

Honorific Usage in Modern Nahuatl: The Expression of Social Distance and Respect in the Nahuatl of the Malinche Volcano Area



Jane H. Hill; Kenneth C. Hill

Language, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Mar., 1978), 123-155.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0097-8507%28197803%2954%3A1%3C123%3AHUIMNT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

Language is currently published by Linguistic Society of America.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/lisa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HONORIFIC USAGE IN MODERN NAHUATL:

THE EXPRESSION OF SOCIAL DISTANCE AND RESPECT IN THE NAHUATL OF THE MALINCHE VOLCANO AREA

JANE H. HILL and KENNETH C. HILL
Wayne State University *University of Michigan*

A complex morphological system for marking respect and social distance exists in the Nahuatl spoken in the Malinche Volcano area of Puebla and Tlaxcala, in Mexico. Principles for usage of the system are described on the basis of observation of 85 speakers in eleven communities. Usage in direct address is relatively stable in all communities. However, usage in reference, which apparently became highly elaborated during the colonial period, is being reduced in some of the modern communities. This seems to reflect the shift in the functional range of Nahuatl toward a usage manifesting indigenist solidarity, with prestige-bearing roles being increasingly encoded in Spanish.*

1. INTRODUCTION. An elaborate system of marking social distance and respect is found in the morphology of Nahuatl as spoken in communities of the Malinche volcano area in the Mexican states of Tlaxcala and Puebla. The complexity of the morphology involved, the semantic range of the elements, and variation in the system in use raise questions of considerable interest for our understanding of the form and function of such systems, both in Nahuatl itself and in other languages.

A system of elements usually referred to as 'honorifics' or 'reverentials' is reported by all the grammarians of Classical Nahuatl (cf. Olmos 1547, Molina 1571a, Carochi 1645, Siméon 1885, Garibay 1970, Anderson 1973, Andrews 1975). Similar systems are reported for several modern varieties of Nahuatl (cf. Whorf 1946 for Milpa Alta in the Federal District; Pittman 1948 for Tetelcingo in Morelos; and Buchler & Freeze 1966 and Buchler 1967 for Hueyapan and Atempán in northern Puebla). None of those reports, except for Pittman's, describes the system in much detail. The present account is based on materials collected in 1974-75 and during the summer of 1976 in a linguistic survey of Nahuatl-speaking communities on the western and southwestern slopes of the Malinche volcano. The communities were selected to represent a range of linguistic conservatism and innovation, and a range of types of adaptations to the economically and politically dominant Spanish language and culture. The communities of the survey can be divided into two major groups: a southern group, oriented toward the city of Puebla as a center, and a northern one, oriented toward the cities of Santa Ana Chiautempan and Tlaxcala. A list of the communities, with population figures and political status, is given in Table 1 (p. 124).

The southern communities, in spite of their proximity to the city of Puebla, are in general much more conservative in dress and in preservation of Nahuatl than are the northern ones, although there is internal variation in both groups. The

* This work was supported in part by Grant No. NEH-RO-20495-74-572 from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and by grants-in-aid from the American Council of Learned Societies. Among the many people who aided us, we wish to thank especially Hugo Nutini, Jane Rosenthal, and Larry Patrick. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 1976 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Washington, DC.

TOWN	POPULATION	MUNICIPIO	STATUS
Southern communities			
San Miguel Canoa	15,000(?)	Puebla	junta auxiliar
San Pablo del Monte (barrio of Tlaltepango only)	20,000	Vicente Guerrero	pueblo (cabecera)
La Resurrección	5,000	Puebla	junta auxiliar
Northern communities			
Santiago Ayometitla	500	Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla	pueblo
San Antonio Acuamanala	1,000	Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla	pueblo (cabecera)
San Rafael Tepatlaxco	1,000	Santa Ana Chiautempan	pueblo
San Felipe Cuahutenco	1,000	Juan Cuamatzi	pueblo
Santa Ana Chiautempan	15,000	Santa Ana Chiautempan	ciudad (cabecera)
San Lorenzo Almecatla	800	San Juan Cuautlancingo	pueblo
Santa María Acxotla del Monte	800	San Luis Teolocholco	pueblo
San Luis Teolocholco	1,000	San Luis Teolocholco	pueblo (cabecera)

TABLE 1. The communities surveyed.

southern communities show relatively little 'long-distance' migration for work; a typical pattern is for workers to leave the community by the day only. In the northern communities, migration by the week is common, although many people work in their homes as weavers and knitters.

In the survey, we interviewed several subjects in each community, covering the age range which used Nahuatl there, and including both male and female subjects. The survey is not a random sample, but represents people we met through social networks, beginning with an initial contact arranged for us in each town. This paper is based on interviews done during 1974-75, although a few from summer 1976 will also be cited. A list of the subjects by age, sex, community, and occupation is given in Table 2 (pp. 126-7).

The survey provided extensive information on the usage of one speaker, hereafter referred to as S1—a 16-year-old student from San Miguel Canoa. S1 conducted all the interviews in Nahuatl, and we were able to observe his usage in interactions with subjects who ranged from his family members and life-long friends to total strangers, from doddering monolingual elders to teenagers who hardly spoke Nahuatl, from priests and municipal presidents to disreputable drunks. S1's usage was somewhat constrained, since he gave the interview from a prepared list of questions. However, he altered the honorific level of the questions to suit the occasion, sometimes forgot a question, and inserted extras as needed—so that, though his usage hardly reflected a traditional Nahuatl speech situation, it was probably reasonably relaxed.

Since the interview was almost the same from subject to subject, the data are partially controlled for topic. The usages for S1 and for all other subjects thus refer to the same topics again and again. However, since many interviews took the form of relatively free-flowing conversations, additional topics are also present.

2. MORPHOLOGY OF THE DISTANCE-RESPECT SYSTEM. We will refer to the system of reverentials as the distance-respect (DR) system. Markers of this system appear in direct-address nominals (hereafter DAN) such as pronouns, personal names,

and titles; in verbs, where they may be in constituency with either the subject or the object; in absolute nouns which are not direct-address (DA) nouns; in possessed nouns, where they may be in constituency with either the noun possessed or the possessor; in inflected postpositions, where they are in constituency with the pronominal prefix; and in words like 'yes' and 'no', when such words are addressed to someone who is receiving DR usages.

In DA we can recognize four levels of usage:¹ Level I, 'intimacy'; Level II, 'neutrality' or 'distance'; Level III, 'honor'; and Level IV, 'compadrazgo'. Compadres—persons who stand in a ritual kinship relationship by virtue of being parent–godparent or godparent–godparent to the same child—address each other in the 3rd person; the other three levels use 2nd person forms. The DAN pronouns and correct verb forms for each level are shown in Table 3 (p. 128).

In this system, Level I is morphologically unmarked. Semantically, however, it is marked as intimate or subordinating, since the neutral usage to strangers of any age, except children or adolescents, is at Level II. Level II is marked by the presence on the verb of the prefix *on-*. In the DR system, this prefix refers to social distance; in other contexts, it can mean physical motion away from the speaker. Level III in 2nd person forms retains the *on-* prefix and adds two additional, interrelated elements to the verb: the reflexive prefix *mo-* and an appropriate transitivity suffix, the choice of suffix being lexically conditioned by the verb stem (see Andrews for a fuller discussion of these suffixes in the Classical language). In addition, verbs at Level III may be marked with the reverential suffix *-tzinōa*. Level IV, the compadrazgo usage, is in the 3rd person—though pragmatically, of course, it is DA. Level IV does not display the prefix *on-*, nor does the 2nd person imperative prefix *xi-* appear; instead, the proclitic *ma* 'may ...' is used.²

Almost the same system of affixes is used for 3rd person referential verbs, shown in Table 4 (p. 129), except that *on-* is not retained at Level III. As will be seen, 3rd person referential usages which display DR markers are more elevated than DA usages of virtually identical morphology.

The DR marker which appears on DAN's, other absolute nouns, possessed nouns, and inflected postpositions is the suffix *-tzin*. This suffix marks diminutive, affectionate, or honorific meaning, depending on the context. Some of the absolute noun formations with honorific *-tzin* have become lexicalized, e.g. *tlācatzintli* 'gentleman' (from *tlācatl* 'man'),³ *zoātzintli* 'lady' (from *zoātl* 'woman'), *ātzintli* 'holy water' (from *ātl* 'water'). Possessed nouns may occur with DR markers to honor either the possessor or the possessed object, e.g. *motōcātzin* 'your name' (Level II or III) vs. *motōcā* 'your name' (Level I), where the Level II or III form refers to the possessor; *motāhtzin* 'your father', where the DR marker refers to

¹ Pittman describes three levels—neutral, H, and HH—for Tetelcingo.

² Andrews (54) says that the Classical language uses the *ma ...* form as the polite imperative. We observed *ma ...* forms consistently only with Level IV.

Unfortunately, we have no data as to what the verb form would be if BOTH the subject and the object were being honored.

³ Pittman (236) reports for Tetelcingo that the form *tlācatzintli* in reference, as opposed to DA, is an 'exceptionally reverent allusion', as for the President of Mexico. In the Malinche communities, this is a very common usage, and carries no more reverence than Sp. *señor*.

SAN MIGUEL CANOA

S1	16	m	student
S2	14	m	student
S3	14	m	student
S4	14	m	student
S5	45	m	farmer
S6	15	m	student
S7	15	m	student
S8	16	f	unemployed
S9	50	m	factory worker/ farmer
S10	20	m	factory worker
S11	90	m	farmer
S12	68	m	farmer/church official
S13	70	m	farmer
S14	90	f	housewife
S15	75	m	farmer
S16	43	m	farmer/shepherd
S17	80	f	housewife
S18	40	m	priest

TLALTEPANGO

S19	62	m	retired foreman/ farmer
S20	55	f	housewife/tortilla vendor
S21	30	f	store clerk
S22	18	f	secretary
S23	50	f	housewife/'postera' ^a
S24	30	m	factory worker
S25	26	m	mason
S26	38	m	policeman
S27	26	f	housewife
S28	29	f	masa vendor
S29	60	f	housewife
S30	26	m	factory worker
S31	39	m	itinerant worker

LA RESURRECCIÓN

S32	24	m	farmer/musician
S33	43	m	teamster/musician
S34	37	f	housewife
S35	55	f	housewife
S36	34	f	housewife
S37	56	m	farmer/musician
S38	85	m	farmer
S39	18	m	student/musician
S40	24	m	mechanic
S41	77	f	housewife

SANTIAGO AYOMETTLA

S42	50	m	farmer/mason
S43	75	f	housewife
S44	66	m	farm worker
S45	39	f	housewife
S46	62	m	pulquero

SAN ANTONIO ACUAMANALA

S47	65	m	tailor/broker
S48	55?	f	housewife
S49	60	f	housewife
S50	50	f	housewife
S51	77	m	itinerant worker
S52	40	m	factory worker

SAN RAFAEL TEPATLAXCO

S53	56	f	housewife/laundress
S54	80-90?	f	housewife
S55	63	m	pulquero
S56	80	m	pulquero/farmer/ itinerant worker
S57	72	m	pulquero/farm worker
S58	100+	f	housewife
S59	70-80?	f	housewife
S60	73	m	weaver

SAN FELIPE CUAHUTENCO

S61	50	m	weaver
S62	46	f	housewife
S63	63	m	farmer
S64	73	m	farmer
S65	47	m	farmer
S66	43	m	farmer
S67	42	m	weaver
S68	47	m	farmer
S69	13?	m	group of boys
S70	30	m	factory worker
S71	30	f	housewife

SANTA ANA CHIAUTEMPAN

S72	63	m	retired teacher
-----	----	---	-----------------

SAN LORENZO ALMECATLA

S73	81	m	farmer
-----	----	---	--------

SANTA MARÍA ACXOTLA DEL MONTE

S74	21	f	housewife
S75	45	f	housewife
S76	80	m	shepherd
S77	75	m	storekeeper
S78	59	f	vendor
S79	36	f	housewife

SAN LUIS TEOLOCHOLCO

S80	63	m	farmer?
S81	48	f	housewife
S82	15	f	unemployed
S83	65	m	pulquero

SAN MIGUEL CANOA (1976)

S84	40	f	vendor
S85	26	f	housewife

the father, if the addressee is an intimate. (The form *motah* never occurs.) Inflected postpositions occur with DR markers to honor the referent of the prefix of the postpositional form, e.g. *inahuactzīn in notahtzīn* 'with my revered father' (lit. 'his-with-DR the my-father-DR'), usually of a deceased father, vs. *inahuac in notahtzīn* 'with my father', a more ordinary usage; *mocōntrahtzīn* 'against you, with all due respect' vs. *mocōntrah* 'against you'.

