address

An instance of the exchange of kinship terms of address which does not follow the general pattern of social deference is found in an occasion of polite address recorded by Sahagún.

They instructed the children ... to speak cultivated words and language ... and to show reverence to all those with whom they met along the road who were officials of the republic, captains or pilli, even if they were but people of the lower class, men and women, as if they were older women; and if some person, even one of ill fortune, greeted them, they inclined their head and greeted him saying; "May it go well, my grandfather". And he who heard the salutation replied, saying: "My grandson, precious stone and beautiful feather, you have done me great mercy, may you go prospering in your road: (Sahagún, 1950: 8: 71).

Information concerning this usage is slim, as it does not appear in any other text surveyed. The applicability of the terms of address to any other class is mere conjecture.

Inherent social rank

Where the terms from G+1 and G—1 express a relative ranking between two individuals of groups, the terms from G:0 denote inherent rank. They function as titles of respect.

The strongest implication of this function comes from the passage which introduced non-biological semantics, part of which I will repeat for convenience:

> El hijo del principal, mercader o oficial dize a su padre, *Niccauhtzin. Niccauhtzine.*

> El hijo del pilli, mercader, o oficial dize a su madre, *niccauhtzin, niccauhtzine* (Sahagún, 1905-7: 6: 199-200).

The presence of the term *niccauhtzin* (n-ik-kaaw-¢iin) 'younger sibling' as a referent for one's father or mother does not follow either the biological semantics nor the rules of social deference. The term is not in error as Alvarado Tezozómoc refers to his father as "Don Diego de Alvarado Huanitzin niccauhtzin. notatzin." (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1949: 7). The term *-ik-kaaw* is a title of respect which, on the basis of the text from Sahagún, is pertinant to the higher social classes. Ruiz de Alarcón understands the term *nihcauhtzine* (n-ik-kaaw-¢iin-e) to mean "mi superior señor" instead of the usual 'my younger brother' (Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52: 39).

The term in this usage is found not only in these texts which refer to one's father, but also in political contexts where there is no kin link discernable. Interestingly, there are no instances in the survey of the same social meaning being applied to the corresponding female referent form *-ik^w*. It is possible that only the male referent form served to mark a non-biological function.

The companion male referent form *-aač-kaaw* also appears to have the inherent marking +rank. Rammow tackles the problem of the contextual uses of 'elder brother' in her dissertation, and after

examining several texts where 'elder brother' did not seem to make any sense, she concluded that *-aač-kaaw* must have reference to the social position of leaders of the community who were also called by that term (Rammow, 1964: 123).

In the discussion on the biological semantic sphere I stated that the dual possessive prefix frequently functioned to remove the ambiguity of the term and to give it a biological rather than social function. There are specific instances when that is not true and the dually possessed terms serves a social function. In a play about the visit of the three kings to the child Jesus, each of the kings addresses the other as *notiachcauhtzin* (no-tee-aač-kaaw-¢iin) (Horcasitas, 1974: 298, 312). The kings are surely not each the elder brother of the other, but the term used is definately dually possessed. The same term is applied to those who are the masters of the youth in the *calmecac*, the *tiachcauh* (tee-aač-kaaw).

The terms in this case not only seem to function as titles of respect but also carry the additional connotation of 'teacher'. The apparent contradiction of these terms with the dual possession which should have linked them to the biological sphere may be explained on the basis of another metaphorical extension of the kinship system into the social sphere. As a definition for the dually possessed tetiachcauh (tee-tee-aač-kaaw) Sahagún gives "el hermano mayor en linaje o en oficio" (Sahagún, 1905-7: 6: 212). This definition clearly opens the possibility that the connotation of the term in the biological sphere may have been borrowed or adopted as a term for a particular social responsibility. The *Florentine Codex* explains how the social marking+instructor is possible:

> One's older brother (tee-tee-aač-kaaw) is a carrier, a taker, a bearer of all the burdens; one who counsels, who prepares others for the work of men (Sahagún, 1950: 10: 9).

As with the +rank term *-ik-kaaw*, only the male referent term *-aač-kaaw* carries the markins +rank and +instructor.

The simple root *-aač* also appears in the social semantic sphere, but only in the context of a particular kind of religious officiator:

> The elder brothers (i-aač-wan) of Huitzilopochtli, those who had fasted for a year-were much feared (Sahagún, 1950: 12: 51).

