

IBERO-AMERICANA: 8

UTO-AZTECAN LANGUAGES
OF MEXICO

A. L. KROEBER

BIBLIOTECA PÚBLICA DEL ESTADO DE JALISCO "JUAN JOSÉ ARREOLA"
MEXICO 2008

UTO-AZTECAN LANGUAGES OF MEXICO

BY

A. L. KROEBER



BIBLIOTECA PÚBLICA DEL ESTADO DE JALISCO "JUAN JOSÉ ARREOLA"
MÉXICO, 2008

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

1934

IBERO-AMERICANA : 8

28 pages, 1 map

Issued September 21, 1934

Price, 35 cents

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, ENGLAND



BIBLIOTECA PÚBLICA DEL ESTADO DE JALISCO "JUAN JOSÉ ARREOLA"
MÉXICO, 2008

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE PROBLEM	I
NAHUATL IN SINALOA	I
PIMA-TEPEHUÁN	3
CLASSIFICATION OF THE SONORAN LANGUAGES	5
CORA AND HUICHOL	8
CÁHITA-OPATA-TARAHUMAR	10
CLASSIFICATION OF UTO-AZTECAN	16
VOCABULARIES	18
Mexicano	18
Opata, Cáhita, Varohío	19
Kinship Systems	23

UTO-AZTECAN LANGUAGES OF MEXICO

THE PROBLEM

MY COLLEAGUE, DR. CARL SAUER, has asked me to comment on the linguistic aspects of his findings in *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico* (No. 5 of this series). His principal propositions of linguistic bearing are these: (1) Sinaloa did not speak Nahuatl. (2) Pima and Tepehuán form a close linguistic unit, well marked off from all the other Sonoran¹ languages, except perhaps Cora. (3) Tahue and Acaxee of the Culiacán plain and mountain-gorge country, and Guasave of the coast northward, were fairly close to Cáhita in speech. (4) Huichol and Tecual were connected with Guachichil to the east, though separated from it geographically by Zacatec. These conclusions will be examined in the light of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic classification here attempted.

NAHUATL IN SINALOA

THE VIEW that Mexicano, that is, Nahuatl, or a mere dialect of Aztec, was spoken anywhere in Sinaloa in native times, is effectively disposed of by Sauer in his earlier paper *Aztatlán*,² and needs no further refutation. The overwhelming majority of obviously non-Mexicano place names ought to have been sufficient indication to the contrary. As I observed recently,³ a distribution of a single language continuously down the length of Sinaloa and Tepic, across the continent from Jalisco by way of Colima and Guerrero to Vera Cruz, and then south to the Maya frontier in Tabasco, would be quite unparalleled in native

¹ Sonoran is used without reference to the state of Sonora, but in the philological sense given it by Buschmann and generally adhered to since: those Uto-Aztecan languages, chiefly in northwest Mexico, which are neither of the Shoshonean nor of the Nahuatl group. Powell unfortunately tried to substitute Piman for Sonoran, but the change is arbitrary and confusing.

² UC-IA, No. 1, 1932.

³ Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America, in press.

North America. Sauer's analysis of the documentary historical evidence lops off at least one end of this "Nahua" band that winds across our maps; and a similar study of the sources for Jalisco and Aguas Calientes may eliminate those areas.

There were, and are, Indians speaking Mexicano in Sinaloa; but they were introduced by the Spaniards. The following are places at which they are locally reported to have lived: Jacobo, south of Rio Presidio; Alayá; Tabala or Sabala; in Piaxtla drainage, below and above San Ygnacio, at San Juan, Tejuco, El Salto, Ajoya; on the flanks of the Sierra Tacuichamona at Bailita, Vinapa, Abuya, Tacuichamona; Mocolito; Bamoa. At many of these pueblos Aztec speech has long been extinct; at others, phrases are remembered by individuals. Vinapa, for example, does not now recall specific individuals who spoke Mexicano; Tacuichamona had two or three until a decade ago; at Abuya, an old man could give me a phrase or two; at Ajoya, a small list of words and phrases was obtained from several old Indians and some of the younger non-Indian men. At Guayapa, two and a half leagues up the Verde branch of the Piaxtla from Ajoya, Donald Brand, Sauer's assistant, was able to get a fair vocabulary, the best parts of which are given below, from an aged, ill, and starved couple. Later he obtained another near Bamoa. It is clear that the "lengua Azteca" or "Mexicana" was once spoken at a fairly numerous series of Sinaloa towns where Nahuatl Indians had been settled in post-Conquest times, but that the speech is now as good as extinct. It appears to have been pretty straight Aztec except with respect to two principal sound shifts from the classical form: medial *tl* is throughout replaced by *t*, final *tl* by *l*. These may represent an old Nahuatl dialect different from Aztec; or they may be changes that have occurred since the transplantation.

