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Introduction

Interest in Nahuatl kinship terminology had an auspicious 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 discus­
sion 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 genea­
logical 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 compo­
nential analysis. The second part of the paper deals with the con­
textual appearance of the terms, for which I have borrowed meth­
ods 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-bisimensi . . . (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 te- '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 *tari* in Molina.

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

The ascription 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 "dice 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 *niculzin* 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 as *n*-ik*-yin* the n[−] being the possessive prefix and *-yin* the referential suffix. Molina’s terms would be *tee-ik*.

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 *tetiicahu* (*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*-kaaw, where /kʰ/→/k/ /k/. A further separation of the *-w* might be suggested as a regular possessive suffix, but the universal retention 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 *tetachcauh*. Like the terms for younger siblings, male speaker, these forms exhibit dual possession in some variations. An examination of the comparative contexts listed in Ramírez’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 taachcauh 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)-aad-kaaw, where the parenthesis indicate the optional morpheme.

Two options exist for the female speaker's term for elder brother. Carochi lists the term noquichiu (n-okiš-iw) and Sahagún gives nachtzin (n-okiš-i). Olmos lists both terms as though they were one, nachnoquichtiuh (n-aad/n-okiš-iti-iw), which suggests that both were given in response to the elicitation of the word for elder brother. The root -aad serves as the basis for the male speaker's term, and -okiš is the generic term for 'male'. The -aad root of the male and female speaker's term are definitely related. The use of -okiš, unlike other terms which do not exclusively refer to the kinship domain, cannot be conceptually separated from the more kin-related term -aad. 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 -weliwu as the male speaker's term and gives nopti 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 -ksee. 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 -teelpooé ‘young man’ and -icpooé ‘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 synonymously 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 inaccurate picture of the overall system.

Second descending generation, G-2

All sources agree that -jutiuw refers to members of the generation G-2 regardless of gender. The only confusion related to the term is the presence of the term -jutiuw 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 tixhuih* (*ete-l. i-iiwiw*) 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 *tiecitoton*, or *tie-tie-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' *-ti7*. 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 *-ti7*.

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 Dictiorium. Both give "achtontli" (-aαt-toon-ά) as the term for great grandfather. Molina has "piptontli" (-pip-toon-ά) for great grandmother and the Dicitiorium renders the term "pilotli" (-pi-toon-ά).

The Vocabulario Mexicano gives "tlacpacohcol" (lakpa-ko7k0l) for the male and "tlacpaçitzin" (lakpa-si7-çiin) for the female. The terms are a description of the members of this generation rather than true kin terms. The words are formed by adding the prefix "lakpa" to the standard terms for G+2. "lakpa" may be analyzed as "ka-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 "aαt-ko7k0l" but they differ greatly in the term for the female of G+3. In Sahagún she is "veltiuhtli" (-welitw-ά) 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, ko7k0l" '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-ko7k0l" 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 "-mín-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 lines. The only exception is the Dicitiorium which does give a female term for G+4. That term, "sciteci", is easily analyzed as "i-si7, tee-si7" 'one's grandmother's grandmother' which is an accurate description of a female four generations ret
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±5

The existence 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 Tezozómoc’s Crónica Mexícayotl corroborates the term which marks the generation G±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 tooolhuan 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 tehuátin yn titepilliuan 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-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 grandfather) are paired. This would make topiptonhuan the female counterpart of tomintonhuan, a use which is entirely unsupported
by the sources. The very strict structure of the descending sequence indicates that the rendition 'great grandmother' is completely inappropriate 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 Tezozomoc allows Olmos' term to be amended from -pip-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 -Aa. The only difficulty comes from Carochi who lists the two possibilities of -Aa7 and -Aaa. 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 -Aa7 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 phonemically rendered, it is impossible to say whether this term is related to -pi7 'elder sister' from the generation G:0. While that is possible, 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 -ma8 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-la7 and mother-in-law is -moon-nan. Sahagún gives the terms -moon-kol and -moon-st7 '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 -pił 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 -teelpooé 'male youth' or -ícpooé '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' -teeá
'sister-in-law' -wepol
female referent: 'brother-in-law' -wepol
'sister-in-law' -weer-ii

Co-parents-in-law are tee-wepol, or one's affines, and the abstract wepol-loÁ 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 extendable 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 interesting regularities. The specific terms in question are: \((G\pm 5)\) \(-pip-toon\), \((G\pm 4)\) \(-min-toon\), \((G\pm 3)\) \(-ik\)-toon, and the various terms from \(G \pm 3\); \(\delta -aad-toon\), \(\xi -pip-toon\), \(\delta lakpa-kolkol\), \(\xi lakpa-sititin\), \(\delta -aad-kolkol\), \(\xi -sititin\), and \(\xi -weltiu\).