The distinction in the social meaning of the terms *-aač-kaaw* and *-aač* separates the semantic difference between an instructor and a religious officiator. While in this social function, the simple root *-aač* is used when the primary referent is male, as opposed to the biological sphere where the simple root is the 'elder brother' of a female. While this is a contradiction of the normal principles, it does give a specific function to the biological sphere's optional female term *okič*. In the social semantic sphere *-okič* is the female referent term for a male religious officiator (Sahagún, 1950: 3: 2). Perhaps the presence of the *-aač* in the religious context is due to a purposeful intrusion of a female referent which would more clearly separate the social meaning of *-aač* and *-aač-kaaw*. The use of the female referent terms in the religious context may also indicate that the terms do not function precisely in the same way as the titles which have a +rank marking, as female terms are not found in those cases. Rather than titles of respect, these terms may borrow on the structural positions of the kin terms.

The set *-aač*, *-okič* mark male religious offiators and the parallel terms *-weltiw* and *-pi7* refer to female religious officiators. The aged women of the kin group admonished their young female relative entering service in the *calmecac:*

> They declared thee, dedicated thee unto our lord, the lord of the near, of the night, that thou shouldst belong with the good, fine older sisters of our lord (i-weltiw-¢iin-wan) (Sahagún, 1950: 6: 126).

The position of the young woman entering the *calmecac* is made more explicit in the following passage:

> Especially extended were the words of the women, because some who spoke had been her older sisters (i-pi7-wan), priestesses (siwa-λamakas-ke), also some had inhabited the calmecac (Sahagún, 1950, 6: 126).

The four terms which refer to the elder brother or sister of either sex are used to delineate a category of people who are dedicated to the service of the gods. It is important to note again that in this context the dually possessed form does not appear, nor does the strictly male referent form of the biological sphere marked by *-kaaw*.

The problematic root pi

A term which remains unexplained in both the biological and social spheres is *pi* and the variations built upon that root. In the biological sphere it apparently occurs on the levels of G+1 (pipi 'aunt') and G+3 (piptontli or pitontli 'great grandmother'). It is unknown whether there is any relation to -*pi7* 'elder sister', though I have mentioned that the reduplication of -pi7 cannot yield -*pip-toon*.

In the social sphere the son of the laborer calls his mother by some elaboration of *pi*. In that passage from Sahagún which prefaced this section, *pi* occurs side by side with the expected *nan*. In that case, it is almost certainly not -*pi7* 'elder sister' since -*pi7* is consistently a female referent term and *pi* is found with a male primary referent in Sahagún's text. Using the regularities of the system as they have been presented in this paper, the semantic range of *pi* can be sorted out.

The first remarkable feature is that although it is given in a list of kin terms, *pi* does not have a possessive prefix. It is secondly used for both a male and a female referent, which precludes -*pi7* as a possible interpretation. Based on the general outline of Sahagún's division of terms by rank it might be tempting to ascribe a marking of +rank as has been done for other terms in the list, but this particular terms occurs in the section of the terms which obviously does not mark rank. In that section, not only is the general term for mother used, but the daughter does not use the term for 'lord', *tewk-λi,* in reference to her father, as in the other samples.

A possible similarity comes from Harold Law's data from Mecayapan where a term *pi* is used as a greeting form (Law, 1948). Law defines the term as 'offspring'. While the two are similar, they do not appear to be identical. The Mecayapan system does not have the same types of rules as did the Classical system, and The Classical *pi* appears to be related to females, where it is not in Mecayapan.

In the biological semantic sphere, the only aberrant root, the one which shows up on different generations, is *pi*. If I posit the form **pi* in each of these cases as a descriptive term rather than a specific kin term, the variations can be explained. As **pi* would be a non-biological modifier (it does not require a possessive prefix), it may be used to describe any female relation. Thus it could appear in several generations and contexts. The creation of the term

for the generation G±5 can be analyzed as the reduplication of
*pi which could phonetically loose the i before the t (pipi-toon
→ pip-toon) where -pi7 could not.