PIMA-TEPEHUAN

SAUER'S CONCLUSION that Pima and Tepehuán speech were closely similar is based on numerous statements and references by early Spaniards. It agrees entirely with J. A. Mason's finding,⁴ from linguistic analysis, that Tepecano is a variety of Tepehuán, and that this is close to Pima-Pápago.⁵ For Cora, the evidence is less certain. At any rate, the Pima-Tepehuán form of "Sonoran" speech extended in a long ribbon from the Gila to the Santiago, with an interruption of only about seventy-five miles in the region of the upper Fuerte. As Sauer points out, this is a highly peculiar distribution, not only because of its narrowness as compared with its length, but also because the Pima are on the lower seaward, and the Tepehuán on the high interior, side of the Sierra Madre, and yet neither people held much first-class territory. This Pima-Tepehuán belt is not so long as the supposed Mexicano one just discussed, nor as sinuous; but it approaches it in uniqueness. Nevertheless, its existence and range must be considered as definitely established. The historical factors which gave the Pima-Tepehuán ethnic unit its peculiar distribution are not known; but, as Sauer says, dispossession is likely to have been one of them. Culturally, of course, there is no indication of equal uniformity.

⁴ Tepecano, a Piman Language of Western Mexico, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 25:309-416, 1917; especially p. 312, but also *passim*.

⁵ The only Pima Bajo I encountered personally, a middle-aged man from Onavas, I met outdoors at night, without chance of recording; but the words he spoke to me sounded like my memory of their Pápago equivalents; and he stated that he had been in Arizona and could converse with the Pápago.

UTO-AZTECAN SOUND EQUIVALENCES

Compiled from Sapir

U-A	Azt	Hui	Co	P-T	C-T-O	Sh
a	a	a	a	a	a	a
e	e	e	e	ĩ ¹	e	ĩ ²
i	i	i	i	i	i	i
ɔ u, o	o, u	o, u	u, i	o, u	o, u	o, u ³
p	p, -	h	p, h	v ⁴	p ⁵	p
t	t	t	t	t ⁴	t	t
tl ⁶	tl	t	t	t ⁴	t	t
tš ⁷	tš	?	ts	š ⁷	tš	tš
k	k	k	k	k	k	k
kw	kw	?	kw	b	kw ⁸	kw
s ⁷	s	s	s	h, -	s	s
m	m	m	m	m	m	m
n	n	n	n	n	n	n
ŋ ⁶	n	n	n	n	n	ŋ
l ⁹	l	?	r	r ¹⁰	r, (l)	n
w	w	w	v	g	w	w
y	y	?	y	d	y	y
h	-	h	h, -	h	h	h, - ¹¹

Abbreviated headings: Hypothetical original Uto-Aztecan; Aztec (Nahua), Huichol, Cora, Pima-Tepehuán-Tepecano, Cáhita-Tarahumar-Opata, Shoshonean.

¹ The *ũ* of Kroeber, *Dolores*, *õ* of Mason.

² Except *e* in Luiseño-Cahuilla.

³ Open *ɔ* becomes *õ* in Ute.

⁴ Plus secondary changes according to associated vowel: *v* > *w*, *t* > *tš*, *š* > *s* in Pápagó.

⁵ See below for examples of *v* and *mb*. Mason gives *v* for Cáhita.

