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Every student of the Nahua culture who reads sources in Nahuatl, sooner or later stumbles upon the omnipresent Nahuatl kinship terminology. In this language, kin terms are used not only to describe relationships within the family, but they also appear as polite forms of address employed for unrelated people; form part of political titulature; characterize relations between deities; appear in the context of priestly hierarchy; and enter many other thematic areas. Since kinship is generally founded on the biological basis, the terms that describe these relationships are not of so much interest to the researchers as they should be. Kin categories, especially the fundamental ones like “mother,” “father” or “child” are still automatically assumed to be universal, because they are so “natural.” Once the Nahuatl term *tatli* is translated as “father,” the whole cultural load of the English term is being transmitted to the Nahuatl one. This implies that the metaphorical usages of *tatli* are interpreted from the point of view of the European cultural background. When the king is named the “father” of his people we understand that this is because he governs them by a “natural law,” being at the same time merciful and punishing if necessary, providing for them, but requiring obedience in return. When the *tlatoani* is called the “father” of his people, we tend to assume the same. Thus, regardless of what other cultural data tell us about the conceptual construction of both the father and the *tlatoani* in the Nahua society, we interpret their roles leaning on our own experience. The research on cultural patterns follows the path from the “facts” assumed a priori to the vocabulary which is “explained” by these facts, whereas it should go in the opposite direction.

The purpose of the present study is the analysis of the Nahuatl kinship terminology as a system of classification, employed to categorize the world. The chronological area of research is sketched broadly, as it encompasses three hundred years of the Spanish colony (1521-1821) as well as these elements of the precontact reality that can be reconstructed on the basis of colonial written sources. Obviously, such a long period cannot be expected to produce one, uniform and concise system of classification, especially under the circumstances of cultural contact. During this time, both the worldview of the Nahuas and their language were undergoing a complex transformation, induced by the Spanish culture but also by other forces that formed part of the historical process. The attempt to grasp the changing “linguistic image of the world,” as preserved in the sources, may help in approaching the Nahua worldview. In particular, my efforts will focus on addressing the following questions:
- what the Nahuas could classify by means of kin terms, i.e. in which classification systems, aside from the kinship one, kin terms were employed;
- which kin terms were employed outside the kinship system of classification;
- what relationships were connoted by each Nahuatl kin term in each of the classification systems it formed part of;
- what were the logical principles that underlaid the extension of kin terms to other spheres;
- what were the rules of constructing polite forms of address based on kin terms;
- how kinship vocabulary and the concepts it connoted changed over time
- is it possible to distinguish between the original usages of kin terms and those imposed by the Spaniards in written sources.

These questions arose to a large degree from the theoretical framework proposed here as a tool for studying kinship terminologies (see below). They have determined the structure of the present work: each kin term is studied both separately and in connection with the other elements of the terminological system. The ordering of chapters was a challenge because it is in itself a classification. My intention was to approximate the Nahua rather than the European criteria but the result could not have been entirely satisfying, mainly because of the diachronic and, at the same time, incomplete nature of the data. Finally, I have divided the analysis into eight chapters. The terms for children and parents (1) are the most widespread and, in the conceptual system, complementary to each other. The latter feature is shared by the terms for grandchildren and grandparents (2) which display close similarities to (1) as far as their usage is concerned. Lesser, though still existing, similarities to children and parents are observed in the case of niblings, uncles and aunts (3). On the other hand, the vocabulary for siblings and cousins (4) seems to operate according to distinct logical principles than the one described in previous chapters. Etymologically, it is tightly associated with the terms for consanguineals of distant generations (5) who form the last group of consanguineal kin discussed in this study. They are followed by affinals (6) and the most general terms of all, designating unspecified kin relationships (7). Finally, two loanwords from the sphere of ritual kinship enter a separate chapter (8), because they are associated with an utterly new phenomenon in the Nahua landscape of social relations.
Within these chapters, the terms are analyzed either under separate headings or (if they are relatively rare) grouped according to their etymological traits and/or the criteria employed by the Nahuatl terminological system (see below). The discussion of each term begins with the dictionary data which is followed by a contextual analysis of its attestations in the sources. Firstly, the usage of the kin term within the kinship sphere is treated and then other classification systems identified for the term are taken into account. It has to be stressed here that for the sake of clarity in ordering the information, I have discerned the “spheres” as I would do for a European culture, i.e. politics, religion, social structure, etc. Obviously, the limits between these “spheres” do not follow exactly the same routes in Nahua culture. Nevertheless, such a reduction was necessary for the analysis to be accomplished. Whenever possible, I have made the attempt to order the data chronologically, starting with the earliest sources and continuing up to the latest ones. At the same time, I separated the “precontact contexts” (e.g. relationships between deities or ranks of children in polygamous families) from the “colonial” ones (e.g. forms of address employed in regard to the ecclesiastics). The terms that resulted from the contact with Spanish culture are always discussed at the end of the respective chapter. Finally, I have made a distinction in the text between standardized forms of terms which go in italics (e.g. -pil or nopiltzine) and attestations cited from the sources in quotation marks (e.g. “ypiltzin” or “nopiltzinne”).

**METHODODOLOGY**

1. **State of research**

Until the 1980’s the studies on Nahuatl kinship terminology focused on the reconstruction of the Nahua kinship system. A group of authors based their research on the lexical material derived from dictionaries and dictionary-like ethnographic texts. Such was the early work of Paul Radin, who simply produced an incomplete list of kin terms found in the dictionary of Molina, juxtaposing them with the similar lists of Mayan and Tarascan kin terms. Otherwise, he left the material without any further comment (Radin 1925). Another source employed by the authors was Book 10 of the “Florentine Codex.” It contains a list
(again incomplete) of the kin terms, together with short descriptions of the qualities and vices of the relevant kin. The terms are divided into two sections that roughly correspond to consanguineal and affinal relatives (although they show some discrepancies). Additionally, the manuscript “Memoriales con Escolios” includes a guide to how children of various social classes referred to their parents. This material was used by the students of tlacamecayotl, particularly by Edward E. Calnek, who understood the concept as a descent group (1974). Assuming that the terms listed by Sahagún’s informants in the first section composed the structure of tlacamecayotl, he attempted to sketch its characteristics, tracing the relations between different terms. A similar approach was adopted by Elena Diaz Rubio (1986), although she focused on the social roles played by the “members” of tlacamecayotl, rather than on its structure. She also postulated a method of research on the Nahuatl kinship terminology which would combine the anthropological, sociological and linguistic analysis with the deep knowledge on the Nahuatl language. Her study, however, remained on a very superficial level from the point of view of all of these disciplines.

Interesting results were obtained by Jerome Offner (1983), who submitted the dictionary material to componential analysis. According to his approach, kin terms may either denote a singular relationship (e.g. father’s brother) or designate a class of relationships (e.g. uncle). Offner generated a list of 40 Nahuatl kin terms together with all the relations they connoted. He further analyzed the terms from the point of view of linguistics, tracing the etymological and derivational relationships among them, and established extension rules for the terminological system. In this stage, one of the most important findings was that many terms for lineals and collaterals of G1 were structurally equivalent which implied the lack of distinction between these two groups in G0 (siblings/ cousins) and G2 (e.g. the term colli covers not only a parent’s father, but also a parent’s parent’s brother and other male collaterals from G2). Offner also observed the strict association of the sibling terminology with the terms for consanguineals of distant generations. These findings were further compared by him with other data on the Nahua kinship system and household organization which resulted in observing several correlates. Offner’s approach involved the assumption that

the structuring of the kinship terminology and the structuring of the society must be investigated and comprehended separately (Offner 1983: 194)
because the changes in the terminological system may occur at a slower pace than the changes in the social structure.

The second, more numerous group of authors interested in the topic, employed the material that extended beyond dictionaries. The first researcher who presented a contextual analysis of Nahuatl kin terms was Helga Rammow (1964). Her work has also been the first— and, to date, only— complete study on the Nahuatl kinship terminology. Rammow leaned on dictionaries, but she complemented the material with extensive information proceeding from grammars and literary genres: huehuetlatolli (the speeches of the elders), annals, chronicles, songs, ethnographic texts, etc. She perceived her work as following the lead of classical anthropological studies of kinship systems. Her main objectives were to demonstrate the functioning of kin terms within the language (as opposed to the artificial composition of dictionaries) and, subsequently, to define kin relationships and recognize the family structuring among the precontact Nahuas. Since she did not take into account the above mentioned assumption regarding a distinct rhythm of developing terminologies and corresponding social phenomena, she failed in completing the latter objective. The attempt to investigate the kinship system solely on the basis of the terminology resulted in forcing the linguistic information into the scheme adopted a priori. The first step of her analysis, however, was much more successful. She made an important distinction between the terms of address and the terms of reference. Several principles that governed the naming of consanguineals and affinals, among them the distinction of age relative to ego, were observed. Finally, Rammow paid attention to metaphorical employment of some kinship terms and to the Christian influence on the Nahuatl nomenclature.

Rammow’s work had inspired Pedro Carrasco, who in his paper “Sobre algunos terminos de parentesco en el náhuatl clásico” (Carrasco 1966) addressed some issues raised by her. Among others, he pointed out that Nahuatl kinship terminology marks a distinction between generations and that it introduces a division between lineal and collateral kin with the only exception of G0 where the same term is used for both siblings and cousins of each sex. Most importantly, Carrasco analyzed the concept of tlamampan which served to count back generations, paying close attention to possible Spanish influence on it and suggesting the convergence of tlamampan with “grado de parentesco.” Finally, he identified a phenomenon of marking the death of a relative through whom the relationship with an in-law was bound by
means of the prefix *micca* (e.g. *no-micca-mon*, “my son-in-law, husband of my deceased daughter”).

Although Rammow indicated some metaphorical usages of Nahuatl kin terms, she did not attempted to understand their nature. Such an attempt was undertaken for the first time by Brant Gardner (Gardner 1982). He divided his analysis into two stages: the first one included systematically classified kinship terms approached from the perspective of componential analysis. Here, a revolutionary finding was made: Gardner established that the terms varied not according to the sex of the speaker (as it had been understood until then) but rather according to the sex of the reference point. In the second stage, the social context of the occurrences of kin terms in written sources was investigated. As a result, it turned out that kinship nomenclature was broadly used in the Nahuatl language in reference to a number of different spheres: religion, politics, social structure, etc. Gardner emphasized its importance as a key to understanding Nahua culture as a whole. Unfortunately, he lacked the ethnohistorical background necessary in this kind of research. The explanations he offered as to the discussed metaphorical extensions of kin terms were in many cases inaccurate, revealing deficiencies to address more fully precontact Nahua culture.

In the 1970’s another methodology in the studies on Nahuatl kinship terms began to emerge. It was closely associated with the extension of the research material to the so-called mundane documents: testaments, municipal records, petitions, etc., housed in archives and for a long time neglected by Mesoamerican scholars. In 1976 Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart discussed the changes which occurred in Nahuatl due to contact with Spanish. It became evident that in the colonial period the kinship terminology was undergoing a transformation, adopting loanwords and probably modifying the meaning of original terms (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976). In the 1980’s Susan Kellogg employed Tenochtitlan testaments in her analysis of two Nahuatl terms related to kinship: *tlacamecayotl* and *teixhuihuan* (Kellogg 1986). To the greatest extent, however, everyday documentation was employed by Lockhart in his chapter on Nahuatl kinship terminology included in “The Nahuaas after the Conquest” (Lockhart 1992). A new kind of sources produced several new terms and helped to draw a complex scheme of the terminological system. The rules of classification were listed in a systematic way and correlates with the social practice were indicated. For the first time, the analysis of the terms included some remarks on regional variation. One of the most
important contributions of this work was a diachronic perspective employed by Lockhart. He pointed to the Christian religion and other aspects of the Spanish culture as factors that heavily influenced the transformation of Nahuatl kinship terminology. He also looked for the origins of the system as it was recorded in the sixteenth century by both Spanish and Nahua writers. As a result, the terms were presented as part of the historical process: a developing and, consequently, not necessarily coherent, cultural product.

The methodology proposed by Lockhart stemmed from a broader approach developed by him and his students and named “New Philology” (Lockhart 2007). Its main objective is the investigation of various cultural phenomena of the colonial period from the perspective of Nahua-authored texts. Taking singular documents or fragments of texts as the point of departure, New Philology attempts to perceive the studied phenomena against the complex cultural and linguistic background. The main focus is put on the language: etymology, the analysis of grammar and syntax, the identification of different registers (common speech, formal speech, polite speech, literary language, etc.) and the definition of semantic fields of terms. The research is based on systematically gathered data and necessarily includes historical method: the sources are studied with the careful consideration of genre characteristics, the background and objectives of the author, etc. Finally, the analyzed text is compared with a possibly large corpus of indigenous texts. Along with undeniable advantages of such an approach, New Philologists themselves acknowledge its deficiencies. The studies tend to remain within a philological method, ignoring, to a large extant, other theoretical fields and their focus on micro-regionalism too often constrains the authors to view their topic of research in a larger context (Restall 2003: 130).

One of the first works that bore a mark of the “New Philology” approach was the critical edition of huehuetlatolli known as the “Bancroft Dialogues” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987). It contained an insightful chapter on the Nahuatl kinship terms employed in the source. Similarly to Gardner, Karttunen and Lockhart pointed out the appearance of some kin terms in a broad social context, extending beyond the “family” sphere. The most important observations referred to the forms of address and their usage in various social situations, such as the avoidance of primary terms in addressing relatives. Nevertheless, the character of the study which excluded the use of comparative data, did not allow the authors to view the kinship terminology as a system. Consequently, such hypothesis as the inversion of meaning
of the kin terms employed in polite speech, seem rather intuitive than based on a broader analysis of Nahuatl concepts.

In conclusion, up to the present date the Nahuatl kinship terminology has been studied from many different perspectives. The greatest achievements were on the part of philology and linguistics whose followers made clear most of the relationships between various terms and the principles that governed the whole terminological system. Anthropological approach was postulated but never actually fully accomplished. The first and only systematic study of all known terms was published in 1964 – since then all works have focused on a selected source or aspect of the topic. Moreover, the interest of scholars hardly extended beyond the kinship system as such. Although metaphorical extensions of kin terms have been recognized by many researchers, their remarks on the topic remained partial, non-systematic and often superficial (e.g. Karttunen 1992b; Kellogg 1995; Montes de Oca 2000).

2. Theoretical framework

The present study intends to fill several gaps left by the previous students of Nahuatl kinship terms. It was inspired by the approach of David M. Schneider to kin terminologies. For many years they were considered to be one of the fundamental subjects of investigation for classical anthropologists. The tendency was started by one of the pioneers of anthropology, Lewis H. Morgan, whose work dealt among others with kinship systems of native Americans. Since the end of nineteenth century until the 1960’s kinship organization was perceived as a firm ground for an anthropologist, contrary to somewhat vague sphere of religion. Its undeniable association with the biological aspect of life made it a perfect research topic for those who wanted to force anthropology into the “scientific” model. As a child of evolutionism, anthropology in its first stages of existence needed to measure, classify and order hierarchies. The theory of kinship proposed in the classical work “The Social Structure” (Murdock 1949) was based on intercultural research that led to the elaboration of “universal” associations between kin terminologies and social practice (marriage rules, inheritance rules, etc). Eventually, this formula came to an end together with the structuralism of Claude Lévi-Strauss who made an ultimate reduction, presenting his famous atom of kinship. The interest in the topic disappeared for several years, to be revived by Schneider who proposed a new
perspective for investigating kinship terminologies. Instead of reconstructing a social structure leaning on “universal” categories, assumed a priori by a researcher, the objective of an analysis should be the identification of these categories within their proper cultural context. The meaning of the terms should further be established and an attempt made to understand the concept of kinship produced by a given society (Schneider 1984: 126). Thus, one of the most important contributions of Schneider was the observation that although kinship is rooted in the biology of a man, the biological relations may be interpreted in a different way depending on a culture. An example that illustrates this idea is the European concept of blood which for centuries was considered a “carrier” of kinship – this meaning has been preserved in language, for instance, in the term “consanguineal.” Nowadays, the “carrier” of kinship is a gene, which involves a whole set of new social and cultural practices.

Schneider’s approach was revised by Mary Douglas. She recognized the importance of analyzing local taxonomies through native categories and logical relations between them but her focus was on studying the ways classification systems are created (Douglas 1999: 103-104). According to Douglas, the categorization of the world is a part of social behavior. Logical principles that govern this process are defined by a given culture but the outcome is perceived by the members of this culture as “natural” and “universal” (ibid.: 255). It can be stated that many classification systems belong to what Clifford Geertz named “common sense” or “common knowledge,” that is, a culturally conditioned set of assumptions about the functioning of the world employed uncritically whenever needed (Geertz 1983: 78-79). Similarly, classification systems are thought to reflect the natural state of things. Hardly are they reflected upon by their users and almost never questioned. This is because they are logical: the discerning of various classes is submitted to consistent criteria. At the same time, these criteria may differ across cultures: for example, in modern European classification system bats and birds do not belong to the same class, because the former are mammals and the latter lay eggs. But the criteria employed by the ancient Hebrews were enviroment and mode of locomotion which made bats and birds categorized together (ibid.: 257-258).

The culturally conditioned logic that stands behind the creation of classification systems belongs to what Douglas calls “implicit meanings.” It cannot be uncovered by an anthropologist through direct questioning because of the deep belief each culture has in its universality and “obviousness.” The logical principles can only be reached through cultural
expressions such as rituals, taboos and, above all, terminologies (ibid.: 103-104). Since classification is systematic, categories and classes they form are structured which implies seeing them in relation to each other. Some categories belong to more than one classification system. This issue was illustrated by Douglas with her analysis of the significance of the cassowary among the Karam. Members of this ethnic group call the cassowary “my nephew” (“a child of my sister”). According to Douglas, the kinship term was transferred to another system because in both it connoted the same relationship. The analysis of relationships between other kin categories and animated beings described with them revealed that the principle that linked both classification systems was taboos. A Karam man called the cassowary “my nephew” because he had to avoid it under the same circumstances and in the same manner he avoided his nephew. The main assumption of this approach is that the analogies between various relationships within classification systems cause these systems to overlap each other (ibid.: 263-266). I adopt it for the purpose of the present study, following Douglas’ general scheme of bringing the “implicit meanings” to the surface by reaching to them through cultural expressions.

Nevertheless, the methodology proposed by Douglas cannot be employed uncritically within Mesoamerican studies. Some necessary modifications are provided by a most notable work dealing with Nahua classification systems: Alfredo López Austin’s “Human Body and Ideology” (1989). In contrast to Douglas, López Austin prefers to speak of “ideological systems” structured by “social consciousness.” He defines an ideological system as

characterized by an interrelated aggregate of ideological elements, marked by particular forms of action in a particular sphere of the universe (López Austin 1989 I: 10).

The systems (such as politics, religion, ethics, aesthetics, etc.) may overlap with each other, but they are governed by different logic. Moreover, every ideological system has its own dynamics, caused by either internal or external factors of change (ibid). In spite of these differences, all the systems are connected to a general worldview of the society by which they were developed (ibid.: 7). The assumption about the relative autonomy of ideological systems structured López Austin’s research. He began with a detailed description of concepts related to body parts and animistic entities, employing linguistic, ethnohistorical and ethnological data. He further explored the relation of these concepts to various spheres of social life.
Finally, he attempted to correlate his findings with the knowledge we have on Mesoamerican worldview. As a result, López Austin demonstrated a wide spectrum of associations between the concepts related to human body and other “ideological systems.” It must be stressed that his focus was as much on terminology as it was on social practice. The main objective of his work was “to explain an ideological system and its place in the societies that gave it birth” (ibid.: 4).

Douglas’ ethnological research was conducted without taking into account the historical change. The communities she investigated were viewed from the synchronic perspective. She recognized regional variation and some modern phenomena associated with colonialism, but generally her focus was on reconstructing a coherent, ahistorical classification system. A slightly different approach was adopted by her in ethnohistorical studies on the Bible. Here one can detect more of a diachronic perspective: cultural contact is viewed as an important factor in developing the worldview of the Hebrews. Still, Douglas’ research was based on one source which presented studied culture as a stable unit, functioning according to a never-changing set of rules. In the case of the Nahua we are dealing with culture that appeared on the European horizon in 1519 and has survived until now. Although all alphabetic sources on this group are colonial, studied together with pictorial manuscripts and archaeological evidence they allow for at least partial reconstruction of the precontact reality. Moreover, since the Nahua were living in a cultural area – Mesoamerica – that shared so many common characteristics, it is possible to employ comparative data associated with other groups (such as the Maya, Otomi, Tarascans, etc.) in an attempt to understand more fully the Nahua worldview. These sources, along with modern ethnological information, have been successfully employed by many researchers, including López Austin. Thus, even if a study is limited to sources written in Nahuatl during some 300 years of colony, the situation dealt with is extremely complex. The sources were produced as a result of cultural contact, whose nature and intensity varied according to period and place. Spaniards brought along

1 In the present work, I do not refer to linguistic groups other than the Nahuas and I use modern linguistic data only sporadically. They are the data included in the Nahuatl to English dictionary of Frances Karttunen (1992) and in the online dictionary developed by Wired Humanities Project (University of Oregon) in cooperation with Instituto de Docencia e Investigación Etnológica de Zacatecas: http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso. They proceed from Morelos, Guerrero and Puebla (Karttunen) as well as from Veracruz, Hidalgo and San Luis Potosi (Huasteca Nahuatl recorded by whp.uoregon.edu).
their own classification systems, initiating changes in both the Nahuatl language and, gradually, in more profound layers of culture.

All these circumstances taken into account, the necessity of applying a diachronic perspective to the studied material becomes obvious. The internal congruence of Nahua classification system as preserved in the sources cannot be taken for granted. One should expect variations and trends in time and space, as well as difficulties in separating Spanish innovations from both precontact phenomena and the results of convergence based on different forms of similarities and correspondencies. One of the crucial tools for understanding the cultural processes recorded in colonial written sources is the concept of “double mistaken identity,” developed by Lockhart and defined by him as:

a process (...) in which each side of the cultural exchange presumes that a given form or concept is functioning in the way familiar within its own tradition and is unaware of or unimpressed by the other side’s interpretation (Lockhart 1999: 99).

The methodology Douglas developed analyzing the Karam kin terms can be, therefore, applied to Nahuatl kinship terminology only with the above mentioned modifications. Consequently, in the present study I will treat this terminology as a classification rather than ideological system, in the same time taking advantage of López Austin’s methodological contribution. This approach implies a greater focus on language, because the first stage of the analysis deals with contexts in which each of the terms is employed. The guidelines to study terminologies through Nahuatl written sources are provided by the already mentioned New Philology. Both this school and Douglas (1999: 120) recognize ethnolinguistics as an important tool for understanding a native worldview. In this field, a particularly useful theoretical category for the kind of research proposed here is the “linguistic image of the world” (Bartmiński 2007). The reconstruction of the linguistic image of the world is accomplished on the basis of several aspects of the language, among whom the most significant, from the point of view of kinship terminology, is the vocabulary. According to Bartmiński, the most interesting results are produced by the analysis of idioms, loanwords and changes of meaning that follow the changes in life brought by historical process. Such an area of interest makes the approach of Bartmiński particularly useful for studying colonial Nahuatl, which was constantly adapting to the changing circumstances induced by cultural contact. The etymological and contextual analysis of the vocabulary is complemented by the information
on derivation processes in which a given term is involved, the term’s grammatical features, synonyms and opposites, etc. Last but not least, the lexical data must be compared to the information of ethnographic nature in order to see them against a more profound cultural background.

3. Sources and Methods

In the review of the present state of research, I have stressed that one of the disadvantages of the previous studies on Nahuatl kinship terms was the limited scope of the material employed in the analysis. The researchers focused either on dictionaries, literary genres or everyday documentation but never combined the three corpuses. Each of them refers to different thematic areas and involves different contexts for the occurrences of kin terms. From the perspective of studying a classification system, only submitting all these kinds of written sources to a comparative analysis may provide reliable results. Naturally, it is not possible to investigate or even read all the existing sources written in Nahuatl, as the corpus amounts to thousands of folios, many of them unpublished and scattered among various archives. Therefore, a selection was necessary in order to provide as much representative a sample as possible. Three criteria were taken into account in the selection process: genre, chronological period and, to a lesser extent, region. Meticulous regional studies on Nahuatl kinship terminology are difficult because of many hiatuses in documentation. For example, there is a large corpus of eighteenth-century testaments from the Valley of Toluca but sixteenth-century texts from this region are unavailable. For this reason, although careful attention is paid to a place of origin of a studied source, the present analysis cannot be considered thorough as refers to the regional variation in the use of kin terms.

The authorship of Nahuatl sources is most often a very complex matter, which cannot be resolved by a simple distinction between Spanish-authored and Nahua-authored texts. The former were usually a result of a close collaboration between a Spanish editor and his native “informants,” who, however, wrote large portions of the text – often quite independently from their supervisor (Burkhart 1989: 22). On the other hand, the indigenous writers took advantage of Spanish oral testimonies and written sources, as well as of European genres and literary conventions. They were educated in a European manner, in schools directed by the
ecclesiastics and, at least officially, their religion was Christianity. Consequently, for each source the nature and degree of Hispanization (from both linguistic and conceptual point of view) of kin terms has to be established separately. Also, one has to take into account the fact that the tight knot of the intercultural, dialogical structure of the sources is not always possible to untie.

The main bulk of sources employed in the present work is composed of 94 documents in Nahuatl written throughout the colonial period, which will be briefly characterized below. Each of these documents was read line by line in order to identify all the attestations of kin terms – whether employed to describe the actual family relations or used in a metaphorical way. Under the label “kin term” I put the vocabulary which, regardless of other possible usages, designates either consanguineal or affinal relatives. Such terms may point to a specific relationship (e.g. a “nephew”) or refer to an unspecified group of related people (e.g. “relatives”). Since I tend to view classification systems from a diachronic perspective, I have considered loanwords from Spanish as belonging to the Nahuatl terminological system. Additionally, I have included in the analysis several terms that describe ritual kinship and are based on actual kin terms, either Nahuatl or Spanish (e.g. -comadre). One important limitation as far as the collected material is concerned, is the grammatical form of terms. As will be explained below, the inherent trait of Nahuatl kin terms is their possessed form which implies the incorporation of possessive affixes. This concerns also Spanish loanwords, combined with possessive pronouns once they enter the Nahuatl terminological system. Nevertheless, the absolutive forms of kin terms do exist and are employed in both the dictionaries (or dictionary-like texts) and narratives – though, in the latter, relatively rarely. The absolutives do not describe relationships and this is why I have decided to exclude them from the analysis. The second group not taken into account in the present study are verbs based on kin terms. In the future, a systematic analysis of these aspects of the kinship vocabulary will be necessary in order to draw a fuller panorama of the terminological system. For now, this kind of research would require too distant a departure from the methodology applied here, to be possible to accomplish within a single study.

__________________________

2 I did not register very common names for women based on kin terms: Teyacapan (lit. one’s eldest child) and Teicuh (lit. one’s younger sibling).
Thus, the material employed in the present work is the attestations of possessed kin terms. The above mentioned number of 94 written sources produced 4058 such attestations. They were recorded in the MS Access relational database, designed for the purpose of the project. Since its principal objective was to follow the native categorization of the world, the basic criterion of classification within the database is a Term. Under each Term its attestations in the sources are listed together with their preliminary analysis. Each attestation is accompanied by the following information: the Quotation which forms the context of the term; the Speaker, the Referent and the Reference Point (the last one is reflected by the possessive prefix); the Grammatical Form: whether it is reverential and to what degree, what kind of possessive prefix does the term incorporate, if it is in vocative, etc.; Affiliation, that is, the sphere to which the relationship described by the term belongs (e.g. family, political hierarchy, precontact religion, etc.); and a broader Context of the occurrence (e.g. a dialogue between two noblemen, a preamble of a testament, etc). Moreover, each Quotation is accompanied by a translation to English or Spanish and localized within a Source with a number of page or folio. Generally, I relied on translations made by the editors of the sources, although sometimes corrections were necessary. These corrections in regard to the edition employed are always indicated in footnotes. Finally, the Sources were also characterized in the database by means of their title, author, genre, exact date, chronological period, place of origin and the edition used for the purpose of the study. Such a construction of the database made it possible to execute queries that would address issues important from the point of view of the research. The following tables contain the basic information on the sources included in the database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources, sixteenth century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, f. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 49, exp. 5, ff. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primeros Memoriales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Códice Florentino 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloquios y doctrina cristiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1575.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1575.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 105-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1575.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Vínculos 279, exp. 1, ff. 126r-127v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 50A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 2338, exp. 1, ff. 8r-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texcoca Accounts of Conquest Episodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de San Antonio's Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulancingo Col., UCLA RL SC, 2073, F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sources, sixteenth century**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author or notary</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, f. 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Soconusco</td>
<td>Oct 9-12, 1587</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistolario de la Nueva España, X, 63-5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Huexotzinco</td>
<td>Feb 22, 1565</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHN, Madryt, doc. 165</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>Jul 30, 1560</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcalan Actas, Cl 134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>Dec 18, 1553</td>
<td>municipal council record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft, Mexican Ms. 93, 2B, f. 30-31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nombre de Dios, Durango</td>
<td>1585?</td>
<td>municipal council record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confessionario mayor</td>
<td>Molina, Alonso de</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan?</td>
<td>1528-65?</td>
<td>penitential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 25</td>
<td>San Pedro, Juan de</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Aug 25, 1580</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>1572-1590</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA, mic. col., s. Tlaxcala, r. 1, i. 21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>May 19-Jun 5, 1566</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, exp. 2, f. 107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coyoacan</td>
<td>Jan 17, 1588</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1525, exp. 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Xochimilco</td>
<td>Jul 11, 1572</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 3</td>
<td>Dávila de Santiago, Alonso</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Nov 18, 1579</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 4</td>
<td>Dávila de Santiago, Alonso</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>1579-92</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>1572-1590</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 9</td>
<td>Dávila de Santiago, Alonso</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Jan 15, 1580</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 10</td>
<td>Dávila de Santiago, Alonso</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Feb 5, 1580</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>1572-1590</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>1572-1590</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Feb 21, 1581</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Jun 02, 1581</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>c. 1580</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 17</td>
<td>San Pedro, Juan de</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Jul 17, 1580</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 50</td>
<td>Maldonado, Miguel Jacobo de</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>May 02, 1581</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 64</td>
<td>Juan Bautista</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Jun 07, 1585</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>c. 1580</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sources, sixteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author or notary</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC, doc. 39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colhuacan</td>
<td>Mar 17, 1581</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia de la venida de los mexicanos</td>
<td>Castillo, Cristóbal del</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>1597-1600</td>
<td>historical account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia de la conquista</td>
<td>Castillo, Cristóbal del</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>1596-1600</td>
<td>historical account</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Sixteenth-century sources recorded in the database.

### Sources, seventeenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author or notary</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crónica Mexicayotl</td>
<td>Chimalpahin and Tezozomoc</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>c. 1609</td>
<td>annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of His Time</td>
<td>Chimalpahin</td>
<td>Mexico-Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>c. 1608-1615</td>
<td>annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulancingo Col., UCLA RL SC, 2073, F14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tulancingo</td>
<td>Aug 8, 1645</td>
<td>bill of sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cuyohuacan tlaquixtilli ytech bintura]</td>
<td>Chimalpahin</td>
<td>Coyoacan and Mexico-</td>
<td>c. 1593-1624</td>
<td>genealogical account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tlahtolli huel neltilizltli yn culhuacan]</td>
<td>Chimalpahin</td>
<td>Tenochtitlan</td>
<td>1592-1624</td>
<td>genealogical account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arte de la lengua mexicana</td>
<td>Carochi, Horacio</td>
<td>Tepotzotlan?</td>
<td>by 1645</td>
<td>grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1621</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coyoacan</td>
<td>Aug 7, 1621</td>
<td>legal statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1632</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coyoacan?</td>
<td>c. 1632</td>
<td>legal statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cocola</td>
<td>Apr 2, 1653</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Hospital de Jesus 210, no. 61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cuernavaca</td>
<td>c. 1610</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Hospital de Jesus 210, no. 62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cuernavaca</td>
<td>c. 1610</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1735, f. 92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coyoacan</td>
<td>Jun 26, 1613</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1611</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jalostotitlan, Jalisco</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1629</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tzacualco San Francisco</td>
<td>Oct 20, 1629</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Criminal 173, f. 491</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Huexotla</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>letter or petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercicio quotidiano</td>
<td>Sahagún, fray Bernardino de</td>
<td>Tlatelolco? or Tenochtitlan?</td>
<td>1574-1620</td>
<td>religious treatise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sources, seventeenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author or notary</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1768, exp. 2, fs. 143r-149v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cempoala, Hidalgo</td>
<td>Mar 1610</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 2488, exp. 1, fs.10r-10v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Azcapotzalco</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1695</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Simón Pochtlan</td>
<td>Aug 16, 1695</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1622</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coyoacan</td>
<td>Jun 12, 1622</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1617</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Bartolomé Atenco</td>
<td>Aug 1, 1617</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Hospital de Jesus 210, no. 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coyoacan</td>
<td>Jul 1, 1608</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA, Col. Gómez de Orozco 185, pp. 15-20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Pablo Tepemaxalco</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>tribute list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Seventeenth-century sources recorded in the database.

### Sources, eighteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 2548, exp.7, ff. 1-2v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Francisco Centlalpan</td>
<td>Sep 18, 1736</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee, UCLA RL, Special Col. 1795</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista Metepec</td>
<td>Dec 9, 1795</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 2541, exp. 9, f. 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Lucas Tepemaxalco</td>
<td>Jun 15, 1731</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 2541, exp. 9, f. 33r-33v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Lucas Tepemaxalco</td>
<td>Jul 1, 1735</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 2541, exp. 9, f. 35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>San Lucas Tepemaxalco</td>
<td>Jul 23, 1736</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHAM 54: 1</td>
<td>de la Cruz, Matias</td>
<td>San Miguel Aticpac</td>
<td>Aug 15, 1737</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry Library, Ayer Ms 1477B [1]</td>
<td>de los Santos, Hipólito</td>
<td>Teopantonco, Calimaya</td>
<td>Apr 05, 1738</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN Tierras 1501, e. 3</td>
<td>don Juan Antonio</td>
<td>San Pablo Tepemaxalco</td>
<td>Sep 21, 1710</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHAM 76: 41</td>
<td>Adrián Josef</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista, Toluca</td>
<td>Mar 02, 1756</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN, Civil 664, exp. 2</td>
<td>Agustín Diego</td>
<td>San Pablo Tepemaxalco</td>
<td>Aug 14, 1762</td>
<td>testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulancingo Col., UCLA RL SC, 2073, F19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tulancingo</td>
<td>Jul 30, 1720</td>
<td>legal statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will begin the discussion of the sources employed for the present study with the work that was not recorded in the database because of its non-narrative structure. I refer here to the Spanish-to-Nahuatl and Nahuatl-to-Spanish dictionary of fray Alonso de Molina (1977) – as I have already mentioned, for many researchers of Nahuatl kinship terminology the main (and often the only) source. Molina arrived in New Spain as a child, shortly after the Conquest and learned Nahuatl while playing with native children in Mexico-Tenochtitlan. His language skills were soon noticed by the Franciscan friars who hired him as an interpreter. After several years of work, Molina took the habit and began to fulfill the tasks of an evangelizator (León-Portilla 1977: XXIV; Moreno 1984: 10-11). The first version of the complete dictionary was published in 1571, being a result of many decades of collecting linguistic information (the Spanish-to-Nahuatl part was published in 1555) (León-Portilla 1977: XVI-XVII). Therefore, we can assume that, at least partially, the content of the dictionary reflects earlier phases of contact between Nahuatl and Spanish. The main target of the work were Spanish ecclesiastics learning Nahuatl with the purpose of the Christianization of the natives. However, it is also mentioned by the Nahua writers as a valuable source preserving their language in its most elegant form (ibid.: XIV-XV). Both parts of the dictionary include kin terms, not only with their basic meaning but also extensions into social and political spheres, often glossed separately. The entries are not grammatically uniform: sometimes a term is glossed under three different forms (absolutive, with the 1st person singular possessive prefix and with the indefinite personal possessive prefix) or one of the forms is chosen. As far as the localization of the language is concerned, Molina’s Nahuatl was of Tenochtitlan origin, but he was aided in his work by native Texcoca (ibid.: XXX). In spite of 50 years of the language experience and the help Molina received from his native collaborators, the kinship terminology included in his work presents significant deficiencies. Several terms are lacking, some of the others are glossed erroneously or the information provided is not sufficient. Sometimes, a tendency to
force the Nahuatl terms into the Spanish conceptual framework is apparent. Interestingly, there are discrepancies between glosses included in the dictionary and the way Molina employed the terms in his “Confessionario mayor en la lengua mexicana y castellana” (Molina 1569), which has been recorded in the database. The “Confessionario” was a penitential published six years before the first edition of the “Vocabulario” and it gained enormous popularity in the sixteenth-century New Spain (Moreno 1984: 13). Its arrangement – two parallel columns of Nahuatl and Spanish text – allowed both the Nahua Christians and their Spanish confessors to employ the penitential. It seems, however, that the main target of the work were the former, because throughout the text Molina often directly addresses the sinful reader, giving instructions as to the manner of preparing himself for the confession. The two-language arrangement also permits a researcher to identify Spanish translations of the Nahuatl terms as well as Nahuatl translations of Spanish concepts, produced by Molina. In the present study, I am employing a facsimile of the “Confessionario” based on its second edition, almost identical with the first one (Moreno 1984: 13-17). As far as the “Vocabulario” is concerned, I am likewise using a facsimile, based on Julio Platzmann’s edition of 1880 (León-Portilla 1977: XVIII).

Following the lead of the previous students of Nahuatl kinship terminology, I included in the research material fray Bernardino de Sahagún’s cultural encyclopedia, currently known as the “Primeros Memoriales” and the “Florentine Codex.” The “Primeros Memoriales” form part of the so-called “Códices Matritenses” which are divided between the library of the Real Palacio (Ms. 3280) and the Real Academia de la Historia (Ms. 9-5524). The former houses the manuscript that deals with religion and calendar while the latter has the portion on natural history and human matters. Both manuscripts are written in several hands, their sections vary as to the chronology and internal structure. In the beginning of twentieth century, 88 selected folios of the “Códices Matritenses” were arranged together and named “Primeros Memoriales” by Francisco Paso y Troncoso (Nicholson 1997: 6). It is believed that the information included in these folios was gathered by Sahagún and his four Nahua assistants, educated in the Colegio de Santa Cruz in Tlatelolco, during their stay in Tepepulco between 1558-1561. As the most recent research shows, the manuscript itself was nevertheless written

---

3 I thank Miguel Ángel Ruiz Barrio for sharing with me the results of his recent work. See: Ruiz Barrio 2013. “La estructura del contenido de los Manuscritos Matritenses de fray Bernardino de Sahagún” [in:] Estudio de los Manuscritos Matritenses de fray Bernardino de Sahagún, Real Academia de la Història, Madrid, in press.
after this date in Tlatelolco. The data of complex nature, including ethnographic information, mythical-historical accounts, songs, *huehuetlatolli* or everyday dialogues, were supposedly provided by the Tepepolcan nobility (ibid.: 3). Most of them were not included in the later work of Sahagún and his collaborators, the “Florentine Codex,” prepared between 1578-1580. It leaned on an earlier manuscript, now lost, completed in Mexico-Tenochtitlan by 1569 with the contribution of Tenochca and Tlatelolca informants. Between 1575-1577 the Spanish translation of the Nahuatl text was prepared (ibid.: 4). As in the case of Molina’s “Confessionario,” the Spanish version helps in understanding how native concepts were interpreted by the ecclesiastics.

Of 12 books of the “Florentine Codex,” I have systematically analyzed (and recorded in the database) only Book 6 including prayers, *huehuetlatolli* and proverbs. Before the Conquest, the genre of *huehuetlatolli* (lit. the ancient speech or the words of the elders) belonged to oral tradition. The speeches were delivered by various people on a number of occasions, but they were far from being informal. Depending on a social situation, speakers and listeners, strict conventions were employed, including the topics treated, vocabulary and the internal structure of the speech. Some pieces were of educational character, while other seem more “ritual” in the sense of constituting social reality. After the Conquest, *huehuetlatolli* were recorded in alphabetic writing which was followed by a change in function. They started to serve the preservation of the endangered Nahua cultural tradition as well as teaching Nahuatl in its most sophisticated form to the ecclesiastics. Book 6 is particularly valuable, because it can be dated back to 1547, thus constituting the earliest part of the “Codex.” The material for the book is distinct from the *huehuetlatolli* included in the “Primeros Memoriales” and was most likely collected in Tlatelolco (Sullivan 1974: 84-85). Following my predecessors, I also focused on the chapters on family in Book 10, as well as on the annotations to these chapters from the section of the “Códices Matritenses” labeled “Memoriales con Escolios.” Thanks to Marc Eisinger’s lexical index of the “Florentine Codex” (www.sup-infor.com) it has been possible to search for particular terms throughout the remaining books without the need to comb them page by page. In the present study I employ the reviewed edition of the “Florentine Codex” translated by Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O. Anderson, released in 2012.

---

4 Miguel Ángel Ruz Barrio, personal communication, April 20, 2013.
There are two sources ascribed to fray Bernardino de Sahagún which have not been studied yet from the point of view of kin terminology. The “Exercicio quotidiano” (Sahagún 1997a) is a collection of teachings, prayers and meditations in Nahuatl for each day of the week. The transcription employed here has been included in the 1997 edition of the “Codex Chimalpahin” because the manuscript is in Chimalpahin’s handwriting (Schroeder 1997: 8). The history of this source is a complex one. The first draft was written by an unknown author of indigenous origin. In 1574, it was corrected and reedited by Sahagún and his assistants. Their purpose was to include the “Exercicio” in the corpus of texts that formed a “doctrinal encyclopedia” destined for the ecclesiastics who learned Nahuatl as a tool for evangelization (ibid.: 10). A few decades later the text fell into the hands of Chimalpahin who between 1593-c.1620 was working as a fiscal and, perhaps, copyist, in the church of San Antonio Abad in Mexico-Tenochtitlan (Schroeder 1996: 38). He copied it, most likely tampering with the vocabulary and style (Schroeder 1997: 9). Obviously, the majority of kin terms provided by the text are employed in the Christian religious context, which holds true also for the second Sahaguntine “doctrinal” manuscript – the “Coloquios y doctrina cristiana” (Sahagún 1986). Nevertheless, in both sources the influence of the Nahua systems of classification is detectable. The “Coloquios” are claimed to be the record of conversations between the first Franciscan friars who arrived in New Spain and the Nahua priests. Reportedly, in 1524 one of these friars was taking notes in poor Nahuatl, trying to preserve the conversations for his followers. The notes were discovered by Sahagún in 1564 in the library of the Colegio de Santa Cruz in Tlatelolco and re-edited with the help of his native assistants (León-Portilla 1986: 19-20). The input of the latter is obvious when one takes into account the rich precontact vocabulary employed in the source. While smoothing the language of the original, the editors also either modernized the Nahuatl Christian terminology or modified it according to the judgment of Sahagún (ibid.: 22). At the same time, a Spanish version of the text was added. Apparently, the two language versions were being worked on simultaneously, but neither of them was thought of as the literal translation of the other one. Such a composition of the “Coloquios” allows to grasp the process of conceptualizing both Spanish and Nahua worldviews in each of the languages.

While Molina and Sahagún were completing their works in the sixteenth century, fray Horacio Carochi was writing a hundred years later. His “Compendio del arte de la lengua mexicana” (Carochi 2001) is one the principal sources for studying colonial Nahuatl. It is
modeled on Latin grammars and includes systematized information on lexical categories, syntax, idioms, etc. Although it was written in Spanish, it employs plenty of examples in Nahuatl, derived from either the works of other ecclesiastics (including Sahagún) or oral and written materials gathered by Carochi and his Nahua assistants. For the present study, the latter cannot be overestimated because they are accompanied by rather free Spanish translations which render the way Nahuatl terms and expressions operated in colloquial speech. The “Compendio” was first published in 1645 but, as observed by James Lockhart, the material it includes had been gathered for several decades and is representative for an earlier stage of the language development (Lockhart 2001: xi). The edition employed here has been based on the 1645 edition (ibid.: xiii), complemented with the English translation and comments by Lockhart.

Among the materials gathered by Carochi’s native collaborators is the collection of huehuetlatolli and everyday dialogues currently known as the “Bancroft Dialogues” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1986). They served as the basis for one of the most important studies on Nahuatl kinship terminology, mentioned above. The collection, now housed in the Bancroft Library in Berkeley, was produced with the purpose of teaching Nahuatl to the Spanish ecclesiastics (ibid.: 2). The first draft was most likely written between 1570’s and 1580’s in Texcoco. Its author was a native Texcocan nobleman, employed by the Franciscan friars as an assistant and undoubtedly educated in one of their “colegios” (ibid.: 7). As I have already mentioned, the source includes two types of texts. The huehuetlatolli display a clear influence of the Sahaguntine “school,” leaning on (or sometimes even copying) the passages collected by the Franciscan friar. The everyday dialogues were apparently selected with the objective of demonstrating polite forms or expressions used in various social situations. At the same time, the scenes are so vivid and authentic that the investigators see in them real events observed by the author (ibid.: 10, 12-13). The transcription and translation made by Karttunen and Lockhart is based on a re-edited version of the first draft, completed in the first half of the seventeenth century. The text is densely sparsed with kin terms, especially as far as polite forms of address are concerned. However, one has to remember that it is only seemingly of precontact character. In spite of its traditional form, it definitely reflects the colonial reality.

Among the material gathered for the present study, an important place have taken the texts produced by native writers who worked independently from the Spanish friars. Still,
these authors were interacting with both the ecclesiastics and the colonial authorities and their writings are pervaded by concepts characteristic of New Spain. Among this group, an eminent person is Domingo de San Antón Muñon Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuani, for the reasons of simplicity known as Chimalpahin. He was of noble, though a little bit obscure, origin (Schroeder 1996: 36). As I have already mentioned, at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries he was working in Mexico-Tenochtitlan, where he came from his native province of Amaquemecan Chalco. The access to a rich corpus of both written and painted manuscripts facilitated the completion of his opus magnum – a universal history. The main idea of the project was to correlate the European and Nahua historiographic traditions, placing Amaquemecan in the center of the meaningful, historical process, directed by Providence. The result was eight “Relaciones,” “Memorial breve de Colhuacan,” “Annals” and other minor documents. In 1983 the documentary basis for this work was discovered in the library of British and Foreign Bible Society in London (ibid.: 56). It was published in two volumes under the title “Codex Chimalpahin” (Chimalpahin 1997). The “Codex” is actually a collection of texts of various genres copied by Chimalpahin or transcribed by him from pictorial manuscripts. Aside from the already treated “Exercicio quotidiano” it includes the “Crónica mexicayotl” which will be discussed below, as well as many shorter accounts. Most of them are cited by Chimalpahin along with pieces of information referring to the author, place of origin and the form (either written or iconographic) of the source. Since the collection is large, not all of the texts were taken into account in the present study. I have analyzed a few documents which I have found the most promising from the point of view of kinship terminology. Otherwise, I focused on the “Crónica Mexicayotl” and two Texcocan sources which were probably employed by Chimalpahin, although they are not in his handwriting. It is with them that I will begin my discussion of the “Codex.”

“Texcoca Accounts of Conquest Episodes” (Texcoca Accounts 1997) and Juan de San Antonio’s letter (San Antonio 1997) seem to be related to each other. Both were written in the same period: the former c. 1560, the latter is dated December 13, 1564. They are letter-petitions produced by the members of the Texcoca ruling dynasty. In the case of the “Texcoca Accounts” the authors are don Pablo Ahuachpam, don Francisco de Andrada, don Lorenzo and other anonymous noblemen, difficult to locate within the landscape of the Texcoca ruling house. Juan de San Antonio includes the thorough information on his genealogy, wherefore we know that he was a grandson of the tlatoani Nezahualpilli and a son of Quauhtlitztactzin.
Both documents were written with an obvious purpose of claiming land property, but the addressees are unknown: in each case the heading is lacking. The authors refer several times to the assistance of Spanish ecclesiastics and it should be assumed that both texts were, to some degree, edited by the friars. Nevertheless, the kinship terminology employed in these letters is so rich and contextually diversified that it has few parallels among all the written sources employed in the present study. Since, until now, they have not been analyzed from the point of view of kin terms, they have thrown new light on a number of issues.

The “Crónica Mexicayotl” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997), on the other hand, was studied by both Rammow and Gardner. It must be stressed, though, that since the original was discovered only in 1983, their work leaned on copies made in the eighteenth century. The text has the form of annals, which were for a long time ascribed to another Nahua historian, Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc. Today we know that Tezozomoc contributed only 19 folios to the text, whose principal author should be considered Chimalpahin. In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” another account, authored by Alonso Franco from Tenochtitlan, is also cited as a source (Schroeder 2011: 234-235). The “Crónica” was written at the time when writing indigenous histories was forbidden by the Spanish law (ibid.: 240). The introduction makes clear the objective of preserving the Mexica’s heritage for the generations to come. The text focuses mainly on the history of the altepetl of Tenochtitlan from the period of migration, through settlement, empire, up to the colonial times. It dedicates a lot of space to the first stage, characterized by events of mythical origin that produce interesting contexts for the occurrence of kin terms. It has to be kept in mind, however, that these “ancient” usages of kinship terminology may be projections from later periods, which Chimalpahin and other authors were familiar with.

Chimalpahin’s annals (Chimalpahin 2006) provide contexts contemporary with the historian. The annals, for a long time known as “Diario,” span the period from 1577 until 1615 and focus on the events witnessed by Chimalpahin in Mexico-Tenochtitlan. Two major areas within which Nahuatl kin terms were employed can be distinguished for this source. The first one is religion, in this case obviously Christianity, as the annals exceed the limitations of the genre, including many detailed and spacious descriptions of processions, ceremonies and other events related to the Church. The other one is titulature, either religious or political, treated by Chimalpahin with an almost obsessive meticulousness. As far as the
“Relaciones” and “Memorial breve de Colhuacan” are concerned, I have not analyzed them systematically. Instead, I have reviewed the earlier interpretations regarding the occurrences of kin terms within these sources. Moreover, transcriptions available on the internet, mainly at www.sup-infor.com, made possible the search for particular terms for comparative or complementary purposes.

The last of the literary genres included in the material is a historical account, represented by Cristóbal del Castillo’s “Historia de la venida de los mexicanos” and “Historia de la conquista” (Castillo 2001). Only fragments of these pieces have survived until our times, preserved in the copies made by Antonio de León y Gama and Antonio Pichardo in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century (ibid.: 17). Little is known of their author, who, although probably lived in Mexico-Tenochtitlan, was not a Mexica himself. There are some indications as to his mestizo origin and rather humble status. He wrote the accounts as an aged man, between 1596 and 1600, perhaps in consultation with the Spanish ecclesiastics who later cited them (ibid.: 23-29). The focus of both texts is the Mexica, treated with a great deal of criticism. Their history is interpreted through biblical patterns and the main purpose of the narrative seem to be the contrasting of peaceful, Christian-like people of the pre-imperial period with blood thirsty warriors who were only defeated by the Spaniards (ibid.: 78-82). The majority of kin terms employed by del Castillo is concentrated in “Historia de la venida de los mexicanos” which provides mainly religious (precontact deities) and political (migrating leaders) contexts.

As far as everyday documents are concerned, I leaned on several collections of texts published during the last four decades (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976; Karttunen, Lockhart 1976; Cline, León Portilla 1984; Lockhart, Berdan, Anderson 1986; Lockhart 1991; Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000-2002; Pizzigoni 2007). Not all of the contents of these studies were recorded in the database: for this purpose the most interesting sources were selected. The material recorded includes documents spanning the period from 1548 to 1795, housed in such institutions as: Archivo General de la Nación, Archivo Histórico del Arzobispado de México and Museo Nacional de Antropología e Historia in Mexico City, University of California Research Library in Los Angeles, University of California Bancroft Library in Berkeley or Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid, as well as in private collections. A large percentage of the texts are testaments, but they are accompanied by many
other genres: bills of sale, rental agreements, petitions, letters, municipal acta, property listings, etc. They present a great regional variation, coming from today’s states of: Distrito Federal, Estado de México, Hidalgo, Tlaxcala, Morelos, Jalisco, Durango, Puebla, and even Chiapas. As in the case of previously described corpuses, the authorship of these documents is complex. Most of them were of formal nature (excluding a few letters) which implies that the writer was a notary (escribano) of indigenous or mestizo origin. He wrote down the words of either private persons (e.g. testators) or the representatives of local authorities (e.g. cabildo members). At the same time, he employed Spanish conventions which affected both the structure of the document and the vocabulary it displayed. Sometimes, whole expressions or even parts of texts (e.g. preambles) were directly calqued from Spanish. This is obvious, for instance, in the majority of testaments. Their structure was quite rigid, including several elements: the first one was the obligatory invocation to the Holy Trinity, followed by a declaration of being of sound mind, a confession of faith and a prayer to the Virgin Mary so that she intercedes for the testator before Jesus Christ (sometimes one or more of these elements was skipped). Then the funeral arrangements were dealt with, masses for the testator’s soul were ordered and bequests to the Church were made. The following bequests to the family were usually listed beginning with the spouse, then children and finally other relatives. The principal part of the will concluded with the listing of debts – those that were owed both by and to the testator. At the end, the executors and the witnesses were named, everybody (including the notary) signed the document and the exact date was written down. Such an ordered structure owed to the models of wills, prepared by the ecclesiastics and widely employed by the notaries. One of the most popular models, authored by Molina, is included in his “Confessionario mayor” (Molina 1569: 61r-63v).

It has to be stressed that although highly conventionalized, mundane documents are also expected to reveal individual traits. In the case of wills, the notaries sometimes departed from the adopted model on their own initiative, or following the words of the testator. Eventually, the result (from the point of view of vocabulary) located itself somewhere between the Spanish conventions, the speech of the testator and the ideas of the notary. A similar situation took place in the case of other documents. For example, formal language ceded to colloquial discourse when the words of witnesses or members of the town council were cited. Sometimes, the entire dialogues between individuals or tirades full of emotional expressions were registered, breaking up the flow of impersonal narrative. Nevertheless, the
genres that featured the greatest freedom as regards the vocabulary employed were letters and petitions. Although many of them were likewise written down by officials, they include polite expressions, metaphors and other stylistic devices characteristic of elegant discourse (tecpillatolli). The scenes described in them situate themselves further from the legal scenery and closer to everyday life which is reflected by a more “naturally sounding” language.

The material collected in the database was supplemented by single attestations of kin terms from many other sources. As I have already mentioned, this additional material included the “Florentine Codex” and Chimalpahin’s “Relaciones” together with the “Memorial Breve de Colhuacan.” Among other sources that provided interesting occurrences of kin terms were: the sixteenth-century “Codex Chimalpopoca,” containing the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan” and “Leyenda de los Soles” preserved in the copy by the Texcocan historian Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl; the sixteenth-century Manuscrito 22 of the “Anales de Tlatelolco”; the alphabetic annotations to the sixteenth-century Texcocan “Mapa Tlotzin”; the huehuetlatolli gathered in the sixteenth century by fray Andrés de Olmos and published by fray Juan Bautista; Olmos’ “Arte de la lengua mexicana”; the collection of sixteenth-century songs known as “Cantares mexicanos,” copied under the supervision of the Jesuits from a manuscript elaborated probably by one of Sahagún’s assistants (Bierhorst 1985a: 9); the incantations included in Hernando Ruiz de Alarcón’s “Tratado de supersticiones” written in the first half of the seventeenth century; Christian religious texts including sermons and dramas of various date collected and published by the researchers (e.g. Burkhart 1996; Sell, Burkhart, Poole 2006); mundane documents published online (www.amoxcalli.org) or collected by myself in the Archivo General de la Nación in Mexico City; and other sources. The main purpose of the additional material was to provide information in those situations where attestations recorded in the database were not sufficient to properly address a given issue or clarify a given usage of a term.

Taken together, the analytical material, theoretical framework and methods presented here, have been selected with the aim of addressing issues listed at the beginning of this study. Its main purpose – reaching to a Nahua worldview through the available sources – requires an interdisciplinary approach. Written sources must be studied from a historical perspective, the language and particularly vocabularies they employ – from a philological or ethnolinguistic one, while the attempt to understand the mind that produced these sources calls for an
anthropological approach. The medium through which “implicit meanings” are brought to the surface here – language – allows for reaching deeper in time than the colonial period in which the sources were recorded, because among multiple changes and innovations it also preserves the way of thinking from before contact. Therefore, in what follows the emphasis is put on understanding the logical principles of classification that had been in operation before Cortés landed in Veracruz. The selection of sources employed here offers both “traditional” contexts, where various usages of kin terms seem to be reproduced almost automatically, often without any attempt to adapt them to new reality and contexts in which new ways of employing these terms, sometimes invented ad hoc by the writer, were forged. The juxtaposition of these two corpuses is essential to grasp the transformation of the Nahua worldview across several centuries.

FAMILY AND GENDER AMONG THE NAHUAS

1. The precontact period

1.1. The Nahua kinship

1.1.1. Gender and ideological basis of kinship

Our knowledge about gender in the precontact Nahua society is based on various kinds of data. Some of them were more vulnerable to Spanish influence than others. The earliest censuses and other genres of everyday documentation date to 1530’s or 1540’s, which means that they describe a society already altered by massive epidemics and confronted with European law and ideology. On the other hand, the encyclopedic format of the often quoted “Florentine Codex” implied the creation of a certain model for social roles, which, moreover, was probably distorted by the Spanish education of indigenous authors as well as by the expectations of Catholic readers. Conclusions drawn from these sources should, therefore, be treated cautiously and cross-checked, whenever possible, with indirect or implicit pieces of information, found in the corpus of Mesoamerican sources.
The model of gender relations in the precontact Nahua society seemed to involve a strict separation of the realms of manhood and womanhood. Different roles were imposed on each of the two genders: the domains of men were warfare, hunting, farming and crafts such as metal- and feather-work; women were generally expected to take care of the household, prepare food and weave (Cline 1986: 112). This division was fundamental for the Nahua social order, as well as for the ideology. Crossing the boundary between the two ultimate categories was regarded a dangerous anomaly that could bring misfortunes for a community. Hermaphrodites were feared of because they fooled people by pretending they were someone else: a “man” turned out to be a “woman” and vice versa. For this reason, they often ended up killed, which was probably also a way to deny their existence and restore the order. The same fate awaited homosexuals and a passive partner received much more severe punishment than the active one who, at least, acted like a man (Klein 2001: 192-192). At the same time, what Cecelia Klein calls “gender ambiguity” played an important role in various transitional moments of social life, which conformed to the liminality of this category (ibid.: 218).

How the two genders were positioned in regard to each other, is a subject of a discussion between scholars. Susan Kellogg classifies the kinship system of the Nahuas as cognatic, that is, characterized by structural equivalence of men and women (Kellog 1986: 105). Her discussion of the topic seems convincing, although it must be kept in mind that it is not necessarily valid for peripheral Nahua-speaking regions. Moreover, she explains that “equivalence” does not mean “equality,” acknowledging that in the precontact Nahua society structural gender parallelism was accompanied by a hierarchy of genders. For example, although it was quite usual for women to own property, they might have not always been able to activate their inheritance rights. At the same time, they had a very limited access to political power, although they happened to perform the highest public offices, such as the office of tlatoani (Kellogg 1995: 88-103). Sarah Cline cites fray Juan de Torquemada who explains that women did not inherit offices because it would cause “foreign blood” to disrupt an altepetl. But, as she herself notes, women’s status affected the status of their children (Cline 1986: 115) and, as will be seen below, royal succession was often determined by the position of mothers of a potential successor.

According to Kellogg, the structural equivalence of men and women was based on two principles: “that the children of a married couple had equal rights from and claims on the
mother and the father; and that all siblings were equivalent.” These principles operated on various levels of social organization and were deeply rooted in the Nahua worldview. One of the most striking examples from the realm of religious beliefs is the parallelism between warriors and pregnant women. The former’s role was to take captives and if they died while performing this task they would go to the afterworld governed by the Sun. The same destiny awaited women who died during the delivery, because giving birth was believed to be a “womanly” equivalent of capturing an enemy (Kellogg 1986: 105). Concurrently, social institutions were organized according to the rule of equivalence and complementarity. For instance, temple schools (calmecac) admitted both boys and girls, though they were trained by the separate personnel and in separate quarters (Kellogg 1995: 101).

Robert McCaa sheds more light on this image, making it much more nuanced. While Kellogg finds evidence for gender parallelism in the “Florentine Codex,” McCaa argues in favor of the opposite leaning on another Sahaguntine text – the “Primeros Memoriales.” Insults employed by both men and women indicate that “women’s talk” was considered tricky and deceitful, whereas men were the only ones capable of exercising authority. Kellogg states that among the precontact Nahuas “equivalent aspects of gender roles outweighed hierarchy,” but McCaa points to the fact that she was using the data from the largest city of the Triple Alliance ignoring rural areas where most of the population lived and where the situation may have been different. Moreover, the information gathered by Kellogg concerns for the most part inheritance, as she was studying testaments and lawsuit documentation. McCaa employs a distinct genre, census, to draw a picture of women’s subordination in rural communities of Morelos. It arises from the naming pattern, which allowed for little distinction among women and large individualism among men and marriage pattern, where a big age gap between spouses resulted in adult men marrying 10 year-old or even younger girls. The latter factor accounted not only for the structuring of power relations within a household, but also for a great number of widowed females who usually remained under the authority of their male relatives (McCaa 2000).

The issue may also be that of a difference between social practice and ideological sphere. In the latter, the gender parallelism undoubtedly is readable: the very biological
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5 S.L. Cline identifies a similar pattern in early colonial Colhuacan (Cline 1986: 117).
foundation of kinship was based on equivalent but also complementary roles of men and women. The word *tlacaxinachtli*, or “semen of either man or a woman” (Molina 1977 II: 116r) indicates that both parents were thought to produce generative liquids. That of a man was called *oquichyotl* (Sahagún 2012 X: 159), while that of woman – *cihuaayotl* (Molina 1977 I: 109r). From this evidence Alfredo López Austin concludes that the act of conception might have consisted on mixing the two (López Austin 1988 I: 176). According to him, the conception, however, was not the starting point of the child’s existence, which was only possible thanks to three animistic entities, *tonalli*, *teyolia* and *ihiyotl*, considered divine gifts. López Austin states that *teyolia*, associated with knowledge and vitality, was given to a child by patron gods of his or her group of reference (*calpolli* or *altepetl*). *Ihiyotl*, responsible for passions and feelings, was probably received while in maternal womb (ibid.: 231-236). Finally, *tonalli* determined one’s animistic strength and was closely associated with personal destiny, constituting a link between a human being and gods. According to López Austin, it was produced by supreme creator deities – Ometeuctli, Tloque Nahuaque and Quetzalcoatl (to list only the most common names) – in any of the nine “heavens.”

As will be seen later, in the analytical part of the study, the spiritual component of human beings was important for the logic of the terminological system and, perhaps, for the construction of kin categories as well. However, as far as the hypothesis of López Austin is concerned, I have too many doubts to employ the threefold division into *teyolia*, *tonalli* and *ihiyotl* as an analytical tool. *Ihiyotl*, or “breath,” was in Nahua culture equivalent to blood in the sense that they both were media employed to carry messages in the communication between humans and gods. The transmission of both blood and breath (e.g. as sacrifice and speech respectively) had creative potential, because it provoked the circulation of divine essence, which was an indispensable condition of the existence of the universe (Olivier 2004: 33-34; López Austin 1988 I: 168-169; López Austin 2000: 33). The fact that blood was a carrier of vital essence rather than a spiritual component suggests that *ihiyotl* as well contained vital essences, but was not an “animistic entity” itself. In his discussion of “breath,” López Austin leans mainly on modern ethnographic data, which, as he acknowledges, do not define *ihiyotl* (named *hijillo* or *ijiyo* among the Chortí Maya) as an animistic entity (López Austin 1988 I: 233). The idea to define it in this way seems to come from the dictionary of Molina, who struggles to translate the Spanish “espiritu o soplo” by gathering Nahuatl terms *yoliliztli* (“life”), *tlapuczaliztli* (“blow”), *ihiyotl* and *ehecatl* (“wind”) (Molina 1977 I: 59v).
However, while “breath” was undoubtedly associated with “life,” the gloss does not automatically mean they were entirely synonymous. López Austin supports his hypothesis by quoting, as one of the most important examples in its favor, the custom of bathing a newborn child, related in the “Florentine Codex.” It is referred to as “the second birth” and the Mexican ethnohistorian states that it took place because the goddess of water, Chalchihuitlicue, breathed upon the child. He draws his conclusion, however, from the passage that says: “Oc ceppa quipitza, quiamamali in tonan in Chalchihuitlicue,” or, according to him, “again our mother, Chalchihuitlicue, breathes on him, penetrates him” (López Austin 1988 I: 230-231, 233). Although the verb *pitz* means “to blow” (for example, “to play a wind instrument”), when juxtaposed with *mamali*, “to drill,” it refers to the act of making fire and is a common metaphor for inauguration or creation. The misinterpretation goes further. López Austin states that *ihiyotl* was located in the liver, but he does not give any direct evidence for that. Instead, he argues that the rite of bathing a child (according to him, associated with breathing) included his or her liver. While the midwife bathed the baby, she was saying:


Take it, receive it. Here is with what you will grow, with what you will sprout. It is what will wake up, purify and make grow a precious thing, what is called a precious thing: our heart and, even more, the liver.6

In my opinion, this passage includes no mention of *ihiyotl*. Instead, it explains how cold and humid forces of growth, carried by water, are deposited in the baby’s animistic centers. These forces – named *itzmolincayotl celicayotl* by López Austin, were, in the Nahua worldview, complementary to hot and dry essences, composing not only the human being, but the entire universe (López Austin 2000: 168-172). However, they can by no means be identified with “breath.”

Once *ihiyotl* is ripped off the scheme, the entire concept of three animistic centers housing three different animistic entities requires revision. There is no place for such a
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discussion, ample as it should be, here, but several comments regarding tonalli and yolia have to be made. In scholarly literature these categories are almost always presented in accordance with the hypothesis of López Austin. In this work, I will only employ the term tonalli because yolia or teyolia raises important methodological problems that cannot be resolved without an additional research. First of all, the term very rarely appears in precontact contexts, contrary to tonalli. In the “Florentine Codex” there is not a single attestation of it, while tonalli comes up dozens of times. Perhaps this is why López Austin in his analysis tends not to separate yolia from yollotl, or “heart” – an animistic center that he believes to house yolia (e.g. López Austin 1988 I: 230-231). On the other hand, the term is extremely popular in Christian contexts, because after the Conquest yolia was equaled with ánima, or “soul.” This circumstance makes the analysis of the term particularly challenging and calls for a careful separation of two kinds of contexts in order not to look at this category through European lenses. In my opinion, the identification of yolia as an animistic entity may in part arise from the methodology employed by López Austin. Strikingly, he himself provides evidence showing that yolia should be perceived as a kind of essence circulating within the world rather than a soul-like animistic entity attributed to humans and humans only. He notes that yolia was likewise possessed by animals, plants, mountains, etc. (López Austin 1988 I: 232). At man’s death yolia was going to the world beyond in order to purify itself so that it could be deposited as a life seed in the great repository of vital essences and then come back to the earth in a constant circle of regeneration (López Austin 2000: 224).

Of the three categories classified by López Austin as “animistic entities,” tonalli is the best analyzed and understood. Many attestations of this term in the “Florentine Codex” associate it with warmth, Sun, fire, and time. Strong evidence points to the fact that tonalli was accumulated in the body, particularly in the head and hair, which is why cutting the latter deprived a person of this vital essence. On the other hand, there were ways to increase it, for example a newborn child was for several days kept near fire to strengthen his or her tonalli (López Austin 1989 I: 208-213). Recent research shows that this category was closely associated with man’s individuality, because items considered someone’s exclusive attributes were called his or her -tonal (Olko 2014, in press). At the same time, the tonalli of an individual seems to be important for a family unit or even to have a direct influence on it. For instance, the “earthly name” (itlalticpactoca) given to a baby could be the one of his grandfather or ancestor, so that the child “would carry his grandfather’s name, would raise his
tonalli” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 203). López Austin points to the fact that the tonalli of ancestors, preserved in locks of hair cut from the top of heads of the deceased, was kept in family houses (López Austin 1989 I: 322). The evidence pointing to the fact that the actions of individuals affected their relatives (both living and dead) leads López Austin to suggest the existence of “family force,” closely linked to tonalli. According to him, it was shared by members of a family including also the deceased and non-human components of the household, such as, for example, fields (López Austin 1989 I: 251-252). Perhaps the concept of “sharing” the force goes too far, contradicting the individualized nature of tonalli. The ideas of “influencing,” “attracting” or “transmitting” seem more plausible and can be considered as an option in quest for the principle on which the whole concept of Nahua kinship was based – such as blood in medieval Europe or genes in modern Western world. But what was attracted, transmitted or influenced upon by the kin? For the reasons I have presented above I prefer not to employ the concept of an “animistic entity.” Until a thorough research on spiritual components of a human being is done, I am inclined to use a more general term – “vital essence.” I understand “essence” as it is defined by the Merriam-Webster English Dictionary: “the basic nature of a thing: the quality or qualities that make a thing what it is” and, on the other hand “a substance that contains in very strong form the special qualities (such as the taste and smell) of the thing from which it is taken.” Both definitions agree with the principle that animated people according to the Nahuas: it was sent by deities and, therefore, had divine nature; it was substantial – it could have been removed from or inserted in the body; and it was responsible for humans being humans. At the same time, I will employ the term “tonalli,” understanding it as a particular kind of vital essence, characterized by heat and individuality.

1.1.2. Classification of the Nahua kinship system

From an outer, scholarly perspective, the kinship system of the Nahuas has been defined as cognatic. According to Sławoj Szynkiewicz’s classification of kinship systems, there are two possible types within this class: ambilinear and bilateral. The organization of the former leans on descent groups while the latter generates a complex structure in which ego can trace his descent from as many ancestors as he or she wishes to (Szynkiewicz 1992: 264-
The scholars dealing with Nahua kinship split into two parties, each one opting for another type. The focal point of the discussion is the Nahuatl term *tlacamecayotl*, understood by some as lineage or other descent unit (e.g. Calnek 1974; Kellogg 1986; Diaz Rubio 1986) and by others as lineal kin relationships (e.g. Offner 1983; Lockhart 1992). I address the arguments of both in detail in the analytical part of the work, opting for the latter interpretation (see: 7.1. *tlacamecayo*). As the structure of Nahuatl kinship terminology demonstrates, all relationships were seen as radiating from ego rather than from an ancestor (Lockhart 1992: 82). This is especially clear in genealogical diagrams, in the Nahua world most typically reading in the opposite direction than European “trees,” where the roots are most commonly formed by a founding couple and branches represent its multiple offspring. In the case of Central Mexican genealogies, ego is usually represented at the top, followed by preceding generations of his ancestors that extend downwards (Olko 2005: 454). This convention reflects not only the focus on ego, but also the multilinear structure of kinship and the resulting freedom in choosing the most advantageous ancestry. Consequently, in Szynkiewicz’s classification the Nahua system should be classified as bilateral.

The grammatical structure of Nahuatl kin terms reflects the focusing of the system on ego. The terms are necessarily possessed which does not mean that their absolutive forms do not come up in the sources. They are found in dictionaries employed as standardized entries or in narratives – though not often – describing one’s status. Sometimes it is obvious that the absolutive form was derived from a possessive, because it incorporates the possessive suffix (e.g. *huelti-uh-tli*). Nevertheless, if a term functions as a kin term rather than an entry or status designator, it is always possessed. From the grammatical point of view, the process implies the loss of the absolutive suffix (*-tli, -li, -tl*) and adding the possessive pronoun in form of a prefix: *no-* (my), *mo-* (your, sing.), *i-* (his, her), *to-* (our), *amo-* (your, pl.) or *in-/im-* (their), *te-* (one’s or people’s – the indefinite personal pronoun). In plural, the suffix *-huan* is necessarily added to a stem. In singular, some nouns do not incorporate any possessive suffix, some have *-uh* and a few retain the older variant *-hui*. Frequently, kin terms are employed in their reverential forms, most easily obtained by attaching the reverential/diminutive suffix *-tzin* (in plural: *-tzitzin*) directly to a stem. The central position of ego is marked by the fact that a kinsman is always seen in relation to him or her: not “brother” but “my brother,” “his brother,” etc. Additionally, the referent (“brother”) is always separated from the reference
point (“my”) which makes the construction “we are brothers” impossible. In Nahuatl, one could only say “he is my brother” (Lockhart 1992: 82).

In order to facilitate the description of Nahuatl kinship terminology I will make use of the criteria developed by George P. Murdock and summarized by Szynkiewicz (1992: 112-115). Seven out of eight possible principles organize the Nahuatl system:

1. generation of the referent (e.g. father (G+1) is described with a different term than grandfather (G+2), -ta, and -col respectively);

2. sex of the referent (e.g. father: -ta, mother: -nan);

3. a relationship through marriage is distinguished (e.g. a man’s brother: -teachcauh or -teiccauh but a man’s brother-in-law: -tex);

4. lineals are distinguished from collaterals (e.g. mother: -nan, aunt: -ahui);

5. relative age of the referent (e.g. man’s elder brother: -teachcauh, man’s younger brother: -teiccauh);

6. sex of the reference point (e.g. man’s elder brother: -teachcauh, woman’s elder brother: -ach or -oquichtiuuh);

7. marking, by means of terminology, if the consanguineal through whom the affinal bond is established is dead (e.g. my son-in-law, husband of my living daughter: nomon, my son-in-law, husband of my deceased daughter: nomiccamon).

Among the criteria developed by Murdock only the sex of the mediator in the relationship was not employed in organizing the Nahuatl system: e.g. the mother’s father and the father’s father were called the same (-col). Additionally, Nahuatl kinship terminology presented certain particularities which might have stemmed from the indigenous concept of kinship. Likewise, the historical process of the development of the classification system may account for what we perceive as incongruities. Siblings and cousins were included in the same category, although other lineal and collateral consanguineals were distinguished. The sex of the referent did matter but only for relatives older than ego, with the exception of the terms
for “son” and “daughter” (Lockhart 1992: 81). The element -micca, referring to a deceased consanguineal, was only occasionally employed for marking the “erasing” of a link with an affinal. Finally, as will be seen below, various terms were used to describe the same relationship.