DR markers do not appear in constituency with 1st person subjects of verbs, except occasionally as a *gaucherie* committed by semi-speakers.⁴ Nor do they occur in constituency with 1st person possessors of possessed nouns, or with 1st person marked postpositions. In a construction like *notlāltzīn*, the appropriate translation is not 'the land of my honorable self', but 'my beloved land' or 'my little piece of land'. Exceptions to the non-occurrence of DR markers with 1st person possessed nouns are, of course, parent and grandparent terms—where honor is done to the relative, not the possessor. An exception to the non-occurrence of DR markers with postpositions is the form *tihuan* 'we together', if one member of the 'we' is being honored, e.g. *tihuantzīn in nonāntzīn* 'my mother and I'.

3. USAGE OF THE DR SYSTEM IN DA. The data from the Malinche-area survey represent an opportunity, not provided by the more formal texts of the Classical period, to observe the meaning and range of DR usage in daily speech. While the DR system of the Malinche area differs from that in use in Classical times, and from the system described for other modern varieties of Nahuatl, we believe that an attempt to identify the range of DR usage with some precision will throw light on information about other variants of Nahuatl. In this section we will discuss the system first in general terms, and then attempt to cast DA usage in a set of rules which informally specify the probabilities of particular usages.

3.1. The DAN's *teh* and *tehuatzīn* are associated by speakers with Sp. *tú* and *usted* respectively; in fact, their modern usages are similar to the T-V distinctions of many European languages, as described by Brown & Gilman 1960. A problem for the history of Nahuatl is to determine whether the *teh/tehuatzīn* distinction in Classical times was also like T-V, or whether current usage reflects an assimilation to the Spanish pattern with Nahuatl lexical material. However, Spanish has no equivalent to Level III or IV usages in surface morphology. Reports from other modern Nahuatl-speaking communities reflect a different range of usage from that of the Malinche area for *teh/tehuatzīn*. Buchler (& Freeze)

⁴ Anderson et al. 1976 contains several texts with Level III forms for 'I die'. Such forms do not occur in our data, although the verb 'to die' is almost always at Level III for other persons (see §5).

TABLE 2. List of subjects by community, age, sex, and occupation. 'Housewife' in the Malinche communities does not imply solely housework. Many women so labeled buy and sell in the market either full time or occasionally, or do farm work with their families or as paid workers. Wives of weavers help their husbands with tasks like cleaning wool. Some time during their lives, women may work as maids or laundresses in the bigger towns.

* A 'postera' is a woman who runs a 'puesto', a place where soft drinks, candy, cigarettes etc. are sold.

LEVEL	USAGE	DAN	ADDRESSEE IS SUBJECT	ADDRESSEE IS OBJECT	IMPERATIVE
I	intimacy or subordination	'you' sg. <i>teh(huat)</i>	'you have it' <i>ticipia</i>	'it happens to you' <i>mitzpanōa</i>	'tell me' <i>xinēchili</i>
II	neutral, distance, or first respect level	pl. <i>namēhhuān</i> sg. <i>tehuatzin</i>	<i>nanquipiah</i> <i>ticompia</i>	<i>namēchpanōa</i> <i>mitzompanōa</i>	<i>xinēchilican</i> <i>xinēchonili</i>
III	honor, reverence	pl. <i>namēhhuāntzitzin</i> sg. <i>māhuizotzin</i>	<i>nancompiah</i> <i>ticonmpialia</i> , <i>ticonmpialihztzinōa</i>	<i>namēchompanōa</i> <i>mitzompanōlita</i> , <i>mitzompanōlithztzinōa</i>	<i>xinēchomilican</i> <i>xinēchonmolhuili</i> , <i>xinēchonmolhuilhtzinō</i>
IV	compadrazgo	pl. * <i>māhuizotzitzin</i> sg. <i>imāhuizotzin</i>	* <i>nancommpialiah</i> , * <i>nancommpialihztzinōah</i> <i>quimopialia</i> , <i>quimopialihztzinōa</i>	* <i>namēchonmopanōlita</i> , * <i>namēchonmopanōlithztzinōa</i> <i>quimopanōlita</i> , <i>quimopanōlithztzinōa</i>	* <i>xinēchonmolhuilhtzinōcan</i> * <i>xinēchonmolhuilhtzinōcan</i> <i>ma-nēchmolhuili</i> , <i>ma-nēchmolhuilhtzinō</i>
		pl. * <i>imāhuizotzihuān</i>	* <i>quimopialiah</i> , * <i>quimopialihztzinōah</i>	* <i>quimopanōlita</i> , * <i>quimopanōlithztzinōa</i>	* <i>ma-nēchmolhuilhtzinōcan</i> , * <i>ma-nēchmolhuilhtzinōcan</i>

TABLE 3. Direct-address DR marking. Starred forms are unattested.

LEVEL	USAGE	PRONOUN	REFERENT IS SUBJECT	REFERENT IS OBJECT
		's/he'	's/he has it'	'it happens to her/him'
		'they'	'they have it'	'it happens to them'
I	intimacy or neutrality	sg. <i>yeh(huatl)</i>	<i>quipia</i>	<i>quipanōa</i>
		pl. <i>yehhuān</i>	<i>quipiah</i>	<i>quimpanōa</i>
II	respect	sg. <i>yehhuatzin</i>	<i>compia</i>	<i>companōa</i>
		pl. <i>yehhuāntzitzin</i>	<i>compiah</i>	<i>quimompanōa</i>
III	reverence	sg. <i>yehhuatzin</i>	<i>quimopialia,</i> <i>quimopialihtzinōa</i>	<i>quimopanōltia,</i> <i>quimopanōltihtzinōa</i>
		pl. <i>yehhuāntzitzin</i>	<i>quimopialiah,</i> <i>quimopialihtzinōah</i>	<i>quimopanōltia,</i> <i>quimopanōltihtzinōa</i>

TABLE 4. Third person DR marking.

report that a *teh* form in Hueyapan and Atempan is used reciprocally among all members of those communities who define themselves as 'indigenous'. A *tehhuatzin* DAN is used with outsiders as a formal usage, and with very high-status insiders as a respect usage. Buchler & Freeze suggest that whether or not the addressee wears shoes (as opposed to huaraches—a traditional index of indigenist self-identification in Mexico) is a crucial indicator in determining what level of usage the speaker selects, although they admit that this is probably an oversimplification. (These papers describe only pronouns; they do not consider verb morphology or other environments for DR distinctions.) Pittman suggests that in Tetelcingo the choice of *teh* vs. *tehhuatzin* levels is primarily determined by marital status, with married people receiving Level II forms. Neither of the distinctions raised by Buchler (& Freeze) and by Pittman will handle usage in the Malinche area. In the survey communities, the same set of forms is used both inside the community and outside it, although the usage described by Buchler & Freeze—Level II forms usually mean 'formality' with outsiders and 'respect' with insiders—does apply. Buchler & Freeze may also be correct in pointing toward indigenist solidarity as at least a partial determiner of *teh* usage; but *teh* usage is not a marker of a solidarity function in the survey communities. In addition, indio/ladino status indicators such as huaraches vs. shoes are not an infallible guide to ethnic self-identification in the Malinche communities. The marital-status constraint noted by Pittman for Tetelcingo does not appear to constrain *teh/tehhuatzin* choice in the Malinche area. The constraints on the usages we observed are reviewed informally below; a more formal presentation is given in the rules of §3.2.

Level I: These forms are used between age-mates who have no ritual kin relationships, if neither is an ascending-generation kinsman to the other. Ascending-generation kinship and *compadrazgo* override intimacy, even when the age is very close and the acquaintance long. For instance, S1 normally used Level I forms with people in their late teens and early twenties in his community; but with his young 'aunt', S85, he used Level II. In addition, Level I forms are used by adults to children and to adolescents, although with older adolescents usage will vary depending on the length of the acquaintance. If an adolescent is not known to an adult, the adult speaker might use a Level II form. Level I forms are also used by the priest to members of his flock, although he may use Level II forms to lay-officials of the church. In one case in our data, Level I usage may have reflected a

status subordination by a layman, where age was not a factor (see Principle X, §3.2). In general, *teh* and Level I usage reflect intimacy or subordination.

Level II: This is the most neutral usage in DA.⁵ It is used with all strangers unless they are very young, very old, or of extraordinary status. The following exchange demonstrates that, in the 2nd person, Level II is not necessarily a signal of respect or even of politeness, but simply of social distance or 'strangeness'. In the exchange, S1 was interviewing an adult male subject, S31, a notorious drunk and ne'er-do-well. S1 and S31 were very slightly acquainted. At the time of the interview, S31 was drunk and drinking, and during the course of the interview he became too incoherent to continue. In asking the standard question to elicit a brief life history, S1 slipped in an insult as follows (the DR level is indicated by subscripts in the translation each time it appears morphologically):

S1: *Pos xnēchonilī itlah den movidahtzīn, tlen tehhuatzīn tconnequiz, quen tontequiti,*
Well tell me_{II} something of your life_{II}, what you_{II} you want_{II}, how you work_{II},
quen tonhuālpānōtīh, quen tonhuīnti, nochi tlen tconnequiz.
how you come along_{II}, how you get drunk_{II}, all that you want_{II}.

S31 (not too drunk to notice the insult): *Quen tonhuīnti, quen tonmotzīnquetza, eh!*
How you get drunk_{II}, how you get buggered_{II}, eh!
Xconitta cabrōn, neh nihuīntic. Mūy niborrāchoh huān nizahuani toz niborrāchoh.
Look here_{II} prick, I I am drunk. Very I am drunk and I am hoarse so I am drunk.