⁶ Mason doubts whether *tl* and *ŋ* are original Uto-Aztecan.

⁷ *Tš* appears also as *ts*, and *s* as *š*, in most U-A languages.

⁸ Mason gives *bw* for Cáhita.

⁹ Mason suggests original U-A *l* and *r*.

¹⁰ Pápagó is written *l*, but the sound may be really an *r*.

¹¹ Southern Paiute lacks *h*.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE SONORAN LANGUAGES

THE FOUNDATIONS of Uto-Aztecan philology were laid by Sapir in his concise monograph, *Southern Paiute and Nahuatl*.⁶ Mason has made some valuable additions and suggestions.⁷ While Sapir primarily compares Southern Paiute and Nahuatl, he adduces considerable material from other Shoshonean and from Sonoran languages. He reconstructs five⁸ vowels and fourteen consonants for original Uto-Aztecan.

The ultimate soundness of this reconstruction in all its philological implications cannot be gone into here. It may however be accepted as a tentative basis for classification. I have therefore built up upon it the adjoining table of sound equivalences, utilizing Sapir's own examples from the various languages, plus some additional material and findings by Mason. This table accepts the philology of these authors, but attempts to use it for an internal classification of the family.

It is evident at once that the main branches of Uto-Aztecan are specialized away from the hypothetical original in very different degrees. Aztec, Shoshonean, and Cáhita with its nearer congeners have remained fairly true to the ancient mother tongue. Cora is more changed; Pima-Tepehuán most of all. These results are equally evident if one wholly disregards original Uto-Aztecan and compares the existing languages *inter se*, that is, if one substitutes descriptive for reconstructive historical procedure. For example:

Departures from original Uto-Aztecan system of fourteen consonants:

Aztec	2 (+ 1)
Huichol	3 (out of only 10 occurrences)
Cora	4 (+ 2)
Pima-Tepehuán	8 (+ 1)
Cáhita-Opata-Tarahumar	3
Shoshonean	2

⁶ Part I: SAP-J 10:379-425, 1913; Parts IIa, IIb, AA 17:98-120, 306-328, 1915.

⁷ In Sapir, IIb, 321-322; also in Tepecano, as cited; and A Preliminary Sketch of the Yaqui Language, UC-PAAE 20:195-212, 1923.

⁸ Or four? He does not quite commit himself as to open *o* being distinct from close *o-u*.

Disagreements among eighteen⁹ vowel and consonant equivalences:¹⁰

Aztec and Pima-Tepehuán	10
Aztec and Cáhita-O-T	2 (+ 2)
Aztec and Shoshonean	4 (+ 2)
Pima-Tep. and Cáhita-O-T	7 (+ 1)
Pima-Tep. and Shoshonean	8
Cáhita-O-T and Shoshonean	3 (+ 1)

That is, Pima-Tepehuán differs from the three other groups in half of its equivalences (from 7 to 10 out of 18 occurrences); but these three groups differ from one another only in a third or a fourth or less (from 2 to 4 out of 18; or, with partial or doubtful disagreements counted, from 4 to 6 out of 18).

It is clear from these figures that Pima-Tepehuán is the most specialized of the four divisions under discussion. It follows that the conventional grouping of Uto-Aztecan family into Nahuan, Sonoran, and Shoshonean must be abandoned. There seems to be no Sonoran block, except geographically. A complete Uto-Aztecan classification would obviously be premature: some languages are very imperfectly recorded, others wholly unknown. Among those here considered, however, the indicated segregation is: (1) Pima-Tepehuán, and (2) Nahuatl, larger Cáhita group, Shoshonean. It cannot yet be affirmed that this classification has historic depth. Possibly Pima-Tepehuán has become rather recently specialized, instead of representing an ancient main trunk of the stock. This question must be left open until analysis has been carried farther. Descriptively, however, there can be no doubt that the classification holds, so far as sound-apparatus is concerned. There are also indications of similar Pima-Tepehuán specializations in structure: the absence of absolute noun endings¹¹ and of *-m* plurals,¹² for example, and the reduced preterit verb stems of Tepecano.¹³

⁹ With *o*, *o*, *u* not discriminated.