1.2. The Nahua household

Among the precontact Nahuas marriage marked the passage into adulthood. The sources present contradictory statements as far as the importance of the pre-marital virginity of a woman was concerned, but it seems that the restrictions were not so severe as among the sixteenth-century Spaniards (Burkhart 1989: 150-151). Marriage practices differed depending on a social class. For the nobility, marriage was a way to forge and subsequently guarantee political alliances (Schroeder 1996: 325). For this reason, noblemen (pipiltin) maintained numerous women of various positions, the Spanish division into wives and concubines being oversimplified and inadequate. Commoners (macehualtin) practiced monogamy, unless they distinguished themselves on the battlefield which accorded them certain privileges. A significant role in arranging a marriage was played by potential bride’s and groom’s tonalli: if it was not compatible, the union would fail (López Austin 1989 I: 301-302). Neither endogamy nor exogamy was obligatory among the Nahuas (Kellogg 1995: 161). Possibly, there existed limitations as to the categories of kin that could enter the marriageable group, their nature, however, is hard to determine because the sources differ significantly on this point (López Austin 1989 I: 304). Jerome Offner suggests that incest rules might have correlated with the structure of households: in the Texcocan area (nuclear family households) the mother-son incest was considered especially horrid, while in the Tenochtitlan area (complex households) the focus would move to the brother-sister incest (Offner 1983: 218). Until the coming of Spaniards the levirate was practiced and one of the socially expected roles of uncles was to act as surrogate parents (Cline 1986: 72). As Cline speculates, widows were also a desirable match because of their economic position (ibid.: 116). Marriage was tightly associated with procreation and the latter received a special emphasis in the Nahua culture. Men who did not want to marry were reproved, abortion was punished with death and sterility made people useless for the society (Burkhart 1989: 151-152).
Undoubtedly, a household as a unit played an important role in defining the family organization among the Nahuas. Kellogg points to a passage in the “Florentine Codex” where the terms referring to biological kinship and cohabitation are juxtaposed with each other as if they were synonymous (Kellogg 1986: 118). The household also performed ceremonial, political and economic functions, provided space for socialization of children and constituted a link between an individual and larger social units: calpolli and tlaxilacalli (Kellogg 1995: 181-182). The residence pattern was very flexible: a married couple moved in the house of either the groom’s or the bride’s family (virilocal and uxorical marriage respectively) or founded their own household (neolocal marriage) (McCaa 2000). However, McCaa assumes that the latter was not common because girls married at such a young age they were physically incapable of fulfilling all the household duties. He suggests that the age-gap between spouses affected the succession to headship as well (McCaa 1999). Generally, the household head was in charge of paying the tribute and, in consequence, held the authority, also of legal nature, over the unit though there are scarce examples of separate tribute payers living in the same household (Offner 1983: 209, 221; Carrasco 1976: 56). In the case of uxorilocal marriages, a son-in-law would be more likely to succeed than a son because he was older than his wife’s brothers (McCaa 1999).

There is evidence that the organization of the household and inheritance practices differed regionally. In Tenochtitlan, a joint household, composed of several nuclear families and other relatives, was typical for both noblemen and commoners. Each family occupied either a story or a separate structure which was entered from the common patio (Calnek 1972: 111). The families were linked through either a sibling-sibling or a parent-child tie. As noted by Kellogg, sometimes the source of the bond was not necessarily among the living: a house could be inhabited by children and grandchildren of siblings who had already passed away (Kellogg 1986: 111-112). Kellogg states that in the precontact Tenochtitlan the status of household head belonged to men (Kellogg 1995: 126) but Offner does not exclude the possibility that women could succeed to it too (Offner 1983: 209). The complexity of households was correlated with inheritance practices, where the emphasis was put on collateral ties. Among the Tenochca dynasty, an ideal successor to the throne was a brother of the previous tlatoani (ibid.: 205-207). Offner suggests that the same pattern might have been valid in the case of the succession to the household headship in which case the compound household would be governed by a brother rather than the father (ibid.: 209-211). Likewise,
the property of a deceased was most probably divided not only between his children, but also
between the collaterals: siblings and niblings. Spouses, as Kellogg suggests, received their
share from their own lineal and collateral relatives (Kellogg 1995: 126-128). A little emphasis
put on the marriage tie as far as inheritance patterns are concerned, was an important
difference in regard to the Spanish system.

The Texcocan area is represented in the sources by the 1540’s “Codex Vergara,”
studied by Offner. Among the households depicted in the codex, the majority had men acting
as household heads, but there were also some married women who held this position. Here
only 13% of households could have been classified as complex, that is, including more than
one nuclear family. This may have been due to recent war but Offner suggests that such a
structure correlated with other characteristics of family organization in the region (Offner
1983: 218). One of them was lineality of inheritance: property was passed from parents to
children. The same pattern was visible in royal succession, where the preference was given to
sons of rulers, then to grandsons, brothers being one of the last considered options (ibid.: 
206).

The 1540’s Tepoztlan and Yauhtepec (Morelos), studied by Pedro Carrasco on the
basis of a census list, placed itself somewhere in between Tenochtitlan and Texcoco. All
household heads reported in the census were males (except for situations where widows held
the position) (Carrasco 1976: 47-48; 2007: 188; McCaa 2000). In both communities about a
half of all households housed a nuclear family (in Yauhtepec less than in Tepoztlan) but
among the remaining group the great majority was composed of only two nuclear families. In
these families, as Carrasco stresses, the tie was most often bound between men (brother-
brother, father-son) (Carrasco 2007: 194). In Yauhtepec the fraternal bond was prevalent: the
majority of household heads lived with either their brother’s or nephew’s nuclear family
(Carrasco 1976: 50-51). The cases where a married brother lived with his married sister and
her family were generally relatively rare, which McCaa explains pointing to a large gap in
marriage age between men and women (McCaa 1999). In all three cases (Tenochtitlan,
Texcoco, Morelos) described here noble houses tended to be complex even if the pattern for
lower classes of the society favored nuclear family organization. The tendency resulted to a
great extent from polygyny among the Nahua nobility which implied that one man could have
been a member (as a spouse and father) of many nuclear families (Kellogg 1995: 171).
2. Changes in the colonial period

Many changes in the traditional Nahua family organization were brought along by the Spanish conquest. Susan Kellogg lists four factors crucial for the process of transformation: demographic upheaval, the imposition of tribute payments, the introduction of the Spanish legal system and the introduction of Catholicism (Kellogg 1995: 204). The first one was responsible for elevating the position of women in regard to the preconquest situation during the first fifty years after the Conquest, because less men than women had survived the war. However, almost from the beginning of the colonial era, women were pushed out of the public sphere which was being reorganized according to Spanish patterns. The institutions that reinforced the position of women in precontact times, such as female priestly organization, schools or control over markets, were either eliminated or handed over to men. As observed by Kellogg, in the sixteenth century women compensated for this status’ decline in courts, using their legal rights to the maximum. Another sphere in which they turned out to be more active than the Spanish women of the time was production – by the eighteenth century unmarried indigenous women were still paying tribute (Kellogg 1995: 104-111). Nevertheless, even if some sectors of production leaned heavily on female labor force, they too gradually fell under control of men. An important factor in approaching the Spanish model for gender roles was Christianity, which brought what Kellogg calls “ideology of purity and enclosure.” Not only was a previously unknown valor added to the concept of “virginity” but the social space occupied by women was limited to the household. Women, together with children, became the responsibilities of men from both material and spiritual point of view (ibid.: 115).

As far as the family is concerned, Kellogg discerns four major spheres within which transformations occurred: marriage pattern, household structure, inheritance and kinship relationships (Kellogg 1995: 187-188). Marriage and residence patterns underwent a significant change after the conquest. Polygamy disappeared, although not immediately: the 1540’s censuses still record undisturbed polygamous relationships (Carrasco 2007). The group of marriageable partners diminished, e.g. levirate, viewed as incestuous, was banned
(Cline 1986: 72). By the end of the sixteenth century, Christian marriage became an indispensable base for the family, which now concentrated to a greater degree around a married couple (Kellogg 1995: 203). It was the only acceptable way of maintaining a sexual relationship. The involvement of Spanish institutions in contracting marriages resulted in a shift in social relations. Instead of being mainly an agreement between two families, the sacrament put an emphasis of tying a couple to the Church, serving, at the same time, as a tool for controlling the native population (Burkhart 1989: 157).

Christianity also affected the concept of household. While before the Conquest vital essence was believed to be shared by both family members and non-human components of the household, in the colonial period spiritual life of its inhabitants apparently concentrated around saints. Likely, the saints whose images were kept in the house were considered members of the family, because, as each adult member or couple, they were assigned a separate room or structure (Lockhart 1992: 66). Other shifts were brought along by demographic disruption which caused a desorganization of the internal structure of households. The lack of adult men or elders disturbed the authority relations within a domestic unit (Kellogg 1995: 206). Kellogg suggests that depopulated households promoted uxorilocal marriages when they could not count on a son to continue with their maintenance (Kellogg 1986: 117). According to her, two household types developed as a result of demographic breakdown due to war and, more importantly, epidemics: “consanguineal households, which included a parent and child or children, or groups of coresident unmarried siblings” and “nuclear family households, including married couples with or without children” (ibid.: 111-113). The seventeenth-century Mexico-Tenochtitlan shows a restructuring of the preconquest complex type. By the end of the sixteenth century the size of these households had diminished – the maximum of consanguineal relatives living with a nuclear family was two. Additionally, the shift from sibling-sibling to parent-child organization took place (Kellogg 1995: 200-201).

As the analysis of testaments from Colhuacan, made by Sarah Cline, shows, by the end of the sixteenth century native inheritance patterns in the Valley of Mexico differed from the contemporary Spanish ones. They apparently still retained their characteristic flexibility that allowed the testator to divide the estate among the chosen (not predetermined by the legal system) heirs, although these heirs generally fit Spanish concepts of inheritance. Thus in
Colhuacan, children and spouses were the usual receivers of bequests. Other lineal as well as collateral kin were also taken into account by the testators, but less frequently, which may be viewed as an influence of the Spanish legal system (Cline 1986: 79-85). Fifty years later, the documentation from the city of Mexico shows that the deeper into the colonial period, the biggest emphasis was put on ties with lineal consanguineals. Kellogg explains it with the imposition of Spanish legal system that defined “family” as “nuclear family” and focused on lineal ties which was most explicitly expressed by the concept por linea recta (Kellogg 1995: 209). While soon after the conquest siblings and niblings received considerable amounts of property, a hundred years later hardly were they taken into account by the testators (Kellogg 1995: 150). In the second half of the seventeenth century spouses and children-in-law entered the circle of frequent heirs, which indicated the increasing stress put on the marriage tie (ibid.: 158). This phenomenon also arose partly from Spanish law which guaranteed a share of property to the spouses of the deceased (Cline 1986: 84). Dominant cultural patterns together with the diminishing in size of households in Mexico-Tenochtitlan led to the “new emphasis on the nuclear family as a social and moral unit” (Kellogg 1995: 160). Moreover, by the end of the sixteenth century the genealogies constructed for the purpose of lawsuits begin to break the balance of the bilateral system, favoring patrifilial ties (ibid.: 190).

The data from the eighteenth-century wills from the Valley of Toluca seem to draw a distinct picture. Here too the emphasis was put on ties with lineal consanguineals to the disadvantage of collaterals. Nevertheless, spouses received little attention as heirs, entering the scene only when children and grandchildren were lacking. The same can be said of in-laws and the ritual kin: godchildren and godparents. As far as gender was concerned, bequests for men prevailed but in many cases women also received substantial parts of the property, although they were not taken into account as potential household heads. This position, as Caterina Pizzigoni claims, was occupied by the eldest man in the household (Pizzigoni 2007: 20-21).

**CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF NAHUA KINSHIP TERMS**
1. CHILDREN AND PARENTS: first ascending and descending generations, linear consanguineals

1.1. -PIL

The Nahuatl term for a “child,” -pil, is ubiquitous in written sources. Fray Alonso de Molina indicates that it was used by both men and women (Molina 1977 I: 71r) and the texts confirm it. However, women formed the reference point for this term only when it was in plural (see: 1.2. -coneuh). Among 472 attestations of this term in the biological sphere in my database I have found only one exception to this rule. It comes from a 1763 testament from the Valley of Toluca, where a woman refers to her child as “nopiltzin” (Pizzigoni 2007: 199-200). It can probably be viewed as a late distortion – there is at least one more example of the mistaken usage of “male” and “female” kin terms in the eighteenth century (see: 1.2. -coneuh).

-Pil was used for children of both sexes and sometimes extended to other consanguineals and affinals from descending generations: sons- and daugthers-in-law or grandchildren. In his will, don Nicolás de Silva gives instructions concerning his funeral to “my children” (“nopilhuatzintzinhua”\(^8\)), among whom is his actual son (“nopiltzin”) together with three sons-in-law (“nomōtzintzinhuan”) (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 118-119); and Juan Fabián bequeaths the property to his “children” (“nopilhua”), among whom he lists his daughter-in-law (“nocihuamontzin”), his grandson (“noxhuiuhtzin”) and finally his actual son (“notetlpoch”) (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 58). In both cases -pil is in plural and it refers to a group of the closest kinsmen, those who receive the greatest share of the testator’s property and who later become the executors of his will. At the same time, the ties that

---

\(^8\) The ending -huatzintzinhua should be read -huatzitzinhua. The spelling has nothing to do with the honorific form nopiltzintzin but rather it arises from the general ortography of the document that comes from mid-eighteenth century (cf. also the next example “nomontzintzinhuan” with the same spelling of the reverential ending).
connect them to the testators are not necessarily blood, because in-laws are included in these select circles.

In her analysis of the testaments from the Toluca Valley, Caterina Pizzigoni notices that by the eighteenth century the use of the term -pil has changed. While traditionally it did not differentiate the referents’ sex, in the late colonial period it began to be used as a male counterpart of -ichpoch, or a (grown) daughter (Pizzigoni 2007: 19). In the earliest examples of this phenomenon coming from 1690s, the children involved were small and as such even less likely to be called with gendered terms in early colonial sources (ibid.: 19, n. 8) (see: 1.3.1. -ichpoch and 1.3.2. -telpoch). In the material I have gathered, the latest example in which a daughter is called -piltzin comes from a 1610 will from the present state of Hidalgo (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 83). At the same time in the Toluca Valley, -pil apparently did not replace -telpoch, because the latter can still be found with the meaning of a grown son in the document from 1736, San Lucas Tepemaxalco (near Calimaya) (Lockhart 1991: 139). In plural, it also continues to include daughters as is evident from the eighteenth century examples where -pilhuan is used for children of both sexes (see e.g.: Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 119).

1.1.1. Noblemen

The earliest grammarians stressed the difference between the two meanings connoted by the term for a child. According to fray Alonso de Molina, the word pilli should be translated as “a nobleman” (“cauallero o noble persona” - Molina 1977 II: 81v) and tepiltzin – as “a child, generally” (“Hijo, generalmente” – Molina 1977 I: 71r). Both Molina (1571: 29v) and Horacio Carochi (2001: 46-48, 216) mention the grammatical criteria that served each time to indicate the proper significance of the term. The most important one was the inherent possession of the kin term, -pil, contrasted with the absolutive form of the social status designator, pilli. This led many scholars to speak of -pil and pilli as if they were homonyms and to focus more on differences than on similarities between them. Such an approach is adopted by Frances Karttunen who discusses the reduplication of the noun stem -pil in plural. According to her, this stem reduplicates only when nobles are meant (-pipilhuan), in contrast to the simple form for children, -pilhuan (Karttunen 1992a: 194). The analysis of the source
base does not confirm this. For example, when Chimalpahin writes -*pipilhuan*, he clearly means “children,” using the reduplication in the distributive sense, defining the reference point as various groups of people:

\[ \text{yn toquichtin. yhuan oc cenca ye} huantin. \text{yn Se} \text{norati. yhuan y nican titlaca timacehualtin ci} \text{huatzitzinti mochintin. mocalt} \text{enq. mocaltzacque. yn inchanchan. y} \text{tlan oquintlallique Yn inpipilhuan (Chimalpahin 2006: 182).} \]

the men and especially the Spanish women and the local, commoner women, they all went into their houses, shut themselves up in their homes, and placed their children next to them (ibid.: 183).

In 1982 Brant Gardner analyzed this puzzling term thoroughly and concluded that -*pil*, or a child, should not be perceived as the homonym of *pilli*, or a nobleman:

The widespread use of the term outside the kinship context led Caroichi to suggest that the root formed two different words, ‘son’ and ‘lord,’ which were distinguished only by the inherent possession of the kin term. The data gathered from the texts do not support that conclusion. Each case of the occurrence of the term may be explained by some aspect of the rules for the social semantic sphere of the Nahuatl kin terms (Gardner 1982: 113).

The stem -*pil* forms part of words that refer exclusively either to children (e.g. *pilhua* – one who has children, *pilhuatia* – to conceive children) or to the nobility (e.g. *pillatoa* – to speak politely and curiously), but it also appears in words that combine meanings from both kinship and social areas: *pilconetl* (a son of a gentleman or, generally, a son); *pillamia* (to boast falsely of one’s noble status) and *pillamilia* (to lie about one’s age rejuvenating oneself)\(^9\); *pilnequi* (the same as *pillamia*) and *pilnequini* (nanny, one who loves children)\(^10\) (Molina 1977 II: 81v). These examples support Gardner’s arguments in favor of the homogeneity of the term *pil*(li).

\(^9\) *Pillamia* is derived from the noun stem -*pil* and the verb *tlamia* – to hide, to avoid sth (Siméon 2002: 614). As far as the verb *pillamilia* is concerned, we deal with the aplicative form of *tlamia* – *tlamilia*, or to hide from somebody. As can be seen, the difference in meaning is slight.

\(^10\) *Pilnequi* can be analysed in the following way: the noun stem -*pil* + verb *nequi* (to want). The suffix -*ni* in *pilnequini* forms a present agentive, literally “one who wants children.”
Gardner pointed to the kinship term -pil as the original one. According to him, the extension into the social sphere would have occurred as a result of a general quality of Nahuatl kinship terms which were broadly used to denote relative deference and social status (Gardner 1982: 113).

The etymological considerations of Helga Rammow and Frances Karttunen support this hypothesis. The former notes that the noun pilli includes the same stem as the verb piloa – to hang, to attach, and she associates it with the concept of descending from someone (Rammow 1964: 86, n. 80). The latter identifies the component pilli in such words as cui travelledpilli, or a tail, nenepilli, or a tongue, mahpilli, or a finger or icxopilli, or a toe. From this evidence she concludes that pilli seems to have the general sense ‘appendage,’ hence it is not unreasonable to associate it in sense with -pil ‘offspring.’ On the other hand, it can also be reasonably connected with piloa ‘to hang’ (Karttunen 1992a: 195).

Edward Calnek associates the ambiguous connotations of the term -pil (“a child” and “persons of royal blood,” as he puts it) with the origins of the Mexica nobility. Written sources identify this group as lineal descendants of the first tlatoani, Acamapichtli. In the bilateral Nahuatl system genealogical connection was obtained through either a paternal or a maternal link, which implied that one had to have either a noble father or a noble mother in order to become a pilli (Calnek 1974: 202). Frances Berdan defines the class of pipiltin as “the children of rulers and chiefs” and she speculates that the children of pipiltin might have, on their part, descended one step on the social ladder, being granted the position of teixhuixuan, or someone’s grandchildren (Berdan 2005: 61). This hypothesis is based on the literal interpretation of the term -pil as used within social structure: one claims his rights on the basis of being someone’s actual child or, to reverse the relation, the legitimization of status is provided by a parent. However, as noted by James Lockhart, though all noblemen were related to their lords or chiefs (teteuctin), their great number made this group unlikely to consist solely of the lords’ children (Lockhart 1992: 102). The comparative analysis of the terms -pil and -ixhuixuh (someone’s grandchild) points to a non-literal reading of these categories within social area. They did not mark the actual distance from the source of
nobility (a parent or grandparent), but rather a degree of accuracy to which one could have claimed his noble status from his more remote ancestors (see: 2.1.1. Minor noblemen).

The form tepiltzin is given by Molina as the basic one as far as the kinship term for a child is concerned. It literally means “someone’s child” or “people’s child” and thanks to its indefinite possessive prefix te- it can be used in reference to “indefinite” children, for example:

\[\text{Nemechnotlaytanililia yn ihuqui tepiltzin in tlein cenca ytech monequi quitlanilian ytatzin} \text{ (San Antonio 1997: 234).}\]

I beg you like the child who asks his father for what he urgently needs (ibid.: 235).

Since te- can likewise have a plural reference point (“people”), tepiltzin often appears in the context of specifying someone’s ethnic identity or his/her belonging to an altepetl (see: 1.1.3. One of us). As such, it forms part of the common phrase nican tepiltzin, or the child of people from here – that is, one of the local people. It is likewise juxtaposed with proper names, for example Mexica tepilhuan, or the children of the Mexico people, the Mexica.

Most importantly, tepiltzin/ tepilhuan functioned as a sort of title among the nobility and/or the designation of a highborn (Karttunen 1992a: 230; Chimalpahin 2006: 116, n. 3). It is not unlikely that it also preserved this meaning in “ethnic” contexts mentioned above, because in the sources it never refers openly to macehualtin. Even when it has the prefix icno-, or poor, it describes noblemen, for example:

\[\text{Auh yhuan yntla cenca oquimotlaçotili tetzcociatl acolhua yn cuitlapilli atlapalli yhuan yn icnotepiltzin} \text{ (San Antonio 1997: 208).}\]

And likewise if he much loved the Texcoca Acolhua common folk, and the destitute noblemen (ibid.: 209).

In one of the speeches in the “Florentine Codex” it is put in vocative (“tepilhoane”) and juxtaposed with ahuaque tepelhuaque, in this context undoubtedly the authorities of an altepetl (Sahagún 2012 VI: 74). Carochi pairs tepiltzin with the doublet in ezti in tlapalli (lit. “blood, color”) and translates the whole phrase, titēpiltzin, titēezço, titētlapallo, as “eres bien
nacido” (Carochi 2001: 362-364). In Molina’s dictionary *tlapalli eztli* is glossed “nobleza de sangre y de linage” (Molina 1977 II: 130v). This concept, as well as *pilli*, connoted concurrently the noble status and kinship ties between parents and children (Montes de Oca 2000: 171). The same can be said of the doublet *in tzontli in iztitl* (ibid.: 172) used together with *tepiltzin* in the “Bancroft Dialogues”:

*Ma onchoca, ma ontlacocoya in cuilapilli in atlapalli, auh in tetzon in teizti, in tepilhuan, ma ompipixahui ma ontetepehui in imixayo* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 130)

Let the commoners weep and sorrow, and let the tears of the well born, the nobles, sprinkle and scatter down (ibid).

There are also examples where *tepiltzin* and *tepilhuan* stand alone and apparently connote someone of a noble status. The first *tlatoani* in Colhuacan, Huehue Nauyotzin, bore the title (or name?) *Tepiltzin* (Chimalpahin 2006: 116-118). In the “Florentine Codex,” the term is explicitly contrasted with *macehualtin: Injn tlatolli ic nemachtiloia, ic nonotzaloia in tepilhoan, anoço macehoalti*, or “With this saying were taught, with this were admonished the noblemen or the common folk” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 242). The rendering “noblemen” owes to the fact that the kinship terms that bear the indefinite possessive prefix *te-* can often be translated as if they had no prefix at all. Given the double significance of *pilli*, *tepiltzin* can be interpreted as either “a child” or “a nobleman” which makes the two forms: *pilli* and *tepiltzin* (or *pipiltin* and *tepilhuan*) synonymous. The word *tlatocatepilhuan*, or royal children, used for instance by Chimalpahin, is at least similar if not identical in meaning to *tlahtoqui tlapilci* catca yn oncan cuyoacan, or “they were rulers and members of the royal dynasty in Coyoacan” (Chimalpahin 2006: 282-283). The “Crónica Mexicayotl” includes an attestation of *tlacotlatocatepilhuan*, or the precious (sacred?) rulers, in reference to the Tenochca dynasty (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 174).

Although *tepiltzin* undoubtedly means “a nobleman,” it nevertheless includes a possessive prefix, which implies a relation to be described. Pedro Carrasco interprets the plural *tepilhuan* as “the children of the same person,” i.e. siblings (Carrasco 1966: 152). This

---

11 C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “tepilhoan” as one’s sons.
interpretation is particularly interesting in the context of the Mexica nobles who, though not literally “siblings,” where all considered to be descendants of the same person. Arguably, the difference in the usage of tepiltzin and pilli is that the latter was more general and the former was preferably used to stress noble filiation.

Christianity introduced a new usage of tepiltzin: it began to designate one of the divine persons – the Son. The new connotation obviously arose from Spanish friars and emerged during process of creation of the so-called “doctrinal Nahuatl” (Tavárez 2000: 23). It is worth pointing out that the friars preferred the non-gendered term -pil over -telpoch, or a grown son. In the sources this form most often occurs in the Trinitarian formula: in Dios tetatzin in Dios tepiltzin in Dios Espíritu Santo, or God the Father, God the Son (Child), God the Holy Spirit. Although it was widely used by the ecclesiastics in various contexts, indigenous writers made use of it (as well as of the form tetatzin for God the Father) only when copying an officially accepted formula, for example in testaments. Otherwise they referred to God with the name Jesucristo or Dios.

1.1.2. Hierarchy among children

A quotation from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” points to the fact that one’s -pilhuan did not form a unified group of descendants, but instead were differentiated by terminology. Here two terms, -tlacio pil and -calpan pil, are contrasted:

*auh niman ye ye quiteca yn tlhacteotzin yn xiuh to miyauhtzin ye oncan tlacati oyttech quizque ye yentin yn intlaco pilhuan oqichtin ynic ce yto ca aculmiztli ynin oncan tlato loco tlactocat. Ynic ome yto ca tecocomoc tli ynin ompa tlactocatit oompa quitlanico yn quauh ttitlan, yni quey yto ca Epcohuatzin, [illeg.] Auh yn icalpan pilhuan quinch iuh yn tlhacteotzin cenca yxachtint* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 126).

And thereupon Tlacateotzin had sexual relations with Xiuh to miyauhtzin. From this were born, from them issued, their three precious children, boys. The first was named Acolmiztli; he ruled in Tlatelolco. The second was named Teçoçomoc tli; he went to be
ruler of Quauhtitlan; they came from there asking for him. The third was named Epcoatzin. And Tlacateotzin begot very many “children-in-the-house” (ibid.: 127).\textsuperscript{12}

Tlacateotzin was \textit{tlatoani} in Tlatelolco and his wife, Xiuhtomiyauhtzin was a daughter of Acolmiztli, the ruler in Coatl Ichan, an \textit{altepetl} of Colhua origin (ibid.: 126). She had certainly been requested by Tlacateotzin to provide the Tlatelolca dynasty with prestigious Toltec heritage and to legitimize the authority of his future successors. All of their sons are called \textit{-tlaçopilhuan}: one of them became the direct successor of Tlacateotzin and another one went to rule in Cuauhtitlan. In this context, the \textit{-calpanpilhuan} of Tlacateotzin seem to be his children born outside of the marriage with Xiuhtomiyauhtzin. Their mothers were most probably women of less prestigious ancestry, because neither their names nor the names and fate of their children are mentioned in the text.

The word \textit{-calpanpil} is derived from \textit{calli}, or “house,” with the relational word \textit{-pan} meaning “on, in, etc.” plus, of course, the stem \textit{-pil}. \textit{Tlaçopil} combines the same stem with the reverential \textit{tlaço}-, usually translated as “precious” or “dear.” However, the meaning of \textit{tlaço}- might have been deeper. James Lockhart notes that after the Spanish conquest the element \textit{tlaço}- was added to concepts from the religious sphere in order to locate them specifically in the Christian context (Lockhart 1992: 552, n. 208). Molly Bassett\textsuperscript{13} notes that before contact this term, along with another honorific, \textit{mahuiz}-, was associated with the concept of \textit{teotl}, divine essence that penetrated the world. For instance, greenstone named “xihuitl” in Nahuatl, is described as “not very green, but a little dead, as if it were not very \textit{mahuizyo}, but was truly a little dirty”\textsuperscript{14} (Sahagún 2012 XI: 223) while the name “teoxihuitl” means “the property, the \textit{-tonal} [= attribute] of \textit{teotl} and it means ‘very \textit{mahuizyo}’ because nowhere it appears a lot, rarely it appears somewhere. This \textit{teoxihuitl} is very \textit{mahuizyo}. When something is visible on it, it is not very \textit{mahuizyo}”\textsuperscript{15} (Sahagún 2012 XI: 223). \textit{Mahuiz}-, therefore, is not only characteristic of \textit{teotl}, but of something rare, light, clear and alive at the

\textsuperscript{12} S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson rendered the phrase “yeyntin yn intlaçopilhuan oquichtin” as “three great noblemen” and the term “icalpanpilhuan” as “[other] noble children.”
\textsuperscript{13} Personal communication, Nov 5, 2012.
\textsuperscript{14} amo cenca qujltic, çan achi mjegui: iauqiuq amo cenca mavizio, çan nel achi ixtileoc. Translation mine. “Mahuizyo” has a derivational suffix “-yoh” which transforms a noun that designates a quality into a noun that designates the embodiment of this quality (Karttunen 1992: 340).
\textsuperscript{15} íiaxca, itonal in teutl iuan, q.n. cenca mavizio; ípampa acan cenca neçi, canin çan quēman in neçi: ínin teuxiujtl cenca mavizio, in itlā, in jtech motta amo cenca mavizio:
same time. Justyna Olko points to the fact that the word -mahuizyo used to form a doublet with -tleyo, “one’s fire, fame, luminosity,” in order to describe divine essences sent to a tlatoani by the creator deity (Olko 2014, in press). The association of tlaço- with the esoteric sphere is less obvious but it is possible that the implications of this term were similar to those of mahuiz-. The two terms are often juxta posed to describe concepts of the greatest – and often sacred – value for the Nahua culture, such as speech, dynastic rulers or children (e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 53, 83, 99). Tlaço-, similarly to mahuiz-, had a connotation of esteem\(^{16}\), associated with rarity and teotl. Teotetl, or “jet” “is just tlaço-, it just lives as tlaço- [= it is rare], as if it were an exclusive attribute of teotl”\(^{17}\) (Sahagún 2012 XI: 228). It should be stressed that all the terms discussed here: tlaço-, mahuiz-, tleyo- or teo- have well-established “secular” meanings that refer to honor, fame, love, esteem, or marvel. It is even possible that these meanings were promoted by the Spanish friars to the disadvantage of more esoteric connotations, as is suggested by a passage from the “Florentine Codex” where native informants deny any “divine” implications of the word teoatl, “ocean” (Sahagún 2012 XI: 247).\(^{18}\) However, in the terms coined before contact, like -tlaçopiltzin, these implications may have been employed consciously to convey additional meanings and associate “precious children” with divine essence.

Molina’s entry for -calpanpil is “Calpampilli. hidalgo” (Molina 1977 II: 11v) which suggests that the term functioned only among noblemen. This is confirmed in “Códice Tudela”:

a los q(ue) eran hijos de libres llamavan calpa(n)pile que quiere dezir principal del pueblo esto se entiende si los padres eran señores o principales q(ue) si eran maçeuals q(ue)s jente comun no tenian esto digo en el poner los nonbres\(^{19}\) (Batalla Rosado 2009: 105).

\(^{16}\) http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso, consulted Dec 17, 2013, see the entry: tlazotla.

\(^{17}\) zan tlazocca zan tlazohnemi: iuhquinma ineixcahuil teutl,

\(^{18}\) Molly Harbour Basset, personal communication, Nov 5, 2012.

\(^{19}\) Along with “calpanpile” the “Códice” lists another rank – “tlacopil,” or “a slave’s child”: “y a los de las maçebas si eran esclavas llamavan tlaçopile que quiere dezir desclavo principal” (Batalla Rosado 2009: 105). I have never seen this term possessed. Nevertheless, there is evidence that it may have been customarily employed
In the “Florentine Codex,” “calpan pilli” is juxtaposed with such terms as *ichtacaconetl*, a secret child of a woman, *mecaconetl* and *mecapilli*, a lover’s child, and contrasted with *tepiltzin, tláçopilli*, or *teoyotica tepiltzin* (Sahagún 2012 X: 2). The presence of the last one, however, indicates that these terms may have already been reinterpreted in the Christian way (see: 1.8.1. The modifier teoyotica) where the central concept consisted on legitimacy and children born out of holy wedlock were negatively valued. In the “Sexta Relación” of Chimalpahin, among nine children of the *tlatoani* Quauhcececutzin, the last one is labeled as “çan icalpanpiltzin,” or “merely his child-in-the-house” (Chimalpahin 1998: 432), as if he were less important than the others. Nevertheless, in the “Memorial breve” one of “ycalpanpilhuantzitzin” of Cuahuitzatzin is classified as *tlatocapilli*, or “a royal nobleman” (Chimalpahin 1998: 140). From Book 10 of the “Florentine Codex” one can find out that although less valued, -*calpanpilhuan* were still considered nobles. A noblewoman called *tetlapallo*, or “one’s color”:

*pilli* *tlatocapan pouhqui, tlatocaiutl itech quizqui, anoço uel tepiltzin anoço calpan tepiltzin* (ibid.: 49).

is a noble, she belongs to rulers, she comes from rulership whether she is a real noblewoman or a noblewoman-in-the-house.20

Camilla Townsend concludes that the terms -*tláçopil* and -*calpanpil* were used only among nobles because commoners did not maintain numerous wives and did not need to differentiate among their children (Townsend 2006: 356). Pedro Carrasco interprets the absolutives of these terms as ranks within nobility. According to him, the latter was ascribed to the sons of concubines (Carrasco 1971: 354) while the former to the sons of wives of high status, i.e.:

women of high birth obtained by the process of petitioning and married in a public ceremony (Carrasco 1984: 44).

---

20 Translation mine.

in the context of the hierarchy of children. Fray Diego Durán, describing the social reforms of Moteucçoma I, “quotes” one of them in the following way: “como entre nuestros hijos, así del rey como nuestros y de todos los señores, nacen algunos hijos de nuestras esclavas y criadas, bastardos, juntamente con los últimos, que aunque son bastardos y hijos de esclavas, son, en fin, nuestra sangre y nacidos entre los legítimos y hijos de grandes señores” (Durán 1867 I: 241).
In the material I have gathered the reference point for -calpanpil is always a tlatoani. The term is used to describe children of both sexes.

Susan Schroeder, having analyzed the usage of tlaçopilli in the writings of Chimalpahin, noticed that the term was sometimes extended to refer politely to nobles in general (Schroeder 1996: 241). Perhaps it is not a coincidence that in the passage quoted by her as the basis for this observation Chimalpahin employs the term tlaçopilpiltin in reference to the nobles of Amaquemecan, his beloved homeland. Taking advantage of the name for high-ranked aristocracy could have been a way to elevate Amaquemecan’s prestige – an aim that never escaped Chimalpahin’s attention. Schroeder likewise states that the absolutive tlaçopilli and its possessive -tlacopiltzin were associated with each other as far as their meaning was concerned. She notes that the latter often seems to identify a legitimate son of a ruler and sometimes, although not always, a successor to the throne (Schroeder 1996: 242).

In the “Primeros Memoriales” this term is undoubtedly used in reference to a potential successor:

\[ Jnic etlamantli inic tlavcoyaya in tlatoani ieioatl in tlaçopilizin yn amo yyel yn amo otlacaqui in amo mozcalia yn ac quipiaz in atl in tepetl in iquac omic in tlatoani \]

(Sahagún 1997b: 250)

The third [occasion when] the ruler was sad was when his beloved son, the one who was to guard the city when the ruler died, was lazy, was stupid, was imprudent (ibid).

However, as the first quotation discussed in this chapter demonstrates, -tlacopilhuan could have been a group of children including the successor. In the case of the Mexica, especially in the first phase of sedentary life in the Valley of Mexico, their “preciousness” was guaranteed by the connections of ruler’s wife with the Colhua tradition. An important aspect of Mexica historiography was the double heritage, taken from the nomadic Chichimecs on the one hand, and from the civilized Toltecs on the other. Marriages with women from the royal dynasties of the cities considered the heirs of the Toltecs, such as Colhuacan or Coatl Ichcan, provided the necessary legitimization of Mexica’s authority and their domination over the region (Gillespie 1989: 21).
In the “Bancroft Dialogues” which represent the Acolhua rather than the Mexica tradition, the term “itlaçopiltzin” is used in reference to Huexotzincatzin, the eldest son of Nezahualpilli (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 156). It appears in a speech of an aged noblewoman who recalls the fate of Huexotzincatzin: he committed a transgression with one of his father’s concubines and Nezahualpilli, in spite of his pain, had to punish him with death in order to comply with the legal rules of Texcoco. Such a context raises suspicions that the element *tlaço-* is intended to stress the depth of Nezahualpilli’s sacrifice rather than the status of Huexotzincatzin. However, it is likely that Huexotzincatzin was indeed his father’s successor-to-be since his mother was a lady of the “house” Atzacoalco, from where the Texcocan *tlatoque* took their principal wives. As Townsend hypothesizes, the execution of Huexotzincatzin opened way for another wife of Nezahualpilli, a lady of the “house” Xilomenco, to become the principal wife and thus the mother of a future successor. Her son, Cacama, eventually succeeded to the throne, nevertheless in the sources he is not called Nezahualpilli’s *-tlaçopiltzin* (Townsend 2006: 370, n. 64; Carrasco 1984: 51).

It seems plausible, therefore, that a successor of a ruler had to be chosen from among *-tlaçopilhuan*, i.e. the children of a wife who guaranteed the legitimacy of the future rule. However, there is an instance where it was a *-calpanpil* who succeeded to the throne. The story is included in a seventeenth century document entitled “Tratado del principado y nobleza del pueblo de San Juan Teotihuacan.” According to this text, after the death of the *tlatoani* Mamalitzin, the rulership went into the hands of don Juan Tlaçolyaotzin, “ica[1]panpiltzin, Cotzatztzin,” or “the child-in-the-house of Cotzatzin,” one of the former dynastic rulers of Teotihuacan. Certainly, the situation fell out of the general scheme, since it happened in the absence of the legitimate distributor of authority in the region – the *tlatoani* Ixtlilxochitl of Texcoco. At this time Ixtlilxochitl was with Hernando Cortés on the famous expedition to Honduras, where several indigenous rulers were killed under obscure circumstances. Tlaçolyaotzin obtained *tlatocayotl* from a temporary governor, Itzcuiucuani, who was not even a member of the Texcoca ruling dynasty (Tratado...: 5v).

In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” there are two instances where the term *-tlaçopiltzin* is applied to personages who appeared on the scene of the Mexica “history” before the founding
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*On Itzcuiucuani see: Texcoca Accounts 1997.*
of Tenochtitlan. The first one is Coatzontli, the “precious child” of a god-carrier Quauhtlequetzqui (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 88) and the second one – a “precious child” of tlatoani Achitometl, his daughter whose skin was used by a Mexica priest to impersonate the goddess Toci (ibid.: 94-96). The rather marginal role of the former in the Mexica historiography cannot be compared to the great significance of the latter; in spite of this difference, they are both labeled as their fathers’ -tlacopilhuan. There are two more things they have in common: association with Colhuacan and gods. Coatzontli married a princess from this altepetl and the sacrificed princess was a daughter of the tlatoani in Colhuacan (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 94-96). Moreover, Coatzontli was the great-grandson of Huitzilopochtli’s sister, the goddess Malinalxochitl (ibid.: 88), and his father, Quauhtlequetzqui, was a tlamacazqui, a semi-divine mediator between the human and the supernatural (ibid.: 106; Contel, Mikulska Dąbrowska 2011). As observed by Alfredo López Austin, the mother of Coatzontli could likewise have belonged to this class of beings, since her name, Xicomoyahual, includes the root -moyahual, associated with transformations and “nahualismo” (ibid.: 128-129). The Colhua princess was not only deified herself, but, as fray Diego Durán informs us, she was also dedicated to be “señora de los mexicanos y muger de su dios” (Durán 1867: 33), that is, Huitzilopochtli. There is no information on the ontological status of her father, Achitometl, but it has to be noted that the children of tlamacazque were an excellent choice for a human sacrifice (López Austin 1989: 130).

In looking for the associations of -tlacopilhuan with the religious sphere, the term can be found in Book 4 of the “Florentine Codex,” extended outside the kinship context. On the eve of 1 Death, the day sign of Tezcatlipoca, the owners of slaves:

vel qujnmavizmatia, ipampa iuh qujmatia, ca ixipltlaoa, ipatillooa, yitlaçopilhoan, mjtoa iuhquijn iquecholhoan, içaquantotooa, itlaçototooan in Tezcatlipuca: (Sahagún 2012 IV: 34)

---

22 I thank Molly Bassett for an inspiring discussion regarding this ritual.
23 This category of beings was, until recently, called “hombres-dioses,” following the term suggested by Alfredo López Austin (1989). The term is, nevertheless, a modern invention which does not allow for acknowledging all implications of the Nahuatl word tlamacazqui (Katarzyna Mikulska, personal communication, Nov 29, 2012).
showed them great esteem, because, so they thought, they were his [Tezcatlipoca’s – J.M.] likenesses and representatives: his beloved sons. It was said that they were like the blue cotingas, the trupials, the precious birds of Tezcatlipoca (ibid).

The exceptional treatment of slaves arose from “the lord of destiny,” Tezcatlipoca. At any moment, this deity could take away authority and riches and assign them to someone. Slaves who were born under the sign 1 Death were likely to become free men and to have slaves on their own. As a reminder, anyone who offended a slave on this particular day, would lose his social status. As Guilhem Olivier observes: “el irrespetuoso heredaba de alguna manera el estatus del ofendido” (Olivier 2004: 74-75). López Austin refers to a similar custom, mentioned in Book 1 of the “Florentine Codex”:

Quien insultaba a un borracho recibía un castigo de lo alto, porque en realidad estaba insultando al numen que en ese momento inflúa en el cuerpo del bebedor (López Austin 1989: 122).

In the above quotation from Book 4, the term -tlaçopilhuan is juxtaposed with ixiptlahuan, ipatillohuan. -Ixipta is most often translated as “one’s image” or “one’s representative.” According to López Austin, it is associated with the concept of “skin,” “coating,” or “peel” (López Austin 1989: 119). In the prehispanic religious context, -ixiptla meant a material body (a human or artifact) filled with divine essence, that impersonated a deity (Hvidtfeldt 1958). The fact that slaves might have been identified with Tezcatlipoca in this way is suggested by the “Codex Borbonicus” which shows Tezcatlipoca wearing quauhcozcatl, a wooden collar which was a symbol of slavery (Olivier 2004: 74, n. 74). The second component of the doublet, the possessive form -patillo, is often juxtaposed with -ixiptla. It is associated with the verb patillotia, “sustituir a alguno en lugar de otro” (Molina 1977 II: 80r). Both -ixiptla and -patillo are likewise used in the context of kin and political relations. Of a good grandchild, the “Florentine Codex” says that he is “tепатillo teixiptla” (Sahagún 2012 X: 6), or “one’s (people’s) substitute, representative.” Even more interestingly, the Chimalpahin’s “Tercera Relación” has several attestations of -ixiptla used in reference to a tlatoani’s successor. For example, Maxtlatzin of Azcapotzalco ompa motlahtocatlalli yxiptla mochiuh yn ittatzin omomiquilli (Chimalpahin 1998: 240-242), or “was installed as a ruler there, he became the substitute of his deceased father.” And when Tehuehuetzin, tlatoani of Quauhnahuac, died, niman iquac motlahtocatlalli in ixipta yn itoca
Ytzcohuatzin (ibid.: 300), or “immediately his substitute named Itzcoatzin was installed as a ruler.”

It seems, therefore, that -ixiptla and -tlaçopiltzin had similar meaning. Both terms appear in the same context in religious and political spheres. The etymology of -tlaçopiltzin associates it with the concept of circulation of divine essence, approximating it to -ixiptla. Within the kinship sphere the actual difference between -calpanpilhuan and -tlaçopilhuan might have arisen from the fact that the latter received special powers, delegated to them by their parents. It must be stressed that in the prehispanic context, the term -tlaçopilhuan is ascribed to children of only two categories of men: tlatoque and tlamacazque. The main responsibility of both of them was to protect their altepetl and they did it by concentrating the divine essence – the vitality of their people – in themselves (López Austin 1989: 150; see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta). According to López Austin, the tlatoque of the Mexica were in possession of great amounts of “fire” which turned them into the “heart of the altepetl” (ibid.: 182). They inherited it from their ancestor, Acamapichtli, who, on his part, was conceived of as a descendant of Quetzalcoatl (ibid.: 173).

Molina ignores the undoubtedly polygamous background of tlaçopilli and calpanpilli, glossing the former as “hijo o hija legítimos” (Molina 1977 II: 118r) and thus forcing it into the Spanish concept of legitimacy. His definition suggests that the colonial period brought the reinterpretation of the term by the Spanish friars. Not only the precontact polygamous relationships disappeared ceding to a single legal marriage, but more importantly, the friars intended to replace the native worldview with the Christian one. Apart from the example of San Juan Teotihuacan cited above, I have not come upon the usage of the term -calpanpil in colonial contexts which may suggest that it was not adopted by the Spanish system for any category of offspring. As far as the term -tlaçopiltzin is concerned, Chimalpahin uses it to name the first-born son of the Spanish king (Chimalpahin 2006: 70, 84-86), apparently with the meaning of “the heir” or “successor.” Arguably, he had similar intentions when he used -tlaçopiltzin with reference to the son of don Hernando de la Cerda, a nobleman of the royal dynasty of Tlalmanalco (Chimalpahin 2006: 110). Although don Hernando was not a tlatoani, he belonged to the Chalca aristocracy and thus was a natural subject of Chimalpahin’s

24 Both translations mine.
admiration and concern. It must be stressed, though, that don Hernando’s wife and the mother of his -tlaçopiltzin was doña Maria Cerón, a daughter of the tlatoani in Xochimilco – another altepetl of Colhua-Tolteca origin (Gillespie 1989: 62). It may suggest that some of the prehispanic connotations of “preciousness” were still valid for Chimalpahin. Interestingly, in an earlier source, the 1572 testament of Constantino de San Felipe (Xochimilco), these connotations are entirely absent and the testator seems to use -tlaçopiltzin in a purely reverential way. Actually, he adds the element tlaço- to every kinship term appearing in the text for the first time (“notlaçonamic,” “notlaçonantzin,” “notlaçoatçin,” etc.) and removes it from attestations that follow. Thus, when his son is mentioned for the first time, he is called notlacoçitçin, but after simply nopiltzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 94-96).

In the religious context, -tlaçopiltzin was yet another term, along with tepiltzin, with which Jesus Christ was designated. I have already mentioned that the two were used interchangeably in the Trinitarian formula. However, while tepiltzin did not surpass several strictly defined contexts controlled by the friars, the phrase Dios itlaçopiltzin, or the precious child of God, was used more willingly by Nahua writers. For example, Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc states:

Inic quizque yn chichimeca yn azteca ynic ompa hualquizque yn ichan aztilan ypan i. ce tecpatl xihuitl. 1064. años. ye yuh nepa ontzontli ypan matlacpohualli ypan yepohualli ypan nauhxihuitl motlacaçillitzino y nelli Dios. ytlacoçopiltzin Jesu christo (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 66).

When the Chichimeca Azteca came forth, when they emerged from their home in Aztlan, it was the year One Flint, 1064. The true God's beloved son Jesus Christ had been born 1,064 years previously (ibid.: 67).

The reason for the preference of itlaçopiltzin over tepiltzin in texts written by the Nahuas may have laid in the prehispanic connotations of both. The latter meant simply a nobleman while the former had a greater potential for describing religious concepts. Jesus as the mediator between the earth and heavens, the embodiment of God, the divine presence in a mundane body, conforms to the Nahua worldview, but this interpretation is also not far from the Christian understanding of Jesus and God’s mutual identity. The indigenous authors of the
“Exercício quotidiano” written under fray Bernardino de Sahagún’s supervision, explain the nature of Jesus using the verb *nenehuitl*, or to equal sb, to resemble sb:

\[
in \text{titetaztin huel nelli tidios. titeutl. titahtohuani: auh in motlaçopilztzin nelli dios. teutl tlahtohuani huel mitzmonenehuitilia:} \quad (\text{Sahagún 1997a: 160})\]

You the Father are indeed the true God; You are the Deity and Ruler. And Your beloved Son, true God, Deity and Ruler, resembles You (ibid.: 161).

1.1.3. One of us

The notion of descent inscribed in the term -*pil* allowed for extending it to the members of whole sociopolitical groups. The members of ethnic groups or the inhabitants of *altepetl* were described as the children of their people or cities respectively. In the example from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” -*pil* is juxtaposed with -*ichpoch*, or a daughter, used in the same sense:

\[
nimà oncan ce tlacatl mixiuh yn inpiltzin. Yn imichpoch in Mexica. ytoca quetzalmoyahuatzin \quad (\text{Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 100}).\]

Then a certain person – a child, daughter, of the Mexica, named Quetzalmoyahuatzin – gave birth (ibid.: 101).

A child, daughter of the Mexica is to be understood as a Mexica woman. Similarly, the Spaniards born in Spain were called “ompa españoles ynpilhuan,” or the children of the Spaniards from there (Chimalpahin 2006: 278). On the other hand, the Creoles were the “children” of the *altepetl* Mexico (Tenochtitlan):

\[
in \text{cenca mahuiztilioni teoyotica tlahtohuani Maestro Don fr. Diego de contreras. Arçobispo. teopixqui S. Augustin nican mexico motlacatilli nican ypiltzin y huei altepetl} \quad (\text{Chimalpahin 2006: 298}).\]
the very reverend spiritual ruler master don fray Diego de Contreras, archbishop, Augustinian friar, who was born here in Mexico and is the child of the great altepetl here (ibid.: 299).

Chimalpahin also describes the Creoles with the phrase *nican tepiltzin*, or the child (of people) from here, in plural *nican tepilhuan*, for example:


He was born here, the child of people here in Mexico; he descended from conquerors (ibid.: 283).

Just like in the case of *tepilhuan/ pipiltin* which referred to the nobility, the term *-pil* was used alternately with proper names of ethnic groups or inhabitants of administrative units. The focal point of difference was the relation-constituting properties of the kinship term. *Mexica* or *español* could have been used somewhat indifferently while *inpiltzin in Mexica* or *españoles inpilhuan* stressed the aspect of descent and the circumstances in which a given individual was born. In this context, a particularly interesting form is *topiltzin/ topilhuan*, or our child/ our children. The pronoun “our” is used here in a sense similar to that pointed out by Benedict Anderson in his analysis of the Indonesian novel “Semarang Hitam.” Its author referred to one of his characters as “our young man,” which, according to Anderson, meant literally:

a young man who belongs to the collective body of readers of Indonesian, and thus, implicitly, an embryonic Indonesian “imagined community” (Anderson 2003: 31).

*Topiltzin/ topilhuan* is sporadically found referring to the actual children of the reference point and it sometimes forms a doublet with *toxhuiuh/ toxhuilhuan*, meaning together “our descendants” (see: 2.1. -ixhuiuh). It never occurs with the sense “subjects,” otherwise common for the term *-pil* (see below). Most often it is used to express that someone belongs to “our” community: whether it was an ethnic group (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 112), an *altepetl* (e.g. Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 196), a social class – *pipiltin* (e.g. Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 154), or, in the postconquest reality, a parish (Cline, León-Portilla
Thus *topiltzin/ topilhuan* can be, in most cases, translated as “one of us”/ “our men.” Depending on the character of the community involved, it refers to either blood ties (*pipiltin*) or the Nahua concept of family as people who live together (*altepetl, parish*). In Nahuatl, the basic identity of an individual is expressed by means of the word *-chan*, or home: *Xochimilco ichan* can be rendered as “he comes from Xochimilco.”

The term *topiltzin* is most widely associated with famous Topiltzin Quetzalcoatl, an impersonator of the deity Quetzalcoatl and, at the same time, the deity himself (López Austin 1989). In this context it is usually translated as “Our Prince.” However, since the often cited here article of Brant Gardner was published, it has become obvious that the possessed forms of kin terms have always something to do with kinship relations, though often extended to a broader social sphere. In written sources the word *topiltzin* is never used with the meaning of a “prince” or a nobleman as such – the term *tepiltzin* would be more adequate for this purpose. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún in Book 6 of the “Historia general” speaks of Topiltzin Quetzalcoatl not only as “nuestro señor Quetzalcóatl” (ibid.: 528, 557), but also as “nuestro hijo Quetzalcóatl” (ibid.: 558, 560, 573), “nuestro señor y hijo Quetzalcóatl” (Sahagún 2001: 486) and “nuestro señor y hijo nuestro Quetzalcóatl” (ibid.: 580). These translations point to the fact that the Franciscan friar did not consider *topiltzin* as a proper name and that in his eyes the term combined connotations from both kinship and social spheres.

There are many sources in Nahuatl that use the “name” *topiltzin* Quetzalcoatl, the most interesting of which will be mentioned here. In the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan” and the “Leyenda de los Soles” the phrase refers to a ruler of Tollan. On fol. 3 of the former the birth of “Quetzalcohuatl ictoyotilo Topiltzin Tlamacazqui,”25 or “Quetzalcoatl, who was named Topiltzin Tlamacazqui” is mentioned (Annales... 1992; Nicholson 2001: 41). The “Leyenda” first describes the Sun (era) 4 Movement as the Sun of “in topiltzin in Tollan in Quetzalcohuatl,” or our child, Tollan, Quetzalcoatl (Leyenda... 1990: f. 77). Then the term *topiltzin* is found on a sketch which represents the descent of Quetzalcoatl from Mixcoatl and Chimalma and his ruling in Tollan (Nicholson 2001: 20-21). Finally, on fol. 81 it is said that *topiltzin* left in Tollan four rulers who are interpreted as his successors (Leyenda... 1990; Nicholson 2001: 21). The same tradition seems to be reflected in the so-called “Toltec Elegy,”

25 In the following summary, the ortography of names referring to Quetzalcoatl follows the sources cited.
a song included in the “Cantares Mexicanos.” The term topiltzin is found there twice: on fol. 26v one of the houses built by “Nacxitl topiltzin” is mentioned and fol. 27r also refers to the houses while asserting that the memory of “Naxitl topiltzin” [sic!] had been preserved in stone and wood before he left Tollan so that his name would never perish (Bierhorst 1985a: 218-221).

Likewise, Chimalpahin’s “Memorial breve” records the turning points of Quetzalcoatl’s life. It begins by stating that:

\[
\text{Nican ipan in tlacat yn Topiltzin Axcitl Quetzalcohuatl yn oncan Tullam; auh amo nelli yn tlacat, ca çan hualmohuicac ynic oncan monextico, campa hualmohuicac amo huel momati, yn iuh quihtotihui huehuetque} \quad (\text{Chimalpahin 1998: 78}).
\]

Here, in this year, Topiltzin Axcitl Quetzalcoatl was born in Tollan; he was not really born, but he just arrived, so that he came to appear there. It is not known where did he came from, that is how the elders go along saying.26

He is also remembered as “yn huey tlahtohuani yn quitocaytiaya Topiltzin Axcitl Quetzalcohuatl” (ibid.: 174), or the great ruler who was named Topiltzin Axcitl Quetzalcoatl.

The “Florentine Codex” contains multiple attestations of the term topiltzin in association with Quetzalcoatl, found in various contexts. Book 10 mentions the disappearance or death of “topiltzin quetzalcoatl” in Tlapallan (Sahagún 2012 X: 170, 176). Book 12 states that the Spaniards were identified by Moteucçoma and his messengers with the returning “topiltzin Quetzalcoatl” (ibid. XII: 5, 9). Book 2 informs us that the priest who fulfilled an important role during the feast of Huitzilopochtli was named “topiltzin Quetzalcoatl” (ibid. II: 175). The huehuetlatolli delivered on the occasion of dedicating a child to the calmecac makes an address to “in totecujo in topiltzin in Quetzalcoatl, in tlipotonquj” as the patron-god of the institution (ibid. III: 62, n. 4). A sermon from Book 1 denies the godly nature of this personage, though this interpretation is certainly inspired by the friars:

---

26 Translation mine.
In iehoantin in veuetque, oqujteutocaque in Quetzalcoatl, in Tollan tlatoanj catca: yoan anqujtaociatiaia, Topiltzin. Injn ca maceoalli, ca miqujn, ca omic, ca opalan yn inacaio, ca amo teutl: (Sahagún 2010 I: f. 35v)

The ancient ones took as a god Quetzalcoatl, who was the ruler in Tollan and you were calling him “our child.” He was a commoner (i.e. human being), a mortal, he died, his body rotted, he was no god.  

In both the “Primeros Memoriales” (Sahagún 1997b: 223) and the huehuetlatolli of the “Florentine Codex” (Book 6), the term topiltzin is used in reference to the creator god instead of the Toltec ruler. In the latter, he is called Tloque Nahuaque and is pointed as the one who, together with Ometeuctli, gives life to a newborn child:

omjtzmomacavili in tloque, naoaque in topiltzin in Quetzalcoatl (Sahagún 2012 VI: 202).

The lord of the near, our child, Quetzalcoatl, had given you.  

omjitzpitz, omjitzmamal, in monan, in mota, in vme tecutli, in vme cihoatl: auh nelli iehoatl, â in tlacatl in topiltzin in Quetzalcoatl (ibid.: 183).

Your mother, your father, Ome teuctli, Ome cihuatl, has cast you, has perforated you and it was truly the lord, our child, Quetzalcoatl.  

It has to be stressed that in the material I have gathered Quetzalcoatl is the only deity referred to with the term topiltzin. The material presented above confirms that the title topiltzin appears in reference to various “aspects” of Quetzalcoatl: the creator deity, a priest, a culture hero, or a “historical” ruler (Nicholson 2001: 266). As Katarzyna Mikulska and José Contel recently demonstrated, all these categories of beings could, depending on their characteristics, belong to the same class – that of tlamacazque – and it seems likely that, from the ontological point of view, they were no different (Contel, Mikulska Dąbrowska 2011: 33). The question remains, why Quetzalcoatl tlamacazqui was assigned the title of topiltzin and

---

27 Translation mine.
28 Translation mine.
29 Translation mine.
who was the reference point hidden under the prefix to-? As will be seen later, in the kin
terms-based designations of other deities, such as tonantzin or tota, the prefix to- established a
relationship between a deity and the entire community. Alfredo López Austin hypothesizes
that Quetzalcoatl was originally the patron-god of the Toltecs. Once they gained domination
over the wider region, he became elevated to the position of the creator of mankind and the
patron-deities of conquered people were subordinated to him (López Austin 1989: 169). Still,
it is not known during which stage of “development” Quetzalcoatl received his title – when he
was “only” a patron-deity or later, as the creator.

Among his multiple roles, topiltzin Quetzalcoatl was also a prototype of a dynastic
ruler (ibid.: 176). According to the so-called “borrowed throne concept,” the Mexica dynasty
traced its descent directly to Quetzalcoatl and was supposed to give the authority back to him
once he returned (Nicholson 2001: 11, 80-81). Quetzalcoatl, similarly to the Mexica tlatoani,
belonged to his people: as a patron-god and, later, the universal creator, he guaranteed their
existence and prosperity. The ruler was commonly described with the doublet in -nan in -ta,
which referred to his function as the one who transmits both creative and destructive essence
to his people, who, as the receivers of essence, were called his -pilhuan (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta).
However, in the context of election, a tlatoani is also sometimes called topiltzin. In Book
6 of the “Florentine Codex” the speaker, “vei pilli” or “vei tecutlato,” instructs the ruler that
from now on he is to be treated as a god because through him speaks Tloque Nahuaque:

maço titolacapo, maço titoenjuh, maço titopiltzin, manoço titiccauh titachcauh ca
aocmo titolacapo ca amo timjitztlacaitta, ca ie titeviviti, ca titepatilloti (Sahagún 2012
VI: 52).

Although thou art human, as are we, although thou art our friend, although thou art our
son, our younger brother, our older brother, no more art thou human, as are we; we do
not look to thee as human. Already thou representest, thou replacest one (ibid).

In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” the Mexica decide to look for their first tlatoani in Colhuacan,
arguing:
Let us go find the child who issued from the warrior Opochtli. For he is our Mexica Chichimeca child. He will want us, he will guard the Mexica Tenochca altepetl (ibid.: 113).

And in a sixteenth-century Texcocan source, the members of the ruling dynasty comment upon the election of a native colonial ruler:

\[ \text{auh tiquitoque ca topiltzin ca tomach Cuix quē tiquitoa açipã onmihmatca yez yn ma quītlatalcalhui in pipiltin yhuan in tetzeuca} \] (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 204)

And we said: He is our son; he is our nephew. Do we say that perhaps because of it he will be prudent so that he won’t offend the noblemen and the Tetzcoca?\(^{30}\)

In all these examples the term \textit{topiltzin} preserves its meaning of “one of us.” In the “Florentine Codex” the ruler is undoubtedly “one of us, humans,” in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” he is identified as a Mexica Chichimeca and in the “Texcoca Accounts” – as a member of the ruling dynasty. The last two quotations use this term as an argument in favor of electing this particular candidate. The first one refers to the concept according to which a human (\textit{topiltzin}) when receiving the attributes of royal power becomes the living impersonator of god. As a \textit{tlatoani}, he is filled with divine fire, inherited from both Quetzalcoatl and Huitzilopochtli (López Austin 1989: 173). A passage from the dispute between two commoners, recorded in the “Primeros Memoriales,” demonstrates that the form \textit{topil} was closely associated with rulers – the doublet may suggest that the two terms were considered synonymous: \textit{cuix ic itechpopoloz / cuix tevatl titopil titotlatocauh} (Sahagún 1997b: 297), or “Will you therefore destroy us? Are you our child, our ruler?” The use of the term \textit{-pil} instead of the one from the first ascending generation indicates that in the discussed contexts the focus was on “us,” the community, as the point of reference for the \textit{tlatoani}. The

\(^{30}\) Translation mine.
structural equivalence between the dynastic ruler and Quetzalcoatl allows for drawing the same conclusion as far as the latter is concerned.

The “Memorial breve” uses the term topiltzin in reference to Huehue Nauhyotzin, the first tlatoani in Colhuacan, who, similarly to Quetzalcoatl, was a tlamacazqui. Significantly, in the same source Nauhyotzin, without the epithet “Huehue,” is called tepiltzin twice (Chimalpahin 1998: 72-74). The difference in titulature may be due to different sources from which Chimalpahin drew his account. One of them might have originated in Colhuacan (“our child”) and the other somewhere else (“people’s child”). It may also point to the possibility that topiltzin and tepiltzin were originally similar in meaning, both referring somehow to the noble status of the person described, although in later times the sense of the former apparently developed.

1.1.4. Subjects

According to Ryszard Tomicki, the term -pil was often used in precontact Nahuaatl with the meaning of “a serf” or “a person devoted to somebody.” Actually, it was synonymous with the word -macehual which, when combined with a possessive prefix, changed its connotation from “a commoner” to “somebody’s vasall, subject.” In his analysis of the denomination “hijos del sol” given by the Nahuas to the Spaniards, Tomicki identifies three contexts in which the term -pil was used outside the kinship sphere. First, the captives or slaves sacrificed to Aztec gods were called “the children of the Sun” (Tomicki 2003: 264-265). In the “Historia de las Indias de Nueva España” by fray Diego Durán, the captives who are to be sacrificed are named “hijos del sol y del señor de la tierra y merced de los dioses” (Durán 1867: 173). The most extensive evidence is included in the “Crónica mexicana” by don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc. The prisoners who were sacrificed to Huitzilopochtli are called there “hijos y basallos del sol, uezinos de la mar” (Alvarado Tezozomoc 2001: 144); “hijos de el sol benidos de Guaxaca” (ibid.: 180), “los hijos del sol y de la tierra” (ibid.: 303) and “los hijos del sol” (ibid.: 376). In addition, the people conquered by Ahuitzotl are named “los hijos del sol, ayre, tierra, biento” and the captives taken during the war are to be well treated “como tales hijos del sol” (ibid.: 320-321). Finally, as Tomicki notes, the slaves
sacrificed by Nezahualpilli during the funeral of Ahuitzotl are spoken of similarly to warriors killed on the battlefield who, in the afterlife, followed the Sun in the heavens:

Beis aquí, señor, estos hijos del sol y pájaros alindados, galanos, cacuan, que delante de bos yrán como a basallos u<uest>ros al balle de Ximohuayan, al eterno de olvido (ibid.: 359; Tomicki 2003: 265, n. 32).

It has to be added that captives were not only children of the Sun, but also of their captors. A very instructive passage of Book 2 of the “Florentine Codex” explains:

_Auh in male, amo uel qujquaia, yn jnacaio imal, qujtoaia, cuix çan no ne njnoquaz: ca yn iquac caci, qujto, ca iuhqj nopiltzin: Auh in malli, qujto ca notatzin: (Sahagún 2012 II: 54)_

But the captor could not eat the flesh of his captive. He said: “Shall I perchance eat my very self?” For when he took [the captive], he had said: “He is as my beloved son.” And the captive had said: “He is my beloved father” (ibid).

Guilhem Olivier interprets this text as an indication that a captive acquired the identity of his captor. The latter treated the former as a substitute victim, benefiting from his sacrificial death as if he was offering his very self (Olivier 2010: 466).

The second group of referents identified by Tomicki were people particularly devoted to a person/deity they worshipped, who were called his or her children, for example Durán refers to Aztec priests as “the children of god” (Tomicki 2003: 265). The sources in Nahuatl contain several attestations of the term -pil used with the meaning of “the children of a deity.” For example, in the “Primeros Memoriales” the explanatory note to the words sung by the goddess Cihuacoatl says: _in namonã auh yn ânopilhoã anchalmeca_, or “I am your mother and you people of Chalma are my children” (Sahagún 1997b: 144). An interesting example comes from Book 10 of the “Florentine Codex”:

They [the Tolteca, J.M.] were rich. By reason of their prudence they caused their goods to appear quickly. Thus it is now said of him who quickly gains goods that he is a son of Quetzalcoatl, that he is Quetzalcoatl’s son (ibid).

Further in the same book the Olmeca, who were a subgroup of the Tolteca, are commented upon:

*Injque y, injc mocujltonoa, injc atle tlaçotli inchã: mjtoaia in ie nechca Quetzalcoatl ipilhoa. Qujl in aqijn mocujltonoa, in motlamachtia: qujl itech pouhquj, qujl ipiltzin* (ibid.: 188).

Because they were rich, because there was such abundance in their homes, it was said of these in times past that they were sons of Quetzalcoatl. It was said that he who was rich, who was wealthy, belonged to – was a son of – Quetzalcoatl (ibid).

The phrase used here as a synonym of *ipiltzin is itech pouhqui*, or the one who belongs to him, the one who is devoted to him. This expression clearly points to the fact that *ipiltzin* is not to be understood in the same way as *itlacopiltzin*. The latter was an extension of his “father,” he shared his identity and the “divine fire” that was within him (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). The former still takes after his “father” (the Tolteca were similar to Quetzalcoatl in their ability of multiplying goods), but they are not the same and their position is not equal. *Ipiltzin* is a mere reflection of his “father” rather than his -ixiptla, and he is subordinate to him or worships him. Tetzaahuhteotl, in Cristóbal del Castillo’s account the patron deity of the Mexica, calls them: “in annopilhuan, in annomacehualhuan” (Castillo 2001: 94), or “you, my children, you, my subjects.”

In the final position of Tomicki’s list, people submitted to somebody, who depended on or served somebody in more terrestrial (also political) terms, were classified as their superior’s children (Tomicki 2003: 264-266). For example, in the “Texcoca Accounts of Conquest Episodes” dating to 1560s, the tlatoani of Texcoco, Coanacochtli, gives orders concerning Hernando Cortés:

*ma çan yhuian quihualnamicitz yn tlacualtzintli yn totolin in çacatl yn atl yn nopilhuan ahu in *quenin* quin[equi?]* (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 192)
Let him peacefully receive food – turkey hens, fodder, and water, and my children, and whatever he may wish (ibid.: 193).

The ruler’s “children,” i.e. his subjects, are listed as one of the items, alongside food and water, which Cortés “may wish.” Though the phrase *itech pouhqui* is not applied to them, they are certainly treated here as one of the ruler’s “belongings.”

There is yet another context in which the term *-pil* appears and it results quite revealing. In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” *-pilhuan* is juxtaposed with the term *tlazcaltilli*, or child placed under the care of a tutor, someone adopted (Karttunen 1992a: 306): *in vevetque in jntlazcaltilhoan, in jnpilhoan oc iooan in qujmjxitia*, or “the students of the old men, their sons, they awaken while it is yet dark” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 113). The reference point for them is the old priests who supervise the young men in the *calmecac*, so there is no biological connotation of *-pil* here. Rather, the term is to be understood, as suggested by Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O. Anderson for *intlazcaltilhuan*, as “students.” At first glance, there is nothing unusual in this usage of the doublet. Children were handed over to *calmecac* at relatively young age, so their supervisors might have been socially assigned the role of “foster parents.” However, another quotation from Book 6 gives a clue as to the nature of this “foster parenting” or, if one prefers, the basis for metaphorical extension of the term *-pil*. Two families meet on the occasion of the announcement of pregnancy of a young wife. The relatives of the woman’s husband deliver a speech, which is then responded by her own relatives:

*Auh no ivi in tehoantin in tivevetque, in tilamatque otoconcujque, otoconanque in oc ceppa ic antonantzitzinoan, in antotatzitzinoan: ic oc ceppa, ic tamopilhoan titochioa:* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 145)

And also like them, we who are the old men, we who are the old women have once again taken, grasped [the counsel] such that ye are our mothers, ye are our fathers, such that once again we become your children (ibid31).

---

31 The word “tamopilihuan” is rendered by C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson as “your sons.”
By these words, the speakers mean that the fact of hearing a huehuetlatolli ("words of the ancients") made them the "children" of those who delivered it and who thus became their "parents." Such a meaning of -pil can likewise be found in other passages of Book 6. The masters of youths answer the speech of huehuetque (speaking of themselves in the 3rd person):
ca njcan qujencuj, qujencaquj in amopilhoan, or "Here your children comprehend all, hear all" (Sahagún 2012 VI: 12832). As will be demonstrated below, the most common forms of address were based on the term -pil, locating an addressee in the position of a "listener," the one who receives the pronounced words and thus temporarily subordinates himself to a speaker. In the word for a "child" one sees the concepts of authority and speech intertwining and it will be seen even clearer in the doublet "mother-father" which was used for a parent and, as an extension, for a ruler (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta).

Somewhat different connotations were ascribed to the term "child" in the Christian conceptual system. In the "Confessionario mayor," fray Alonso de Molina uses the Nahuatl word to convey the Christian concept of humans as the children of God, their creator:

\[Maxicmati, cacenca motechmonequi tetlaçotlaliztica ticmotlayecoltilitz: yua teoymacaxiliztica ticmolacamachitz yn moteouh yn motlatocauh: ynic vel ticnextitz, canelli tipiltzin.\]

pués ten entendido, qte conuiene mucho seruir có amor, y có temor reurecical obedecer y hazer la voluntad de tu dios y señor paraq muestres ser verdaderamente hijo suyo.

Although the relation between God and his "hijo" is likewise one of servitude – God is the believer’s "señor" – the service is to be done not only with respectful fear but with love as well. The child of the Christian God is his beloved, "amado hijo" in Molina’s terms. The author of the "Confessionario" translated this phrase using the element tlaço-, or precious, and the result is the term -tilacopil. Originally, it was deeply rooted in the prehispanic worldview, focusing on the circulation of divine essence (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). In Molina’s Nahuatl God’s itlacopilhuan are those who are afraid of him and respect him:

32 The word “amopilhoan” is rendered by C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson as “your sons.”
auh cenca quimomahuicälhuia: yn nelli ytlacopilhuan, yn tetlaçołtlanì, yn tecame: auh atle ipan quimmottitlia, yn quimimacaxìla, quimomauhcayxtitlia, iniuhque tequitque, tlacotin ypan momati,

y tiene en mucho y en gran estimación a sus verdaderos y amados hijos, que tiene amor y obras y no estima ni hace caso: de los que solamente le temen y tienen respecto como jornaleros o como esclavos (Molina 1569: 112v).

The comparison between the children of God and his slaves and laborers brings to mind the above-mentioned “children” of Coanacochtli and suggests that the term as such still fit the native classification system. Nevertheless, the element tlaço- introduced in this context by Molina could have led to misinterpretations. Another confusing factor is the usage of the same phrase (itlaçopiltzin Dios) with reference to both a human (Christian) and deity (Jesus; see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). The creation of this category cut through the native classification system. It mixed concepts from opposite classes: subjects and royal or divine delegates.

When referring to colonial reality, the Nahuas continued to use the term -pil in two of the contexts identified by Tomicki – the one excluded was obviously human sacrifice. In the Christian religious sphere writers often included the term -pil in circumlocutions which functioned as alternative names of religious orders (Tomicki 2003: 265). For example, the Franciscans were described as “yn sanct franco ipilhuan” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 182) and the Poor Clares as “yn ipilhuan Sancta clara” (Chimalpahin 2006: 26), or the children of San Francisco/ Santa Clara respectively. Every name of a patron could have formed part of such a phrase. In written sources we also deal with “the children of Santa María” – the nuns of the Conceptionist Order (e.g. ibid.: 68) or the Carmelites (e.g. ibid.: 30), and, more interestingly, “the children of the Holy Trinity” – the Trinitarians (e.g. ibid.: 204).

A complaint against the priest of Jalostotitlan published in “Beyond the Codices,” combines the terms -pil and -macehual within a doublet referring to the native subjects of colonial authorities:
If he does not leave, many of your children and subjects will flee because of our vicar, and also the tribute of our great ruler and king will be lost (ibid.: 173).

Earlier in the same source the authors quote the words of the bishop and vicar general, who scolded the priest: *xiquinyolali macehualtin ca mopilhuan*, or “console the commoners, for they are your children” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 168-169). The answer of the priest is: *coz nopilhuan ca ypilhuan diablo*, or “are they my children? They are children of the devil” (ibid.: 172). A similar example in the Christian religious context, where “children” are those who serve somebody, is to be found in the “Coloquios y doctrina cristiana”: the pope calls the newly converted Nahua *nopilhuan* (Sahagún 1986: 102). Finally, it is in these terms that a quite common phrase *ipilhuan in dios*, or the children of God, with the meaning of “Christians,” should be understood (Tomicki 2003: 265). Chimalpahin gives another version of this circumlocution: “ypilhuantzitzinhuan (...) Sancta yglesia” (Chimalpahin 2006: 274) or “the children of the Holy Church.”

In the material I have gathered, one of those connotations of *-pil* that is present in the colonial contexts but not in the precontact ones (though, perhaps, due only to the scarce data concerning Aztec religious vocabulary), is “something established or founded by others.” Chimalpahin writes about the Theatines and Antonines:

ynin ypilhuan huel achno ytlatlalilhuan yn Don Pedro carrafa (ibid.: 202).

They are the children of and were first founded by don Pedro Caraffa (ibid.: 203).

*huel ypilhuantzitzinhuan y huel ytlacahuillohuan yn nican tlaltipac quinmocahuilitia yn ihecac momiquilitzino omoteneuhtzino notlaçomahuizthatzin S. Antonio Abad* (ibid.: 292).
The true children and relics of my said precious revered father San Antonio Abad, whom he left here on earth when he died.\footnote{The reviewed translation of James Lockhart, Susan Schroeder and Doris Namala. They render this passage as: the true children and relics that my said precious revered father San Antonio Abad left here on earth when he died (Chimalpahin 2006: 293).}

Although the Hospital Brothers of San Antonio followed the rule of San Agustín, and Antonio’s patronage resulted from the history of the order (Rudge 1913), Chimalpahin seems to imply that it is San Antonio Abad whom he considers the founder of this community (Chimalpahin 2006: 292). Thus the “children” of saints grouped in religious orders were not only their patrons’ worshippers, but also, in a manner, their extensions or heirs “here on earth.” It is tempting to think that similar connotations were intended by indigenous authors of the “Coloquios y doctrina christiana” where the angels are called “jpilhua tot’ Dios,” or “children of our lord God” and a bit further in the same source they address Jesus with the following words: “timomacevalhuan timotlachualhuan,” or “we are your serfs and creatures” (Sahagún 1987: 182). Unfortunately, my data do not allow comparison of these contexts with similar ones within pre-Christian reality or determination of the extent to which they were influenced by Spanish friars.