This remarkable exchange, carried on at a full-dress Level II, shows very well that Level II usage is not necessarily polite, but signals only that the two parties involved do not know each other well. But Level II usage can be one of respect when it is used with addressees who are intimates of the speaker. As a respect level, it is used categorically to ascending-generation kinsmen, regardless of age, and occasionally to lay-religious and secular officials of the community, unless some higher level of usage takes priority.⁶

Level III: Buchler (& Freeze) do not report Level III, with its distinctive DAN *māhuizotzīn*, for Hueyapan-Atempan; but Pittman does report it for Tetelcingo. The DAN *māhuizotzīn* is always accompanied by Level III verbs, with reverential suffixes in varying proportion. *Māhuizotzīn* means something like 'reverence' or 'honor'. Molina 1571b translates Classical Nahuatl *māhuizotl* as 'honor, or dignity of the great', and a verb *māhuizotia* 'to give honor or glory to another'. Several parameters can elicit Level III usage in DA. Great age, as a strong elicitor of this level, should be accompanied by obvious physical decline, at least in S1's usage, and need not be accompanied by wealth or high status. S80, a vigorous man in his sixties, of obvious wealth, received Level II from S1; while S76, a slow-moving elder, a shepherd by profession, wearing dirty white traditional garb with a maguey thorn holding his ragged blanket in place, received Level III. Sex appears not to be a constraint on Level III; both men and women received it. However, there was no question that the deeper the wrinkles and the more arthritic the limbs of the

⁵ Pittman reports for Tetelcingo no equivalent to our Level II marked with *on-*. He reports several H-marking morphemes (apparently Level II or III), such as *te-*, *ne-*, *-wa*, and *-lo*, in verb constructions which do not occur in our data.

⁶ Pittman reports for Tetelcingo that wives use Level II to husbands. We noted such a usage in only one case, that of the elderly S41 to her husband.

addressee, the more likely it was that S1 would use Level III. Apart from great age, only extraordinary status elicits Level III. For instance, S18, the priest of S1's town, received Level III from S1, although S18 is only forty years old. Observation of Level III usage is complicated by the fact that few people of high enough status to elicit it on that basis alone actually speak Nahuatl. One must be a religious or high secular official to merit Level III—the governor of a state, at least, to merit it on secular grounds. In Anderson et al., the Corregidor of Tlaxcala is the only regular recipient of Level III, other than royalty. Mere wealth will not invariably elicit Level III; we were considered very wealthy by most subjects, but we were only rarely addressed as *māhuizotzīn*. Another American linguist did receive the usage once in our presence, but this may have been a *compadrazgo* claim.⁷ Thus the usage is still reserved for 'the dignity of the great'. In Level III usage the frequency of true reverential verbs, suffixed with *-tzīnōa*, is an additional index of status; this point will be discussed in §3.2.

At most levels, the use of DR markers with possessed nouns (in constituency with the possessor) and with postpositions is highly variable. The variability can be informally treated in terms of the implicational hierarchy in Figure 1.

Postposition	▷ Body part	▷ Other nouns	▷ Kin term	▷ Grandparent term	▷ Parent term
variable at Level III	variable at Level III, rare at II	categorical at Levels III, II	categorical at Levels III, II	categorical at Levels III, II, variable at Level I	categorical at all levels, except in insult

FIGURE 1. Implicational hierarchy for presence of *-tzīn* on possessed nouns and postpositions.

At all levels, the words for 'mother' and 'father' are suffixed with *-tzīn*, even if the possessor is a 1st person. The only time the word for 'mother' appears without *-tzīn* is in insult, as in an expression like:

Pūtoh mitztlācatilih in monānah.

Where she bore you the your mother.

This is, of course, a fighting insult; one of the most common reasons given when we ask people 'Do you think it is necessary to speak Nahuatl?' is 'Yes, you have to know it so people can't say rude things like [the expression above] to you without your knowing about it.' The speaker who uttered the above did in fact say *pūtoh* instead of *pūtah* 'whore'; many Nahuatl speakers, even those who are largely bilingual, are very uncertain about Spanish genders.

3.2. While descriptions of honorific usage in Nahuatl and in other languages have usually been in categorical terms, a dynamic model can be usefully applied to data on variation from a large sample of speakers. In this section, we will attempt to describe the constraints on variability in DR usage in more formal terms, in a set of rules stated probabilistically. Unfortunately, even our survey of almost 100 speakers to date does not yield enough data on many aspects of honorific usage to permit formal probabilistic statements of the type suggested by Cedergren & Sankoff 1974 or Labov 1972. Most descriptions in the so-called 'quantitative

⁷ The claimant was S76, a compadre of the American's comadre, S75. Persons thus linked may call themselves *compadres* if the connection seems advantageous.

paradigm' have been of very low linguistic levels, such as phonology, or have considered extremely frequent syntactic devices, such as negatives. From many of our speakers we have only three or four instances even of DA honorific forms, and 3rd person DR usages are also very scanty. Probably a true quantitative formulation of a level as high as DR usage would require a larger sample than we have, as well as a research design specifically addressed to this question. Thus the rules given here are not stated in quantitative terms.

The data on which this section is based come entirely from 'real' conversations. The interviews contain many reported conversations; but the evidence suggests that reported conversation tends to exaggerate actual usage through parody or idealization. A good example of problems involved in evaluating reported conversation can be seen in the following brief text, in which S18, a priest, reports a conversation with the president of the community (the official status of the community is 'junta auxiliar', thus the president is 'presidente auxiliar'):

S18: *Occē tōnal ōniquiltaya in presidēnte auxiliār, 'Xquitta presidēnte auxiliār, nican*
 Other day I was saying to the presidente auxiliar, 'Look here, presidente auxiliar, here
nopuēblo de San Miguēl Canōah, xconitta teh tonpresidēnteh. In occē
 in my town of San Miguel Canoa, look here_{II} you_I you are president_{II}. The other
tōnal tehhuatzin ōtonhuālmōicac tnēchmolhuiltaya, tlēca āmo nioh monahuactzin?
 day you_{II} you came_{II} you were saying to me_{III}, why don't I go with you_{III}?
Tlen ōnimitzmolhuilik, "Yon nion monahuactzin, yon nioh mocōntrahtzin,
 What I said to you_{III}, was "Neither I go with you_{III}, nor I go against you_{III},
porque por namehhuāntzitzin nannēchīliah 'pādreh', 'tiopixcatzin',
 because according to you-all_{II} you-all say to me_I 'father', 'priest',
huān de tētahtzin, āmo cualtiz yaz favōr de nin partidoh, o de nōn partidoh. Parējoh
 and of a priest, not can go in favor of this party or of that party. Equally
namēchtlazohtla, huān solamēnte namēchmolhuilīa, 'Nechmaca gūstoh, nipāqui
 he loves you all_I and only he says to you all_{III}, 'It gives me pleasure. I am glad
que teh ticalaquiz presidēnte o nozo tehhuatzin toncalaquiz de presidēnteh,
 that you_I you will enter_I as president or you_{II} you will enter_{II} as president,
pero que neh niaz mocōntra o niaz favōr āmo. Solamēnte Diōs.
 but that I I will go against you_I or I will go in favor no. Only God.
Nicomotlatlahiltz por tehhuatzin, para āquin Diōs quimonōchiliz, pues norrespēto
 I will pray to Him_{III} for you_{II}, for whomever God He will call_{III}, well my respect
para yehhuāntzitzin.'" Āxan yōtoncalac. Tonpresidēnteh. Porque
 is for them_{II}.'" Now you have entered_{II}. You are president_{II}. Because
tonpresidēnteh ocachi tiez tonnoamigoh, ozo ocachi tiez
 you are president_{II} more you will be_I you are my friend_{II}, or more you will be_I
tonyez tonnoenemigoh, lo mismo queme tehhuatzin por tontequihuah
 you will be_{II} you are my enemy_{II}, the same as you_{II} for you are a leader_{II}
huān neh noihqui.'
 and I also.'

During this report of what S18 said, he varied the level of his reported DA forms from Level I to Level III. This may in fact be what happens when an ordinary parishioner is transformed into a person of high status; but we have never observed this kind of random variation in actual confrontations, which almost always display a very stable level of usage, with any deviation being fairly easy to explain on contextual grounds.

The rules given below apply in order to generate correct DA DR usages for the Malinche communities. By convention, each earlier rule takes priority over all succeeding rules.

PRINCIPLE I: The better acquainted the speaker and the addressee, and the more accustomed they are to the speech situation, the more stable the usage.

The need for this general principle is shown by several instances in the data. Speakers occasionally started at a higher level and shifted to a lower one, which remained stable, or vice versa. Several speakers began addressing S1 at Level II, and later shifted to Level I. These speakers were probably initially impressed by S1's connection with foreigners, and sized him up as a 'coyote' (well-dressed urbanite), but then realized that he was just a kid and a fellow 'morenito' (Indian). The problem of becoming accustomed to a context is illustrated by several examples in S1's usage. In the first three interviews which he performed, he varied between full Level III and other levels in a way which cannot be explained by any of the principles below:

S1 to S53: 4 verbs at Level III; 30 at Level II.

S1 to S54: 27 verbs at Level III; 8 at Level II.

S1 to S59: 28 verbs at Level III; 4 at Level II.

With both S54 and S59, S1 was evidently aiming at Level III, since he used a normal proportion of the reverential suffix *-tzinōa* (see discussion under Principle VI, below). Both subjects are elderly women who might normally receive Level III usage. Normally, there is never a slippage into Level II from Level III; the only other example we have of such a switch is one sentence in the interview with S17, where S1 dropped to Level II in one verb while making a joke; S1 was laughing during the sentence. The interview with S53 was the first interview. S53 is a robust woman in her early 50's who would not be expected to receive Level III forms from S1; so it seems probable that the occurrence of the four Level III forms, all very early in the interview, was caused by overcaution and nervousness.

An additional example of Principle I comes from the interview with S12, who is S1's compadre. The first two questions from S1 were in the 2nd person at Level III, where normally we would expect the 3rd person Level IV usage. When S1 was asked why this happened, he replied: 'They should have been in the 3rd person, but I forgot because I don't have much practice in talking to compadres.' S12 was thrown off by S1's error and also gave his first verb in the 2nd person; but the two immediately shifted into invariant Level IV, which continued for the remainder of the interview.

It is important to be able to see a stranger and make judgments about him to achieve appropriate usage. This can be observed in the speech of two blind people (S38 and S43) who were interviewed. They both addressed S1 aberrantly at Level III. S41, who is S38's wife, also used Level III to S1, although she is not blind. She may have been following her husband's example, although her interview took place several days after his. S43 did use one Level I form; she opened her interview with her name and the expression *servidōr de teh* 'servant of you₁'.

PRINCIPLE II: To be polite, use more DAN's, either pronouns or nouns.

This principle was brought to our attention by the *compadrazgo* usage. *Compadres* use the DAN *imāhuizotzīn* 'his/her honor'. They also use the DAN *compadrītoh*, *comadrītah* (or, more rarely, *compālehtzīn*, *comālehtzīn*). A remarkably high frequency of such DAN's appeared in the interview between S1 and S12. Frequency is measured as a percentage of actual occurrence vs. potential occurrence, with potential occurrence being defined as a position in constituency with every DA verb form. S1's usage to S12 was 15%, a fairly normal level; but recall that S1 admitted that he did not control *compadrazgo* usage well. S12's usage to S1, however, was 50% DAN, mostly the form *compadrītoh*. This strikingly high frequency of DAN's (and our observation that this was common in *compadrazgo* usage which we overheard or which was addressed to us, even in Spanish) led us to investigate whether DAN frequency might display some significant variation in other interviews. Table 5 illustrates the frequency of DAN usage over all the interviews.