¹⁰ This second set of figures diminishes the logical possibility that the reconstruction of original Uto-Aztecan has been weighted by Sapir through preoccupation with Nahuatl and Paiute. On the basis of descriptive comparison between actual languages, Pima-Tepehuán comes out just as aberrant as on the basis of matching these languages against their hypothetical original.

¹¹ Tepecano in fact often shortens the absolute noun.—Mason, 322.

¹² Except a few crystallizations. ¹³ Mason, 353.

Some real problems emerge from this set-off linguistic position of Pima-Tepehuán in Uto-Aztecan, because the geographical position of the group is the opposite of set off. An aberrant branch of a stock is most often territorially detached, or at least peripheral to the remainder of the stock. Pima-Tepehuán however winds along the edge of the Cáhita-Opata-Tarahumar group, in part through it. It is difficult to conceive of the deep-going differentiation between the two groups arising while they were occupying their present territories. But if we construe one of them as having formerly been geographically isolated or peripheral, this in all probability would have to be Pima-Tepehuán. And if this group had once lived elsewhere as a unit, it is difficult to see it attaining its present ribbon-like distribution. I prefer for the present not to indulge in the hypotheses which might be framed in explanation, especially as any credible theory would have to take cognizance of linguistic as well as historical and cultural facts, and the evidence along all three lines is as yet glaringly deficient. But it is clear that something unusual has happened to the Pima-Tepehuán at some time in their past, in comparison with most of the Uto-Aztecan. The existence of a considerable historical problem concerning them must be recognized.



CORA AND HUICHOL

THE PLACE of Cora and Huichol in Uto-Aztecan is far from clear. Preuss has recently published a Cora grammar, but his approach is so different from that of, say, Mason's Tepecano, that intensive analysis will be required before the degree of similarity of the two languages becomes clear. The Huichol material is very limited.

So much however is evident: there is little to give substance to the occasional early Spanish opinion that Cora is especially close to Pima-Tepehuán. According to the table, Cora keeps original *p*, *tš*, *kʷ*, *s*, *ɣ* where Pima-Tepehuán has altered to *v*, *š*, *b*, *h* (or *-*), *d*. Original *w* becomes *v* in Cora and *g* in Pima-Tepehuán. Where both languages agree, as in *tl* > *t*, *ŋ* > *n*, *r* > *l*, the original sound is least certain. A cursory inspection of Preuss's and Mason's grammars also suffices to dispel any idea of particularly close similarity.

In a few traits Cora shows special resemblance to Aztec: original *p* > Aztec *p*, *-*, Cora *p*, *h*; original *h* > Aztec *-*, Cora *h*, *-*. But these concordances should not be overweighted.

In the map accompanying this study I tentatively include Totorame or Pino-me in the Cora group on the authority of the Spanish statements assembled by Sauer, but with the reserve imposed by the fact that no Totorame speech material appears to be extant.

Huichol is even more difficult to place than Cora, because of deficiency of material. This is particularly unfortunate, because Sauer's strong confirmation of the suspicion that the Huichol-Tecual were a branch of the Guachichil puts the center of distribution of this group well to the eastward of the remaining "Sonoran" languages, and not very far north of undoubted Nahuatl territory, with only the Otomi intervening. With fuller knowledge, Huichol-Guachichil might thus easily prove a connecting link between Sonoran and Nahuan. There are a few words which point this way:

Hui ota two, Az ome, other U-A wa-, etc.

Hui iyali heart, Az yolotli

Hui ome bone, Az omi-tl, other U-A o-

Hui utši eye, Az ištoli, other U-A pu-
Hui (and Cora) ha, water, Az a-tl, other U-A pa

The last two illustrate Sapir's $p > Az p, -, Co p, h, Hui h$.

Again, however, this is very fragmentary evidence. A real study of Huichol is badly needed. At present we cannot say whether Huichol forms a group with Cora, or is a separate branch of "Sonoran," or shows more significant transitions to Aztec than the other Sonoran languages. The one thing that seems clear is that Huichol is not especially close to Pima-Tepehuán.