The presence of the created term in the position G+3 becomes
clearer in the light of this hypothesis. Because the elicited form
required a female in a position not described by a specific term,
the female related *pi was used as the root. As a parallel of the
generation construction, the regular suffix -toon was added yielding
-pip-toon. While it must be admitted that this explanation is heavily
based on inference, it is an inference based upon regular rules of
the language and can be productive in explaining this anomaly
in the Nahuatl kinship terminology.

Semantic shifts through reduplication

Several of the terms examined in this paper have been redu-
plicated. That process requires some explanation as it bears on the
construction of the Nahuatl kinship vocabulary. The general seman-
tic effect of reduplication it to create a new nuance on the root term.
In one specific case from Molina's dictionary, the effect is one of
diminution:

tepuz colli.	garauato de hierro.	"pothook or grapple of iron"
tepuz cocolli.	anzuelo.	"fish hook'
tepuz colli.	garauato de hierro.	"pothook or grapple of iron"
tepuz cocolli.	anzuelo.	"fishhook"

Reduplication is the only difference in the two entries, yet that redu-
plication effected a significant semantic shift on the root term.

In the same way the reduplicated form of -pi7 (or *pi) appears
in Molina's dictionary under the form tepipi 'criada'. This shift
would take a meaning of 'elder sister' and transform it into 'female
servant'. The mirror of that transformation occurs with the root
-aač. As translations of the Spanish entry 'paje' Molina gives teach,
teaach. While the first entry is unclear due to the lack of length in
the vowels, the second entry may be supplied with the glottal stop
to provide the reduplicated form tee-aa7ač.

As for the process of reduplication itself, there appear to be two phonetic principles which come into play. The first is documented by Sullivan (1976: 222-3) as the addition of a glottal stop in the first syllable which is reduplicated. This accounts for the glottal stop in the form *tee-aa7ač*. The second phonological process comes from an analysis of reduplicated forms in Carochi, where the clear trend is the lengthening of the vowel in the first syllable with a vowel of normal length in the second, regardless of the original length of the vowel in the root form. In this form a glottal stop in the reduplicated syllable remains in the syllable with the vowel of normal length, that is the second syllable of the reduplicated term. Reduplication is the only difference in the twon entries, yet that reduplication effected a significant semantic shift on the root term.

In the same way the reduplicated form of *-pi7* (or **pi?*) appears in Molina's dictionary under the form *tepipi* 'criada'. This shift would take a meaning of 'elder sister' and transform it into 'female servant'.

The mirror of that transformation occurs with the root *-aač*. As translations of the Spanish entry 'paje' Molina gives *teach, teaach*. Neither entry is precisely clear on the phonetics, but the second at least shows signs of a probable reduplication of the initial vowel. The phonetic redition of the terms relies upon two rules. The first is documented by Sullivan (1976: 222-3). A glottal stop is added in the first syllable of the reduplication. This would produce *-a7ač*, a reasonable reading of Molina's *teach*. The second phonological process in volves vowel length and comes from an analysis of reduplicated terms in Carochi (taken from Canger, et al., 1976).

The clear trend in reduplication is the lengthening of the vowel in the first syllable with a vowel of normal length in the second, regardless of the original length of the vowel in the root form. A root which ended with a glottal stop retains the glottal stop in root-final position, that is *-pi7* → *-piipi7*. Given this rule for vowel length, Molina's term *teaach* should be rendered *tee-aa7ač*.

The presence of such a reduplicated form as *-pip-toon*, or *-piip-toon* (correcting length according to the above), as a constructed term has a parallel in the dictionary sources. The *Vocabulario Mexicano* has an unmarked term for 'brother' in the form *cahcahu* (kaa7kaaw), which is the reduplication of the element of the male sibling term minus the element which marked relative age.

CONCLUSIONS

The variety of kinship terms with their apparent meanings can be sorted out only be segregating the semantic domains in which the terms appear. When in a strictly kinship oriented setting they demonstrate a high degree of uniformity and fit into a discernible system.

The social context of the kinship terms provides meanings which vary from those for the same term in the purely biological semantic sphere. Those social meanings may be metaphorical extensions of the kin terms meanings or an extension of the ordering inherent in the kin terms. As social markers they index the social focal point of any occasion, and some are used as titles of respect of rank.

Specifically in the case of the terms of relative social deference, there were times when the kin terms used allowed for an understanding of the relative position of political emmisaries from differing locations. It is distinctly possible that kin terms can serve to segregate the relative positions of differing communities if the proper texts are found.