While the distribution was nearly continuous, most of the highest-frequency interviews were either with 'super-status' individuals like S18, the priest, or with 'difficult' subjects—people who were making it very clear that they did not want to be interviewed, but had been dragooned by enthusiastic friends into talking with us. S27, S71, S52, S64, and S79 all fall into this category. S81 and S80 were the wealthiest people interviewed; the interview was conducted in their urban-style 'living room'. S37 was our *compadre*. S18 may also fall into this category, since he complained of a headache and of inordinate demands on his time during his interview. The recipient of the highest frequency of DAN's was a willing subject; she was, however, the *comadre* of an American linguist who had introduced us to her and was present during the interview. Since she had just fed all of us dinner, she perhaps merited extra politeness. That high DAN frequency marks politeness is perhaps borne out by the fact that some of the lowest DAN frequencies in the data were found in interviews with S8, S17, and S5—all close relatives of S1. The other very low DAN frequency was with S31, the drunk discussed in §2, to whom S1 was emphatically NOT polite. We are unable to account for the low DAN frequency with S59, a charming elderly woman who told excellent stories—except that this was only S1's third interview, so that the deviation may have been caused by Principle I.

A burlesque of *compadrazgo* usage given by S78 displayed a DAN frequency of 78%, in keeping with its parody nature. S78's parody does suggest that high DAN frequency is a salient feature of *compadrazgo* usage. Additional evidence that high DAN frequency is related to some factor which should be separated from respect or distance is shown by the fact that DAN frequency does not rise from Level I to Level III. If a high DAN frequency is actually a politeness feature, and if it is a highly salient feature of usage between *compadres*, this may imply that *compadrazgo* usage is as much a polite usage as a usage indicating respect and esteem. This point will be raised again under Principle IV.

PRINCIPLE III: If the speaker and the addressee are *compadres*, they will use (a) Level IV forms and (b) a high frequency of *-tzīn* suffixes on 'yes', 'no' etc.

Part (a) of this principle seems to be categorical: the *compadrazgo* principle

SUBJECT	#DAN	#VERBS	%DAN	LEVEL	SUBJECT	#DAN	#VERB	%DAN	LEVEL
S75	14	42	33	II	S6	5	32	16	I
S18	12	38	32	III	S24	5	33	15	II
S58	9	31	29	II	S70	8	53	15	II
S27	11	39	28	II	S25	6	40	15	II
S81	9	32	28	II	S12	6	41	15	IV
S71	10	36	28	II	S41	6	41	15	III
S80	10	37	27	II	S20	5	34	15	II
S52	12	47	26	II	S39	6	43	14	I
S64	8	32	25	II	S23	5	36	14	II
S50	9	37	24	II	S49	4	29	14	II
S37	8	33	24	II	S51	5	37	14	II
S79	12	50	24	II	S15	6	45	13	III
S32	9	41	22	II	S61	4	31	13	II
S42	9	41	22	II	S73	7	55	13	III
S19	9	43	21	II	S48	5	40	13	II
S77	8	39	21	II	S16	6	49	12	II
S40	10	49	20	II	S14	5	42	12	III
S35	8	40	20	II	S60	7	61	11	II
S43	7	35	20	II	S53	4	35	11	II
S78	8	40	20	II	S56	5	44	11	II
S36	8	40	20	II	S62	3	28	11	II
S65	9	46	20	II	S11	4	39	10	III
S26	8	42	19	II	S67	4	40	10	II
S83	8	42	19	II	S13	4	41	10	III
S45	7	37	19	II	S7	3	31	10	I
S10	7	38	18	I	S63	4	42	10	II
S44	9	50	18	II	S76	6	65	9	III
S9	7	39	18	II	S54	3	35	9	III
S33	8	45	18	II	S38	4	47	9	III
S28	7	40	18	II	S21/S22	3	37	8	II
S66	8	46	17	II	S8	2	32	6	I
S46	9	52	17	II	S5	2	34	6	II
S72	5	29	17	II	S59	2	34	6	III
S74	8	48	17	II	S31	1	25	4	II
S34	8	49	16	II	S17	1	32	3	III
S29	7	44	16	II	S30	0	8	0	II
S57	6	38	16	II	S82	0	8	0	II

TABLE 5. Frequency of DAN in DA by S1, ranked by percentage of DAN usage.

overrides all principles except I. Our only example of an extended exchange between compadres, that between S1 and S12, is particularly instructive, because S1 is only 16 years old, while S12 is 68 years old and is 'portero' of the church—a highly responsible office in which he controls access of visitors to the church and the parish offices. It is not surprising to find that S1 used Level IV in the interview; but it is striking that S12, who would use Level I if he were not S1's compadre, also used Level IV forms, and in addition used *-tzin* suffixes throughout the conversation. However, he used no reverential verbs to S1, which is a feature predicted by Principle VI, below.

The use of *-tzin* on the words for 'yes', 'no' etc. is a feature almost entirely restricted to usage between compadres. During the interview between S1 and S12, the forms of Table 6 were produced.

	BY S1	BY S12	
<i>quēmah</i>	15	16	'yes'
<i>quēmahcatzīn</i>	13	16	'yes'
<i>quēmantzīn</i>	1	4	'yes'
<i>āmo</i>	5	35	'no, not'
<i>āmotzīn</i>	—	6	'no, not'
<i>coxāmo</i>	—	1	'by chance not'
<i>xāmo</i>	6	—	'by chance not'
<i>tlāmo</i>	—	3	'if not'
<i>quenāmo</i>	—	2	'of course'
<i>ayāmo</i>	1	2	'no longer'
<i>ayāmotzīn</i>	—	1	'no longer'
<i>āco</i>	1	—	'no longer'
<i>ācmo</i>	3	19	'no longer'
<i>ācmotzīn</i>	—	1	'no longer'
<i>āncomati</i>	—	1	'who knows?'
<i>āncomatitzīn</i>	—	2	'who knows?'

TABLE 6.

The only other occurrences of such forms in the interviews were by blind old S38, who produced *āmotzīn* 'no' and *ihcōntzīn* 'thus', and by S37, who produced one example of *āmotzīn* which may have been addressed to K. Hill, his compadre—although S1 actually asked the question.

PRINCIPLE IV: The more elderly the addressee, the more likely the speaker will use Level III in DA.

Level III is the 'reverence' level. S1 used Level III to the following addressees: S11, S13, S14, S15, S17, S18, S38, S56, S73, and S76—all very old people except for S18, the priest. One might imagine that a person such as a priest would receive the status of an elder by virtue of his prestige; but it might be necessary to specify another principle, indicating that the higher the social status, the more likely is Level III usage. However, as indicated in §2, Level III usage on status grounds, without the age factor, is rare. The indicator of high social status is not simply the choice of Level III, but also the proportion of reverential verbs used within Level III, which is the subject of Principle VI.

That Principle IV must be stated in probabilistic terms is suggested by the fact that S1 did not use Level III forms with two excellent candidates: S43, age 75, blind and very old in appearance; and S58, probably over 100. S58 is, however, still vigorous, and was interviewed in her kitchen while she fixed dinner. She received an extremely high DAN frequency, which may have made up for S1's not using Level III to her.

PRINCIPLE V: Inherently reflexive verbs almost always receive the reverential suffix at Level III.

This principle is a grammatical constraint of virtual 'knock-out' power on the production of *-tzīnōa* verb suffixes. It is noted by the grammarians of the Classical language (e.g. Olmos 1885:93, Carochi 1645:69a–b, Siméon 1885:xliv, Anderson 1973:59, Andrews 1975:115). It stands to reason that the constraint should exist: even at Level I, inherently reflexive verbs have the reflexive prefix and the transitivizing suffix which mark Level III usage on non-reflexive verbs; hence the only

way to mark them as being at Level III is to add the reverential suffix. Table 7 shows, however, that even inherently reflexive verbs (defined here as verbs which appear as reflexives in Level I interviews) are not always suffixed with *-tzinōa*. In addition, many non-reflexive verbs appear with *-tzinōa*; so it is clear that an additional principle governs the level of reverential verb usage in Level III DA.

VERB	GLOSS	NUMBER	PERCENT	INHERENT REFLEXIVE ?
<i>motlacoīa</i>	'buy, go shopping'	10/10	100%	yes
<i>monāmiectīa</i>	'get married'	3/3	100%	yes
<i>moyōlcohcōa</i>	'suffer'	16/17	94%	yes
<i>motlapōilia</i>	'chat'	24/27	89%	yes
<i>mitzonmopanōltīa</i>	'happen to you'	5/6	83%	no
<i>moyōlcuitīa</i>	'confess'	8/10	80%	yes
<i>motlayotārhuilia</i>	'vote'	10/13	77%	no
<i>moyēcahccicāmachia</i>	'understand well'	2/3	67%	no
<i>momiquilia</i>	'die'	9/15	60%	no
<i>mopāquilia</i>	'be happy'	9/15	60%	no
<i>monōchilia</i>	'call'	3/5	60%	no
<i>moyēctendērhuilia</i>	'understand well'	5/13	38%	no
<i>mitzonmopāctilia</i>	'please you'	10/30	33%	no
<i>mosuhfrīrhuilia</i>	'suffer'	1/3	33%	no
<i>mopialia</i>	'have'	4/18	22%	no
<i>morrezārhuilia</i>	'pray'	2/9	22%	no
<i>moīca</i>	'go'	7/40	18%	no
<i>molhuilia</i>	'tell'	7/53	13%	no
<i>momachilia</i>	'know'	2/48	4%	no
<i>mottilia</i>	'see'	1/48	2%	no

TABLE 7. Verbs used by S1 with *-tzinōa*, ranked according to percentage of tokens suffixed.

PRINCIPLE VI: The higher the status of the addressee, the more reverential verbs the speaker will use; see Table 8.

SUBJECT	NUMBER	PERCENT	SUBJECT	NUMBER	PERCENT
S18	17/38	45%	S14	9/42	21%
S76	21/65	32%	S54	7/34	21%
(S76 [repeats])	15/59	25%)	S11	8/40	20%
S12	12/40	30%	S73	11/55	20%
S17	9/32	28%	S56	9/46	20%
S59	8/34	24%	S15	8/42	19%
S38	11/50	22%	S41	8/42	19%
S13	9/41	22%			

TABLE 8. Addressees ranked by percentage of reverential verbs among verbs of address used by S1 in Level III and Level IV interviews.

This table shows the percentage of reverential verbs received by addressees in Level III and Level IV interviews as a percentage of total verbs of address produced by S1. Note that most addressees received about 21% reverential verbs, but a few received a higher level. S18 is, of course, the priest. S12 is a senior compadre of S1. S17 is a senior maternal kinswoman, a classificatory 'aunt' of S1, who was interviewed while S1's mother was present. S76, who is somewhat deaf and slow,

required frequent repetitions of questions: if we subtract the six verbs which are obviously immediate repetitions of previous material from the total for S76, his total drops to 25%—still high, but somewhat more in line with the common pattern.

The clustering of percentages of reverential verbs around 21% in Table 8 is not just the result of suffixation of inherent reflexives. Inherent reflexives vary in frequency from 70% to 12% of all reverential verbs in the interviews, as shown in Table 9. Not included there are the percentages in the interviews with S54 (0%) and S55 (13%), where we feel S1's performance was not representative (as discussed under Principle I).

S11	63%	S18	12%
S12	50%	S38	70%
S13	56%	S41	63%
S14	56%	S56	66%
S15	50%	S73	55%
S17	33%	S76	40%

TABLE 9. Inherent reflexives as a percentage of all reverential verbs in Level III and Level IV interviews (n = 12; mean = 51.2; s.d. = 16.3).