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 'Aakpa-kolkol' and 'Aakpa-sititin' have already been discussed as terms which were created in response to an elicitation by the compiler of the dictionary. On the strength 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 requested 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 \(-aad-toon\) 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"-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 -aaé and -ik" are roots which refer to members G: 0. On that level they serve to separate elder and younger brothers. The ascription of -aaé to G+3 and -ik" 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 pilés 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 iconenh Ismael" '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 inherently 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 yueltiu in Cecilia... y para decir: Cecilia hermana menor de Andres, dizen, Cecilia yuquichtiu in Andres... y si es hermana mayor, dizen ychu in Andres... (Cárceres, 1905: 135).

In the first example, the term chosen for 'sister' was -yueltiu, 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
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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 nehuin eua (newan ewa) which means "hermanos o hermanas que vienen de unos mismos padres"
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 (oki-) or for female (siwaa-). Thus in Olmos’ list the term for ‘daughter’ is rendered nocihuapilizin (no-siwaa-pil-cin) 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 wekapanoteacuh (wekapa-no-tee-aa-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 akpa- ‘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 kakpa-ta7 and 'step-child' is kakpa-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-laawa-na as 'step-mother' and tee-laawa-konee as 'step child (of a woman)', but also tee-laawa '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 laawa, 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 her 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-siawa 'my woman' or 'no-namik 'my marriage partner'), hence the woman may be called one's laawa 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 laawa relation. Since all of the laawa 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 -laawa-konee (translated step-child in the sources) because the relationship is traced through a female. The secondary male relationship would always be marked with kakpa- as indicated above.

Relationship through a deceased relative

In the same way that laawa 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>linear</th>
<th>collateral</th>
<th>affinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-5</td>
<td>-plp-toon</td>
<td>-plp-toon</td>
<td>-plp-toon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4</td>
<td>-otl-toon</td>
<td>-otl-toon</td>
<td>-otl-toon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3</td>
<td>-tl-toon</td>
<td>-tl-toon</td>
<td>-tl-toon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2</td>
<td>-kl</td>
<td>-kl</td>
<td>-kl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-0</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G+1</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G+2</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G+3</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G+4</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
<td>-tl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M: male secondary referent (the relative)
P: female secondary referent
S: male primary referent (indicated in possessive prefix)
F: female primary referent
Y: older
X: 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 principal, mercader, o oficial dice a su padre, Niccauhtzin. La hija dice Noconetzin.

El hijo del labrador dice a su padre, Notatzin. La hija dice Notecutzin. Técuzte, Tachitze, Tacietze.

El hijo del pilli, mercader, o oficial dice a su madre, Niccauhtzin, Niccauhtzine. La hija dice Noconetzin, Notecutzin.


SeJ.f-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, I 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 deference 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 -cun ‘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, Cuecalli... in tonan, in total...
- in monan, in tota mítlan tecutli...
- in monan, in tota in quetzalcoatl...
- in tonan, in tota in tlahtecutli
- in tonan, in tota tonatiuh...


The formulaic occurrence 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, noto cetochtli tezcatl... nohueltiuh cenmalinalli, nonan tlatecuintli... yn tlamacazqui chicomexochtli, yn nohueltiuh yn nizcoacihuatl ... (Ruiz de Alarcón, 1948-52: 77).

my mother tlatecuintli, my father ce tochtli tezcatl, my elder sister cenmalinalli, my mother tlatecuintli... the priest chicomexochtli, my elder sister nizcoacihuatl ...

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

There is one reference in the texts to brothers:

Es, y ven sacerdote o diablo (tlamacazqui) un pedernal, ve a sauer si duerme mi hermana (nohueltiuh), que ya voy a sacarla para que no cudicen 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 -weliiw 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 "nopilhoantsitzin totecujoon, laçoctillaca, noxiuitzinoon ..." (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, iSwiw) 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 cal通ac (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- nan 'my fathers' (Alvarado Tezozomoc, 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 huehuetlatollti. According to the general pattern, the person of higher rank is called -iSwiw (Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 20; Sahagún, 1950: 8: 15; 6: 189), or is addressed with the pair -pil, -iSwiw. These terms serve to mark the relationship even when there is no occasion of address:
traigamos a vuestro Chimalpopoca, que es nuestro nieto, y que