I USE this cumbersome group designation, until a more appropriate one is invented, to include not only the three languages mentioned but also Varohío, Concho, probably Acaxee, and perhaps Tahue and others. In short, it comprises all the "Sonoran" languages on which there are data except Pima-Tepehuán-Tepecano, Cora, and Huichol-Guachichil.

The only modern work dealing with any member of this group is Mason's sketch of Yaqui.¹⁴ Mason allows only two certain shifts, of original *p* and *kʷ* to Yaqui *v* and *bw*, respectively; besides Yaqui *r* and *l*, which he suggests may be derived from two original sounds instead of *l* alone (and *tl* > *t*, *η* > *n*, where he questions the validity of the original).

I bring together in the subjoined table (p. 11) the principal consonant equivalences apparent in my Opata, Yaqui, Mayo, and Varohío vocabularies printed below, and in Ferrero's Tarahumar dictionary.

It is apparent, as from the vocabularies, that these five languages form a substantial unit as compared with Pima-Tepehuán; but also that most of them agree with Pima-Tepehuán in one or another shift.

Thus, *p* becomes *v* not only in Pi-Te but at times in Op, Yaq, Ma; *kʷ* (Pi-Te *b*), *bw* in Yaq, Ma; *w* (Pi-Te *g*), *g* in Ma, *g* (or *ηg*) in Opata, *w* (or *gv*) in Yaq; *y* (Pi-Te *d*), *d* or *δ* in Opata; *h* (Pi-Te *h* or *-*) is sometimes *-* in Yaq, Ma, Tar. Only Varohío fails consistently to agree with Pima-Tepehuán in any of these shifts.

These partial resemblances lend some color to the second interpretation suggested above, namely, that Pima-Tepehuán may be not so much a quite anciently diverging main branch of Uto-Aztecan, as a limb which more recently specialized extremely on certain shifts most of which occur also, though only incipiently or partially, in one or another idiom of the Cáhita-Opata-Tarahumar group.

¹⁴ As cited above.

U-A	Op	Yaq	May	Var	Tar	Pi-Te
P	*b, v, p	*mb, v, p	*v, b, p	p	*b, p	v (> w)
T	t, d	t	t	t	r	t (> tc)
KW		bw	bw, w	w	w, kw	b, g
W	g (ŋg)	w (gv)	g	w	w	g
Y	d, δ	y	y	y, h	-, y	d
H	h	h, -	h, -	h	-, y	h, -

* Initial only.

Words illustrating the shifts:

P: 3, 6, 9, o.brother, y.brother, head (hair), eye, flesh, belly, water, river, star, ash, mat, road, tobacco, grass, maize ear, mesquite, tuna, jackrabbit, skunk, flea, fly, lie.

T: mouth, tooth, breast, belly, foot, sky, sun, day, night, stone, metate, live oak, flea, white, up, down.

KW: land, large, eat, sing.

W: 2, 4, foot, pine, coyote.

Y: people, old man, mother, nose, rain.

H: bone, liver, wind, skunk.

*Opata*¹⁵ is possibly the nearest to Pi-Te. Its fricative δ, which I recorded several times, is perhaps the stepping-stone by which original *y* reached *d* in Tepehuán. Peculiar also is the palatal nasal *ŋ*, which I heard in the word for coyote, *ŋgoi*. Very common is the absolute noun-ending *-t*. There may be others: *mba-t* or *mbā-vi*, water; *navu-tc*, tuna. *Doh-me*, people, looks like a plural of *dor*, man, cf. *Yaq yorême*. The terms for youth and girl contain what seems a diminutive *-tši*.