The ecclesiastical influence that actually can be traced in the Nahua-authored writings is the already mentioned usage of the element tlaço-. Chimalpahin adds tlaço- to the standard designations of friars or nuns, for instance ytlacopilhuantzitzinhua yn ieytilitzin tto. dios. la Sancta Trinidad, or “precious children of the three-part nature of our lord God, the Holy Trinity”; yn itlaçopilhuantzitzinhuan totlaçomahuiztatzin, S. Domingo. Patriarcha, or “the precious children of our precious revered father Santo Domingo the patriarch” (Chimalpahin 2006: 204-205); and yn itlaçopilhuantzitzin Sancta clara cihuateopixque, or “the nuns who are the precious children of Santa Clara” (ibid.: 70). Interestingly, he never uses this form in reference to cofrades. Statistically, out of 43 attestations of the term -pil used in reference to the members of religious groups, 12 refer to the members of cofradías and none of them has tlaço-. Out of the remaining 31 that refer to priests or nuns, 10 have tlaço-. It seems, therefore, that, at least as far as the term -pil is concerned, by the times of Chimalpahin tlaço- had followed the way from the strict association with the “divine fire” to the rather honorific association with “holiness.” Although both cofrades and friars had their patron saints, only the
latter were actual ecclesiastics. Still, when speaking of them, Chimalpahin uses *tlaco-* quite freely, without any discernible criteria regarding which friars can be referred to with this element and which cannot. Apparently, when the Poor Clares are called Santa Clara’s “precious children,” it does not mean that they are her *ixiptlahuan*. The word *-pil* has a meaning of “a worshipper” and *tlaco-*, though its original connotation is faintly remembered, does little more than flavor the noun with reverence.

The last example of the usage of the noun *tlaco-* combined with *-pil* likewise seems to be reverential. The sense of the entire word is, nevertheless, difficult to assess. In the 1608 testament of Bábara Agustina from the Coyoacan area, the testator says:

*yn iquac nech<ma>niliquihui y notlazopilhuatzintzin teopantlacan cecan niquinotlatlauhtillia* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 98)

at that time my dear children the church attendants will come to take me; I urgently request it of them.

Perhaps the application of the term to the *teopantlaca* builds upon the concept of speech as a way of exerting authority (see below). The church attendants are Bábara’s “children” because she directs her urgent request to them.

### 1.1.5. Vocative forms

A remarkable trait of the vocatives based on the term *-pil* is that they are always combined with the 1st person singular possessive prefix. My sample consists of 88 attestations of the forms: *nopiltze, nopilhuane, nopiltzine* and *nopilhuantzitizine* along with their variants: either with the noun *tlaco* (“precious”) or without the vocative ending *-e* used only in male speech. The material comes from 13 sources. None of the examples bears a possessive prefix other than the 1st person singular *no-*. It occurs even if the reference point is actually plural and the prefix expected would be *to-*, or our:

*in tetaoan qujtoa: Veh nopilhoâtitzitizine, quen vel ameoantin in oamopan muchiu, in tlein ie muchioaz* (Sahagün 2012 XII: 25)
The fathers of people said: “My children [= you, who listen]! How did it happen to you? What will happen?”

amanococ tictomachilican in totecujo, quen qujnonequítia, ca oc motequitilia, ca oc nelli techmoioocolia. Tle anqujomachitia totoecuoane, nopolhoantzitzine: ma tltaltech ximaxitican, ma amechmotlamatcatlalili in totecujo (ibid. VI: 146).

Let us perhaps have confidence in how our lord wants it, for he still works, for he still truly creates us. This is what you know, o our lords, my children [= you, who are listening to me]. May you approach the earth [= rest], may our lord give you peace.

O nopiltze, notelpuchtze: ca aocmo cenca titototzintli, ca ie timotlachialtia, ca ie timotlacaqujitia: izcatquj in cententli, in cencamatl, in tonequjxtil in tivevetque, in tilamatque: (ibid.: 215)

O my child [= listen], o my son, no longer are you a tiny little bird, you already see, you already hear [= you already understand things]. Here is one lip, one mouth [= one speech] which is an obligation of us, the old men, the old women [= the keepers of tradition].

In his translation of the entry nopiltze, fray Alonso de Molina ignores the presence of the possessive prefix and renders the term as “ola, hao, oys. para llamar a alguno” (Molina 1977 II: 73v). As the comparison with other vocative forms based on kin terms (see below) shows, it may suggest that in the discussed forms the pronoun no- (“my”) has frozen to the stem, becoming its inherent part (nopil-). Since it apparently does not correspond to a reference point, it can be treated as inoperative and omitted in translation.

Molina’s interpretation of nopiltze suggests that this form of address was of quite general nature. According to Horacio Carochi, the vocative ending -tze implied less reverence and affection than -tzine (Carochi 2001: 42-44). Its counterpart in plural was nopolhuane, characterized by the lack of any reverential morpheme. The two terms can be found in a number of contexts, used by and in reference to people of various social positions. In the

34 The translation of the three passages mine.
“Primeros Memoriales,” the teuctlatoque who admonished people during special gatherings begin their speech as follows:

\[
\text{nican n amonoltitoqz nopilhoane y ye tixquich y ye timuchi otiçenquiçaco in titecutli,}
\text{in tachcauhtli in titequiva in ticalpixqui in titelpuchtli, auh in tipilli in titlapallivi yn}
\text{titlamacazqui in titelpuchtli} \quad (\text{Sahagún 1997b: 232})
\]

Here you are, people; all of you have come forth together, you the lords, you the constables, you the valiant warriors, you the majordomos, you the youths, and you the noblemen, you the marriageable youths, you the priests, you the youths (ibid).

In the “Florentine Codex” a father whose wife had just delivered a baby is customarily greeted “nopiltze telpuchtle” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 195) or “my child [= listen], youth!” The newly elected ruler admonishes his subjects using nopilhuane in reference to brave warriors (ibid.: 70). A high dignitary uses this term when admonishing the inhabitants or authorities of an altepetl (“aoaque tepeoaque”) (ibid.: 82). In the “Crónica Mexicayotl,” a leader and god-carrier Quauhtlequetzqui addresses in this way all the Mexica (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 102-104). Finally, the passage from the “Primeros Memoriales” explicitly states that also commoners could have been called nopilhuane:

\[
\text{in tiçitl niman quicenteca in macevalti in oqcencaltilli, nimã ie q’nonotza quimilvia}
\text{nican amonoltitoqz nopilhoane} \quad (\text{Sahagún 1997b: 216})
\]

the soothsayer assembled the commoners together; he brought them into one house. Then he addressed them; he said: “you who are seated here, my children [= listen, J.M].”

In the examples above where social status is discernible, the speaker is of higher status than the addressee. However, we also deal with the opposite situation, for example when a high dignitary (“vei tecutlato”) instructs the newly installed tlatoani addressing him: nopiltze, totoce tlatoanje, noxviuhtze (Sahagún 2012 VI: 51), or “my child [= listen], o our lord, o ruler, o my grandson [= lord!]”. This example shows that it was not the status of the parties involved that governed the choice of the nopiltze/ nopilhuane form, but rather the lack of

35 T. Sullivan and H.B. Nicholson rendered the word “nopilhoane” as “my sons.”
necessity of creating much distance between interlocutors. *Nopiltze* and *nopilhuane* are usually found in the context of giving advice, teachings, admonitions, instructions or orders. In the “Florentine Codex,” there are also many examples where a speaker is an actual parent of an addressee (e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 87, 93, 105). Whatever the permanent social position of the interlocutors, the term *nopiltze/ nopilhuane* used by one of them implied that he assumed a role of a “teacher” or (less frequently) “commander,” while the primary referent was assigned a role of a “disciple” or “subject.” Even when the parties involved were a parent and a child, the -pil vocative was most likely meant to define their social roles – the giver and recipient of a *huehuetlatolli* – rather than kinship bond. Since the term -pil was used to address both subjects and disciples, one can assume that they were structurally equivalent in the classification system. The one who received a speech or was transmitted knowledge was perceived similarly to a ruler’s vassal: he temporarily took on the position subordinate in regard to the speaker.

Similar contexts are likewise found with the vocatives *nopiltzine* and *nopilhuantzitzine*, for example in the “Florentine Codex” when a midwife informs the relatives of a pregnant woman how she is to be taken care of (Sahagún 2012 VI: 158 – “nopilhoantzitzin”) or in the “Mapa Tlotzin” when Tecpoyoachcauhltli teaches Tlotzin the Toltec way of life (Thouvenot 1992: plate 2 – “nopiltzine”). However, a certain difference in usage can be detected between less and more reverential variants of the -pil vocatives. In the material I have gathered the former are never used by women (if the respective forms existed, they would probably be *nopiltzin* and *nopilhuan*), contrary to the latter. On the other hand, the -tzin(e) forms are almost never used in reference to actual children of a speaker. Both these features may result from the very fact that -tzin(e) was a more polite vocative form than -tz(e) and its plural variant (Carochi 2001: 44). It is found in much more elaborate phrases than the forms discussed above and tends to be more often juxtaposed with other honorifics:

*Nopilhoantzitzine, totecijoane: amotzontecontzin, amelchiqujuhtzin, atoconeoa tamechtocianmjctilia* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 136)
O my children [= you, who are listening], our lords, we make your heads, your chests [= your vitality] depart, we make you get tired.36

_Tle anqujmomachitia nopilhoantzitzin, tlaçotilaca, totecujiooan_ (ibid.: 182)

Take heed, o my children [= sirs, J.M.], precious persons, our lords (ibid).

_Auh injn nopilhoantzitzin totecujiooan, tlaçotilaca, noxviuhtitzinoan: acaçomo anmotlacaioctuxzinoa, in anmotzatzitia: aço ie itencopatzinco in tlalticpaque_ (ibid.: 154)

But, my children [= ladies, J.M.], our lords, precious persons, my grandchildren [= ladies, J.M.], perhaps ye do not create a person when ye lament; perhaps it is by command of the lord of the earth (ibid).37

In the “Florentine Codex,” one can come upon yet another _-pil_ vocative used only by women: _nonopilhuantzitzin_. It is unusual because it doubles the possessive prefix. Apart from _-pil_, none of the kin terms-based vocatives in the “Codex” displays this grammatical form. There is also no attestation of _-nopil_ combined with any other possessive prefix. There are only five examples of _nonopilhuantzitzin_ in the source and one of them suggests that here too, like in the case of other _-pil_ vocatives, the prefix _no_- is inoperative. It has a plural reference point:

```
auh in tenanoan qujtoa: Nonopilhoantzitzin, que ço uel amehoanti in anqujmaviçoqzque in tlein ie topan muchioaz: (Sahagún 2012 XII: 25)
```

And their mothers said: “My beloved sons, how will you marvel at what is about to befall you?” (ibid.)

Here, the discussed term appears in the context of an upcoming conquest when parents or elders (_tetahuan_ and _tenanhuan_) lament the fate of little children. While the men use the form _nopilhuantzitzine_, women express their concern by means of the vocative with double _no_- . This form seems to be, therefore, particularly associated with the “female speech.”

---

36 Translation mine.
37 In both citations C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson rendered the word _nopilhoantzitzin_ as “my sons.”
However, as has been demonstrated, women also used the forms with single *no-*; for example *nopilhuantzitzin*. The scarcity of data does not permit any conclusions on the connotations of the discussed form. It should be nevertheless noted, that the remaining four attestations in the “Florentine Codex” are also associated with the conquest, since they are used in the context of one of the omens which appeared before the coming of the Spaniards:

*Injc chiquacentlamantli tetzañtl, mjiecpa çihoatl cacoia chocatiuh, tzatzitiuh, ioaltica, cenca tzatzi: qujtotinemj, nonopilhoantzitzin ie ic çan ie touj* (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 18)

[As] the sixth omen, often was heard a woman, who went weeping and crying out at night. She cried out loudly; she went about saying: “O my beloved sons, now we are at the point of going!” (ibid.)

An interesting vocative form based on *-pil* can be found in the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan.” Tezcatlipoca, talking with Quetzalcoatl, addresses him several times with the term *nopiltzin*:

*Quilhui nopiltzin tlamacazqui ca nimomacehual ompa nihuitzin nonohualcatepetl itzintlan ma xicmottili in monacayotzin, niman cenmacac in Tetzcatl quilhui ma ximiximati ma ximotta nopiltzin* (Annales... 1992: f. 5)38

He said to him: “My child [= listen], offering priest, I am your vassal, I come from the place at the foot of the Nonoalca mountain. Take a look at your body.” Then he gave him the entire mirror. He said to him: “Recognize yourself, see yourself, my child [= you who listen to me].”39

From the terms *nopiltzin* and *tlamacazqui* it can be seen that Tezcatlipoca, although a male, does not apply the vocative ending *-e* to the forms of address. Other persons in the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan” do not follow this pattern. The form “nopiltzine” can be found on f. 23 while “nopiltzintzine” on ff. 50, 52 and 54. The manner of speaking ascribed to Tezcatlipoca may be a convention used in the “Toltec” variation of Nahuatl, reinforcing his identification as a Nonoalcatl. In the “Florentine Codex” we read:

38 I have revised the word division in Marc Thouvenot’s transcription.
39 Translated in consultation with the Spanish translation of Primo Feliciano Velázquez (Códice... 1975: 9).
These Tolteca, as is said, were Nahua; they did not speak a barbarous tongue. However, their language they called Nonoalca. They said as they conversed: “My noble lord; my lord younger brother; my lord elder brother” (ibid).

Interestingly, the word rendered by Dibble and Anderson as “lord,” on the basis of the Spanish version in the “Historia general” (“señor, señor hermano mayor, señor hermano menor” – Sahagún 2012 X: 170, n. 15), is actually teotl: a deity or divine fire. I have never otherwise seen this term used with an honorific sense – it may be another characteristic feature of the “Toltec” way of speaking. I have already mentioned the concept of the divine essence on the occasion of discussing the term -tlaçopiltzin. Here it is associated not only with -pil, but also with -iccauh and -achcauh. If the “Toltec speech” reflects an ancient version of Nahuatl (the vocative ending has not yet developed), it can be expected to associate important concepts in a more explicit way than the later “Aztec” version did. The usage of the term teotl in the context of polite speech suggests that not only kinship but deference as well were somehow conditioned by the concentration of the divine essence.

After the conquest the -pil vocatives were adopted by Spanish friars for their own purposes. In the material I have gathered nopiltze, nopilhuane, notlaçopiltze, notlaçopiltzine and notlaçopilhuane are almost always used by priests in reference to the native people. In only one case is it God who addresses angels as notlaçopilhuane, or “o my precious children!” (Sahagún 1986: 182). One of the most significant changes in the use of these terms was the widespread introduction of the reverential tlaço-. The forms with tlaço- do appear in prehispanic contexts but they are not very common: of all the sources analyzed here they can be found only in the huehuetlatolli of the “Florentine Codex” and in the accounts of Cristóbal del Castillo. They are used by parents or other relatives in reference to their actual children or younger relatives respectively and by midwives or visitors to a newborn in reference to the baby (Sahagún 2012 VI: 169-172, 194, 215). In “Historia de la venida de los mexicanos” Huitzilopochtli addresses with them the Mexica who throughout the source are described as his actual kin and, at the same time, subordinates (Castillo 2001: 110, 116). Exactly the same
contexts can be defined for the forms of address based on the term -xocoyouh (see: 1.3.3. -xocoyouh), and indeed, the two are quite often juxtaposed, for example:

Notlaçopiltzin, noxocoiohuñ izcatquij itatlalilli, machiotl qujlali in monan, in mata in Ioaltecuitli, in Ioalticitl: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 171)

O precious child, o dearest one, here it is the rule, the example which your mother, your father Yoaltecutli, Yoalticitl, have established.

O notlaçopiltze, noxocoiove: maiecuel, ma xonmovica: (ibid.: 215-216)

O precious child, O dearest one, let’s go, go there!

ic imiquiztempan oquimilhui in imacehualhuan. O Notlazopilhuanê, noxocoyohuanê (Castillo 2001: 116)

When he was on the verge of death, he said to his subjects: O precious children, O dearest ones! 40

In these contexts the vocative notlaçopil- does not create much distance and is flavored with affection rather than with particular reverence. Given the significance of tlaço- combined with -pil in indirect speech (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children) this affection may have been somehow undermined by the implication of the circulating essence.

Molina found the forms notlaçopiltze and notlaçopiltzine appropriate to render the phrase “mi amado hijo!” with which he addresses his reader throughout the Spanish part of his “Confessionario mayor.” He ignores the peculiarities of the endings -te and -tze which traditionally indicated lesser or greater distance between speakers and uses them interchangeably. The form notlaçopil- is removed from the usual context of intimate relations and transferred to the social situation that involves authority on the one side (an author of a book, teacher, sage in divine matters, representative of a dominant nation) and submission on the other (a reader, disciple, sinner, representative of conquered people). The element tlaço- is simply a literal rendering of the word “amado,” by no means preserving any trace of the

40 All of the three translations are mine.
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indigenous worldview. This pattern is followed likewise in the Sahagún’s sermon-like confutations of the “Florentine Codex,” though their Spanish version in the “Historia General” lacks the respective forms of address (Sahagún 2012 I: 62-67; 2001 I: 95-99). The term *notlacoçilhuane* used by God with reference to angels in the “Coloquios y doctrina cristiana” is rendered in the Spanish part of the source as “hijos y caualleros míos” (Sahagún 1986: 94, 182).

The texts written by the ecclesiastics use *nopilhuane* and *notlacoçilhuane* interchangeably, preferring, however, the latter. In the sources which record everyday situations rather than in sermons or doctrinal texts the element *tlaçoi-*, used in the contexts described above is absent. The priests address the natives *nopiltze*, *nopiltzine* or *nopilhuane* (e.g. Molina 1569: 20r, 48v-49r; Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 42). Although we cannot be sure in what manner these forms were actually understood by the Nahuas, they were certainly designed by the friars as literal renderings of the term “hijo” which served priests to address worshippers. This is indicated by the fact that in the sources the priests are always responded with “o my/ our father!” (e.g. Molina 1569: 16; Carochi 2001: 264; San Antonio 1997: 220) and not with the traditional honorifics based on the terms -*pil* or -*ixhuiuh* (see: 2.1.2. O supreme lord!).

In conclusion, the comparison between precontact and Spanish-influenced honorifics in Nahuatl shows that although they were used within the same language and were based on the same kind of classification system (a kinship system), they were entirely different. The traditional forms of address based on the term -*pil* served to render the subtleties of discourse, to indicate distance between interlocutors and to mark the “social focal point of the moment” (as Brant Gardner often puts it, see: Gardner 1982). The friars forced them into reflecting the hierarchical nature of their mutual relation with the natives. Although they still used the -*pil*-vocatives in their most common context of teaching, admonishing or commanding, the “teacher” could no longer have occupied either a higher or a lower position than his “disciple” in the social hierarchy. The role of disciples was permanently given to the natives and the respective kin term was destined to constitute a stiff social hierarchy. In relatively early sources such as the “Testaments of Culhuacan” or the “Bancroft Dialogues” the -*pil*-vocatives based on the Spanish classification system are put in the mouth of priests engaging in conversation with the Nahuas. It suggests that by the second half of the sixteenth century
these usages were already understood and appreciated by the Nahuas along with traditional ones.

1.1.6. Lords

Helga Rammow was the first to notice the particular form *nopiltzintzin(e)*, distinct from the plural of *nopiltzine*. It differs from the latter in that it doubles the reverential ending -*tzin*, instead of regularly reduplicating it as -*tzitzin* (Rammow 1964: 94, n. 28). It has to be noted that in this particular case the ending -*tzintzin* does not connote plural number and is never combined with the plural possessive ending -*huan*. Rammow quotes Ignacio Paredes, who noted in his edition of Carochi’s “Arte:”

> Cuidado, no se equivoque nopiltzin, mi hijo, con nopiltzintzin, que significa Señor; y se usa elegantemente cuando se habla con personas de calidad y carácter (Paredes 1910: 24)

The term is also given by fray Alonso de Molina, who glosses *nopiltzintzin(e)*: “a señor, vel. o señor, vel. señor (dize el que habla con persona de calidad)” (Molina 1977 II: 73v).

According to Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart, the double reverential ending “allows the word to be possessed and yet unambiguously retain its sense of «noble.»” However, as their analysis of the attestations of *nopiltzintzin(e)* in the “Bancroft Dialogues” points out, this term’s “possessiveness” is actually inoperative. Similarly to *nopiltze/ nopiltzine/ nopilhuane*, it combines only with the first person singular possessive prefix. I have not come upon a single attestation of the term -*piltzintzin(e)* used with other (mo-, i-, to-, amo-, in-) possessive prefixes. The form with no- is used even if the speaker is plural, for example:

> *Tlacatle, tlatoanie nopiltzintzine cihuapille ticnepechtequilia in teucyotl in tlatocayotl, ticpachoa in amomatzin in amocxitzin* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 118-119)

Oh lord, oh ruler, oh (my) nobleman, oh lady, we bow down to your lordship and rulership, we kiss your hands and feet (ibid.: 120).
Then they spoke to me; they said: (My) lord, we [do not wish yo] sadden you. Listen (ibid.: 219).

Then they spoke to me; they said to me: (My) lord, we [do not wish yo] sadden you. Listen (ibid.: 219).

This feature points to the fact that no- in nopiltzintzin(e) does not have a reference point, but rather is frozen to the stem, forming part of the honorific. Other conclusions of Karttunen and Lockhart demonstrate that this form is less flexible than the previously discussed vocatives.

Although it can be used in reference to both men and women, the speakers are only male, which is also confirmed in sources other than the “Bancroft Dialogues.” Moreover, nopiltzintzin(e) is invariant as to number, i.e. it can have both singular and plural primary referents (ibid.: 40), for example:

ca nechonnotz in amocol fran{co} xallacatl niman ye nechilhuia. Nopiltzintzine tla xiualmouica (San Antonio 1997: 234)

your senior official Francisco Xallacatl called out to me and then said to me: Nobleman, come (ibid.: 235).

Draw close, o lords, you, Miguel Iuhcatlatzin and you, Miguel Coatequitzin, I instruct you (pl.) (ibid.: 235). 42

Finally, nopiltzintzin(e) differs from other -pil vocatives in that it can likewise be used as an absolutive, so it not only serves as a polite form of address but a title as well, for example:

41 In all three citations I put the original “my” in parenthesis.
42 In both passages I removed the possessive prefix “my” from the original translations.
Ca onoconcac. ohualmotlayhuali yn niccauhtzin ŷ nopiltzintzin yn tecocoltzin
(Texcoca Accounts 1997: 188)

I have heard that my younger brother, the lord Tecocoltzin, has been sent as messenger
(ibid.: 189). 43

Since nopiltzintzin(e) lacks a normally functioning possessive prefix, it is useless when
it comes to describing kin relations. Similarly to nopiltze/ nopiltzine/ nopilhuane it is
sometimes found in reference to an actual kin, but even in these situations it should be
interpreted as a title or honorific rather than kinship designator. The manuscript “Memoriales
con Escolios” contains the annotations of fray Bernardino de Sahagún to Book 10 of the
“Florentine Codex.” They deal with the forms of address used by children of various social
classes with reference to their parents. According to this list, “el hijo del señor dize a su padre
nopiltzintzin. nopiltzintzine” (Sahagún 2012 X: 1, n. 2) and “el hijo del principal dize a su
madre nopiltzintzin. nopiltzintzine” (ibid.: 2, n. 6). These examples are sometimes interpreted
by the researchers in terms of “reciprocity:” children call their parents in the same way they
are referred to by their mother and father (Rammow 1964: 55-56; Díaz Rubio 1986: 67).
Obviously, no reciprocity can occur here. Although the form nopiltzintzin(e) has the same
root as the term for a child, -pil, it is not a kinship term. The annotations of Sahagún tell us
that, accordingly to the definition of Molina, children of the highest social status addressed
their parents “lady/ lord.”

The use of this title was not limited to the circle of the closest kinsmen. It is put in the
mouth of governors, noblemen, wedding guests, teachers, or “the Mexica” in general (see
e.g.: Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 112, 144, 164; Texcoca Accounts 1997: 188; Chimalpahin,
Tezozomoc 1997: 96). However, the primary referent of nopiltzintzin(e) is always a person of
high social status: a tlatoani, his wife, governor, nobleman or noblewoman. The “quality” of a
person spoken to is further stressed by other honorifics juxtaposed with this title of respect.
For instance, in the “Bancroft Dialogues” two noble boys address their mother: nopiltzintzine
tlacatle, cihuapille (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 142) – all three titles can be translated as “o
lady!” In another place in the same source a nobleman speaks to the governor: nopiltzintzine
tlatoanie (ibid.: 164), or o lord, o ruler.

43 As before.
I have not come upon any single attestation of the title nopiltzintzin(e) in the clearly “colonial” context. It is absent from the ecclesiastical literature, although the friars were obviously familiar with this form as is evident from the dictionary of Molina.

1.1.7. Compound terms based on -pil

Fray Alonso de Molina records the term oquichpiltzintli which he glosses as “niño o muchacho” (Molina 1977 II: 77v) and cihuapiltzintli, “moçuela” (ibid.: 22v). The terms are based on piltzintli, a child, plus a sex modifier, producing a male child and a female child respectively. They are not honorific forms, as Frances Karttunen suggests (Karttunen 1992a: 180). -Tzintli is a diminutive here and serves to distinguish a child from a nobleman (pilli). The possessive forms related to both terms which act as kin terms are -oquichpil and -cihuapil. They exist in modern Nahuatl de la Huasteca, connoting a son and a daughter respectively, regardless of the sex of the reference point.44 As far as colonial texts are concerned, I was not able to find them employed for an actual son or daughter. Nevertheless, I have decided to discuss them briefly. My material comes mostly from the central part of the Nahuatl-speaking area and since north of it the terms are at present used as kin terms, it is likely that in the colonial times they were, in some regions, employed in the same way. Moreover, -cihuapil is easy to be mistaken for a possessive form of cihuapilli, a noblewoman.45 As the following discussion will demonstrate, it is, however, a counterpart of -oquichpil which does not come from oquichpilli – a nobleman is simply pilli. It means that both terms developed on the basis of the kin term -pil, combined with a sex modifier. Finally, a closer look at -cihuapil and -oquichpil may provide a background for analyzing a puzzling term -telpochpil (see below).

There are five attestations of -oquichpil registered in my database and they are all used within polite speech. Interestingly, while the singular -pil would undoubtedly have a male reference point, -oquichpil appears only with a female reference point. The referent is always

44 http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso, consulted Jan 18, 2013.
45 In Cristóbal del Castillo’s “Historia de la conquista” the Nahua concubines of the Spaniards are called in inmecahuan, in incihuapilhuan (Castillo 2001: 147), or “their concubines, their noblewomen.” Here -cihuapil obviously does not refer to a female child.
male. The term is used by a midwife who welcomes a newborn baby boy: “noxocoioih, noquichpiltzin, notelpuchtzin” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 167), or “dearest one, my male child, boy;” by a groom’s mother giving thanks to an elder for delivering a huehuetlatolli: “Noquichpiltzin noconetzin” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 116), or “my male child, lord,” and “noquichpiltzin tlaçotli tlacatzintli,” or “my male child, precious personage, proper man” (ibid); and in a conversation between Illancueitl and her husband Huehue Acamapichtli, the tlatoani of Colhuacan: noquichpiltzin (Chimalpahin 1997 II: 88). The first example may suggest that noquichpiltzin was used to stress the gender of the person spoken to (similarly to notelpochtzin, see: 1.3.2. -telpoch). It was certainly reverential, though, as forms of address with which it was juxtaposed show, suitable for both the tender and official way of speaking.

Brant Gardner observes that on fray Andrés de Olmos’ list of kin terms nocihuapiltzin is classified as “a daughter” (Gardner 1982: 104). Similarly to -oquichpil, all occurrences of this term that I came across belong to the sphere of polite speech. The two terms seem to be the exact counterparts of each other: nocihuapiltzin is used only by women in reference to women and comes up in similar contexts as noquichpiltzin. In a huehuetlatolli, an elderly noblewoman addresses a young mother (her daughter?): nocihuapiltzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 146, 156); noblewomen argue among themselves referring to each other: “noconetzin noçivapiltzin” (Sahagún 1997b: 295), or “my child [= lady], my female child;” a midwife says to a newborn girl, cutting her umbilical cord: “Nochpuchtzin, nocioapiltzin” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 172), or “my daughter [= girl], my female child;” and an old woman admonishes her young relative before she enters the calmecac: “nochpuchtzin, nocioapiltzin, noxocoioih” (ibid.: 218), or my daughter [= girl], my female child, my youngest child [= dearest one].

As in the case of noquichpiltzin, nocihuapiltzin is juxtaposed with either tender or formal forms of address and it seems to stress the gender of the referent.

In my database there is one attestation of -telpochpil, which is the combination of -telpoch, or “a (grown) son” and -pil, or “a (man’s) child.” Thelma Sullivan and Henry B. Nicholson take it to be based on telpochti, or “a male youth,” and render the term as “youth

---

46 For an explanation of such a translation of the accompanying kin terms, see: 1.2.1. -Coneuh in polite speech, 1.3.2. -Telpoch and 1.3.3. -Xocoyouh.
47 As before, see also: 1.3.1. -Ichpoch.
child,” that is, a child of a woman (!) conceived before marriage. The whole phrase in which the term is to be found is translated:

\[\text{auh yehoatl i, yn ichpochtli: yehoatl quimati yn ita yn aço cana cocchotiz: auh yn iconeuh yn çiuatl, amo, quiuicaya, çan conanaya, yn itta moteneuaya, ytelpochpiltzin (Sahagún 1997b: 219).}\]

And as for the girl, when her father knew that perhaps somewhere she was to take a husband, and when her child was a girl, she did not take [the child] with her; rather, her father took [the child]. She was called her youth child (ibid.: 219-220).

Normally, the term -pil in singular could not have a woman as a reference point. However, in view of -oquichpil and -cihuapil above, it can be assumed that -pil combined with certain modifiers was excluded from this principle. If -telpochpil functioned parallelly to -oquichpil, it should have a female counterpart, -ichpochpil. I have not found this term in texts, but Molina has the entry: “Ichpochpiltzintli. moçuela” (Molina 1977 II: 32v), though he fails to record telpochpiltzintli.

Following the parallel with -oquichpil, telpoch- in -telpochpil is more likely to indicate the gender of the child rather than the young age of his mother. Actually, I believe that if there were a need to stress by means of terminology the fact that the child was born by an unmarried woman, the relevant term would be based on ichpochtli (a young woman), rather than telpochtli (a young man). Therefore, it would make more sense if the passage in question presented an alternative: if a child was a girl, she was not taken, but if it was a boy, he was accepted. I suggest the translation of the passage to be as follows:

And as for the girl, when her father knew about it, she would perhaps take a husband somewhere. And when her child was a girl, she would not accompany [the maiden’s] father, he would only take to him [the maiden’s] male child.
1.2. -CONEUH

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses the term -pil as “hijo, o hija de alguno” (Molina 1977 II: 103r), thus implying that it was used by both mothers and fathers. Nevertheless, a separate term for a child existed, -coneuh, which was used almost only with the female reference point (Molina 1977 I: 71r), at least in the actual kinship context. Strikingly enough, -coneuh hardly ever appears in plural. Actually, I have been able to find this form only when it did not bear a possessive prefix. For example, in Juan Bautista’s “Huehuetlatolli” we read:

*auh in tetecuhitin in tlahtoque in pipiltin in cocone* (Bautista 2008: 42v)

lords, rulers, nobles [described with absolutive forms of *pilli* and *conetl*].

Here the term *cocone* forms a doublet with *pipiltin*, indicating that both Nahuatl terms for children were used to mark social groups. In his testament, a male descendant of Ixtlilxochitl uses the term -pil when describing kinship ties and *cocone* in order to point out to a specific social status:


My children will take it because they are the royal children who descend from the great nobleman Ixtlilxochitl.48

However, the significance of the term *cocone* was not limited to the nobility. Chimalpahin describes the intentions of black rebel slaves in the following way:

*quil ynin ye quincahuazquia ypanpa ynic quinmachtizquia huel quimixtlamachtizquia yn inpilhuan tiltilque yn ica mochi tlamachiliztli yn ixquich quinomachiltia. ynic no oc yehuantin quil teopixcatizquia missa quichihuazquia yn cacatzac cocone* (Chimalpahin 2006: 222).

48 My translation.
reportedly they were going to spare them [the priests] so that they would teach and instruct the children of the blacks in all knowledge, everything that they know, so that black children too, reportedly, would become religious and perform mass (ibid.: 223).

Here the phrase *cacatzac cocone*, or black children, is used along with *inpilhuan tliltique*, or the children of blacks, but the two should not be perceived as synonymous, and *cacatzac cocone* does not denote high social status. *Conetl* in its absolutive form was joined to animals’ names resulting in the terms for cubs, for example *canauhconetl*, or baby duck, and *cacatzac* had a negative connotation of dirtiness (Olko 2012b: 179). It is possible that Chimalpahin chose to use *cocone* with the aim of showing disdain to rebel slaves.

Whether referring to high social status or showing disdain, the plural (and unpossessed) form of *conetl* is attested only outside the actual kinship area. When describing the relationship between a mother and a child, it always has the singular form, even when the context points to the plural meaning of the term, for example: *ca tellamo miac niciapia noconeuh ca ça niquxcahua y noxihuato nochito*, or “I don't have many children; the only one I have is little Juan alone” (Lockhart 1991: 72-73). Earlier in the document the same person gives a similar statement: *camo miactin niquipian nopilhua ca ça yehuatl y noxihuato ca çan icelto*, or “I don’t have many children, only my little Juan, the only child” (ibid.: 71-72).

As these examples show, as far as children were concerned, if plurality needed to be expressed, women would use either the “female” term *-coneuh* in singular or the plural form of *-pil*. José Luis de Rojas suggests that *-coneuh* may in fact be a collective noun, though in the dictionary of Molina it also seems to be particularly associated with singularity. The terms given by Molina for a single child, “centeconetl” and “ycel conetl” (Molina 1977 I: f. 71r) do not have their *-pilli* counterparts. Perhaps this phenomenon can be explained by the semantic field of the root *-cone* which appears in many words related to a fetus or infant. These are for example: *conechichilli* and *conechichilpil*, or a baby (lit. a child fed with milk), *conecuitlatl*, or baby’s excrement, *conequimiliuhcayotl*, or diapers, *conematlatl*, or an amniotic sac (Molina 1977 I: 102v; II: 24v). In her dictionary, Frances Karttunen has the word *coconetl*, or a doll (Karttunen 1992a: 39). A single woman can have several children but most often only

---

49 Personal communication, May 07, 2012.
Caterina Pizzigoni observes that in the late colonial testaments from the Toluca Valley the term -pil changes its meaning and begins to be employed as a male counterpart of -ichpoch (see: 1.1. -pil). She likewise has tested -coneuh for the parallel loss of non-genderness but the results are ambiguous. Although all the children she has found labeled with this term are male,

in some instances the word is used for not having children, which would imply that it applies to either gender (Pizzigoni 2007: 19).

In the material I have gathered the latest example of the term -coneuh as used in reference to a girl comes from 1608, the area of Coyoacan (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 99), while the one in reference to a boy (not counting Jesus Christ as the son of Virgin Mary) – from 1737, the Valley of Toluca (Pizzigoni 2007: 77).

As James Lockhart notes, there are examples of -coneuh attested in the sources with the male reference point (Lockhart 1992: 74). The only such attestations in the biological sphere that I have found come from a very late (1776) Tlaxcalan testament. The testator, don Félix Martín Ramos repeatedly refers to his children as noconetzitzinhuan. Thus, he not only uses the term with the male reference point, but also, unusually, in plural (Offut 438-443). Addressing his children individually, he employs the singular form noconetzin (ibid.: 440) while speaking of his wife and himself as the reference point for the children, he chooses the term topilhuan (ibid.: 438). It has to be noted, that when Chimalpahin speaks of a child of both mother and a father, he uses a doublet composed of “male” and “female” terms, for example: ynpiltzin ynconeuh yn contador ybarguen catca yhuan Doña catalina de Alçega, or “the child of the late royal accountant Ibarquen and doña Catalina de Alcega” (Chimalpahin 2006: 230-231). Interestingly, in the “Florentine Codex” a tlatoani refers to his son in tinopiltzin, in tinoconeuh (Sahagún 2012 VI: 105), as if he were acting as both mother and a father. Actually, the doublet can be interpreted as corresponding to in -nan in -ta, which was employed to indicate a person who delivers a huehuetlatolli (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta).
There are earlier examples where both parents are the reference point for -coneuh. In 1586, doña Juana de Guzmán states:

\[ \text{yc missa topan mittoz yn tonehuan notlaçonamictzin moyetzticatca dios oquimohuiquili señor don pedro de sotomor canel ayac çe toconetzin monemiltia} \]  
(\text{Lockhart 1991: 83})

and masses will be said with it for both of us, my dear late husband señor don Pedro de Sotomayor, whom God took, and me, since no child of ours is alive (ibid).

In 1583, a fiscal writes in a posthumous statement:

\[ \text{auh ypampa y nican nicnezayotia aocac ynconeuh oquicauhtiaque mochintin omomiquillique auh atle quichiuhtiaque testamento çan yuh momiquillique} \]  
(\text{Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 194}).

The reason I manifest this here is because they left no children; all of them died, and they made no testament; they just died (ibid.: 195).

The phrase “all of them died” may suggest that more people than just a married couple were meant here – perhaps all members of the household. In such case, “ynconeuh” has more a flavor of “their heirs” than “their children.” In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” a tlatoani says to his daughter: \text{cuix ticmjtalhvia in titoconetzin ma njnochioa, ma njtlacati,} or “Wilt thou perchance say, thou who art our child, ‘I make myself, I form myself’”? (\text{Sahagún 2012 VI: 96}). Moreover, in the same source the reference point of \text{toconetzin} is also formed by the elders of the family who described with this term a newly delivered woman (ibid.: 180), as well as by the entire community, including a midwife who is the speaker: \text{oquenteltzin yionjca, teputzco qujtlaz in jchpuchtzintli, in piltzintli, in toconetzin:}, or “In some manner, in his absence, the maiden hath cast forth the baby, our child” (ibid). Contrary to \text{topiltzin} which often describes men of authority, \text{toconetzin} is applied in a tender manner of speaking for women and children. Perhaps the connotations of both terms are similar, referring to individuals important, for different reasons, for a community.

I have also found attestations of -coneuh with the male reference point outside the actual kinship context. As in the case of don Félix Martín Ramos’ -conetzitzinhuan, they
come from an eighteenth-century document, though this time originating in the Valley of Toluca. The phrase “Dios yconetzin,” or the child of God (here apparently: “a good Christian,” “a simple man”) is used there interchangeably with the usual Dios ipiltzin (Lockhart 1991: 108).

1.2.1. -coneuh in polite speech

Another level on which the term -coneuh operated was polite speech. In this area it is similar to nopiltzintzin(e) (see: 1.1.6. Lords) in that it can be found in either vocative (direct speech) or absolutive (indirect speech), for example:

Noconetzin ye iuh oquimochiulique ye iuh oquimopulhuique tlacatl motlatzin notecuiyo (San Antonio 1997: 230)

My child, they did this to the lord your uncle, my lord; thus they ruined him (ibid.: 231).

quēn nitlācatl, in tla ōquimomachiti in noconetzin in tlein nopan ōmochiuh?

q serà de mi si mi padre [sic!] sabe lo que me ha sucedido? (Carochi 2001: 418-420)

Nevertheless, the honorifics based on the term -coneuh stand out from polite forms of address based on -pil in that they are quite irregular, as far as both grammatical and contextual matters are concerned. I have been able to find fifteen attestations of -coneuh-based vocatives: thirteen, as expected, have the 1st person singular possessive prefix no- and the reverential ending -tzin (noconetzin). Two, however, bear no possessive prefix and the resulting form is conetzin: Hotzin cocotzin, tepitzin, conetzin, nochpuchtzin or “O dove, little one, child, my daughter” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 99) and noxocoiouh conetzin, cocotzin, tepitzin, or “my youngest one, child, dove, little one” (ibid.: 102). Perhaps in these examples the possessive prefix was omitted inadvertently, because Horacio Carochi, who copied one of them into his “Arte,” complemented the stem with no- (Carochi 2001: 458). On the other hand, conetzin is repeated twice in the same speech, in both cases accompanied with another, “regular” form of address: “nochpuchtzin” and “noxocoiouh” respectively. While in the case of -pil-based
vocatives the prefix *no-* has been proven to be inoperative, here I have not been able to find any plural reference point hidden under the singular prefix.

Both polite forms of address and titles based on *-coneuh* are used only by women\(^{50}\) – the pattern which can be perceived as an extension of the usage of this term in the biological sphere. Interestingly, as Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart (1987: 40) note for the “Bancroft Dialogues” and as other sources I have analyzed confirm, the honorific *nopiltzintzin(e)* is used solely by male speakers. This fact points to the possibility of these terms being the counterpart of each other in “female” and “male speech.” In the list of terms with which parents from various social classes are addressed by their children, a son of a “principal” or “señor” addresses his parents *nopiltzintzin(e)* while a daughter of the same class refers to them *noconetzin* (Sahagún 2012 X: 1, n. 2, 2, n. 6). Moreover, the “female” form of address often goes accompanied with the same honorifics as the “male” one (see: 1.1.7. Lords), for example: *Noconetzin, totecujo, tlaçotitlacatl* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 179), or “o my lady, o our lady, o precious person!” However, there is another side to the coin, too. While *nopiltzintzin(e)* was employed only for noblemen, in the “Primeros Memoriales,” as Helga Rammow notes, the term *noconetzin* is used virtually in the same way between women of high and low social classes (Rammow 1964: 94). The only difference is that one of the noblewomen puts an honorific “toteco” (Sahagún 1997b: 294-295), or “our lady,” and another – “noçivapiltzin,” or “my female child” (see: 1.1.7. Compound terms based on -pil), after the kin term while the commoners avoid honorifics. Moreover, while *nopiltzintzine* is put in the mouth of various classes of people, the vocative *noconetzin* is used mainly among relatives or people remaining in intimate relations with each other. A close relative of a newly delivered woman employs it in reference to the midwife (Sahagún 2012 VI: 179), it is put in the mouth of a mother who addresses her daughter (Carochi 2001: 458), or is used by an aunt who addresses her nephew (San Antonio 1997: 228-230). These data suggest that although the vocative *noconetzin* was undoubtedly very polite, it was not an exact counterpart of *nopiltzintzine* and drew less distance between speakers than the “male” term.

The non-vocative forms of *-coneuh* used as the titles of respect present even more problems in interpretation. Firstly, they are not grammatically uniform like *nopiltzintzin(e)* is,

---

\(^{50}\) Female speakers do not add a vocative ending to a noun’s stem, so in the texts the vocative forms look exactly the same as non-vocatives.
since they appear as either reverential (-conetzin) or non-reverential (-coneuh) forms. For instance, in the “Texcoca Accounts” doña Marina says, referring to Cortés: Ca ye mohuica in noconetzin in Capitan (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 186), or “for my lord, the Captain, is going,” and subsequently to Tocpacxochtli, a royal son and Cortés’ ally: Catli in noconeuh in Tocpacxochitzin (ibid.: 188), or “where is my lord Tocpacxochtizin?” In a 1548 document from Coyoacan, a woman named Ana sells her land to the tlatoani of Coyoacan whom she calls: yn noconeuh yn tlatohuani in don juā (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 93), or “my lord, the ruler, don Juan” and y noconeuh yn tlactl coyacan do juatzin (ibid.), or “my lord, lord of Coyoacan, don Juan.” Karttunen and Lockhart suggest that the term noconeuh might be used here with the sense “my relative of the succeeding generation” (ibid.: 92) but in view of the examples from the “Texcoca Accounts” it seems that it is meant to be an honorific title.

In the above translations, I purposefully took into account the possessive prefix no- because, unlike in nopiltzintzin, in the case of -coneuh-based titles of respect it is undoubtedly operative. In my sample they can likewise be found combined with the 2nd person singular possessive prefix mo-, resulting in the form moconetzin (“your lord”), used by a mother in reference to her daughter’s father: ca otoconmocujli, ca otoconmanjli yn ihijotzin in moconetzin. in tlacatl in motecujotzin, or “thou hast grasped the spirit of thy child, the master, thy lord” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 99). This feature, as well as the lack of plural referents for the prefix no- in my material, suggests that the terms based on -coneuh have not yet been fully transformed into honorifics at the time of contact. While the morphological traits of nopiltzintzin(e) allow to clearly differentiate it from actual kin terms, in the case of -coneuh such differentiation can only be done on the basis of context. Lockhart finds linguistic evidence that may suggest later development of the term -coneuh in regard to other basic Nahuatl kinship terms (Lockhart 1992: 496, n. 63). Perhaps this is the reason why it also came into use relatively late as an honorific.

1.3. TERMS INDICATING GENDER AND RELATIVE AGE
1.3.1. -ichpoch

The absolutive form *ichpochtli* is glossed by fray Alonso de Molina as “virgen, o muger por casar” (Molina 1977 II: 32v). The translation “virgin” was a European innovation and in prehispanic times the term simply meant “an adolescent girl” or “young woman” (Burkhart 1989: 150; 1996: 197). According to Alfredo López Austin it referred to secondary sexual traits: “she of the dark down” (López Austin 1989 I: 289). Molina renders the possessive form (*teichpoch*) as “hija de alguno, o de alguna,” or one’s (male’s or female’s) daughter (Molina 1977 II: 94r). Just like -*pil* it could have been extended to the kin who were raised by their guardian and thus fulfilled the social role of his or her “daughters.” For example, in the “Testaments of Culhuacan” María Tiacapan, who lived in the house of her uncle, don Antonio Tlemachica, is introduced as “tlemachica ychpoch,” or “the daughter of Tlemachica”51 (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 174). In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” there are several examples where a young woman is called a “daughter” of her elder relatives (*huehuetque ilamatque*) and even of the relatives of her future husband who announce when the wedding begins:

*Tamechtomauhtilizque: ca tictanjlico in tochpuchtzin, ma icxitzin qujmanjli: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 131)*

We shall cause you to be frightened, for we have to come to take our daughter. May she undertake the journey (ibid).

The kinship term -*ichpoch* referred most often to daughters “ready to marry,” or, speaking more generally, grown ones. According to Brant Gardner, it originated in the absolutive *ichpochtli* which described the stage of maturity (Gardner 1982: 94). -*Pil* and -*coneuh* were used to speak about little girls, often in the context of either their birth (see e.g. Chimalpahin 2006: 232, 234) or securing their future in the case of parents’ death (see e.g. Cline, León Portilla 1984: 26; San Antonio 1997: 222-224). -*Ichpoch*, on the other hand, usually appears in reference to already married daughters (e.g. Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 74-76), or ones mature enough to be married soon. Marriage or sexual relations are

51 S.L. Cline and M. León-Portilla give the translation “young woman of Tlemachica” but both the lack of the absolutive ending and the information included in the testament speak in favor of my interpretation.
common contexts for this term: a wicked priest tried to rape Juan Vicente’s -ichpoch (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 170); black slaves were plotting to dishonor the viceroy’s -ichpochhuan (Chimalpahin 2006: 220) and a grandson of Acamapichtli married the ruler’s of Tollan -ichpoch (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 117). Likewise, in the “Florentine Codex” the vices of “a bad daughter” are associated with sexual relations: she is “tlaueliloc (...) cuecuech, (...) ciuatlaueliloc (...) auilnemi, auilquiztinemi” etc., or “perverse, dissolute, a whore, she is given to pleasure; a courtesan” (Sahagún 2012 X: 3). As Louise Burkhart notices, in precontact times the absolutive ichpochtli was a name for the earth goddess in her nubile aspect (Burkhart 1989: 154).

In the eighteenth-century testaments from the Toluca Valley, Caterina Pizzigoni notes the tendency to use the term -ichpoch in reference to little girls. In such cases, the diminutive suffix -ton was added to the stem, forming -ichpochton, or one’s little daughter (Pizzigoni 2007: 19). This form was not an innovation because already in the sixteenth-century “Testaments of Culhuacan” we read: otlaciquiuhtepiton (sic) oquicouh ychpochton alguacil mayor v tel cacahuatl, or “the young daughter of the alguacil mayor bought a small reed basket for five cacao beans” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 42-43). In this example, however, the term is apparently used for a girl mature enough to take part in the auction of the estate. 52 On the other hand, the attestations found by Pizzigoni describe children who are still being raised by their parents (e.g. Pizzigoni 2007: 89, 100). One of the testators even clearly distinguishes between three of his nochpoch (“my daughter”), for whom he arranged marriage and a nochpochton (“my little daugther”), whose marital situation is not mentioned (ibid.: 128-129). Thus, the usage of -ichpoch in the eighteenth century would reflect the emerging need to differentiate the sex of little children. This is not to mean that in the early colonial or precontact period children were considered entirely nongendered. The speeches of midwives discussed below made use of either boy or girl terminology, depending on the sex of a newborn. In the “Bancroft Dialogues” the term -ichpoch is applied to little girls on the occasion of the execution of a daughter of Axayacatl, punished for a transgression of sexual

52 As will be seen below, the suffix -ton not always conveyed the sense of “little.” When combined with the terms for siblings, it was used for great-grandchildren, and great-grandparents. It is not impossible, therefore, that this early example of -ichpochton likewise describes a relation different from the one of a father and a daughter. Unfortunately, more data is required for this idea to be tested.
character. The term stresses the fact that the story was destined particularly for women – it was supposed to serve as a moral example for them:

\[ \text{quinhualhuicaque izcihuapipiltin in imichpochhuan; inmanel ye coçolco onoque, inic quintlachialtique} \] (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 154)

the ladies brought along their daughters, even though they might still be in the cradle, to have them see (ibid.: 155).

Outside the kinship sphere -ichpoch is to be found employed in the same contexts as -pil. It is used to describe someone’s belonging to a group or community (see: 1.1.3. One of us), for example the women of Colhuacan are called “yn imichpochhuan yn culhuaque,” or “the daughters of the Colhuaque” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 94). In another passage from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” the form with the indefinite personal possessive prefix is used: oncan teychpoch yn accotlan cihuateopen, or “she was a daughter from Acxotlan Cihuateopen” (ibid.: 152). Concurrently, the characteristic form tochpoch or tochpochtzin (“our daughter,” “a woman who is one of us”) appears in the sources, for example when the Mexica decide that the wife of their first tlatoani, Acamapichtli, will be his adoptive mother Illancueitl from Colhuacan. She is then expected to become a “daughter of the Mexica,” i.e. a Mexica woman: ma conmochihuilitiuh yn tochpotzin. yn cihuapilli. yn illancueytl, or “let the noblewoman Illancueitl come to be our daughter” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 114-115).

Along with -pil and -coneuh, -ichpoch is yet another term for a child employed in addressing people. Similarly to -pil, in the vocative it is combined solely with the 1st person singular possessive prefix, even if the speaker is plural, for example:

\[ \text{njman ie ic qujnonotza in vevetque, qujitlapaloa, quellaquaoa: qujlvia. Nochpuchtze ca njcan timoietztica} \] (Sahagún 2012 VI: 130)

Thereupon the old men addressed her, greeted her, animated her. They said to her: “O my daughter, thou art here” (ibid).

\[ \text{Auh ioan jlamatque: njman qujnonotza, qujnanaoatia in cioamontli: qujlvia. Nochpuchtzin: ca njcan mjtzellaquaoa, in monanoan, in motaoan} \] (ibid.: 132)
And also the [groom's] old women then admonished her; they counseled the daughter-in-law. They said to her: “My daughter, thy mothers, thy fathers encourage thee here” (ibid).

The vocatives based on -ichpoch can be found with different suffixes, connoting either less (-tze) or more reverence (-tzine). The former are used for instance by a ruler who addresses his daughter (Sahagún 2012 VI: 93-94, 98), by parents-in-law who admonish their pregnant daughter-in-law (ibid.: 142) or by an elder speaker who instructs a bride as to her future obligations (Karttunen, Lockhart 1986: 110). The last example specifically identifies the form of address nochpochtze as a sort of title, since the speaker is certainly not the girl’s father – he directs his next speech to the couple’s parents. When speaking to the bride and the groom as a couple, he calls them nopilhuane (ibid.: 109), which would suggest that the two terms may have had similar connotations (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms). Indeed, in all the examples listed here and many more in the sources the women addressed nochpochtze are being admonished or instructed. The lack of accompanying honorifics further confirms the relatively small deference implied in the term. Nochpochtze is juxtaposed with such forms of address as: cocotze (“o dove!”), tepitze (“o little one!”) (Sahagún 2012 VI: 94, 98) or nopiltze (“hey, you!”) (ibid.: 98). These observations are valid as well as far as the female vocative nochpochtzin is concerned. I have not come upon nochpoch in the vocative whence I must assume that nochpochtzin was the “female” counterpart of nochpochtze in polite speech. It is used for example by a mother with reference to her daughter (ibid.: 99), by elder women who admonish a bride (ibid.: 132), or by a midwife with reference to both a woman in childbirth (ibid.: 160) and a newborn girl (ibid.: 167). The forms of address which accompany it are for example: cocotzin, tepitzin (ibid.: 99), noxocoyouh (“o dearest one!,” see: 1.3.3. -xocoyouh), but also cihuapilli (“o noblewoman!”) (ibid.: 167).

The second group of attestations of -ichpoch in polite speech is characterized both by morphemes connoting more reverence and by more impressive titulature accompanying the term. The difference is detectable especially in female speech: the contexts in which the discussed forms are used are no longer instructions or admonitions, but greetings or solemn rites. In the “Primeros Memoriales” a noblewoman replies to the greeting of another lady: nicā timovicatz notecuïyoçihoatl nochpuchticatzin, or “you are welcome here, my lady, my maiden.” When these noblewomen quarrel, one of them addresses the other
“nochpuchticatzin,” omitting only the honorific -tecuiyo, or a lady (Sahagún 1997b: 295). Horacio Carochi informs us that preterit agentives of verbs ending in -ti were sometimes used by women as nouns to address somebody in a formal way (Carochi 2000: 311, n. 4) and the texts provide evidence that men likewise employed them (see e.g. the form noxhuiuhticatzin – with the vocative ending characteristic for male speech, Sahagún 2012 VI: 141). Equally reverential, though perhaps more affectionate, was the form with the element tlaço-, or precious. In the “Florentine Codex” it is used by a midwife in a farewell to a woman who died in childbirth: ma xitechalmomachiti notlaçoichpuchtzin, quauhcioatl, cioapilli, or “visit us, my precious maiden, valiant woman, noble woman!” (ibid.: 165). In the “Bancroft Dialogues” a woman greets her relative: otemihiyohuitl noconetzin notlaçoichpochtzin, or “greetings my child, my dear daughter!” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 106).

The only two examples of the -ichpoch vocatives ending in -tzine (male speech) that I have are likewise set in the context of greetings. They combine both affectionate (cocotze, tepitze) and respectful (noxhuiuhtzine, xocoyotle) forms of address. In the second example the two forms: nochpochtze and nochpochtzine are juxtaposed, which points to the fact that the difference between them was indeed subtle:

_Tle ticmomachitia, tle ticmatcatzintli, noxiuhtzine, nochpuchtzine, cocotze, tepitze, xocoitle_ (Sahagún 2012 VI: 184)

Be of good cheer. Rest in peace, O my granddaughter, O my daughter, O dove, O little one, O youngest child! (ibid).

_Nochnputze, nochputzine, ciuapille, cioapiltzintle, otiquihjiovi, oticiauh_ (Sahagún 2012 IV: 114)

O my daughter, O my beloved daughter, my lady, my beloved lady, thou hast endured suffering and fatigue (ibid).

Generally speaking, the -ichpoch vocatives are found in a variety of contexts and they do not seem to be particularly attached to any set social situation. They are, however,

---

53 Notecuiyocihuatl should be analysed as the possessed noun notecuiyo plus the absolutive noun cihuatl. If we dealt here with the compound of two stems, notecuiyocihuauh or noteuccihuauh would be a result.
frequently employed in speeches designed specifically for girls (e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 93-94, 98, 105, 116, 215). They are also indicated as an alternative for -telpoch vocatives (see below) in cases when a speech can be delivered to either a man/ boy or a woman/ girl, for example to a newborn:

qujlvia. Noxocoiouh, notelpuchtzin, anoço qujlvia: nochpuchtzin: ma itech ximixiti in monan, in mota, in chalchiuhtli icue, in chalchiuhtlatonac (Sahagún 2012 VI: 176)

she said to it: “My youngest child, my grown son,” or she said, “My grown daughter, approach thy mother, thy father, Chalchiuitl icue, Chalchiuhtlatonac!” (ibid.)

qujlvia. Oticmjhijovilti, oticmociavilti noxocoiove notelpuchtze, anoco, nochpuchtze (ibid.: 192)

[The speaker] said: “Thou has suffered, thou hast endured fatigue, O my youngest son, O my grown son, or O my grown daughter” (ibid).

From this data as well as from the connotations of -ichpoch in indirect speech, I suggest that the main function of -ichpoch vocatives was stressing the female gender of a referent. Depending on a context it should be then translated as “O girl!,” “O woman!,” or “O lady!” This conclusion will be further supported by the results obtained from the analysis of -telpoch vocatives.

1.3.2. -telpoch

-Telpoch is the male counterpart of -ichpoch. It derives from the absolutive telpochtli, or “mancebo” (Molina 1977 II: 96v) and is glossed by fray Alonso de Molina (“tetelpuch”) as “hijo o mācebo ya crecido de alguno,” or one’s son or grown youth (Molina 1977 II: 106v). James Lockhart observes that both -telpoch and -ichpoch are absent from the lists of kin terms made by fray Andrés de Olmos and fray Bernardino de Sahagún. He perceives it as an

54 C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson rendered “noxocoiouh” as “my youngest one,” “notelpuchtzin” as “my beloved youth” and “nochpuchtzin” as “my beloved maiden.” In the example below “my youth” and “my maiden” were the translations of “notelpuchtze” and “nochpuchtze” respectively.
indication that these terms were late (though not colonial) innovations in the terminological system which otherwise “would have contained literally no sex distinctions for junior relatives” (Lockhart 1992: 74-75, 496). Similarly to ichpochtli, the absolutive telpochtli described the age class between childhood and adulthood, referring to sexually mature youths: Alfredo López Austin analyzes the term as “he of the dark protuberance” (López Austin 1989 I: 289). After the (spiritual) conquest it was likewise charged with the connotation “virgin” (Burkhart 1989: 150-151).

As far as the use of this term is concerned, a number of parallels with -ichpoch can be pointed out. -Telpoch can have either a mother or a father as a reference point and it is sometimes extended to mean “members of an ethnic/ social/ political group” (e.g. Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 92, 112). Similarly to -ichpoch, in the early colonial period -telpoch hardly ever refers to little children, its main connotation being grown sons: for example Chimalpahin records the death of his father, stating that: itelpochtzin catca cihuapilli. Doña luisa. xoquiquetzaltzin, or “he was the son of doña Luisa Xochiquetzaltzin” (Chimalpahin 2006: 90-92); a testator from San Bartolomé Atenco indirectly suggests the age of his son by making a bequest to: yn nocihuamo yhuan noxhuiuh yhuan yehuatl notelpoch, or “my daughter-in-law, grandson and son” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 58-59); finally, in the “Coloquios y doctrina cristiana” the already married sons of Noah are called “itelpuchua” (Sahagún 1986: 202). -Telpoch is also found associated with marriage or sexual relations (e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 117) and it very often appears in testaments, where the age of heirs was extremely important for the way of distributing property. Grown sons received their bequests directly, while little children’s share was often put under the custody of a living parent who was supposed to hand it on to them upon their coming of age. As observed by Caterina Pizzigoni, in the late “Testaments of Toluca” the use of -telpoch undergoes a change: it is now employed for all sons regardless of age, acquiring the diminutive suffix -ton if a boy is still little (Pizzigoni 2007: 19). In some cases the change goes even further: -ton is omitted, although the term clearly refers to a small child:

no yhua nitlanahuatia notelpoh Martin Leon Ca yehual nicCahuilia noCoMadre Maria de pelegrina yhua nocopadre Marselo Martin Ca yehuatzi ytlasonantzi oquiMoquiMoquatequili onpa quiscaltisque (ibid.: 217)
In addition I order that I leave my son Martín León to my comadre María de Peregrina and my compadre Marcelo Martín, for she is his precious mother who baptized him; they are to raise him there [at their place] (ibid).

In the cited testament Martín León is also called *-piltzin* several times.

The vocative of *-telpoch*, like those of other terms for children, was used in addressing people. Not surprisingly, it is always combined with a 1<sup>st</sup> person singular possessive prefix, even if the reference point is in fact plural:

`auh in oacico tequiapan titlanti, njman ic hiciuhca calactuetzi ipan in motecuçuma qujlhuja. Totecujet potzine (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 72)`

And when the victory messengers had come to arrive, then they quickly entered into the presence of Moctezuma and said to him: “O our lord, O my grown son” (ibid).

In another example (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms), the elders address a youth “nopiltze notelpuchtze.”

As the above examples show, *notelpoch-* was combined with either more (*-tzine*) or less (*-tze*) reverential vocative ending. The counterpart of *-tze* in female speech was *-tzin*.<sup>56</sup> *Notelpochtze* and *notelpochtzin* were often used by older members of a family in reference to representatives of younger generations (not necessarily their own children) (Sahagún 2012 VI: 105, 116, 215); by tutors in reference to their disciples (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 158) or by midwives when they addressed newborn boys (Sahagún 2012 VI: 167, 176-177, 202). On the other hand, *notelpochtze* does not have any counterpart in female speech, at least there is no one in the material I have gathered. It is never used among the members of a family, but rather to address the authorities: the *huey tlatoani* (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 72; XII: 6) or the cabildo members (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 114). While more informal vocatives go accompanied with neutral or affectionate forms of address (in the examples above for example: *nopiltze* and “xolotze xolote” or “o boy, or servitor!”), *notelpochtze* is paired

---

<sup>55</sup> C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson rendered “notelpotzine” as “O my youth!”

<sup>56</sup> Fray Manuel Pérez notes for the eighteenth century Mexico that women address men “Notelpote” (Pérez 1713: 75). However, the vocative ending he gives is characteristic for male speech.
with such honorifics as *nopiltzintzine* or *totecuiyoe*. This evidence suggests that choosing either of the vocative endings depended on the amount of reverence that needed to be expressed and distance (large or small) between interlocutors that needed to be created. 57

The vocatives based on *-telpoch* are used in a variety of contexts but, as I have already stated above (see: 1.3.1. *-ichpoch*), they seem to be particularly associated with stressing the male gender of the referent. They are used in speeches directed specifically to boys (e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 215) and are given as an alternative for *-ichpoch*-based vocatives when a speech can be delivered to either a boy or a girl. For this reason I suggest that *notelpochtzel* *-tzin* and *notelpochtzine* can be understood either as “o boy!” or as “o sir!”

1.3.3. *-xocoyouh*

The absolutive term *xocoyotl* is glossed by fray Alonso de Molina as “hijo o hija menor o postrera” (Molina 1977 II: 160v). In the “Florentine Codex” it is also used as a title referring to the high nobility or rulership, for example: *in tlacatl, in tlatoanj, in xocoiotl, in tlacatecutli* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 81), or “the lord, ruler, *xocoyotl*, the lord of people.” This usage can stem from the terminological association of children with the nobility, initiated by the extension of *-pil*. The word can be analysed as the noun *xocoh*, in Morelos used to designate the youngest child (Karttunen 1992a: 329) and being a common name for girls in Central Mexico (Sahagún 1997b: 254), with the abstract ending *-yotl*. *Xocoh*, on its part, is likely to be related to *tzoco*, or something very small (Karttunen 1992a: 315). Thus, the possessive form, *-xocoyo* or *-xocoyouh* (in Molina 1997 II: 112v: “Texocoyouh. hijo o hija postrera”) could literally be understood as “something small that belongs to or is part of the reference point.” 58

57 There is one exception, though. In the “Bancroft Dialogues” a governor is addressed by one of the wedding guests: *Tlacate tlatoanie notelpochtze nopiltzintzine* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 112), or “o lord, ruler, my grown son, nobleman!” Perhaps it is a mistake made by a writer or a copyist, although it can also prove that the principles which underlaid the terminological system were not very strict.

58 I refer here to the inalienable possession of nouns (Carochi 2001: 302, 308), which is discussed in details in 3.1. *-Pil()*o.
This term is scarcely attested in the kinship sphere. Much more often one can come upon it when used as a form of address. The vocative *noxocoyohue/ noxocoyohuane* shares the grammatical traits of other terms for children employed in direct speech (excluding the form *nopiltzintzine*). It can be either singular or plural and its possessive prefix is inoperative – *no*- is frozen to the stem and does not change to *to*- (“our”) even if the reference point is in plural, for example:

_Dos viejos principales saludan á unos Cantores: Anmotolínia noxocoyohuane, oanquiyohuique_ (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 162)

Two elderly noblemen greet some singers: You are suffering (standing here waiting in the cold?), oh my youngest ones; greetings (ibid.: 163).

Similarly to many other forms of address based in kin terms, *noxocoyohue/ noxocoyohuane* does not describe a kin relation between a reference point and a referent. Even if a speaker is an actual parent of the one addressed, the term should rather be translated as “o dearest one” than as “my youngest child.” This form of address is sometimes used in admonitions, but contrary to *-pil* this is not its principal domain. It seems that in speeches “the youngest children” are treated less severely and much more tenderly than “children.” Those who use the vocatives based on *-xocoyouh* often express gratitude towards their interlocutor, concern over his well-being, or joy at seeing him, for example:

_Manican tihuitz noxocoyohue, ca onimitz poloca, onimitzmiccatocaca, ximocalaqui_  

ven en buen hora hijo mio, que te auia perdido, y tenido por muerto, entra (Caro 2001: 298).

_O, noxocoyohue, oticmocnelili in tlacal in toxhuiuhtzin; auh otiquimicneli in iz monoltitoho in tenanhuan in tetahu in tlacazcaltique in tlacahuapauhque, auh in tehuanolique_ (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 114)

Oh my youngest, the lord our grandson (the governor) owes you thanks, and so do the parents present here, the raisers and educators of children, and the relatives (ibid.: 115).
Noxocoyohue/ noxocoyohuane does not appear in reverential forms, which makes one think that it was not considered very formal. Indeed, the “Florentine Codex” shows that, though not being limited to any particular social class, it was typical for the commoners’ speech. While pipiltin greeted their newborns with the highly reverential honorifics based on -ixhuiuh (see: 2.1.2. O supreme lord!), in the same context macehualtin employed the vocatives based on -xocoyouth (Sahagún 2012 VI: 193-194).

Arguably, the choice of the term -xocoyouth as a marker of the gentle manner of speaking was influenced by the role of the youngest child in the Nahua household. Caterina Pizzigoni noticed that in the eighteenth-century testaments of Toluca xocoyotl enjoyed a special position in the family (Pizzigoni 2007: 126). In the twentieth-century traditional Nahua communities the youngest son usually inherited the lion’s share of property. Although this strategy would have not been possible in the sixteenth century when at parents’ death xocoyotl tended to be an infant (McCaa 1999), his or her status as such could have been similar to the contemporaneous one.

Noxocoyohuane is sometimes juxtaposed in a doublet with nopilhuane. I have found two such examples, both coming from a speech delivered during a wedding and addressed to a bride and a groom. The speaker begins with brief congratulations to the married couple, calling them noxocoyohuane. Then he passes to the main part of his speech, which is generally of educational nature. While admonishing the bride and groom he addresses them nopilhuane, but at the end he again adopts a more tender manner of speaking, saying:

\[ \textit{cocoliztli namechonnocuitiliz, nictequipachoz in amixtzin in amoyollotzin, noxocoyohuane nopilhuane} \] (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 110)

I (do not wish to) make you ill (with long talking), I (do not wish to) disturb your spirits, dearest ones.\(^59\)

Apparently, the kin terms the speaker chooses with reference to the newlyweds are adjusted to the general tone of his talk. On the other hand, they themselves stress the character of various parts of the speech.

\(^{59}\) F. Karttunen and J. Lockhart render the doublet “noxocoyohuane nopilhuane” as “my youngest ones, my children.”
1.3.4. -yacapan

*Yacapan*ti*li* is glossed by fray Alonso de Molina as “primogenito o primogenita” (Molina 1977 II: 30r). He also gives “Noteyacapã. mi primogenito, o mi primogenita,” “Notlayacapan. mi primogenito o primogenita” (ibid.: 74r), “Tiacapan. primogenito o primogenita” (ibid.: 112v) and “Tiyacapan. primero engendrado, o nacido, o primero nacida y engendrada. s. primogenito, o primogenita” (ibid.: 113r). In the Spanish-to-Nahuatl part of the dictionary he has “Hijo o hija mayor. tiyacapan. yacapantli” (ibid. I: 71r) and “Mayor hijo. tiyacapan. achtotlacat” (ibid.: 80v). In the sources recorded in my database there are only nine attestations of this term of which four refer to women (not counting the cases where the term is used as a proper name). Molina’s entries imply that three variants of this kinship designation existed: -yacapan, -teyacapan and -tlayacapan. The last one has the impersonal possessive prefix *tl* and can be translated as “something’s” rather than “someone’s eldest child” – unfortunately, I have not found any attestation of this term in the sources. The second one doubles the possessive prefix similarly to the term -teachcauh (see: 4.4. -achcauh and -teachcauh) – as a result, the indefinite personal prefix *te-* becomes incorporated into the stem. The only example of this variant in my database comes from Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” where a midwife says to the old women, the relatives of a pregnant woman: in *cioatzintli, in at amotlacoieoauh, in at amotiacapan, in at noço amoxocoiouh*, or “the little woman who is perhaps your [pl.] second child, perhaps your [pl.] eldest, or perhaps your [pl.] youngest” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 153). As this quotation shows, -teyacapan could have been extended to a young female relative who remains under the charge of the elders of her family.

The word -*yacapan* is derived from *y*acatl, or a nose, combined with the postposition -pan (on, in, on the surface of, etc). Therefore, it literally means “on the nose” and metaphorically – “on the lead” (Lockhart 2001: 241). It should be noted that in the Nahuatl-to-Spanish part of the dictionary Molina, similarly to fray Bernardino de Sahagún in the “Primeros Memoriales” (Sahagún 1997b: 255) clearly prefers the translation “firstborn” while in the Spanish-to-Nahuatl he opts for “the eldest.” It does make a difference, since “the eldest child” can be understood as “the eldest of those who have survived until now” and this is not necessarily the firstborn. The problem is particularly puzzling if one takes into account the
naming pattern. In prehispanic and colonial periods, the common name for the eldest daughter was Teyacapan or Tiacapan: she would probably receive this name even if she were the sixth child and the first daughter at the same time. Would the name be taken over by the next girl in the family if her elder sister died? It is impossible to solve this problem leaning on the material I have gathered.

Among the attestations of -yacapan in my database there is one vocative form. A guide to the underworld welcomes the noblewoman Quetzalpetlatl who has just been buried by her relatives: auh teacapane, quetzalpetlæ, otiquihiyovi, tla oque xocuica, or “And you, first-born, Quetzalpetlatl, you have suffered. Come on! Sing!” (Sahagún 1997b: 180). Here -yacapan is likely to be employed with an extended meaning; this meaning is, however, impossible to guess from the context. Far clearer is the metaphoric usage of -yacapan in the “Exercicio quotidiano.” The Three Kings are referred to as “the firstborns” of the newly converted Nahua:

yn eyntin tlahtoque yn toyancuiyohuan yn toyacapanyohua omochiuhque tlaneltoquiliztica (Sahagún 1997a: 148)

the three rulers, who became our firstborn, our oldest children, as regards the Faith (ibid.: 149).

The context leaves no doubt that the term “toyacapanyohua” should be understood as “those who had set a precedence for us.” The Three Kings were the first Christians, the first ones to be converted and the Nahua should follow their example. Arguably, this metaphoric usage of -yacapan speaks in favor of the meaning “firstborn” as far as the original kin term is concerned.

In the above example -yacapan is paired with another kin term, -yancuiyo, which means literally “something new which belongs to one or is one’s part” and is glossed by Molina as “mi primogenito o mi primogenita” (Molina 1977 II: 30v). This is the only attestation of this term that I have come upon.
1.3.5. -tlacoyehua

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses *tlacoyehua* as “el seguido hijo o hija, o de tres o qtro engendrados o nacidos” (Molina 1977 II: 118v). The term is composed of *tlaco*, middle or half and the verb *ehua*, to rise, but also to be born, as it is still used in modern Nahuatl de la Huasteca. It comes up in the sources employed as a proper name (e.g. Chimalpahin 1997 I: 116) and I have found it twice bearing a possessive prefix. Both attestations come from Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex”:

*Auh in axcan ca cententica, cencamaticca njmjtznotza, njmjtztzatzilia, in tinopiltzin, in tinoconeuh, in tinocozqui, in tinoquetzial, in tinoteach, in tinotlacoeoauh, in tinoxocoiouh* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 105).

And now, to thee who art my son, who art my child, who art my precious necklace, who art my precious feather, who art my oldest, my second, my youngest son, I speak, I call out a word or two (ibid).

*in cioatzintli, in at amotlacoieoauh, in at amotiacapan, in at noço amoxocoiouh* (ibid.: 153).

the little woman who is perhaps your second child, perhaps your eldest, or perhaps your youngest (ibid).

In both cases -tlacoyehua is employed in the sequences which intend to cover all the children of a person, as far as their order of birth is concerned. This context suggests that the term could refer to more than one child: it described everyone born between -yacapan or -teach (see: 4.3. -ach) and -xocoyouh. The two quotations likewise demonstrate that – accordingly with Molina’s information regarding the absolutive form – it was used in reference to both men and women.

60 [http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso](http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso), consulted Jan 30, 2013.
1.4. -TA

- Ta is the Nahuatl term for a “father” and it was used by children of both sexes. Fray Alonso de Molina quotes it in absolutive, “Tatli. padre.” He also has entries “Tatia. nicno. tomar a otro por padre” and “Tata. por tayta, padre [dize el niño]” (Molina 1977 II: 91r). As Helga Rammow points out, although only children from the class of commoners were addressing their fathers with the term -ta, as a term of reference it was used by representatives of all social classes (Rammow 1964: 54-55).

Well into the colonial period the plural of -ta, -tahuan, is very rarely extended to mean “parents.” Normally, the word “parents” was rendered by the doublet in -nan in -ta, or someone’s mother, someone’s father, so that it is easy to imagine an inadvertent omission of one of these elements by the writer. However, in two passages from Chimalpahin’s “Annals” such a usage of -ta is undoubtedly a calque of Spanish “padres:”


a widow and old woman, who was the spouse of señor Diego de Muñon; they were patrons of the churchly home of lord San Antón Abad in Mexico Xoloco and parents of the very reverend father fray Agustín del Espíritu Santo (ibid.: 173).

huel innahuatil. yn quintlamamacatiazque. yn iquac yntzonquiçalizpan. yn tetahuan anoço tepilhuanc necoc (Chimalpahin 2006: 112)

they are to distribute to them all that is bequeathed to them at the death of either the parents or children (ibid.: 113).

1.4.1. Advisers
In precontact contexts a form of -ta commonly used outside the kinship sphere is the plural, non-reverential -tahuán. In the material I have gathered its reference point in these contexts is always a deity/priest (the two are often difficult to separate in texts) or a political leader. In the “Primeros Memoriales” Ixcozauhqui, the fire god, sings:

\[Huiya\ \text{tzonmolco\ notavane\ ye\ namechmayapinauhtiz.\ /\ tetemoca\ ye\ namechmayapinauhtiz}\ (\text{Sahagún} 1997b: 137).\]

In Tzonmolco, O my fathers, I’ll offend you; / In Tetemocan, I’ll affront you (ibid).