In other areas, the clarification of the use of kin terms to designate temple workers changes completely the usual interpretation of one of the reasons for Quetzalcoatl's fall from Tula. It has been suggested that Quetzalcoatl's indiscretion with 'his older sister' violated the fabric of Nahuatl society by breaking the incest taboo. It is more likely in the light of the possible meanings of 'older sister', that the violation was religious and concerned a priestess of the temple.

Careful attention to the domain defined by the use of kinship terms not only is important to our understanding of Nahuatl kinship, but it becomes crucial to our comprehension of the culture as a whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldama y Guevara, Joseph Agustín de,
    1754 *Arte de la lengua mexicana,* México, Imprenta de la Biblioteca
    Mexicana.

Alvarado Tezozómoc, Hernando,
    1944 *Crónica Mexicana,* México, Editorial Leyenda.
    1949 *Crónica Mexicáyotl,* México, UNAM, Instituto de Historia.

Andrews, Richard,
    1975 *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl,* Texas, University of Texas
    Press.

Anguiano, Marina and Matilde Chapa,
    1976 "Estratificación social en Tlaxcala durante el siglo XVI", *Estra-
    tificación social en la Mesoamérica prehispánica,* México,
    INAH, p. 118-156.

Arizpe S., Lourdes,
    1972 "Zacatipan Kinship Terminology: A Dual Approach", *Cana-
    dian Revue of Sociology and Anthropology,* 9:227-37.

Bandelier, Adolf F.,
    1877 "On the Social Organization and Mode of Government of
    the Ancient Mexicans", *Tenth Annual Report of the Trustees
    of the Peabody Museum,* Cambridge, Peabody Museum,
    p. 557-699.

Brockway, Earl,
    1969 "Términos de parentesco del Náhuatl, dialecto del Norte de
    Puebla", *Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e His-
    toria,* México, INAH, 1:123-125.

Calneck, Edward E.,
    1974 "The Sahagún Texts as a Source of Sociological Information",
    Sixteenth Century Mexico. Ed. Munro S. Edmonson, Albu-
    querque, University of New Mexico Press, p. 189-204.

Canger, Una, Karen Adrian and Kjeld K. Lings,
    1976 *Diccionario de vocablos Aztecas contenidos en el Arte de la
    lengua mexicana,* Denmark, University of Copenhague.

Carochi, Horacio,
    1645 *Arte de la lengua mexicana,* México, Juan Ruyz.
    1759 *Compendio del Arte de la lengua mexicana.* Ed. Ignacio Pare-
    des, México, Imprenta de la Biblioteca Mexicana.

Carrasco, Pedro,
    1964a "Family Structure of Sixteenth-Century Tepoztlan", *Process and Pattern in Culture.* Ed. Robert A. Manners, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, p. 185-210.
    1964b "Tres libros de tributos del Museo Nacional de México y su importancia para los estudios demográficos", *XXXV Congreso Internacional de Americanistas,* México, Editorial Libros de México, p. 373-378.
    1966 "Sobre algunos términos de parentesco en el náhuatl clásico", *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl,* México, UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 6:149-160.
    1972 "La Casa y la hacienda de un señor Tlalhuica", *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl,* México, UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 11:235-241.

Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin,
    1889 *Annales.* Ed. Rémi Siméon, Paris, Maisonneuve et Ch. Leclerc.

Clavigero, Francisco Xavier,
    1973 *Rules of the Aztec Language.* Tr. Arthur J. O. Anderson, Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press.

De Olmos, Andrés,
    n.d. *Arte y vocabulario en lengua mexicana,* Photograph of the manuscript in the William E. Gates Collection, Brigham Young University.
    1875 *Grammaire de la Langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine.* Ed. Rémi Siméon, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale.

Dictionarium ex-bismensi in latinum sermonem . . . ,
    n.d. Manuscript dictionary. Photograph in the William E. Gates Collections, Brigham Young University.

Dietschy, Hans,
    1951 "Das Verwandtschaftssystem der Azteken", *Geographisch-Ethnologishen Gesellschaft.* Korrespondenzblatt, 1:8-14.

Durán, Diego,
    1967 *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e islas de la tierra firme,* 2 v., Ed. Ángel Ma. Garibay, México, Editorial Porrúa.