Yaqui, one of the two surviving Cáhita dialects, alters original *kw* to *bw* and *p* to *v*. As Mason observes, there is, however, a sufficient number of examples of *p* being retained, both initially and medially. Further, I recorded several words with initial *mb*: *mbaki*, three, *mbā'tani*, nine, *mbā'a*, *vā'am*, water, *mbôvok*, toad. Somewhat analogous is the approach in *svôi*, two, where the original sound is *w*—but Mayo, Opata, and Pima-Tepehuán have *g*-. With respect to *r* and *l*, Mason generally heard *l*, but recognizes *r* as distinct. I heard *r* except

¹⁵ The accent is on the first syllable: ópata.

in a few words.¹⁶ The difference is probably one of apperception. The corresponding sound of Pima and Pápago has been written *l* by all Americans (Russell, Dolores, Kroeber, Mason), but regularly appears as *r* in place names adopted by the Spaniards. The phonetician Hans Uldall declares the sound to be retroflex *r* in Pápago. Yaqui however seems to recognize *l* as distinct from *r*. The stopped consonants are prevailingly if not universally unaspirated. Yaqui, like Pima-Tepehuán, appears wholly to have lost absolute noun-suffixes. Nevertheless, it retains an active plural suffix *-m*, which sometimes seems to have collective force, as the vocabulary forms for firewood, salt, tobacco, etc., indicate.

Mayo is beginning to break down under Spanish contact, at least in much of its territory. The Spanish plural *-s*, *-es*, is now regularly added to Mayo words. The several terms for uncle and aunt have been replaced by *tio* and *tia*. The pronunciation has almost certainly been affected.¹⁷ Yaqui *mb* and *v* have assimilated to *b*¹⁸—but Yaqui *p* is *p* also in Mayo, which confirms the distinctness of two Cáhita sounds corresponding to U-A *p*. Yaqui *bw* was heard sometimes as *w* and sometimes as *bw* in Mayo. In “two,” *gôî* corresponds to Yaqui *gvôî*. Some of these differences may be native, some owing to Spanish influence. A century ago Mayo must have been very close to Yaqui. The dialects are mutually intelligible now, in the main.

Tarahumar, to judge from Ferrero's account, is conservative with respect to original Uto-Aztecan in some points but has specialized in others. U-A *p* is always written *p* medially, but usually *b* when initial in Tar. *Kw* is usually *w*, but retained in *coá*, eat; *w* remains such. *Y* is both lost and retained; *h*, if Ferrero's orthography is to be trusted, is either lost or replaced by *y*. U-A *t*, almost without exception, has become *r*. These are not very fundamental changes from Cáhita and Opata; the most obtrusive is *t* > *r*. The usual absolute noun-suffixes are lacking. In their place appear *-ka*, *-ki*, *-tši*, *-ke*, *-ra*, *-ri*, *-ko*, *-ku*, etc.,

¹⁶ *Il·î'-tci*, small; *ili'ûsi*, child; *ô'la*, old man (but *ham-y-ora*, old woman); and endings *-li* and *-la* occurring on several terms of relationship denoting the younger of two correlatives.

¹⁷ Most Mayo are bilingual, and many Mexicans of the region speak some Mayo.

¹⁸ Though I heard Mayo ^mbaso, grass.

about in that order of frequency. It is not clear whether these function as new absolutes or are deriving suffixes.

Varohío, or Huarajía as I recorded it,¹⁹ is all in all most similar to Tarahumar. But it can hardly be, as one of Sauer's sources has it, merely a provincial dialect of Tarahumar which the Varohío learned when they gave up their own language in the seventeenth century.

Varohío has retained the hypothetical original Uto-Aztecan consonant scheme with less change than any other known Sonoran language. *P, t, w, y, h*, are unaltered;²⁰ *kʷ* appears as *w*. The stops are prevailingly aspirated; when medial, they even seem preceded by a breath: *na'po'*, *tuna*, *ku'pa'*, *hair*, *te'tê'*, *stone*. The accent falls most often on the last syllable, as in Tarahumar, whereas Opata and Cáhita favor the next to the last. There is no indication of absolutes, and but little of the characteristic Tarahumar suffixes. Occasionally an entirely new word crops out, like *nero'i* for water—confirmed by Sauer.