The reference is undoubtedly to some temple activities, since Tzonmolco was the principal temple of the fire god in Tenochtitlan (ibid.: 137, n. 11). A similar attestation of no-tahuán is found in the explanatory glosses to the song of Tlaloc:

\[ca\ \text{tel\ nechpinavia\ camo\ nechvelmati (…) yn\ notava\ ioá\ y\ noquacuiloa\ y\ oceloquacuilj (…)\ in\ tlapoca\ xiuhalco\ id\ est\ axcoyacla\ (…)\ vmpa\ valquizq. (…)\ y\ notavá\ y\ noquacuiloá\ acatonal}\ (\text{Sahagún} 1997b: 133-134).\]

but they offend me, they do not give me pleasure (…) my fathers, my old priests, my old jaguar priests (…) Tlalocan, house of turquoise, that is, house of fir (…) from where they came forth (…) my fathers, my shorn-heads, Acatonal (ibid).

According to Ángel María Garibay, in this section of the song the speaker is Tlaloc himself. His “fathers” are “sus sacerdotes y los ancianos dedicados a su culto.” The first attestation of notahuán is accompanied by the terms noquacuilohuan and oceloquacuilli, both referring to the priests “que son los tonsurados del dios, o sea los mismos dedicados a su culto” (Garibay 1995: 52-58). The second attestation forms part of the doublet “y notavá y noquacuiloá” and is accompanied by a calendric name Acatonal, in another place of “Primeros Memoriales” used in reference to a priest of Chalchiuhtlicue (Sahagún 1997b: 92). According to Miguel León-Portilla, while the first notahuán is spoken by the deity, the second one is pronounced by the priest of Tlaloc. In his interpretation, the name Acatonal “belongs either to Tlaloc himself or to one of his attendants, the Tlaloque” (León-Portilla 1980: 194-195).

\[61\ T.\ Sullivan\ and\ H.B.\ Nicholson\ render\ the\ word\ valquizq\ as\ “he\ came\ forth.”\]
In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” the migrating Mexica led by Huitzilopochtli to their final destination, Tenochtitlan, are sometimes called the god’s “fathers”:

\[auh\ niman\ ye\ hualpeuh\ yn\ huitzilopochtli.\ \textit{yn quinhualhuicac\ yn\ itahuan\ yn imacehualhuan\ yn\ mexica}\ (Chimalpahin,\ Tezozomoc\ 1997: 82)\]

and then Huitzilopochtli left; he brought along his fathers, his subjects, the Mexica,\textsuperscript{62}

but in other places it is revealed that it was a mediator – \textit{tlamacazqui} – who bore Huitzilopochtli’s name:

\[auh\ niman\ oquihto\ yn\ tlamacazqui.\ \textit{yn\ huitzilopochtli.\ auh\ quimilhuia\ yn\ itahuā\ yn motenehua\ yn\ teomamaque\ (...)\ auh\ quimilhuia\ notahuane\ ca\ amo\ notequihu\ yn quimotequiuitlia\ yn\ malinalxoch}\ (Chimalpahin,\ Tezozomoc\ 1997: 78)\]

And then the offering priest Huitzilopochtli spoke; He spoke to his fathers [= senior auxiliaries] known as the god-carriers (…). And he said to them: My fathers, what Malinalxoch practices is not my practice (ibid: 79).

This passage suggests that Huitzilopochtli was a priest, through whom the deity was communicating with the Mexica, and the deity at the same time. When god-carriers answer Huitzilopochtli, they address him with the title \textit{tlamacazqui}:

\[ca\ ye\ qualli\ tlamacazque.\ \textit{Otlacauhqui\ y\ moyollotzin\ ma\ quicaquican\ y\ mottahuan\ yn huehuetque\ yn\ ixquichtin}\ (Chimalpahin,\ Tezozomoc\ 1997: 102)\]

It is well, offering priest. You have been generous; let all your fathers (= senior advisers), the old men, hear it.\textsuperscript{63}

Huitzilopochtli’s “fathers” are, therefore, the “fathers” of a divine being mediating between the human and the supernatural and the same interpretation is most likely valid for the examples from the “Primeros Memoriales.” Brant Gardner, in his interpretation of the

\textsuperscript{62} S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “itahuan” as “his advisers.”

\textsuperscript{63} The reviewed translation of Susan Schroeder and Arthur J. O. Anderson.
examples from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” views them as the “fathers” of a priest. According to him, such a usage of the term -tahuan belongs to the area of relative social deference. Within this area kin terms function inversely: “the more important persona of the occasion” is addressed with the terms from descending generations and the less important one – answered with those from ascending generations. Gardner juxtaposes Huitzilopochtli’s “fathers” with an example from the “Florentine Codex” where a god is addressed by a priest with a term “based on the root -pil” (Gardner 1982: 110-111). However, such a classification of -tahuan is not convincing. -Tahuan appears in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” not only as a term of address (and those were analysed by Gardner) but as a term of reference as well: teomamaque are Huitzilopochtli’s “fathers” always, not only when the tlamacazqui speaks to them directly (notahuane). Moreover, in the example from the “Florentine Codex” mentioned by Gardner, Tezcatlipoca is addressed “tlacatle, totocue, tlacopille” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 4), or “o lord, o our lord, o precious noble!” Tlaçopilli is not a kin term here, because it lacks a possessive prefix; it is an honorific based on the term for a high-ranked group of nobles (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). Thus, it cannot be treated as a counterpart of -tahuan.

Pedro de Cárcer states in his “Arte de la lengua othomi”:

llama el señor o gobernador del pueblo, a los viejos, que tiene en su compañía, por consejeros, s. mis padres, notauan (after Gardner 1982: 112).

Gardner draws on this information concluding that in the political sphere the term -ta had a connotation of “counselor” (Gardner 1982: 112) and he is on the right track here, but he uses a questionable example in Nahuatl to support his statement. It comes from the “Florentine Codex” where, according to him, the term -ta “is found in reference to the pipiltin who install a new ruler” (Gardner 1982: 112). However, in the passage he indicates the referent is actually called “in tinantli in titatli” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 67), or “you the mother, you the father.” This doublet is not only absolutive and as such useless in defining any relations, but it is also well known to be a metaphor for a ruler. Nevertheless, Susan Schroeder and Arthur J.O. Anderson agree with Gardner’s suggestion and translate the term -tahuan as “one’s senior auxiliaries” or “advisers” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 77, n. 7). Following this interpretation, the “fathers” mentioned in the “Primeros Memoriales” would be the auxiliaries of Tlaloc. As is evident from the above quotations from the “Crónica Mexicayotl,” -tahuan are identified there with both Huitzilopochtli’s teomamaque, or god-carry and huehuetque.
or the elders. The advanced age is firmly associated with -tahuan: Cárceres indicates that they were “viejos” (see above) and cuacuiltin, the priests described with the discussed kin term in the “Primeros Memoriales,” are in the “Florentine Codex” referred to as: in tlamacazque vevetque, in jntoca Quaquacujltin (Sahagún 2012 VI: 210), or “the offering priests, the elders, whose name was cuacuacuiltin.”

In the Chimalpahin’s “Tercera Relación,” the “fathers” of a political leader can be identified with teuctlatoque. According to Schroeder, the title of teuctlatoani was associated with the institution of calpolli. In those calpolli where tlatocayotl was present, the office of teuctlatoani was automatically held by a tlaatoani. The calpolli deprived of tlatocayotl were subordinate to those with the royal seat and that is why their leaders were called the tlaatoani’s -teuctlatocahuan (Schroeder 1996: 91-94). The “Tercera Relación” lists the names of six noblemen, who accompanied the tlaatoani of the Teotenanca and his wife, when they decided to settle in Tiçatepec:

achtz kat en i mochintin huallaque en ñtahuan ñn ñteuhc tlahtocahuan hualmochiuhtiaque en tlaçopipiltîn (Chimalpahin 1990: entry for 1162)

Here are all the precious nobles, who came appointed as their fathers, their teuctlatoque.  

The same year entry identifies the tlaatoani as the one who was responsible for the deity of the Teotenanca named Nauhyoteuctli (ibid). Thus, in the “Tercera Relación,” the priest-ruler is accompanied by a group of high-ranked officials (his “fathers”) who act as his auxiliaries and, once the migration is over, receive teuctlatocayotl (Schroeder 1996: 293-295). The teuctlatoani rank provides yet another context for interpreting the term -tahuan as used in the “Crónica Mexicayotl.” In the writings of Chimalpahin, tlamacazqui is often presented as the leader of calpolli migrating from Aztlan, for example the Mexica were led by the great tlamacazqui Huitzilztzin (Schroeder 1996: 221). In the “Crónica Mexicayotl,” when the Mexica finally settle in Tenochtitlan, the Huitzilopochtli orders his four “fathers” to settle in four separate quarters and to form rulerships (“xitlahtocayotican,” or “act as dependent rulers!”) (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 108). As a consequence, the huehuetque,

---

64 Translation mine.
teomamaque and -tahuan can be understood not only as deity’s auxiliaries but also as leaders of sub-groups, subordinate to tlamacazqui in political terms.

Arguably, one of the assumptions that linked the group of priests and/or subordinate leaders with fathers in the kinship sphere was the already mentioned old age. Certainly, a hierarchy within the family was not involved in the construction of the term’s extended usage. In such a case, -ta would have meant someone of a superior position and the “Crónica Mexicayotl” explicitly states quite the opposite. In the above-cited passage (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 82) the Mexica (probably teomamaque) are called Huitzilopochtli’s “yn itahuan yn imacehualhuan,” or his fathers, his subjects. Gardner explains this phenomenon by means of inversion and I have already addressed his arguments above. If the inversion were to be complete, a group of leaders, in contrast with -tahuan, would be called -pilhuan and this was not the case. In fact, in the texts -pilhuan is, similarly to -tahuan, paired with -macehualhuan, or subjects (see: 1.1.4. Subjects).

However, a symmetrical relation between “fathers” and “children” in the Nahua terminological system does exist. In Book 10 of the “Florentine Codex” one’s father, among others:

*tlacazcalitia, tlacuapaua, teizcallia, teizcalia, tenonotza, tenotza* (Sahagún 1960-69 X: 1)

rears children, he is their tutor, he raises people, he educates them, he advises them, he admonishes them.65

Alonso de Zorita writes about the duties of a Nahua father:

Demás de criar los hijos con la disciplina o cuidado que se ha dicho, los padres [indígenas] asimismo lo tenían en les dar muchos y muy buenos consejos y los tienen hoy en día los indios principales por memoria en sus pinturas (after: Hernández de León-Portilla, León-Portilla 2002: XI).

On the other hand, one’s good child:

65 Translation mine.
tlamauiztilia, tlatlacamati mocnoteca, mocnopilmati, mocnelilmati, tequixtia, tenemiliztoca, tetlaieiecalhuia (Sahagún 2012 X: 2)

shows reverence, obeys, humbles himself, thanks with humility for benefits received, he is thankful, he trusts people, he imitates people’s way of life, he imitates people, while a bad child:

hatecacqui, tlamaxaqualoani (...) hamo cana, hamo quicui in naiutl, in taiutl. Centlapal quiça centlapal cataqui in inacazo in tlacazcaltiloni, in tlacauapualoni (ibid.)

is disobedient, the one who crushes something with his hands (...) he doesn’t grasp, he doesn’t take the duty of mother, the duty of father (= the admonitions). One who raises children, a tutor, enters into his ears on the one side and emerges on the other.

In other words, a father is the one who teaches, gives advice and admonishes while a child’s role is to listen, learn and be obedient. The same roles are ascribed to these categories outside the kinship sphere. In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” the “fathers” of a leader are those who act as his advisers. On the other hand, the forms of address derived from the term for a “child”: nopiltze, nopilhuane and, to a lesser extant, nopiltzine and nopilhuantzitzine are often found in reference to those being advised, taught or admonished (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms). Interestingly, teuctlatoque who are associated with the term -tahuan in the writings of Chimalpahin, in Sahaguntine texts are presented as those whose duty was to give advice or admonish people. In the “Primeros Memoriales” they deliver admonitions to nobles and commoners addressing them with the -pil vocatives (Sahagún 1997b: 229-245). In the “Florentine Codex” the term nopiltze is used in a speech of educational nature, delivered to a tlahuan by:

ce aca vei tlenamacac: anoço vei pilli, anoço aca vei teculato (Sahagún 2012 VI: 47)

---

66 Translation mine.
67 Translation mine.
someone who was a fire priest or a great noble or someone who was a great teuctlatoani.68

Significantly, Diego Durán who based his account on the “Crónica X,” in his version of the events described in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” translates the term -tahuan as “ayos” or “padres y ayos” (Durán 1687: 22, 25). The Spanish term “ayo,” or a tutor, the one who raises and educates a child, points to rather social than biological role of a father. With its extended meaning, the term “fathers” connoted, most generally, those who provided support (priests, high officials) while the duty of “children” was to accept this support. The two did not stand on the opposite poles of a hierarchical scale: a leader could have had both -tahuan and -pilhuan among his subjects. However, while the former’s role was to support him and give him advice, the latter’s role was reduced to simple obedience.

The above analysis may serve to explain the only usage of -tahuan in the Christian religious context:


They have been governing the Atzaqualca ever since their first fathers and governors, who were the Discalced Carmelite fathers, left them (ibid.: 175).

It should be noted that those who governed the Atzaqualca after the Carmelites were also friars – the Augustinians. Generally, the role of friars as teachers and advisers of people conforms to the connotations of -tahuan, but here Chimalpahin juxtaposes this term with -tepachocahuan, or one’s governors. This meaning is more reminiscent of the form tetahuan, or town elders (see below) but then again, what would the indigenous town elders have in common with the Spanish ecclesiastics in Chimalpahin’s mind? The term -ta was employed for the friars in the form totatzin, pl. totatzitzinhuan (see: 1.4.3. Teta and tota in religious contexts). It is possible that Chimalpahin’s usage with a different possessive prefix is a rare calque from the Spanish “padres.”

68 Translation mine.
69 Read: intahuan.
1.4.2. Town elders

The term -tahuan is often to be found with an indefinite personal possessive prefix te-, tetahuan, or people’s fathers. This form is known to mean actual fathers and with this meaning it is also seen in singular, for example:

\[\text{vncah njtoa: in jtenonztalaiztlatol in tetatzin in pilli, anoço tlatoanj: injc qujnonotzaiz ipiltzin, in jtechpa in nematiliztli in teixpan: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 121)}\]

Here are told the admonitions of the father, nobleman, or ruler, to counsel his son regarding prudence in public (ibid).

The plural, on the other hand, often seems to refer to the elders living in a household – the men with the social status of fathers – and has a female counterpart tenanhuán. The two most often form a doublet (see: 1.6. In -nán in -ta), but they are also sometimes seen separately, for instance:

\[\text{in tetaoan qujtoa: Veh nopilhoàtzitzine, quen vel ameoantin in oamopanchiu, in tlein ie muchioaz: auh in tenanoan qujtoa: Nonopilhoantzitzin, [etc.] (Sahagún 2012 XII: 25)}\]

The fathers of people [= male elders] said: “My children [= you, who are listening]! How did it happen to you? What will happen?” And the mothers of people [= female elders] said: “My children [= you, who are listening]! [etc.]”\(^{70}\)

*Tetahuan* is extended yet further: from the level of a household to that of the whole altepetl. James Lockhart has traced such a usage in a sixteenth-century document from Tlatelolco, where “fathers” is employed as a synonym of huehuetque, the altepetl officials (Lockhart 1992: 154):

\(^{70}\)Translation mine.
ynic vel nocomati ya cenpavalxivitl. ocastoli ypā oxivitl. quicouh tlali yn ōpa tolpetlac yevatl quicouh ytocac magdalēnē teyacapā auh in iquac quicouh quimispāti yō tetavā (AGN Tierras, vol. 17, parte 2a, exp. 4, f. 12r)

I know well that 37 years ago the one named Magdalena Tiacapan bought the land in Tolpetlac. When she bought it, she presented herself to the elders.\(^{71}\)

Further in the document, the prefix te- is substituted with to-, stressing that the elders fulfill their duties in our altepetl:

yn itatzin ocatca ca mochipa oquītlatlauhtiyaya yō totavā yō quemaniyā ytilma yō quimacaya (ibid.: f. 13r)

His late father was always imploring the elders of our altepetl, sometimes he was giving them cloaks.\(^{72}\)

Another late sixteenth-century source, an agreement between the Mexica and Tarascans as to the allotment of tasks, from Durango, is claimed to have been declared before alcaldes, regidores and mochintin tetahua y mechicapa yhua michihuacapan, or “all the heads of families, Mexica and Michoaca.” These “fathers” are subsequently named altepehuaque, which can identify them as either the citizens or leaders of the altepetl (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 126-128).

The term apparently survived until the eighteenth century because in the “Testaments of Toluca” it is used twice in reference to the altepetl officials, although its form is notahuan. One of the attestations suggests that it could have been conventionalized, since the prefix no- does not correspond to the plural reference point:

niCa titlacuilohua ypa mestli 17 de setibre teyxp a ymixpa notahua (Pizzigoni 2007: 241)

We are writing here on the seventeenth of the month of September in the presence of my fathers (ibid).

\(^{71}\) Transcription and translation mine.

\(^{72}\) Transcription and translation mine.
Finally, there is a curious example from the early seventeenth century, where the authorities of an *altepetl* seem to identify themselves as “precious fathers” of another *altepetl*’s cabildo:


we [your dear fathers] who govern here the town called Tzaqualco San Francisco, all we alcaldes and councilmen (ibid.: 197).

The interpreters of the document suggest that the word “damolazodahuan” can be understood as *tiamotlaçotahuan,* or we, your precious fathers, and that this term “has the force of «town elders,» or the like, while the possessive would be merely a courtesy” (ibid.: 197, n. 11). Unfortunately, such a form of -tahuan is an isolated example in my database and for the lack of comparison with similar attestations I cannot draw any conclusions about it.

### 1.4.3. Teta and tota in religious contexts

The term *-ta* is rarely seen employed in the precontact religious sphere, unless in a doublet with *-nan.* The only attestation of *teta,* or one’s father, that I have been able to find, comes from the “Primeros Memoriales.” The superior priest, the one standing at the top of priestly hierarchy, is compared to a father and a ruler at the same time:

> yoä yc tlapiaya ca iuhqui in tetta muchiuhticatca ſy calmecac, iuhqui in ma intlatocauh catca in teteuvatzïtzï ynic noviã (Sahagún 1997b: 81)

And he watched over things, for he was like the father in the calmecac; he was like the ruler of the priests everywhere.\(^73\)

*Tota,* our father, comes up in the “Florentine Codex”:

---

\(^73\) T. Sullivan and H.B. Nicholson rendered the phrase *in tetta ... ſy calmecac* as “the father of those in the calmecac.”
Upon the tenth day of Izcalli, tamales stuffed with greens were eaten. It was maintained, it was said: “Our father, the fire, roasteth [food] for himself” (ibid).

Xiuhtecuhtli: Ixcoçauhquij, yoan Cueçaltzin. Iehoatl motocaiotia in Tletl, anoço Veueteutl yoan Tota (Sahagún 2012 I: 72)

Xiuhtecutli, Ixcozauhqui and Cuezaltzin (“flame”). He was named Fire, or Huehueteotl (“old deity”), and Our Father.74

Fire, or the god of fire, was not the only being designated with the term tota. Fray Diego Durán describes the celebration of Tlaloc’s feast day:

Todos estos juegos y fiestas se hacían a un bosque que se hacía en el patio del templo delante la ymagen del ydolo tlaloc en medio del qual bosque yncauan vn arbol altissimo, el mas alto que en el monte podian hallar al qual ponian por nombre tota que quiere decir nuestro padre. (...) Es de notar que la figura presente se soleníçaba en nombre de padre que quiere decir tota, para que sepamos que reuerenciauan al padre y al hijo y al espíritu santo y deçían tota, topiltzin y yolomtle los quales bocablos quieren decir nuestro padre y nuestro hijo y el coraçon de ambos haciendo fiesta a cada vno en particular y a todos tres en vno donde se nota lo noticia que huuo de la trinidad entre esta gente. (...) A este arbol ponian por nombre tota que quiere decir nuestro padre a caussa de que a la redonda del ponian otros quatro mas pequeños quedando el como por padre de los demas (Durán 1880: 140-141).75

Durán sketches an image of something which is obviously a representation of the world: space is limited by four posts – trees – which connect three levels of the universe (the underworld, the heavens and the earth). Their trunks are tunnels through which the divine essence of both masculine and feminine nature circulates, producing time and, therefore, life on earth. The great tree in the middle is the center of cosmos. It comprises in itself the four

74 Translation mine.
75 I thank Agnieszka Brylak for bringing this passage to my attention.
posts: it is one, four and five at the same time (López Austin 2000: 19-21, 225). Durán produces two explanations of naming the central tree “our father,” both in accordance with his own cultural background. Firstly, he looks for the trinity, since if there is father, there should also be the son and the spirit. Subsequently, he associates father with the “head of the family,” the most important person in a group. Neither of his explanations is valid. The prefix to- has already been seen combined with a kin term (see: 1.1.3. One of us), indicating the entire community as the reference point. Both the cosmic tree and fire are given by López Austin as sources of tonalli, hot vital essence sent to humans from the heavens and particularly from the Sun. I suggest these two were called “fathers,” because they enabled life, transmitting vital essences to people.

The term “father” plays a significant role in the Christian classification systems, being used in reference to God, saints, the pope and priests. For the purpose of both teaching the doctrine and building relations between the natives and ecclesiastics it had to be, therefore, translated into Nahua. The simplest way to make a calque of the Spanish word “padre” (used without a possessive pronoun) was to combine the stem -ta with the indefinite possessive prefix te-. The earliest source from my sample where the result, tetatzin, appears, is the “Confessionario Mayor” by fray Alonso de Molina and the term is used there in reference to God the Father:


Yo te señalo co la señal dela cruz, y te forfalezco y esfuerço, conla chrisma de saluacion, en el nombre del padre, y del hijo, y del espiritu sancto. Amen (Molina 1569: 90r).

In the contemporary and later sources, the trinitarian formula is the most common context for this term, also when the authors of the text are the Nahuas. In the “Exercicio quotidiano” a variation on tetatzin is made which is never seen in “prehispanic” context. The whole term is treated as a noun’s stem, combined with the element tlaço- and applied in the vocative to God:
O our Lord God, O All-Pervasive One, O beloved Father: You have indeed revealed to us your compassion, Your love for us people of the world (ibid.: 147).

The same text also uses in this context the simple vocative *tetatzine* (ibid.: 152, 158).

An early seventeenth-century annalist, Chimalpahin, employs *tetatzin* in reference to a saint: *huey tetatzin Patriarcha Sant. Ignacio*, or “the great father and patriarch San Ignacio” (Chimalpahin 2006: 164-165) and to a lay friar: *tetatzin fr. Sebastian de Aparicio. teopixqui S Franco quateçontzin*, or “the father fray Sebastián de Aparicio, a Franciscan lay friar” (ibid.: 66-67). However, such attestations of the term are rare. Priests are usually referred to with the form *totatzin*, or our father, and its variants. There is some evidence which can suggest that *totatzin* quickly became a “frozen” term. It is often preceded by either a demonstrative pronoun *inin* (“this”) or an indefinite article *ce* (“a”), for example: *yn iPadrino mochiuh ce tottatzin huel sancto*, or “a very holy father became her godfather” (Chimalpahin 2006: 234-235). As can be seen in this example, the translators of the “Annals” ignored the possessive prefix *to-* and interpreted the term as simply “father” rather than “the father of ours.” Moreover, *totatzin* is frequently found forming part of the phrase *totatzin fray*, for instance: *quitlacahualtique yn totatzin fr. Jeronimo de çarate*, or “they restrained our father fray Gerónimo de Zárate from doing it” (Chimalpahin 2006: 200-201). It suggests that it was treated as a Nahuatl equivalent of the Spanish “fray.” In today’s Nahuatl de la Huasteca *totahztin* means a “priest” – the possessive prefix is inoperative.76

In the material I have gathered there are six attestations of -*ta* which refer to priests as “fathers” of either the Spanish king or the indigenous authorities of an *altepetl*, for example:

Our lord sovereign, we also say and declare before you that your fathers the twelve sons of St. Francis reached us (ibid.: 183).

The majority of these attestations, which are all quite early (1560’s) come from the letter of Juan de San Antonio to the indigenous authorities of Texcoco. This letter was written under the supervision of Franciscan friars, who were helping Juan in his long-time struggle to regain some properties he had lost in his youth. It is therefore possible that it was the friars’ suggestion to replace four of five amotatzin, or your (pl.) father with totatzin. The corrections are visible in the text:

Auh ca in ye chico‘xxiuitl, yn iquac Señor Don luys de velasco visorrey, ytettzinco quiualmocauili Jus‘ amo‘ilaçotatzin fray diego de olarte guardian yvan in señor Jorge Ceron Allde mayor yn ipã. 1558 d’s (San Antonio 1997: 234).

And seven years ago, when señor don Luis Velasco, the viceroy, had entrusted justice to your [J.M.] our beloved Father the guardian fray Diego de Olarte and to the alcalde mayor señor Jorge Cerón, in 1558 (ibid.: 235).77

The only attestation of amotatzin which has not been corrected comes from the section of the letter that generally lacks corrections, so it could have been simply overlooked. Arguably, the data suggest that in the initial period the Nahuas tended to view the friars not as the “fathers” of them all, but rather as the “fathers” of their authorities. If the corrections were made by the Franciscans, it would point to the ecclesiastics as the principal speakers in favor of the form totatzin. What was wrong with amotatzin from their point of view? Perhaps the form simply sounded strange from the point of view of the usual Spanish expression “nuestro padre.” Or, if the reviewer was familiar with the nuances of Nahuatl terminology, he would not want the friars to be perceived as having any special relations with the authorities but rather to be viewed as “fathers” of all the natives.

I have come upon two attestations of totatzin used in reference to a saint (San Francisco) instead of a priest (Molina 1569: 73v; Chimalpahin 2006: 46). Interestingly, the earlier one comes from “Confessionario mayor” which suggests that the form could have been

77 In the letter, alternative prefixes are added, in the manner of corrections, also to other nouns and verbs.
The majority of the attestations of the term *-ta* employed for saints is provided with the element *tlaç-o*, forming *totlaçotatzin*, or our precious father. In this context, the term is certainly not an equivalent of a Spanish title, neither is it included in a conventionalized phrase such as *totatzin fray*. *Totlaçotatzin* was used prevalently in the Christian religious context – the only attestation outside this sphere that I have been able to find comes from a sixteenth-century document and refers to an actual father of the authors (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 100). Also, I have not come upon *totlaçotatzin* in any doctrinal text that I have analyzed, which could point to the Nahuas as inventors of this “title.” It should be pointed out, that it is used not only for saints but also for priests when there is a need for particular reverence. Since it is not employed for lay brothers who are instead described with the form *totatzin* (e.g. Chimalpahin 2006: 258), the possibility arises of associating the element *tlaç-o* with “holiness” (see: 1.1.4. Subjects). Finally, the most reverential form of this term is *totlaçomahuiztatziin*, used likewise in reference to both saints and priests (e.g. Chimalpahin 2006: 204; Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 64).

1.4.4. Other relations with “fathers”

The most common precontact kin term to address a ruler was the doublet *in -nan in -ta*, or one’s mother, one’s father (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta). Nevertheless, “father” alone was also, though rarely, used in reference to rulers. A proverb from Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” shows that parents were considered structurally equivalent to *tlatoque* and royal authority, and that the term *-ta* could have been used as a shorter form of the doublet, a kind of *pars pro toto* perhaps:

Similarly was told, thus was scolded the one who dishonors his father, his mother or his ruler, his governor. He was told: Do not throw the ruler or your father or the mat, the throne [= a person of authority] heads down.\footnote{Translation mine.}

Finally, in the colonial period, the council of Huexotzinco wrote to the king of Spain:

\begin{quote}
\it O Totecuiyoe totlatocatzine in tiRey ca ipa timitzontomachitian yn ilhuicac moetztica yn icel teotl dios ca vel ipan timitztomachitia \textit{in titotatzin} \cite{Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 188}.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
O our lord sovereign king, we rely on you as on God the one deity who dwells in heaven, we trust in you as our father \cite{Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 189}.
\end{quote}

However, it seems that not every ruler could enjoy being called the “father” of his subjects. Bad sovereigns, who did not care for their domains, did not deserve this designation. The members of the council of Cuernavaca complained on their governor:

\begin{quote}
\it ahmo totatzin ypapan ticmatin za toyaoh techcocolia amo tle ytlah yc techpalehuia \cite{Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 101}.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
He is not our father, because we know he is only our enemy and hates us; he doesn't help us in any way at all \cite{Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 102}.
\end{quote}

It is possible that in the colonial period the doublet \textit{in -nan in -ta} as employed in reference to rulers gradually ceded to the more hispanized concept of a “father.” As my sample indicates, the doublet had not survived until after sixteenth century. Nevertheless, the attestations of \textit{-ta} in the context of political authority are so scarce that no conclusion can be drawn on the basis of the material gathered.

Much more often, the term \textit{-ta} is used in the religious context, either precontact or Christian. Above, I have discussed the usage of the conventionalized forms \textit{totatzin} and \textit{totlaçotatzin}. Here, I will deal with forms bearing other possessive prefixes, those which indicated an actual relation established between a referent and a reference point. In Book 2 of
the “Florentine Codex” a relation between a captive and his captor, whose identity the former assumes, is described by symmetrical terms: -pil and -ta respectively (see: 1.1.4. Subjects). Although in the majority of cases priests are referred to as a group, -tahuan, in the description of the feast of Xocotl Huetzi, recorded by Sahagún, it is said that the statue of the impersonator of Huitzilopochtli named Paynal, was carried to the top of the pyramid and then brought down by a priest called “his father or his elder brother” (jta, anoço iach) (Sahagún 2012 II: 115).

Another category of beings described with the term -ta in the context of precontact religion were gods. Although, similarly to rulers, a common term to address gods was in -nan in -ta, at some occasions only one of the doublet’s components was used – either purposefully or because of an inadvertent omission. In the following example, the deity mentioned is Tloque Nahuaque, at the very moment invoked as the creator of a newborn child: omjitzmjhoali in motatzin, in tlacatl, in tloque, naoaque, in teiocoianj, in techioanij, or “Thy beloved father, the master, the lord of the near, of the nigh, the creator of men, the maker of men, hath sent thee” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 167-168).

In the Christian context, Chimalpahin employs the term -ta with the connotation of “creator” in reference to the founders of religious orders. For instance, Ignacio Loyola:

ynin huel yehuatzin achtopa intatzin huel yehuatzin yancuican ytlapehualtilztitzinhuam ytlanextiltitzinhuan yn la compañia de Jesus teopixque (Chimalpahin 2006: 164).

was the very first father of the religious of the Company of Jesus and they were first started and manifested by him (ibid.: 165).

In another example, the issuing of regulations for a community is treated as the very beginning of the order’s existence:

yn inteotlatecpanemilitzin yn quinmotalliliteltehuac Regla ypan monemiztique ynic quinmonahuatilteltehuac yn omoteneuhtzino yntlaçottatzin S. benito. Patriarcha (ibid.: 236).
Their holy rules of life, the rule by which they are to live, that their said precious father St. Benedict the patriarch issued, ordered, and left behind for them... (ibid.: 237).

The Christian God was also referred to as the father of individuals, though I have not come across any attestation explicitly associated with creation. Instead, the term notlaçotatzin, or my precious father, is often used in testaments, in the context of taking away the testator’s life, or placing the testator’s soul in the hands of God:

\[
\text{ca çà nienochielilia yn itlatoltzin yn notlaçotatzin dios yn quemman nechmotlatzontequililiz ynic nicahuaz yn tlalticpac (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 58).}
\]

I am only awaiting the word of my dear father God when he will sentence me to leave the earth (ibid.: 59).

\[
\text{Ca huel acachtopa yn noyolia Nanimantzín Ca huel ycenmactzinco nicontlalia in notlaçomahuiztahtzin Dios (Pizzigoni 2007: 55).}
\]

first of all I place my spirit and soul very entirely in the hands of my precious revered father God (ibid).

God is likewise described as one’s “father” in the context of bequeathing property. A seventeenth-century author of a document declares while listing various parts of his estate: \[
milli yn itechtzinco puhui yn dios notlaçotatzin, or “a field that is dedicated (or: belongs) to God my dear father” (Lockhart 1992: 462).\] Significantly, in this document God is only one of a number of the author’s “heirs.” The man begins with an explanation that he had used to sweep in front of the image of the Most Holy Trinity (probably housed in a local church). However, after some time the image was moved to a church school and his service was no longer needed. Now he wants “his house to be a home of God.” Having “donated” to God several buildings and fields, the author continues with the bequests for the images of San Francisco, Nicolás, Jacinto, Santa María, two crucifixes, and the \textit{Ecce Homo} depiction\textsuperscript{79}.

\textsuperscript{79} Reading mundane documents and wills in particular, it soon becomes obvious that the Christian style of representing particular aspects of saints, like, for example, Mary at the Cross or the Assumption of Mary, was
(Lockhart 1992: 463). One gets the impression that God is treated here like a member of the pantheon of saints (including Mary and Jesus). In colonial times, he was generally considered the owner of a household, though specific parts of household’s property were assigned to different saints in order to “sustain” them, i.e. to buy candles, incense and ornaments for their images. Each saint who “lived” in a household (i.e. whose image was kept there) owned “his/her” part of the property and the members of the family served him by performing various rituals. Among them one of the most important was sweeping, in the precontact tradition perceived as a form of offering (Burkhart 1989: 117; Lockhart 1992: 238-239). Returning to the document analyzed, it is likely that when the narrator is no longer able to serve God by sweeping, he decides on another form of offering and dedicates a part of his property to “sustain” the Holy Trinity. Perhaps this disturbs the previous distribution of the property among the “saints,” to whom he is serving, therefore he reorders things and grants the “saints” some units of minor importance. As has been established by Lockhart (1992: 239), these offerings did not actually mean that the property was ceded to the Church, but rather that the “donator” was becoming a “tenant” of sacred beings, who, on their part, played the role of landlords.

There is another example, where one’s “father,” this time a saint, apparently owes the land. The central character of a sixteenth-century document, Ana, is planning to build a house on a newly acquired piece of land:

\[
\text{ca ye polihuiz cadelatzin yhua popotzintli nicnomaquilitaz y notlaçotatin y santo sa Miguel ypanpa ca ytlalpatzinco y ninocaltia (Lockhart 1991: 74)}
\]

Candles will be burnt, and I will go along providing incense for my precious father the saint San Miguel, because it is on his land that I am building my house (ibid).

Here, the relation “landlord-tenant” extends from the level of household to the level of entire community. Since the town was called San Miguel Tocuillan, San Miguel was obviously its patron saint. The phrase “it is on his land that I am building my house” clearly indicates that

not really fully grasped by the Nahuas. Here too the crucifix and the motif of Ecce Homo are conceived as the images of two separate “deities” – or better, according to the belief in the actual presence of saints within their representations – two separate deities as they were. For more on this subject, see: Wood 1991.
he was also considered owner of the entire town, an indigenous belief widely attested in colonial Mexico (Lockhart 1992: 237).

The discussed examples can be used as a background against which some usages of the term -ta in Chimalpahin’s “Annals” result more understandable. Chimalpahin refers to three personages as his “fathers.” The first one is obviously his actual father, the second one is a saint, San Antonio Abad, and the last one – a friar named Agustín del Espíritu Santo. The relation which the chronicler maintained with San Antonio was a close one. In the name Domingo Francisco de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuauitzin the “San Antón” part derived from the name of San Antonio (Schroeder 1996: 38). The saint was also the patron of a religious order, but it is most likely that Chimalpahin never joined it (ibid.: 42). Instead, he was living at the church under San Antonio’s patronage, that is, at his home, which is clearly said in the following passage from the “Annals”:

ynin tlahtolli nehuatl onicmachiyyotl Don domingo de S. Anton Muñon Quauhtlehuauitzin, macihui yn amo nolhuil nomacehual ynic nican nitlatequipanotinemi ychantzinco y notlaçottatzin S. Antonio (Chimalpahin 2006: 258).

This account was recorded by me, don Domingo de San Antón Muñón Quauhtlehuauitzin, who though I am not worthy of it have been serving here at the home of my precious father San Antonio (ibid.: 259).

Apparently, the church of San Antonio Abad had also a more earthly “proprietor”: fray Agustín del Espíritu Santo. He was a son of Diego Muñón who belonged to the family that took care of the church, and most likely a nephew of don Sancho Sánchez de Muñón, maestrescuela in the cathedral. Although Chimalpahin gave distinction to don Sancho (Schroeder 1996: 39, 46), in the account of the year 1591 it is don Diego whom he calls the patron (padron) (Chimalpahin 2006: 36). In the entry for 1611, apparently after the death of don Diego, the title padron appears with the name of his wife, Leonor Marin. Likewise, in this year the death of Leonor is recorded and Chimalpahin states that:

yn axcan oncan ye no yehuatzin Patron mochiuhtzinotica. quimopiiallia. yn iteopancaltzin Sancto. S. Antontzin (ibid.: 172).
He [Agustín del Espíritu Santo] now likewise becomes patron there and owns the church building of the saint San Antonio (ibid.: 173).

The fact that Agustín was (in a sense) the owner of the church is confirmed by another passage:

\[ y\ no\ thatzin\ Padre\ fray\ Agustin\ del\ espiritu\ Sancto\ Patron \ quimopachilhuia\ y\ huel \ yxcoyantzinco\ yaxcatzin\ ynic\ quimopielia\ yn\ iteopancaltzin\ notlaçomahuizthatzin\ yn\ hueytzintli\ S.\ Antonio\ Abad \] (ibid.: 290).

My father, father fray Agustín del Espíritu Santo, the patron, who governs and as his very own property has charge of [or: owns, J.M.] the church of my precious revered father the great San Antonio Abad.

Thus, the relationship between Chimalpahin and both San Antonio and fray Agustín reminds of the relation between a tenant and a landlord because the annalist lived at the place “owned” and “governed” by them. Likewise, although he does not say it explicitly, his sustenance depended on them, because he worked as a fiscal at the church.

The connotations of -ta implied in Chimalpahin’s seventeenth-century writings continue into the eighteenth century. A 1738 testament from the Calimaya region includes a whole range of relations between the testator and saints, described with the discussed term. Firstly, the preamble names the patron saint of the altepetl “the precious and revered father” of Félix de Santiago:

\[ NiCan\ iPa\ yAltepetzit\ notlaSomahuistatzi\ S."to\ S."\ P.º\ Calimaya\ niCa\ nichane\ yhua\ nipohui\ niCa\ ypan\ tlaxilaCali\ Bario\ tiopantongo,\ yhua\ niCa\ nicpehualtia\ y\ noMemoria\ testamento\ nehual\ notoCa\ felis\ de\ S."tiago\ v.º \] (Pizzigoni 2007: 216)

---

80 J. Lockhart, S. Schroder and D. Namala render the word “quimopiallia” as “he is in charge of.” In the early seventeenth century the verb pia was already used with the sense of “to have,” but the precontact meaning “to guard” is possible here as well (see: Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 44). I believe that my translation is justified by the passage from the same source cited below.
here in the altepetl of my precious revered father holy San Pedro, Calimaya, I named Félix de Santiago, widower, citizen here, begin here my memorandum of testament; I belong to the tlaxilacalli and barrio of Teopantonco here (ibid).

Further, both San Pedro and San Pablo are called “notlaSomahuistatzitzihua Patrones S.º S.º P.º,” or “my precious revered fathers the patrons lord San Pedro and holy San Pablo” (ibid). San Pablo was the patron saint of the altepetl Tepemaxalco, which, together with Calimaya, formed a single administrative unit, a double altepetl (ibid.: 6). In the same phrase, “notlaSoMahuiatstzi S.º miguel ArCanJel” is mentioned, whose affiliation is not entirely understood, although Caterina Pizzigoni suspects that he was the patron saint of a tlaxilacalli (a smaller unit within an altepetl) in Calimaya (ibid.: 190). Finally, Félix asks to be buried wearing the habit and the rope of “notlaSoMahuiatstzi S.ºto S.º fr.ºº,” or “my precious revered father holy San Francisco” (ibid.: 217). In Calimaya/Tepemaxalco a lot of men included Felix’s request in their wills (ibid.: 15) and women sometimes asked to be girt with the rope of San Francisco, although the habit they were wearing belonged to a female religious order (e.g. ibid.: 133). Arguably, the fact of wearing the garment of the Franciscans identified the deceased with a Franciscan friar – therefore, he was becoming “a child of San Francisco” (see: 1.1.4. Subjects) while the saint was his “father,” or patron. This custom might have stemmed from the same beliefs of precontact origin, that made the Nahuas clad their deceased tlatoque in the costumes of their divine patrons, as a means of transforming the ruler into a divine being (Olko 2005: 464).

Summing up, it seems that after the conquest the term -ta began to be employed in more contexts than before, “replacing,” in a way, the doublet in -nan in -ta. Originally, the relationship between the father and his child might have been associated with the transfer of vital essence (as in the case of a captor who used his captive to communicate with the supernatural – see: 1.1.4. Subjects). Afterwards, it acquired the connotations of “patron,” understood, as the texts indicate, in terms of authority, ownership and creation. Arguably, although distinct from the precontact concepts, colonial innovations included some elements of the native worldview. Viewing a church as the home of its patron saint can be traced back to prehispanic times, when gods “lived” at the temples dedicated to them (Lockhart 1992: 236-237). Moreover, Sahagún’s informants code the concept of ownership in a series of
epithets associated with owning and distributing the property, that compose a portrait of a good father:

motetzontia, tetetzontia, tlapachoa, tetlapachilhuia, monepacholtia, monemachtia, tenepacholtia, veca tlachia, tetlamachia, tlatlalia, tlatecpana (Sahagún 2012 X: 1)

He stores up for himself; he stores up for others. He cares for his assets; he saves for others. He is thrifty – he saves for the future, teaches thrift, looks to the future. He regulates, distributes with care, establishes order (ibid).

1.4.5. -ta vocatives

While the vocatives based on the term -pil are numerous, grammatically diverse and adapted to connote various amounts of respect, there were only two -ta-vocatives in precontact contexts: notatzine and notahuane. The usage of the latter is entirely consistent with the usage of the respective form of reference, -tahuan, discussed above (see: 1.4.1. Advisers). As several examples from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” explicitly show, both forms were used in reference to the same people, having the same person as the reference point, for example:

yn ohualiçac niman ye choca yn mallinalxoch. quimilhuia yn ittahuan notahuan campan tiazque (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 78)

when Malinalxoch awoke, she wept. She said to her fathers [= senior advisers]: My fathers, where shall we go? (ibid.: 79)

-Tahuan described a particular social or political rank and the vocative notahuane was both derived directly from and used to refer to that rank. Therefore, it cannot be interpreted in terms of relative social deference, as suggested by Brant Gardner (1982: 111).

The singular form notatzine is rarely seen in precontact contexts. The kin terms list in the “Memoriales con Escolios” suggests that only children of commoners addressed their parents with direct kinship terms (Sahagún 2012 X: 1, n. 2, 2, n. 6). In the fray Juan Bautista’s
huehuetlatolli notatzine is employed to greet a commoner and juxtaposed with nocoltzine and notlatzine (Bautista 2008: 51v). -Colhuan was used to refer to officials or workers associated with land and subordinate to a lord (see: 2.2. -col), while -tla described a lord’s ally – also of inferior position (see: 3.3. -tla). It is therefore possible that also notatzine as employed in polite speech was based on the connotations of -tahuan. A nobleman, who greeted a commoner with the words “Nottatzine nocoltzine, notlatzine” (ibid.) would have simply referred to all his possible ranks as a lord’s subject. However, it has also to be stressed, that in the very same huehuetlatolli a son – apparently a nobleman – uses the form notatzine in reference to his father (ibid.: 15r, 15v, 25v, 27r). Perhaps in this case the vocative is employed not so much with the sense of a “father,” as with the sense of “the one who transmits knowledge,” since all attestations appear in the context of acknowledging the received advice. Similar contexts are seen as far as the vocatives based on -techiucauh are concerned (see: 1.7.1. -techiucauh).

The remaining vocatives based on -ta are to be found in Christian contexts. I have already mentioned the form (tilaço)tetatzine which was a way of addressing the Christian God (see: 1.4.3. Teta and tota in religious contexts). Other forms of address appear exclusively in reference to Christian priests and (together with (tilaço)tetatzine) they must be viewed as products of the colonial reality. Some of them were undoubtedly based on forms employed in indirect speech. Thus, one finds totatze (San Antonio 1997: 220) and totlaçotatzine – the latter used in reference to the pope (Sahagún 1986: 104). Fray Alonso de Molina suggests that a sinner should address a confessor with the term notatzine (Molina 1569: f. 16). Obviously this is a calque from “padre mio” and it has nothing to do with the above-indicated notion of transmission of knowledge. Arguably, more elaborate forms of address employed by the Nahuas in later sources built on friars’ imposition. The form notlaçotatzine is found in reference to a confessor (Carochi 2001: 264), friar (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 136, 138) and prior (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 64). Additionally, a father guardian is called notlaçomahuiztatzine (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 166). It has to be said, that the forms with the 1st personal singular possessive prefix are much more frequent than those with the plural prefix. Both were new to the native terminological system but the former better suited the general pattern of constructing polite forms of address.
1.5. -NAN

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses the term -nan under “Tenan. madre de alguno,” or one’s mother (Molina 1977 II: 98r). Within the family sphere it was used primarily for biological mothers, but in the context of the origins of the Tenochca royal dynasty it is also found extended to a stepmother:

*ma oc niquilhui yn inantzin yn illancueytl. ynin yllancueytl çan quihuapauh ynic quimoconeti. ca y yahitzin yn acamapich* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 114)

Let me just speak to his [Acamapichtli’s] mother, Illancueitl. This Illancueitl had merely brought him up when she had adopted him as her child. She was Acamapichtli’s aunt.81

As Sarah L. Cline notes, in the “Testaments of Culhuacan” doña Luisa Juana referred to her stepmother, doña Elena Constantina, with the term -nan (Cline 1986: 70). Another extension is to be found in a 1738 will from Calimaya, where -nan is employed for a child’s godmother, not bearing the usual modifier *teoyotica*:

*no yhua nitlanahuatia notelpoh Martin Leon Ca yehual nicCahuilia noCoMadre Maria de pelegrina yhua nocopadre Marselo Martin Ca yehuatzi ytlasonantzi oquiMoquiMoquatequili* (Pizzigoni 2007: 217)

In addition I order that I leave my son Martín León to my comadre María de Peregrina and my compadre Marcelo Martin, for she is his precious mother who baptized him (ibid).

The hints regarding the role the term -nan might have fulfilled in the classification system of a Nahua noble house are scarce. As far as this matter is concerned, the richest source is the “Cantares Mexicanos.” The term -nan appears in songs sung by women, often concubines or wives of a lord. John Bierhorst states that in these songs it “refers to ‘sister’ musicians or female sex partners” and he lists all the examples of such a usage of the term in

81 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson render the clause “ma oc niquilhui yn inantzin yn illancueytl” as “Yet I must not speak of Illancueitl as his mother.”
the “Cantares” (Bierhorst 1985b: 225). In the “Chalca Woman’s Song” translated and analyzed by Camilla Townsend a concubine complains about her fate: *Ya cue nonantzin nontlaocolmiqui o ye nican ye noquichuacan*, or “Hey mother, I am dying of sadness here in my life with a man” (Townsend 2006: 385). In the second part of the song the concubine is already old and says (though we do not know who the reference point is): *nahuilylama namonan*, or “I am an old courtesan. I am your (pl.) mother” (ibid.: 389).

The “Dove Song” contains a satirical dialogue between two women who make love to each other, Chalchiuhnenetzin and Nanotzin – the former, who is the seducer, is constantly calling the latter *nonan*, or my mother (Bierhorst 1985a: 396-399). At the end of the song, however, the amusing dialogue cedes to the serious monologue of Chalchiuhnenetzin, who reproaches her “mother”:

*Tle ypanon tinechmati tinonan anca nicozcatli tinechtlatia anca yoccan ahuiliz tlamatiz noyoliol yca nichocaya* (Bierhorst 1985a: 400).

O mama! How do you treat me? It seems I’m a jewel, and you hide me. I think it’s time for my hearts to revel and enjoy themselves. And so I weep (ibid.: 401).

Finally, in the “Wanton Dove Song” we again meet Chalchiuhnenetzin and Nanotzin. This time, the former reproaches the latter for not letting her dance:

*onca yahue aya izquixochitl ymancan çan tocnoma tlaca ompa niaz tinonantzin çan ca nicmamatiaz noxochihuaya maniya huitta tocnoma. Onca yahue aya çan tinechahua tinonanotzin ma nonittotia* (ibid.: 406)

Our poor soldier men are where these popcorn flowers lie. And there I’ll go, dear mama. I’ll carry off my flowers. Ah, poor hands! They’re lying [there]. Oh my Nanotzin, you’re pricking me. Let me dance (ibid.: 407).

Bierhorst states that in these songs Nanotzin is a stock character (Bierhorst 1985a: 510). Her name means literally “maternity” and she always plays a role of the one in control of carefree Chalchiuhnenetzin – the one who restrains her and needs to be asked for permission. The “Florentine Codex” indicates the existence of a group of elder women who
played an important role in a family. When a messenger of the ruler visited a house where a baby was born, he greeted not only the baby and his or her mother, but also

\[ \text{in pilhoaque, in vevetque: quijmjlvia. Ca njcan anmonoltitoque nopolhoane: auh noce in antenanoan, in amjlamatlaca, in antzonjztaque, in anquaiztaque: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 195)} \]

those who have children, the old men. He said to them: “Listen, you who dwell here. Also you, the mothers of people, old women, the white-haired ones, the white-headed ones.”

A passage from Book 8 describes how the women of aristocracy were trained:

\[ \text{tlaqualchioa, achioa, qujnomauja: vncate in jnnahoan in qujmqzaltia, ioan in cocoa tepotzome cihoa, tzapame, cujca, tlatzotzona: injc melelqujxtia (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 49).} \]

They voluntarily prepare food and chocolate. There are their mothers who raise them and sick hunchback women, dwarves, sing and play drums with which they take pleasure.

The passage evokes the image of women’s quarters, probably in a traditional Nahua compound family house, perhaps even in a teccalli. In the context of Nahua polygynous system such quarters would be inhabited by the lord’s wives, concubines and their offspring. As Townsed notes, women who entered polygynous relationships were often entirely separated from their relatives (Townsend 2006: 356). In the first quotation from the “Chalca Woman’s Song” above, the concubine speaks, in Townsend’s words, “as if to her mother – but it might be to any older woman in her quarters” (ibid.: 379). Arguably, the same situation takes place in the “Dove Song” and “Wanton Dove Song”: Chalchiuhnnetzin is a young wife or concubine and Nanotzin is one of her “mothers” or elder women in charge of the young ones in the household.
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By now, the majority of examples analyzed in this chapter have been the attestations of -nan with the female reference point. In both “Cantares Mexicanos” and Book 8 of the “Florentine Codex,” -nanhuan are the mothers of women and the relation described by this term seems to be the one of taking responsibility and care for the young protegées. The above example from Book 6 displays the term combined with the indefinite possessive prefix te- and juxtaposed with the word ilamatlaca, or old women. It suggests that in some contexts tenanhuán may have been understood as referring to one’s status as an aged woman and at the same time an experienced parent. “The mothers of people” tend to be with young women in the key moments of their lives, such as the wedding or childbirth. In the “Bancroft Dialogues” a wedding guest thanks tenanhuán on behalf of the married couple (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 110) and in the “Florentine Codex” tenanhuán along with a midwife take care of a pregnant woman (Sahagún 2012 VI: 156).

However, as the above examples from the “Cantares Mexicanos” show, those aged mother figures are also found in situations of erotic character. In Book 2 of the “Florentine Codex” tenanhuán and ahuianime, or prostitutes, are listed as those who join the ceremonial dance of men:

_Auh no tehoan in cioa mjtotia: mjtoa tenaoan, çan illo tlama, amo tequjuhtiloia: auh çan no iehoantin yn aujianjme, in maaujltia_ (Sahagún 2012 II: 56).

And also women danced with them (they were called mothers), only of their own accord; they were not made to. And likewise pleasure girls, who amused themselves (ibid).

Townsend again sets this phenomenon in the context of households based on polygamous marriage pattern:

Because most of the wives and female slaves bore children and eventually grew old, there emerged a secondary connotation for the word “mother” (usually a term of great respect) that conveyed the notion of someone like an abandoned old courtesan, a woman who had been sexually accessible for years, and was now dependent on the household (Townsend 2006: 375-376).
She notes that sexual connotations of the term are likewise present in the “Tlaxcalan Actas.” The word based on the root -nan is used there in reference to women corrupted by the cochineal traders. However, in the two documents involved the stem of the word is not -nan, but the reduplicated -nanan:

\[
yvan \text{ yn } yehuan \text{ nochiznequiloque } / \text{ yn quichuia } \text{ yuququi } \text{ ynn } \text{ inahnnavan } \text{ mochiua } \text{ yn } c\text{iva tlapalcui} \ (\text{Lockhart, Berdan, Anderson 1986: 82, see also p. 82, n.7})
\]

And these cochineal dealers act as if the women who gather dye have been made their mothers.

And the second example:

\[
no \text{ yuan cavaltioloque } \text{ yn } c\text{iuia tiyanquizco mouquipana } \text{ ya oncan } \text{ tlapalnechicolouaya } / \text{ yuququi } \text{ ynn } \text{ inahnnavan } \text{ quinchiuaya } \text{ tlapalnequiloque} \ (\text{ibid.: 89})
\]

And also the women have been prevented from lining up in the marketplace where they collected dye, and the dye dealers made them like their mothers.  

The only attestations of -nanan that I have been able to find outside the “Tlaxcalan Actas” come from the “Cantares Mexicanos.” In one of the poems the singer sings about death:

\[
cuicatl \text{ ijca y nilnamicoz } \text{ ohua } \text{ nopinohuã } \text{ niaz } \text{ nipolihuitiuh } \text{ cozcazpetiac } \text{ ninotecatiuh } \text{ chocotiaz } \text{ nonanãhuan} \ (\text{Bierhorst 1985a: 234})
\]

I’ll be recalled in songs. O warriors, I’ll go to my destruction: I’ll go and be dispersed upon this mat of jewels and parrots. All my mothers will be weeping (ibid: 235).

Additionally, in the already cited Wanton Dove Song, the warriors who lose their lives in battle are glorified and one of the lines says: \textit{Oliniquetl tonanahua San Palacizco huicaloya}, or “These shakers, these mothers of ours! They’re carried off to San Francisco, i.e. to the saint who resides in heaven as a judge” (ibid.: 402-403, 508). The last quotation, I find particularly difficult to interpret. The noun \textit{oliniquetl} may have something to do with dancers. The identity

\[84\text{ In both citations A.J.O. Anderson, F. Berdan and J. Lockhart render the word } \textit{innahnvan} \text{ as “their relatives.”}\]
of a singer is not certain, though in other sections of the song it is undoubtedly Chalchiuhnenetzin, a young concubine.

To sum up, in the context of the Nahua noble house the term -nan is very often linked to sexuality. It may be associated not only with the polygynous system but also with the fact that in the Nahua worldview women, contrary to men, were believed to retain their sexual appetite until a very advanced age (López Austin 1988 I: 296). There is a possible distinction between the roots used with either female (-nan) or male (-nanan) reference point, though the evidence is too scarce to be certain. Likewise, the distinction would have occurred only when sexual connotations were involved, because in hundreds of attestations of the term -nan as a basic kin term that I have gathered, the root is identical for both sons and daughters.

1.5.1. Tenan and tonan in religious context

The term -nan forms part of numerous designations ascribed to female deities. They are constructed with various possessive prefixes, but the most common forms are tenan and tonan. The former is included for example in the name of a fertility goddess, Zapotlan tenan, or the mother from Zapotlan (Sahagún 1997b: 84). It is also the name of a mountain mentioned by Chimalpahin: tepetl yn quitocayotia Tenan, or “the mountain they call Tenan” (Chimalpahin 2006: 234). According to Alfredo López Austin, in Mesoamerica mountains were considered protector deities of neighboring settlements (López Austin 1989: 64). This function was combined with aquatic associations: every mountain was considered a replica of Tlalocan, a great tank of water on which the sustenance of people depended (López Austin 2000: 162, 184-185). These associations are absent from Chimalpahin’s usage of tenantzin in the Christian context, as an exact rendering of the Spanish word “madre”:

* motemachizti ynic yancuican ohualla españa yn iyecetenehualiztlahtolotzin huey Sancta tenantzin la madre Theresa de Jesus. ynic motenehua Beatificacion çan oc ycatzinco Oquimochihuilli yn Roma Sancto Padre Paulo quinto (Chimalpahin 2006: 286)
it was announced, there had newly come from Spain the statement, called beatification, blessing the great saint mother Teresa de Jesús, which the holy Father in Rome, Paul V, provisionally made in her name (ibid.: 287).

The form with *io-* is far more widespread in the sources. It is extensively used in the songs recorded in the “Primeros Memoriales.” One of the passages, an explanatory gloss to the archaic text of the song of Chicomecoatl, makes it clear that *tonan* or *tonantzin* was understood as a kind of epithet rather than a proper name:

\[
a \text{ca tonã titechinocavazqu} / \text{tiyaviã mochã tlallocã noviya} / \text{id estximeva, xixva, xiça ca otimovicaya yn mochãtzinco in tlalocã ca iuhquĩ titonãtzĩ} (\text{Sahagúñ 1997b: 148}).
\]

You, our mother, will leave us bereft; / You have gone to your home in Tlalocan. / that is, arise, sprout up, wake up, for you have taken yourself off to your home in Tlalocan; you are like our mother (ibid).

Chicomecoatl, identified with maize, is asked here to emerge from Tlalocan in order to grow again on earth. In the song of Teteoinnan, the goddess called *tonan* is said to have come forth from Tamoanchan (Sahagúñ 1997b: 135). In the following verses she is identified with Itzpapalotl (*tonan itzpapalotli*) and Tlalteuctli (*tonan tlalteuctli*) (ibid.: 136). Both deities were responsible for the beginning of growth, life and death on earth: Itzpapalotl was banished from Tamoanchan after having committed a transgression and Tlalteuctli was torn into pieces by gods, thereby putting an end to primordial chaos (Graulich 1983: 576-578). Other female deities called *tonan* in the songs collected by Sahagúñ are Yaocihuatl – an aspect of Cihuacoatl Quilaztli (Sahagúñ 1997b: 144) (see below) and Tlazolteotl (ibid.: 145). The former name means an “enemy-woman” and may be associated here with women who died in childbirth. The latter belonged to the deity of filth and adultery who was, however, also a patron of childbirth (Olko 1999: 105).

Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” mentions, in the context of giving birth to a child, “in tonan in cioapilli in Cioacoatl, in Quilaztli” (Sahagúñ 2012 VI: 180), or “our mother, the noblewoman, Cihuacoatl Quilaztli.” When a woman dies in delivery, she is told by the midwife to “approach” “in tocennan in tecitzin, in iooalticitl” (ibid.: 155), or “our eternal
mother, the grandmother of people, Yoalticítl.” Both goddesses were associated with pregnancy, newborns and giving birth (López Austin 2000: 193-194) and thus had creative aspects. In the last example the term based on -nan is juxtaposed with the one based on -ci, or grandmother. It seems that in the religious sphere a “mother-goddess” was also associated with the figure of ilama, or an old woman, whose main role both in historiography (as an ancestor) and in a household (as an elder) was the transmission of knowledge or tradition. Georges Baudot cites Sahagún’s “Calendario mexicano” which mentions “a feast called llamatecuhtli, and by another name Tonan, and by another Cozcamilauh” (Baudot 1974: 182). This dual role (the one who gives birth and is responsible for the community’s identity and existence) conforms to Alfredo López Austin’s assertion that mother-goddess figures fulfilled the roles of both “dueñas de los poderes del crecimiento” and patron goddesses of altepetl (López Austin 2000: 200, 217). Quilaztlí was also a patron deity of the Colhuaca Chichimeca and they called her tonan (Sahagún 1997b: 222).

After the coming of Christianity, the term -nan began to be employed above all for the Virgin Mary. Her titulature is thoroughly discussed in Louise Burkhart’s “Before Guadalupe.” There is little I can add to this discussion drawing from the material I have gathered. Sahagún suggested that after the conquest the goddess Tonantzin was identified with the Virgin of Guadalupe, for which reason he opposed the usage of tonantzin for Mary (López Austin 1989: 76). However, as Burkhart remarks, this term was a title used for various female deities rather than a proper name, which makes the identification with a particular goddess questionable (Burkhart 2001: 11). In the majority of my examples referring to precontact deities, it has the non-reverential form tonan, although it is also found once with the ending -tzin:

\[
\text{cujx à tomjecca in ticioatzitzinti ca toiaioiuh: ca vncan mjiquztequjti in Ciuacoatl, in Quilaztlí in tonantzin (Sahagún 2012 VI: 180).}
\]

Certainly it is our mortality, we who are women, for it is our battle, for at this time our mother, Ciuacoatl, Quilaztlí exacteth the tribute of death (ibid).

Burkhart hypothesizes that in this quotation the term tonantzin “could even be taken as a veiled allusion to Mary as a patron of childbirth“ (Burkhart 2001: 11). However, in Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex“ Cihuacoatl Quilaztlí is, in the context of childbirth, much more often named tonan, and this form was never used in reference to the Virgin Mary. Instead, in the
“Coloquios y doctrina cristiana” it is employed to describe Eve as the first mother of “us all” (Sahagún 1986: 192, 196-198) and as such it displays “procreative” connotations found in precontact contexts.

Burkhart came across the form tonantzin used in reference to the Virgin Mary in many doctrinal texts (Burkhart 2001: 11). Helga Rammow (1964: 178) likewise found it in Juan Bautista’s “Huehuetlatolli” (Bautista 2008: 51r). In the same source tonantzin occurs several times in reference to the Church as well (ibid.: 73r, 74v, 75r). Such a usage of the term seems to be more or less a calque from Spanish, probably introduced by the friars:

ca yuhca ytenahuatiltzin yn tonantzin sancta yglesia, ynic achtopa neyolcutilo nyxpan Sacerdote: yn ayamo nenamictilo.

porque assi lo manda la Sancta madre Yglesia: que antes que se casen los que se uieren de casar, se confiessen ate el sacerdote (Molina 1569: 52r).

It has to be noted that all (forty) attestations of the form tonantzin employed in the context of Christianity that can be found in the sources recorded in my database (annals, mundane documents and early doctrinal texts), refer to the Church. Although in other sources the term appears in reference to the Virgin Mary, the most common designation for her is totlaçonantzin, or “our precious mother” and totlaçomahuiznantzin, or “our precious and revered mother.” This “title” was either introduced by the friars or very early accepted by them – its earliest attestation in my database comes from the “Confessionario mayor” (Molina 1569: 67v). It may be a calque but, although Spaniards did associate the Virgin Mary with the concept of “mother” of the people, they most often referred to her as “nuestra señora.” James Lockhart suggests that the possible reasons for choosing the term “mother” for Mary were: the lack of a smooth Nahuatl counterpart of the Spanish “nuestra señora” (on the part of the Spaniards) and the dualistic worldview of the Nahuas compelling them to seek a female partner for God the Father (on the part of the Nahuas) (Lockhart 1992: 252). Perhaps the form tonan employed for Aztec goddesses was so quickly adapted by the Nahuas for Mary, that the only thing the friars could do was to “christianize” the term by means of the element tlaço-. On the other hand, the form totlaçonantzin may have served to differentiate the Virgin Mary from the Holy Church through terminology, defining them as two separate categories. In any
case, for Lockhart this term is the sign of “an important doctrinal alteration of Spanish orthodoxy” (ibid).

Eventually, totlaçonantzin became so tightly associated with Mary that Nahua writers hardly felt compelled to give further explanations as to whom they were talking about, for instance: yaxca nican totlasonantzin cobratia sa martin, or “It is a property of the cofradía of our dear mother here in San Martín” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 176-177). As the example shows, the term could have formed part of the name of a cofradía. Other frequent contexts in which it comes up are: the names of religious orders, for example: yni monjastin ypilhuantzitzinhuan totlaçonantzin conception, or “these nuns were children of our precious mother of Concepción” (Chimalpahin 2006: 68-69); the names of churches, for example: Totlaçonantzin nuestra Señora de las Mercedes (ibid.: 304); and holy images, among them those ceded to family members in testaments, for example: ninomaquilia totlaxomaisnatzi de los ageles yahua sa frǻ ynemaqu in agustin de los ageles, or “I give our precious honored mother of the Angels and the saint San Francisco to Agustín de los Angeles as his inheritance” (Lockhart 1991: 137).

1.5.2. Mother as matrix

In the material I have gathered the term -nan appears mostly in the context of family and household organization. Outside this sphere, it is primarily found in reference to religious concepts, either precontact or Christian, but in the “Florentine Codex” there are interesting usages of -nan in another sphere:

cvncà, mjtoa, inà çan tlaeltel, çaçan ie tetl, amo mavizio, amo no neconj, atle ipan itto: (...) Auh inin mjtoa inan in tlaçotetl, amo no motqujtica, çan canjn qujmotlalili (Sahagún 2012 XI: 221)

[The precious stone] is in, as they say, its mother. It is just a dirty rock, any rock, it is not respected, nor is it beneficial, it is viewed as nothing (...). This, as they say, mother
of the precious stone is not the whole solid thing [= rock] either, only where it placed [the precious stone].

A part of the rock where the precious stone is found is called the stone’s mother. Similarly, the rock which produces gold is called gold’s mother:

*in coztic teucujtlatl, ca tlallan in mochiva, (...) ca onca inan: iquac in neçi in jnan in qujavi, in jaio (in qujtoa) iiaix cenca chiava (...) auh in mache inan ca tlalli, anoço tepetl itic in onoc, in ca coztic teucujtlatl: (ibid.: 233)*

Gold is in the earth, where it is produced (...). It is in its mother: when its mother appears, it rains her water (of which they say) her urine, it is very stained (...). For the most part, its mother is the earth or the interior of a mountain, where gold lies, where it is.

Finally, in another source, the bed of the ravine is the ravine’s mother:

*Auh yn ce atl huallauh ypan y quauhximalpa[n] yn intlalpan yn espanolesme auh zanno oncan mochippa quitoca yn inan yn atlauhtly yeuatl yn itiecavan yn quitoca yn ompa itztiuh cuyuacan yn imilpan altamirano (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 214)*

And one stream comes through Quauhximalpan on the lands of the Spaniards, and also there is [its branch], always following the bed of the ravine which goes toward Coyoacan on the fields of Altamirano (ibid.: 215).

From this evidence, it results that as far as the natural world was concerned, “mother” was understood as a “matrix,” a place occupied by something that originated in it.

As far as the relationship between goddesses (Virgin Mary included) and their worshippers is concerned, the reference point of *to(tlaço)nan(tzin)* was the entire community (*altepetl, Christians, humans, etc*). In the songs recorded in the “Primeros Memoriales,” the “archaic” verses which contain the term *tonan* are sometimes followed by “modernized”

---
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verses sung by the goddess herself. She identifies herself as the mother of people, probably her worshippers:

\[ A \text{ vmei quauhtli, ye tonan aya chalmecatecutlj (\ldots) q.n. Matlactli vmei quauhtli y\text{á} notonal in namonã auh yn ãnopilhoã (Sahagún 1997b: 144) } \]

Thirteen Eagle is our mother, Chalman lady. (\ldots) This means, Thirteen Eagle is my sign. I am your mother and you [people of Chalma] are my children (ibid).

Additionally, the term -nan was combined with other possessive prefixes that seemed to establish a more personal relationship between a deity and an individual. While bathing a newborn the midwife was saying to him or her: \[ Auh in axcan ma itech ximaxiti in monantzìn in chalchiuhtli icue, in chalchiuhtlatonac, or “And now arrive with thy mother, Chalchiuhtli icue, Chalchiuhtlatonac” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 202). \] In a speech to a woman who died in childbirth, the midwife exalted her: \[ otonamànajqujli in monantzìn, in cioapilli in quauhcioatl, in cioacoatl, in qujlaztli or “Thou hast behaved in conformity with thy mother, Ciuapilli, Quauhciuatl, Ciuacoatl, Quilaztli” (ibid.: 164). \] In both the same source and the same context (childbirth) Cihuacoatl Quilaztli is called “our mother” (see above). It seems, therefore, that there is no significant shift of meaning here. The prefix to- implies that the creative powers of Cihuacoatl Quilaztli are essential for the entire community, while the singular mo- directs them towards the woman in childbirth, for whom the goddess is considered a role-model. The same can be said of Chalchiuhtlicue who, by cleansing a newborn, “perforated” him, i.e. “inaugurated,” re-created him, but she also performed this function in regard to all people (tonan).

Humans were not the only possible reference point for “mother-goddesses.” A name of a precontact female deity frequently found in the sources is teteo innan, commonly translated as “the mother of gods” (e.g. Sahagún 1997b: 61-62; 102, n. 54). This title is ascribed to various female deities. In the “Primeros Memoriales” Cihuacoatl is called “ynáztí teteu” (Sahagún 1997b: 123). In the “Florentine Codex” Yoalticítli is referred to as “in teteu innan: in tonan” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 153). The name teteo innan was also juxtaposed with Toci and “Tlalli iyollo,” or Heart of the Earth (Sahagún 1997b: 102, n. 54). The latter denomination makes one think of altepetl iyollo, or the heart of the altepetl, a “title” given to “dioses-protectores” of various communities that referred to the concept of a heart as
something that sets life in motion and contains in itself the nature of the entire being (López Austin 1989: 60-61).

There is evidence that the connotation of -nan employed for natural phenomena (applying here, somewhat artificially, the Western distinction between “nature” and “culture”) was likewise valid, at least sometimes, in regard to goddesses. In a *huehuetlatolli* from the “Florentine Codex,” Citlallatonac Citlalicue, a deity etymologically associated with stars, is identified with the heavens and called the “mother” of *teteo*:

\[\text{in conjiaoa ilhvicac: qujtoa. Nimjtznotza njmjtzatzilia: in teteu tinnan, in Ticitlallatonac, in Ticitlalicue (ibid.: 203)}\]

she raised him as an offering to the heavens. She said: “I address thee, I cry out to thee, thou who art mother of the gods, thou who art Citlallatonac, thou who art Citlalicue” (ibid).

In another speech, the identification of a goddess with an artifact, a cradle which is the “mother” of a baby, occurs:

\[\text{njman tzatzi in qujtoa, injc qujnotza coçulli: qujlvia. Inantzin: ma xiqualmanjli, ilamatzin maca quen xicmuchivili in piltzintli, ma xiciamanjli: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 206)}\]

Then she cried out as she spoke to address the cradle. She said to it: “[Thou who art] its mother, receive it! Old woman, do not do anything to the baby; be gentle to it” (ibid).

The cradle is viewed as a “matrix” that holds the baby. The heavens can equally be seen as a place where *teteo* are to be found, especially if by *teteo* the author of the speech meant celestial bodies.

Concluding, both “mother” and “father” are, in the Nahua thought, associated with procreation. While father is hot and vital, mother is “dark, humid, the source of winds and rains, at the same time fertile and the place of death” (López Austin 1988 I: 272). This dichotomy is reflected in the categories described with -*ta* and -*nan* respectively. “Our father” is fire and the center of the cosmos through which vital essence circulates (see: 1.4.3. Teta
and tota in religious contexts). “Our mother,” on the other hand, is earth, maize or filth, birth and death at the same time. While “father” is pure creative energy, “mother” evokes the associations with a humid place, a cave, from which life sprouts, but where it also comes to an end, buried.

1.5.3. More relations with “mother” in the Christian context

In the colonial context, Chimalpahin uses the term “mother” in exactly the same way as “father” (see: 1.4.4. Other relations with “fathers”), with the connotation of a creator or founder. The blessed Teresa de Jesús is the “mother,” i.e. author of the rule of the Discalced Carmelites:

ynin omoteneuhtzino Sancta ca huel ynantzin yehuatzin oc ceppa quinmoyancuilili yn teopixcatlatecpancanahuatilli regla (Chimalpahin 2006: 288).

The said saint [Teresa de Jesús] was really the mother of and renewed for them [the Carmelites] the priestly constitutional ordinance, the rule (ibid.: 289).

In addition to this isolated example, I have collected 11 attestations of -nan with the first person singular possessive prefix, referring to the Virgin Mary. Their grammatical form is notlacomahuiznantzin, or my precious and revered mother, and they all come from testaments, probably because of the personal character of these documents. The term is to be found in various sections of wills. In preambles it is customarily included in the prayer to Mary, when she is asked to intercede for the testator before her son:

notlasomahuiznatzin sata Maria mochipa huel neli yxpochtli ynic nopapan quimotlatlatiliatzinnos yn itlasomahuizseteConnetzin yn t°x° (Lockhart 1991: 138)

...my precious honored mother St. Mary, forever a very true virgin, (I desire) that on my behalf she implore her precious honored one child, our lord Jesus Christ (ibid).

caninoneltoquitia y noteotzi y notlatocatzin y dios no ihua notlasomaisnatzin sata maria ma nopa motlatoltiz quimotlatlalis yntlasomasiscenconetzin y ttyo jesu sto nehmopolpoluhuilis y notlacoli notlapilchiahua niahua (Lockhart 1991: 136)
I believe in my divinity and ruler God, and also may my precious honored mother St. Mary speak for me and ask her precious honored one child our lord Jesus Christ to pardon me my sins and evildoing (ibid).

The term -nan employed in reference to the Virgin Mary is also found combined with the term tepantlato, or intercessor: notepantlatocanantzin, or “my intercessor and mother” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 112).

In a 1756 testament from the Valley of Toluca, in the section containing funeral arrangements, Mary appears as the patron of a religious order whose habit is to be worn by a deceased:

\[
yhua \text{ yc moquimilos yn notlalo nozoquio ytlaquezi notlazomahuiznanzin la Virgen del Carmen yhuan yc ninolpis ycordonzin notlazotatzin, S, } S, ^n \text{ fra}^o
\]

(Pizzigoni 2007: 114)

And my earthly body is to be shrouded in the habit of my precious revered mother the Virgen del Carmen, and I am to be girt with the rope of my precious father lord San Francisco (ibid).

Above, I have suggested that wearing either the habit or rope of San Francisco served to identify the deceased with a Franciscan friar and this is why San Francisco was called his “father” (see: 1.4.4. Other relations with “fathers”). Here, the term “mother” is employed with the same sense. The testator, Juan de los Santos, asks to be shrouded in the habit of the Carmelite order, whose “mother” (i.e. patron, or specific object of cult) was the Virgen del Carmen.

“My precious and revered mother” Mary is likewise a receiver of bequests. Most often the designation refers to a cofradia, although holy images and churches form an equally plausible alternative:

\[
auh \text{ yn axcan niquitohua za no yehuatzin nicnomaquilitiuh ynotlazomahuiznantzin candelaria yc quimotequipanilhuiz ynoxhuiuhtzin onicteneuh ytoca tomas de los santos yntla quimochicaahuiliz Dios (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 70)\]

156
and I now declare that I am also giving that to my dear honored mother (of) Candelaria so that my grandson whom I mentioned, named Tomas de los Santos, will work (the land for the cofradia) if God gives him strength (ibid.: 71).

ynic 4 tlamatlin niguitoahua metzintzinti cepatlin ni[gui]guinomaguillia yn notlazonthatzin S.do tomigon ynhua yehuatzin notlazomahuinatzin [Solitaria?] (ibid.: 108)

Fourth, I declare that I am giving a row of maguey to my dear father Santo Domingo and my dear honored mother [Solitaria?] (ibid.: 109).