Otro

que allí estaban dijeron: no es bien que venga aca, sino la

mujer que es nuestra nieta e hija rey Tezozomoc... (Alva-

rado 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 Tezo-
zómoc, 1944: 183, 202), another important but lesser ruler (Alva-
rado Tezozómoc, 1944: 499), and a man heralded as a "gran sabio"
(Alvarado Tezozómoc, 1944: 529). Cárceres indicates: "llama el
señor o gobernador del pueblo, a los viejos, que tiene en su compa-
ñia, 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' (ka7-wan) in their dealings with the
ruler (Sahagún, 1950: 9: 6). Though it is exclusive to the poch-
teca, the term seems to function in the same manner as the more
universally applicable terms. The pochteca may be addressed as
no-ka7-wan 'my uncles' by the ruler and they may refer to them-

selves as no-ka7-wan 'your uncles', but they do not address the
ruler with the reciprocal ma7 'nephew'. In the sources surveyed they

only use titles or the term -pil. Rammow has collected a text which
hints that -ma7 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 par-
ticulares 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 pipiltín en todas
las fiestas del año, se adornaban con sus mantas ricas y con to­
dos sus plumajes... (Sahagúin, 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 occurrence 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 occurrence 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 tec-iwui-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 Sahagúin.

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: (Sahagúin,
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-čiin) '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 pertinent to the higher social classes. Ruiz de Alarcón understands the term niccauhtzine (n-ik-kaaw-čiin-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. It is possible that only the male referent form served to mark a non-biological function.

The companion male referent form -aad-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 -aaé-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 notiaachcauktin (no-tee-aaé-kaaw-čiin) (Horcasitas, 1974: 298, 312). The kings are surely not each the elder brother of the other, but the term used is definitively dually possessed. The same term is applied to those who are the masters of the youth in the calmecac, the tiachcauh (tee-aaé-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-aaé-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-aaé-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 -aaé-kaaw carries the markins +rank and +instructor.

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

The elder brothers (i-aaé-yan) of Huizilopochtli, those who had fasted for a year-were much feared (Sahagún, 1950: 12: 51).
The distinction in the social meaning of the terms -\textit{aa\textendash}kaaw and -\textit{aa\textendash}separates the semantic difference between an instructor and a religious officiator. While in this social function, the simple root -\textit{aa\textendash} 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 \textit{okic}. In the social semantic sphere -\textit{okic} is the female referent term for a male religious officiator (Sahagún, 1950: 3: 2). Perhaps the presence of the -\textit{aa\textendash} in the religious context is due to a purposeful intrusion of a female referent which would more clearly separate the social meaning of -\textit{aa\textendash} and -\textit{aa\textendash}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 -\textit{aa\textendash}, -\textit{okic} mark male religious officiators and the parallel terms -\textit{weltiw} and -\textit{pi7} refer to female religious officiators. The aged women of the kin group admonished their young female relative entering service in the \textit{calmeccac}:

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 (\textit{i-weltiw\textendash}\textit{fiin-wan}) (Sahagún, 1950: 6: 126).

The position of the young woman entering the \textit{calmeccac} 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 (\textit{i-pi7-wan}), priestesses (\textit{\textfuturelanguage{si\textendash}amakas-ke}), also some had inhabited the \textit{calmeccac} (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 -\textit{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', *teek-ki*, 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 \(\rightarrow\) pip-toon) where -pi\(T\) 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 reduplicated. That process requires some explanation as it bears on the construction of the Nahuatl kinship vocabulary. The general semantic effect of reduplication is to create a new nuance on the root term. In one specific case from Molina’s dictionary, the effect is one of diminution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduplicated Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tepuz colli.</td>
<td>garauato de hierro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tepuz cocolli.</td>
<td>anzuelo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tepuz colli.</td>
<td>garauato de hierro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tepuz cocolli.</td>
<td>anzuelo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In the same way the reduplicated form of -pi\(T\) (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 -aad. As translations of the Spanish entry ‘paje’ Molina gives teach, teach. 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 teex-aad\(\dagger\)
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-aa7al. 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 two entries, yet that reduplication effected a significant semantic shift on the root term.

In the same way the reduplicated form of -pi7 (or *pi7) appears in Molina's dictionary under the form teipi '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 -aad. As translations of the Spanish entry 'paje' Molina gives teach, teach. 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 rendition 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 -a7al, 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 teach should be rendered tee-aa7al.

The presence of such a reduplicated form as -pip-toon, or -pip-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.
The variety of kinship terms with their apparent meanings can be sorted out only by 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 enmisaries 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.
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