Varohío apparently remains considerably farther from extinction than Opata, and it is probable that a satisfactory study of the structure of the language could be made without much difficulty. It seems more archaic than Tarahumar, rather than derived from it: perhaps it is a surviving proto-Cáhita-Tarahumar.²¹

Concho appears to be unrecorded except for three words noted in the Chamuscado expedition of 1581. "The Conchos... call corn *sanate*, water *bate*, and each other *yolly*."²² These terms suffice to estab-

¹⁹ Dr. Donald Brand informs me that in *Misiones de Tarahumara, 197-205*, the name is spelled Guarijía; the language is referred to as a mixture of Yaqui and Tarahumara; and the site is given as Santa Ana (Loreto) mission, between the Mayo and the Otero, in the municipio of Chínipas.

²⁰ Except occasional *y > h*, as in *ho'tce-duame*, old man.

²¹ I obtained *Ma'kura'we'* as the Huarajía name for themselves. Other tribal names are *Taroho'mali*, *Hô'pa'ta'*, *Pî'mā'*, *Mayo'*, *Hía'kî*. These are evidently native pronunciations of the current Spanish designations, like *Sawena'ndo* for San Fernando. *Nawin-erotši* is the Huarajía translation of Mayo Navobampo. The following were given me by an old woman of Chorijoa, Santos Huitimea, as Huarajía names of places in their own territory: *Hûrawie'po*, *Urapaco*; *Sêtêxko'*, *Sejaqui*; *Sêtahakitši'*, *Setajaqui*; *Se'para'*, *Tepara*; *Kutšuwe'ri*, *Cuchuhueri*; *Wahara'i*, *Huajaray* (San Pablo). *San Luís*, *Loreto*, *Chínipas* are Tarahumar; probably also *Jecopaco* in Chihuahua. *Macoyahui*, *Techobampo*, *Yuricarichic* now are Mayo, formerly were Huarajía. *Tepahui*, and from *Conicari* down, were old Mayo territory.

²² Hammond and Rey, *Obregón's History, 275, 1928*. In a footnote they add that in the Gallegos relation of the Rodríguez expedition corn is given as *fonet*, water *bod*, the people *yosli*. These are evident misreadings of the words cited above.

lish Concho in the Cáhita-Opata-Tarahumar group. Sanate for maize corresponds to my Opata sunut, even to the absolute suffix -t. Lombardo in 1702 gives xunut (=šunut). Bate, water, is my Opata mbat. Again the absolute is evident. Yolli, people, corresponds not with my Opata or Buckingham Smith's Eudeve-Heve-Dohema Opata dohme, but with Cáhita (and Varohío?) yorê'me. The corresponding Tarahumar terms are sunú, bahuiqui (=bawi-ki), rejoin (=rejoin). It can be inferred that Concho was a distinct language within the Ca-Op-Tar group, mostly closely related to Opata, and perhaps most different from Tarahumar.

*Acaxee*²³ is also unknown, except a few phrases which do not lend themselves to definitive analysis. They are:

oneya queuaua dios tocaca veuincome, I believe-in God (our?)-father almighty.²⁴

tesaba, i'dolos²⁵

neyuncame, demonio, "el que todo lo hace."²⁵

The most distinctive element is the suffix *-kame*. This is almost universal in the "Sonoran" languages; but as an agentive, such as it seems to be here, it is characteristic of Cáhita, Opata, and Tarahumar.²⁶ In Tepecano it forms chiefly abstract nouns, and in Tepehuán is said to be passive.²⁷ In Cora it seems rare.²⁸

This slender clue suggests that Sauer may be right in conjecturing Acaxee to have been a member of the Cáhita group in the larger sense; that is, of what I have called the Cáhita-Opata-Tarahumar division. But the inclusion must be accepted with reserve. I should doubt seriously whether a missionary familiar with Cáhita could complete a real catechism among the Acaxee of Topia in twenty days.

²³ Akashe'e or Akashe'e' is likely to have been the original pronunciation.

²⁴ From Drey Neue Relaciones, 1607: in seventh letter from P. Ayerbe, from the Baimoa, a northern Acaxee group; communicated to me by Sauer. The phrase is the first line of the Credo.