Garibay, Ángel María,
    1968 *Poesía Náhuatl,* 3 v. México, UNAM.
    1970 *Llave del Náhuatl,* México, Editorial Porrúa.

Hasler, Juan A.,
    1958 "Acerca de: 'Las formas de salutación en el Pipil del Golfo" *Archivos Nahuas,* 1:116-125.

Horcasitas, Fernando,
  1974 *El Teatro Náhuatl. Épocas novohispana y moderna*, México,
         UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas.

Kirk, Paul L.,
  1966 "Social vs. Consanguineal Distances as Reflected by Mazatec
         Kinship Terminology", *Summa Antropológica a Robert J.
         Weitlaner*, México, INAH.

Law, Howard W.,
  1948 "Greeting Forms of the Gulf Aztecs", *Southwestern Journal of
         Anthropology*, 4:43-48.

Law, Joan A.,
  1965 *An Ethnolinguistic Study of Nahua Consanguineal Kinship
         Terminology*, M.A. thesis, University of Texas, Austin.
  1969 "Nahua Affinal Kinship: A Comparative Study". *Ethnology ...*,
         8:103-121.

Miller, Wick R.,
  1967 "Uto-Aztecan Cognate Sets", Publications in *Linguistics*, Ber-
         keley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, v. 48.

Molina, Alonso de,
  1880 "Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana", *Anales del Museo
         Nacional de México*, México, 4:129-223.
  1970, rpt. *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexiecana
  1571   y castellana*, México, Editorial Porrúa.

Morgan, Lewis Henry,
  1871 "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity". The Netherlands:
         Anthropological Publications.

Radin, Paul,
  1925 "Maya, Nahuatl and Tarasco Kinship Terms", *American An-
         thropologist*, 27:100-102.
  1931 "Mexican Kinship Terms". Publications in *American Archae-
         ology and Ethnology*, University of California, 31:1-14.

Rammow, Helga,
  1964 Die Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen im Klassischen Aztekischen.
         Dissertation for the Universität Hamburg. Hamburg: Univer-
         sität Hamburg.

Romney, Kimball,
  1967 "Kinship and Family", *Handbook of Middle American Indians*,
         Austin, University of Texas, 6:207-237.

Ruiz de Alarcón, Hernando,
1948-1952   "Tratado de las Supersticiones de los naturales de esta Nueva
             España", *Tratado de las supersticiones, dioses, ritos, hechicerías
             y otras costumbres gentílicas de las razas aborígenes*, México,
             Ediciones Fuente Cultural, p. 21-180.

Sahagún, Bernardino de,
1905-1907   *Códices Matritenses*. Ed. Paso y Troncoso, Madrid, Fototipia
             Hauser y Menet.
    1950-   *Florentine Codex*, Ed. and Tr. Arthur J. O. Anderson and
             Charles E. Dibble, 12 v., New Mexico, The School of Amer-
             ican Research and the University of Utah.
    1969   *Historia general de las cosas de la Nueva España*, 4v., México,
             Editorial Porrúa.

Shimkin, D. B.,
    1941   "The Uto-Aztecan System of Kinship Terminology", *American
             Anthropologist*, 43:223-245.

Siméon, Rémi,
1965, rpt.   *Dictionnaire de la langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine*, Graz,
             Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt.

Soustelle, Georgette,
    1959   *Tequila: un village nahuatl du Mexique oriental*, Paris, Institut
             D'ethnologie.

Sullivan, Thelma,
    1976   *Compendio de la gramática Náhuatl*, México, UNAM, Instituto
             de Investigaciones Históricas.

Tapia Zenteno, Carlos de,
    1753   *Arte novíssima de lengua Mexicana*, México, Viuda de D.
             Joseph Bernardo de Hogal.

Tyler, Stephen A.,
    1969   "Context and Variation in Koya Kinship Terminology", *Cogni-
             tive Anthropology*. Ed. Stephen A. Tyler, New York, Holt,
             Rinehart and Winston, Inc., p. 487-503.

Vocabulario Mexicano,
    n.d.   Manuscript dictionary. Photograph in the William E. Gates
             Collection, Bringham Young University.

Watkins, Mark Hanna,
    1930   *Terms of Relationship in Aboriginal Mexico*, Master's thesis,
             University of Chicago.