It is evident that in these examples “mother” is again used in a way parallel to “father,” this time meaning a patron, the object of worship, perhaps also the actual owner of the testator’s property (see: 1.4.4. Other relations with “fathers”). One of the authors explicitly places Mary among the household saints:

Auh yn yehuatzin yn notlazotatzin s. franco yhuan s. nicolas yhuan yecce homo sta cricifixus yhuan yehuatzin notepanlatocanantzin asumptio maje yhuan s. jacinto yhuan crucifixu maje yn itechzinco puhuíz (Lockhart 1992: 463)

And to [the images of] my dear father San Francisco, and San Nicolás, and Ecce Homo, the Holy Crucifix, and also to the image of my intercessor and mother the Assumption [of Mary], and San Jacinto, and the image of the Crucifix, to them will belong… (ibid).

Interestingly, in one of the seventeenth-century testaments mentioned above the term notlaçonantzintz is employed in reference to Santa Catalina. Both the saint and the Virgin Mary (called notlaçomahuiznantzin) receive bequests. The former, the patron saint of the local church, receives a granddaughter (!) of a testator along with a piece of land. The task of the granddaughter is to work for Santa Catalina, particularly the field bequeathed to the saint (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 70). This may suggest that bequests made to Mary were likewise meant to “sustain” the images of her or cofradias under her patronage.

The example with Santa Catalina confirms yet another phenomenon, manifest already in the case of the term -ta: by the seventeenth century Nahua authors begin to classify saints,
Mary and God under the same label. The term *notlaço(mahuiz)tatzin* refers to both God and male saints while *notlaço(mahuiz)nantzin* – to both Mary and female saints. The identical nomenclature implied similar treatment: “precious mothers” and “fathers” functioned as patrons, received bequests and were handed over to heirs so that they continue to worship them and “sustain” them. Such an understanding of the term -nan in the Christian context contrasts with the emphasis put on the creative aspect of mother-goddesses. However, the implication of patronage can be detected in both precontact (Cihuacoatl Quilaztli as the patron of women in childbirth) and colonial (Mary as the patron of cofradía members) religious systems. Christianity adds to the connotations of -nan the important concept of “intercessor.” Arguably, it was easy to incorporate into the native classification system, where mother was tightly associated with the role of protecting or guarding:

> in qualli yillo cochiçani tzicuictic, mopopoxani yiel, ixtoçoani, yillo ymac ca, miçauiani, tlacauapaua, tecemmati, [tececemmati] texoxocoiomat teca mochiua, teca miçauia hatlaixcaua (Sahagún 2012 X: 2)

her heart is good [= she is sincere], she is vigilant, diligent, energetic, helpful, she stays up late, her heart is in her hand [= she is attentive], she is the one who fears, she rears people, she pays close attention to people, she flatters people, she takes care of them, she worries about them, she does not neglect things.87

Frances Karttunen states that the term -nan has a connotation of “protector”:

> a tree planted to shade crops is called NAN-TLI, and the coral snake is called an ‘ant-mother,’ because it is believed to live in ant hills and protect the insects (Karttunen 1992a: 160).

Finally, it has to be noted that in doctrinal texts the frozen form *tonantzin* used in reference to the Holy Church becomes more flexible at times:

> çan occen ca ye yxquich motlapal ticchiuaz, ynic ticmotlacamachitiz ymnoteouh immotlatocatzin Dios, yuan ymmonantzí sancta yglesia,

---

87 Translation mine.
You are to place in the deepest recesses of your heart the admonitions with which your
mother the holy Church admonishes you (ibid.: 179).

These usages, however, seem to be entirely imposed by the ecclesiastics.

1.6. IN -NAN IN -TA

The doublet composed of the terms for “mother” and “father,” usually, as noted by Helga Rammow, arranged in this very order (Rammow 1964: 52), was employed within various areas. On the most basic level it meant “parents,” for example:


Take heed, my daughter, my young noblewoman, the youngest one: when thou wert still a tender little thing, still tiny, there were present those from whose loins thou camest, thy father, thy mother, those of whose blood thou art (ibid).

When combined with the indefinite personal possessive prefix _te_-, it referred to a status which involved being a parent, something that fray Alonso de Molina renders as “padre o madre de familias”:

_Auh yn titepachoua, inanoç o titenan, titeta, acaçomo teotlaçotlaliztica otiquinchicauh ynmotlapacholhuan (intiquimitqui, tiquinmama) yuan acaçomo tetlaçotlaliztica tiquinnonotz, acaçomo tiqncahualti_
Y tu que tienes cargo de otros, o eres padre, o madre de familias, dexaste de esforzar con caridad a tus subditos (de los quales tienes cargo,) o por ventura no los corregiste con caridad, ni les fuiste a la mano (Molina 1569: f. 100v).

Here, the focus is more on engendering children than on the social role of parents:

\textit{in acachto ohuallaque in tetahuan in tenanhuin omochiuhique in omotlacaxinachoque} \\
(Castillo 2001: 108).

Those who arrived first became the parents, they were those who begot people.\textsuperscript{88}

Still within the household sphere, the doublet \textit{in -nan in -ta} tends to appear in plural but with the singular reference point, for example:

\textit{O nochpuchtze, xocoiotle, cocotze, tepitze: ixquich y, aic aco mjtzilpia, mjitzetziloa in monanoan, in motaoan, in motechiuhcaoan in vevetque, in jlamatque, in njcan monoltitoque:} (Sahagún 2012 VI: 143)

O my beloved daughter, O youngest one, O little dove, O little one, this is all. By this thy mothers, thy fathers, thy progenitors, the old men, the old women who are here encourage thee, animate thee (ibid\textsuperscript{89}).

Since an individual cannot have numerous biological mothers and fathers, one has to assume the extension of meaning. In the above example the doublet is juxtaposed with another difrasismo, \textit{huehuetque ilamatque}, or the old men, the old women, as well as with the term – \textit{techiuhcahuan}, or one’s progenitors. The former described either ancestors or the elders of the household who were responsible for passing the oral tradition to subsequent generations. The latter was extended to teachers or advisers, people who “engendered” one by sharing knowledge with him or her (see: 1.7. -techiuhcauh). In the above example “parents” are those who have just pronounced a \textit{huehuetlatolli}. In another passage from the same book the elders of a family give thanks to other elders for speaking the words of wisdom:

\textsuperscript{88} Translation mine. \\
\textsuperscript{89} C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson render the word \textit{motechiuhcaoan} as “thy forefathers.”
Auh no ivi in tehoantin in tivevetque, in tilamatque otoconjuque, otoconanque in oc ceppa ic antonantzitzinoan, in antotatzitzinoan: ic oc ceppa, ic tamopilhoan titochioa: (ibid.: 145)

And thus also we who are the old men, the old women, have taken it, have grasped it [the words], so that once again you are our mothers, our fathers, so that once again we become your children. 

The example demonstrates that the expression “to become one’s parent” was employed in the context of delivering a speech. Those who pronounced the words were the “mothers-fathers” of those who received them and who were given the role of “children” (see: 1.1.4. Subjects). When a tlatoani says to his actual children:

ca ânopiloan ca namonan namota in nehoatl in cuel achic in nachicacaujit in naiuhcaiuatl in naiultâcaiutl in njcchihujlia in atl in tepetl: (ibid.: 87)

for ye are my children; for I am thy mother, I am thy father, I who for a brief moment, for a short time bring about errors, mistakes for the city (ibid.91)

he does not mean that the children are half-orphans and he has to substitute for their mother. He extends the term “parent” with the intention to say that he is going to be teacher now: he will deliver a huehuetlatolli and the children are to listen well.

Other sources likewise contain examples for the use of the discussed doublet (in various grammatical forms – not necessarily possessed) in the context of transmitting knowledge. In the “Bancroft Dialogues” an elderly noblewoman gives thanks to the tutor of her grandchildren for teaching the boys: tla ompopohui tla onixtlahui in nanyotl in tayotl, or “let the parenthood flourish” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 144). In the “Huehuetlatolli” recorded by fray Andrés de Olmos and published by fray Juan Bautista a father concludes the speech he is delivering to his son by saying: auh in axcan yc ixquixch yc ninoquixtia in nimonan in nimotta (Bautista 2008: 14v), or “And now it is all with which I, your mother,

90 Translation mine. For the analysis of this example see also: 1.1.4. Subjects.
91 C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson render the word ânopiloan as “ye are my sons.”
your father fulfill my duty.”\textsuperscript{92} Finally, a mother admonishes her daughter: \emph{canel ahmo ticcuic ahmo tican in nanyotl, in tayotl} (ibid.: 20v), or “for you don’t take, you don’t grasp the parenthood [= teachings].”\textsuperscript{93}

The difrasismo \emph{in huehuetque in ilamatque} was used for both the elders and the ancestors and so did \emph{in-nan in-ta}. In the “Primeros Memoriales” we read:

\begin{quote}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textit{nican timiximati yn avcmo iuhq’ yn avcmo iehoatl in monemiliz yn iuh nentihui yn amonavä in amotavan, yn omomiquilique} (Sahagún 1997b: 237)
\end{footnotesize}
\end{quote}

All of you here understand, you are here aware that your way of life no longer is like that which your mothers, your fathers went about living, they who have died (ibid).

Here “parents” (ancestors) are conceived of as those who provide an example for subsequent generations. They establish the tradition which is to be followed – this tradition is further transmitted by contemporary “parents” (or \emph{huehuetque ilamatque}), the elders in communities and families. \textit{Huehue ilama} is a metaphor for fire and smoke (Ruiz de Alarcón 1984: 166), which further adds to the association of this group with mediation. The transmission of words is also one of the main tasks of a \emph{tlatoani} (“the one who speaks”) who should act as the “mother-father” of his vassals:

\begin{quote}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textit{ahu in yuh quichiuhy yn coanacotzin cuix yc quipati yn altepetl cuix ymaquixtiloca mochiuh yn macehuali ynic quicauhtiquiz altepetl cuix amo yc tlaliloc yn inan yn ita yn macehuali} (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 192)
\end{footnotesize}
\end{quote}

But when Coanacochtzin thus acted, did he help the altepetl? Was it for deliverance of the commoners that he suddenly left the altepetl? Were the commoners’ mother and father, [Coanacochtzin,] there? (ibid.: 195)

\begin{quote}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textit{a ieh motolinja in tlautqitl, in tlamamalli, in cujtlapilli, in atlapalli: ca inan, ca ita qujtemoa, ca inan ita qujnequj, ca mopachollanj:} (Sahagún 2012 VI: 23)
\end{footnotesize}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{92} Translation mine.
\textsuperscript{93} Translation mine.
O, the poor, the governed, who seek their mother, their father; who require their mother, their father; who desire to be governed (ibid).

*intlac* ticcuj, *intlac* ticana, *intlac* ticcaquj, in mjtzmaca in monan, in mota: *ca njcan mjtzmonomatcavilia in tlacatl, in tlatoanj, in atl, in tepetl: auh ac oc mach ie in ticcaqujz (ibid.: 80)*

If thou graspest not, takest not, hearest not that which thy mother, thy father give thee, for here the master, the ruler, the city deal personally with thee, then to whom besides him wilt thou listen? (ibid).

As Mercedes Montes de Oca remarks, the ruler was described with this doublet because his function was, in analogy to biological parents, to guide his people and to transmit to them tradition, as well as the rules of conduct (Montes de Oca 2000: 130). Also, a wider group of authorities could have been called the vassals’ parents:

*Auh yn axcan totecuiyouane tlatoquehe Ca ammehuititicate yn amicocahuan tlacatl amotechiuhcauh neçausalpiltzintli in antonantzitzimuan in antotatzitzinuã (San Antonio 1997: 234).*

And now, O our lords, O rulers, you who are seated, you who are dependents of the lord your progenitor Neçahualpiltzintli, you who are our mothers and fathers (ibid.: 235).

In a speech to a newly elected *tlatoani* those who have installed him are called the parents of the *altepetl*:

*Auh ca iz monoltitoque in jnanoan, in jtaoa, in atl, in tepetl in mjtzopuchtia in mjtzitzcactia: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 85)*

And here are the mothers, the fathers of the city, who put thee to the left, who put thee in obsidian sandals (ibid).

In the “Primeros Memoriales” the noblemen, rulers and elders are presented as one and the same category – the parents of people:
y nican chaneque quimacazi inatl in tepetl quimacazi in pilli in tlatoani in vevetzin in illamatzin quipinava quimaviztilia quitoa y nican channeque qué techitaz in tonan in totan (Sahagún 1997b: 238)

Here the inhabitants respect, the city respects a nobleman, a ruler, an old man, an old woman. They are modest, they honor him or her. The inhabitants here say: 'How will our mother, our father regard us?' (ibid.)

However, a governor is at times the reference point rather than the referent of the doublet in -nan in -ta:

*Tlacatle tlatoanie notelpochtze nopiltzintzine cocoliztli nimitzoncuutiliz nictlapololtitz in teucyotl in tlatoayotl: ca nican quimomacehuia quimocnopilhuia in monanhuan in motahuan in moteucyotzin in motlatocayotzin:* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 112)

Oh lord, o ruler, oh my youth, oh my noble, I (do not wish to) make you ill, to distract your lordship and rulership. Your mothers and fathers (those present) here are enjoying your lordship and rulership (ibid.: 113).

The last example suggests that the basis for the usage of the discussed doublet was not the hierarchy of power. The “mothers-fathers” of the governor are certainly his subjects, though the text does not specify their position. Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart (1987: 46) hypothesize that this use is an inversion with the meaning of “aides.” The interpretation of “mothers-fathers” as the counselors of the ruler is consistent with the use of other terms for parents in the Nahua system (see: 1.4.1. Advisers, 1.7. -techiuhcauh). At the same time, the concept of “inversion” seems irrelevant as far as the use of this doublet is concerned, because, as will be seen below, all relations described with it are built on the same logical principle. Confusingly, in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” in -nan in -ta is used with an apparent intention of setting the hierarchy. Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc says that Mexico Tenochtitlan:

*ynan yta nizleco mochiuhtica yn mochi yxquich yc nohuian altepetl. in yancuiç nueva españa* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 60).

---

was becoming the mother, the father, the head of all, of every altepetl everywhere in New Spain (ibid.: 61).

It is difficult to say if the usage of the term “parent” with the meaning of a leader existed before contact. Making use of the doublet employed for a tlatoani would provide a good basis for the extension. On the other hand, Tezozomoc juxtaposes it with the word itzonteco, or its head, which in colonial times was employed as a calque of the Spanish “cabecera.” This makes one suspect that the way in which “ynan yta” is used here is an invention influenced by Spanish. I have not come across similar attestations of the doublet in the sources.

The last area in which the term “parent” is employed is religion. Here the term is used most often in reference to deities. The single tota, or our father, refers to the sources of vital essence (1.4.3. Teta and tota in religious contexts). Tonan, or our mother, is to be found as a title of both patron-goddesses of various altepetl and female deities who have creative aspects (see: 1.5.1. Tenan and tonan). Tonan tota, on the other hand, is seen only with the names of deities who guaranteed the existence of all mankind but at the same time were responsible for death and destruction. In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” it is ascribed to Mictlanteuctli (Sahagún 2012 VI: 21), Ometeuctli (ibid.: 175), Yoalteuctli (ibid.: 206) and Tonatiuh and Tlalteuctli juxtaposed in a doublet (ibid.: 13). Tlalteuctli, when identified with Teteoinnan, was called tonan (see: 1.5.1. Tenan and tonan), which shows that, if needed, the female aspect of a dually gendered deity was abstracted from the entity. In the “Florentine Codex” she appears as the earth that nourishes people (ibid.: 36) while Tonatiuh, or the Sun, is commonly known to be the source of vital essence. When juxtaposed with each other, the two life-giving deities receive warriors killed in battle:

\[Auh \ in \ axcan \ tlacatle, \ totecoe: \ titlacoane, \ ma \ ivian, \ iocoxca \ yxillan, \ itozcatlan, \ imacocheo \ ommoteca \ in \ tonan, \ in \ tota, \ in \ tonatiuh \ in \ tlaltecutli: \ (Sahagún \ 2012 \ VI: 13)\]

Now, personage, our lord, Titlacahuan, let them peacefully, calmly, lie down in the womb, breast, arms of our mother, our father, Tonatiuh, Tlaltecuhtli.  

---

95 Translation mine.
Another deity, Ometeuctli, is the one who sends newly born children to earth:

àn ca oqujoalmjoali in tonan, in tota, in vme tecutli, in vme ciuatl, in chicunauhnepanjuhca, in vmeioca: (ibid.: 175)

Our mother, our father Ome tecutli, Ome ciuatl, from [above] the nine heavens, in the place of duality, hath sent him (ibid.)

while Mictlantecuhtli is presented as the one who “remain thirsting there for us, hungering there for us, panting there for us” (ibid.: 4). However, as proposed by Katarzyna Mikulska, Mictlantecuhtli and Ometeuctli can be viewed as two complementary aspects of the supreme creative-destructive deity: the former’s realm was the night while the latter’s – the day (Mikulska Dąbrowska 2008: 237, 393). In one of the speeches, the name Yoalteuctli Yacahuitztl Yamanaliztli, a deity apparently associated with the night (yohualli) is substituted for Ometeuctli (ibid.: 206). Similarly to mother-goddesses, the deities described with the term “parent” are, therefore, those who both give and take away life. As Louise Burkhart notes, the roles of actual parents and Aztec deities met at the point of delivering physical punishment to those who committed transgression (either children or people as gods’ creations) (Burkhart 1989: 32). Likewise, tlatoani is said to bring both consolation and destruction to macehualtin (Sahagún 2012 VI: 84). The term “parent,” employed in regard to all these classes of beings might have, therefore, stressed the common creative-destructive aspect of their complex natures.

The same bond as between gods and mankind was established between gods and individuals. A midwife says to a newborn:

omjtzpitz, omjtzmamal, in monan, in mota, in vme tecutli, in vme cihoatl: auh nelli iehoatl, â in tlacatl in topiltzin in Quetzalcoatl (ibid.: 183).

Thy mother, thy father, Ome tecutli, Ome ciuatl, and verily the master, Topiltzin Quetzalcoatl, have cast thee, have perforated [= have inaugurated, J.M.] thee (ibid).

She also tells her that she cuts her umbilical cord by order of “your mother-father Yoalteuctli Yoalticxitl” (ibid.: 171-172). Several other creator deities are named the “parents” of the
individuals – Tloque Nahuaque, Quetzalcoatl, Chalchiuhtlicue, Mictlateuctli, Tonatiuh, Tatlteuctli:

\[ auh \ ma \ mjtzmjmachili \ in \ tloque, \ naoaque, \ in \ monantzin, \ in \ motatzin \ in \ mache \ pilhoacatzintli: \] (ibid.: 169)

May the lord of the near, of the nigh, [who is] thy mother, thy father, the revered parent, cherish thee, array thee (ibid).

\[ Ca \ tiqulli, \ ca \ tiieclti \ in \ tioaliualoc, \ in \ mjtzchiuh \ in \ mjtiocux \ in \ monan, \ in \ mota \ in \ quetzalcovatl: \] (ibid.: 31)

Thou wert good, thou wert fine when thou wert sent here, when thy mother, thy father, Quetzalcoatl, made thee, created thee (ibid).

\[ tocontocaz \ in \ monan, \ in \ mota \ in \ mjetlan \ tecutli: \] (...) \[ at \ tocontocaz \ in \ monan, \ in \ mota \ in \ tonatiuh \ in \ tlaltecutli: \] (ibid.: 58)

Thou wilt follow thy mother, thy father, Mictlan tecutli. (...) Perhaps thou wilt follow thy mother, thy father, the sun, the lord of the earth (ibid).

\[ qujlvia. \ Noxocoiouh, \ notelpuchtzin, \ anoço \ qujlvia: \ nochpuchtzin: \ ma \ itech \ ximaxiti \ in \ monan, \ in \ mota, \ in \ chalchiuhtli \ icue, \ in \ chalchiuhtlatonac: \] (ibid.: 176)

she said to it: “My youngest one, my beloved youth,” or she said, “My beloved maiden, approach thy mother, thy father, Chalchiuitl icue, Chalchiuhtlatonac!” (ibid).

The last passage is the words spoken by a midwife while bathing a newborn child. Chalchiuhtlicue Chalchiuhtlatonac was asked to remove from the child the filth with which it was born. At the same time the child was filled with tonalli, or the vital essence without which one was not able to live (López Austin 1988 I: 211). During the bath the gifts were asked not only from Chalchiuhtlicue (who likewise belonged to a group of deities bringing death on people), but also from other gods who decided on humans’ existence: Ometeuctli, Tonatiuh, Tatlteuctli, etc. Thus the child was said to be born for a second time (ibid.: 213, 337).
Finally, in specific cases not only humans but gods as well can form a reference point for *in-nan in-ta*. In the “Florentine Codex” Huehuetotl – an ancient deity, associated with fire and time, who remains at the center of the universe – is called “in teteu inna, in teteu inta, in veueteutl,” or “the mother of gods, the father of gods, Huehuetotl” (e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 19). This usage demonstrates the terminological equivalence between Huehuetotl and a *tlatoani* (the mother-father of the *altepetl*), who was believed to represent him on earth by order of Tloque Nahuaque: *copuchtia, quijzcactia in tetu innã in tetu inta in tlalxicco onoc*, or “And he placeth him to the left, he provideth him the obsidian sandals of the mother of the gods, the father of the gods, who resideneth in the navel of the earth” (ibid.: 88). This concept of the origins of authority was closely associated with powers and functions of royal words, filled with divine essence by the creator deity (Houston, Stuart, Taube 2006: 153).

Brant Gardner follows Ángel María Garibay in interpreting the doublet *in-nan in-ta* as used in reference to deities as “one’s sustenance.” According to him, this use owes to “the extension of the duties of a father and mother into a metaphorical meaning” (Gardner 1982: 108). On the other hand, Montes de Oca looks for a common denominator for all relations described with the doublet *in-nan in-ta* which is, as she puts it:

> esta capacidad de protección y de guía natural, aunque en este difrasismo no se focaliza únicamente la protección sino que también ésta pone en relieve la guía y la pauta moral que los padres (y en un caso más específico los gobernantes) debían dar a sus hijos (Montes de Oca 2000: 162).

This explanation, however, does not take into account the fact that also a war leader was called a “parent” of a deity:

> **quijpacholtia in quappetlatl, in ocelopetlatl, imac quijmanjlia, in quauhxicalli, in quappiaztli: iehoatl tonatiuh inan ita muchioa: iehoatl teatlitia, tetlamaca in topã in mjctlan:** (Sahagún 2012 VI: 88)

He [Tloque Nahuaque, J.M.] putteth him in charge of the military. In his hands he placeth the eagle vessel, the eagle tube [= he makes him responsible for human sacrifice, J.M.]. This one becometh the mother, the father of the sun. He provideth those above us [and] those in the land of the dead with drink, with offerings (ibid).
We may say that the war leader “protects” the Sun but this explanation does not tell us what was exactly the nature of their relationship. He was a mother-father of the Sun because thanks to him warriors were killed on the battlefield and were taken as captives to sacrificial stones. Blood was considered to contain vital essence (López Austin 1988: 168; López Austin 1989 I: 214). By causing a flow of blood, the captor provided the Sun with the animating principle – the same that was transmitted by the words of “mothers-fathers” who delivered huehuetlatolli to their “children.” Guilhem Olivier notes that in Nahua culture speech or breath were equivalent to human sacrifice or autosacrifice in that they both were requested from people by gods as a form of cult (Olivier 2004: 33-34). Among the Maya, the act of speaking was believed to have provoked the transmission of essence with creative potential, necessary for such activities as the communication with the supernatural or governing (Houston, Stuart, Taube 2006: 153). The same is true for the Nahuas, for whom creation was firmly associated with both speaking and the flowing of blood, the acts which, at the same time, served to establish contact with the supernatural (Olivier 2004: 34-35). “Mothers-fathers” sent to their children essences of complex nature. One of the components, tonalli, was believed to be related to the Sun while other were related to water and earth (López Austin 1988 I: 206-207). It has to be stressed that essence transmitted by either blood or breath had also harmful potential (ibid.: 168-169), which is why “mothers-fathers” took part not only in creation, but in destruction as well.

The doublet in -nan in -ta was, by its nature, so deeply set in the dualistic worldview of the Nahuas that its almost entire absence from Christian religious contexts should not be surprising. However, a few examples actually are to be found. As shown by Burkhart, it was employed for the primordial couple: Adam and Eve (Burkhart 1989: 114). Rammow notes that in the Olmos’ “Huehuetlatolli” the term is used in reference to godparents (Rammow 1964: 52), but the quotation she gives apparently contradicts her statement:

*ahmo timoxicotiaz ahmo timoteopouhtiaz, ahmo īca timotzatziliz ī monāhuā mottahuā ī Padreme* (Bautista 2008: f. 56r)
You will not go along being angry at, you will not go along offending, you will not scream in anger at your mothers, your fathers, the ecclesiastics.\textsuperscript{96}

The diffrasisimo is juxtaposed here with the Spanish loanword \textit{padre} which, in the Nahuatl sources, always means “ecclesiastic” and never “godparent” for whom another Spanish loanword, \textit{padrino}, is sometimes used (see: 1.8.2. Loanwords). This usage may be interpreted as the rare case of conceiving the friars as those who, by means of teaching the doctrine, mediate in passing the divine “gifts” to people.

The last attestation of \textit{in -nan in -ta} in the Christian religious context comes from the “Bancroft Dialogues” and refers to God:

\begin{quote}
\textit{A otiquimonmomachiti, a otiquimonmotoquili. a intech otimaxitito in machcocolhuan in motechiucahuin? ca otoconmotoquili, ca itech otimaxiti in tonan in tota:}
(Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 130)
\end{quote}

Have you not gone to, reached your forebears and progenitors? You have gone to and reached our Parent (ibid.: 131).

The passage is based on a prayer from the “Florentine Codex” and originally deals with the Aztec god of the Underworld – Mictlanteuctli (ibid.: 46). The authors of the “Bancroft Dialogues” simply exchanged the precontact deity for the Christian one: this use, as is evident from other sources, did not spread in the colonial literature.

\textbf{1.7. -TECHIUHCAUH}

In the dictionary of fray Alonso de Molina \textit{-techiuhcauh} is glossed under the following entries: “techiuani. hazon, crijador, o engendrador” (Molina 1997 II: 92v), “notechiuhcauh. mi cauallero o senador, o mi hazedor,” “notechiuhcauian. mis caualleros o senadores, o mis hazedores” (ibid.: 73v) and “totechiuhcauian. los que gouieran y rijen la republica” (ibid.: 150r). Helga Rammow derives \textit{-techiuhcauh} from \textit{chihua}, to make, engender, plus the

\textsuperscript{96}Translation mine.
indefinite personal possessive prefix te- (Rammow 1964: 75). The absolutive form, techihuani, can be rendered as “engenderer, maker of people” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 41).

As pointed out by Rammow, the category of -techiuhcauh encompasses ancestors distanced from ego with varying number of generations, beginning with actual parents until the forefathers so remote, that they cannot be named with any of the existing terms for G+. Both men and women can be referred to with this designation. For the sake of precision, it is often juxtaposed with another kin term, which indicates the distance between ego and the primary referent (Rammow 1964: 76), for example:

_Auh in yeuatzin tlacatl notlatzin Don her{do} cortes ixtlilxochitzin, yhuá yn ameuantzitzin, maço yuin çaz cetzin tlacatl amotechiuhcauh yn amotatzin_ (San Antonio 1997: 216),

And though the lord my uncle don Hernando Cortés Ixtlilxochitzin and you had one [and the same] lord as your progenitor, your father (ibid.: 217).

_acaçomo yehuatl anquimottilia aço yeuatl yn amotechiuhcauh yn amocoltzin yn nican chane_ (ibid.: 234)

Perhaps you do not see him or your progenitor, your grandfather whose home is here (ibid.: 235).

However, the doublets formed by -techiuhcauh and both -col and -achcol (grandfather and great-grandfather) can also have the general meaning of “ancestors” (see: 2.2. -col, 5.2. Older than ego). Whatever the exact connotation of the doublet, the term is always firmly associated with the concept of lineal descent.

Rammow notes that “for the sake of generalization” -techiuhcauh is often paired with the terms huchuetequ and ilamatque, or the old men, the old women, also – the ancients (Rammow 1964: 76). The material I have gathered shows that such a juxtaposition is frequent indeed, nevertheless, it does not owe to a need for generalization. _In huchuetequ in ilamatque_ are often evoked as those who, in ancient times, were the authors of huchuetequatolli, the depositaries of knowledge and tradition, which they subsequently passed to further generations:
Çan cuel izqujcamatl yn, in njmijzmaca, in njmijzcaqujtia in axcan: quexqujch in mopixtoc tlalolli, in nemoanj, in pialonj: in concauhteoaque in totechiuhtaoan in vevetque, in jlamatque, in tzonjztaztivi, in quiaztaztivi: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 124-125)

In brief, these are as many words as I give thee, as I now cause thee to hear; as many words lie guarded, those to live by, those worthy of being guarded. Our progenitors, the old men, the old women, the white-haired ones, the white-headed ones, departed leaving them (ibid).

in toptli, in petlacalli: in concauhteoaque in vevetque, in jlamatque, in tzonjztaztivi, in quiaztaztivi, in pipinjxtivi in totechiuhtaoan (ibid.: 106),

the secret [knowledge] – that which the old men, the old women, those who go white-haired, those who go white-headed, those who go emaciated with age, our progenitors, left as they departed (ibid97).

In huehuetque in ilamatque who live in “present” times are still conceived of as the depositaries of knowledge (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta). When they share this knowledge with people, they become their “progenitors,” just like the ancients in the quotations above. The elder relatives of a pregnant woman who deliver a speech to a midwife are introduced in the following way: *auh ca iz onmonoltitoque in vevetque, in jlamatque in motechiuhtaoan*, or “And here are the old men, the old women, thy [i.e. the midwife’s, J.M.] progenitors” (Sahagún ibid.: 151). The pregnant woman herself is told after hearing the huehuetlatolli delivered by her in-laws:

*ixqujch y, aic aco njtztelpia, njtztetziloa in monanoan, in motaaoan, in motechiuhtaoan in vevetque, in jlamatque, in njcan monoltitoque* (ibid.: 143)

this is all. By this thy mothers, thy fathers, thy progenitors, the old men, the old women who are here encourage thee, animate thee (ibid98).

97 In both examples C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “totechiuhtaoan” as “our forefathers.”
98 C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “motechiuhtaoan” as “thy forefathers.”
Particularly revealing is the fragment in which the midwife thanks the relatives of the pregnant woman for their *huehuetlatolli*:

*Auh ca iz anmoietzticate, iz anmonolititoque in antotechihucaoaan in ie anveveinanti, in anveveitati, in oamechmoteutlalili totecju* (ibid.: 153),

and ye who are here, ye who are seated here, ye who are our progenitors, who are already the old mothers, the old fathers whom our lord hath set up as gods (ibid).

The term *-techiuhcauh* is juxtaposed here not only with the doublet *in -nan in -ta* which was employed for the one who delivered essences of both creative and destructive potential (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta). It is likewise paired with the verb *teotlalia* which includes the root *teo*, referring to the concept of divine essence. In another speech a young man is advised:

*Xicvevetlali xicvevequixo xicvevetlaça: auh xicteutlali in moten in motlatol,* or “Make thy [heart] that of an old man, make it resemble that of an old man, cast it as that of an old man. And make holy thy utterances, thy words” (ibid.: 53). Therefore to “make oneself an old man” is equaled with making one’s words filled with divine essence. Arguably, it indicates that the essence is transmitted through the act of pronouncing *huehuetlatolli*. The “maker of people” may act in a biological (the kinship sphere) or a cultural way: “engendering” people by transmitting traditional knowledge to them.

Since speaking and exercising authority were two concepts closely related in the Nahua worldview, there is nothing surprising in Molina’s glossing of the term *totechiuhcahuan* as “those who govern the state.” This usage is to be found in the “Bancroft Dialogues” where the teacher of noble boys calls the “teteuctin (...) in quitqui quimama altepctl,” (“the nobles who rule the city”), *amotechiuhcahuan*, or “your [boys’] progenitors” (ibid.: 136). Since it is already clear by now that *-techiuhcauh* and *in -nan in -ta* had very similar connotations, the former should appear somewhere employed for a *tlatoani*, however, I have not come across such an attestation. In the precontact religious sphere Tlaloc, a deity who provided sustenance for people and the earth, is called *totechiuhcauh* (Sahagún 1997b: 181; Contel, Mikulska Dąbrowska 2011: 30). Exactly the same form was later used for the Christian God:
canel titlachihualhuan ca títlayocoxhuan, ca icenmactzinco ticate, ca totechihuhatzin ca toteyocoxatzin, quen techonmonequililiz in moztla in huipta, tla tictotlatolchialican (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 146)

Since we are His creatures and entirely in His hands and He is our Engenderer and Creator, let us await His command as to what His will will be for us in the future (ibid.: 147).

In the Christian religious context “our progenitor” was understood as “the creator of mankind” while the same term employed for Tlaloc probably referred to the nature of his realm, Tlalocan, where all beings were loaded with the forces of growth as a part of a constant circle of regeneration (López Austin 2000: 224). In prayers addressed to Tezcatlipoca two other deities of creative-destructive aspects are named Tezcatlipoca’s “progenitors”:

in vnca in moteahaltilitica, in motechihucauh, in teteu innan, in teteu inta, in veveteutl (Sahagún 2012 VI: 19)

There is being bathed thy progenitor, the mother of the gods, the father of the gods, Ueueteotl (ibid).

cá ontocoz, ca itech onaxoa, in motechihucauh: in mictlan tecutli, in cueçal, in tzontemoc: in acan veli qujchiuhtoc, in oallamatatacatoc (ibid.: 4),

For there will be the following after, the approaching to thy progenitor Mictlan tecutli, Cueçalli, Tzontemoc, who remaineth unsatiated, who remaineth coveting (ibid).

-Techiuhcauh is yet another term which shows that power hierarchy was not a basis for extending the Nahuahtl kinship terminological system into other areas. Governors and deities could have been called their vassals’ and worshippers’ “progenitors” but the reverse was also possible. In contrast with totecheiucahuan, Molina glosses “otechihucauh. mi cauallero o senador, o mi hazedor” (Molina 1977 II: 73v). In the “Florentine Codex,” -techiuhcahuan is to be found juxtaposed with -tahuan, the tlatoani being the reference point: quijacana in jtechiucaoaan, in jtaoan, necoc vmac in mantuuj, in qujtlaepujliuuj, or “his
progenitors, his advisers went before him; on both sides, on either hand, they proceeded as they went clearing the way for him” (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 29\(^99\)). The term -tahuan was used in reference to teuctlatoque or, perhaps, also other high dignitaries, who were close auxiliaries and advisers of the tlatoani and were allowed to speak on his behalf (see: 1.4.1. Advisers). Depending on how this particular difrasismo works, -techiuhcahuan can be viewed as either synonymous with or complementary to “fathers.” I would opt for the former possibility, because -techiuhcauh is most often found alone, meaning undoubtedly a dignitary from the tlatoani’s closest circle – a high-level aide, as suggested by Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart (1987: 41). The sources designate with this term dignitaries who, in the morning, wait for the ruler in the temple:

   Ca ye imman in, aço toconmaniliz in mocxitzin, inic tonmohuicaz ichantzinco totecuiyo: ca ye iz moch mitzochialitoque in motechiuhcahuan (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 164).

   It is late, take to your feet to go to the house of our Lord, for all your progenitors (aides) are awaiting you here (ibid.: 165),

or a brother (sic!) of Moteucçoma Ilhuicamina, who was a tlacateccatl:

   niman quillhuig ca yehuatl yn motechiuhcauh yn tlacateccatl huehue çacatzin (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 146)

   Then they said to him [Moteucçoma, J.M.]: It is your progenitor, Huehue Çacatzin tlacateccatl (ibid.: 147).

In the “Bancroft Dialogues” a speaker on a wedding juxtaposes -techiuhcahuan with both the doublet in -nan in -ta and the word for “vassals,” addressing the governor:

   otiquinmocnelli tlacate tlatoanie in momacehualtzitzinhuan in mocnonanhwuan in mocnotahuan in motechiuhcahuan:

\(^{99}\) C.E. Dibble and A.J.O. Anderson render the doublet “in jtechihucaoan, in jtaoan” as “his chamberlains and his elders.”
Oh lord, ruler, your vassals, your humble mothers, your humble fathers, your progenitors owe you thanks.\textsuperscript{100}

Finally, a teacher of noble boys is called an elderly noblewoman’s (probably their grandmother’s) “progenitor” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 156). In all these examples, -
techiuhcauh can be understood as the one who serves his superior with advice.

The usage of the term -techiuhcauh in polite speech conforms to the principles described above. The already mentioned elderly noblewoman addresses her grandchildren’s tutor notechiuhcauh (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 114). The pregnant woman gives thanks for a huehuetlatolli referring to the elders who have just delivered it “notechiuhcaoan” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 147). Interestingly, the “Florentine Codex” states that if, during an exchange of huehuetlatolli, an old man responded to huehuetque ilamatque, he employed the vocatives based on -pil. If, however, a youth delivered a speech to the elders, he said to them: “notechiuhcatzitzinoane” (ibid.: 195). It suggests that young people were not able to stand on the position of those who transmit traditional knowledge. Even if they actually did this, they waived their claim to this position by means of the terminology used in address, giving the role of a real “speaker” to their elder listeners.

1.8. TERMS RESULTING FROM CULTURAL CONTACT

1.8.1. The modifier teoyotica\textsuperscript{101}

The modifier teoyotica is strongly associated with Christianity. It literally means “through divinity” and it was broadly used after the conquest to construct such Christian terms as for example: teoyotica tlatoani (“a bishop” or “archbishop,” lit. “a spiritual ruler”); teoyotica machiotia (“to confirm,” lit. “to designate spiritually”); or teoyotica nenamictilitiztli (“a marriage through sacrament”). It was also combined with three terms for consanguineals:

\textsuperscript{100} Translation mine.
\textsuperscript{101} The information for this chapter was partially provided by the database of the project Language Encounters Between the Old and New Worlds: Language as the Medium of Cross-Cultural Transfers in Early New Spain, directed by Justyna Olko and financed by the Foundation for Polish Science.
-pil, -coneuh and -ta. Logically, also -nan should form part of this set, but I have not come upon the phrase teoyotica -nan.

The earliest source in my corpus, which has an attestation of teoyotica -piltzin is fray Alonso de Molina’s “Confesionario mayor.” Molina uses this term in the section on the principles of inheritance and renders it as “hijo legítim” (Molina 1569: f. 60). The illegitimate children are amo teoyotica -pilhuan, or “children not through sacrament”:

\[\text{ytlaye oncate cequintin yn amoteoyotica ypilhuan yçan ymecapilhua, yeuantin quicuizque ymaxca: inaço oquichtin anoço ciua.}\]

y tuuie otros no legítimos (conuiene asaber: hijos de sus mãecebas) agora seas machos o hebras ellos ha de auer su hazienda y bienes (Molina 1569: f. 60r).

The Molina’s translation shows clearly what he meant by “not legitimate”: born out of holy wedlock. Most likely, the same connotation can be ascribed to the “female” term, teoyotica -coneuh, as employed in a sixteenth-century testament:

\[\text{Yniquetlamantli nitlanahuatia yn teoyotica noconeuh yn itoca balsar garauajar nicmaca huerta cali zan quicenuiz yehuatl yn icaltizin yhuan yn ihuertatzin teoyotica nonamictzin (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 54)}\]

Third, I order: to my legitimate son named Baltasar Caravajal I give the orchard and house, he is to take all of it, it was the house and orchard of my legitimate husband (ibid.: 55).

Molina reports yet another meaning of kin terms modified by teoyotica. He glosses “Padrino de bautismo. nequatequiliztica teta. teoyotica teta” (Molina 1977 I: 91v), “Madrina de baptismo. nequatequiliztica tenan. teoyotica tenan. teoyoticanantli” (ibid.: 80r). As I have already mentioned, teoyotica -nan does not appear in the sources recorded in my database. Teoyotica -ta, on the other hand, is employed only by Chimalpahin. Since a person can have only one biological father, it was not necessary to charge the modifier teoyotica with the meaning “legitimate” in this case. Chimalpahin refers with teoyotica -ta to godfathers or confirmation sponsors. He uses the term both as a status or function indicator (with the impersonal prefix te-) and as a tool to describe a relationship. As far as the former is
concerned, he juxtaposes it with the Spanish loanword *padrino*, which apparently serves here as a complement, setting the Nahuatl term in the proper context:

\[
yehuatzin \text{ yn Padre comissario} \quad \text{quinmocuaatequilli, auh \text{ yn teoyotica tettahuan} \text{ yn Padrinos mochiuhtzinoque çanno yehuantzitzin \text{ yn huehuetque totatzitzinhuan frayles Fran}^{cos} (Chimalpahin 2006: 276).}
\]

the father commissary baptized them, and it was likewise the eldest among our fathers the Franciscan friars who became the spiritual fathers, the sponsors (ibid.: 277).

Interestingly, when using *teoyotica*-ta with possessive prefixes other than *te*-, Chimalpahin does not pair it with the Spanish loanword:

\[
ynic ce moquatequi. yehuatl \text{ yn pilli teuhctli Jabon. ytoca mochiuh \text{ yn onca ypan} \text{ baptismo Don Alonso. teoyotica. ythatzin mochiuh \text{ yn Don hernando de altamirano. capitan de la guarda} (ibid.: 174).}
\]

The first baptized was a noble and lord of Japan whose name upon baptism became don Alonso; don Hernando Altamirano, the captain of the guard, became his godfather (ibid.: 175).

In the “Testaments of Culhuacan,” both *teoyotica*-*pil* and *teoyotica*-coneuh are used with the meaning of a godchild. In his testament, Simón Moxixcoa explicitly states that his *teoyotica*-*pil* was a biological son of somebody else: *Auh yn teoyotica napiltzin yn itoca mathia yn ipiltzin Jacobo tlatollehua*, or “And I have a godchild named Matías, son of Jacobo Tlatollehua” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 156). Juana Tiacapan leaves a small metate and three small hanks of yarn to her *teoyotica*-coneuh Miguel, undoubtedly not a biological child, since the substantial part of her property went to her brother-in-law (she probably did not have children of her own) (ibid.: 148-150). According to the rules developed within the kinship sphere, *teoyotica*-coneuh appears in these contexts only in singular. When there is need for naming several legitimate children or godchildren of a woman, the term *teoyotica*-pilhuan is used (e.g. Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 122).

However, there are also situations when the reference point of *teoyotica*-coneuh is a man. The most instructive examples come from the “Testaments of Culhuacan.” In the entire
set of wills men are twice attested as the reference points of teoyotica -pil and twice as the reference points of teoyotica -coneuh. In the former case, both testators (Vicente Xochiamatl and Simón Moxixicoa) have their own children and to them goes the lion’s share of the property. Addionally, they have their teoyotica -pilhuan (probably godchildren). The godson of Vicente receives one chinampa of his relatively big estate and he is listed as one of the witnesses to the testament. The godchild of Simón is given two chinampas and it is his father who serves as Simón’s witness. In both cases the relations seem to be rather formal – no particular interest in godchildren is expressed by either of the testators (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 112-115, 154-159).

When it comes to teoyotica -coneuh, the situation changes completely. Tomás de Aquino has not got his own children: he generously allows the children of his wife (probably from her previous relationship) to stay in the house after his death but the one whom he obviously favors is his teoyotica -coneuh, a boy named Gaspar. Tomás states:

\[
\text{ça mochi itech çeyez y nonamic yhuan yehuatl teoyotica noconetzin y nicnonapalhui yn itoca casbar yn ipiltzi marcos morales ychan cohuatla tenanco} \text{ (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 66)}
\]

all of it together will belong to my wife and my ward that I adopted (embraced), named Gaspar, child of Marcos Morales, whose home is Coatlan Tenanco (ibid.: 67\textsuperscript{102}).

The second example concerns a mature man, Juan Francisco. His mother, Ana Juana, leaves him her entire property, but she is very worried about his stepfather, Gabriel Itzmalli. Gabriel is, according to her, a real scoundrel and it is quite likely that he will cause trouble to Juan Francisco after her death. Under such circumstances she decides:

\[
\text{ca nicnotlatlauhtillia yn yehuatzin yn Sennor don francéö florez alde ma ypa motlatoltiz ma quihualmanilliz canel teoyotica yconetzin macamo quimoxicahuilliz} \text{ (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 82)}
\]

\textsuperscript{102} S.L. Cline and M. León-Portilla render “teoyotica noconetzin” as “my godchild.”
I beseech lord don Francisco Flores, alcalde, to speak for (my son) and come to take him, because (my son) is his ward. Let him not abandon him (ibid.: 83\textsuperscript{103}).

In both the above examples the relation defined by the term *teoyotica -coneuh* is far more significant than in the case of *teoyotica -pil*. It focuses on men acting as guardians or adoptive fathers of their “spiritual children.” We are not told whether the relation godparent-godchild occurs here too but I believe that the reason for ascribing the term *-coneuh* to the male reference point is the need to differentiate between godchildren (*teoyotica -pil*) and wards or adoptive children (*teoyotica -coneuh*). In a 1760 testament from the Toluca Valley, another Tomás de Aquino states that his only heir, Isidro Serrano, “noteoteticacune,” is to take care of everything regarding his burial. He explains:

*Ca yehual ytech nimotemachitia ypanpa ca oquimohuapahuilitzinno Dios yhuan quin oc tepa nehual Ca notlaquatequil desde tepitzin Onichuapahuan* (Pizzigoni 2007: 182-183)

I have confidence in him because God and after that I myself raised him, for he is my godchild; I raised him since he was little (ibid).

Thus, Tomás was Isidro’s guardian or adoptive father but at the same time he was his godfather. These two aspects of their relation are pointed to by two different terms: *teoyotica -coneuh* on the one hand and *tlauuadtequilli*, a neologism not involving the kinship concept, on the other hand. Arguably, men used the term originally reserved for women to describe the children related to them not by blood or religious sacrament but rather by social ties. It would be interesting to see if women used the singular form *teoyotica -piltzin* analogically. Unfortunately, I have not come upon such data by now. Instead, the adoptive children of women are described with the undoubtedly precontact (and, perhaps, originating within the polygamous marriage pattern) term *-chahuacuneuh* (see: 6.1.6. -chauh group).

The two “primary” meanings of *teoyotica -pil* and *teoyotica -coneuh*, a legitimate son and a godchild, continued into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In his annals, Chimalpahin speaks of “yn huel teoyotica. oquinchiuhque. ynpilhuan,” or the truly legitimate

\textsuperscript{103} S.L. Cline and M. León-Portilla render “teoyotica yconetzin” as “his godchild.”
children that they engendered (Chimalpahin 2006: 112-113) and the 1610 Spanish translation of a testament renders the term *noteoyotica nopiltzin* as “mi ahijado” (Rojas Rabiela et al. 2000 III: 96-97). In the “Testaments of Toluca” Isabel María leaves to her -*teoyotica coneuh* two small magueyes (Pizzigoni 2007: 60). Additionally, Chimalpahin records the further extension of the term *teoyotica*-pil into the baptized ones who are the children of the Holy Church:

> mocuaatequizque ynic no teoyotica Sacramentotica ypihuantzitzinhuan yezque tonantzín Sancta yglesia Romana (Chimalpahin 2006: 274)

they are to be baptized, so that they will also be children of our mother the holy Roman Church in matters of the holy sacraments (ibid.: 275).

Finally, in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” there is an interesting combination of *teoyotica*-pil as a legitimate child with the high status indicator, *tepiltzin*. The author lists the offspring of the *tlatoani* of Mexico-Tenochtitlan, don Diego Huariantzin. The first six individuals (both sons and daughters) are described as “teoyotica tepilhuā,” or the nobles born in holy wedlock. They are followed by three daughters, each of them classified as *tlaçoconetl* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 172). This term comes up in the “Florentine Codex” as a counterpart of *tlaçopilli*, or high-ranked nobleman ( Sahagún 2010 X: f. 32v). Here it also refers to the members of a high class: it seems to stress that although the daughters in question were illegitimate, they were still granted noble status.

### 1.8.2. Loanwords

The Spanish term “madre” was not included in the Nahuatl terminological system as a kin term. I have not found it combined with possessive affixes. On the other hand, Chimalpahin uses it three times, referring to the blessed Teresa de Jesús, for example:

> motemachizti ynic yancuican ohualla españa yn iyectehualiztlahtolotzin huey Sancta tenantzin la madre Theresa de Jesus. ynic motehua Beatificacion çan oc ycatzinco Oquimochihuilli yn Roma Sancto Padre Paulo quinto (Chimalpahin 2006: 286)
it was announced, there had newly come from Spain the statement, called beatification, blessing the great saint mother Teresa de Jesús, which the holy Father in Rome, Paul V, provisionally made in her name (ibid.: 287).

Apparently, *la madre* is a kind of a title here, although its primary meaning is understood by the author, as the phrase “huey Sancta tenantzin” suggests. Since “mother” was a customary Spanish designation of a nun, the title was most probably derived from a Spanish source (either written or oral). In the actual kinship context, *madre* appears in 1762:

\[
yhuan niltanahuatia yntla tl Dios nehmotlaocolitzinos yn itlazomiquiliStzin noSepoltura Motlapos teopancalitic yxpaltalantzin nra S de guadalupe = canpatomotoCazino noS Madre moeStiCatca\]

(Pizzigoni 2007: 141)

And I order that if our lord God favors me with his precious death, my grave is to be opened inside the church building facing the altar of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, where my late lady mother was buried (ibid).

The testament is full of Spanish kin terms adapted to the Nahuatl system, such as *-sobrino* or *-primohermano*. In this case, however, it is the word *señora* rather than *madre* that bears a possessive prefix. For this reason, *madre* again seems to function more as a status indicator than a Nahuatl kin term.

The loanword *padre* was operating within Nahuatl according to similar rules. I never came upon it combined with possessive affixes, nor was it employed in the actual kinship context. To the contrary, the common plural form of *padre, padreme*, makes use of the absolutive ending *-me*. Interestingly, in my database the word is never employed in reference to God the Father, for whom, apparently, various forms of *-ta* seemed more appropriate. Instead, *padre* is a very common (162 attestations compared with 3 occurrences of *madre*) designation for an ecclesiastic, including the phrase with which the pope was described: *Santo Padre*. It has to be stressed that, while *Santo Padre* was not translated into Nahuatl, *padre* with the meaning of “priest” had its counterpart in the term *totatzin*.

Of two Spanish terms for godparents, “madrina” and “padrino,” only the latter is to be found in the Nahuatl texts analyzed here. Surprisingly, while *madre* and *padre* did not acquire
possessive affixes, -padrino sometimes did. Most likely, this fact stems from the usage of all these loanwords in Spanish. “Madre” and “padre” with the meaning of “nun” and “friar” respectively, were from the beggining adopted by Nahuatl as titles, while “padrino” necessarily involved a relationship between two persons. Its possessive form is to be found already in the fray Alonso de Molina’s “Confessionario mayor,” where it is used for a confirmation sponsor:

Ynic macuillamantli, monequi ticmatiz: cainaquin mitzitzquiticaz, yniquac mitzmomaquiliz confirmacion yn obispo ca mopadrino mochiua.

La quinta es: que tengas entendido, que aquel que te tuuiere, quando el obispo te confirmare, es hecho tu padrino (Molina 1569: 84r).

Fifty years later, Chimalpahin also employs it in this way, though this time in reference to a godfather:

quitocayotique ynic mocuaatequi ypiltzin ytoca mochiuh Doña Mariana manuel auh yn iPadrino mochiuh ce tottatzin hue sancto ytoca fray Pedro Lazaro teopixqui S. Franco (Chimalpahin 2006: 234).

when his child was baptized they named her and her name became doña Mariana Manuela, and a very holy father named fray Pedro Lázaro, a Franciscan friar, became her godfather (ibid.: 235).

At the same time, however, he makes use of the absolutive form of the term:

ce ynpillo yn confirmacion quicuic auh yehuatl quimopalehuilli yn licenciado Vallezillo fiscal del Rey de lo ciuil teoyotica tettzatzin padrino muchiu (ibid.: 278)

One of their nobles received confirmation, and he was aided by licenciado Vallecillo, the royal prosecutor for civil matters, who became the spiritual father, the sponsor (ibid.: 279).
It has to be noted that in this example Chimalpahin first wrote “teoyotica tettatzin” and then complemented it with *padrino*. It may suggest that he felt more comfortable with the former term, but was convinced that the latter would be better understood by many of his readers.

2. GRANDCHILDREN AND GRANDPARENTS

2.1. -IXHUIIH

The term *ixuiuhtli* is glossed by fray Alonso de Molina as “nieto o nieta” (Molina 1977 II: 48v), or a grandson or granddaughter. Indeed, it very often can be found with the meaning of a grandchild regardless of sex. It can have either a grandmother or a grandfather as a reference point. According to rules which govern the whole terminological system, -ixhuiuh can also be extended to collateral kin of the second descending generation (Lockhart 1992: 75), though I have not found explicit evidence of this practice in the texts. Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart observe that in the “Bancroft Dialogues” the term is employed for children in general, adults being the reference point (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 50). In some examples it cannot be determined with certainty whether the children referred to are the actual grandchildren of the reference point or not. However, -ixhuiuh is also used to describe disciples and the reference point is their tutor:

*xiquinnmocalaquili notechiuhcauh: ma itla conitlacotin: mitzmotolinilia in moxhuihuan* (ibid.: 138)

Bring them in, my progenitor. Let them not damage anything; your grandchildren (charges) cause you too much trouble (ibid.: 139).

Unfortunately, I have not found any similar attestations of the term in other sources. I can only speculate that this extension of -ixhuiuh may be based on the same logical principle as the extension of -pil to mean “subjects.” The authority involved in the relation between the tutor and his “grandchildren” would be of a different (perhaps milder or more reverential – as
the children belong to aristocracy) nature than the authority exercised by a tlatoani onto macehualtin.

In plural, -ixhuihuan, or grandchildren, is sometimes extended to mean “descendants,” for example:

yn amo tlaca cate tlatilolca cenca moxicohuani. yn axcan ca ye yuhqui yn imixhuihuan yn iuhqui yn iuhqui amo tlaca nemi (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 110)

The Tlatelolca were evil, very bad-tempered. Their grandsons are now like that, they live like evil ones (ibid.: 109).

The quotation describes the first Tlatelolca, the founders of the altepetl. According to the “Crónica Mexicayotl,” this event took place in 1337 so there was no possibility of the founders’ grandsons living “now” – in the colonial period. The merging of the two meanings within one kin term would present many problems, especially for studying genealogical patterns. Fortunately, as far as “descendants” are concerned, the sources give preference to the difrasismo -pilhuan -ixhuihuan over the simple -ixhuihuan. The doublet is mentioned by Molina under the entry “Nietos descendientes abaxo. tepilhuan. teixuiuan” (Molina 1977 I: 88v). When juxtaposed, these two terms seem to refer not to particular children and grandchildren of a reference point, but rather, generally, to his/ her descendants. For example, Miguel Hernández describes with it his grandchildren – the children of his deceased son:

notech pohuiz yn cempantli aço ytlantzin nechtlacollizque y nopilhua y noxhuihua ca tel oca yn inatzin y nomicaçihuamotzin missa nechitlanizque (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 274)

one section (wing) is to belong to me, and perhaps my children and grandchildren will favor me with some little thing; although their mother, my daughter-in-law, wife of my late son, is alive, they are to request a mass for me (ibid.: 275).

In the 1738 bill of sale the formula that prevents any future claims for the sold land is as follows:
in tehuantin anose topilhuan anose toxhuihuan tlacatisque anose tlacatiquihue acmo
in tlatohuallan yes Canel huel tolloloica tictonamaquiltilique in omotenehutzino
Caxtiltecatzinile Sr Dn Antto Gones (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 102)

Our children and grandchildren who will be or should come to be born will no longer
have a voice in it, for truly very willingly we sold it to the aforementioned Castilian
Señor don Antonio González (ibid.: 103).

In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” -pilhuan -ixhuihuan is juxtaposed with the difrasismo -
emyo -tlapallo, “(someone’s) blood and color,” which metaphorically described someone’s
offspring. Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc legitimizes his account as the heritage of the
Mexica that should be preserved forever:

ynic notehuantin occeppa yn Topilhuan yn toxhuihuan yn teçohuan yn totlapallohuan
yn totechcopa quicazque ynic mochipa noyehuantin quipiezque (Chimalpahin,

Therefore we too, but especially our sons, our grandsons, our offspring, those who will
issue from us, they too will always guard them (ibid.: 63).

One cannot help but notice that in the last two quotations the -pil component of the
discussed doublet adopts the form topilhuan, which, when acting separately, is most often
used to mean “one of us” (not necessarily “our descendant,” see: 1.1.3. One of us). The form
toxhuiuh cannot be perceived as the exact counterpart of topiltzin, because, unlike the latter, it
can have both a woman and man as a reference point. If Nahua parents wanted to refer to their
child, they would use the doublet topiltzin toconeuh unless they referred to multiple children –
then the single topilhuan would be possible. For this reason -pil with the 1st person plural
possessive prefix is definitely less frequently found within the kinship sphere than toxhuiuh/
toxhuihuan. Nevertheless, the latter does appear in the contexts similar to topiltzin/ topilhuan
and perhaps can also be interpreted as “one of us.” For example, in the “Crónica Mexicayotl”
the Mexica ask the tlatoani of Colhuacan, Achitometl, for his daughter whose skin will later
be used for impersonating the goddess Toci:
ca timitzotlatlauhtilia yn timocolhuan yn timomacehualhuan yhuã yn ixquichtin yn Mexica. ca ticmomacahuiliz ca titechmomaquiliz, yn mocozqui yn moquetzal yn mochpochtzin yn toxhuiuhtzin yn cihuapilli (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 96)

We, who are your grandfathers, your subjects, implore you together with all the Mexica to agree to this, to give us the one who is your necklace, your quetzal feather [= your child], your daughter, our grandchild, a noblewoman.104

Arguably, the princess is a Mexica’s grandchild for the same reason Quetzalcoatl is a Mexica’s child (see: 1.1.3. One of us). As was already mentioned (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children), she played a significant role in establishing and legitimizing the tlatocayotl of the Mexica. In written sources the term toxhuiuh/ toxhuiuhtzin/ toxhuihuan is generally associated with power and noble status. In the “Florentine Codex’s” chapter on the qualities and vices of noblewomen, it is used interchangeably with teixhuiuh, a noble of a lesser status (Sahagún 2012 X: 50; see: 2.1.1. Minor noblemen). In the “Bancroft Dialogues,” the governor of an altepetl is referred to with the title in tlacatl in toxhuiuhtzin, or the lord our grandson (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 114). An old noblewoman gives advice to a younger one, probably her daughter, about raising children:

\[ \text{Auh inin nocihuapiltzin, ma çà huel onneecuitlahuiilocan in toxhuihuan, ca ohuican in tlalticpac} \] (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 156)

And so, my lady, let our grandchildren be very well taken care of, for the world is a difficult place (ibid.: 157).

Since the mother and her daughter cannot be together the reference point of (biological) grandchildren, the prefix to- must refer here to a broader group, probably the entire family or Texcocan nobility. Alfredo López Austin interprets the speech to which the passage belongs as expressing the fear of pipiltin population decline (López Austin 1988 I: 310) – in this context children are to be especially valued. In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” a relative-in-law of a pregnant woman refers to her as “toxviuhtzin” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 144) and the same form is used in reference to a newborn, greeted by huehuetque ilamatque (ibid.: 185-187).

104 Translation mine.
186). The “grandchildren” – Achitometl’s daughter, noblewomen, a governor, the Texcocan children, a pregnant woman who ensures the survival of the family’s heritage – are of an important status and at the same time they are “our,” they belong to the community of a speaker. Perhaps the preference of the term toxhuiuhztzin over topiltzin in these examples is based on its quality of indicating a greater distance (in the kinship sphere – from Ego). The Colhua princess was not a Mexica herself, the governor might have been appointed by the Spanish authorities and the pregnant woman was referred to by her in-laws. Speaking in terms of transmission of the vital essence, while children received it directly from their parents, grandchildren might have been thought of as receiving it indirectly – through a mediator.

The term -ixhuiuh with the sense of a member of a community or group is also sometimes seen forming a difrasismo with -pil. A 1570 complaint against a Martín Jacobo by a delegation from Xaltepec states:

>y yehuatl y min sacobo chicotetl y veveĩ y nixtlāvactl y tocalpolal y tomil ōqnanamaqiltin espanoles vel tocolhua totava ynmil tovevemil yvā cenquitin doxvivā dopilvā ymil y qncuilia yn qmaxcatic y castilā tlācah av ivā yn macevaltzitzinti cenca ye motoliniayā aoctle y quimochivilia y miltzintli (Lockhart 1991: 95)

this Martín Jacobo has sold seven large meadows, our calpolli land and our fields, to various Spaniards, which were very much our fathers’ and our grandfathers’ fields, our patrimonial fields, and from some of our children and grandchildren he takes their fields and has made them the property of Castilians. And the poor commoners are suffering greatly and no longer plant fields (ibid).

In the entire passage the pronoun “our” refers to a community larger than a family, probably, as the text indicates, a calpolli. “Our children and grandchildren” are either the actual commoners or the members of the calpolli in general, designated with the term “macevaltzitzinti” in order to stress how miserable they are. In either case the doublet informs us that the people in question belong to the same community as the delegates. Perhaps it is meant to show some diversity in their status. In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” the tlatoani of Colhuacan allows the Mexica to take Acamapichtli as their ruler, arguing that he is amopiltzin amoxhuiuh, or your (pl.) child, your (pl.) grandchild (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 114). Acamapichtli was not a pure Mexica: he was a son of a Mexica man and a Colhua woman,
therefore the component *amoxhuiuh* may have been necessary to indicate the larger distance from his group of reference. A similar principle might explain describing a governor with a variant of the doublet employing the term *-telpoch: in totelpochtzin in toxhuiuhtzin* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 112).

2.1.1. Minor noblemen

In the 1960’s a controversy arose over one of fray Alonso de Molina’s entries, namely “Primo, hijo de hermano. teixuiuh. yxuiuhli” (Molina 1977 I: 98v). Helga Rammow discussed the problem of giving the term for a grandchild as the translation of the Spanish “primo.” She explained it with a possible extension of the word “hijo” — according to her, Molina could have used it to mean a descendant in general. Rammow also saw nothing wrong in the juxtaposition, as synonyms, of two different Spanish kinship terms: “primo” (a cousin) and “hijo de hermano” (a nephew) (Rammow 1964: 188). Her conclusions were revised by Pedro Carrasco who, leaning on another work of Molina, the “Confessionario mayor,” interpreted the entry in question as follows:

son primos hermanos los que descienden de un abuelo común; o, dicho de otro modo, los nietos de un mismo abuelo son primos entre sí (Carrasco 1966: 151).

The concept of a common grandfather is expressed by means of the indefinite personal prefix *te*-.* Teixhuihuan* are “someone’s grandchildren” which is understood as “the grandchildren of the same person.” Obviously, the peculiarities of the Nahua kinship system extend this group beyond the limits of lineal descendants (Kellogg 1986: 111). *-Ixhuiuh* refers not only to someone’s actual grandchild but also to a grandchild of this person’s sibling. Additionally, the bilateral kinship system implies that both grandfathers and grandmothers could have formed a reference point for *teixhuihuan*. All together, these features suggest that within a family the number of *teixhuihuan*, a group of people who were in capacity of claiming the same rights, must have been quite large.

The meaning of the word as deciphered by Carrasco appears in a lawsuit from Tenochtitlan analyzed by Susan Kellogg (AGN Tierras 55, exp. 5, f. 3v):
in tocol ytoca tocuiltecatl mopilhuati matlactin qnchiuh auh za ce in mopilhuati ytoca tlacachin auh totatzin in nehuatl anna xoco yhua ceqntin teyxhuihua öcate (Kellogg 1986: 108)

our grandfather named Tocuiltecatl had children, he engendered ten, but only one had children, named Tlacochin, and he was the father of me, Anna Xoco, and other grandchildren who are there (ibid).

In another document from Tenochtitlan analysed by Kellogg (BNF 112, f. 28v) teixhuiuh is still inscribed in the context of family but it seems to extend its meaning:

yn felipe ca huel oca teyxuiuh yn itic calli auh yn icolhuan y mocoh ehuaya: yn inatzin felipe quinomominiquillique ypanpa huel itech pouhticca: y fellipe yn teixhuiuh (Kellogg 1986: 108)

Felipe is truly a grandchild there, in the house. His grandfathers were all departing, they died together with Felipe's mother. For this reason, it truly belongs to him. Felipe is a grandchild.105

According to Kellogg, the document is a part of a lawsuit between Felipe and his half-brother, concerning the house mentioned above and the adjacent property. The quotation forms part of a testimony made by one of Felipe’s witnesses who tries to convince the court of Felipe’s rights to the house. The main thread of argumentation consists of tracing Felipe’s claims back to his great-grandfather and great-grandmother (Kellogg 1986: 108). In this context, the term teixhuiuh used in reference to Felipe can be understood as “a person who claims his rights from the grandparents."

Lockhart observes the association of teixhuihuan with “someone’s children,” tepilhuan or pipiltin, suggesting that on the social level the distance between these groups could have paralleled the generational distance between the respective kin (Lockhart 1992: 97). The two terms were used both in the kinship sphere and as social class designators or titles. Actually, they often form a difrasismo which describes high classes of the society:

105 Translation mine.
amo can tlapohualtin in tepilhuan in teixhuihuan catca: auh amo onnopohuaya in tetlan nenque macehualtin, noce in tlatlacotin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 146);

There were countless nobles and lesser nobles, and one could not count the commoners who were dependents, or the slaves (ibid: 147).

huel Xiccaquican Xicanacan yn antepilhuan yn anteyxhuihuan, ynan Mexica ynan Tenochca (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 64)

Listen well; accept them, you children and grandchildren, you Mexica and Tenochca (ibid.: 65).

In Brant Gardner’s words:

This use of the term is not explicable by the rules of social deference but rather with the borrowing of the structural principles of the biological order to another ranked hierarchy (Gardner 1982: 113).

In his terms, the larger generational distance between Ego and his or her grandchild in the kinship sphere implies the lesser status of teixhuihuan in the social hierarchy. In the “Primeros Memoriales” tepiltzin “desires to be honored” but “teixvihu” “is arogant” (Sahagún 1997b: 258). The comparison of -pil and -ixhuihuh seems particularly interesting if one takes into account the Mexica nobility. In Tenochtitlan, the status of pilli was granted to those who were lineal descendants of the first tlatoani, Acamapichtli (Calnek 1974: 202). It is said that because the ruler’s wife, Illancueitl, was sterile, Acamapichtli married numerous daughters of leaders, with whom he had children. Later some pipiltin, though certain as to their close kin ties with Acamapichtli, were not able to identify any child of Acamapichtli from whom they descended and they could have traced their ancestry only to his grandchildren, called huehue pipiltin, or “old noblemen” (Carrasco 1984: 57-59). The “Crónica Mexicayotl” explains this matter as follows:

\[\text{\footnotesize 106 F. Karttunen and J. Lockhart rendered the doublet “in tepilhuan in teixhuihuan” as “(minor) nobles and lesser relatives.”}\]
And here are called by name all those said to be and known as old noblemen, grandsons of the late lord ruler, Huehue Acamapichtli: they issued from all his children, who were mentioned by name and who begot them. And although it is not known who [the grandsons'] begetters, the fathers, were, what were the names of those who begot them, it is said, however, that they indeed were the grandsons of the lord Acamapichtli, that with him [their ancestry] ended. Hence they are called the old noblemen (ibid.: 117).

The implications of the term *ixhuiuhtzitzinhuan* here are the same as those of *teixhuihuan* as examined by Carrasco. *Huehue pipiltin* were noblemen who were “the grandchildren of the same person,” that is, of Acamapichtli. Obviously, also other *pipiltin* were his grandchildren but, as Tezozomoc implies, they were able to base their claims on ties with their fathers, the sons of Acamapichtli, whose names had been remembered into the colonial period. According to Tezozomoc’s explanation, the ancient *huehue pipiltin* were lacking this possibility because in the time when the “Crónica Mexicayotl” was written, the names of their fathers had already been forgotten and their noble status could have only been claimed from their grandfather.

In view of the material and its analysis presented here, some of the suggestions made by Kellogg need revision. Working with data from Tenochtitlan, she defined *teixhuihuan* as a
descendant-focused concept, contrary to *tlacamecayotl* which she perceived as ancestor-focused, and she translated it tentatively as “one’s potential descendants.” According to her, *teixhuihuan* included “at least the children and grandchildren of an individual.” In support of her hypothesis she cites the phrase “yn inpilhuan yn [te]ixhuihua” from a document located in Ramo Hospital de Jesús in AGN, translated contemporarily into Spanish as “todos sus descendientes.” Square brackets suggest that *te*- was added by the transcriptor and the phrase was originally the common doublet *-pilhuan -ixhuihuan* which indeed means “one’s descendants.” The example cannot be used, therefore, as an argument in the discussion of *teixhuihuan*. The second example cited by Kellogg is the phrase *teixhuiuh tepiltzin*, found in an order of sale (AGN Tierras 42, exp. 5) and rendered, in the accompanying Spanish translation, as “un deudo descendiente.” Kellogg argues that it refers to “a woman’s brother’s daughter and not to a grandchild” (Kellogg 1986: 111), in any case conforming to the semantic field of *-ixhuiuh*, but she overlooks the presence of the component *tepiltzin*. Again, the doublet does not prove the existence of a group of potential descendants, but rather it describes someone of a noble status whose rights are based on claims from both parents and grandparents. My conclusion is that on the level of a family *teixhuihuan* did form a group of one’s descendants but not “all potential” – they all belonged to the same generation (G-2) and were equal in terms of inheritance. On the level of the society, in turn, they were probably viewed as a kind of social class whose claims were based on weaker ties with the ancestor than it was in the case of *tepilhuan*, or *pipiltin*.

The concept of *teixhuihuan* was likewise studied on the basis of Tlaxcalan sources. In Tlaxcala *teixhuihuan* were a separate social class that held a well-defined place within the *teccalli* (lordly house) system (Hicks 2009: 571). Frederic Hicks hypothesizes that they were distant lesser kin of the nobles plus descendants of past followers of the nobles when they were first establishing their domains (ibid.: 582).

According to Hicks, the Tlaxcalan *teixhuihuan* could have possessed their own lands, but they were smaller than those of *pipiltin*. On the other hand, they had tribute obligations, but lesser than *macehualtin* or even voluntary (ibid: 581). Their status was certainly dependent, though in a different way than that of commoners. Don Julián de la Rosa, a Tlaxcalan *teuctli*, states in his 1566 testament:
I gave fields to the dependents who are at Atlantepec; a man named Francisco Xiuhtototl supervises them so that they obey me (ibid.: 51).

The verb chosen to describe the relation of these dependents to their “masters” is *tlacamati*. It can be either transitive or intransitive. In the former case it means “obedecer a otro” (Molina 1977 II: f. 115v) while in the latter “ser rico y prospero” (ibid.: f. 115r). It contrasts with the phrase *itech pohui*, or to belong/ to be dedicated to someone, which usually served to indicate the relation between the “masters” and their “children” (-*pilhuan*) (see: 1.1.4. Subjects). While *itech pohui* can likewise be found in reference to *teixhuihuan*, I have not come upon *tlacamati* used in reference to *macehualtin*. The rather noble than humble status of *teixhuihuan* seems to be further confirmed by the testament of don Julián, who uses the difrasismo *teixhuih tepiltzin* in the context of social hierarchy, discussed here:

*Auh in teixuiuh tepiltzin yn iuh otechmotlacachiyaya tiuan niccauh juo ximenez caniuah yezque ynic quintlacamatizque in di o yuan baptista* (ibid.: 48)

And as to the dependents who have obeyed us, my cousin Juan Jiménez and me, they are to be as before, so that they will obey Diego and Bautista (ibid.: 49).

Although the defined social class of *teixhuihuan* was unique to Tlaxcala (Hicks 2009: 571), an attempt can be made to use the implications of (*te*)*ixhuiuh* in Tenochtitlan as support for Hicks’ hypothesis. The term would point to the noble status of the group but, at the same time, it would stress lesser accuracy in tracing *teixhuihuan*’s descent from the source of legitimization of the noble position. The somewhat cloudy ancestry of the group would imply its lesser status in relation to *pipiltin*. Unfortunately, the matter cannot be entirely resolved. Lockhart cites evidence showing the ambiguity of *teixhuihuan*’s position in Tlaxcala to the point that he is inclined to view this group as transitional between commoners and nobles (Lockhart 1992: 98). A 1554 land suit speaks of “*macehualtin* who are called *teixhuihuan*” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 47, n. 17).
A parallel between *tepiltzin/ tepilhuan* and *teixhuiuh/ teixhuihuan* in the terminological system makes one wonder about the function of the absolutive of –*ixhuiuh: ixhuiuhtli*. If *tepiltzin* as a status indicator had its absolutive counterpart *pilli*, would it be possible that *ixhuiuhtli* was also used to describe a social position? In his description of qualities of various kin, fray Bernardino de Sahagún avoids the term *pilli*, choosing *tepiltzin* and *piltontli* instead, but he does not have these objections when it comes to *ixhuiuhtli*. The grandchild is:

*tepiltzin, tetzon, teizti, tentzontli, ixquamulli, teuitzio, teauaio, tetzicueallo, tecacamaio, tenecauhca, cozcatl, quetzalli, tequixti* (Sahagún 2012 X: 6).

someone’s child (or a nobleman), someone’s hair, someone’s fingernail (= a nobleman by birth), beard, eyebrow (= a grandchild, a nobleman by birth), a thorn that belongs to someone (= someone’s descendant), a person of a noble lineage, small ears of maize that belong to someone (= someone’s descendant), someone’s trace, necklace, a precious feather, one who trusts another.108

Similarly to the term *pilli* (see: 1.1.1. Noblemen), *ixhuiuhtli* combines connotations from two spheres: a kinship and a social one. In the same book of the “Florentine Codex,” in the chapter that deals with noblewomen, one of them is described as *teixuiuh, ixuiuhtli* and the corresponding Spanish text explains that she is “La muger de buen parentesco” (Sahagún 2012 X: 50, n. 27). The description begins as follows: *in teixuiuh, ca pilli, tecpilli, tlacopilli* (ibid.: 50), or “a noble(woman) (of *ixhuiuhtli* status) is a noble, a lady, a precious noble.”

Another example of *ixhuiuhtli* can be found in the “Crónica Mexicayotl.” When the Mexica decide to elect their first *tlatoani*, they remember that in Colhua lives a generation of children born from Colhua mothers and Mexica fathers, who settled there some time ago. They agree that a ruler of mixed origin would be a perfect choice (due to the legitimizing power of Colhuacan) and they head to the *tlatoani* of Colhuacan to ask him for an elect:

*auh ca ticmomacahuiliz. ca nel tomericapiltzin. auh ca toyollo quimati. ca culhuaaca yxhuiuhtli. ca yntzon yntizi. yn teteuhctin. yn tlahtoqte. yn culhuaque* (Chimalpahin and Tezozomoc 1997: 114).

---

108 Translation mine.
And you will grant him [to us]: for he is truly one of us, the Mexica, and we know in our hearts that he is the Culhua grandchild, the very hair, the very fingernail, of Culhuaque lords and nobles (ibid.: 115). 

From the kinship point of view, the elect is indeed a grandchild of (two) Colhuaque, because he is a son of a Colhua woman. He likewise is a grandson of (two) Mexica, being a son of a Mexica man. However, the term used in this quotation is not meant to describe a relation – it is an absolutive. A “Colhua grandson” is the status of the elect and it implies that his distance from the source of nobility is greater than it would be in the case of a Colhua pilli – the full “son” of the Colhuaque.