It is also possible that the clustering of percentages was produced by automatically affixing *-tzinōa* to about every fifth verb. We tested this possibility and found that S1 was not using this strategy. Thus the uncannily regular production by S1 of reverential verbs at about 21% of all Level III verbs for elderly addressees of ordinary status seems to be a good example of a quantitative competence at work: when speaking to very old people not otherwise distinguished by status, put in about 21% reverential verbs, making sure you figure in the inherent reflexive constraint.

The interview between S1 and his elderly, high-status compadre S12 shows that frequency of *-tzinōa* is seriously constrained by social status. In that interview, S12 used a very high DAN frequency and a high frequency of *-tzin* suffixes on 'yes/no' forms, but he used NO *-tzinōa* suffixes to S1, out of 29 DA verbs. We have the impression that *-tzinōa* usage normally occurs at a high level between compadres who are about the same age; and it is almost always heard in greetings, where it reaches its highest frequency. In fact, even rather ordinary people may receive *-tzinōa* in greetings; we were often greeted with this form even by people who otherwise addressed us at Level II. Reported conversations in the compadrazgo parody by S78 show *-tzinōa* forms running over 50%; however, the parody is primarily of the greeting ceremony, where high frequencies of *-tzinōa* always occur.

The non-use of reverential verbs by S12 to the much younger S1 suggests, first, that we are correct in associating *-tzinōa* usage with a status constraint; and second, that the basic impact of compadrazgo usage, as suggested above, may be more associated with distance and politeness than with respect and esteem. It is extremely important for compadres to avoid friction. At the ceremony in which new compadres are joined, they bless each other with incense and beg *Ma nēchmopohpolhuilihtzinō ica in itōcātzin in Diōs* 'May s/he (the new compadre) forgive me in the name of God', so that any previous friction between the two will be forgotten. In addition,

they exchange fine gifts, establishing the foundations for future reciprocity. Their relationship should thereafter be characterized by qualities usually referred to by the catchwords *respeto* 'respect' and *confianza* 'confidence'. They should feel free to confide in each other, exchanging secrets and asking for help when it is needed, under the quality of 'confianza'. Such a relationship might, in ordinary usage, be prone eventually to give offense: a secret which would strain an ordinary relationship might be exchanged or a burdensome favor be requested. However, as the relationship continues, the *compadrazgo* linguistic usages place extreme social distance between the *compadres*; even if a confidence or request should give offense, the offense can be ignored—since, by the 3rd person usage, the *compadre* is not directly addressed. Instead, the relationship itself, the social role, is the actual addressee. In addition, the high DAN frequency in *compadrazgo* usage shows that every attention, every politeness, is being paid to the *compadre*, again lessening any potential offense. In this way the stability of the relationship can be preserved. Seen in this perspective, the term 'respeto' may refer primarily to respect of the distancing type, and not of the reverential type—although reverence and esteem are, of course, not precluded in the relationship between *compadres*.

PRINCIPLE VII: Imperative verbs have a slight probability of being at Level III if the rest of the interview is at Level II.

This principle is illustrated in the variation in the interviews with S55, where three of the four Level III forms produced by S1, in an otherwise Level II interview, were imperatives; and with S43, where the only Level III form in an otherwise Level II interview was an imperative. This appears to be a natural principle which would allow the softening of the force of imperatives without resorting to the extraordinary elevated usages of Level IV imperatives.

PRINCIPLE VIII: If the addressee is a kinsman of the ascending generation, the speaker will use Level II.

This usage, which is categorical except where overridden by prior principles, is illustrated in the interviews with S5, S1's father, and with S85, S1's aunt. We were also able to observe this usage informally on many occasions during field work.

PRINCIPLE IX: In Level I usage, impersonal 2nd persons are likely to be at Level II, while personal 2nd persons are at Level I.

Nahuatl allows an impersonal usage much like that of English where the pronoun 'you' appears instead of the more formal 'one'. Impersonal sentences, such as 'In the old days, when you went down to Atlixco, you would hear them greet each other "Ave Maria"', are often at the socially neutral Level II, even in Level I interviews. Unfortunately, it is often impossible to separate unambiguously such impersonal usages from actual DA, and thus clearly to separate the effects of this principle from those of Principle I.

PRINCIPLE X: The younger the addressee, the more likely it is that the speaker will use Level I.

This principle produces the subordinating Level I usage. That the principle is best stated probabilistically is apparent from the variation in our data. S1 would address strangers who were 17 or 18 years old at Level II; but when he interviewed

a group of strange boys who were playing marbles in the street in Cuahutenco, S69, he used a stable Level I. The usage of other subjects to S1 is also instructive. Since S1 is in late adolescence, he is apparently at a somewhat ambiguous age for strangers and even for distant acquaintances. The usage of other speakers to S1 is shown in Table 10. It appears to be impossible to predict who will choose to use Level I to him.

LEVEL:	I	I~II (I dominant)	II~I (II dominant)	II	III (~II~I), IV
	Age				
SOUTHERN TOWNS		<i>S15m</i>	<i>S13m 20_I/9_{II}</i>	<i>S14f</i> <i>S11m</i>	<i>S38m 10_{III}/3_{II}/1_I</i> <i>S41f 1_{IV}/10_{III}</i> <i>S12m (IV)</i>
	60	<i>S35f</i> <i>S23f</i> <i>S9m</i>	<i>S19m 19_{II}/5_I</i>	<i>S20f</i>	
	40	<i>S18m</i>	<i>S16m 11_{II}/1_I</i> <i>S31m 4_{II}/3_I</i>	<i>S26m</i> <i>S36f</i> <i>S21f</i> <i>S28f</i> <i>S32m</i>	
	20	<i>S10m</i> <i>S39m</i> <i>S8f</i> <i>S7m</i>			
		<i>S51m</i> <i>S44m</i> <i>S47m</i> <i>S72m</i>	<i>S58f 11_I/7_{II}</i>	<i>S77m</i> <i>S60m</i> <i>S57m</i>	<i>S43f 10_{III}/1_I</i>
	60	<i>S55m</i>	<i>S46m 4_{II}/3_I</i> <i>S48f 5_I/1_{II}</i>	<i>S49f</i> <i>S78f</i> <i>S53f</i> <i>S61m</i> <i>S65m</i> <i>S75f</i>	
	<i>S50f</i>				
NORTHERN TOWNS	40	<i>S52m</i>	<i>S45f 7_{II}/1_I</i>		
	20				

TABLE 10. Usage to S1 ranked by age in the southern and northern towns. (Italics = previous acquaintances of S1; f = female, m = male.)

In only one case in our data did we observe Level I possibly in use as a status subordinator between adults. In a long conversation between S46 and S47, S47 addressed S46 consistently at Level I, and S46 reciprocated with 15 Level II forms and one Level III form. S46 is an elderly pulquero, while S47 is a ladino-ized man of the world—an important figure in his community, who holds the local government grain concession. S47's usage may thus have been subordinating. However, it may also have been an invocation of an intimacy strategy under Principle XI, since S47 was trying to talk S46 into giving us an interview.

PRINCIPLE XI: The better acquainted the speaker and addressee, the more likely the speaker will use Level I.

This principle is of course superseded by all principles above it. S1 used invariant Level I to S6, S7, S8, S10, and S39, and also to S69 (the boys in Cuahutenco) under Principle X. Except for S69, all these subjects are close friends, schoolmates, or cousins of S1. This pattern of usage continued in the summer 1976 season, when we concentrated on the usages of young people in Canoa.

PRINCIPLE XII: If no other principles apply, use Level II.

With persons who are not marked by any of the attributes specified by other principles—i.e. with strangers of neutral age and status—Level II usage will be chosen. Level II is thus the most neutral usage, although it is morphologically marked—as opposed to Level I, which is not morphologically marked, but in fact carries a marked pragmatic force of intimacy or subordination. S1 exhibited stable Level II usage with the following addressees: S5, S9, S16, S19, S20, S21, S22, S23, S24, S25, S26, S27, S29, S30, S31, S32, S33, S34, S35, S36, S37, S38, S42, S44, S45, S48, S49, S50, S51, S52, S57, S58, S60, S62, S63, S64, S65, S66, S67, S70, S71, S72, S74, S75, S77, S79, S80, S82, S83, S84, S85. This is 51 out of 85 interviews examined, or 61% of the sample. Normally this is an invariant level except for deviation predicted by Principle VIII; however, with S28 and S46, S1 used one Level I form in each interview, for unknown reasons.

4. SEMANTICS OF THE DR SYSTEM. The DR system as revealed through an examination of morphology and usage in DA above displays two major parameters: (1) intimacy vs. distance, and (2) subordination vs. respect. DAN frequency variation suggests that a third parameter, politeness, should perhaps also be distinguished. The distance parameter is a scale as shown in Table 11.

DISTANCE 0	DISTANCE +1	DISTANCE +2
Level I	Level II, III	Level IV
unmarked	<i>on-</i>	3rd person markers

TABLE 11.

The morphemes for the distance scale are clear physical-distance metaphors for social distance. The intimate Level I forms carry no distancing morpheme. Level II and III are marked with *on-*, an element which also means 'motion away from speaker', in contrast with *huāl-* 'motion toward speaker'. This 'motion away' meaning occurs in our data in examples such as this (S46):

tlā ōconpanōltīh *oc*
 if anterior-object-away-pass-transitive-past still
 'if it still goes to the other side, is still passable' (of a bridge)

The 'motion away' meaning is noted by the grammarians of the Classical language, but the Classical grammarians do not describe the social-distance meaning of *on-*. Garibay (49) notes that there is some confusion, and that *on-* may 'emphasize' the pronoun. Molina and Siméon, coming closer to what we observe in the Malinche communities, note that the attachment of *on-* signifies, apart from motion away, 'an ornate manner and a nice sound' (Molina 1571b:2.77) or

‘euphony and elegance’ (Siméon, 319). Carochi observes (429) that, while *on-* may refer to (physical) distance, it is used mostly for ‘gracefulness and elegance’. This association with elevated style may prove, in the light of the information from the Malinche usage, to be best interpreted as a social-distance usage, or as an expression of regard for the addressee in the case of people well-known to each other.

The element *on-*, in spite of being a good distance metaphor, has spread into a respect range for use with intimates such as kinsmen or in the 3rd person usages discussed in §5. Level III DA usages in our data always include *on-* along with the reflexivizing apparatus and reverential elements, but its precise significance here is unclear. Presumably it is still functioning as a ‘distancer’, but with no greater intensity than at Level II.

Maximal social distance is achieved through the 3rd person metaphor of *compadrazgo* usage (Level IV), where the speaker, in a sense, pretends not to be speaking to his addressee at all. This usage is well known from the V-pronouns of European languages such as German, Portuguese, and Spanish, which are 3rd person in origin.

On the respect continuum, we can observe four levels, as in Table 12.

RESPECT - 1	RESPECT 0	RESPECT + 1	RESPECT + 2
Level I for non-age-mates, non-intimates	Level I between age-mates and intimates; Level II between non-intimates	Level II between intimates	Level III
Unmarked	Unmarked or with <i>on-</i>	Marked with <i>on-</i>	Marked with reflexives and reverentials

TABLE 12.