²⁵ From the Santarén letter in Alegre, vol. 1.

²⁶ Mason, UC-PAAE. 20:201; Pimentel, Cuadro Descriptivo, 1:112, 266 (Tar.-game-ke).

²⁷ Mason, Tepecano, 324; Pimentel, 1:234.

²⁸ Preuss, IJAL 7:14. But Pimentel, 1:286, basing on Ortega, gives two examples of -kame with agentive meaning.

Tahue, in the Sinaloan coastal plain, is even more dubious in respect of its affiliation, because there is virtually no material beyond place names. These ring as if *Tahue* belonged to the present group rather than to Pima-Tepehuán. *Sumupa* is given as meaning place of maize. This looks like a derivation from Cah-Op-Tar sunu, maize, rather than Pi-Te huni or Aztec cen-tli. Yet *jalmichi*, a fish, suggests Aztec mich-; but may not be a native word.

Jumano and Suma.—These two tribes have generally been left unclassified, as in the articles on them in the Handbook of American Indians. Sauer sees them as probably Uto-Aztecan. I incline to his opinion, on the basis of the words and names he cites; but reserve is indicated. The words are *abad*, water; *teoy* or *tooy*, maize; *aguacate*, beans; *parba*, *porba*, or *payla*, copper. None of these are patently Uto-Aztecan, though *abad* is certainly suggestive; especially in view of the Concho sources varying between *bate* and *bad* for water. The Jumano sources have evidently been similarly corrupted, as the forms for copper show. The list of forty personal names cited by Sauer does not help much, partly because the etymologies are unknown, partly because of the probability of poor copying. I assume that *f* in this list represents original manuscript *s*, but it seems rash even to conjecture what *ph* may have stood for. The list rings definitely more Uto-Aztecan than Athabaskan, but none too sonorously Uto-Aztecan at that. Under the circumstances a probability of Uto-Aztecan affiliation can be posited, but hardly an opinion as to place within the family. Geography would suggest linkage with Opata and Concho; but geography alone would mislead fundamentally with respect to the classification of Pima and Tepehuán.

CLASSIFICATION OF UTO-AZTECAN

ON THE BASIS of the foregoing considerations, the widespread and historically important Uto-Aztecán speech family is tentatively classifiable as follows.

I. SHOSHONEAN; wholly within the United States, and separated by non-Uto-Aztecans (Yuman and Athabascan tribes) from all its congeners. The tentative classification I made twenty-five years ago²⁹ seems to have been widely accepted, has not been assailed, and appears still serviceable.

A. *Hopi*. Perhaps the most divergent of the four Shoshonean branches.

B. *Plateau branch*. Includes three groups.

1. Ute-Chemehuevi. Ute, Southern (or true) Paiute, Chemehuevi, Kawaiisu.
2. Shoshone-Comanche. All true Shoshone, including the Wind River and Comanche east of the Rocky Mountains; also the Panamint or Koso.
3. Mono-Bannock. Bannock, Northern Paiute or Paviotso, Mono.

C. *Kern River or Tübatulabal*.

D. *Southern California*. Also in three groups.

1. Serrano, including Kitanemuk, Alliklik, Vanyume.
2. Gabrielino, including dialects like Fernandeano.
3. Luiseño-Cahuilla, including Juaneño and Cupeño.

II. PIMA-TEPEHUÁN. In a narrow belt from the Gila to the Santiago, with an interruption about the upper Fuerte. Pápago, Pima Alto and Bajo, Tepehuán, Tepecan.

III. CÁHITA-OPATA-TARAHUMAR.

Opata (Eudeve, Heve, Dohema).

Presumably, because of its position, Jova.

Concho.

Tarahumar.

Varohío or Huarejía; perhaps with Chínipa, Guasapar, Temori.

²⁹ Shoshonean Dialects of California, UC-PAAE 4:65-165, 1907.

Para consultar el documento completo puede usted acudir a las instalaciones de la Biblioteca Pública del Estado de Jalisco “Juan José Arreola”, en el área de Acervo Histórico.