The last attestation of the term in absolutive that I have been able to find, is the only example of its plural form, ixhuiuhtin. It comes from the seventeenth-century “Códice de Ixhuatepec” which contains information on ownership of various lands:

**Tepecoman**

_Acasitli, tlaltetzahuitl Ytlal nemac tepecoman yhuan acazitli yniix huiuh, Mateo_

_secan catl, yhuan Alonso tenoxochitl yhuan Juan Cuitlach_

_yehuantin Omentin_

_yxhuiuhtin tepilhuan teczohuan_ (Valero de García Lascuráin 2004: 294).

Tepecoman.

It is the inherited land of Acacitli Tlaltetzahuitl and a grandchild of Acacitli, Mateo Cecancatl along with Alonso Tenoxochitl and Juan Cuitlach.

These two are the grandchildren, the noblemen, someone’s blood [= the descendants or noblemen].

---

109 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson rendered the word “tomexicapiltzin” as “our Mexica child” and the phrase “culhuaca yxhuiuhtli” as “the grandson of the Culhuaque.”
In the comparable entry for Huitznahuac the last clause that contains the absolutive form “yxhuiuhtin” is replaced with “yxhuihuan tepilhua[n] Teczhuan tetlapalohuan” (ibid.), or “his grandchildren, the noblemen, someone’s blood and color [= the descendants or noblemen].” Due to the scarcity of data we cannot be sure if ixhuiuhtin is a simple error here or if this form really existed and was used as the name for the social class of more distant ties with the noble “ancestors” than pipiltin.

2.1.2. O supreme lord!

-Ixhuiuh is another term for a relative younger than Ego used in honorific speech. It serves only as a form of address (like the vocatives based on -pil, -xocoyouh, -ichpoch and -telpoch) and not as a title (like noconetzin and nopiltzin). It can be used in either singular or plural but it never comes up with other possessive prefixes than the 1st person singular - even if the reference point is plural, for example:

yn Mexica. quihuique co tihuaallaque tlaclate noxhuiuhtzin tlahtohuanie
(Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 114)

The Mexica said to him: we have come [before you], O lord, O my grandson, O ruler.111

niman oyahque yn mexica oquinotzato. quihui. totecuiyoye noxhuiuhtzin. tlaclate tlahtohuanie timitztotlcalcahualtizque. timitztotlapololitzque. yn timomacehualhuan (ibid.: 96).

The Mexica then went to summon him. They said to him: Our lord, my grandson, lord, ruler, we [do not wish to] make you forgetful, to confuse and distract you, we who are your subjects (ibid.: 97).

The -ixhuiuh vocatives have different connotations depending on a grammatical form chosen. Noxhuiuhtze and its plural, noxhuihuane, are used for example by a noblewoman in

---

110 Translation mine.

111 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson rendered the word noxhuiuhtzin as “our grandson.”
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reference to her actual grandsons (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 142-144) or by a high dignitary who instructs a newly installed ruler (Sahagún 2012 VI: 51) – in the latter case the speaker is of a lesser position then the referent, but the social distance between them is rather small. On the other hand, *noxhuiuhtzine* and *noxhuihuantzitzine* are often paired with other honorifics and reflect a much greater gap between a speaker and an addressee, for example the Mexica address their ruler: *noxhuiuhtzine tlatoanie* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 116), or “o my grandchild, o ruler!” and to a ruler of Colhuacan they say: *tlacatle noxhuiuhtzine tlatoanie* (ibid.: 114), or “o lord, o my grandchild, o ruler!” A poor man greeted by a son of a ruler, answers him: *noxujuhtzine cozcalle quetzalle* (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 71), or “o my grandchild, necklace, quetzal feather [= nobleman?].” Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” has the form “noxviuhtizcetine,” employed in formal speech (see: 1.3.1. -ichpoch). It is juxtaposed with other honorifics, such as *tlacotitlcatle* (o precious person!), *maquiztle*, *chalchiuhtle* (o bracelet, o precious green stone!) and used by in-laws of a pregnant woman who address her, beginning the occasional *huehuetlatolli* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 141).

In the material I have gathered, the polite forms of address based on -*ixhuuiu* refer only to people of high social classes and the most common context for their usage is greetings:

_Auh yn Mexica nima ye quitlatlauhtia yn tlacatl. quilhuia = noxhuiuhtzine tlahtohuanie / oticmihiyohtili oticmociyahuilti_ (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 116).

And the Mexica then importuned the lord. They said to him: My grandson, ruler, you are most welcome (ibid.: 117).

_auh yn oacic yn oncan tiçaapan in yeuhatl yn achitometl. quilhuia yn Mexica ynic ye quihualnamiqui. oticmihiyohuiliti. noxhuiuhtzine tlacatle tlahtohuanie. cocoliztli timitztocuitilizque yn timocolhuan. yn timomacehualhuan_ (ibid.: 96).

And when Achitometl reached Tiçaapan, the Mexica said to him when they met him: Greetings, my grandson, lord ruler. We your grandfathers, your subjects, [do not wish to] make you ill [with our importunities] (ibid.: 97).
Likewise, in the “Bancroft Dialogues” there are several examples for greeting noble boys: *tlaximocalaquitihuian noxhuiuhtzitzinhuane*, or “do come in, o grandchildren!,” *xicalaquican noxhuihuane*, or “come in, o grandchildren!” *tlazamohuicatze noxocoyohuane noxhuihuane*, or “do come here, o youngest children, o grandchildren!” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 138, 140).

The greatest difference in usage between the vocatives based on the terms for children and those based on -*ixhuiuh* is seen when one compares the contexts in which the non-reverential forms appear. Such terms as *nopiltze, nochpochtze* or *notelpochtze* instead of greetings are often found in admonitions, instructions or orders.112 *Noxhuiuhtze* and *noxhuihuane* are rarely used in such contexts and if it does happen, they are paired with *nopiltze* and *nopilhuane* respectively, for example:

*Tla xiccaquj nopiltze, noxviuhtze, tzontle, iztitle, xocoiotle: ca otimoioliti, ca otimotlacatili in tlalticpac* (Sahagún 2012 VI: 213)

Listen to this, o my child, my grandchild [= a noble person who is listening], hair, nail [= offspring], the youngest child [or: nobleman], for you came to life, for you were born on earth.113

A passage from the speech of a great dignitary who informs a newly elected *tlatoani* as to the matters of governing:

*Hvi nopiltze, totoce tlatoanje, noxviuhtze: ca oallaueuetzqujtilo in totecujo, in tloque naoaque* (ibid.: 51)

O my son, O our lord, O ruler, O my grandson: our lord, the lord of the near, of the nigh, is made to laugh (ibid),

and a passage from the speech delivered by a midwife who accepts the task of helping in a labour, saying to the relatives of a pregnant woman:

112 See e.g. a speech on chastity in Sahagún 2012 VI: 116; instructions concerning the auction of estate in: Cline, León-Portilla 1983: 42; orders given by a god-carrier to the Mexica in: Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 112-114.
113 Translation mine.
But, my children, our lords, precious persons, my grandchildren, perhaps ye do not create a person when ye lament (ibid).

The doublets composed of -ixhuiuh and -pil vocatives were analyzed by Brant Gardner, who concluded that:

these terms serve to mark [the] group as the recipients of [the] particular discourse and therefore the social focal point for the moment (Gardner 1982: 111).

However, the role of this doublet was even greater, because it also marked subtleties of the tone of discourse. It was employed in the situations when someone was to be instructed but with the tone of particular reverence. In the above-cited examples the vocatives nopiltze and nopilhuantzitzin are complemented with the -ixhuiuh vocatives. The former are, as usually, rather neutral in tone, merely pointing to the listener of the speech. At the same time, the latter serve to add the necessary amount of reverence or, alternatively, to remove the potential tone of boldness from the statements. In the Nahua classification, the category of grandchildren was not only placed one generation further from Ego than that of children, but it also included non-lineal relatives. Thus, the term “grandchildren” implied greater distance between relatives than “children” and in direct speech this rule was valid as well. While the -pil-vocatives initiated a speech to any audience, -ixhuiuh-vocatives were tightly associated with nobility, and therefore, they can be rendered as “o, (supreme) lord(s)!”

There is also another kin term used in polite speech, which is found juxtaposed with noxhuiuhtze/ noxhuihuane, that is: noxocoyohue/ noxocoyohuane. As I have already stated, this form of address corresponded with the tone of tenderness (see: 1.3.3. -xocoyouh). In the huehuetlatolli of the “Bancroft Dialogues” an old woman says to her actual grandsons:

Alas, my grandchildren, my youngest ones, my eyebrows and lip hairs, how fortunate are the lady and the city that our Lord the Master of heaven and earth is letting you grow up so (ibid.: 143).

The same boys are greeted by an aged nobleman, perhaps their actual grandfather, in the following way:

*Tla iz annohuicatze noxocoyohuane noxhuhihuane. Ini*la oc amixco amocpac tlachiani in teteuctin in tlatoque amotechiuhcahuan, quenin cenca motlaçocamatizquia amechmochoquililizquia? (ibid.: 138)

Do come here, my youngest ones, my grandchildren. If the lords and rulers your progenitors should still behold you, how very grateful they would be, and how they would cry over you! (ibid.: 139).

Although both examples involve the actual kinship relation (grandparents-grandchildren), the juxtaposition of the vocative noxhihihuane with noxocoyohuane makes the former ambiguous. One cannot be somebody’s grandchild and the youngest child at the same time. There is no doubt that the latter term is used here in metaphorical sense and perhaps also the former can be interpreted as an honorific. In such a case, tenderness apparent in these statements would be complemented by reverence implied by -ixhuiuh vocatives. Both the grandmother and the alleged grandfather stress the noble descent of the boys (ibid.: 141) and express hope that they will become rulers in the future (ibid.: 145). Therefore, the usage of the -ixhuiuh vocatives may result from the general tone (and topic) of the speeches.

2.2. *COL*

In fray Alonso de Molina’s dictionary this term can be found under “Tecul. ahuelo” (Molina 1977 II: 93v) while the entry “Tecol” says “tio, hermano de ahuelo o de ahuela” (ibid.: 93r). The differentiation is misleading. Similarly to its counterpart from the second descending generation, -ixhuiuh, -col was used for both linear (a grandfather) and lateral relatives (a grandfather’s/ grandmother’s male sibling) (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 201
Arguably, such a usage is what we deal with in an example from an already mentioned 1593 document analyzed by Susan Kellogg (BNF 112: fol. 28v):

ypanpa cecan ytech moyollallitiua yn felipe yn icolhua catca po poliuhtoc pedro cochpin miguel lazaro juana xoco yehuantzin yn itlacamecayohua y felipe de stiago (Kellogg 1986: 108)

So that everyone will understand, Felipe's grandparents were Pedro Poliuhtoc, Pedro Cochpin, Miguel Lazaro, Juana Xoco, they were his tlacamecayohua (ibid).

Since an individual has only two grandfathers, at least one of those listed here must not be a linear relative of Felipe. Interestingly, the category of -colhuan encompasses a woman as well. In the sources, if one wanted to refer to his or her grandparents as a group, the general practice would be to use the difrasismo in -col in -ci, exactly like in the case of parents (in -nan in -ta). The plural of -ta was sometimes extended to form a calque of Spanish “padres” (see: 1.4. -ta), and if the situation is parallel here (a calque of “abuelos”), the linguistic change is very early.

As Helga Rammow observes, -col was extended not only to grandfather’s siblings, but also to their cousins, even very distant ones. She cites a passage from Chimalpahin’s “Octava Relación” where don Vicente de la Anunciación, “nauhtlamampa yteyccauhtzin,” or the younger brother in fourth grade of Chimalpahin’s grandfather, is likewise referred to by the annalist as nocoltzin (Chimalpahin 1983: 115-116; Rammow 1963: 66).

The term -col forms part of a number of idiomatic phrases which designate ancestors (see: 5.2. Older than ego). The most common one is the difrasismo in -ta in -col, a counterpart of in -pil in -ixhuiuh, or someone’s descendant (see: 2.1. -ixhuiuh). For instance, the authors of a sixteenth-century petition state:

ma xicmomachitin ca y yehuatl y min sacobo chicotetl y vevey yn ixtlavactl y tocalpolal y tomil oqnanamaqiltin espanoles vel tocolhua totava ynmil tovevemil (Lockhart 1991: 95)
Be informed that this Martín Jacobo has sold seven large meadows, our calpolli land and our fields, to various Spaniards, which were very much our fathers’ and grandfathers’ (i.e. ancestors’ – J.M.) fields, our patrimonial fields (ibid).

An early seventeenth-century testator Juan Bernardino locates his “fathers and grandfathers” in very distant past:

_Yhuan niquitohua notlatol onca callali yn ypan altepetl Xa Palacisco caxtoli ome ycalali ca moch meyotec yquin canin oquimocahuylitiaque notahuan nocolhua canel yehuan oquitzintique oquimanque ynin huey altepetl Cenpualan_ (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 89)

And I pronounce my statement: there is house-land in the altepetl San Francisco, seventeen house lots, all of them planted with magueyes. My ancestors left it (at death) some time ago because they began, they founded this great altepetl Cempoallan.114

Similarly, a late sixteenth-century historian Cristóbal del Castillo mentions _in tocolhuan in totahuan_ in the context of the first settlement of migrating groups:

_Auh ca yuh nicmati ca no ompa ohualitzhuallaque in tocolhuan in totahuan in tetzcoca in nican otlalmaceuhque_ (Castillo 2001: 122)

According to my knowledge, our ancestors, the Texcoca, who acquired land here, had also come heading in this direction from there.115

Neither _-tahuan_ nor _-colhuan_ is a calque here. The plural is allowed because the terms no longer mean “fathers” or “grandfathers” as such, but they refer to a more unspecified and sometimes chronologically more distant group.

At times, _-col_ is used with the sense “ancestor” without a complementary term: _Tleica in anquipoloa in nemjiliztli, yn jntil, in jntlapal tocolvan, vevetque_, or “Why do you destroy the way of life, the black, the red of our grandfathers, the ancient ones?” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 258). In the “Exercicio quotidiano” this usage is further extended to a non-biological context:

---

114 Translation mine.
115 Translation mine.
tiquinmonochilitzino ynic quimiximachilizque motlaçopiltzin in yehuántin tocoltzitzinhuan yn eyntin tlahtoque yn toyancuyohuan yn toyacapanohuá omochiuhque tlaneltoquiliztica (Sahagún 1997a: 148)

You called to our grandfathers, the three rulers, who became our firstborn, our oldest children, as regards the Faith, so that they would recognize Your beloved Son (ibid.: 149).

The reference point for tocoltzitzinhuan is the newly converted Nahuas. It appears that they consider the Three Magi as their ancestors in faith. They were the first people ever to convert into Christianity, by which they set example to follow by all the heathens.

The editors of Juan de San Antonio’s letter remark that in this document when - col(huan) is not reverential, it “evidently indicate[s] workers or assistants, not relatives” (San Antonio 1997: 207, n. 3). It is true that all over the written sources reverential forms of -col are usually restricted to the biological sphere (not counting the idiomatic phrases discussed above) while simple ones exceed it, though there are scarce exceptions (see e.g. the first quotation in this chapter). The 1564 letter of Juan de San Antonio provides a vast array of classes of people who fall within the category of someone’s -colhuan. In the following example the syntax indicates that these are calpixqui, tlayacanqui and tequitlato. Tecutlato seems to form yet another category. The reference point is the indigenous authorities of Texcoco, probably the tlatoani with his brothers and nephews:

\[\text{ca intla tel çan aca amocolhüa calpixqui, yn anoço tlayacanqui, tequitlato auh yn anoço tecutlato, yn anoço ceme amachcauá yn amotlantzinco nemi} \quad (\text{San Antonio 1997: 208})\]

Yet if it were one of your senior officials, a steward or a leader, a tribute boss, or [other] dignitary, or one of your managers, living with you (i.e. serving you – J.M.) (ibid. 209).

Calpixque, tlayacanque and tequitlatoque were middle-level officials in charge of tribute (Lockhart 1992: 43-44). The last term is glossed by Molina as “mandon o merino, o el que tiene cargo de repartir el tributo o el tequio alos maceuales” (Molina 1977 II: 105v).
Calpixque functioned on different levels of socio-political organization. Those who served as links between the tlatoani and pipiltin were themselves nobles, while those who collected tribute from macehualtin for the benefit of tetecutin were of more humble status (Hicks 1982: 235). In the letter, calpixque probably occupy the former position since their direct supervisor is the royal dynasty of Texcoco.

In Juan de San Antonio’s letter the main context in which the term -col is to be found is land-keeping. The officials from the quotation above are listed as potential beneficiaries of the tlatoani Ixtlilxochitl’s generosity. Juan de San Antonio states that if one of them had needed land, Ixtlilxochitl would have certainly given it to him, but this was not the case: all the land was entrusted to close relatives of the tlatoani (San Antonio 1997: 208). Further in the source the authorities order that tocol calpixqui, or our grandfather the calpixqui, is to watch constantly and speak for the cultivated property in Yahualihcan and Maçaapán (San Antonio 1997: 218). Another passage confirms that -colhuan could have received land from their masters, although not on the same rights as actual heirs. Juan cannot believe that his father’s land was only entrusted and not given to him by Ixtlilxochitl:

Auh tle ypan quimottili tle ypan quimomachiti cuix yach cuix noço ycol, yz çan ye quimopialtilia (San Antonio 1997: 214)

Did he care for it, did he think of it? Was he [Quauhtliztactzin] his [Ixtlilxochitl’s] elder brother or perhaps his senior official, that he only entrusted it [land] to him?116

Juan’s uncles mention -colhuan who probably “keep” land:

tla xiquimonnitta yn tocolhuã huey milpan cate, yhuã yz cihuapilmilpan cate papalotecapan yn itech poui totiachcauh Don J{o} quauhtliztactzin xiquimonnahuati (ibid.: 218)

visit our senior officials who are at the large cultivated properties and the noblewoman’s cultivated properties at Papalotecapan. They belong to our elder brother don Juan Quauhtliztactzin. Speak to them (ibid.: 219).

116 Translation mine.
And let your senior officials, the field hands, await your utterances, your words (ibid.: 239)

In these two quotations -colhuan are no longer people of relatively high position. The term is juxtaposed with mayeque, who were a type of macehualtin. Their main occupation was cultivating fields of their noble masters (Lockhart 1992: 97). Likewise, it is said that they belong (itech pohui) to don Juan Quauhtliztactzin – the expression often associated with the commoners or vassals. Indeed, the “Crónica Mexicayotl” calls the Mexica both -colhuan and -macehualhuan of the tlatoani of Colhuacan, Achitometl:


They said to him: Our lord, my grandson, lord, ruler, we [do not wish to] make you forgetful, to confuse and distract you, who are your subjects. We beg you, we your grandfathers the Mexica (ibid.: 97).

Interestingly, in a similar context, where the reference point is another tlatoani in Colhuacan, this source employs the doublet -tahuan -colhuan:

yn Mexica. quilluique co tihuallaque tlacatle noxhuiuhtzine tlahtohuanie timitztotlalcahualtilizque. timitztotlapololtizque. yn timocolhuan yn timotahuan yn timexica tichichimeca) ca tiquicnoytoco yn matzin y motepetzin yn tenochtitlan (ibid.: 114).

The Mexica said to him: We who are your grandfathers, your fathers, we Mexica Chichimeca have come [before you], O lord our grandson, O ruler, [not to] make you forgetful and confused, [but] to humbly ask you for your altepetl, Tenochtitlan (ibid.: 115).

117 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson render the phrase “amocolhuan mayeque” as “your senior officials and the field hands.”
The examples presented here show that the category of \(-\text{colhuan}\) encompassed a vast social area: from the officials of noble status to commoners who cultivated land. Land seems to be the common denominator for them all. The “grandfathers” either supervise it or work it, but always for the benefit of their masters. Likewise, in the passages from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” cited above, the relation between the Mexica and the \(\text{tlatoque}\) of Colhuacan involves land tenure. The Mexica lived as the vassals of the Colhuaque in Tizaapan, granted to them by the \(\text{tlatoani}\) Coxcoxtli, intermarrying with their benefactors (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 92). One of their descendants, Acamapichtli, was later asked by the Mexica to become their first \(\text{tlatoani}\) and to “guard” Tenochtitlan – the \(\text{altepetl}\) which belonged to the \(\text{tlatoani}\) of Colhuacan (\(\text{ma conmopielliquî in matzin in motepetzin}\)) (ibid.: 114). Once the ruler installed, the Mexica are called Acamapichtli’s “fathers, grandfathers”\(^ {118}\) (ibid.: 116). The doublet, in other contexts used for ancestors, here undoubtedly describes a group of subordinates. Above I have suggested that a \(\text{teuctlato}\) was not included in the category of \(-\text{colhuan}\). In fact, \(\text{teuctlatoque}\), dignitaries who were very close to the \(\text{tlatoani}\), were often referred to as his \(-\text{tahu\text{n}}, or\) fathers (see: 1.4.1. Advisers). Tenant farmers and officials in charge of land occupied a position more distant in regard to the ruler and perhaps this is why they were metaphorically addressed with the term from a more distant generation in regard to ego. Arguably, juxtaposing “fathers” and “grandfathers” in a doublet served to encompass a more diversified group of subordinates.

Rammow notes the existence of the reduplicated form of \(-\text{col}, \text{-cocol}\) (Rammow 1963: 67-68). According to Molina, \(\text{nimococol}\) means “soy a ti encomendado, paraque tengas de mi cuy dado” (Molina 1977 II: 23v). As has been demonstrated above, it is most often the simple form, \(-\text{col}\), which is used with the sense of “subordinate.” However, I have also found \(-\text{cocol}\) employed in this context in the “Mapa Tlotzin”:

\[
\text{Auh in Tecpoyoachcaultli huecahuac in itlan nimiy\text{a} Tlotzin. Niman ye quinahuatia, quilhui : Nopiltzine ! ma niya\text{u} ! ma niquimithu in mococolhuan in Chalca, in C... tlateca ! (Thouvenot 1992: pl. 2)}
\]

\(^{118}\) Actually, the doublet is “\(\text{yn mocolhuan yn motlahuan,}\)” but since \(\text{-h}a\) is otherwise never paired with \(-\text{col}\), it must be an error of the copyist.
Tecpoyoachcauhtli spent a long time living with [= serving] Tlotzin. Then he asked his permission, he said to him: O lord! Let me go! Let me see your grandfathers the Chalca, the C...tlateca.\textsuperscript{119}

As in the case of -tahuán, also the term -col(huan) was used in direct speech. For example, the tlatoani Achipetl addresses his Mexica “tenants”: ca ye qualli nocolhuane, or “it is well, my grandfathers” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 96-97). The “Florentine Codex” informs us that the proper way of greeting an “old man” by the ruler’s child was: xioalmoujca nocultzine, ma njmjtznotlaxili, or “come hither, my beloved grandfather; let me bow before thee” (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 71). In both cases the vocative based on -col seems to imply both subordination of the person addressed and reverence expressed towards him.

Finally, it has to be noted that -colhuan always refer to their master with the term noxhuiuhitzine (see examples above). Apparently, a generational correspondence exists here: a group described with the term for G+2 in relation to a ruler addresses him with the term for G-2. However, neither rulers are called their tenants’ “grandchildren” in the absolutive, nor -colhuan are the only ones who use vocatives based on -ixhuiuh (see: 2.1.2. O supreme lord!). Therefore, the correspondence does not result from a consistent terminological system, but rather from the logical principles that governed the metaphorical usage of terms. The “fathers” of the tlatoani were his high-ranked advisers – they passed to him their words in the same way as an actual father gave both admonitions and substance to his child. The “Florentine Codex” says that also a good grandfather tenonotzani, teizcaliani, or is an adviser, an indoctrinator (Sahagún 2012 X: 4). However, the sources analyzed here show that, given the grandfathers’ association with land, the main vital resources they transmitted were crops rather than words.

2.3. -CI

In fray Alonso de Molina’s dictionary “citli” is glossed as “liebre, abuela, o tia hermana de abuelo” (Molina 1977 II: 22v) and “teci” as “tía, hermana de ahuelo, o de ahuela”\textsuperscript{119} Translation mine.
Frances Karttunen, Olmos differentiates between the two connotations of the term by insisting on the word for “hare” involving reduplication in plural: *cicitin*. In the twentieth century Guerrero the root of the term for “grandmother” was -*ciz* (Karttunen 1992a: 34), the same as in the rare term for mother recorded by Molina in the sixteenth century: “Tecitzlī. madre de alguno” (Molina 1977 II: 92v). The two may have originally been the same: in the “Memoriales con Escolios” a son from the lowest social class addresses his mother “notecitze,” but also “tecitzte” and “tecitzine” (Sahagún 2012 X: 2, n. 6). If -*teciz*, mother, was based on the same root as -*ci*, grandmother, it might have been created according to the pattern that occurred in the case of -*iccauh/*teiccauh* and -*achcauh/*teachcauh*: the indefinite personal possessive prefix -*te-* was added to the stem. I have found only one attestation of -*teciz* as employed in a narrative: *Yhuã quihuicac yn iteçitzin don her.{do} ymyeyx ŭ ymecahuã. ŭ cohuanacotzin*, or “And don Hernando [Cortés?] brought Coanacochtzin’s mother and three of his concubines” (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 188). It is difficult to say why this term was chosen by the authors. Other Texcocan sources from mid-sixteenth century employ -*nan*.

-Ci is used with either male or female reference point and it appears extended beyond the meaning of “a parent’s mother.” The editors of “Beyond the Codices” claim that the terms for grandparents “were frequently used for more distant relatives of the same generation” (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 24, n. 1), but I do not have any obvious example of such a usage in my sample. In Juan de San Antonio’s letter the term is extended, but in a different way:

*Auh in yeuatzin tlacatl notlatzin Don her^{da} cortes ixtlilxochitzin, yhuã yn ameuantzitzin, maço yuin çaz cetzin tlacatl amotechiuhcauh yn amotatzin, auh in ye Eecemme amotechiuhcauan tocititzinuã yn amechmochiulique yn amechmotlacatililique* (San Antonio 1997: 216).

And though the lord my uncle don Hernando Cortés Ixtlilxochitzin and you had one [and the same] lord as your progenitor, your father, but your progenitresses, our grandmothers, who begot you, who bore you, were different (ibid.: 217).
Juan is referring to the wives of Nezahualpilli. His father, Juan Quauhtliztactzin, and Hernando Cortés Ixtlilxochitl were full brothers, born of the same mother. But his uncles to whom the letter is addressed were born of other wives. All these wives are referred to by Juan as “our grandmothers.” It is puzzling whom he actually means as the reference point of this term. From the context, it would seem that by “our” he wants to say “all of us, the descendants of Nezahualpilli” and this category would encompass two generations. In another place, he refers to one of Nezahualpilli’s wives as “our grandmother,” again pointing to both himself and his uncles as the reference point of the term:

Auh yvan yece açaço iuhqui ymaceualtizin moyetzticatecă amatzin yn notecuiyo Don Ju[o] quauhtliztactzin ca amixpâtizinco ca ca anquimomachitia, yz cenca no quimotlaçotiliaya amotechiuhecauh yn tocitzin atzaqualco (ibid.: 208).

But also while your late elder brother, my lord don Juan Quauhtliztactzin, was before you and you knew him as his vassal, he also much loved your progenitress, our grandmother in Atzaqualco (ibid.: 209).

It seems, therefore, that the wives of Nezahualpilli are “grandmothers” to both Nezahualpilli’s children and grandchildren. They are not only unrelated to some of those who call them “grandmothers” – they can be the actual mothers of some of them! In this context, the term -ci seems to be associated with their social position as wives of Nezahualpilli who was the point of departure for all property claims made by his descendants in Juan de San Antonio’s letter. In this respect it is parallel to the term -ixhuiuh, which was employed with the sense of “the one who claims his rights from grandparents” (see: 2.1.1. Minor noblemen).

The similarities between “mother” and “grandmother” are further seen on the level of the usage of both terms. -Ci forms part of the doublet in -ci in -col with the meaning of “grandparents” in the same manner in which in -nan in -ta stands for “parents” (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta), for example:

nima ytatzi ynantzi yhua ycoltzin yeitzin yntech opouh 5 pos yc omochiuh ynmissas yn mochinti (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 78)
then with 5 pesos belonging to his father and mother and his grandfather and grandmother, were held masses for all of them (ibid.: 79).

This doublet is also extended to mean ancestors:

\[ \text{cuix nimã tehoan njcan amjxpâzinco tocôpologq in veve tlamanjtiliztli in qujveymattiuj in tocolhuã in toçihuã} \] (Sahagún 1986: 138),

are we here to destroy, before you, the old customs that our grandfathers, our grandmothers [= our ancestors] held in high regard?  

Susan Schroeder observes that in Chimalpahin’s writings ilamatque, or “the old women,” tonanhuán, or “our mothers,” and tocíhuan, or “our grandmothers," are among the keepers of huehuetlatolli (Schroeder 1992: 53-54). Indeed, while the doublet in -ta in -col which likewise has the meaning “ancestors” (see: 2.2. -col) usually, though not always, appears in the context of property claims, the difrasismo in -ci in -col is employed to point to the transmission of knowledge or tradition. For example, the title of a chapter in the Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” says:

\[ \text{auh injc quitlatlahtiaia in piltontli, injc qujitlapaloaia, ioan in jnantzin, in jîtzin, auh in jčultzin, in jčitzin: vevetque muzcalianj, in vellatoa: in qujchíoaia yn} \] (Sahagún 2012 VI: 183).

Thus they were delivering a speech to the baby, they were greeting him/ her, together with his/ her mother, his/ her father. And his/ her grandfather, his/ her grandmother, the elders, the experienced people who speak well were doing this.  

The family members ask a young woman to accept their huehuetlatolli:

\[ \text{ma titechpinauhti, ma titechvevetlaz: ma tiqujmjlamatlaz in monanoan: auh cuix oc mjitzalmati in mocolhvan, in mocioan: ca ie nachca mantivi} \] (ibid.: 130).

120 Translation mine. The Spanish version of the “Colloquios” says: “no nos parece cosa justa que las costumbres y ríos que nuestros antepasados nos dejaron, tuyieron por buenas y guardaron, nosotros con liviandad las desamparemos y destruyamos” (Sahagún 1986: 86).

121 Translation mine.
Do not embarass us; do not reject us as old men, do not reject thy mothers as old women. And perchance thy grandfathers, thy grandmothers still acknowledge thee, for already they have gone beyond (ibid).

Chimalpahin refers to ancient tradition in order to locate the discovery of giant bones within the framework of his conceptual universe:

\[
\text{ceme yehuatl. ymomiyoo yniquin quema. yn onemico. nican ypan tlalli. yn quintocayotitihui. yn quinteneuhtihui huehuetque tocihuanci tocolhuan. quinameti (Chimalpahin 2006: 110).}
\]

some of their bones were like those who lived formerly here on earth, whom the ancients, our grandmothers and grandfathers, named and called giants (ibid.: 111).

Admittedly, this doublet is found far more rarely than \textit{in -ta in -col}. I have collected only nine attestations of it.

Olmos lists \textit{nocitzine} as one of the terms used by young noblemen to greet a commoner of advanced age, along with \textit{nonantzine}, \textit{notatizine}, \textit{nocoltzine} and \textit{notlatzine} (Bautista 2008: 51v-52r). \textit{Nonantzine} and \textit{notatzine} are hardly seen in precontact contexts, but \textit{notlatzine} and \textit{nocoltzine} are employed in reference to people of subordinate position (see: 2.2. -col, 3.3. -tla). In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” the \textit{tlatoani Nezahualcoyotzin} addresses two old women “tocioane,” or “our grandmothers!” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 118). It is one of just a few instances, where the vocative form of a kin term is combined with the possessive prefix other than the 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular.

Finally, \textit{-ci} is employed as a designation of female deities in prehispanic religious contexts. In the “Florentine Codex” it is used for Yoalticitl, the patron of childbirth, and juxtaposed with a term based on \textit{-nan}: \textit{ma itech onaci in nochpuchtzin, in tocennan in tecitzin, in iooalticitl}, or “Let my daughter approach our eternal mother, Teci, Yoalticitl” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 155). In another passage Yoalticitl is called “in tonan in temazcaltecitzin, in iooalticitl” (ibid.), or “our mother, the sweatbath-grandmother, Yoalticitl.” Here the form \textit{teci}, or the grandmother of people, is employed, which gives the goddess a more universal character. However, the most common designation is Toci, or our grandmother, the prefix \textit{to-}.
clearly pointing to a community as the reference point, here most likely to the Mexica. Toci, similarly to Yoalticitl (Teci) acted as a patron of childbirth (López Austin 2000: 194), but she also played a very important role in establishing the Mexica’s identity (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). In the Song of Macuilxochitl -ci is likewise seen with the prefix no-: Ayya yyao. a yvin tinozc aya teumechave oya, yao, or “So also you, grandmother mine with the thigh-skin face paint” (Sahagún 1997b: 152). In the Song of Tlaloc the thigh-skin face paint is ascribed to a tonan (ibid.: 135-136), which establishes another link between the two kin terms, as employed in the sphere of precontact religion.

3. NIBLINGS, UNCLEs AND AUNTS: first ascending and descending generations, colateral consanguineals

3.1. -PIL(l)O

The term -pil(l)o is glossed in the dictionary of fray Alonso de Molina under “Nopilo. mi sobrino, dize la muger,” or “my nephew, says a woman” (Molina 1977 II: 73v). The material I have gathered confirms that within the kinship sphere -pil(l)o was always used with the female reference point. It described not only nephews, as implied by the Molina’s entry, but nieces of women as well: yehuatl quinemiltiz nopillotzin juo po quipiez, or “my nephew Juan Pedro is to maintain and keep (the mule)” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 99-100) and:

\[Yhuan niquitohua yn nocal yn onca nihuetztoc yn tonatiuh ycallaquianpa ytzticae nici\text{macatiuh y nopillotzin ytoca fran\{ca\} tiacapan yn catqui cuitzlahuac ca ychan\]

(Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 124)

And I declare that my house where I lie, which faces west, I give to my niece named Francisca Tiacapan who is in Cuitlahuac, because it is her home (ibid.: 125).

-Pil(l)o includes the root pil, the same as the kin term -pil, “child.” On the kinship level, a close relation between the children terminology and the sibling’s children terminology
is paralleled in the respective ascending generation: -tla, or “uncle,” and -ta, or “father,” also include a common root (See: 3.3. -tla). The root pil is likewise present in the verb piloa (pil + verbal suffix -oa), “to hang, to attach,” from which it can be concluded that it connotes descent. Based on this assumption, pilli (pil + nominal suffix -li), or “a nobleman,” can be interpreted as “the one who descends” (see: 1.1.1. Noblemen). Molina has the abstract noun pilotl (pil + abstract suffix -yotl = “the state characteristic of descent”), glossed as “nobleza” or “niñería de niños” (ibid.: 81v), which refers to either of the two basic connotations associated with descent: nobility or childishness respectively. Finally, -pil(l)o, or “niece or nephew of a woman,” can be analyzed as pil + suffix of inalienable possession -yo, that is, “descent which belongs to ego.” It has to be stressed that according to my interpretation, neither pilotl (childishness) is the abstract form of -pil(l)o (nephew/niece), nor -pil(l)o is derived from pilotl. Each of the terms was developed separately, taking as the point of departure the basic root pil.

There is an interesting piece of information on the status of nephews and nieces within households. The “Florentine Codex” says that -mach (a man’s nephew or niece) is: ycnol, tlacnocaualli, tetloc tenauac nemini, tetlan nenenui tetlan nenqui, or “an orphan – parentless – who serves in another’s house, a servant; one who lives with others” (Sahagún 2012 X: 4). Perhaps this description could be extended to women’s nephews and nieces, for a good -pil(l)o ochpana, tlachpana, tlacuicui chicotlanauac tlateca, tlateca, tetloc tenauac mocalaquia (ibid.), or “sweeps, serves at the house, moves things to one side, places things on the floor; he is hired by someone.” The Nahualt doublet tlachpana tlacuicui from the above description, translated here as “he serves at the house,” means precisely “los que se ofrecen a servir y obedecer en la casa de dios o en la casa de los señores” (Kellogg 1986: 111-112).

In large Nahua families, the most significant ties were often those between siblings. A single household was inhabited by several brothers and sisters together with their spouses and children (ibid). Consequently, nephews and nieces lived with their aunts and uncles under the same roof and, as implied in the “Florentine Codex,” their position may have differed, depending on their parents having been alive or not. The same source states that in the latter case uncles and aunts used to act as substitutes of parents for their nephews and nieces (Sahagún 2012 X: 4), but at the same time it was clear that the status of the latter was lesser than that of biological children. In the world where nobility was actually synonymous with
descent, one’s nephews and nieces must have been differentiated from one’s children by means of terminology. Arguably, the term -pil(l)o referred to the fact that they were of the same descent as their aunts.

In her dictionary, Frances Karttunen follows the pre-Gardner differentiation between the two “meanings” of pilli and, consequently, she looks for the same differentiation in the case of pillo. As she notes, in Molina’s dictionary terms which refer to kin ties are glossed with the root -pilo while those which have to do with nobility or childishness have -pillo (Karttunen 1992a: 195). However, the examples I have gathered show that both roots functioned as kinship terms meaning niece or nephew of a woman, for example: ypioltzin yn cihuapilli doña Juana de guzman, or “the nephew of the lady doña Juana de Guzmán” (Lockhart 1991: 87); y nopillotzin ytoca fran[ca] tiacapan, or “my niece named Francisca Tiacapan” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 124-125). If the difference in usage of the two forms did exist, it may have been marked by the social status of the woman who formed a reference point. However, since the choice is merely between single or double “I,” it presents a great scope for author’s, copyist’s or transcriptor’s error and thus makes every analysis of its criteria tentative. I have found thirty attestations of -pi(l)lo as used within the kinship sphere.\textsuperscript{122} Out of this sample all women who form the reference point for -pilo come from a high social class, as do for example doña Catalina de Sena, cihuapilli, or a lady (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 56), doña Juana de Guzmán, the wife of a ruler (Lockhart 1991: 81-87) or the wife of Pedro Tetlahuehuetzquitzin, the ruler of Texcoco (San Antonio 1997: 230). On the other hand, the reference point of -pillo is more differentiated. One can find here women of lower social position, for example Barbara Agustina (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 99), María Tiacapan or Lucía Teicuh (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 20, 124),\textsuperscript{123} as well as some of noble status: in the “Testaments of Culhuacan” this root is used by Angelina Mocel, the daughter of a prominent Pablo de San Gabriel Huitznahuatl and María Inés whose niece was doña Elena Constantina (ibid.: 80, 121).

\textsuperscript{122} 17 are registered in the database.

\textsuperscript{123} The difference in status between these two groups is reflected not only in the contextual information but in their names as well. The latter lack titles and use a simple naming pattern of two Spanish names or a Spanish name with an indigenous one, while the former takes advantage of Spanish surnames or saints names (cf. Lockhart 1992: 122-123).
There is one example of -pilo with a female reference point, which may not refer to a niece or nephew. A judge-governor Juan de Guzmán speaks to his elder sister, Juana:

\[\text{yntla oc çemihuitzintli nechmochahuitliz tteo dios yhua yn mopioltzin ca} \]
\[\text{oquichhtzintli yn onechmotlau[?]}\]
\[\text{ttoeo dios yhua yn nonamic y mopioltzin ca} \]
\[\text{mochipa nican hualmohuicatiuh yn chichicohometica yn ipa sabado} \]

If God gives life a while longer to me and the boy your nephew, whom our lord God has granted me, and my wife, your niece, why she has always come here every week on Saturday... (Lockhart 1991: 84)

It seems that both an actual nephew of Juana and her sister-in-law are referred to with the same term. I have not come upon any similar attestation of -pil(l)o. Another possibility is that the translation of the quotation should rather be: “... and my wife together with your nephew, why they have always come here every week on Saturday...”

The term -pil(l)o was likewise used outside the actual kinship context. Within this sphere, Horacio Carochi identifies it as the possessive form of pilli. He notes that when a possessive prefix was added to a noun, the absolutive ending was lost automatically. The only exceptions were pilli and teuctli, or lord,

\[\text{los quales hazen nopilo, y notècuio como si se deriuran de sus abstractos pillôtl, y} \]
\[\text{teucyôtl. nopillo, significa mi cortesano (Carochi 2001: 302).} \]

Indeed, there was no way to say “my noble” or “my courtier” using the form derived from -pil, nopiltzin, because it connoted one’s subject, somewhat loosing the flavor of “nobility.” An easy way to differentiate between “nephews” and “courtiers” was the reference point: all attestations of -pil(l)o in contexts exceeding family ties that I have come upon, have a male reference point.

Carochi juxtaposes -pil(l)lo with -tecuio, stating that “ĭpillôhuan, itècuïyôhuân, in tlâtoâni, son los cortesanos del Rey” (Carochi 2001: 302). This doublet is also used in other sources, for example:
And when Tlacateotzin was installed as ruler he then spoke; he said to his noblemen, his lords: Go to Coatl Ichan. Speak to Acolmiztli. Let him give me one of his daughters (ibid.: 125-127).

Another variant of this doublet is -pill(o) paired with -tlatocayo:

He made flee Nezahualcoyotzin, tlatoani in Texcoco, along with many of his “courtiers,” as was said in every word of the year count.124

In this year Tepaneca killed Huehue Xaltemoctzin, Atecpanecatl teuctli, who was tlatoani in Cuauhtitlan. Tezozomocctli, tlatoani in Atzcapotzalco, sentenced him to (death from) rope, they hanged him. They just called for him secretly, they invited him for a meal in Tepanohuayan. With him they brought many of his “courtiers.”125

Niman ie ic muchichioa, mocencoa in Motecuçomatzin injc tenamjqujz: yoan oc cequjntin veveintin tlatoque in tlaçopipilti, in jilatocaiovan, in jipilloan: (Sahagún 2012 XII: 43)
thereupon Moctezuma arrayed himself, attired himself, in order to meet them [the Spaniards, J.M.], and also a number of great lords [and] princes, his ruling men, his noblemen [arrayed themselves] (ibid).

The abstract nouns pilloitl, teucyotl and tlatocayotl are the keywords to understand the Nahua social and political organization. Together they formed a phrase in pilloitl in teucyotl in tlatocayotl which, according to Ryszard Tomicki, most probably meant “la calidad de lo destacado, la calidad de ser gobernante” (Tomicki 2003: 253, n. 21). Separately, each of them was associated with what can roughly be described as a social class. Pilloitl, as I have already mentioned, means “nobility” and is derived from pilli, or noble. Teucyotl is glossed by Molina as “señoria de estado o dignidad” (Molina 1977 II: 93v) and comes from the word teuctli, or lord. Finally, tlatocayotl is “señorio, reyno, corona real o patrimonio” (ibid.: 140v) and derives from tlatoani, or ruler.

The English terms “lord” and “ruler” do not render properly the implications of Nahuatl teuctli and tlatoani. Every teuctli (most often male, although females happened too) was the head of teccalli, or lordly house, the institution that gathered his relatives (pipiltin) and played an important role in land distribution. As Frederick Hicks states:

The rank of teuctli was hereditary. A teuctli designated one of his sons (by a noble woman) as his heir, or if he had not done so before he died, the nobles of the house met and selected one among them for the post (Hicks 1986: 41).

The rank of pilli was necessary to attain the status of teuctli and both were required if one was to be elected tlatoani. According to James Lockhart, there were so many parallels between these two functions that tlatoani could have been perceived as “a large-scale teuctli” (Lockhart 1992: 102-103, 109). In the simplest terms, he was a dynastic ruler who held authority over a political unit, a city-state, called altepetl. However, this title referred as much to his political office as to his social rank, designating, in Hicks’ words, “a grade of nobility” (Hicks 1986: 42). Thus the three terms: pilli, teuctli and tlatoani can be viewed as a kind of social “pyramid,” with the broadest group of nobles at the base and the narrowest, of rulers, at the top.

---

126 The phrase is to be found for example in “Anales de Cuauhtitlan,” fol. 15.
Nevertheless, in the above quotations we are not dealing with the social ranks themselves, but rather with the inalienably possessed concepts associated with them. In written sources the possessed form -tlatocayo appears in a number of contexts. It could have been understood as either someone’s royal domain, kingdom, or royal authority. Molina suggests that it could also have functioned as a title, glossing this term as “rey coronado” (Molina 1977 II: 140v). -Tecuiyo likewise operated within different semantic spheres, most often functioning as a title or honorific. In the passages cited above, -tlatocayo and -tecuiyo are paired with -pillo to form two doublets which describe ruler’s subordinates of, most likely, high social rank. It is particularly implied in the quotations from the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan” where in -pillohuan in -tlatocayohuan were so close to their tlatoani that in the moment of his failure, they either had to flee or get killed along with him. In the “Florentine Codex” the group of dignitaries described with this doublet accompanies Moteuçoma on one of the most solemn occasions during his lifetime – the first meeting with the Spaniards. And in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” Tlacateotzin sends his in -pillohuan in -tecuiyohuan to ask for a wife who will bring the Colhua prestige and legitimacy into the altepetl of Tlatelolco.

Another two ranks paired with -pill(o) likewise point to the intimate bond between the ruler and his subjects described with this term:

_Ic matlactli omome capitulo, vncan mjtoa: injc tlanaqujliaia tlatoanj, injc qujnnanqujliaia ypilloan, in jtecutlatocauoa: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 61)_

Twelfth Chapter. Here is told the manner in which the ruler responded to reply to his noblemen, his dignitaries (ibid).

_auh inipillohuan iniciacahuan ceceyacayuh mochichihuaya mochintin chichiquiltopilli maquauhtopilli in quitquitinemia Huexotzinca, ipan moquixtitinenca in oncan tecpan ic nenca mo Huexotzinca notzaya (Annales 1999: f. 42)._

Of his noblemen, his valiant warriors, each one dressed himself in this way: all of them were going along holding arrow staffs, war clubs, [like] the Huexotzinca. Since
they were living in the palace there, they were speaking among themselves [like] the Huexotzinca.\textsuperscript{127}

As many Sahaguntine texts show, -teuctlatocahuan were allowed to speak on behalf of the tlatoani and as such formed part of the most important body of state officials (see: 1.4.1. Advisers). -Tiacahuan were simply valiant warriors, but Anales de Cuauhtitlan describe the group of the ruler’s -pillohuan -tiacahuan, as those who accompanied him in the royal palace.

All of the discussed titles: -tlatocayo, -tecuiyo, -teuctlato and -tiacauh, seem to add a specification to the more general category of -pil(l)ohuan. In other terms, tlatoani’s -pillohuan included his dependent rulers, lords, spokesmen and valiant warriors, along with, perhaps, other high dignitaries whose titles are not mentioned in the written sources included in my sample. The term could have also been used in a more general way, without specification:


and we not merely named someone, we went in person, we who rule, and we brought all our nobles and all of our vassals to aid the Spaniards (ibid.: 183).

It is remarkable that -pillohuan and -macehualhuan are listed in this passage as two separate categories. Obviously, the former were considered something more than mere vassals.

Along with the examples where -pil(l)o occupies a position inferior in regard to the reference point, one can find evidence for the opposite situation. In the “Tlaxcalan Actas” the very same doublet which, when associated with a tlatoani, was used to mean his high ranked subordinates, appears undoubted in reference to one’s superiors:

\textit{auh yn canpa tetech pouiya yn aquin ytecuyo ypillo aoc quen quitta / yehica yaualmota onca...} (Lockhart, Berdan, Anderson 1986: 81)

\textsuperscript{127}Translation mine.
And he who belonged to someone no longer respects whoever was his lord and master, because he is seen to have gold and cacao (ibid).

no ypanpa yn quichiuaz yn quenin tetlayecoltizque maceualzizintin yn tlen quimacazque yntecuyouan ynpillouan ynic amo tolinilozque (Solís, Valencia R., Medina Lima 1986: 63-64).

likewise because he will establish how the commoners are to serve others, what they are to give to their masters, their -pillohuan so that they would not suffer.¹²⁸

yuan yn aquiñe yntech poui teteccalco cate tetlacamatizque yn in pilohuan (ibid.: 190)

And those who belong to someone, who are in lordly houses, are to obey their – pilohuan.¹²⁹

The term functions in this way not only in Tlaxcalan sources. In Chimalpahin’s annals it is used in reference to the leader of Japanese people:


the nobleman from there who came appointed as the leader of the Japan people was greatly honored (ibid.: 173).

A similar context is to be found in the “Anales de Tlatelolco,” where cihuacoatl Tzihuacpopocatzin is called the Tenochca’s -pil(l)o:

yquac peuh y ye momimictia tenochca yey calli xiuuil ypa quimictique yn in pillo Ciuacoatl tziuacpopocatzi (Klaus 1999: 132)

Then the Tenochca began to kill one another. In the year 3 House, they killed (one of) their noblemen, cihuacoatl Tzihuacpopocatzin.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ Translation mine.
¹²⁹ Translation mine.
¹³⁰ Translation mine.
Finally, in the “Florentine Codex” -pil(l)o is paired with tlatoani, but not in its inalienably possessed form, as in the case when it described subordinates:

> ocelutl: quauhtla chane, texcalco chane, atlan chane: tecpilli, tlaçopilli: qujl inpillo, intlatocauh iniolque: (Sahagún 2012 XI: 1)

A jaguar is a dweller of the forests, of crags, of water. He is a noble, a precious noble. It is said that he is the -pillo, the ruler of animals.\(^\text{131}\)

Apparently, in the above examples, -pil(l)o is again conceived of as a broader category which can be specified with indicators of rank: -tecuiyo or -tlatocauh. What logical connection can be drawn between -pil(l)ohuan of the commoners and -pil(l)ohuan of the rulers or lords? Firstly, it has to be stressed that the usages of this term within the social hierarchy cannot, in my opinion, be classified as the extensions of the kin term -pil(l)o. This is a unique phenomenon within this study: while other analyzed kin terms were simply extended into various spheres and the logic of the process is usually easily detectable, in the case of -pil(l)o no logical connection exists between nephews of a woman and noblemen in relation to either their masters or vassals. The only possible conclusion is that we deal here with homonyms derived, admittedly, from the same root pil, but based on either its primary (descent) or secondary (nobility) connotation. As I have already mentioned, the suffix of inalienable possession points to the interpretation of the term for a nephew/ niece as “someone of descent who belongs to (is part of) his aunt.” According to the same principle, its homonym should be interpreted as “someone noble who belongs to (is part of) his lord or his vassal.” The intimate bond between -pil(l)ohuan and their partners in the relationship, suggested by the grammatical form of the term, can also be concluded from the contextual information in the above cited examples. On the one hand, they are “courtiers” who belong to the closest circle of the tlatoani – in some cases the text explicitly states that they take part in the palace life. On the other hand, in the “Tlaxcalan Actas” their bond with the commoners is constituted by tribute obligations. As Alfredo López Austin observes, tribute was a part of the exchange that founded the social order, the obligations of the noblemen being the communication with the supernatural and the organization of the social life (López Austin

\(^{131}\) Translation mine.
1989: 70-71). In this context, one’s -pil(l)ohuan seem to form a group of noblemen whose relationship with ego consists of both privileges and obligations in regard to him.

In Christian doctrinal texts, the analyzed term – almost untouched as far as its meaning was concerned – was transferred from social sphere to the religious sphere. Both Molina and Sahagún employ it for the “noblemen of God,” either confirmed Christians or angels:

\[
\text{tipillo timochihuaz yn totecuiyo Jesu Christo, caictiquicnopilhuiz inimachiyo yn Cruz y cauallero de nuestro señor jesu christo: y mereceras tener contigo, la señal dela cruz (Molina 1569: 93v)}
\]

\[
\text{amagelome in chiuhcnautilamancan anquizticate ca cenca anmahuiztililoni, cenca antlatlauhtiloni ca amitaçohuan amipillohuan in dios. ipalnemohuani (Sahagún 1997a: 136)}
\]

you who are the angels of the nine orders, are much to be honored, much to be importuned, for you are the beloved of God, the Giver of Life; you are His noblemen (ibid.: 137).

The quotations stress the privileged position of God’s -pil(l)ohuan. Molina translates the term as “caballero,” or knight, and Sahagún juxtaposes it in a doublet with “the beloved ones.” I all attestations of -pil(l)o in the Christian context that I have collected, the reference point is of higher position than the primary referent. In the “Exercicio quotidiano” the newly converted Nahuas once called themselves in tamopilohuan in tamotlapacholhuan in tamotlahuialanalhuan (Sahagún 1997a: 150), or we your noblemen, we your subjects, we your dependents, in regard to the Three Magi. Nevertheless, this is most probably an error, since a few lines earlier almost identical phrase describing the same relationship has the term -pil instead of -pil(l)o: in amopilhuan yn amomacehualhuan yn amotlapacholhuan (ibid.: 148), or your subjects, your vassals, your subordinates.
3.2. -MACH

Fray Andrés de Olmos glosses the word nomach as “mi sobrino” (Olmos 2002: 25) and fray Alonso de Molina precises that machti is “sobrino, de varon” (Molina 1977 II: 50v). He also has the entry “Nomach. mi sobrino [dize el varon]” (ibid.: 73r). Within the kinship sphere -mach is indeed used only with the male reference point, however, as some of the quotations below will show, it describes not only nephews, but nieces as well (Karttunen 1992a: 128). As noted by James Lockhart, -mach was extended to affinal kin (Lockhart 1992: 79). For example, Chimalpahin writes of don Rodrigo de Vivero:

ynin ymachtzin. yn tlahtohuani Don luis de velasco Marques. visurrey Mexico. yniquimachtzin. ytechpa Yn inamictzin. catca (Chimalpahin 2006: 170)

He was the nephew of the ruler don Luis de Velasco, Marqués, viceroy in Mexico; he was his nephew through his spouse (ibid.: 171).

The “Florentine Codex” informs us that temachhuan had a clearly defined status within the household. Their position was determined by the fact that they had no living parents and depended on uncles and aunts (Sahagún 2012 X: 4).

A very informative passage from a sixteenth-century testimony of don Juan de Guzmán of Coyocoan, includes the term -mach combined with the indefinite personal possessive prefix te-:

Cuix amo oncate tepilhua, temachhua, teyshuihua, Cuix amo cenca mitzonmahuilizque yntla dios omitzmohuiquili, mitzonmotlatelchihuihilizque (Lockhart 1991: 83)

Aren't there children, nephews [of men, J.M.], granchildren, and won't they complain greatly of you when God has taken you, and curse you for it? (ibid.)

As we can learn from the testimony, a sister or cousin of don Juan, doña Juana de Guzmán, had no surviving children and for this reason she decided to leave all her property to the Church. The property in question was the palace and ruler’s lands (tlatocatlalli), which had
belonged to doña Juana’s deceased husband, don Pedro de Sotomayor, the tlatoani of Xochimilco. On her deathbed, she informed her brother (cousin?) about the arrangements and she met with a violent reaction. Don Juan pointed to other family members who had rights to the patrimony: “tepilhua, temachhua, teyshuihua.” In this phrase temachhuan is inserted between the terms who were often used in the context of inheritance and indicated one’s distance from the source of legitimization of his or her claims (see: 2.1.1. Minor noblemen). Since none of doña Juana’s children was alive, tepilhuan must have been a group of people who based their claims on either being the children of her husband, don Pedro de Sotomayor, or tracing their descent directly from a common ancestor. Similarly, teixhuihuan could refer either to their grandparents or to indirect lineal descent (with a missed link) from an ancestor. Temachhuan formed yet another group whose rights must have been based on collateral ties with don Pedro (or/and his male cousins/ancestors). Taken together, these three terms indicate how complex and large was the group of potential heirs of doña Juana.

There are examples where the usage of -mach seems to extend outside the kinship sphere. The first one to discuss comes from negotiations concerning the marriage between a ruler of Texcoco and a daughter of a ruler of Tenochtitlan, included in the “Bancroft Dialogues.” The former is constantly called by the parents of a requested girl tomachtzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 120-122) and he indeed may be a nephew of the Tenochca tlatoani. However, as it was seen in the case of other kin terms characteristic of either “male” or “female” speech (e.g. -pil and -coneuh), when people of both sexes were the reference point for the term, the usual practice was to juxtapose it with its counterpart. Another striking example from the “Bancroft Dialogues” involves an elderly nobleman who refers to his companion of the same age as nomachtzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 50, 165). Helga Rammow observes that although -mach points to G-1, it is often employed in reference to people of the same generation for the sake of shortening the distance, as she interprets it (Rammow 1964: 104).

Yet another controversial example comes from the “Primeros Memoriales.” The passage in question describes the circumstances in which a daughter-in-law of Moquihuix, the tlatoani in Tlatelolco, died:

Auh y yehoatl, yn ioq’chvi chalco pixcato amo, ma ixpā ŝ mic can icāpa auh in omic nima ye quitoa yn itava ca vmic in tomatzin, ma tictlatican (Sahagún 1997b: 180)
And her husband had gone to gather a harvest in Chalco; she died in his absence; he was away. And when she died, her elders then said: “Our niece has died: let us cremate her (ibid).

Here “itava,” or her fathers, may well be mistaken for “itlava,” or her uncles. However, if “itava” was correct, it would mean that the elders of the household who may have been related to the woman in various ways called her “our niece.”

In the “Texcoca Accounts” the sons of Nezahualpilli relate how don Hernando Velázquez became the tlatoani of Texcoco:

\[
auh\text{ tiquitoque ca topiltzin ca tomach Cuix quē\ tiquitoa açipā onmihmatca yez\ yn\ ma quītatlacalhui\ in\ pipiltin\ yhuan\ in\ tetzcuca\ (Texcoca\ Accounts\ 1997: 204)
\]

And we said: He is our son; he is our nephew. Do we say that perhaps because of it he will be prudent so that he won’t harm the noblemen and the Texcoca?  

Since don Hernando was a son of Coanacochtli, he indeed was a nephew of the authors of the account. However, tomachtzin is juxtaposed here with topiltzin which probably has a meaning of either “one of us, the Texcoca” or “one of us, the members of the ruling dynasty” (see: 1.1.4. One of us). The juxtaposition with the word which is actually not a kinship term may suggest that also tomachtzin is charged here with some additional connotations.

The vocatives based on -mach are quite rare in the sources, I have registered only two such attestations. In both nomachtze is employed by a man in reference to his actual nephew (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 162). However, one of them suggests that no- in nomachtze may be inoperative, as it is in many kin terms used in direct speech:

\[
Auh\ ca\ niman\ ye\ no\ annehcommolhuilia.\ Nomattze\ ca\ nicā\ tica\ ticcaquī\ totlatol,\ auh\ ticcaquī\ iuh\ mopā\ motlatoltia\ totatzitzinhuan\ in\ teopixque\ omitzmocnelilique\ (San\ Antonio\ 1997: 226-228)
\]

\[132\] Translation mine.
And then you [pl., J.M.] said to me: My nephew, here you are. You hear our words, and you hear how our Fathers the priests speak in your favor (ibid.: 227-229).

Interestingly, Rammow (1964: 105) found an example of a -mach-based vocative employed undoubtedly outside the kinship sphere. It comes from Hernando Alvarado Tezozomoc’s “Crónica mexicana” written in Spanish but full of Nahuatl vocabulary:


“Netle nomatzine” should literally be translated as “hey, my nephew!” Rammow likewise observes that the term “sobrino” abounds in the “Crónica mexicana,” being used there for a variety of relationships (Rammow 1964: 105). In the already cited narrative, the Huexotzinca, defeated by the Tlaxcalteca, resort to their current enemy Moteucçoma to beg him for help. They arrive at the doorway to the palace and ask the guards:


If the Spanish “sobrino” were the rendering of -mach here, the same term would be employed to describe the Huexotzinca in regard to the Mexica and Moteucçoma in respect to the Huexotzinca. Unfortunately, the material is too scarce to draw any firm conclusions as to the connotations of -mach outside the kinship sphere. The main basis for speculations is the supposed relationship between -mach and its counterpart from G+1, -tla, or “uncle.” Logically, these two terms should describe the opposite poles of the same relation. The latter term referred to the person who rendered favors to ego and thus obliged him to gratitude (3.3. -tla). Concurrently, -mach should describe a receiver of favors, which would also be in accordance with the social position of nieces and nephews, as described in the “Florentine Codex.” If this hypothesis were true, Moteucçoma would address the Huexotzinca as “you, (who will be) my debtors,” which makes sense, but why would the Huexotzinca refer to Moteucçoma as “our debtor”? At the same time, in the “Bancroft Dialogues,” the royal parents of the Tenochca bride would refer to their Texcoca son-in-law as “our debtor,” which
again makes sense, but why would an older nobleman call his companion “my debtor”? Perhaps these questions could be answered if more attestations of -mach outside the kinship sphere were available.

### 3.3. -TLA

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses the term *tlatli* as “tio, hermano de padre, o de madre” (Molina 1977 II: 140r). According to Jerome Offner, -*tla* and -*ta*, or father, are derived from the Uto-Aztecan term *taha*, which meant “uncle” (Offner 1983: 190). Concurrently, -*pil(l)o* is closely associated with a word for a lineal kin, child (*-pil*), because they both originate in the same root (*pil*). Following Offner’s suggestions, James Lockhart perceives in this a trace of the phenomenon clearly visible in the case of sibling terminology: including both lineal and collateral consanguineals in the same category (Lockhart 1992: 76).

In the material I have gathered -*tla* appears with both the female and the male reference point. Within the biological semantic sphere it denotes either father’s or mother’s brother or half-brother (see e.g.: Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 160). As Lockhart notes, -*tla* could have likewise been extended to the marriage partners of consanguineal kin. Thus one used the term “uncle” in reference not only to his or her parents’ brothers but to his or her aunt’s husband as well (Lockhart 1992: 79). Offner suggests that -*tla* might have also been used to describe collateral male kin of the first ascending generation, related to ego through his or her grandparent, grand-grandparent, etc. (Offner 1983: 178). In the comment to the “Bancroft Dialogues,” Karttunen and Lockhart suggest that on some occasions the extension “males one generation older than the point of reference” is possible too (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 46).

“Uncles” were one of a few collateral kin categories (along with aunts, nephews and nieces) included in the *tlacamecayotl*. Susan Kellogg states that the reason for this exceptional treatment was that they were considered substitutes for fathers (Kellogg 1986: 107). The “Florentine Codex” says:

> in tetla, ytech necualoteuani, itech necahualoni, tenice, machice, mamale, naoatile.
yn qualli tetla ycnoio, teca muchioani [motecuitlauiani, tlamocuitlauiani] tlaceliani, tlapiani, tepiani, itech netlacaneconi, mauhqui, tlamauhcachiuani, teca muchiuia, teca tlaocuya (Sahagún 2012 X: 3)

One’s uncle is a person to whom one leaves [his children] on dying, a trustworthy person, he is the one in charge of the belongings, the one who gains them by position, the one who takes responsibility, the one who has authority.

One’s good uncle is compassionate, he acts in one’s favor, he is the guardian of people and things, he is the receiver of people, the keeper of people and things, a trusted person, solicitous, acting with concern, he acts in favor of people, he is concerned about people.  

Apparently, the role of an “uncle” within a household focuses on both social and material aspects of being in charge of his orphaned nephews and nieces. He raises them, he has parental authority over them, but at the same time he is entrusted the property which the deceased parents of his wards had left. The significance of the material aspect of this relation is again stressed among the vices of an uncle, who “tlaauliquixtia, tlaaulizitta, tlaaulipoloa” (ibid.) or “he squanders the property, he wastes it, he looses it by negligence.” The corresponding text in the “Historia general” says:

Tio. El tío tenían por costumbres estos naturales de dexarle por curador o tutor de sus hijos y de su hazienda y de su muger y de toda la casa.

El tío fiel tornava a su cargo la casa de su hermano y muger como la propria suya.

Tio vil. La propiedad de mal tío es ser desperdiciador, desbaratado; es aborrescedor y despreciador (Sahagún 2001 II: 764).

In Book 9 of the “Florentine Codex” -tla is used several times in reference to the merchants:

---

133 Translation mine.
The ruler Ahuitzotl came to greet them. He said to them: “O my beloved uncles, O merchants, O vanguard merchants, you have suffered fatigue” (ibid).

Here is what became the price of the heads, the chests [= the effort] of your uncles, the merchants, who went as the disguised merchants, as the one who surrounds people in war. This is not something they had owned, they suffered hunger and fatigue [to get it], this is not something they had taken. Accept it!  

No longer will you reach the place where you go, for it is already in the land of the lord who causes terror, Huitzilopochtli. For your uncles, the Mexica, the merchants, the vanguard merchants, have fulfilled their duty. 

In the “Anales de Tlatelolco” doña Marina says to a native person who “betrayed” Cuauhtemoc and other tlatoque during the infamous expedition to Honduras:  

_Auh in Malintzin Ohualquiz quihuia Yn Mexicatl te\textsuperscript{idente} yn tuxtica Notlatzin Mexicatl_ (Klaus 1999: 40)  

_Y Malintzin salió hacia el mexicatl diciendo: “¿Qué haces, mi venerado tío, mexicatl?”_ (ibid.: 41)  

Chimalpahin writes about the conquest of Amaquemecan: 

---

\textsuperscript{134} Translation mine.  
\textsuperscript{135} Translation mine.
Auh nican yn hualla y Neçahualcoyotl Acozmiztli Yoyontzin, yn tlahtohuani Tetzcuco Acolhuacan ynic quitocaque yn itlatlahuan yn tepaneca (Chimalpahin 2003: 104)

Y aqui vino Nezahualcóyotl Acolmiztli Yoyotzin, tlahtohuani de Tetzcuco Acolhuacan a quien seguían sus tíos los tepaneca (ibid.: 105).

Since in both “Anales de Tlatelolco” and the work of Chimalpahin -tla is juxtaposed with ethnic designations (“Mexicatl” and “Tepaneca” respectively), Helga Rammow suggests its association with “nationality.” On the other hand, she interprets the form of address “notlatzitzioane” used by tlatoani Ahuitzotl with reference to merchants as reverential and not carrying any additional meaning (Rammow 1964: 63-64). Brant Gardner notes that although merchants are tlatoani’s “uncles,” they do not address him with the reciprocal term -mach, or “nephew,” but rather with -pil, or “child.” Unfortunately, he does not give specific references (Gardner 1982: 112), but the options are limited and it is very likely that the vocatives Gardner saw were regular honorifics, such as nopiltzine (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms). In such a case, the merchants would have simply address the ruler respectfully, while he called them with the title somehow related to their position or role. Gardner assumes that the choice of a collateral term instead of a lineal one, “fathers,” was due to the peculiar nature of the social status of pochteca, who were placed somewhere between pipiltin and macehualtin (Gardner 1982: 112-113).

Neither Rammow nor Gardner propose a coherent hypothesis which would encompass all the different usages of -tla outside the kinship sphere. The majority of its attestations has no association with ethnic issues; the vocative notlatzitzihuane describes the same relation as the absolutive form of -tla and thus cannot be a mere honorific; and if the transitional status of a group was a criterium for labeling it “uncles,” how to explain the usage of the term in the “Anales de Tlatelolco”? A hint which helps to understand the connotations of -tla extended outside the kinship sphere is provided by John Bierhorst in his interpretation of the “Water-pouring Song” from the “Cantares mexicanos.” The verse which contains the term -tla is the following:

Noxochiaçaçacayatzini huanitzin nechymacaco notlatzitzihua tlaxcalteca ye chichimeca anen tla xia (Bierhorst 1985a: 334)
My Tlaxcalan uncles have come to give me Huanitl, my flower-water charge. O Chichimecs, pass away, and not in vain (ibid.: 335).

The verse is sung by a Mexicatl. According to Bierhorst, he gives thanks to his foes, the Tlaxcalans, for forcing the Mexica into paradise (Bierhorst 1985a: 483). Within this logical framework, the Tlaxcalans are the singer’s “uncles” because, in spite of being his enemies, they did him a favor for which he is grateful. By the same token, the “traitor” who uncovered the alleged conspiration of the native rulers in the “Anales de Tlatelolco” was doña Marina’s “uncle” because he did her a favor. In the quotation from Chimalpahin’s “Séptima Relación” above, Nezahualcoyotl is leading the Texcocan army to Chalco, accompanied by his allies (“uncles”), the Tepaneca.

In the last of the passages concerning the pochteca above, Moteucçoma sets off to conquer a province, but it turns out that there is no need to make such an effort – the merchants have already taken possession of the land on behalf of the leader. In the first passage Ahuitzotl expresses his gratitude towards pochteca and in the second one they lay before him the war devices employed by the captives they had taken. In this context, more important than the transitional status of merchants within the social structure is the role they played in Aztec politics. They were sent as spies to hostile territories and their death was understood as a provocation which resulted in an instant war and, inevitably, the conquest of “provocators.” Merchants were also negotiators who could peacefully submit a territory by means of sketching to its leaders the dreadful consequences of the Mexica invasion (Olko 2004). This is the reason why tlatoque and war leaders acted as if they were indebted to the pochteca and why they called them their “uncles.” This interpretation may be helpful in understanding the usage of -tla in a huehuetlatolli delivered by a ruler and recorded in Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex”:

\[ Oc cenca amehoan namechnotza, namechtzatzilia in antecpipiltoonti: auh in antotlatzitzioan in anpipiltin, in antlatocapipiltin: \]

(Sahagún 2012 VI: 69)

I speak, I cry out especially to you, ye who are lords, and ye who are our uncles, ye who are noblemen, ye who are the sons of rulers (ibid).
In the ideological system of the Nahuas the noblemen occupied the privileged position of “specialists.” According to Alfredo López Austin,

el pueblo estaba convencido de que una vida normal era imposible sin aquellos oficiales del poder. Sabían dirigir los trabajos comunales, juzgar, legislar, realizar los complicadísimos rituales que requerían las divinidades agrícolas, mandar los cuerpos militares que aportaban los calpulli de macehualtin (...) en fin, dar a los hombres su calidad (López Austin 1989: 70-71).

In return for these services, the commoners paid tribute to the noblemen. The entire community depended on the help of “specialists” and owed them gratitude which acquired a material form. Arguably, the relation between people and their “uncles” was based on the exchange of gifts. An “uncle” was the one to whom one felt indebted because of the favors he had received.

3.4. -AHUI

Fray Andrés de Olmos glosses “Ahuitl – tia, naui – mi tia” (Olmos 2002: 29) and fray Alonso de Molina precis: “Teaui. tia. hermana de padre o de madre” (Molina 1977 II: 91v). The term was used with either the male or the female reference point (Lockhart 1992: 78). Along with a sister of either of parents it also designated the uncle’s wife, as is evident from Juan de San Antonio’s letter:

Auh ca yn iquac oiuh niquilhui hin nahuitzin yn inamic catca notlatzin Don po tetlaueuetzquititzin, ca cenca ic qualan (San Antonio 1997: 230)

And after I had told this to my aunt, the late wife of my uncle don Pedro Tetlahuehuetzquititzin, she was much angered thereby (ibid).

Together with uncles, nephews and nieces, aunts were included in the tlacamecayotl (Kellogg 1986: 120). As noted by Helga Rammow, in texts “uncles and aunts” tend to appear among the inhabitants of the house, the closest members of the family (Rammow 1964: 63), for example:
The mother, the father, the parent, the parent of the nobleman, the old men, the old women know not yet of it, nor do any of the kinsmen – one's aunt, one's uncle – know yet in what manner the begotten one may perish (ibid).

Or in the farewell to a young merchant:

We thy mothers and fathers implore thee: pay good attention; look well; take care, O my son. Go in peace, leaving thy aunts and uncles, etc. (ibid).

There are some indications of extending the term -ahui beyond its primary meaning. For example, the “Crónica Mexicayotl” explains: ynin yllancueytl çan quihuapauh ynic quimoconeti. ca y yahuitzin yn acamapich (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 114), or “This Illancueitl had merely brought him [i.e. Acamapichtli, J.M.] up when she had adopted him as her child. She was Acamapichtli’s aunt” (ibid.: 115). Since the source does not specify the detailed genealogy of Illancueitl, it cannot be established with certainty if she was his parent’s sister. It is also possible that “aunt” is extended here to “adoptive mother.” Similar ambiguity occurs in the case of one of Chimalpahin’s statements:

ynic ce yehuatl yn Don fernando altamirano comendador S.tiago. auh yn oc omentin monjastin oncan cate yntlan Yn imahuitzitzinhuan yn oncan monasterio totlaçonantzin Regina Angelorum (Chimalpahin 2006: 250)

the first don Hernando Altamirano, comendador of Santiago, and the other two are nuns who are with their aunts at the nunnery of our precious mother Regina Angelorum (ibid.: 251).
Again, we cannot be sure if the actual aunts of the two nuns are mentioned here, or if the term is used to mean “caretakers.” Finally, the “Bancroft Dialogues” contain the doublet -ahui -ci:

\[
\text{quename ic oquimonahuatili in tloque nahuaque in ilhuicahua in mictlane: ma ticmoxiccahuili in ica in ichichihualtzin, ipan timotlatoltiz inic conmocuitlahuizque in mahuitzitzinhuan in mocihuan} \text{ (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 128)}.\]

As the All-pervasive, the Master of heaven and the underworld dispatched him, do not neglect his breastfeeding, see to it that your attendants care for him (ibid).

Here the reference point is a tlatoani’s wife and her “aunts, grandmothers” are to look for the tlatoani’s child. The term most probably refers to women unrelated to the lady, because in Texcoco, where the dialogues were recorded, the principal wives of rulers were of Tenochca origin. Coming to the Texcocan court, they were leaving the elders of their families in Tenochtitlan. Unfortunately, the material is too scarce to allow for any conclusions as far as the extended meaning of -ahui is concerned.

### 3.5. Loanwords

On the list of the Spanish loanwords prepared by Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart, -sobrina appears already in 1598 (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 65). It is employed for a niece of the Spanish king:

\[
\text{Auhvin axcan cenca tlamociui ynic movicaz quimonamiquiltiuh yn inamictzin yn opa balcerona ychpoch y Emperador de Roma ca ysuprina y quimonamictitzinoz} \text{ (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 204)}.\]

and now there is much concern about his going to meet his wife [esp. Reina] there at Barcelona, daughter [esp. hija] of the Roman Emperor, and it is his (own) niece [esp. sobrina] he is marrying (ibid.: 205).

The same list has -sobrino as late as 1746 (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 86), but the earliest attestation of this term that I have been able to find comes from a 1671 testament from the Valley of Toluca (Pizzigon 2007: 54). This testament also contains the earliest example of -
sobrina employed in reference to an indigenous woman that I know of. A 1762 testament from the same area has the form “Nosobrinos” employed for nephews: it combines the Nahuatl possessive prefix with the Spanish absolutive ending and the obligatory suffix -huan is lacking. Another will of this period includes the phrase “noSobrinoS yhua nosobrinas,” or “my nephews and nieces” (Pizzigoni 2007: 171).

There is no doubt that in some regions -sobrina and -sobrino replaced the indigenous categories: in my database, the latest attestation of -pil(l)o (with biological sense) comes from 1608 (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 99), while -mach cedes after 1610 (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 81-83). As Lockhart observes, the Spanish “sobrino” and “sobrina” follow the rules of classification distinct from those that govern the use of the Nahuatl -mach and -pil(l)o. While the latter pair distinguishes the sex of the reference point, the former distinguishes the sex of the referent. Therefore, the changes in the terminological system must have been associated with changes regarding family structure (Lockhart 1992: 85). This process, however, did not follow the same path in the entire Nahuatl-speaking area. Admittedly, today’s Nahuatl de la Huasteca does not differentiatne among the female and the male reference point (like Spanish), but at the same time, instead of a loanword, it makes use of the native term -machconeuh, based on the precontact -mach.136

The loanwords -tia and -tio are less frequent in the sources than -sobrina and -sobrino. The “Testaments of Toluca” include only one attestation of the former, dating 1762 (Pizzigoni 2007: 172). Karttunen and Lockhart note the earliest occurrence of the latter in 1760 (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 80), but it is already employed in 1693 in the “Testaments of Toluca” (Pizzigoni 2007: 132). Perhaps the loanwords replaced the native terms in some regions, because in my database there is no occurrence of -ahuï and -tla in eighteenth-century texts. However, as Lockhart notes, the introduction of -tia and -tio in the terminological system is rather suprising, given the seemingly identical semantic sphere covered by the Spanish and Nahuatl terms (Lockhart 1992: 84). Perhaps the difference in the social roles of aunts and uncles in each of the cultures was strong enough to justify giving up the old terminology.