The use of the reflexive forms for Respect + 2 is interpreted by Whorf (388) as a metaphor for greater potency of involvement of the addressee or referent in actions which s/he performs or which affect her/him. He interprets these as reflexive causatives, i.e. ‘you cause yourself to do X’, and translates them as ‘you deign to do X’ or ‘you please to do X’. Reflexiveness thus interpreted seems a natural metaphor for power or potency. The analysis is not straightforward, however, since we can observe that the reflexive prefix *mo-* may also be in constituency with an object pronoun, e.g. *mitzonmomaquiltiah* ‘they give it to your honored self’. Such a construction is ambiguous in Malinche-area Nahuatl, where *mo-* is the reflexive prefix for all persons; the construction might also mean ‘the honorable ones give it to you’. In the Nahuatl of the Valley of Mexico, the situation is still worse. In that variety of the language, reflexive prefixes must agree with the subject of the verb, i.e. *ni-* ‘I’ co-occurs with *no-*, *ti-* ‘we’ with *to-*, and the other subject persons with *mo-*. This is true even when the reflexive prefixes are actually DR markers in constituency with the object. Thus we find constructions like *nimitzno-tlazohcāmachitīa* (Olmos 1885:90), which on interpretation of the surface form should mean ‘I-the-honorable thank you’. However, since such a usage would be gauche, the construction must mean ‘I thank your-honorable-self’. Thus the metaphor of power of the object suggested by Whorf, that the honored object can

'take it or leave it', as it were, is not easily accessible from surface morphology in such constructions.

The *-tzin/-tzinōa* suffixes are of considerable interest. The *-tzin* suffix on nouns is used not only as a DR marker, but also to express diminutiveness (of a positive kind) and endearment or intimacy. In this usage it appears freely with possessors in any person, or with DAN's at Level I (except for pronouns), e.g. *nococonētzin* 'my little child, my dear child', *noāxnohtzizihuān* 'my sweet little donkeys, my dear donkeys', *Lōlahtzin* 'dear Lola, cute little Lola' etc. In some usages it is ambiguous: forms like *nonāntzin* 'my mother' or *nochtzin* 'my grandmother' can have the force of 'my reverend mother', 'my revered grandmother'—or, equally well, of 'my dear little mother', 'my dear little grandmother'; and they may carry both connotations at once. The obvious surface resemblance between *-tzin* and the verbal suffix *-tzinōa* associates the two and brings *-tzinōa*, which is used only for reverence, within the scope of the ambiguity. An element with a scope of reference ranging from diminution and endearment to 'the dignity of the great' is unexpected, to say the least (but cf. Classical Nahuatl *pilli* 'child; prince, nobleman'). The association of diminution and endearment is a natural metaphor, well-known from other languages; but we are unable to give an example of another language where reverence and esteem are associated with diminution and endearment. It would seem more likely that reverence and esteem would be marked with an augmentative element, cf. the augmentative and reverential *-ón* of Sp. *patrón*. Whorf seems to be the only grammarian of Nahuatl to have noted the problem: he claims (378) that the *-tzin* usage in, e.g., constructions such as *notahtzin* 'my father' or *teotzin* 'God' is a 'diminished augmentative', and 'implies that a thing is great but the speaker's contact with it is of diminished degree, modest, humble'. A difficulty with this analysis is that, if *-tzin* expresses the humility of the speaker, why is this humility expressed by an endearment diminutive rather than a pejorative diminutive like *-pōl*? (E.g., Jane Rosenthal has pointed out to us that in prayer and confession, people will say *nehhuapōl* 'I humbly...') Perhaps the danger of ambiguity of the constituency of the suffixed element would be too great if a pejorative were used; the use of the endearment diminutive may represent a sort of linguistic lesser of two evils. In any case, this ambiguity of the reference of *-tzin* deserves further exploration.

5. VARIATION IN THIRD PERSON DR USAGE AND THE FUNCTIONS OF THE DR SYSTEM. DR usage is rarer, and 'means more', in the 3rd person than in DA. (The *compadrazgo* usages, which are morphologically 3rd person but pragmatically DA, are not included in this generalization. This section deals with pragmatically referential usages only.) In order to receive DR usages in reference, the referent must command considerably greater respect than the addressee of the morphologically very similar forms of DA. A subject who is a referent will receive a usage one 'morphological degree' lower than the same subject in DA. Thus, in communities which display a conservative pattern in reference, a priest is addressed at Level III, but referred to at Level II. Living parents are addressed at Level II, but referred to (usually) at Level I.

Tables 13 and 14 show the constraints on distribution of 3rd person referential

Referents:	God/saints	'to die'	Malinche	dead people	priests	other living people	religious non-human
Santa Ana		S72 I	S72 I	S72 I			
Chiautempan							
San Felipe	S65 III	S65 I (twice)	S61 I S62 I S63 I S65 I	S62 I S63 I S65 I	S62 I S65 I	all I	S67 I (of church)
Cuahutenco			S65 I S80 I	S80 I	S81 I	S81 II (of parents) all others I all I	
San Luis		S83 I		S80 I	S81 I		
Teolocholco		S81 I		S81 I			
San Rafael	S55 I	S56 I	S53 I	S53 I	S53 I		
Tepatlxaco	S53 III	S57 I	S56 I	S54 I	S59 I		
		S60 I	S59 I	S55 I			
		S59 III ~ I (2 ~ 1)	S60 I	S56 I			
		S53 III		S58 I			
		S58 III		S60 I			
San Antonio	S43 III	S43 III	S48 I	S42 I	S46 I	all I	S46 I (of first offering, chapel, prayer)
Acuamanala	S44 III	S46 III		S43 I	S47 I		
and Santiago	S45 III	S47 III		S44 I	S48 I		
Ayometitla	S46 III	S49 III		S46 I			
	S50 III			S48 I			
				S49 I			
				S50 I			
				S51 I			
				S52 I			
San Lorenzo	S73 III			S73 I	S73 I	all I	S73 I (of prayers)
Almecatla							
Santa Maria	S76 III ~ I	S74 I		S74 I	S78 I	S73 I	
Axotla del	(8 ~ 1)	S75 III		S75 I	S76 II ~ I	S76 III (of J. Rosenthal)	
Monte	S75 III	S78 III		S76 I	(1 ~ 1)		
				S77 I			
				S78 II			

Tlaltepango	S26 III	S25 I	S19 I	S24 I	S28 III (of parents)	S26 II (or Word of God)
	S29 III	S20 II~I (5~5)	S24 I	S26 II (of evangelist)	all others I	~I (things of God)
			S31 I			
			S21 II			
			S23 II			
			S20 III~I (5~2)			
			S29 III~II (6~1)			
			S34 I	S41 I	S35 II (of compadres)	S34 III (of mass)
			S35 I		S36 II (of compadres)	S38 III (of mass, prayers)
			S36 I		S41 II (of S1, of husband)	
La Resurrección	S33 III		S41 II~I (3~1)			
	S35 III	S34 III	S41 II~I (9~9)			
	S37 III	S38 III	S39 II			
	S38 III		S37 III~II (2~2)			
			S10 I	S10 II	S16 II (of grandmother)	
			S11 I	S13 II	S12 III~II (5~6) (of 'our brothers', 'your compadre', 'fiscals)	
			S5 III~II~I (14~2~6)	S15 II	S1 III (of J. Rosenthal)	
				S16 II	S18 III (of archbishop, bishop, governor)	
				S17 II	all others I	
				S5 III~II~I (2~2~1)		
San Miguel Canoa	S5 III	S13 I	S10 I	S12 III (of nuns)		
	S11 III	S15 I	S11 I			
	S12 III		S14 II~I (10~1)			
	S16 III		S1 II			
	S18 III		S15 II			
		S1 III	S16 II			
		S17 III	S17 II			
			S5 III~II~I (4~3)			

TABLE 13. Third person levels of usage: verbs and pronouns.

Referents:	God/saints		Malinche		dead people		other living people	
	postpos.	nouns	nouns	postpos.	nouns	postpos.	nouns	
San Felipe Cuahutenco			S61 \emptyset S62 \emptyset					
San Luis Teolocholco				S81 \emptyset		S42 \emptyset		
San Antonio Acuamanala,		S44 - <i>tzin</i>		S50 \emptyset		S44 \emptyset		
Santiago Ayometitla				S52 \emptyset		S74 \emptyset		
Santa María Acxotla del Monte		S76 - <i>tzin</i> ~ \emptyset				S75 \emptyset S78 - <i>tzin</i> ~ \emptyset		
Tlaltepango	S19 - <i>tzin</i>	S78 - <i>tzin</i> S19 - <i>tzin</i>		S24 \emptyset S26 \emptyset				
La Resurrección	S37 - <i>tzin</i> ~ \emptyset	S33 - <i>tzin</i>		S37 - <i>tzin</i> S38 - <i>tzin</i>		S41 \emptyset		
San Miguel Canoa	S12 - <i>tzin</i>		S5 - <i>tzin</i> S13 - <i>tzin</i>	S1 \emptyset S14 - <i>tzin</i>	S12 - <i>tzin</i> S18 - <i>tzin</i>	S18 - <i>tzin</i> (archbishop)		

TABLE 14. Third person DR usages: postpositions and possessed nouns. (No data on the referents 'Malinche postpositions', 'priests', and 'religious non-human'; no data from the towns of Santa Ana Chiautempan, San Rafael Tepatlaxco, or San Lorenzo Almecatla.)

DR usage. Most 3rd person forms are unmarked with DR elements; the referents indicated in the tables are the only ones which ever occur with DR markers. Unfortunately, our data on referential DR usage are scanty, both because productive referents for the forms are rare and because, in the interviews, people were asked mainly to talk about themselves.

Table 13 in particular shows that 3rd person referential DR usage has the form of a wave, with maximal extension of the usage through the possible referents occurring in the more conservative southern communities and in Acxotla, and with minimal realization of the usage in the other northern communities. We believe that the wave is pushed by a shift to a 'solidarity' function at the expense of a 'prestige' function for Nahuatl in the communities. (The heading 'Malinche' in the table refers to the female spirit of the volcano, who sends hail and rain.)

The weakest referent for 3rd person DR production is a religious non-human antecedent. No speaker in any community used any DR element in this context except in reference to religious objects or concepts. Our data display only four examples of the use of DR elements in reference to religious items (other than the divinities):

- conixmati* 'she knows it' (the Gospel, the Word of God) (two tokens, S26)
nnequi momisahmaquilihtzinōz 'I want to give a mass' (S34)
mopēhuitihtzinōa 'it begins' (a prayer, the mass) (two tokens, S38)
mahcoctzinōa 'he elevates (the sacred host)' (two tokens, S38).

During the interviews many speakers mentioned their responsibilities toward images of saints etc., in their capacities as mayordomos or members of sodalities, but only in these four examples did DR markers appear. Thus the tendency to use the markers in reference to sacred objects is weak and appears only in the southern communities.⁸

The second weakest referent consists of living persons. In the southern communities and Acxotla, where DR markers occurred with living-person referents, they began to appear at a much higher level of status than did Level II and III markers in DA. *On-* prefixes appeared in referential DR usages when subjects spoke of priests, and once of a protestant evangelist. This usage referring to priests is almost categorical in the southern communities, except for one very poor speaker—a young man in Tlaltepango, S24. Thus this category is given a column separate from that for other living people in Tables 13 and 14. Other than in reference to priests, *on-* appeared also in reference to a living compadre, to a living grandmother and aged parents, and to the fiscales of the church. S12 and S18 both showed a relatively high frequency of DR usage in reference to living persons. Their more 'elevated' usage in this environment may reflect their own high status. Thus S12 referred to 'our brothers in the city', scholars who can write Nahuatl, at Level III, and to the fiscales who gave him his office at Level II. He referred to S1's compadre at Level II. S18 used reverential verbs to refer to archbishops, bishops, and the governor of the state of Puebla. In addition, reverential verbs were

⁸ The word for the church itself, *teopan*, almost invariably appears as *teopantzintli*. However, the church as subject or object of verbs or as subject of postpositions did not appear with DR markers in the interviews. (The usual form for 'to the church' is *teopantzinco*, a DR form.)

Referents:	God	'to die'	dead people	priests	other living people	non-human religious
Tlaxcala 1566	I	III (of wife)	I	I	I	I (say mass)
Coyoacan 1566	III	III (of self!)	I ('late') III (of father)	III	I	I
San Bartolomé Atenco 1617	III		I ('late')			
Coyoacan 1622	III	III (of self and others)	I ('lie buried') III (of a dead princess)	III (?)	III (of a high official)	
San Simón Pochtlan 1695	III					III (give child to a religious sodality)
Metepec 1795	III		III ('late')			

TABLE 15. Referential usage: Verbs and pronouns from will and testament texts in Anderson et al.

used about another American linguist, perhaps as a *compadrazgo* invocation, by S76 (see fn. 7), and about the same individual by S1 in our presence—probably as a mark of respect for a friend of ours.

The next referent consists of the dead. Here there may be a constraint of specificity; a specific individual, especially a dead parent or grandparent, is much more likely to be referred to with DR markers than is some generalized group of 'ancestors'. Our data are not rich enough on this point to allow us to quantify this intuition; both referents do display DR markers. In Canoa, where our data are richest, usage about the dead varied from true reverential verbs (in the speech of S18, about the old-time priests) to Level II and variation between Level II and unmarked forms (Level I). Speakers in La Resurrección displayed a similar pattern. In Tlaltepango, only female subjects showed this pattern, and all male subjects used categorical Level I. (During 1976 we collected one example of a Level II DR usage in an 'ancestors' reference from a young man from San Pedro, the *barrio* of San Pablo del Monte adjacent to Tlaltepango.) The northern communities are almost categorical in their failure to mark such usages.

The verb 'to die', of someone already dead, is a heavy environment for DR markers at Level III in most of the communities. The southern communities are categorically Level III in this environment. However, the northern communities are variable and even categorical Level I speakers may be found there, as in the case of S65, who twice said *ōmic* 'she died₁' about his mother, of all people—a usage which would be unthinkable in Canoa or La Resurrección.

The heaviest referent for DR usage, categorical for all speakers, consists of God, Jesus, and the Virgin. We observed only one exception in hundreds of examples: S55 in Tepatlaxco twice used Level I verbs in referring to the Virgin of Guadalupe. However, this occurred in a context where S55 was switching rapidly back and forth from Nahuatl to Spanish and exhibiting some confusion about what was expected of him. S38 included the archangels in Level III usage. Surprisingly, the saints did not always receive this usage; S19 in Tlaltepango told a whole story about Saint Paul, the patron of his town, entirely at Level I.

Some speakers in the southern communities used DR marked forms in talking

Referents:	God	dead people	priests	other living people	non-human religious
	postpos. nouns	nouns	postpos.	postpos.	postpos.
Tlaxcala 1566	<i>-tzin</i>	<i>-tzin</i>		∅ (of alcalde)	
Coyoacan 1588	<i>-tzin</i>	<i>-tzin</i>	<i>-tzin</i> (of late husband's house)		<i>-tzin</i> (church)
San Bartolomé Atenco 1617		<i>-tzin</i>	∅ (wife's name)	<i>-tzin</i>	∅
Coyoacan 1622	<i>-tzin</i>	<i>-tzin</i>	∅ (soul, name of dead)		∅ (executors) <i>-tzin</i> (an image of Christ entombed)
San Simón Pochtlan 1695		<i>-tzin</i>			∅ (witnesses) <i>-tzin</i> (church)
Metepc 1795		<i>-tzin</i>			∅ (church)

TABLE 16. Referential DR usage: postpositions and possessed nouns from will and testament texts in Anderson et al. (No data on the referents 'dead people, postpositions', 'priests, nouns', 'other living people, nouns', or 'non-human religious, nouns'.)

about the spirit Malinche. This usage never occurred in Malinche stories from the northern communities.

Data on the use of DR markers with possessed nouns and inflected postpositions are sparse; they have been displayed in Table 14. While it is difficult to draw conclusions from these scattered examples, they do not appear to contradict the picture shown in Table 13—of a wave moving from least to most conservative communities, whereby DR marked usage is replaced by unmarked referential usage.

Data gleaned from the colonial-period 'will' texts in Anderson et al. are shown in Tables 15–16. It is of interest that the oldest text in this collection (1566) displays little DR usage in reference, even with verbs about God at Level I. (However, a 1548 text in Karttunen & Lockhart 1976 displays a few referential DR usages.) Some honorific usages do not appear until relatively late in the 'will' sample. For example, an element *catca* 'late' (in reference to the deceased, lit. 's/he was') continues without honorifics until the text from 1795, when a Level III form *metzticatca* 'late' appears. An examination of some Classical texts shows that a relatively low level of referential DR usage, compared to that of the modern communities in the southern part of the Malinche area, may be the conservative pattern for the Classical language. For instance, even in the very conservative prayers and orations of the *huehuetlatolli* (Sahagún, 16th c.), 3rd person DR usage appears only sporadically. One may trace the usage for 's/he died'. In the modern Malinche-area materials, and in the colonial-period wills, this is a heavy referent for Level III DR markers. However, the first chapter of Sahagún's *Primeros memoriales* (Jiménez Moreno 1974) contains a number of references to deaths, including deaths of deities, all at Level I. These texts date from before 1560. This is also true for the Classical texts given in the grammars of Andrews and Garibay. Thus the elaboration of referential DR usage seen in the southern Malinche communities may represent not a preservation of a Classical pattern, but the relic of a pattern that reached its height during the colonial period. The precise form

of the elaboration of the DR system during colonial times demands more extensive study; we mention the problem here because of its relevance to the interpretation of our data. It is possible that, to our hypothesis of southern = conservative and northern = innovative, a counter-hypothesis might be advanced, namely the hypothesis that the north conserves the Classical pattern and the south innovates a more elaborate pattern. However, we feel we are correct in rejecting such a hypothesis because of the much wider functional range of Nahuatl in the southern communities, and because of the greater number of monolingual and Nahuatl-dominant bilinguals in those communities. We are assuming that, during the colonial period, the elaborate pattern for referential DR usage was present in the northern communities as well.

From a purely linguistic point of view, the shift in DR referential usage moves in a wave pattern from the lightest to the heaviest referents. These 3rd person referents are, of course, in turn more lightly constrained than are the DA examples; you cannot offend a referent unless s/he is physically present. Usage of DR markers for many referents was apparently variable even during the colonial period, during which time the system may have become most highly elaborated. In the modern communities, referential DR usage disappears first in the weakest instances—those for non-human religious objects—and the wave of loss moves through the system, eliminating next the ‘living person’ and the ‘priest’ references, then ‘dead person’, then the verb ‘to die’. Only ‘God/saints’ seems to be intact, even though no community in the sample except Canoa still uses Nahuatl regularly in religious worship. (The definition of a good speaker for our informants was a person who knows Nahuatl *hasta la doctrina* ‘even the catechism’.) The DA system appears to be intact in all the communities.

We suggest that the situation of linguistic change which is revealed in an examination of referential DR usage reflects a change in the northern communities: Nahuatl’s function of encoding intra-community distinctions of prestige and status has been replaced by a functional range devoted exclusively to encoding the reinforcement of community or indigenist solidarity. This model of a shift in the function of Nahuatl is in accord with a general model which can be developed about the relationships between the Nahuatl-speaking and the Spanish-speaking peoples of Mexico. Early in the colonial period, Nahuatl was retained as a language within which high-status roles could be encoded. In the 17th century, however, it was stripped of its official status, and New Spain was castilianized (Heath 1972: 37–55). But prestige functions for Nahuatl could continue in Nahuatl-speaking communities, which were isolated from mobility in the larger society by economic strategies such as the *encomienda* and *hacienda*, which bound the indigenous peasant populations to the land in the service of Spanish and ladino landlords, as well as the general development of so-called ‘dominical’ strategies (Aguirre Beltrán 1973), which relegated the indigenous populations to the lowest socio-economic positions.

The restriction of mobility made it possible for Nahuatl peasant communities to develop extensive internal stratification; such developments as the establishment of the civil/religious hierarchies in the communities were officially encouraged by church and state. However, the oppression and exploitation of the indigenous

populations led to the development of strategies of solidarity on their part to enable them to cope with economic uncertainty. The solidarity strategy of 'indigenism'—the emphasis on symbolic expression of self-identification as an Indian through language, housing, clothing, arts and crafts, ceremonies, and maintenance of traditional subsistence patterns—has been actively encouraged by Mexican intellectuals, particularly since the Revolution (cf. Friedlander 1975). The Nahuatl language has played a major role as an indigenist symbol, both among ladino intellectuals and in indigenist communities. However, a Nahuatl language with an elaborate system to encode the recognition of prestige differences in surface morphology is hardly in accord with Nahuatl as a symbol of indigenist solidarity. The contradictions in this situation could be effectively sorted out only when education in Spanish and access to social mobility in the Spanish-speaking sectors of society became available to the indigenous populations; this has occurred increasingly, particularly since the Revolution, as new job opportunities, universal primary education, improved transportation, and access to mass-communications media have become available to the indigenous populations. The prestige functions of language thus can be, and are, increasingly handled in Spanish by the new generations of bilinguals. On the other hand, the more downtrodden the community, the more appealing is the adaptive strategy of maintaining Nahuatl as a vehicle for reinforcing community unity and solidarity, and as a vehicle for secrecy and hostility against the outside world.

The northern communities in our sample, with the exception of Acxotla, display a fuller development of this split between prestige functions, encoded in Spanish, and solidarity functions, encoded in Nahuatl, than do the southern communities. Among the southern communities, Canoa, which is the most conservative community in referential DR usage, is also the most culturally isolated and conservative. Canoa actively maintains ethnic boundary symbols in dress, housing, language, and other customs; and it uses Nahuatl almost exclusively in daily life, except for the 'dedications' over the town public-address system. The presence in Canoa of a Nahuatl-speaking priest allows the perpetuation of the prestige functions of Nahuatl in the religious hierarchy, since the priest can interact with lay officials of the church in elevated forms of Nahuatl. Canoa has been further isolated by its terrible reputation; Canoeros are thought to be violent and dangerous, particularly since an incident in 1968 involving the murder of some university students who visited the town. The reputation, however, predates that incident. Thus many outsiders are afraid to go to Canoa. Canoeros themselves visit Puebla often (a bus leaves for the city every half-hour, all day long), and they go long distances to market towns. Many men work in Puebla. However, most migration out of Canoa is by the day only, so all non-work time is spent in the community. Older men, particularly, retain a pattern of day-work in the city only during slow periods for agriculture.