4. SIBLINGS AND COUSINS

4.1. -IUC

Fray Andrés de Olmos defines “Ycuīt – nicui – mi hermano o hermana. dize lo sola la muger” (Olmos 2002: 25). Fray Alonso de Molina has “teicu. hermana menor” (Molina 1997 II: 94v) as well as “icuh. mi hermano, o hermana menor. (dize la hermana mayor)” and “mi hermana menor. (dize el hermano mayor)” (Molina 1977 II: 34r). James Lockhart asserts that he has never seen -iuc with the male reference point and neither it is used in this way in the sources I have analyzed. He assumes the root iuc to be identical with ic of the terms -iccauh and -teiccauh and suggests that it may have originally conveyed the sense “thereupon,” as in the word icpac, “on top of” (Lockhart 1992: 498, n. 69). If -iccauh, “a younger sibling of a man,” was derived from -iuc, it would suggest that originally the latter might have indeed been employed with both male and female reference point.

In the sources I have analyzed -iuc is used for both men and women. Lockhart states that it was extended to cousins (Lockhart 1992: 74) but I was not able to find any example, where the meaning of a cousin could be established without doubt. Lockhart likewise notes that this term was avoided in direct speech (Lockhart 1991: 78). The only example of its vocative form in my database comes from Horacio Caroche’s “Arte” and its translation by the author ignores the information about age relative to ego carried by the term: niuetzin ca nel ye àmō timonāmictāznequi mātēl çāyē ximoyēcchichihua, or “hermana, ya que no te quieres casar, adornate si quiera, y componte” (Caroche 2001: 436). When combined with the indefinite personal possessive prefix te-, teicuh, -iuc serves as a name for a younger (but not the youngest) daughter (Sahagún 1997b: 254).

Sarah Cline and Miguel León-Portilla note that in one of the sixteenth-century Colhuacan’s documents the term is used with an extended meaning. The passage they analyze is the following:

Ca tehuantin ticcahuatihui yn huentzintli ypampa Canel ticuiuhtzin ocatca ynn omac/(t?)otia (?) (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 184)
and we will go and make the offering, because (it was to our older sister to whom it was given?) (ibid.: 185).

The interpreters render “ticuiuhtzin” as “our elder sister” because they believe this use to be an inversion with the purpose of showing respect. The two unmarried women who are pronouncing the words, earlier in the testament are indicated as the sisters-in-law of the testator, Angelina Mocel, who, therefore, cannot be their younger sister (ibid.: 181). However, the term -iuc refers not only to sisters, but to brothers as well. If the women were unmarried, they had to be sisters of Angelina Mocel’s husband – the alternative connoted by the term for a sister-in-law, brother’s wife, is not possible. In her testament, Angelina orders various items to be sold in order to pay for masses on behalf of her deceased husband (ibid.: 182). In the passage quoted above her sisters-in-law simply fulfill her request, making the offering for their younger brother – described with the term “ticuiuhtzin.” In conclusion, no extension of meaning occurs here. As far as I was able to determine, -iuc was never employed outside the kinship sphere.

4.2. -ICCAUH AND -TEICCAUH

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses the term iccauhltli as “hermano menor” (Molina 1977 II: 32r), which implies that it was employed only for male siblings. Nevertheless, James Lockhart gives an example for using -iccauh in reference to a woman: in the “Testaments of Culhuacan” one of the testators calls his sister Juana Tiacapan “nicauhtzin” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 154; Lockhart 1992: 497, n. 69). In an account from Colhuacan, copied (or “transcribed” from a painted manuscript?) by Chimalpahin, -iccauh is employed for a female cousin of a man, namely, for a father’s brother’s daughter (Chimalpahin 1997 II: 92). It is likewise used for male cousins younger than ego (see the discussion in: Lockhart 1992: 497-8, n. 69). Juan de San Antonio employs it several times for don Hernando Pimentel who was a son of Juan’s father’s brother:

c a xpi ano in tlacatl niccauhtzin, y h u ã ca uel quimomachtia yn huel nitiachcauh ynic çaz ce tocoltzin ynic çaz ce tocitzin (San Antonio 1997: 232).
The lord my younger cousin is a Christian, and he knows well that I am indeed his elder cousin. [We are descended from] the same grandfather, the same grandmother (ibid.: 233137).

In my database this term always has a male reference point.

There are scarce indications that -iccauh was further extended outside the family sphere. Juan de San Antonio writes in his letter:

\[
\text{Auh ų nel chiyauhtla totlauã ų amiccauhtzitzinhuã cuix atle ic ixco cuix atle ic icpac nemi yn amatzin yn amotepetzin yn quinēcuhticate yn quinenchiuhticate amocococatzin chiyauhtla onoc tlatocatlalli yhuã in tecpillalli (San Antonio 1997: 236).}
\]

And truly as to our uncles your [pl.] younger brothers in Chiyauhtla: does it not offend your [pl.] altepetl when your [pl.] dependents who live in Chiyauhtla wrongly take and misuse the ruler's lands and the noblemen's lands (ibid.: 237)?

Juan addresses the Texcoca authorities, among whom are most likely his actual uncles and cousins. The younger brothers of his uncles cannot be their uncles at the same time and this is what the pronoun “our” (“totlauã”) implies. More plausibly, the term -tla is used here with its extended meaning – an ally or the one to whom another person is indebted (see: 3.3. -tla). The hypothesis is further supported by the usage of the word -cococauh in reference to that group. Molina glosses cococatl as “property or sustenance” (Molina 1977 II: 23v) and cococauh as “to be one’s slave” (ibid). Following this lead, Juan de San Antonio classifies the residents in Chiyauhtla as those who render favors to his family (i.e., to his uncles, cousins and himself) and the dependents of the Texcocan authorities at the same time. This group is called the authorities’ “younger brothers.”

Another example where -iccauh is likely to be used with a similar meaning also comes from Juan de San Antonio’s letter:

\[\text{__________________________________________________________________________}\]

137 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “niccauhtzin” as “my younger brother” and “nitiachcauh” as “I am (...) his elder brother.”
ca intla tel çan aca amocollhuà calpixqui, yn anoço tlayancqui (...) yntla ytlà calli milli, quimopialtilizquia tlacatl amattzin Don her do cortes ixtlilxochitzin. Auh ynin ca hamo, yehica ca amattzin auh ca amiccauhitzitzinhuà (San Antonio 1997: 208)

Yet if it were one of your [pl.] senior officials, a steward or a leader (...) if it were some house or cultivated property, the lord your [pl.] elder brother don Hernando Cortés Ixtlilxochitzin would entrust it to him. But this was not [the case], because he was your [pl.] elder brother. And they were your [pl.] younger brothers (ibid.: 209).  

It seems that in this case the group labeled as the authorities’ “younger brothers” were the officials in charge of their land (see: 2.2. -col). Unfortunately, I have not found any other source which would extend -iccauh in a clearly similar way, wherefore I cannot draw any firm conclusions as to the connotations of this term. From the examples presented above it appears that it described a type of dependency, which allows a comparison with the term -pil. Both -pil and -iccauh designated kin younger than ego and were used with a male reference point. As will be seen below, they displayed many similarities when employed in direct speech. In 4.4. -achcauh and -teachcauh, I argue that the counterpart of -iccauh for an elder sibling or cousin was extended outside the kinship sphere with the meaning of “principal, or the most important of.” Kin terms employed to describe power relations varied depending on conceptual classes to which the parties involved belonged. If a leader was called one’s “parent,” he certainly counted among people of other (higher) class than his “child” – a subordinate. Concurrently, if he was one’s “elder brother,” he belonged to the same class as his dependent (see: 4.4. -achcauh and -teachcauh), i.e., arguably, his “younger brother.”

As I have already mentioned, -iccauh was used not only as a term of reference, but as a term of address as well. Its usage in vocative displays striking similarities to the usage of various forms of -pil. Molina glosses the form nicca as “ola, hao, oys, para llamar a alguno” (Molina 1977 II: 71v) which is, word for word, the same definition as in the case of nopiltze (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms). There is no doubt, however, that nopiltze was far more common. The only attestation of nicca that I have come upon was produced by Horacio Carochi. Alexander the Great says to Diogenes:

138 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson rendered the phrase “ca amattzin auh ca amiccauhitzitzinhuà” as “they were your elder brother and your younger brothers.” However, it does not make sense in the context and I am inclined to interpret auh as a marker of the beginning of a new sentence.
O, hui, nicca, auh tlè tacticà in oncanon? mach tiqmâneloa, mach toconitztiuh in niccaomitl! tle ótax? aoc ticmati?

valgame Dios hermano, que hazes ay? parece que rebuelues, y andas mirando los huessos de los muertos! que tienes, as perdido el juyzio? (Carochi 2001: 456)

Other vocatives based on -iccauh were niccauhtze and niccauhtzine. Like the majority of polite forms of address based on kin terms, they are never seen with other possessive prefixes than the 1st person singular and display it even if the reference point is plural, for example:


And when the arrival [of the captives] had taken place, they massed greeting Mayeuatzin. They said to him: “O my beloved younger brother, fare thee well.” And Mayeuatzin replied to them: (ibid).

dcoçoltica onoc. yn ihquac in ye inpan ye callaqui in huehue Acamapichtli. ytlan ca yn illancueytł. yn inpan callaquito yn itex. yn izquitecatl. quimilhui ma ximehuitititiecan tlacatle niccauhtzine (Chimalpahin 1997 II: 88).

He was lying in the cradle when Huehue Acamapichtli entered among them. With him was Illancueitl, who [also] entered among them. His brother-in-law Izquitecatl said to them: Greetings, lord, my younger brother (ibid.: 89).

Niccauhtze and niccauhtzine are similar to nopiltzintzine in that they are indifferent as to number (see: 1.1.6. Lords). They do not have plural forms, although they can refer to a group of people, for example (see also the example above):

_Nicauhtzine moch in cônchichua y cohuanacotzin yn amacaltzi. chicontetl yn oquihuicac_ (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 188)

My younger brother, all that Coanacochtzin has done is that he has taken with him seven of your [pl.] boats (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 189),
he spoke to us and said: My younger brother: Possibly such is my nature, and my body has been sick. I [do not wish to] make you [pl.] angry (ibid.: 225).

On the already discussed list from the “Memoriales con Escolios” the forms niccauhtzin and niccauhtzine are ascribed to “el hijo del principal, mercader, o oficial,” who thus addresses his father and to “el hijo del pilli mercader, o oficial,” who thus addresses his mother (Sahagún 2012 X: 1, n. 1, 2). From this piece of information several problems arise that need discussing. Firstly, the list suggests that only men used vocatives based on -iccauh. This is in accordance with the male reference point of -iccauh within the kinship sphere. It is likewise confirmed by the data I have gathered, including the conversations recorded in the “Primeros Memoriales,” classified according to the sex of a speaker (Sahagún 1997b: 295-296). In both “Primeros Memoriales” and “Memoriales con Escolios” men use the terms nopiltzintzine and niccauhtzte/ine, while women employ noconetzin.

Secondly, we are inclined to think of the relationship between children and their parents as of a hierarchical one and interpret the respectful terms of address children are using as confirming this hierarchy. As written sources show, niccauhtzine did not serve to mark the permanent positions of the parties involved in a conversation, but rather, the recipient of the discourse. In Chimalpahin’s writings, when the tlatoani Huehue Acamapichtli talks with his brother-in-law Izquitecatl, they employ niccauhtzine reciprocally:

auh oc ceppa quihto yn huehue acamapichtli ahu ic maltiz niccan cuix omalti. connanquilli quilhui ca yohuatzinco niccauhtzine. auh tle ytoca yez. conilhui ca ye ynic onihualla. niccauhtzine (Chimalpahin 1997 II: 88).

And again Huehue Acamapichtli said: And when will he be bathed here? Has he [already] been bathed? [Izquitecatl] answered him and said to him: Early in the morning, my younger brother. And what will his name be? [Acamapichtli] said to [the other]. For this have I come, my younger brother (ibid.: 89).
Finally, the fact that noblemen addressed with *niccauhtzine* both their fathers and their mothers can point to non-genderness of the term within the kinship sphere. Above, a passage from the “Codex Chimalpahin” is cited, where *niccauhtzine* is employed in reference to Huehue Acamapichtli and his wife, Illancueitl. Nevertheless, I have not found this vocative used in reference to a woman alone, nor came I across it in reference to an actual parent of the speaker. Molina suggests addressing people who confess: “Nicauhtzine (yntla ciuatl) ciuapille,” or “Hermano mio (y si fuere muger) señora” (Molina 1569: 59r), but this usage may be distorted by the Spanish influence.

Helga Rammow states that the vocatives *niccauhtzine* and *niccauhtze* were used by noblemen to speak among themselves (Rammow 1964: 58). However, as the “Primeros Memoriales” demonstrate, *macehualtin* were using them too. It seems that, as in the case of *nopiltze* and *nopiltzine*, *niccauhtze* and *niccauhtzine* served as markers of common and polite discourse respectively (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms). The former is eagerly employed by *macehualtin* (Sahagún 1997b: 296), while *pipiltin* use it when they are angry or deal with unpleasant matters, for example:

ca namechnonahuatilia nicauhtze ma hámotlaxicahuiliti. ma intlã xonmomâtzitzinoca yn amocolhuâ amyetetlacauh yn altepetl (San Antonio 1997: 200).

I command you, my younger brothers, not to be neglectful; stay with your grandfathers; you are the servants of the altepetl (ibid.: 201).

*Nicauhtze ca ye nixco ca ye nocpac nemin nomach Ju{o} de sant antonio* (ibid.: 220),

My younger brother: my nephew Juan de San Antonio offends me (ibid.: 221).

On the other hand, in the “Primeros Memoriales” the noblemen use more reverential *niccauhtzine* even if they fight with each other: *oc xicaq’ nicauhtzine y iehoatl tiquitoa ų molatlol camo tlachia*, or “Listen yet, my younger brother. What you say, your words, have no vision” (Sahagún 1997b: 295). This, however, does not have to contradict my hypothesis, because the discourse of those quarrels is indeed very polite, for example: *nicauhtzine oc xictlali moyollo ma oc ximocevi etc.*, or “My younger brother, be yet of good cheer. Rest yourself. Etc.” (ibid).
-Iccauh vocatives are less common than -pil vocatives: my sample consists of 28 attestations. While the usage of the latter can cross the boundaries of classes, the former are always used within the same class: a commoner addresses with these terms only another commoner, etc. Vocatives based on kin terms can be employed in reference to actual kin, although they are not meant to stress the consanguineal relationship but rather to perform the same function as always: marking the recipient of words and the level of discourse. This may also be true for niccauhtze and niccauhtzine, although I have not come across any explicit example of addressing younger brothers with one of these terms. As far as the role of the recipient is concerned, -pil vocatives marked him or her as the one who received vital essence from his “parents,” for example in the form of huehuetlatolli (see: 1.1.5. Vocative forms). No such transmission is implied in the case of -iccauh vocatives – they are not even used in huehuetlatolli registered in my database. The main context for them seems to be regular conversations between same-class members.

The above discussion of the term -pil showed that next to the vocatives nopiltze, nopiltzine and their variations, there was a title of respect nopiltzintzin(e), whose modified ending suggested its separation from the kin-related terminological system (see: 1.1.6. Lords). While vocatives operated according to the main logical principle of extending the terms for children (marking them as receivers), nopiltzintzin(e) lacked these implications and was to be translated as “lord.” This title of respect had its counterpart among the terms for younger siblings, but what makes the analysis of this form extremely difficult is that it bears no distinction in relation to other usages of -iccauh. In the following example it can be recognized only because it is put in a doublet with nopiltzintzin: Ca onoconcac. ohualmotlayhuali yn niccauhtzin ý nopiltzintzin yn tecocoltzin, or “I have heard that my younger brother (i.e. lord, J.M.), my lord Tecocoltzin, has been sent as messenger” (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 188). Another indication for its existence is the “Memoriales con Escolios” list where, along with the vocative niccauhtzine used while addressing a parent of high social class (“principal”), the form of reference niccauhtzinz is mentioned. In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” it is employed by Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, who, however, was the son of a tlatoani, labeled in the excerpt not as “principal” but as “señor”: 

244
I issued from his beloved daughter, the lady, the noblewoman, my mother, named doña Francisca de Moteuhcçoma. She was the wife of the lord don Diego de Alvarado Huanitzin, my lord, my father.139

The task of identifying the -iccauh-based title of respect would be easier if it were combined only with the 1st person singular possessive prefix, like nopiltzintzin. Unfortunately, it behaves more like the title -conetzin, bearing any possessive prefix. For example, the messenger sent by a tlatoani in order to greet the father of a newborn baby was saying to him:


The lord your younger brother, the tlatoani N, who guards there for you [the altepetl of] N, has sent me, has dispatched me. He says: Go, see the lord, my younger brother, who has worked as a slave, who has paid the tribute [= has fulfilled the obligations of a subject?].140

From the context it is apparent that no kin relations are involved here: either of tlatoque is called another tlatoani’s “lord.” Both men belong to the same class. If there is any hierarchy which orders their mutual relations, it is not reflected in the titulature. The question arises: how many examples can we find, where it is possible to determine whether a person involved in a described relation is one’s actual brother or rather a respected “lord”? This issue has to be taken into consideration when analyzing the order of birth (for example, of possible successors to the throne) on the basis of kin terms.

139 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “niccauhtzin” as “my parent.”
140 Translation mine. I rendered the second “mjccauhtzin” as “my younger brother” because I believe that “m-” is the scribe’s error and the word “njccauhtzin” was meant here. The corresponding passage in the “Historia general” says: “Anda ve, ve a N, mi hermano que vive y govierna...” (Sahagún 2001: 563).
The last problem concerning the extension of *-iccauh* into the sphere of respect and politeness likewise has to do with its similarity to *nopiltzintzin(e)*. The latter functioned as both a term of reference and a term of address. If the parallel between the terms does exist, *niccauhtzine* should, at least at times, be translated as “my lord” by colonial Spanish authors and indeed it is. For example Hernando Ruiz de Alarcón renders “Caye qualli nihauhtzine” as “Sea en buen hora, mi superior señor” (1953: 39).

The term *-teiccauh* has been of interest to several scholars due to its unusual double possession. Rammow analyzes it as the stem *-iccauh* + indefinite personal possessive prefix *te*-. She also notes that Molina glossed it separately from *-iccauh* (Rammow 1964: 131). Although his entry “Teiccauh. hermano menor” should be interpreted as a standardized form of *-iccauh* (the following entry is “Teichpuch. hija de alguno, o de alguna”), he also gives “Teteiccanauan. hermanos menores,” literally “one’s one’s younger brothers” (Molina 1977 II: 94r, 106v). Brant Gardner confirms the validity of the term on the basis of the Olmos’ work. In “Arte de la lengua mexicana y vocabulario” the relevant gloss is “noteycauh. mi hermano menor” (Gardner 1982: 92; Olmos 1985: 31). Gardner suggests that in the terms *-teiccauh* and *-teiachcauh* (see below) both the prefix *te* and the suffix *-cauh* were associated with the male reference point, while the bare root of the term (*-iuc* and *-ach* respectively) were used with the female reference point (Gardner 1982: 92). Karttunen and Lockhart agree with this opinion, although they add that “in actual usage consistency was not complete” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 47, n. 19). They also state that the term *-teiccauh* was extended to a younger cousin of a man (ibid.: 47) which is confirmed in Molina’s “Confesionario mayor.” Because of the ambiguous meaning of the term, Molina had to specify it by means of a concept of *tlamampan*, used to count back generations:

`aço aca yequimonamictiznequi yhuayolqui, yn ontlamampan yteyccauh, yça teyxhuiuan, ynanoce ontlamapan yhuelpol, anoço ytlah, anoço yyahui, yn anoce y copadre, yn anoce y comadre,

o si alguno dellos se qere casar cò su parieta ñ segudo grado de cosanguinididad, o en segudo grado de afinidad, o con su tio, o tia, o con su copadre: o comadre (Molina 1569: 49v).`
A further contribution of Gardner to the understanding of -teiccauh is the correct interpretation of the columns labeled “dize el baro[n]” and “dice la muger” in Olmos’ “Arte.” As he notes, Molina ignored the distinction based on the sex of the reference point, glossing “teiccauh” as a “younger brother” and “teicu” as a “younger sister” in an attempt to force these terms into his own conception of the terminological system. According to Olmos, the criterium here was not the sex of the referent but rather that of the “speaker,” i.e., actually, of the reference point (Gardner 1982: 91-92; Olmos 1985: 31-32). Though in the material I have gathered the majority of the attestations of -teiccauh refer to men, a 1583 document from San Miguel Tocuillan has it twice in reference to a woman, for example: ninman oquimitalhui y jua migeltzin quimołhuili yn ite[n?]catzin yn anatzin, or “Then Juan Miguel spoke and said to his younger sister Ana” (Lockhart 1991: 71). Likewise, in the above-quoted passage from “Confessionario mayor” the phrase “yhuayolqui, yn ontlamampan yteyccauh” is rendered by Molina as “su parieta ē segudo grado de cosanguinidad.”

The application of the criterium “primary referent’s sex” to -teiccauh is not consistent throughout the written sources. Along with the examples where the term is employed for a woman, there exist doublets which clearly contrast -teiccauh with -hueltiuh, or “elder sister of a man,” thus implying that the former was used for men and the men only. These doublets are analyzed in 4.5. -hueltiuh, here I will present only one example, interesting because of its obscurity for the translators:

yn tepilhoã ytech quiça ţ temach ţ tepilo yoã ytech quiça ţ tetla. ţ teavi. yn tetla. ţ teavi. ţ qûichoa ţpilhoa. auh ţ temachoayc monotza ţ teycaoa yntla oquichti. auh ţyta çiao yveltioa (Sahagún 1997b: 251).

This passage of the “Primeros Memoriales” has been translated by Thelma Sullivan and Henry B. Nicholson as:

One’s children issue [from one]. One’s nephew, one’s niece likewise issue from one’s uncle, from one’s aunt. One’s uncle, one’s aunt engender their children. And if the offspring of the aunt and uncle were male, they were called one’s younger brothers, and if they were female, his older sisters (ibid).

Pedro Carrasco suggests another, in my opinion, more relevant translation:
De los hermanos procede el sobrino (de hombre), el sobrino (de mujer). Y de ellos proceden el tío y la tía. El tío y la tía engendran hijos. Y los primos se llaman “hermanos” si son varones, y si son hembras “hermanas.”

The rendering of “tepilhuā” as “siblings” and “temachoa” as cousins results from Carrasco’s understanding of the prefix te- combined with some kin terms (-ixhuīuh, -pil, -mach, -pil(ł)ø) as “the same person.” Thus, according to him, teixhuīuhuan would be the grandchildren of the same person (cousins), tepilhuan – the children of the same person (siblings), etc. (Carrasco 1966: 152). The text explains the concept of collaterality: the categories of nephews, nieces, uncles and aunts originate in the bond between siblings. Male cousins of ego are called his -teiccahuan, while his female cousins are -hueltihuan. Perhaps the usage of -teiccauh for younger brothers and its usage for younger siblings of both sexes represent two different phases of the development of the terminological system. Although they proceed from the same place (the Valley of Mexico) and period (the second half of the sixteenth century), the rarity of the latter suggests that, by the time of contact, it might have already been ceding from the language.

Confusingly, there is one attestation of -teiccauh in Juan de San Antonio’s letter, which seems to have women as the reference point:

\[\text{auh ų manel yciuauatzitzinhuan catca notlatzin vexutzincatzin ca yn amotechiuhcauh yn tocitzin atzaqualco ca moch cōmocēmaquitī ca moch cōmocemaxcatili ca moch cōmocentlatquitili ynteiccauhtzin yn notecuiyo Don Ju{o} quauhtliztactzin} (San Antonio 1997: 208).\]

although there were wives of my uncle Huexotzincatzin, [including] your progenitress, our grandmother in Atzaqualco, he gave and presented all to their younger brother, my lord don Juan Quauhtliztactzin (ibid.: 209).

The 3rd person plural possessive prefix in “ynteiccauhtzin” suggests that the reference point is the wives of Huexotzincatzin. Huexotzincatzin and Quauhtliztactzin were sons of the tlatoani of Texcoco, Nezahualpilli, and “our grandmother in (or rather: of the noble house of) Atzaqualco” was most probably their mother. As a result, Quauhtliztactzin would be referred to as a younger brother of both his sisters-in-law and his mother. In my opinion, a much more
plausible option is that the letter “n” in the possessive prefix is an inadvertent insertion by either a writer or a transcriptor of the document and that the 3rd person singular possessive prefix y- refers to Huexotzincatzin. The fact that Quauhtliztactzin was the younger brother (“iteiccauh”) of Huexotzincatzin is confirmed in the “Bancroft Dialogues”:

Çan ye no ihui niquittac inic connotzacuiltitia in Quauhtliztactzin izçan huel iteiccauhtzin Huexotzincatzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 156)

Likewise I saw how Cuauhtliztactzin, younger brother of Huexotzincatzin, was punished (ibid.: 157).

Since both -iccauh and -teiccauh apparently cover the same semantic field (“a younger sibling or cousin of a male”), one feels compelled to seek any difference in usage between the two terms. As my sample shows, -teiccauh survived longer. The latest attestation of -iccauh employed for a consanguineal comes from 1566 (Anderson, Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 46-48), while -teiccauh appears in the “Testaments of Toluca” until 1740 (Pizzigoni 2007: 19). In 4.4. -achcauh and -teachcauh I hypothesize that -teachcauh was, for some reason, favored by the friars, since it is employed throughout the revised section of Juan de San Antonio’s letter in contrast to the sections that lack corrections and where -achcauh is abundant. The same cannot be said of the pair -teiccauh and -iccauh: there is no difference here among the various sections of the letter. However, in Juan’s text the former term has only five occurrences, compared to 38 of the latter (not counting the polite vocative forms). At the same time, -iccauh (with the sense of “brother” or “cousin”) does not appear in ecclesiastical writings recorded in my database.

-Teiccauh sometimes occurs outside the kinship context. Chimalpahin pairs it with the term for friends, signalling as the reference point either the community of Xoloco or people associated with the church of San Antonio Abad:

ynin omoteneuhtzino Sancta cruz. ca ymaxcatzin yehuantin yntlaquetzaltzin yn tocinuhtzitinhuan yn toteyccauhtzitinhuan Juan Morales yhua yn iyome Bernabe de S. Jeronimo cuechiuhque (Chimalpahin 2006: 252)
This said holy Cross was the property of and was raised by our friends and younger brothers Juan Morales and Bernabé de San Gerónimo, who are married to sisters and are skirt makers (ibid.: 253).

Frances Karttunen notes that the term *icniuhtli*, or “a friend,” is used for a sibling in modern Morelos (Karttunen 1992a: 94). It is quite possible that it contains the same root as -*iuc*. I have not found it with the sense “brother” in Classical Nahuatl texts, which is why I have not included it among the gathered material. Nevertheless, in Central Mexico *icniuhtli* remained semantically close to *-iccauh*, which is particularly visible outside the kinship sphere. Thelma Sullivan remarks that in sixteenth-century Tlaxcalan documents the term denotes either equality between people or dependency, because it is found with the meaning of “terrazguero” or the laborer who pays rent for occupying the master’s land. The laborer is also named *talicniuhtli*, or the land-friend (the land-brother?) (Sullivan 1987: 40). Actually, these two meanings of *icniuhtli* do not have to be “distinct” – they match exactly what has been said above about the extended usage of *-iccauh* as a dependent of the same class. The same connotations were most likely true for *-teiccauh*, because a 1557 document employs it in reference to a branch of a ravine:

\[
Auh \text{ yn ce atl huallauh ypan y quauhximalpa[n] yn intlapan yn espanolesme auh zanno oncan mochippa quitoca yn inan yn atlauhtly yeuatl yn iteiccavan yn quitoca yn ompa itztiuh cuyuacan yn imilpan altamirano (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 214).}
\]

And one stream comes through Quauhximalpan on the lands of the Spaniards, and also there is [its branch], always following the bed of the ravine which goes toward Coyoacan on the fields of Altamirano (ibid.: 215).

The principle of remaining within the same class brings us closer to the understanding of the rules that governed the extension of siblings terminology in contrast to those applied to parents and children terminology. A *huehuetlatolli* from the “Florentine Codex” contains another clue as to the logic that governed the process:
And still behold, I place all before thee, I cause thee to see all. The third oldest brother, thy responsibility, thy younger brother, my N.: dost thou not look to him, take example from him, learn from him, depend upon him whom our lord hath humbled? (ibid.: 109)

The person described as moteiccauh is a tlatoani, whom the father sets as an example for his son. It is not clear if he is really a brother or cousin of the boy: the Spanish text of the “Historia general” at first read “tu hermano, el qual nascio despues de ti” but then was changed to “tu primo hermano, el qual es maior que tu” (ibid.: 108, n. 11). It is likely, therefore, that moteiccauh is meant to be a title of respect, adding to the virtual equivalence between -iccauh and -teiccauh. What is particularly interesting in this case is that “your younger brother” has been put in a doublet with the word momamal which signifies “your charge,” “your responsibility.” It can suggest that while parents “governed” their children, because they transmitted to them vital essence, elder brothers “were responsible” for their younger brothers which is a more subtle way of exercising the authority.

The term -teiccauh is employed by Chimalpahin in a Christian context. In his account on establishing San Basilio’s religious rule, Chimalpahin states:

[when he] gave them another separate said exemplary arrangement for living a spiritual, priestly life, his rule, which he gave to and entirely made the eternal property of his precious younger siblings as priests (Chimalpahin 2006: 293).

The term “itlaçoteopixcatelyauhtzitzinhuan,” “his precious priestly younger siblings,” describes the Basilians in relation to San Basilio. Normally, the relationship between friars
and their patron is denoted with the term -pil (see: 1.1.4. Subjects). Chimalpahin, however, stresses that San Basilio was an Antonine friar (“San Antonio teopixqui”) who renewed the order’s rule, which, in turn, led to the emergence of the name Basilios (Chimalpahin 2006: 292). Therefore, both San Basilio and his followers belonged to the same class of teopixeque – the Antonines – though the former’s position in the history of the order was, obviously, higher than the position of the Basilians. Arguably, the superiority, either chronological or hierarchical, of San Basilio over his followers and, at the same time, their ontological sameness, is connoted by the term -teiccauh.

Drawing a line between the precontact and Spanish-influenced usage of -teiccauh is not easy. The 1774 dictionary of the Real Academia Española glosses “hermano” as, among others:

Por extension se llaman todos los Christianos, por ser hijos de una misma Madre que es la Iglesia, y de un Padre que es Jesu Christo.\textsuperscript{141}

This definition stresses the hierarchical equality of “brothers.” It seems that such an understanding underlaid the usage of -teiccauh in the “Confessionario mayor,” where San Agustín addressed Christians “notlaço teyccahuane” (rendered by Molina as “o hermanos muy amados;” Molina 1569: 17v). Another connotation of the Spanish “hermano” is:

Tratamiento que dán los Reyes à otros Reyes, y à los Cardenales, y el Papa à los Cardenales y Obispos.\textsuperscript{142}

Accordingly, in the “Coloquios y doctrina cristiana” the pope Adrian VI calls the cardinals noteiccahuan (Sahagún 1986: 104). On the other hand, in the same source Lucifer says to the devils:

\begin{quote}
Ye anquimottilia noteiccavane, in tlein topã omochiu, in quenjn cêmâyan otitelchivaloque, auh motivaltococoque ý vmpa ilhuicac: (ibid.: 176)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{141} http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/, consulted Mar 01, 2013.
\textsuperscript{142} http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/, consulted Mar 01, 2013.
You see, my younger brothers, what happened to us, how we have been diminished once and for all. We have been expelled from heaven.\(^\text{143}\)

Although in the first quotation from the “Coloquios” the usage of \textit{-teiccauh} seems to be influenced by the Spanish, it conforms, at the same time, to the native classification system. Both the pope and the cardinals belong to the same class, similarly to Lucifer and the devils. The pope and Lucifer have positions superior in regard to their \textit{-teiccahuan}. Significantly, while Molina employed “hermano” for rendering \textit{-teiccauh}, the Spanish version of the “Coloquios” in both cases prefers “hermanos menores.” Contrary to the original Spanish usage of “hermano,” the term \textit{-teiccauh} that marks relative age of the referent involves a kind of authority on the part of the reference point.

\section*{4.3. \textit{-ACH}}

According to James Lockhart, \textit{-ach} is etymologically related to the word \textit{achto}, or first (Lockhart 1992: 498, n. 69, see: 4.4. \textit{-achcauh} and \textit{-teachcauh}). Fray Horacio Carochi states that the term \textit{achtli} means “older brother of a younger sister” (Carochi 2001: 466). Indeed, it refers only to men, but, as observed by Helga Rammow, it definitely comes up in the sources with both a female and a male reference point (Rammow 1964: 121). Among these attestations of \textit{-ach} recorded in my database, for which the sex of the reference point can be established, the rate is 30 (male) to only 6 (female). For example, Juan de San Antonio says:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Auh in yeuatl nautzin çã niquilhui, otinechmocnelili otlacã moyolotzin auh otiemocnelili yn tlacatl mattzin moyetzticatca yn notecuïyo Don Ju(o) quauhtliztactzin yn ticmolnamiùilia yhuã yn ipã timotlatoltia} (San Antonio 1997: 228),
\end{quote}

And I only said to my aunt: Thank you very much for the favor you have shown me. And you have shown favor to the lord your elder brother my lord don Juan Quauhtliztactzin, whom you remember and on whose behalf you intercede (ibid.: 229).

And several pages earlier he writes:

\(^{143}\) Translation mine.
Ca nelli cenca vei tetzauitl yhuan vey iztlacatiliztl yhuan huey tecocoliztl neyolcocoliztl. yn imicampazinco omito omoteneuh yn tlacatl notlatzin Don her{do} cortes ixtlilxochitzin, yhũa yn iattzin in notecuiyo Don Jo{do} quauhtliztactzin (ibid.: 216).

For truly what has been said and mentioned behind the back of the lord my uncle don Hernando Cortés Ixtlilxochitzin and his elder brother my lord don Juan Quauhtliztactzin, was an extraordinarily frightening thing and a great lie and a great harm, grief.144

I have not come across any situation in which -ach would be used in reference to a younger brother. Its connotation “elder brother” is confirmed by a sixteenth-century document, where the “elder brother,” Juan Miguel, refers to his sister with the term for a younger sibling: niman oquimitlhu y teatzin ma yuhquí mochihua [no]tecauhtzinne, or “Then her older brother said, ‘Very well, my younger sister’” (Lockhart 1991: 71).

According to Lockhart, the category of -ach encompassed both brothers and cousins (Lockhart 1992: 74). I have not found any explicit example of the latter usage, but in the first quotation above the term is extended to an affinal: a husband’s brother. As observed by Elena Díaz Rubio, -ach was also used to mark the relative age of children (Díaz Rubio 1986: 73), for example:

auh ac te in tonmocneliz, cujx te in titeacapan, cujx te in titeach, cujx tilaceoeoa, cujx noço tehoatl, in tixocoitol (Sahagún 2012 VI: 92).

And which one of you will profit? Thou who art the firstborn? Thou who art the oldest? Thou who art the second? Thou who art the youngest? (ibid.)

Remarkably, in this quotation it is used in the way, which suggests that -yacapan and -ach are not considered synonyms. In another place, however, a tlatoani says to his oldest son: auh tzonen titeach, tzonen tiacapantli, or “But in vain art thou the oldest, in vain art thou the firstborn” (ibid.: 89), equalling the two terms (see: 1.3.4. -yacapan).

144 Translation mine.
Diaz Rubio claims that the forms of address employed by the children of a “labrador” in regard to their father, listed in the “Memoriales con Escolios” – tachitze, tachietze, tachitzin – are based on -ach (Diaz Rubio 1986: 68). However, in that case they should not have an “i” as the final vowel of the stem: tachtzin instead of tachitzin. For this reason a more plausible option is that they are based on achi, or “a small amount,” similarly to the terms pitze, pitzetzine, pitzetze and pitzin employed by men from the same social class in regard to their mothers (Sahagún 2012 X: 2, n. 6). Pitze may look like a form based on -pi, “an elder sister of a woman,” but tepitze is a well attested tender form of address (see e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 184) derived from tepitzin, “a little.” Admittedly, if these forms were based on kinship terms, it would also fit the terminological scheme. Unfortunately, they do not come up in the sources, which makes the verification of either of the hypothesis impossible.

The connotations of -ach outside the kinship sphere are given in the dictionary of fray Alonso de Molina, who did not include this word as a kin term. Instead, he has “teach” or “teach,” glossed as “paje, criado, moço de casa, o corcobado” (Molina 1977 II: 91r). In the “Florentine Codex” the priest who brought the Huitzilopochtli’s -ixiptla, Painal, down from the pyramid during the feast Xocotl Huetzi, was called ita, anoço iach, or “his father or his elder brother” (see: 1.4.4. Other relations with “fathers”). This titulature may be reminiscent of a conceptual equivalence between the two terms in more ancient times. The priest performed a role of a helper, an -ixiptla’s “servant,” which is in accordance with the gloss of Molina, but at the same time is not that distant from the role of priests called “fathers” of deities (see: 1.4.1. Advisers). In the Song of Tlaloc recorded in the “Primeros Memoriales” the concepts of “father,” “elder brother” and “sacrifice” are likewise intertwined: Ava nach a tozcuecuexi / niyayalizqui aya / ychocaya, or “My older brother is Tozcuecuexi. / I shall go. / It is his time to weep” (Sahagún 1997b: 134). Tozcuecuexi gave his daughter to be sacrificed to the lords of Tlalocan so that they would send rain (Sullivan, Knab 2003: 172). Perhaps these verses are sung by the sacrificial victim, who refers to her father as the one who leads her to death.

Finally, other passages from the Sahaguntine texts confirm that the “elder brothers” of an -ixiptla, that is, of a deity himself, were those who accompanied him (served him?) right before the sacrifice. During the feast of Toxcatl, the -ixiptla of Titlacahuan was accompanied by “yn iachoan chicueintin,” or “his eight elder brothers” – Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O.
The elder brothers of Uitzilopochtli, those who had fasted a year, were very much looked upon with extreme fear; they were looked upon with terror; there was complete dread; they were completely to be dreaded (ibid.: 53-54).

4.4. -ACHCAUH AND -TEACHCAUH

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses the term -achcauh, similarly to many other kin terms, under the standardized form with the indefinite personal possessive prefix te-: “teachcauh. hermano mayor, o cosa mayor mas excelente y auentajada” (Molina 1977 II: 91r). He also gives the variant “tiachcauh. hermano mayor, y persona, ocosa auentajada, mayor y mas excelente que otras” (ibid.: 112v). Apparently, the two forms have the same meaning. According to Brant Gardner, the latter owes to variable ortographic depictions of a phoneme /e/ which is rendered e or i in classical ortography (Gardner 1982: 93).

The absolutive form achcauhtli is absent from the dictionary of Molina, but present in the work of Rémi Siméon, who derives it from the adjective achto, or “first,” and the verb cahua, or “to remain, survive” (when reflexive) (after: Rammow 1964: 122, n. 151). Obviously, this etymology is wrong. The absolutive form achcauhtli is based on the reanalysis of the possessive form -achcauh (Lockhart 1992: 496, n. 63). The possessive suffix -cauh indicates that the original absolutive form was an agentive ending in -ni or -qui (Lockhart 2001: 54). The agentive, in turn, should have been based on a verb with the root ach- but the dictionary of Molina does not contain any plausible option. The suggestion of Siméon that -achcauh is etymologically related to “being first” is logical, though Frances Karttunen observes that there is a vowel-length discrepancy between the kin term and achto (Karttunen 1992a: 2).
The term -achcauh appears very rarely in the actual kinship context. Helga Rammow cites four attestations, two from the work of Chimalpahin and one from the “Leyenda de los Soles.” In all four cases the reference point is male (Rammow 1964: 123, 125). In a 1558 document from Tlatelolco -achcauh likewise describes a brother of a man:

\[
\text{auh yn iquac omic ý Juā de Sanctiago. nimā ymac ocócauhtevac yn axcā pablo vitznavatl. ya matlacxiuhtica y quiypiya. yquac yn omic yn iachcauh} \quad (AGN, Tierras, v. 17, parte 2a, exp. 4, f. 13v).
\]

And when Juan de Santiago died, he then left it on dying in the hands of today’s Pablo Huitznahuatl. He has kept it since ten years ago, when his elder brother died.\(^{145}\)

Outside the kinship sphere, on the other hand, the attestations of -achcauh are abundant. First of all, the term sometimes forms a doublet with -iccauh, for example: amo çan mjccauh, amo çan machcauh: yn jiollo, amo çan no iuhqujn moiollo, or “is not the heart of thy younger brother, of thy older brother the same as thy heart?” (Sahagün 2012 VI: 73) These words form part of an admonition addressed to a drunkard: the doublet points to the fact that he is essentially the same as a respected warrior, he has all the potential, why, therefore, is he going downhill? Another quotation from Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” suggests that the sameness of “brothers” arises from their social position. In a speech to a newly installed tlatoani the term macehualli describes commoners, while -iccauh -achcauh seems to refer to noblemen:

\[
\text{Maço iehoa, momjtzmavilti in maceoalli: auh maço mjtztlacaavilo in mjccauh, in machcau: yn axcan ca otiteut} \quad \text{(ibid.: 52)}
\]

Although the common folk have gladdened thee, and although thy younger brother, thy older brother have put their trust in thee, now thou art deified (ibid). Arguably, -iccauh and -achcauh are employed in a doublet because they are complementary – they describe the two poles of the same relationship.

\(^{145}\) Transcription and translation mine.
Book 12 of the “Florentine Codex” includes the only example of the vocative based on -achcauh that I have been able to find. The tlatoani of Cuitlahuac, Mayehuatzin, asks one of the principal Mexica war leaders named Coyohuehuetzin to inform his vassals that he had not been killed:

_Auh in Maiehoatzin in oqujma in ca qualanj, in jmaceoalhoan: injc qujitaqualanjlia: njmã qujlhuj in Coiovevetzin. Nachcauhtzine_ (Sahagún 2012 XII: 110),

But Mayehuatzin, when he knew that his vassals were angry, was therefore angry at them. Then he said to Coyooueuetzin: O my elder brother! ... (ibid).

The scene takes place during the siege of Tenochtitlan and Mayehuatzin and Coyohuehuetzin are “brothers in arms.” The text does not employ an -iccauh-based vocative that served as a conventional form of address among noblemen (see: 4.2. -iccauh and -teiccauh). Possibly, the term for an elder brother points to the superiority of the Mexica over Cuitlahuac, but there is no comparative material, which would allow testing this hypothesis.

The most common form of -achcauh used outside the kinship sphere is teachcauh or tiachcauh. The indefinite personal possessive prefix te- often transforms kin terms into titles or status indicators and the case of -achcauh is no exception. Molina includes this term in several entries which have to do with authority or leadership. “Acalco teachcauh” or “acalco tiachcauh” is “patron de nao” (Molina 1977 II: 1r); “intiachcauh inamatlacuiloque” or “tlacuiloca teachcauh” – “escriuano mayor” (ibid.: 39r, 120r); “yaotcauh” – “capitan de soldados” (ibid.: 31r); “acallachixa teachcauh” or “acallachiani ynteachcauh” is “piloto principal” (ibid.: 1v), the prefix _yn_ in the latter being in fact a separate particle, since _acallachiani_, or a pilot, is put in singular. He likewise has the verb “teachcauhuia. nitla. (pret. onitlateachcauhui.) ser mejorado en manda de testamento o enlo que se reparte amuchos” (ibid.: 91r). Frances Karttunen indicates that _te/iachcauh_ contrasts with _tiacauh_, or someone brave, valiant, “although they are probably cognates” (Karttune 1992: 240). I exclude _tiacauh_ from the present analysis, noting, however, that it does appear in contexts similar to those of _te/iachcauh_, for example the third gloss for “patron” o “capitán de nao” in Molina’s dictionary is “acalco tiacauh” (Molina 1977 II: 1r).
"Te/iachcauh" appears in a number of contexts, which I will briefly summarize now. Sometimes, when used, for instance, in comparisons, it seems to convey a more general sense of “someone of distinction,” for example:

\[\text{noviian mochamauhtiuh, tlachamauhtiuh, tachcauh icatiuh, tlaiacatitiuh, panj icatiuh, conqujxtilitiuh yn jmijiliz} \text{ (Sahagún 2012 IV: 9),} \]

Everywhere he goes along boasting, bragging, he goes as a leader, he goes leading, as the one on the top, he goes along making headway in his life.\(^{146}\)

Most frequently, however, it is paired with titles associated with educational institutions or temple service and warriors, such as: \text{telpochtlato, telpochtequihua, yaotequihua, tequihua} and once with a doublet \text{huehuei quaquauntin huehuei ocelome}, or “valiant warriors” (see below). \text{Telpochtlatoque} means literally “those who speak to the youths,” or, by extension, “the rulers of youths.” Fray Bernardino de Sahagún ascribes this title to the leaders of \text{telpochcalli} and \text{cuicacalli} and fray Diego Durán (1880: 113) employs it for leaders of priests who provided the temple of Tezcatlipoca with ritual firewood. Perhaps it was generally associated with presiding over young men, since in the “Codex Mendoza” it is glossed “masters who govern youths” (Berdan, Anawalt 1997: 176, n. 29). The way \text{telpochtlato} is juxtaposed with \text{te/iachcauh} suggests that the terms were considered either synonymous or complementary and together formed a doublet:

\[\text{Cujcacalli, vncan catca in tiachcahoan, in telpuchtlatoque vncan tlatepanoaia injc qujehiaia tlein tequjtl} \text{ (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 43),} \]

In cuicacalli were the masters of the youths, the rulers of the youths. From there they were going to the palace to wait for what the duties were [= for the assignment of work].\(^{147}\)

\[\text{Achtopa iehoantin calaqui in telpuchtlatoque, in tiachcacaoan: (ibid. VI: 129)} \]

First the rulers of the youths, the masters of the youths entered (ibid).

\(^{146}\) Translation mine.

\(^{147}\) Translation mine.
The second of the terms listed above, *telpochtuequihua*, seems to be very similar if not identical to *telpochtlatoto*. Instead of the component *tlatoani* it contains the word *tequihua*, or “a military leader.” *Telpochtuequihuaque* also tends to form doublets with *te/iachcahuan*, but the second example below shows that the two terms were considered rather complementary than synonymous; they are separated in the text by the conjunction *ihuan*:

mjtotiaia in telpuchtequjoaque, teachcaoa, in nauj cacitinemj, yn anoce oc quezqujnti ymalhoan: (Sahagún 2012 II: 54)

There danced the rulers of the youths, the leaders of the youths, who had gone to take four or more captives (ibid).

auh yn qujnnamictia, yn inmatitech qujmantiuj, çan iehoantin in mauiztililonj in teachcaoaan, yoan in telpochtuequjoaque, yoan in quaquachicti, yn otomj, yoan in pipilti: (Sahagún 2012 II: 98)

And they went joining with, went taking by the hands those worthy of honor, the masters of the youths, and the young seasoned warriors, and the shorn ones, the Otomi, and the noblemen (ibid).

Alfredo López Austin observes that the Spanish column of the “Florentine Codex” uses the term *tiachcauhatlatoque* – yet another combination associated with the *telpochcalli* – as a counterpart of *telpochtuequihuaque* in the Nahuatl column (López Austin 1985: 9). *Tiachcauh tlatoque* likewise appears in the Nahuatl text of Book 8 (Sahagún 2012 VIII: 61) in the context similar to that of another compound term: “tiiauchcauh tlaiacatique” (ibid.: 62), or “the firsts among the masters of youths/ distinguished warriors.”

Apart from the phrases built on the basis of *te/iachcauh*, one can also come upon compound nouns whose presence confirms that the term became conventionalized as an indicator of rank. In the “Florentine Codex,” the most common one is *yaotiachcauh*, apparently detached from the context of the internal organization of *telpochcalli* or *cuicacalli* by means of the component *yao-*, or “war.” It is paired with terms clearly indicating its association with military leaders:
As for those whom we had called the war leaders, the captains of soldiers, they were coming out of the place where Moteucçoma was shearing or shaving as Otomi those who were warriors.\textsuperscript{148}

\textit{aoc momocactia inic calaqui tecpan tlachtoca in ompa cate uehuey quaquauhti, uehuey ocelome i yaotachcaua} (ibid).

he was no longer shod when he entered the royal palace, where were the great men dexterous in arms, the war leaders (ibid).

\textit{Yaotequihuaque} mentioned in the first quotation were war leaders who distinguished themselves by seizing six or more “cuextecas” or “tenime,” that is, barbarous enemies from the Gulf Coast. López Austin considers this term synonymous with \textit{yaotiachcahuan} (López Austin 1985: 266). However, it is also possible that \textit{yaotiachcahuan} conveyed a more general sense, since in Book 12 it is used in reference to Cortés and his Spanish captains. In the latter case Sahagún’s informants defined the term as “the governors of soldiers”:

\textit{Auh ie vncan in vitzilla ontenamjc Motecucomatzin, njman ie ic contlamamaca in iautachcauh, in intepachocauh iauqujzque} (Sahagún 2012 XII: 44),

Moteucçomatzin went to arrange the meeting as far as Huitzillan. He right away went to give gifts to the captain of soldiers, the commander of soldiers.\textsuperscript{149}

\textit{njman ie ic qujtlecavia in tlapanco ixpan conquetzato in Capitan in iautachcauh} (ibid.: 121).

Thereupon they took him up to the roof terrace; they went to stand him before the Captain, the war commander (ibid).

\textsuperscript{148} Translation mine.

\textsuperscript{149} Translation mine.
Another interesting term based on *te/iachcauh* is “ichpuchtiachcauh,” employed in the “Florentine Codex” in the context of *telpochcalli*:


And if the baby girl belonged to the *telpochcalli*, she was left in the hands of, she was entrusted to the one called the leader of the girls (ibid).

The “Codex Mendoza” has the image of a person labeled “teachcauh” (described also with the term *telpochtlato*) that presents this title as a well-defined rank, identified by means of a distinctive body paint, hairstyle and garment (Berdan, Anawalt 1997: 149-150). There is no doubt that the contexts of *telpochcalli* and military hierarchy count among the most common ones for this title. However, the brief summary of its attestations shows that it had a more general meaning, associated with authority and leadership. This meaning correlates with the obligations of an elder brother listed in the “Florentine Codex” (Sahagún 2012 X: 9; see below). The question arises, why a collateral kin (a brother) became involved in the metaphorical reference to power, if the terminological system had already charged the parents-children dyad with the meaning “leaders-subjects.” The simplest answer is that lineal and collateral terms provided different basis for a metaphorical extension and, consequently, described different relations of power. The doublet *in-nan in -ta* is very often employed in reference to *tlatoque* who are considered the “parents” of their vassals. This relation involves two different conceptual classes (*tlatoque* and *macehualtin*) and the transmission of vital essence between them. At the same time the relationship between “brothers” remains within the boundaries of a single class and no kind of transmission is indicated in the sources. *Achcauh* is not so much a ruler, as he is a superior, the one distinguished from among his fellows.

Such a reading of *-achcauh* can be tested on the examples from the precontact religious sphere. In the “Crónica Mexicayotl” and the “Florentine Codex” the term is employed in reference to deities, Huitzilopochtli and Izquitecatl respectively.
Right there Huitzilopochtli assembled, arranged, and counted all the devils. For he was the leader, the chief [lit. the elder brother, J.M.], of the devils (ibid.: 81).

In this passage Huitzilopochtli is said to be “the elder brother” of all the deities. Although the author of the source pairs this designation with the noun teyacanqui, or “leader,” Huitzilopochtli is not referred to as the “parent” of the gods. This is due to the fact that he is considered the most important among them rather than their creator. In the “Florentine Codex” Izquitecatl, an octlí god, is referred to as in imachcauh totochtin (Sahagún 2012 IV: 17), or “the elder brother of rabbits.” Since centzontotochtin, or “400 rabbits,” was a metaphor used for octlí, the phrase can also be understood as “the elder brother of wine” or “the elder brother of wine deities.” Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O. Anderson translate the phrase “the principal wine god,” which is in accordance with the interpretation of -achcauh proposed here.

Following this lead, the title te/iachcauh was at first probably designed to connote something as “a distinguished one” with the general sense. An example from the “Florentine Codex” cited above confirms that it was still used with this meaning at the time of contact. However, a really tight connection was established between this term and “schools,” as well as military hierarchy. López Austin defines the “elder brothers” in educational institutions as los estudiantes que se distinguían en el telpochcalli o en el cuicacalli, y que adquirían mando y jurisdicción sobre sus compañeros (López Austin 2000: 234).

Although they stood out from their fellows, they still remained telpopochtin, similarly to telpochtequihuaque or yaotequihuaque, who were distinguished from among warriors thanks to their achievements, but, nevertheless, they still remained warriors. This usage of the term -achcauh arose not only from the relative age of siblings in the Nahua classification system, but, arguably, also from the social role of the eldest brother. According to Susan Kellogg, in the early colonial period he tended to act as the guardian of the property inherited by the group of siblings (Kellogg 1995: 93). Leaning on the connotation of -iccauh identified above
(4.2. -iccauh and -teiccauh), the authority of -achcauh, in both kinship and other spheres, may have consisted of taking the responsibility for his “younger siblings.”

The form te/iachcauh became a stem itself, to which yet another possessive prefix was added, for example noteachcauh (lit. “my one’s elder brother”) (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 24, n. 4). Because of the double possession, this term, similarly to -teiccauh, does not have an absolutive form (Rammow 1964: 124; Lockhart 1992: 496, n. 63). A passage from the “Florentine Codex” puts all the kin terms based on the root -ach (-ach, -achcauh, -te/iachcauh) together:

TETIACHCAUH, teachcauh, teteachcauh, teach, tecemitquini, tecenuilanani, tecēmamani, teixtlamachtiani, tetetzaoani (Sahagún 2012 X: 9).

OLDER BROTHER. One’s older brother [is] a carrier, a taker, a bearer of all the burdens [of his father’s household]; one who counsels [his younger brothers] who prepares them for the work of men (ibid).

From this quotation, Rammow concludes that one could have chosen from among these terms arbitrarily and she finds textual evidence for employing both -achcauh and -te/iachcauh for the same relation (Rammow 1964: 125). Likewise, Gardner understands all these kin terms to be variants of one term (Gardner 1982: 92).

Rammow quotes Pedro de Cárceres, who states:

y algunas vezes vsan de los nombres “noteachcauh” etc. ... en lugar de “vecapa noteachcauh” por lo cual sera bueno tornar a preguntar, si es su hermano o primo hermano (after: Rammow 1964: 138).

On the basis of textual evidence, James Lockhart confirms that the term -te/iachcauh refers to an older brother or cousin of a male (Lockhart 1992: 74). Although fray Manuel Pérez seems to suggest that it was also used with a female reference point (Pérez 1713: 75; Rammow 1964: 125, n. 156), in my database there is not a single occurrence that would confirm it. In most cases it is impossible to know whether a brother or a cousin of an individual was meant by the writer. However, in the letter of Juan de San Antonio the term is employed twice with a clear reference to a cousin. The relation in question involves don Juan de San Antonio and
don Hernando Pimentel. They were both grandsons of Nezahualpilli but born of different fathers: the former of don Juan Quauhtliztacztzin and the latter of don Antonio Pimentel Tlahuitoltzin. Juan de San Antonio speaks of don Hernando in the following way:

ca xpiano in tlacatl niccauhtzin, yhuã ca uel quimomachtia yn huel nitiachcauh ynic çaz ce tocoltzin ynic çaz ce tocitzin (San Antonio 1997: 232),

The lord my younger cousin is a Christian and he knows well that I am truly his elder cousin in the manner that our grandparents are the same. 150

Gardner observes that -te/iachcauh appears mostly in the actual kinship context, while -ach and -achcauh are often found in reference to the social sphere. From this he concludes that dual possession may be an optional means of distinguishing between the social and biological spheres of reference (Gardner 1982: 92-93),

but he remains uncertain as far as his hypothesis is concerned. I am not upholding it, because the textual material clearly shows that both -achcauh and -te/iachcauh were employed in each of the spheres. Gardner himself notes that the latter, similarly to the former, comes up in the context of the telpochcalli and calmecac hierarchy (Gardner 1982: 115). During the feast of Huei Tecuilhuitl a woman who committed a sexual transgression was punished and expelled from a cuicacalli by cihuatetiachcauhan:

Auh in cioatl çan qujtotoca, in cioatetiachcaoan: aoqujc no teoã cujcoianoz, aoqujc no tenaoaz (Sahagún 2012 II: 103),

And the mistress of the women just expelled the [erring] woman. Nevermore was she to sing and dance with the others; nevermore was she to hold others by the hand (ibid).

As noted by Kellogg, the text also employs the term ichpochtlayacanqui for the group of “principal women” and the two resemble the pair te/iachcauhan and telpchtlatoque, discussed above (Kellogg 1995: 98). In the same book, the forms -achcauh and -te/iachcauh

150 Translation mine.
are paired with each other: *Auh no naujntin, teachcaoan, tetiachcaoan, çan ie yujn moxima*, or “And also there were four constables, masters of youths. They cut their hair similarly” (Sahagún 2012 II: 69).

The “Crónica Mexicayotl” employs the title *tetiachcauh* in the political rather than educational sphere. The *tlatoani* of a migrating group is suggested to be the principal god-carrier and referred to with the term “the elder brother”:

* Auh in yehuantin teomamaque quinotzque in yehuatl in tetiachcauh in quinyacana. yn intlatocauh azteca mexitin yn itoca catca chalchiuhtlatonac* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 74).

And the god-carriers summoned the elder brother who led them, the ruler of the Azteca Mexitin, whose name was Chalchiuhtlatonac (ibid.: 75).

The connotation “the principal one among those of the same class” was likewise made use of by Chimalpahin to describe a Christian concept. The annalist pairs the Nahuatl kin term with the Spanish “hermano mayor” and uses the doublet in reference to the superior of a religious order:


twelve of them took vows and made profession to their most senior member, the eldest brother, at a mass early in the morning in the presence of the viceroy and all the judges of the Royal Audiencia (ibid.: 233).

Finally, in the “Bancroft Dialogues,” a nobleman addressing another nobleman who has just finished his speech, refers to the authorities of the *altepetl* (among whom he also is counted) as *timotiachcahuan*, or “we, your elder brothers” (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 116). Karttunen and Lockhart explain it as an extension based on the fact that the town council was often referred to as *huehuetque*, or “the elders” (ibid.: 47). Nevertheless, this suggestion does not explain why the elders are called the nobleman’s brothers and not, for instance, parents or with any other kin term. A more plausible explanation would be that the term is meant to
stressed that both speakers belong to the same social class, though the "elder brothers" – the
town authorities – occupy a more distinguished position than their "fellow."

Rammow observes that -te/iachcauh is also to be found in the vocative form,
notiachcauhtze, used almost exclusively outside the kinship sphere (Rammow 1964: 125-
126). She gives an example from the "Analess de Cuauhtitlan," a passage which describes how
Nezahualcoyotl and Tzontecochatzin were saved by a nobleman named Coyohua in
cooperation with the sons of the Mexica tlatoani-to-be Itzcoatzin. Coyohua notices a boat
with the rescuers sent by Itzcoatzin:

\[niman\ ye\ quimontzatzilia\ quimihuia\ niccahuane\ cuix\ amehuan\ niman\ ye\ icquin\ hualnotza\ quihualihuique\ ca\ tehuantin\ notiachcauhtze\ (Annales... 1992: \textit{f. 36}).\]

Then he shouted to them, he said to them: my younger brothers, is it you? Then they
thus called to him, they said to him: it is us, my elder brother.\textsuperscript{151}

Arguably, in this case the vocative form of -te/iachcauh is applied to Coyohua as the principal
member of the rescue team. One should also note that it remains in conformity with other
known vocatives based on kin terms, displaying a singular possessive prefix, even though the
reference point is plural. -Te/iachcauh and -teiccauh are likewise employed as forms of
address in "La comedia de los Reyes," where the three kings address each other with the
terms "notlazotiachcauhtzine" (Horcasitas et al. 2004: 343, 354), or "o my precious elder
brother!" and "notlazotiachcauhtzitzihuane" (Horcasitas et al. 2004: 341, 342, 343, etc.), or "o
my precious elder brothers!" The only one to use a -teiccauh-based vocative is Gaspar who
once addresses Melchor and Baltasar "notlazoteicauhtzitzihuane," or "o my precious younger
brothers" and Melchor answers him "titotiaicauhtzinx," or "you are our elder brother" (ibid.:
354). Since Gaspar is always mentioned first when the names of the three kings are listed,
Agustín de la Fuente, the supposed Nahua author of the play (Horcasitas et al. 2004: 328),
could have easily concluded that he was the principal one.

It seems, however, that in some cases the rendering of -te/iachcauh as "first among
equals" is not relevant. In Book 6 of the "Florentine Codex" the term is used for a youth

\textsuperscript{151} Translation mine.
raised in the *telpochcalli*. The family elders who decide to find a wife for their young relative, organize a meeting with “tiachcaoa, in telpuchtlatoque:”

Niman ie ic ontlatoa in vetetque: qujtoa. Ca njcan amonoltitoque in antopilhoan in antelpupuchtin, in antequi, in antlacoti: amechmotlapololtiliz yn amotiachcauh, ca oncalaguj’nequj in xomolco (Sahagún 2012 VI: 128)

Then the old men spoke, they said: “You are present here, you who are our children [= you to whom we direct our words], you who are young men, you who have paid the tribute, you who have worked like slaves [= you who have fulfilled your duty]. Your elder brother will cause you to become distracted, for he wants to withdraw.”

The youth is called here “the elder brother” of the leaders of the *telpochcalli* but nothing else suggests that he is a “leader” of all the establishment. I would rather say that *amotiachcauh* is to be interpreted here as “one of the principal *telpopochtin* in your school.” Another observation that has to be made is the lack, in the context of schools, of the corresponding term -teiccauh. It points to the possibility that at some point the title *te/iachcauh* began to live its own life, quite independently of the kin term, and its possessed form began to describe any member of the *telpochcalli* or *calmecac*. The same connotation is suggested in texts for the corresponding term -pi, or “an elder sister of a woman,” as employed in the context of schools (see: 4.7. -pi).

Further evidence in support of this hypothesis is provided by Cristóbal del Castillo’s “Historia de la venida de los mexicanos.” In the text, the deities several times refer to the Mexica’s patron-god, Tetzauhteotl, as *toteachcauh*, or “our elder brother.” At the same time nothing suggests that he is their leader. On the contrary, the author of the source was rather unfriendly in regard to the Mexica, so there was no reason for which he would elevate their patron-deity to a ruling position. Moreover, other deities explicitly give commands to Tetzauhteotl:

152 Translation mine.
Auh yece ca ic oticnahuatique in toyaoteachcauh Tetzauhteotl inic timochintin totencopa omitzhualquixti in atenco anepantla Aztlan metztli iapan Chicomoztoc (Castillo 2001: 118).

Still, we commanded our war leader Tetzauhteotl to take you, by order of us all, out of the edge of the waters, of the middle of the sea, of Aztlan, the moon, in the water of Chicomoztoc.\textsuperscript{153}

The variant of toteachcauh employed here is toyaoteachcauh. It suggests that speaking of Tetzauhteotl, the author was thinking rather of the status designator employed in the military and educational spheres than of the kin term in which it originated. Perhaps, instead of “our war leader” it should be translated as “our fellow distinguished warrior” in order to avoid the misleading implication that Tetzauhteotl was “leading” the other deities.

From the definition of an elder brother contained in the “Florentine Codex,” as well as from the association of -te/iachcauh with the telpochcalli, Gardner concludes that this term had, in the social sphere, the connotation of “teacher” (Gardner 1982: 115). The examples gathered here show, however, that it exceeded the context of educational institutions and entered other spheres as well. Gardner’s main concern seems to be the difference in usage between -achcauh and -te/iachcauh. In my opinion, the former is more archaic: it is employed in the context of precontact religion and displays the conventionalized form te/iachcauh, associated with schools and military. Arguably, this association became so pervasive, that the term gradually ceded from the kinship sphere, making place for the double possessed form -te/iachcauh. The latter appears in more differentiated contexts than -achcauh and it is also used for the concepts characteristic of colonial times, while -achcauh is not. The latest attestation of the single possessed term in my database comes from the early seventeenth-century “Crónica Mexicayotl.” Its double possessed relative continues up to the eighteenth century (e.g.: Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 118).

The term -ach underwent a similar process. Differences in usage between -ach and -te/iachcauh can be observed in Juan de San Antonio’s letter, where both terms are employed extensively. The former appears mainly in the first part of the letter, where the author presents

\textsuperscript{153} Translation mine.
evidence for his rights to the claimed property, as well as at the very end, where he describes his deplorable fate. The latter, on the other hand, is to be found in the middle part of the text, which relates the steps Juan undertook to recover his land. As multiple corrections prove, this section was submitted to a thorough revision, probably done by Franciscan friars (see: 1.4.3. Teta and tota in religious contexts). It may suggest that for some reason the friars promoted the usage of \( -\text{te} / \text{iachcauh} \); perhaps they considered it more “correct” than the “obsolete” \( -\text{ach} \) and \( -\text{achcauh} \). In my database, the latest attestation of \( -\text{ach} \) comes from 1583.

4.5. -HUELTIUH

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses the term \(-\text{hueltiuh}\) as “ueltiuhtli. hermana mayor” (Molina 1977 II: 157r) and “tueltiuh. hermana mayor” (ibid.: 11v). Since the absolutive form of this term includes the possessive suffix \( (\text{hueltiuhtli}) \), the possessed form had to be the original one (Lockhart 1992: 496, n. 63). It may be based on the same root as \( \text{huel} \), “well, able, possible, more, very.” However, there is a vowel length discrepancy: the \( e \) in \( \text{hueltiuh} \) is long, while in \( \text{huel} \) – short (Karttunen 1992a: 86-87).

In the sources \(-\text{hueltiuh}\) refers only to women and appears only with the male reference point. In most cases it is difficult to establish whether one’s sister described with this term is indeed older than her brother. Helga Rammow observes that there is no well defined term for a younger sister of a man in the Nahuatl terminological system (Rammow 1964: 128). Indeed, the terms \(-\text{iccauh}\) and \(-\text{teiccauh}\) very rarely, if not sporadically, appear in reference to women. Likewise, the Spanish grammarians tend to translate \(-\text{hueltiuh}\) by simple “hermana,” although this may be viewed as an intention to adjust the Nahuatl term to the Spanish classification system. Fray Horacio Carochi renders “y tictlanochilia in mohueltiuh” as “eres alcahuete de tu hermana” (Carochi 2001: 242). Pedro de Arenas has “hermana” for \( \text{tehueltiuh} \), but he generally ignores relative age indicators (Arenas 1793: 49). This pattern is followed even by Molina, contrary to what he states in his “Diccionario”:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ynaco ytlacatcapo, aco yhuanyolqui: cenca vel quintlatemolizque, ytechpa ynitlacamecayo, ynic ayac quimmonamicitz centlamampan, anoço ontlamampan yueltiuh,}
\end{align*}\]
Si son (por ventura) entre si deudos, o parientes, examinandolos bien acerca del parentesco que se han, porque nadie se case con su hermana, en primero o segundo grado (Molina 1563: 46r).

It has to be stressed, however, that I have not been able to find any clear example of naming a younger sister of a man with the term *-hueltiuh*.

The modifiers *centlamampan* and *ontlamampan* used in the above passage together with *-hueltiuh* indicate that the term was also extended to (elder?) female cousins. As observed by Pedro Carrasco, *centlamampan* *-hueltiuh* was sometimes employed in reference to a cousin (instead of a sister), which reflected a broader tendency concerning this modifier (Carrasco 1966: 159). Juan de San Antonio uses *-hueltiuh* in reference to his uncle’s daughters:

\[
\text{yn cõmomaquili yn cõmotlauhtili milli axalpan yn axcan quichiu nohueltiux yn ipilhuã notlatzin Don p{o} tetlaueuetzquititzin (San Antonio 1997: 208),}
\]

[they] gave and presented my elder sisters, children of my uncle don Pedro Tetlahuehuetzquititzin, cultivated property at Axalpan, which they now work (ibid.: 209).

In his letter, he also includes a further extension of *-hueltiuh* which he employs in reference to an affinal kin – the wife of an elder brother:

\[
\text{no ixpã yn toueltiuh yn inamic totiachcauh tlatohuani Don p{o} tetlaueuetzquititzin yn iahui tomach Ju{o} de santo antonio (San Antonio 1997: 224)}
\]

also in the presence of our elder sister, the wife of our elder brother the ruler don Pedro Tetlahuehuetzquititzin and aunt of our nephew Juan de San Antonio (ibid.: 225).

Arguably, the semantic field of *-hueltiuh* covered all consanguineal and affinal female kin of a male, who belonged to his generation. As many terms for siblings, it is also extended to G+3 as the female counterpart of *achtontli*, i.e. great-grandmother, although it is the only term in this set, which does not modify its root by means of the diminutive suffix *-ton* (Sahagún 2012 X: 5; see: 5. Distant consanguineals).
There are examples, where -hueltiuh is paired with -teiccauh and the two terms seem to be used without the implication of age relative to ego:

\[ ahu \text{ in toteycahuan y } tohueltihuan \text{ ca } ye \text{ yexihuitl } yn \text{ ao } c \text{ ile } \text{ maco} \] (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 190)

But for three years nothing has been given to our younger brothers and elder sisters (ibid.: 191).

\[ auh \text{ in vecapa } \text{ in moteiccaoan, in moveltioan xiqujmonjitta} \] (Sahagún 2012 VI: 107),

And look at thy male cousins, thy female cousins (ibid).

The latter translation of the doublet, made by Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O. Anderson, seems more appropriate. They explain that originally the Nahuatl text lacked the modifier huecapan. After it had been inserted, the Spanish version in “Historia general” was changed from “Y mira a tus hermanos menores, y a tus hermanas” to “Y mira a tus primos menores, y a tus primas” (ibid.: 107, n. 10). From a few attestations of this doublet a conclusion can be drawn that it described a group of relatives who depended on ego – arguably, for the most part – economically. The hypothesis is supported by the fact that -teiccauh had a connotation of someone for whom one is responsible (see: 4.2. -iccauh and -teiccauh). However, I have also found a variant where -teiccauh is replaced by -teachcauh:

\[ ca \text{ ticmati } \text{ yn } \text{ neçahualpiltzintli } \text{ yn } \text{ iuh } \text{ quintlaçotlaya } \text{ yn } \text{ iteachcahuan } \text{ yn } \text{ ihueltihuan yeica } \text{ ca } \text{ ymaxca } \text{ in quinpialia } \text{ ca } \text{ yxiptla } \text{ in intatzin} \] (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 190)

We know that Neçahualpiltzintli loved his elder brothers and sisters, because he guarded their property for them; he was the representative of their father (ibid.: 191).

Perhaps -teachcauh is a mistake here – the scarcity of material does not allow for a verification.

Susan Schroeder analyzes the story of a personage named in Chimalpahin’s “Cuarta Relación” inhueltiuhih Tequapan tlaca, or “the elder sister of the people of Tequapan.” This woman was a daughter of the leader of the group. When the Tequapan tlaca had arrived to
Amaquemecan, one of the local *tlatoque* had taken her as his concubine and she had born a son who later became the ruler of Tequanipan. The group obtained permission to settle and formed the third sub-division of Amaquemecan. Schroeder concludes that the elder sister of the people of Tequanipan seems to serve as some sort of inducement to prompt the local tlatoque to recognize the newcomers and then perhaps grant them permission to settle in Amecameca (Schroeder 1992: 81).

Arguably, Schroeder’s interpretation may also help in explaining a passage from the “Bancroft Dialogues” where the *tlatoani* of Texcoco who asks the ruling couple of Tenochtltlan for a bride, says:

*Auh ma niman noconcaqui in imiyyotzin in intlatoltzin iniquin onhuiloaz in conmanilitthui in tlacatl izcihuapilli tohueltihuatzin inic conmopachihuiquihu in iatzin in itepetzin* (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 120),

Let me quickly hear word from them how a party will come to bring the lady our elder sister to come to govern her city (ibid.: 121).

Apparently, the bride is called with the metaphor “the elder sister of the people of Texcoco.” She serves as a medium, through which a bond with Tenochtltlan is strengthened. Only the marriage with a Tenochca princess (of the house Atzacoalco) could produce legitimate successors to the throne in Texcoco (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). Texcoco, equally to Tequanipan, is a weaker party in this relationship; they are those who, potentially, need contact to be established. Arguably, this is why the princess is called their (rather than Tenochca’s) elder sister: it is the Texcoca whom she will actually serve.

Another interesting example of this kind is to be found in the “Anales de Cuauhtltlan.”

During the war with the Tepaneca, the Texcocan *tlatoani* Nezahualcoyotl is planning to defeat a town called Toltltlan. He is heading there together with his Huexotzinca, Tlaxcalteca and Chalca allies. They have a spy in Toltltlan – a daughter of the *tlatoani* of Cuauhtltlan married to the *tlatoani* of Toltltlan. She sends them regular reports and, once in

---

154 I thank Jerry Offner for drawing my attention to this occurrence of *hueltiuah.*
battle, sets fire to the temple of the altepetl’s patron deity. Unaware of her cooperation with
the alliance, the Chalca seize her. Seeking to save herself from other captives’ fate, she
reveals her identity to the ruler of Huexotzinco:

totecuyo canehuatl ca nimohueltihuatzin, ca notatzin in tlacatl in tlatohuani
Tecocohuatzin Quauhtitlan nican nech hualmocahuilli otonehuac ochichinacac in iyollo ininacayo eta (Annales... 1992: f 46).

Our lord, it is I, I am your elder sister, for my father is the lord ruler Tecocohuatzin of
Cuauhtitlan. He sent me here, his heart, his body, suffered pain, hurt, etc.155

Again, the elder sister is a woman sent to a place with which she then helps to establish
contact. Obviously, this contact does not necessarily lead to friendly relations of the two
groups. What seems to determine the use of -hueltiuh is the fact of delegating a mediator who
connects two “worlds” for the benefit of her “brother.”