La Resurrección is not as isolated as Canoa by reputation, but it still preserves most of the outward indigenist boundary markers. It is even closer to Puebla than is Canoa, so brief trips into the city are again a common pattern. La Resurrección is apparently going through an attitudinal shift which is affecting features like dress and language; many families have shifted from the exclusive use of Nahuatl

to the occasional use of Spanish within the last couple of years, and one hears women who are not at all fluent in Spanish speaking it to their children. Female children are no longer always dressed in traditional clothing. Thus it is highly likely that, in a few years, Nahuatl will change its functional range in La Resurrección.

About twenty-five years ago, Tlaltepango went through the same rather sudden shift which is apparently now taking place in La Resurrección. Many women report that they learned Spanish then and began speaking it to their families with great effort; one seldom meets a person under age twenty-five who will admit to speaking Nahuatl, and little children think the language is a joke.⁹ However, Nahuatl has an important function in the community as a secret language for solidarity, particularly in drinking and joking. In Tlaltepango, only women preserve the conservative distribution of referential DR usages. Tlaltepango differs from La Resurrección and Canoa in its more 'modern' appearance in dress and housing and in economic adaptation; relatively more people are full-time factory workers. People from Canoa and La Resurrección speak pejoratively of Tlaltepangueros as *obreros* 'workers', as opposed to themselves, the *campesinos* 'peasants'.

In the northern communities, the shift of Nahuatl to an exclusively solidarity-reinforcing function is in accord with the much heavier involvement of these communities in the Spanish-speaking world through long-distance migration and through involvement in the textile industry, centered in Santa Ana Chiautempan. In the most northern town, Cuahutenco, one sees the fullest development of the functional split. In surface linguistic and cultural forms, Cuahutenco is quite conservative—although not as much so as, say, Canoa. Cuahutenco, like Canoa, is high on the volcano, on marginal lands often damaged by hail or frost; and it considers itself oppressed by the town of San Bernardino Contla, the heavily ladino-ized cabecera (county seat) of its municipio (county). The weavers, who are a substantial part of Cuahutenco's population, are in a classical pose of exploitation/oppression vis-à-vis the yarn suppliers and blanket wholesalers of Santa Ana Chiautempan and San Bernardino Contla (Nutini 1968). Cuahutenco is geographically isolated, but at the same time heavily involved in the urban economy. In Cuahutenco even small children speak Nahuatl; but we cannot identify, in the speech of Cuahutenco subjects, anything like the elaborate referential DR complex of Canoa and La Resurrección. Cuahutenco speakers use referential DR markers consistently only for the 'God/saints' referent. It might be worth mentioning that Cuahutenco was the most overtly suspicious and hostile of the communities in which we worked, in spite of wonderful help from our first contact there. Thus Cuahutenco shows us a superficially conservative pattern of language

⁹ The precipitate nature of the abandonment of Nahuatl in the municipio of Vicente Guerrero, in which Tlaltepango is located, can be inferred from the following data from the general census:

DATE	POPULATION	MONOLINGUALS	% MONOLINGUAL
1940	8168	3734	45.7%
1950	10437	1603	15.4%
1960	14578	1841	12.6%
1970	20198	744	3.7%

use, with many 'good' speakers of Nahuatl; but on close examination this can be seen to represent a highly advanced stage of split between Nahuatl in the solidarity functions and Spanish in the prestige functions. The other northern communities are apparently in advanced stages of total abandonment of Nahuatl, all our informants there being people of late middle age or older. In these communities, Nahuatl functions only in a very limited way, even in the strategy of indigenist solidarity.¹⁰

It is interesting to note the relationship between the functions that Nahuatl serves in a community, as indexed in referential DR usages, and attitudes about hispanisms. In an earlier paper (Hill & Hill 1977), we wrote that high rates of hispanisms discourage the preservation of Nahuatl, since hispanisms make the language a less effective marker of indigenist solidarity. Hispanisms, as borrowings from the high status-dominant language, are the result of a prestige function which is in contradiction with the solidarity function; and of course they are Spanish, the language of the very people against whom the solidarity strategy is directed. However, in a community where intra-community prestige is still an important function of Nahuatl, the incorporation of hispanisms is not contradictory. Thus, during the period in the history of Nahuatl when prestige was still within the functional range of the language, massive numbers of hispanisms of all types (see Karttunen & Lockhart) were incorporated into everyday usage. Modern Malinche-area speakers may use hispanisms at a rate of 40–50% of lexical items in running speech, and the fact that Nahuatl is being spoken is evident only from inflectional morphology. However, in communities where the prestige function is in decline and the solidarity function is becoming dominant, hispanisms become maladaptive and stigmatized, and their presence hastens the decline of the language. Since Nahuatl is so highly hispanized, it is not a good vehicle for indigenist solidarity; it thus becomes an object of contempt as a mixed language, an imperfect form, and rapidly goes out of use.¹¹ The solidarity strategy can be continued, but is encoded through other symbolic forms.

We hypothesize that, as long as Nahuatl retains a prestige function in a com-

¹⁰ Nahuatl can be preserved in the indigenist solidarity strategy even by non-speakers. For instance, Willett Kempton (personal communication) reports that he was assailed several times by the insult *Xnēchmaca mohuelti* 'Give me your sister.' When he replied *Āmo* 'No', at least once the challenger did not understand. (The appropriate response, by the way, is a return insult: *Āmo, pero in nocnih quēmah* 'No, but my brother, yes.') Non-speakers would often challenge us to prove our fluency by giving them the word for pulque (Nahuatl *necuhtli* = /nekʷli/), the favorite local alcoholic beverage. The drinking of pulque, which is fermented from maguey juice, is an important indigenist symbol, and Nahuatl tends to be maintained in this context even by non-speakers, who will request pulque at a party with *Cē litroh de necuhtli!* 'A liter of pulque!' The status of pulque as an indigenist symbol is signaled by the popular doggerel *Los gringos de Europa toman vino de ley | pero los indios mexicanos toman pulque de maguey* 'The foreigners from Europe drink legal wine, but Mexican Indians drink pulque from maguey.'

¹¹ While the favorite challenge of the non-speaker to us was to request the word for pulque, the favorite challenge of speakers was to request that we produce the *legítimo mexicano* 'real Nahuatl' forms for such items as 'hat', 'shoes', 'table', and 'train'. For these there exist elaborate Nahuatl neologisms which are never used in ordinary speech (hispanisms being used instead), but only in an indigenist, solidarity-affirming context.

munity, it can absorb massive hispanization without its existence being threatened.¹² It is only when the functions of the language are shifted, and become contradictory to the content of the symbolic medium, that we will witness spectacularly rapid decline. The fact that functional shift is affecting all the Malinche-area communities is evident from the universal attitude that Nahuatl is not 'legitimate', but is 'mixed up' and too hispanized. In the presence of this attitude, the decline of the language is spectacularly rapid, apparently taking place virtually overnight. The decline is so rapid, in fact, that it is extremely difficult to recover the historical facts of functional shift; we are fortunate that the referential DR system seems to provide an index to the functional assignments the language is carrying, and that several types of communities have survived on the Malinche volcano. Thus Nahuatl honorific usage can be studied not only as a piece of charming linguistic esoterica, but also as a critical route into fundamental questions about why some languages die, and others survive.

REFERENCES

- AGUIRRE BELTRÁN, GONZALO. 1973. *Regiones de refugio*. México: Instituto Nacional Indigenista.
- ANDERSON, ARTHUR J. O. 1973. *Rules of the Aztec language: Classical Nahuatl grammar*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- ; FRANCES BERDAN; and JAMES LOCKHART (eds.) 1976. *Beyond the codices: the Nahuatl view of colonial Mexico*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- ANDREWS, J. RICHARD. 1975. *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- BRIGHT, W., and R. W. THIEL. 1965. Hispanisms in a modern Aztec dialect. *Romance Philology* 18:444–52.
- BROWN, ROGER, and ALBERT GILMAN. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. *Style in language*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 253–76. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press of MIT.
- BUCHLER, IRA R. 1967. The analysis of pronominal systems: Nahuatl and Spanish. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9:5:37–43.
- , and R. FREEZE. 1966. The distinctive features of pronominal systems. *Anthropological Linguistics* 8:8:78–105.
- CAROCHI, HORACIO. 1645. *Arte de la lengua mexicana con la declaracion de los adverbios della*. México: Iuan Ruyz.
- CEDERGREN, HENRIETTA J., and DAVID SANKOFF. 1974. Variable rules: performance as a statistical reflection of competence. *Lg.* 50:333–55.
- FRIEDLANDER, JUDITH. 1975. *Being Indian in Hueyapan: a study of forced identity in contemporary Mexico*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- GARIBAY, ÁNGEL MARÍA. 1970. *Llave del náhuatl: colección de trozos clásicos, con gramática y vocabulario, para utilidad de los principiantes*. 3rd ed. México: Porrúa.
- HEATH, SHIRLEY BRICE. 1972. *Telling tongues: language policy in Mexico*. New York: Teachers College Press.

¹² We might be able to date functional shifts in the past through periods of particularly heavy acquisition of hispanisms, representing periods of prestige-seeking through Nahuatl, as opposed to light periods or periods with substantial attention to neologism formation, such as in the Nahuatl Academy movement of the 1920's and 30's, which would represent periods of attention to solidarity. Bright & Thiel 1965 suggest this kind of dating in their discussion of Tlaxcalan Nahuatl hispanisms.

- HILL, JANE H., and KENNETH C. HILL. 1977. Language death and relexification in Tlaxcalan Nahuatl. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 12.55-70.
- JIMÉNEZ MORENO, WIGBERTO. 1974. 'Primeros memoriales' de Fray Bernardino de Sahagún. (Colección científica, 16.) México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- KARTTUNEN, FRANCES, and JAMES LOCKHART. 1976. Nahuatl in the middle years: language contact phenomena in texts of the colonial period. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1972. Language in the inner city: studies in the Black English vernacular. (Conduct and communication, 3.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- MOLINA, ALONSO DE. 1571a. *Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana*. México: Pedro Ocharte. [Facsimile edition, Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1945. English translation: *Grammar of the Mexican (Nahuatl) language (1571)*, trans. by Kenneth C. Hill. *Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Publications in Linguistics*, 1:4.i-iv, 1-99 (1975).]
- . 1571b. *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexicana y castellana*. México: Antonio de Spínosa. [Facsimile edition, México: Porrúa, 1970.]
- NUTINI, HUGO G. 1968. San Bernardino Contla: marriage and family structure in a Tlaxcalan municipio. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- OLMOS, ANDRÉS DE. 1547. *Arte para aprender la lengua mexicana*. [First published, Paris: Imprenta Nacional, 1875. Reprinted, México, Ignacio Escalante, 1885.]
- PITTMAN, RICHARD S. 1948. Nahuatl honorifics. *IJAL* 14.236-9.
- SAHAGÚN, BERNARDINO DE. 16th c. *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*, libro sexto [Edited and translated by Charles E. Dibble & Arthur J. O. Anderson as *General history of the things of New Spain*, book 6 (Florentine codex, part VII; *Monographs of the School of American Research*, 14:7.) Santa Fe: The School of American Research; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1969.]
- SIMÉON, RÉMI. 1885. *Dictionnaire de la langue nahuatl ou mexicaine*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. [Reprinted, Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1963.]
- WHORF, BENJAMIN LEE. 1946. The Milpa Alta dialect of Aztec. *Linguistic structures of Native America*, by Harry Hoijer et al. (Viking Fund publications in anthropology, 6), 367-97. New York.

[Received 26 March 1977.]