Brant Gardner examined the usage of -hueltiuh in the incantations included in the
Hernando Ruiz de Alarcón’s “Tratado de las supersticiones.” He concludes that it was based
on the organization of the kinship system: the goddesses named “elder sisters” are, according
to him, labeled by Alarcón as “diosas menores.”156 Therefore, he seems to suggest (although
he does not say it expressis verbis) that major goddesses would have been named “mothers”
of the officiator (Gardner 1982: 108-109). What he ignores is that in the “Tratado” the term -
hueltiuh is employed in reference not only to deities but to humans and other beings as well.
When casting a spell that brings sleep, the officiator uses the form nohueltiuh, or “my elder
sister,” to designate a woman whom he is hypnotizing (Ruiz de Alarcón 1984: 77). In the
incantation recited during lime-making, the lime is called nohueltiuh (ibid.: 87). The one who
departs in search of wild bees refers to his sandals as nohueltiuh (ibid.: 92) and to his wife
whose beauty is to attract the bees as nohueltiuh Xochiquetzal (ibid.: 93). The one who is to
hunt deer uses the term nohueltiuh in reference to a female deer, to a rope and to his hand
(ibid.: 95, 101). In the spell intended to protect a field against coatis, the magic earth with
which a magic barrier is to be constructed is called nohueltiuh (ibid.: 109). The examples

155 Translation mine.
156 In fact, in the passage in question the neighboring terms nohueltiuh and antlaçoteteo, or you, the beloved
goddesses, most probably refer to different categories (Ruiz de Alarcón 1984: 336, n. 45).
could further be multiplied, but from the ones listed here it can already be seen that the officiator uses the term “my elder sister” in reference to people or things, over whom he wants to exert influence. Interestingly, only the term for a sister could have acquired such a connotation: there is no example of a term for a brother employed in a parallel way in the “Tratado.” Instead, the male counterpart of nohueltiuh in this source may be the term tlamacazqui, used in reference, for example, to a male deer which is to be hunted (ibid.: 95), a tree which is to be cut (ibid.: 87) or an ax which is to cut the tree (ibid.: 83). According to José Contel and Katarzyna Mikulska, tlamacazqui is a being involved in communication and exchange of “gifts” between the human and the supernatural (Contel, Mikulska Dąbrowska, 2011: 56). In the “Tratado” the two are very similar in meaning and, considering the role of -hueltiuh in the social sphere, the connotation of mediator for the latter term seems appealing.

The “Primeros Memoriales” name as one of the Mexican priests “Mexjco teveltzin,” which is rendered by Thelma Sullivan and Henry B. Nicholson as “an elder sister in Mexico” (Sahagún 1997b: 120). However, the root of tehueltzin is huel rather than huelti and another form of this title given in Book 2 of the “Florentine Codex” is “tevelteca” (Sahagún 2012 II: 197), based on huelteca, to arrange well something which is lying (on the flat surface) (Molina 1977 II: 156v). It seems, therefore, that tehueltzin is associated with stretching victims on a sacrificial stone rather than with elder sisters. In the “Florentine Codex” the term -hueltiuh is, in turn, used in reference to cihuatlamacazque, priestesses in the calmecac. A young girl is told:

Verily thou wert still a tender little thing, yet a girl, yet a baby when they declared thee, promised thee, dedicated thee unto our lord, the lord of the near, of the nigh, that thou shouldst belong with the good, fine older sisters of our lord, the beautiful, the virgins, those like precious green stones, like bracelets, like turquoises, like precious feathers (ibid).
Cihuatlamacazque, the female mediators between the human and the supernatural, are described here as the elder sisters of Tloque Nahuaque. In view of what has been said above, I suggest this “title” to be interpreted as “those whom Tloque Nahuaque delegates to another world (earth) for his own benefit.”

There are more mediators described with the term -hueltiuh. Alfredo López Austin notes that in “La historia de Tlatelolco” both the hombre-dios Tlohtepetl and his “elder sister” Huitzilmiloyahual died on the same day, which would suggest their identical nature (López Austin 1989: 129). In the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan,” Quetzalpetlatl, the woman with whom Quetzalcoatl committed a fatal transgression, is described as his “elder sister,” ihueltiuh (Annales... 1992: f. 6). Henry B. Nicholson suggests that she could have been his priestess (Nicholson 2001: 47). As has been stated above, the category of “hombre-dios” is an artificial construct – the beings described with this term by López Austin belong to a broader class of tlamacazque (see: 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children). At the same time, the interpretations of the status of the elder sisters of the tlamacazque Tlohtepetl and Quetzalcoatl – a “woman-goddess” and a “priestess” respectively – use Western terminology where the Nahuatl term tlamacazqui (or cihuatlamacazqui) should be employed.

In the “Crónica Mexicayotl,” several goddesses are named the “elder sisters” of deities or other supernatural beings: Malinalxochitl (e.g. Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 76-78), Coyolxauhqui (ibid.: 82) and Teoxahual (ibid.: 72). In the “Florentine Codex” Chicomecoatl is the elder sister of Tlaloc and of teteo tlamacazque (Sahagún 2012 VI: 38) or tlaloque (ibid.: 35), Chalchiuhcihuatl Chalchiuhltlicue Chalchiuhtlatonac is “teteu innan, teteu inveltiuh” (ibid.: 176) and “in cioapipiltin, in jlvicacioa” are the elder sisters of the Sun (ibid.: 164). In some cases the “title” of an elder sister seems to be clearly associated with mediating between the supernatural and human. The role of cihuapipiltin was to bring a woman who died in childbirth to Tonatiuh:

Ma xommovica, ma xoconmotoqujli in tonan, in tota tonatiuh: ma itech mjtzonmaxitili in jveltioatzitzinoan in cioapipiltin, in jlvicacioa: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 164)

Go, accompany our mother, our father, the sun! May his older sisters, the cihuapipiltin, the celestial women, bring thee to him (ibid).
Chicomecoatl was identified with tonacayotl, our sustenance, i.e. maize. She lived in Tlalocan together with Tlaloc and tlaloque (ibid.: 35) who cyclically sent her to earth in order to prevent hunger:

\[
\text{auh ca quitqujiax ca ixillan actiaz, ca ic ytaquetiaz, ca nachca conquetzatiuh in moveltioatzin, in teteu in tlamacazque inveltiu}_{\text{h}} \text{ (ibid.: 38)}
\]

And thy older sister, the older sister of the gods, the Tlamacazque – Chicome coatl – will cause them to carry, will insert in their entrails, will provide them with provisions, will go establishing them beyond (ibid).

Many goddesses named somebody’s “elder sisters” have, on their part, their “elder brothers.” There seems to be a firm relationship between the terms -hueltiu}_{\text{h}} and -oquichtiu}_{\text{h}}. It is discussed in the following chapter.

4.6. -OQUICHTIU}_{\text{h}}

The term -oquichtiu}_{\text{h}} has a construction parallel to -hueltiu}_{\text{h}}: a ligature -ti- is inserted between the root (here: oquich-, a man) and the possessive suffix (Carochi 2001: 302, n. 4). Horacio Carochi states: “la hermana dize de su hermano mayor noquichtiu}_{\text{h}}, y con reuerencia noquichtiu}_{\text{h}}uátz}_{\text{i}}” (ibid.: 302). According to James Lockhart, however, the term was employed for both an elder brother and cousin of a woman (Lockhart 1992: 74). The latter meaning is suggested by Sarah Cline and Miguel León-Portilla to be found in a sixteenth-century testament of Colhuacan (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 192). In late dictionaries of Pedro de Arenas and Francisco Xavier Araoz there is a gloss centlamampan -oquichtiu}_{\text{h}}, “-oquichtiu}_{\text{h}} of the first grade,” here: “a cousin.” Pedro Carrasco believes it to be a calque from “primo hermano” – a parallel process occurs with -hueltiu}_{\text{h}}, employed in those dictionaries in the construction centlamampan -hueltiu}_{\text{h}}, translated as “prima hermana” (Carrasco 1966: 159). In the sources of narrative character, I have not yet seen an attestation of -oquichtiu}_{\text{h}} used clearly in reference to a cousin.

The term -oquichtiu}_{\text{h}} is employed within the sphere of precontact religion to describe relations between supernatural beings. In this context, it seems to involve an extension of
meaning, because reciprocal relations between “brothers” and “sisters” are not followed by the usage of reciprocal terms indicating relative age. Deities never have younger siblings. For example, Malinalxochitl is an elder sister of Huitzilopochtli, but at the same time Huitzilopochtli is her elder brother:

Auh in yehuatl initoca Mallinalxoch. yn ihueltiuh yn huitzilopochtli. oquihui yniconeuh in yehuatl yn itoca Copil. quihui nonantzine. ca cenca nicmati onca moquichtiuh (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 84)

And to her named Malinalxoch, Huitzilopochtli’s elder sister, her child named Copil said: My mother, I know well that you have an elder brother (ibid.: 85).

In Book 2 of the “Florentine Codex” it is stated:

Jnjn vixtocioatl, iuh mjtoa qujlmach inveltiuhih, catca in tlahque: yoan qujlmach yioq’chtioan in tlahque (Sahagún 2012 II: 91)

This Uixtociuatl, so it was said, was thought to be the elder sister of the rain gods. And it was thought that the rain gods were her [elder, J.M.] brothers (ibid).

The same situation is found in Book 3, regarding Coyolxauhqui and Centzonhuitznahua: auh in jnveltiiuh in Coiolxauh: quimjvi noqujchitioan techavilquixtia, or “And their elder sister, Coyolxauhqui, said to them: ‘My elder brothers, she hath dishonored us’” (Sahagúin 2012 III: 2). In the “Tratado de las supersticiones” the goddess Xochiquetzal, sent to seduce Yappan, addresses him:

nooquichtiuh yappan onihualla nimohueltiiuh nixochiquetzal nimitz tlapaloco, nimitzciauhquetzaco

My older Brother, Yappan, I have come. I, your older sister, Xochiquetzal, have come to greet you. I have come to give you greetings (Ruiz de Alarcón 1984: 204).

To which Yappan answers:

otihualla unhohueltiue, xochiquetzale
You have come [i.e., welcome], O my older sister, O Xochiquetzal (ibid).

All these goddesses – Malinalxochitl, Coyolxauhiqvi, Huixtuicuahqui and Xochiquetzal – belong to a category described, in the Nahuatl sources, with several terms associated by Spanish authors with magic: *teyolloquani*, “the one who eats people’s hearts,” *tecotzquani*, “the one who eats people’s calves,” etc. (Graulich 1992). Katarzyna Mikulska enumerates certain characteristics ascribed to these beings which shed light on the connotation of *hueltiuhi* and *oquichtiuhi*.” Brujas,” as the Spaniards called them, used to devour those parts of the human body that contained the greatest concentration of vital essence: heart, liver and calves (Mikulska Dąbrowska 2008: 323). They were said to “mock” people in the same way as Tezcatlipoca did, implying the change in their destiny (ibid.: 325). They also possessed seductive abilities, which tendency has already been seen in the above example with Xochiquetzal and Yappan. Mikulska (ibid.: 322) cites an example from the “Leyenda de los Soles” where Xiuhnel, seduced by women-deer, says to the creature: *xihuallauh nohueltilhue* (Leyenda... 1990: f. 79), or “come, my elder sister.” Nearly the same words are employed by Yappan, when he greets Xochiquetzal. In the version recorded by fray Juan de Torquemada, the creature is called Cihuacoatl Quilatzli and she identifies herself as “hermana” of Xiuhnel and Mixcoatl (Torquemada 1723: 80). Graulich points to the fact that Quilatzli stands for Malinalxochitl in Torquemada’s writings (Graulich 1992: 92). Cecelia Klein complements the picture with the observation that in the “Historia de los mexicanos por sus pinturas” Quilatzli falls from the sky in the form of a two-headed deer. She states that Quilatzli was of ambiguous gender – neither man nor woman – which in the Nahua culture represented the reversal of the cosmic order (Klein 2010: 233. n. 100). It would suggest, therefore, that Malinalxochitl/Quilatzli was viewed as a liminal being, drifting between the two “worlds” but belonging to neither of them.157

In 4.5. *hueltiuhi*, I have stated that the term *hueltiuhi* connoted a mediator delegated by someone to another “world.” The above-presented material shows that this mediation involved the transfer of vital essence. The activities of “brujas” lead to the incorporation of vital essence by either eating a part of the body, interfering with a person’s *tonalli* (destiny, but also vital essence) or initiating a sexual act, which caused the departure of the *tonalli*

157 I thank Jerry Offner for pointing to me that the fact that *hueltiuhi* is a mediator – be it between the two families or between the humans and the supernaturals – accounts for her liminal state.
Those who delegated to them their vital essence were called their “elder brothers.” As the examples discussed in this and the previous chapter show, the delegation could either harm or actually reinforce the one who was using -hueltiuh. It was not the result of the act that governed the use of the terms -hueltiuh and -oquichtiuh, but rather the mere fact of transferring a part of the vital essence of the “elder brother” to the “elder sister.” The most important implication of this conclusion is the actual nature of “kinship” relations between deities. “Brothers” and “sisters” share the same essence, but they should not be understood in terms of descending from the same parents (at least not in the first place). They are, above all, delegators and delegates, static and dynamic, belonging to a defined world and mediating between worlds respectively.

4.7. -PI

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses “Tepi. criada o siruienta, y hermana mayor” (Molina 1977 II: 102v) and “Pitli. hermana mayor, o dama, o criada que acôpaña a su señora” (ibid.: 82v). Fray Andrés de Olmos precisеs: “nopi – mi hermana mayor; dizelo sola la muger” (Olmos 2002: 25). There are eleven attestations of this term in my database and in each case the reference point is female. In the “Testaments of Culhuacan” Lucía Teicuh makes a bequest to her -pi, here certainly an elder sister, because her name is Tiacapan, that is “The Oldest”:

No yhuan centetl Casa nicm(aca) yn nopitzin ana tiacapan yn ina{c} mel{or} tianquiznahuacatl (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 126)

Also there is a chest that I give to my elder sister Ana Tiacapan, wife of Melchor Tianquiznahuacatl (ibid.: 127).

James Lockhart states that -pi was also extended to cousins (Lockhart 1992: 74), which is confirmed by Chimalpahin’s use of the term in reference to Santa Isabel:

ypan ylhuitzin visitacion ynic quimotlapalhuito totlaçonantzin S.ta maria yn itlaçopitzin S.ta isabel (Chimalpahin 2006: 228).
on the feast day of Visitación, when our precious mother Santa María went to greet her dear older cousin Santa Isabel (ibid.: 229\textsuperscript{158}).

In the “Florentine Codex” tepi, or “one’s older sister” is given as a synonym of tiacapan, “the oldest daughter” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 3).

The “Bancroft Dialogues” contain an account of the execution of the adulterous daughter of a tlatoani:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ca cenca huel huey in mochih, ca amo çan tiapohualtin in quitzauctiaque, in ihuan cihuapilli mecaniloque tetepacholole, cequin calpixque, cequin tolteca, cequin pochteca: niman ye in ipihuan, ihuan in itlannencahuan izcihuapilli} (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 154).
\end{quote}

that it was done on a grand scale and countless people were punished, who were hanged (strangled?) and crushed with stones along with the lady: some stewards, some artisans, and some merchants, and also the ladies-in-waiting and dependents of the lady (ibid.: 155).

Karttunen and Lockhart translate the term \textit{ipihuan} as “her ladies-in-waiting” and suggest that this usage may be an inversion (ibid.: 43, n. 15). However, it should be noted that in the text “the elder sisters” are not included in the category of “dependents” (lit. those who live with one), so they may have been viewed as ladies of a relatively high position. The authors of Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” juxtapose this term with \textit{-tecuiyo}, or “one’s lady/ lord”:

\begin{quote}
\textit{quenjn tlatlapalaquia, in mopitzitzioan, in motecuijitzitzioan, in totecujiooan, in civapipilti:} (Sahagún 2012 VI: 96).
\end{quote}

how to apply colors [to please] thy sisters, thy ladies, our honored ones, the noblewomen (ibid).

The passage comes from a speech of a tlatoani who admonishes his daughter and informs her about the model she is to be reaching to. The “elder sisters” of a young lady are artisans from

\textsuperscript{158} J. Lockhart, S. Schroeder and D. Namala render the word “itlaçopitzin” as “her dear older sister.”
whom she is to learn various womanly crafts. Likewise in the “Primeros Memoriales,” -pihuán are mentioned as those who give example to women (similarly to ilamatque, or “elder women,” who often play the same role in the sources): in avemo yuh tinemi inic nentivi in amopíhoá ynu iuh tzava in iuh iquiti, or “You no longer live as your elder sisters go living [and] thus spin, weave” (Sahagún 1997b: 238).

Helga Rammow notes that the metaphoric usage of -pi is nearly equivalent to the metaphoric usage of -ach, or “the elder brother of a man” (Rammow 1964: 130, n. 168; see: 4.3. -ach). The latter could be summarized as “helper” or “assistant.” Moreover, the terms derived from -ach, -achcauh and -te/achcauh, served to describe boys in educational institutions, in some cases only those who presided over their colleagues, in some cases, perhaps, all of them. For women, the combined word cihuatetiachcauh was coined (see: 4.4. -achcauh and -teachcauh) but the female candidates for priestesses could have also been called -pihuán, as is suggested in Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex.” The family members say to a young girl who is leaving her home in order to enter calmecac:

Ixquichtzin nequjxtilli conchiao, in monantzitzinoan, in motatzitzinoan: auh ieohoantin in mopitzitzinoan: ma ivian ma iocuxca xonmovivicatiuh nocentetzin (Sahagún 2012 VI: 218)

This is all what your mothers, your fathers, have done to [your] satisfaction. And these are your elder sisters. Go there accompanying them peacefully, calmly, my only child.159

Another passage from the same source explains:

intla cihotl, no iuhqyj mjtoa: cioatlamacazquj iez, _MUXITZ_ no mopixtinemjz, amo teuhtli tlaçulli itech aciz: intlan nemjz in mopixque in jchpupuchtí: in mjtoa ipioan in calmecac onoque, in mopía, in caltentoque (ibid.: 209).

If it were a female, the same would also be said: she will be a priestess, she will be [one’s?] older sister, she will also be a continent person, no filth or dirt will get close to her. She will live among those who guard themselves, the girls who are called her

159 Translation mine.
elder sisters, who are in the calmecac, who guard themselves, who are gathered inside the house.\textsuperscript{160}

The last passage suggests indirectly that all girls in the calmecac were called each other’s -pihuan.

Rammow notes that in the 1956 edition of the “Historia general” the term -pihuan is rendered as “hermanos mayores,” from which she concludes that it could have been extended to siblings of both sexes (Rammow 1964: 131). However, in the 2001 edition the phrase “hermanas mayores” is used (Sahagún 2001 I: 584) – perhaps Rammow was dealing with an error in transcription. Another controversial example she gives comes from fray Andrés de Olmos’ “Huehuetlatolli” (Rammow 1964: 131). A girl begins her speech to the mother with the words “otinechmocnelilitzin nopitzin,” or “you have favored me, my elder sister,” and then continues in the following way: Maca yuh nicma ma ca yuh nimitznottili in tinonantzin in tinopitzin, in tinotatzin (Bautista 2008: 21r), or “May I not take it in this manner, may I not see you in this manner, you, who are my mother, my elder sister, my father.” The kin term can easily be mistaken for a tender designation based on pitzin (something little) which was employed by lower classes in reference to mothers (Sahagún 2012 X: 2, n. 6). Here, however, tinopitzin is juxtaposed with the doublet in -nan in -ta that indicates that the mother is addressed as her daughter’s teacher rather than relative (see: 1.6. In -nan in -ta). Therefore, it is possible that “the elder sister” likewise had the connotation of the one who taught or gave example.

\textbf{4.8. LOANWORDS}

Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart note that in 1698 the loanword -hermana appears in a Nahuatl text (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 74). I have found an even earlier attestation of this term in a 1639 testament from Azcapotzalco: nonamiztzi doya María Ysaper yn ielmanatzi do Pedro de San Miguel (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 219), or “my spouse, doña María Isabel, who is a sister of don Pedro de San Miguel.” The

\textsuperscript{160}Translation mine.
situation regarding \textit{hermano} is different. While in Nahuatl \textit{-hermana} was not extended outside the kinship sphere, \textit{-hermano} was. Actually, it first entered Nahuatl as an extension: Karttunen and Lockhart note “hermano, brother (in a sodality)” in 1573 (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 63), whereas in my database the earliest attestation of the kin term comes from Chimalpahin’s “Annals” written c. 1608-1615 (Chimalpahin 2006: 234). Thus, from the point of view of the Nahuatl classification system, the meaning “brother” was the extension of the term for a member of a cofradía. The majority of the attestations of \textit{hermano} with the latter sense do not follow the structure of Nahuatl kin terms. Chimalpahin employs the absolutive forms \textit{hermano}, \textit{hermanos} and \textit{hermano mayor}, although the last one he once pairs with the possessed term \textit{-te/iachcauh}: “yn intiachcauh hermano mayor” (ibid.: 232), referring to the senior member of a cofradía. In one case, however, he writes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{oncan quinmochillitica. yniqu in españa hualmohuizcaque. yn teoyotica ynhermanotzitzinhuan teopixque. yn motenehua canonigos. reclares. yhua yc monetza comendadores. de S. Anton} (ibid.: 172)
\end{quote}

there he is awaiting the time when his spiritual brothers will come from Spain, the religious who are called regular canons and comendadores of San Antón (ibid.: 173).

This example demonstrates that the Spanish loanword was employed not only as a status designator, but also to describe the relationship between members of a religious order. Likewise, it suggests that Chimalpahin was aware of the kin connotations of \textit{-hermano}, because he complemented it with the modifier \textit{teoyotica} in order to avoid ambiguity. Indeed, Chimalpahin uses \textit{-hermano} twice to mean an actual brother, but both persons referred to are Spaniards (ibid.: 234, 282). This makes one think that Chimalpahin got the information from a Spanish source and decided to retain the original terminology (ibid.: 234, n. 1). In any case, he did not feel very sure about the term, because in one of the examples he paired it with \textit{-teiccauh} – either to give additional information (“younger brother” instead of simply “brother”) or to explain the Spanish term (Lockhart 1992: 83). After Chimalpahin’s “Annals,” the earliest attestation of \textit{-hermano} in my database comes from 1639 (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 221) and since then it begins to be employed in everyday documentation.
The Nahuatl terms for younger siblings do not point to the sex of the primary referent; the Spanish terms for siblings do mark the difference, but only by means of suffixes (*hermana* and *hermano*), while the stem remains the same for both men and women. Here, however, the faint similarities come to an end. The Spanish *hermana* and *hermano* define neither the sex of the reference point nor the age relative to ego, contrary to the Nahuatl terms for a sister (*-iuc, -(te)iccauh, -hueltiuh* and *-pi*) and a brother (*-iuc, -(te)iccauh, -*ach, -(te)achcauh* and *-oquichtiuh*). Both can be modified by combining with “menor” (for a younger sibling) or “mayor” (for an elder sibling), but none of these combinations has been found in the texts (*hermano mayor* in Chimalpahin’s “Annals” is used outside the kinship sphere). The incorporation of these loanwords into the Nahuatl classification system had to be, therefore, associated with transformations on the social level. In a 1736 document from the Chalco region, Lockhart notes a sign of further adaptation to the Spanish system: the phrase “ynnometermanos,” or “we two siblings (here: a brother and a sister)” lacks a possessive prefix which was obligatory in the Nahuatl terminological system, even for Spanish loanwords (Lockhart 1992: 84).

It seems that in the colonial period, in some regions, the native terms for siblings gradually ceded from the language in favor of the Spanish loanwords. In my database, the latest attestation of *-oquichtiuh* employed within the kinship sphere comes from the first half of the sixteenth century (Molina 1569: 46r); of *-iccauh* is dated 1566 (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 46-48); of *-ach* – 1583 (Lockhart 1991: 71-72); of *-iuc* and *-pi* – c. 1615 (Chimalpahin 2006: 228, 300); and of *-hueltiuh* – 1629 (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 198). *-Te/iachcauh* is still in use in 1736 in the Chalco region (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 118) and *-teiccauh* dissapears from the Toluca Valley Nahuatl only after 1740’s (Pizzigoni 2007: 19, n. 4). Lockhart notes that in 1970’s Tetelecingo, Morelos, *-icniuh* was employed for both brother and sister, making no distinction as far as the sex of both the reference point and the referent, as well as age relative to ego was concerned, in which it differed from both Spanish and older Nahuatl classification systems (Lockhart 1992: 501, n. 97). Neither *hermano* nor *hermana* are employed in today’s Nahuatl de la Huasteca spoken north from the Valley of Mexico.\(^{161}\) They are, however, frequent in the late colonial “Testaments of Toluca”

\(^{161}\) Victoriano de la Cruz Cruz, personal communication Nov 20, 2012.
(Pizzigoni 2007: 19) and they were in use in 1953 Nahuatl from Zacapoaxtla, Puebla (Lockhart 1992: 501, n. 97).

Most likely, all Nahuatl terms for siblings were, at the same time, terms for cousins. If needed, the modifier -tlamampan was employed in order to precise the grade of consanguinity, but it is highly probable that such a usage was a colonial innovation (Carrasco 1966: 160). Generally, children of ego’s parents fell into the same category as children of ego’s aunts and uncles. Spanish was more strict when it came to differentiating between siblings and cousins. The terms “prima hermana” and “primo hermano,” “first female cousin” and “first male cousin” respectively, entered the Nahuatl classification system as -primahermana and -primohermano. The former is to be found in Chimalpahin’s materials for “Relaciones,” dated c. 1593-1624:

Auh ynin Don Diego de S fran[co] tehuetzquititzin oquimonamicti yn iprima hermana Doña Maria yn ichpochtzin huehue Mauhcaxochitzin (Chimalpahin 1997 II: 104)

And this don Diego de San Francisco Tehuetzquititzin married his first cousin, doña María, daughter of Huehue Mauhcaxochitzin (ibid.: 105).

The second attestation that I have come upon appears in a 1762 testament from the Valley of Toluca (Pizzigoni 2007: 172).

Chimalpahin’s materials, namely, an account from Colhuacan which he copied, contain an interesting term, -primoteiccauh, where “hermano” has been replaced with the Nahuatl term indicating age relative to ego: ynin xilomantzin ca yprimoteyczcauh yn tlahtolcalztzin yn tlahtohuani mochih colhuacan, or “This Xilomantzin was a younger cousin of Tlatolcalztzin, who became ruler of Culhuacan” (Chimalpahin 1997 II: 92). To be exact, Xilomantzin and Tlatolcalztzin had a common grandfather, Nauhyotl. The former was a son of his daughter whose name had been forgotten, and the latter was a son of his son Acoltzin (ibid.: 90-92). Interestingly, Chimalpahin did not include the term -primoteiccauh into neither his “Relaciones,” nor “Annals.” He employs -primohermano, but only once in his entire work (Chimalpahin 2006: 282).
Lockhart has found -primohermano juxtaposed with -te/iachcauh in a 1596 document from Texcoco (Lockhart 1992: 83). There are four attestations of this term in eighteenth-century wills included in the “Testaments of Toluca” (Pizzigoni 2007: 102, 116, 141, 172). It is likewise employed in a 1746 document from Amecameca, where the term -primo, “cousin,” appears too (Lockhart 1992: 84).

5. DISTANT CONSANGUINEALS

As observed by Jerome Offner, the majority of kin terms for consanguineals from G3 and G4 is composed of a term for a sibling plus a diminutive suffix -ton. The terms for older siblings (-ach and -pi) serve as a basis for ancestors (great-grandfather, etc.), while the terms for younger siblings (-iuc and -iccauh) make up words that designate descendants (great-grandchild, etc.). Thus, Offner states, “the Aztecs called their greatgrandkin ‘little older’ or ‘little younger sibling’” (Offner 1983: 185). James Lockhart also speaks of “projection” of G0 terminology to ancestors and descendants. But why would such a projection take place? What a logical principle underlies naming distant consanguineals (both lineal and collateral) “little siblings/ cousins”? I have been looking for similarities in either the usage of these terms or social roles of described kin, but I have not found any. Offner speaks of a presumed “generational solidarity” between ego’s generation and their great-grandparents against parents and grandparents who used to discipline children (ibid.: 213). Nevertheless, he immediately finds data that contradict his statement, not mentioning the fact that his hypothesis does not take into account the great-grandchildren who were also called “little siblings.”

For now, the only logical explanation of this phenomenon that I can think of, is that originally all consanguineals older than ego (save for parents?) were called -ach and -pi, while all consanguineals younger than ego (save for children?) were called -iuc (-iccauh is definitely a later term). Then the differentiation began: the terms for G2 were introduced and the need emerged to distinguish the terms for G3 from the sibling/ cousin terminology. This was done by adding the diminutive suffix which may function similarly to “great” in English.
marking the generational distance between a relative and ego. This hypothesis, however, calls for a linguistic study in order to be tested.

5.1. Younger Than Ego

The term -iucton, “a great-grandchild,” is associated with -iuc, or “the younger sibling/cousin of a woman.” Fray Alonso de Molina has “Icutontli. bisnieto, o bisnieta” (Molina 1977 II: 34r). I have recorded only one attestation of this term. It is to be found in the “Primeros Memoriales,” among the kin included in the tlacamecayotl: /tepilhoan. /teixvoan. /teteycaoa. /teicutooan /temintooa (Sahagún 1997b: 251) or “one’s children, one's grandchildren, younger siblings of a man, great-grandchildren (of a woman?), one's great-great-grandchildren.” Thelma Sullivan and Henry B. Nicholson translate “teicutooan” as “one’s younger sisters” and they remark:

If in grammatical construction it is analogous to teminton, it may signify one of a generation younger than younger sister, i.e., one’s niece (ibid.: 251, n. 2).

Apparently, Sullivan and Nicholson understand -ton as connoting the meaning of “one generation younger than the category with which it is combined.” Nevertheless, it was likewise used in terms for distant consanguineals older than ego, marking the difference between them and the terms for siblings. The distance between siblings and “little siblings” was at least three generations. The passage quoted above lists four subsequent generations: children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren. The only term that does not fit here is “teteycaoa,” “younger siblings of a man,” the fact, which in all likelihood means that writing it down, the scribe inadvertently omitted the suffix -ton. If the intended form was teteiccatotonhuan, it could easily be paired with “teicutooan,” producing: “great-grandchildren of a man, great-grandchildren of a woman,” i.e. “great-grandchildren.” The rest of the terms in the sequence does not need to be juxtaposed in doublets, because they do not differentiate the sex of the reference point.

James Lockhart claims that in one of the Culhuacan testaments -iucton appears as -iuctzin, suggesting that the diminutive suffixes -ton and -tzin are interchangeable as far as the term for a great-grandchild is concerned (Lockhart 1992: 76). The passage in question is as
follows: *oca quimocuillizque ohuatzintli / y nicuictzintzinhua*, or “And (my great-grandchildren?) are to take their tender maize from there” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 230-231). I do not see the reason for which the term should be translated as “my great-grandchildren” instead of “my younger siblings (or cousins).” True, the testator is an aged woman – she has grandchildren, but it is still more likely for siblings to appear as heirs in a testament than for great-grandchildren. Moreover, I have never seen any other term for a distant consanguineal replacing -*ton* with -*tzin* – such a practice would lead to confusing the categories, which otherwise were so carefully distinguished by means of -*ton*.

The second term for a great-grandchild, -*iccaton*, does not show up in the dictionary of Molina, but it is to be found in texts. It is based on the term for a younger sibling of a male, -*iccauh* (Rammow 1964: 114, n. 135). Helga Rammow came across it in the work of Chimalpahin, where it is used with the indefinite personal possessive prefix *te-* and juxtaposed with *teixhuihuan* as well as with parallel terms for more distant generations. The “Crónica Mexicayotl” has it in a similar context, though this time apparently derived from the term -*teiccauh* (Rammow 1964: 114):

*mochipa ticpiezque in tehuantin yn titepilhuan yn titeyxhuihuan yn titeteyccatotonhuan yn titemintotonhuan yn titepiptonhuan yn titeyxhuihuan* (Chimalpahin 1997 I: 60)

we shall always guard them, we sons, grandsons, great-grandchildren, great-great-grandchildren, great-great-grandchildren, we, their descendants, their offspring (ibid.: 61162).

In a somewhat distorted version of this conventional phrase Cristóbal del Castillo writes:

*in oncan acitihui in aquique amopilhuan amoxhuihuan, amomintonhuan, amoteiccahuan, amotentzonhuan, amixquamolhuan, amiztihuan, amocacamayohuan* (Castillo 2001: 112)

Where those who are your children, your grandchildren, your great-grandchildren, your great-great-grandchildren, your great-grandchildren, your beards-eyebrows [= offspring], your fingernails, small ears of corn that sprouted from you, will arrive.163

162 S. Schroeder and A.J.O. Anderson render the word “titeteyccatotonhuan” as “their younger brothers.”
An error that consists of putting -teiccauh instead of -teiccaton has already been seen above. Here it can probably be attributed to one of del Castillo’s copyists.

I have found only one attestation of -iccaton in singular and it is used for a man (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 146). However, most likely both genders were covered by this term. Both Jerome Offner and James Lockhart suggest that it could have been used only with the male reference point (Offner 1983: 185; Lockhart 1992: 76) – another parallel with -iccauh – and my scarce data appear to confirm it. In three attestations of this term for which it can be established, the reference point is male.

5.2. OLDER THAN EGO

The term -achcol appears in two variants: either without or with the second syllable reduplicated (-achcocol). It is composed of the term -col, or “grandfather,” and the root -ach, which signifies “elder brother,” but here most probably has the meaning of “first,” “earlier” or, as suggested by Lockhart, “great-” (Lockhart 1992: 498, n. 72). Frances Karttunen confirms that -achcol, contrary to -achcauh, but similarly to achto (“first”), has the first vowel short (Karttunen 1992a: 2). Lockhart takes -achcol and achcocol to be two separate terms, thus implying the existence of two respective plural forms: -achcocolhuan and -achcocolhuan. He asserts that as far as the term -col is concerned, the plural never shows reduplication whence it is impossible to form -achcocolhuan out of -achcol (ibid.: 499, n. 72). However, on some occasions the form -cocolhuan actually does show up (see: 2.2. -col). Moreover, as the textual evidence for the term -ach(co)col shows, in plural the syllable -col is always reduplicated – there is no attestation of -achcocolhuan in the sources I have been analyzing. My sample contains 20 attestations of the plural -achcocolhuan, 8 attestations of the singular -achcocol and 2 (from two different sources) of -achcol.

The discussed term is not included in the dictionary of Molina. According to Helga Rammow, Pedro de Cárceres gives the entry “ascoli – nacscolol = bisaguelo” (Rammow 1964: 71). In spite of this she states that -ach(co)col means a “forefather” and she notes that it

163 Translation mine.
often forms part of doublets with the meaning “ancestors” (Rammow 1964: 76). Offner likewise interprets this term as referring generally to ancestors (Offner 1983: 186), but his interpretation is criticized by Lockhart who states that the significance of the single -<i>ach(co)col</i> is confused here with the one provided by doublets. The former should be translated as “great-grandfather” (Lockhart 1992: 499, n. 72). Nevertheless, in his later work, the translation of Chimalpahin’s “Annals” into English, Lockhart accepts the rendering “forefather”:


And our forefathers, the ancients who were still idolaters, called pagans, were not able to find out anything about this because they lived in confusion (ibid.: 181).

Karttunen glosses -<i>achcol</i> as both “great-grandfather” and “ancestor” (Karttunen 1992a: 2). I have not been able to find an example, which would undoubtedly provide the meaning “great-grandfather.”

The “regular” term for a great-grandfather is -<i>achtan</i>, which is associated with -<i>ach</i>, or “an elder brother” (Rammow 1964: 73, n. 61). Molina has “Achtōtl. visabuelo” (Molina 1977 II: 2r) and “Ermano de tu bisahuelo. achtontli. teachton” (Molina 1977 I: 56v). In the “Florentine Codex” the term is included in the <i>tlacamecayotl</i> together with the information that the value of a great-grandfather lies in his reputation and fame (Sahagún 2012 X: 5). According to Rammow, Pedro de Cárceres classifies -<i>achtan</i> in G+6 (Rammow 1964: 71), but this may be due to its frequent usage in sequences describing forebears.

Confusingly, in the “Annals” Chimalpahin uses this term with the meaning of a cousin, complementing it with the Spanish loanword -<i>primohermano</i>:

<code>auh ynic oc ceppa ycuitlahuic ohuallaca oncan cuyohuacan ca çan centlamanpa iyachton yPrimo hermano y conitlanca ynic hualla oncan cuyohuacan yn quihualmonamictica achtopa ytoca Don felipe de guzman</code> (Chimalpahin 2006: 282)
The reason she came back again to Coyoacan was that her older brother once removed, her first cousin, had asked for her [in marriage], so that she came to Coyoacan, where she married first the person named don Felipe de Guzmán (ibid.: 283).

This usage should probably be attributed to the annalist’s error. In the “Anales de Cuauhtitlan” the singular -achton preserves its regular meaning: auh inicoltzin ininantzin ita ito quauhixtli iniachtontzintocantzin calpixqui (Annales 1992: 30), or “His grandfather, the father of his mother, was named Quauhixtli, his great-grandfather was Tocantzin, a majordomo.”

The remaining five attestations of -achton in my database are in plural and form part of sequences, which are meant to convey the sense “ancestors” (see also: Lockhart 1992: 499, n. 72) by enumerating several generations, for example:

_Auh in tiquitoa in mixpantzinco ca amo vecahuaz inic cenpopoliuz inic xixiniz in mociudad Vexuco yehica ca amo quiximatia tlacallaquili yn totavan in tocolhuan yn tachtouan ayac quitlalaquiliayaca zan mixcavica catca_ (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 188)

And we declare to you that it will not be long before your city of Huejotzingo completely disappears and perishes, because our fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers knew no tribute and gave tribute to no one, but were independent (ibid.: 189).

Other sequences found in the sources are -achtonhuan -cocolhuan (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 132), _in jnaoan, yn jtaoan, in jculhoan in jcioan in jachtoa_, or “his mothers, his fathers, his grandfathers, his grandmothers, his great-grandfathers” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 64) and _tocihuan tocolhuan yn tachtõhuan yn tomintonhuan yn topiptonhuã yn tochichicahuan_, or “our grandmothers, grandfathers, great-grandfathers, great-great grandparents, great-grandmothers, our forefathers” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 60-61). All of them provide the meaning “ancestors.”

---

164 Translation mine.
165 A.J.O. Anderson, F. Berdan and J. Lockhart render “tachtouan” as “our ancestors.”
A term for a great-grandmother was -pipton, glossed by Molina as “Piptontli. visahuela” (Molina 1977 II: 82r). It was associated with the term for an elder sister of a woman, -pi (Lockhart 1992: 76). Lockhart observes that the root -pi has the final glottal stop (-pih) which may correspond to the syllable final p in -pipton (ibid.: 498, n. 72). In modern Nahuatl de la Huasteca one’s elder sister is -pipi – perhaps this term reflects the older gloss preserved in -pipton and subsequently reduced, in the central Nahuatl area, to -pih. In the material I have gathered, -pipton is employed only in the sequences which describe the following generations of forefathers, such as the one cited above, recorded in the “Crónica Mexicayotl.”

As observed by Rammow, in Juan Buenaventura Zapata y Mendoza’s “Historia cronológica de la noble ciudad de Tlaxcala” there is an unusual term composed of -achtón and -ci, or “grandmother”: -achtón-cí, where the first component performs the role of “great-” (“great-grandmother”) (Rammow 1964: 72). I must admit, though, that I was not able to find this occurrence in Luis Reyes and Andrea Martínez Baracs’ edition of 1995. Another controversial term for a great-grandmother, -achpílli, written also -pílli, is to be found in a 1736 document from Tlalmanalco (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 119). Lockhart mentions it (them?) in his discussion of Nahuatl kin terms, noting only that they conceivably represent variation or variation plus combination of the terms projected from sibling terminology (Lockhart 1992: 498, n. 72).

I have not come across -achpílli in any other Nahuatl text.

-Minton describes the largest generational distance from ego of the terms included in tlacamecayotl. It is glossed by Molina under “Mintontli. hermano de tercero abuelo, o nieto de tercero o nieta de tercera” (Molina 1977 II: 56v) and “Teminton. nieto o nieta tercera” (ibid.: 97v). This is quite confusing, because Molina implies that the term was used for collateral relatives from G+4 – but only males – and linear kin from G-4 of both sexes. Edward Calnek ignores this unsystematic definition and classifies -minton as the term for a great-great-grandparent – a man or a woman (Calnek 1974: 198). In his analysis, he is leaning on the “Florentine Codex,” where -minton is described as an ascendent: Qualli mintontli iecnélhuaitl tlatzintia tlapeualtia, mopixoa mocacamaotia, or “The good great-great-grandparent [is] the originator of good progeny. He started, began, sowed [a good progeny];
he produced off-shoots” (Sahagún 2012 X: 5). From this information Calnek concludes that -
minton was a founder of tlacamecayotl which he defines as a cognatic descent group (Calnek
1974: 199-200). Other researchers of the topic show, however, that neither tlacamecayotl
should be perceived as a descent group (see: 7.1. -tlacamecayo) nor the entries of Molina
should be entirely ignored. Rammow observes that -minton was actually used for great-great-
grandchildren (Rammow 1964: 115). Moreover, similarly to the terms for kin of G+2 and
G+3, it applied also to collaterals (Rammow 1964: 74; Lockhart 1992: 76). I have not been
able to find the latter usage in the sources, but as far as the former is concerned, one of the
above quotations from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” includes -mintotonhuan among descendants
(see: 5.1. Younger than ego). The same source has it also for ascendants:

\[ \text{yhu} \text{a} \text{n \ ote} \text{c} \text{h} \text{m} \text{a} \text{c} \text{i} \text{y} \text{ot} \text{li} \text{t} \text{i} \text{a} \text{q} \text{e} \text{ t} \text{e} \text{x} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{p} \text{a} \text{n} \text{ y} \text{n} \text{ h} \text{ue} \text{h} \text{e} \text{u} \text{t} \text{que} \text{ y} \text{l} \text{la} \text{mat} \text{que} \text{.} \text{ c} \text{at} \text{c} \text{a} \text{ y} \text{n} \text{ t} \text{o} \text{ci} \text{h} \text{u} \text{a} \text{n} \text{ t} \text{oc} \text{i} \text{l} \text{h} \text{u} \text{a} \text{n} \text{ y} \text{n} \text{ t} \text{ach} \text{t} \text{ō} \text{h} \text{u} \text{a} \text{n} \text{ y} \text{n} \text{ t} \text{o} \text{mi} \text{n} \text{t} \text{o} \text{n} \text{h} \text{ua} \text{n} \text{ y} \text{n} \text{ t} \text{op} \text{i} \text{p} \text{t} \text{on} \text{h} \text{u} \text{ā} \text{ y} \text{n} \text{ to} \text{ch} \text{i} \text{c} \text{i} \text{c} \text{a} \text{h} \text{u} \text{a} \text{n} \text{ (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997 I: 60)} \]

as those who were the ancient ones, men and women, our grandmothers, grandfathers,
great-grandfathers, great-great-grandparents, great-grandmothers, our forefathers, (...) 
exemplified for us on paper (ibid.: 61).

Finally, the “Crónica Mexicayotl” employs -mintotonhuan for G-4, describing with this term
nuns who were the great-great-grandchildren of Moteucçoma Xocoyotl. Their genealogy is
drawn in detail: Moteucçoma begot doña Leonor, who gave birth to another doña Leonor,
who, in turn, gave birth to don Hernando and he begot the said nuns (ibid.: 162).

In view of this data -minton can be translated as “a consanguineal four generations
distant from me.” It has the diminutive suffix -ton which leaves us with the root min- and the
general rule of constructing terms for distant relatives indicates that it should be applicable to
a sibling (Offner 1983: 186). The dictionaries of classical Nahuatl do not present any
plausible option, but in the modern Nahuatl de la Huasteca there exists a term -mimi: “one’s
elder brother.”  

166 Victoriano de la Cruz Cruz, personal communication, Nov 20, 2012.
6. AFFINALS

6.1. SPOUSES AND THEIR OFFSPRING

6.1.1. -Cihuahu

The absolutive form *cihuatl* is a word for “a woman.” The possessive prefix locates it among kin terms according to the same rule which is applied to the Spanish term “mujer”: *teciuauh* is “muger agena o muger casada” (Molina 1977 II: 92v) and “muger de alguno” (Olmos 2002: 31), or “one’s wife.” In fray Alonso de Molina’s dictionary the root *cihua-* forms part of several terms associated with marriage: “ciuaua. marido, hombre casado,” “ciuaunyolcatl. pariente por casamiento,” “ciuaunyolcatl. parentesco por casamiento,” “ciuauatia. nino. (pret. oninociuauati.) casarse el varon” (Molina 1977 II: 22v), “neciuauatiltli. casamiento de varon cõ muger” (ibid.: 65r), “yancuicam mociuauati. nouio” (ibid.: 30v).

There is no doubt that *-cihuauh* had a different significance before and after the conquest, due to substantial changes in the marital pattern introduced by the Spaniards. Likewise, its connotations changed over time during the colonial period. In the sixteenth century, *-cihuauh* was adopted by the Spanish friars to describe the only wife married in holy wedlock. Molina uses it with this very sense throughout his “Confesionario mayor” and in the “Coloquios y doctrina cristiana” it is used in singular in reference to both the wife of Noe and the wife of Kain (Sahagún 1986: 200, 202). However, in the sources where vocabulary was less controlled by the ecclesiastics, *-cihuauh* very often appears in plural, designating numerous “women” of precontact lords or rulers, for example:
auh ychiconteyxtih yn acalli ynic ya mexico Cohuanacotzin yhuã oncã yeto yn teocuítatl y tlatoctlatquitl yn iaxca neçahualcoyotzin yhuã neçahualpiltzintli moch ic quinmaquixti yn icihuahuã (Texcoca Accounts 1997: 188)

And Coanacochtzin went to Mexico with seven of his boats, and in them went the gold, the royal possessions, Neçahualcoyotl’s and Neçahualpiltzintli’s property, with all of which he ransomed his women (ibid.: 189).

The eldest son of Nezahualpilli

izçan huel iyo connotzacuiltitia inic quimoçucapiquitili in Tollan cihuapilli in ichahuanantzin izcihuahuan tlacatl (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 154)

was punished just for composing songs to the lady of Tollan (Tula), his stepmother, one of the wives of the lord (ibid.: 155).

In the sources written by the Nahuas in the sixteenth century, I have found only one example of applying the term -cihuauh to a single wife and it involves the juxtaposition with another term for a spouse, -namic:

Auh in no ye neuatl atle ma nechmacac yn oc ye cenca hualca nechmacazquia ynic oppa notlatzin, yn içan çemiteme notecuiyo notatzin, yhuan yn itechpa yciuauh yn inamic ynic çan no cemiteme notecuiyo nonantzin (San Antonio 1997: 210)

But he gave nothing to me, to whom he should have given much more, since he was twice my uncle, born of the same mother as the lord my father, and as regards his wife, his consort, who likewise was born of the same womb as my lady my mother (ibid.: 211).

Nevertheless, James Lockhart states that the censuses from the Cuernavaca region ignore -namic and “use virtually only -cihuauh and -oquichhui, even at times with couples married in the church” (Lockhart 1992: 81).
The early seventeenth-century “Crónica Mexicayotl” has several attestations of -cihuauh in singular, used in reference to a wife of a precontact lord, as though she was the only one:

ynin omotocateneuh tlacayelleltzin cihuacohuatl yn icihuaah catca ytoca Mahquiztzin
ynin yn ichpochtzin catca yn itoca huehue quetzalmaçatzin chichimeca teuhctli

The wife of this aforenamed Tlacaeleltzin was named Maquiztzin. She was a daughter of the ruler of Amaquemecan, Huehue Quetzalmaçatzin Chichimeca teuhctli by name (ibid.: 139).

Chimalpahin likewise occasionally employs this term in the colonial context, in the way imposed by the friars: in singular and in reference to the wife married in holy wedlock, for example: quihualmohuiquilli ycihuauh ytoca Doña Anna Mexia Manrique, virreyna, or “his wife, named doña Ana Mejia Manrique, the virraine, accompanied him [the viceroy]” (Chimalpahin 2006: 76, 77, n. 4). In the works included in my database he never pairs this term with -namic. James Lockhart notes that Nahuatl annalists seem to prefer the term -cihuauh in precontact, and the term -namic for a wife in colonial contexts (Lockhart 1992: 81).

According to Caterina Pizzigoni, starting from 1650’s -cihuauh was gradually replacing -namic (as used for a wife) in the Valley of Toluca. By the eighteenth century the terminology for spouses had already, in this region, become

a close equivalent to the pair of words in the Spanish of that time for a married couple: marido and mujer (Pizzigoni 2007: 21).

Pizzigoni notes that this phenomenon was likely to be special for the Valley of Toluca (ibid.: 13). I have not come upon the term -cihuauh in the eighteenth-century documents from other regions.
6.1.2. -oquich(hui)

Fray Andrés de Olmos gives two forms of the term for a husband: “oquichtlì, hombre, noquichhui, vel noquich, mi hombre” (Olmos 2002: 22). -Oquich(hui) is derived from the word for a man, oquichtlì, following the same pattern as -cihuauh, which is derived from cihuatl, or “a woman.” The form -oquichhui has an archaic possessive suffix -hui, which in many kin terms turned into -uh (e.g. -coneuh, -achcauh). As noted by James Lockhart, the reverential form of the term, -oquichhuatzin (hui alters the last vowel with the long “a”) parallels the form -cihuahuatzin (Carochi 2001: 302, n. 4).

According to fray Horacio Carochi, the term -oquich(hui) is used by a woman in reference to her husband or friend (“amigo”) (Carochi 2001: 302). It points to a certain ambiguity of this word, perhaps having to do with the precontact concept of relationship and marriage. Before the conquest, it was not uncommon for unmarried couples to live together in a union called nemecatiliztli (see: 5.1.5. -mecauh). Such a relationship could have either resulted in marriage or be ended without consequences – unless there was a child (Burkhart 1989: 150). There is no explicit indication how such partners were called, but if -cihuauh was used in reference to wives or “concubines” of different status, than perhaps also -oquich(hui) would not differentiate between spouses and “friends.” This ambiguity is not reflected in the material I have gathered, where -oquich(hui) always refers to a spouse. Fray Alonso de Molina uses it extensively in the context of marriage in holy wedlock, for example:

*Cihuatl yctlatlaniloz. Cuix aca occe oquichtlì motech acic, yn omitztecac, ynic otimopilhuati: auh yn moquichui yn moma aço vel ypiltzin yn moconeuh, yn otitlcatili?*

Preguntas para la muger. Ha tenido algun otro varo parte contigo, y por esta causa ouiste algun hijo del, y tu marido tenia entedido, que era verdadero hijo suyo, el q pariste? (Molina 1569: 35r)

-Oquich(hui) is to be found far less frequently in the sources than -cihuauh, mostly because it cedes over time to -namic. The latest text in my sample which has this term is the “Crónica Mexicayotl.” Don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc uses it in the context of interdynastic marriages arranged in precontact times (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 132).
Likewise, the “Primeros Memoriales” apply this term to the preconquest reality (Sahagún 1997b: 180).

A particular vocative form of oquichtli is used in the huehuetlatolli published by fray Juan Bautista. A woman addresses her husband “noconetzin notecuiyoquichtli” (Bautista 2008: 34r), or “o my lord, my lord and husband!” Both noconetzin and notecuiyo are expected to be used in reference to a spouse (see: 1.2.1. -coneuh in polite speech), however, oquichtli is intended to mean a “man” rather than “husband” here. It parallels the term notecuiyocihuatl, used in the “Primeros Memoriales” as an honorific during the conversation between two unrelated noblewomen (see: 1.3.1. -ichpoch). Neither oquichtli nor cihuatl are actually made part of the discussed honorifics, since they retain their absolutive endings in spite of -tecuiyo being possessed.

6.1.3. -namic

-Namic is a genderless term for a spouse and it can only be deduced from the context whether, in a given situation, it refers to a wife or a husband. Although, as all Nahuatl kin terms, it is typically possessed, fray Alonso de Molina gives it in the absolutive form: “namictli. casado o casada” (Molina 1977 II: 62v). It cannot be established with certainty whether this term was precontact or developed as an early innovation (Lockhart 1992: 270). It is etymologically related to the verb namiqui, “to meet,” and its root forms part of a number of terms associated with marriage, included in the dictionary of Molina: “namictia,” or “to marry” (Molina 1977 II: 62v), “nenamictiliztli,” or “marriage” (ibid.: 67v), “ciua nemactli ypan nenamictiliztli,” or “wedding dowry” (ibid.: 22v), “ipan nonenamictiliz,” or “after I marry” (ibid: 41v), “nenamictiliz nemiliztli,” or “married life” (ibid.: 67v), “nenamictiloyan,” or “a place were weddings are organized” (ibid.: 67v), etc. On the other hand, the dictionary of Molina also contains the entries: “inamic,” or “its equal” (Molina 1977 II: 38v), “namictia,” “to join or equal two things” (ibid.: 62v) and “cemacicanamictia,” “to reward, recompense something richly” (ibid.: 15v), which could point to an earlier connotation of -namic – “a match,” “mate” (Lockhart 1992: 270). Both in the “Primeros Memoriales” and the “Florentine Codex” the term is often used with this meaning, for example in the last speech of Moteucçoma to the Mexica from Book 12:
Let the Mexicans hear! We are not the equals of [the Spaniards]! Let [the battle] be abandoned! (ibid).

It should also be noted that in the “Primeros Memoriales” “-namic” does not appear with the sense “spouse.”

In “The Nahuas after the Conquest,” James Lockhart discusses the term “-namic” extensively, inclining, eventually, to classify it as an innovation (Lockhart 1992: 81). Whether “-namic” had been associated with marriage before the Conquest or not, it undoubtedly made a big career after the coming of the Spaniards. In the sources it is firmly associated with the postconquest reality and rarely used in precontact contexts, in which “-cihuauh” and “-oquich(hui)” are given preference (see: 5.1.1. “-cihuauh, 5.1.2. “-oquich(hui)). However, in the early “Confessionario mayor,” Molina freely substitutes “-cihuauh” or “-oquich(hui)” for “-namic,” without any visible change of meaning or context. Sometimes they are even put together in a doublet, for example: “auh yninamic ynioquichui ymmoma aço huel ypiltzin?, or “y su marido, tenia entendido que era suyo?” (Molina 1569: 34v). A similar doublet, “yciuauh yn inamic,” is also used by Juan de San Antonio in 1564 (San Antonio 1997: 210).

Molina likewise juxtaposes both “-namic” and “-cihuauh” with the modifier “teoyotica,” employed to set terms within the Christian conceptual frame:

moneq anquimatizque: cayninacayo oquichtl, inteoyotica tenamic cayuhqnaocmo ypacayo, cay axca inteoyotica iciuauh: auh ynciuatl yncacayo cayaxca, ytechpoui yn oquichtl.

conuye que sepays, que el cuerpo del varon: casado por la yglesia, no es ya suyo: sino de su muger (auida por matrimonio) y el cuerpo de la muger, no es ya suyo, sino desu marido (Molina 1569: 54v-55r).

It should be noted that the “Confessionario mayor” is the only source where I have been able to find “teoyotica” accompanying the term “-cihuauh” and I have never seen it juxtaposed with “-oquich(hui). The term “-namic” is often accompanied by “teoyotica,” but the latest attestation of
this phrase that I have come upon dates to 1617 (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 60). There is not a single occurrence of *teoyotica -namic* in the late colonial “Testaments of Toluca.”

The data gathered here suggest that although in the early phase of contact both gendered and genderless terms for spouses had been treated equally, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the latter became more firmly associated with Christian marriage, while the former gradually began to be used in precontact contexts. In the sources dated to this period -namic is employed to describe concepts important for Christianity: the Virgin Mary as the spouse of St. Joseph and vice versa (Sahagún 1997a: 144, 156) and the relation of an archbishop to the Holy Church:

\[
ynic çan oc çeccan puerta omocallaqui ynic quimotlapalhuito ytaçonamictzin Sancta yglesia, yhuan yhtic ye omihto missa quimochihuillito yhuan quinmottilito quinmotlapalhuito yn itlapacholtzitzinhuan Cabildo tlaca canonigos (Chimalpahin 2006: 262).
\]

so that he went in by another door to greet his precious spouse the holy church and went inside, as was said, to perform mass and to see and greet his subjects, the cathedral chapter members, the canons (ibid.: 263).

-Cihuauh and -oquich(hui) are never used in such contexts.

Starting from the 1650’s, -namic had undergone another change of meaning, at least in the Valley of Toluca. It began to be paired with -cihuauh to describe the dyad husband-wife. Possibly, the phenomenon did not extend outside this region (see: 5.1.1. -cihuauh). In a 1736 will from the Amaquemecan area, -namic is employed for both a husband and a wife (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 118-119) and in a 1738 document from Azcapotzalco it refers to a wife (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 100).
6.1.4. -nemac

A term cihuanemactli, identified by Luise Burkhart in Motolinia’s “Memoriales,” referred, according to the author of this source, to women asked for by noblemen (in contrast to the seized ones) and married without a complete ceremony (Motolinia 1971: 323). She translates the term as “given women” (Burkhart 1989: 151) or “woman gifts” (Burkhart 2001: 50). Fray Alonso de Molina has the entries: “nemactli. don, o merced que se recibe” (Molina 1977 II: 67r), “nonemac. la merced o don qese mehizo o dio” (ibid.: 73r) and “tenemac. dadiu o don hecho a otro” (ibid.: 98v), but he gives nemacahualtiliztli for “a divorce” and nemacahualtia, “to bring a divorce” (ibid.: 66v). The only attestations of -nemac with the meaning of a spouse, that I have been able to find, come from the religious texts collected by Burkhart in “Before the Guadalupe” and refer to the Virgin Mary:

The texts seem to be making a distinction between Mary as Joseph’s legitimate wife wedded with full ceremony (...) and Mary as partnered with the Holy Spirit in a less equal relationship, in which she is bestowed as a gift. She cannot have two namictin, but it appears that Nahuas could conceive of her as one man’s namictli and God’s nemactli (Burkhart 2001: 50).

A prayer of the early seventeenth century says:

Ça nelli cemihcacaichpochahuiaxatiztle, Ca çan no yehuatzin in tiynemactzin espũ S. to teotlatlaçotlalizyolotica omitzmoyollotoli, ynic ticmotlahpalhuitiuh;

It is true, oh forever a maidenly fragrant one, that you are also the wife of the Holy Spirit. With sacred loving heart he inspired you so that you would go to greet her [St. Elizabeth, J.M.] (ibid.: 51).

Two other prayers use the form titlaçonemactzin, or “you are his precious wife” (ibid.: 119) and titlaçoyecnemactzin, or “you are his precious and proper wife” (ibid.: 127), inscribing the term, by means of the element tlaçoc-, in the religious context. Both attestations appear in the descriptions of Mary’s relationship to the Holy Trinity: she is a daughter of God the Father, the mother of God the Son and -tlaçonemactzin of God the Holy Spirit. As Burkhart notes, in
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the discussed texts -nemac is likewise employed for the relation of Mary to St. Joseph. The passage in question says:

_telpochtle xihualmohuica yn axcā xictizqui y notopil. yntla momac Cueponiz yn xochitl tevatl monemactiz mopialtiz yn maria_

Oh youth, come, now grasp my staff. If a flower blossoms in your hand, Mary will be your wife, will be your ward (ibid.: 35).

The doublet monemactiz mopialtiz is an unusual, perhaps erroneous, conflation of possessed nouns with verbs (ibid.: 36, n. 30). -Nemac, literally “something given,” is juxtaposed here with pialli, lit. “something guarded.”

6.1.5. -mecauh group

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses mecatl as a “rope” (Molina 1977 II: 55r) but he also has “temecauh. manceba de soltero” (ibid.: 98r) and “teichtacamecauh. manceba de soltero” (ibid.: 94r), lit. “one’s secret lover.” The root meca- is included in several terms related to sex, birth or biological kinship: mecatia, “to start living together” (“amancebarse;” also, “to provide oneself with ropes”), mecayotl, “lineage or consanguineal kinship” (ibid.: 55r), nemecatiliztli, “amancebamiento” (ibid.: 67r). Louise Burkhart translates the latter as “tying oneself” (Burkhart 1989: 150), but since it is based on the verb mecatia, its literal meaning would rather be “providing oneself with ropes” or “living together, cohabitation.” Susan Kellogg suggests that the verb mecahuia, “to fall while tied,” could have metaphorically referred to descent (Kellogg 1986: 106), but she does not give any textual evidence for this hypothesis. In Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” the verb is associated with birth: a midwife announces birth by saying “ca omecavi in piltzintli” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 206), or “the baby falled tied.” Arguably, in this expression the root meca- refers to the umbilical cord — xicmecayotl, lit. “a navel-cord,” in Nahuatl (López Austin 1988 II: 186). The “Florentine Codex” contains the phrase “in vel icujtlaxcolloc, yn vel imecaioc,” which is translated by Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O. Anderson as “those of the same womb, those of the same
lineage” (Sahagún 2012 I: 49). Kellogg suggests that “imecaioc” should rather be rendered as “those of the same cognatic descent group” (Kellogg 1986: 118).

Kellogg, and before her Helga Rammow (1964: 40), explained the biological connotations of the root meca- by referring to the concept of descent. Each of them considered meca- in the context of tlacamecayotl in the first place and they both interpreted tlacamecayotl as a descent group, a lineage. In my opinion, this term referred rather to a family understood as people connected by means of consanguineal relations who were viewed from the perspective of ego instead of a common ancestor (see: 7.1. -tlacamecayo). On the other hand, a common European association between the concept of kinship and a rope is that of metaphorically tying people together, creating a bond between them (Rammow 1964: 40, Kellogg 1986: 106, Burkhart 1989: 150). Perhaps a similar association existed in the Nahua world, but it should not be assumed a priori. The root meca-, as viewed through the above presented linguistic evidence, seems to be tightly connected to the biological, as opposed to social, aspects of human existence.

Like any term that originated in the polygamous marriage pattern, -mecauh presents problems when analyzed through the inevitably Christian-influenced sources. Burkhart notes that the elimination of nemecatiliztli, understood as concubinage, was of special concern to the friars (Burkhart 1989: 154), the concern that may have charged this and related terms with negative value. Motolinia clearly contrasts -mecauh which he renders as “manceba” with -cihuauh, “mujer legitima,” indicating that the former described one’s female partner before and the latter after wedding ceremonies (Motolinia 1971: 323). In the “Confessionario mayor,” Molina translates it as “manceba” in contrast to -namic, or “muger”:

Cuix aca ciuatl otitecac (ynaço monamic anoço momeauh) yniquac otztli, yncenca yevey yti, yyeyciuhttiuh,

Tuuiste parte co algua muger (apra fuesse co la tuya o co tu manceba) estado preñada, y muy crecido el vietre, y en dias de parir (Molina 1569: 80v).

In the material I have gathered -mecauh refers to both men and women. In the “Primeros Memoriales” it describes the father of a maiden’s child:
And if a woman had a child while she still lived as a maiden, no longer was she considered a maiden, and he who was her lover, if he were to have sexual relations with her, was punished (ibid).

Finally, the “Crónica Mexicayotl” speaks of -mecahuan in the context of war between Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco, contrasting the term, perhaps under the Spanish influence, with -namic. According to this source, the war was provoked by the tlatoani of Tlatelolco, Moquihuixtli, who expressed the act of breaking the alliance with Axayacatzin by pulling away from his wife (-namic), Axayacatzin’s sister. Instead of living with her, he preferred the company of his -mecahuan (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 136-138).

The root meca- combined with -pil, “one’s child,” resulted in -mecapil, rendered by Molina as “hijo de manceba”:

Auh intla oncate teoyotica ypilhuan, yhuan yntlano oncate cequintin ymecapilhuan, çanye ynic macuillamantli ytlatqui, vel yntech quipouhtiaz çanyeyo çanyeyxquich.

Y si tuuiere hijos legítimos, y otros no legítimos (scilicet) hijos de sus mancebas, solamente la quinta parte de sus bienes, les podra dar, y no mas, quiero dezir (Molina 1569: 60v).

The “Florentine Codex” places mecapilli among the terms for “illegitimate” children: ichtaconetl (“a secret child”), calpanpilli, calpanconetl. As my analysis of the term -calpanpil shows, its original significance resulted most likely from the precontact hierarchy of wives and concubines rather than from the “legitimacy” understood in European terms. Under the supervision of friars, -mecahuh and -mecapil were charged with negative value, but before the friars appeared, the terms may have simply described couples involved in informal relationships (i.e. not married in any of precontact models) and their offspring. As far as the sexual life before marriage is concerned, the sources are contradictory. The above cited “Primeros Memoriales” state that young men were punished for having sexual relations with women, while fray Diego Durán informs us that couples could live together freely unless they
had a child, which obliged them to marry (Burkhart 1989: 150). But why ascribe to children born of nemecatiliztli a separate term, -mecapil, if they ended up in a “legitimate” family (parents married) anyway?

The earliest attestation of -mecapil in my database does not solve the problem:

oncate ymecapilihua yn nonamicatca amo tle quitoq yeica ca huel nocaltzin
ynnonicnomaquilli yn noconeuh yn tlatohuani in don jua ynn onechcohuilli
(Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 93)

My late husband had illegitimate children; they are to say nothing, because it is truly my house that I gave to my lord the ruler don Juan, that he bought from me (ibid167).

The late husband, Diego, was a tlacateuctli, lord, and since the document was written in 1548 it is possible that he performed this function before the arrival of the Spaniards, having been an adult man in 1519. From this point, two options are possible: either Ana, his wife, employed the term “ymecapilihua” in an already altered, Christian way, indicating that the children were illegitimate (born before or during the marriage); or she referred to the precontact meaning of the term, suggesting, perhaps, that they were born of a free union, before Diego contracted the marriage with her. No information contained in the document provides a clue as to the proper reading of -mecapil.

The already mentioned passage in the “Florentine Codex” includes likewise the term mecaconetl, but I have not been able to find it possessed in the sources. If both -mecapil and -mecaconeuh were employed before contact, it would suggest that both men and women could have meca-children. However, because of the lack of the textual evidence one cannot be sure if mecaconetl is not an innovation of the authors of the “Florentine Codex,” writing under the influence of Christianity.

167 F. Karttunen and J. Lockhart rendered the term “noconeuh” as “my child,” but see: 1.2.1. -Coneuh in polite speech.
6.1.6. -chauh group

Fray Alonso de Molina has an entry “chauh. no. mi combleça” (Molina 1977 II: 19r). At the same time he glosses the verb *chahuacocoya* as “estar afligida la muger porque su marido esta amancebado, o por tener alguna grave enfermedad” and *chauhnecocoya* as “estar endemoniado” (ibid). *Cocoya* means “to be ill” (ibid.: 23v) while the prefix *ne-* in the second entry signals that we are dealing with a reflexive verb. Frances Karttunen has “chāhu(a) – someone in an irregular, nonlegitimate relationship, someone likely to arouse jealousy, mistress.” She notes that in modern Morelos the word appears with the pejorative diminutive suffix -*ton* and a verb is recorded there, *chahuati*, meaning “to be envious, jealous, suspicious.” In modern Puebla one finds *chahualiztli*, or “envy, jealousy, suspicion” and *chahuatia*, “to incite jealousy” (Karttunen 1992a: 45). These entries are not present in the dictionary of Molina. Instead, he includes vocabulary regarding stepparents and stepchildren, where the root *chauh-* stands for “step-” (see below). It may suggest that -*chauh* was originally associated with (official?) partners, while modern connotation of jealousy is secondary, perhaps developed under the influence of the Spaniards.

The only example of -*chauh* that I have been able to find conforms to this hypothesis. In the “Primeros Memoriales” a commoner woman quarrels with another woman of her class. She begins with stating that her adversary is in no position to stand up against her:

> ay civato ma nachca quē tinechpevaltia / cuix tinonamic cuix tinoquichvi / ay / tlei / čivato / tētlatlazicpol ma ximotlalli tlē tinechilhuia aviyanito / cuix tinochauh
> (Sahagún 1997b: 297)

Ah, little woman! Away! How will you dispute with me? Are you my husband? Are you my spouse? Ah! Little woman of some sort with the mouth stuck shut, sit down. What are you telling me, little pleasure girl? Are you my married lover? (ibid.)

Thelma Sullivan and Henry B. Nicholson render the word *tinochauh* as “you are my concubine” rather than “you are my married lover” but this does not make any sense. In the passage, *tinochauh* is more or less equivalent to *tinonamic* and *tinoquichui* (both meaning “my husband”). These three ranks are listed in order to invoke manly authority, which the opposing party lacks. It has to be stressed that the word “combleça” used by Molina to
translate -chauh can refer to either a man or a woman: “persona amancebada con hombre o mujer casados.” Moreover, the kin terms built on the basis of -chauh: -chahuanan (“stepmother”), -chahuapil and -chahuaconeuh (“woman’s stepson”) describe relations bound through a man: a wife of my father and a child of my husband respectively. Therefore, I suggest that the term -chauh was used within the polygynous family for a male partner not married in a ceremony, who also had other wives of higher rank. If this is true, the word chahuayotl traced by Townsend in songs and interpreted by her as concubinage (Townsend 2006: 366) would rather be “cohabitation” – from the point of view of a woman.

Unfortunately, for the lack of data this suggestion has to remain hypothetical. The term was apparently banned from written sources. The fact that Molina associates it with demons is also significant: a concubine (-mecauh) was barely tolerable, but a married lover of a woman had to be unthinkable. If my hypothesis holds true, some modern translations of the terms based on -chauh need revision. For example, the famous phrase from the “Crónica Mexicayotl” – “because of concubines Tlatelolco was no more” – blames concubines for the fall of Tlatelolco, while it should blame their “lover,” because the Nahuatl original says: “yn chahuapolliohuac yn tlatilolco” (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997 I: 136-137).

As I have already mentioned, there are several other designations of step-kin relationships based on -chauh, which are constructed by means of combining it with a kin term (either -coneuh, -pil or -nan). -Chahuaconeuh is glossed by Molina as “Chauaconetl. entenado de muger” (Molina 1977 II: 19r). The term refers to either men or women:

\[ auh ca mochi niquinmacatiuh niquincahuilitiuh y nochahuaconehuan fran\{ca\} Juana tiacapan \] (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 22)

And I give and bequeath all of it to my stepchildren Francisca and Juana Tiacapan (ibid.: 23).

\[ ma quihualcaquititin y nochahuaconetzin yn itoca casbar ma quimoxtlahuilli yn i ps ypan 4 t\{s\} \] (ibid.: 78)

\[ 168 \text{ Cf. rema.lae.es, consulted Nov 19, 2012.} \]
\[ 169 \text{ Note, however, that in the only example available, the term is employed by a commoner woman and it is believed that monogamy prevailed among the commoners.} \]
let someone go and inform my stepchild named Gaspar; let him pay the peso and four tomines (ibid.: 79).

The reference point is always a woman. The term comes up not only in colonial (the “Testaments of Culhuacan” above), but also in precontact contexts. In the “Primeros Memoriales” a noblewoman Quetzalpetlatl meets her deceased –chahuaconeuh, while travelling across the underworld (Sahagún 1997b: 182). In Molina’s dictionary the gloss “entenado de muger” is also ascribed to the term -chahuapil (Molina 1977 II: 19r). I have not been able to find this term in the texts.

Finally, Molina has the entries: “Chauanan. no. mi madrastra” and “Chauanantli. madrastra” (Molina 1977 II: 19r). In my database, the term appears only with the male reference point, but the female reference point should come up somewhere too. -Chahuanan, similarly to -chahuaconeuh but contrary to -chauh, appears in both precontact and colonial contexts. The example of the former is provided by the “Bancroft Dialogues”:

\[
\text{auh çan ye no ihui niquittac inic conmomecnalique in tlacatl Huexotzincatzin in iyacapan catca tlacatl tlatoani Neçahualpiltzintli: izçan huel iyo conmotzacuititia inic quimocuicapiquilili in Tollan cihuapilli in ichahuanantzin ízcihuahuan tlacatl:} \\
\text{(Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 154-156)}
\]

And likewise I saw how they hanged (strangled?) the lord Huexotzincatzin, who was the eldest son of the lord ruler Nezahualpilli; he was punished just for composing songs to the lady of Tollan (Tula), his stepmother, one of the wives of the lord (ibid).

The passage locates the term -chahuanan within the polygamous family pattern. “Stepmother” seems to be “one of my father’s wives, who is not my biological mother.” We can suppose, therefore, although I have not found any explicit evidence for this hypothesis, that -chahuaconeuh was “a child of my husband’s other wife.” The crucial point of difference between precontact and colonial realities was that in the latter case an individual could marry a second wife only if the first one had passed away. While before contact a child could have had numerous living “stepmothers,” after the coming of the Spaniards he was able to have only one stepmother at a time. As the “Testaments of Culhuacan” show, in colonial times -chahuaconeuh and -chahuanan were used reciprocally. In one of the above examples, the
testator named Maria employs the former term in reference to Gaspar, while the notary describes her as Gaspar’s *chahuanan: yhui yn quito yn caspar ynic omopacanonotzque yn ichahuanatzin*, or “Thus said Gaspar, with which he and his stepmother came to agreement” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 78-79).

**6.1.7. -tlacpahuitec**

Fray Alonso de Molina has an imprecise entry “Tlacpauitectlí. antenada” (i.e., entenada) (Molina 1977 II: 119v). Jerome Offner clarifies that -*tlacpahuitec* connoted a stepchild (either a stepson or a stepdaughter) of a man. He glosses the word *tlacpa* as “second fruit or fruit that comes after season,” but he does not give any specific source as far as the gloss is concerned (Offner 1983: 191). Frances Karttunen suggests that the element *tlacpa* is related to *tlacpa*, “to the vicinity of, toward.” She lists several terms of which it formed part: *tlacpaconetl* (“stepchild”), *tlacpaichpochtli* (“stepdaughter”), *tlacpatelpochtli* (“stepson”), *tlacpaicniuhtli* (“stepbrother, stepsister”), *tlacpanantli* (“stepmother”), *tlacpatatli* (“stepfather”) (Karttunen 1992a: 256). Of these terms, only the last one is to be found in the sources I have analyzed, though in the absolutive form (Sahagún 2012 X: 9; Molina 1977 II: 119v). What is appealing here, is that all the terms given by Karttunen are composed of the element *tlacpa-* plus a term for a consanguineal. The same pattern has already been seen in the case of both *meca-* and *chauh-* terms. Two observations should be made on the basis of this fact. Firstly, the existence of the term -*tlacpa* for a spouse, or (female?) partner can be assumed, though I have not been able to find such a term in the sources. Secondly, the question emerges, why a term for a stepchild was -*tlacpahuitec*, given that -*huitec* is not a term for a child. The only word including the root *huitec*- I am familiar with is the verb *hitequi*, “to strike, beat,” and this association is likewise suggested by Offner (1983: 191).

-*Tlacpahuitec* is likewise the only *tlacpa-*term which I have been able to find, combined with a possessive prefix. In a 1583 document it is employed for a woman:

*auh yn itech çalliuhtica caltontli quauhchayahuacayo ynemac yn inamic p° ychan sanct ju° bap° ollopan yn itlacpahuitec ju° gonçalles tocuiltecatl* (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 194)
And the small house attached to (the house), of wooden grating, is the inheritance of the wife of Pedro, whose home is San Bautista Ollopan; (she is) the stepchild of Juan González Tocuitlecatl (ibid.: 195).

Chimalpahin, on the other hand, uses it for a man:

*ynpiltzin ynconeuh yn contador ybarguen catca yhuan Doña catalina de Alçega yn axcan ye ynamic yetica yn Doctor Antonio de Morga allde de corte Mexico. yc ytlacpahuitec yn omoteneuh telpochtli comendador* (Chimalpahin 2006: 230)

the child of the late royal accountant Ibarguen and doña Catalina de Alcega, who has now become the spouse of doctor Antonio de Morga, alcalde of court in Mexico, so that the said youth who is a comendador is his stepson (ibid.: 231).

6.2. IN-LAWS

6.2.1. -mon group

The most basic term for an in-law is *-mon*, glossed by fray Alonso de Molina as “Montli. yerno. marido de hija, o ratonera” (Molina 1977 II: 59v). Son-in-law and mousetrap are not likely to be lexically related (Karttunen 1992a: 153). Molina also has a verb “Montia. nino. tomar yerno casando su hija” (Molina 1997 II: 59v). In my sample *-mon* is used only for men, but the reference point can be either a male or a female (12 and 7 attestations respectively). The term survived well into the late colonial period: the latest attestation in my database comes from a 1795 will from San Juan Bautista Metepec in the Valley of Toluca (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 74-76). Sons-in-law could play an important role in the household hierarchy: after their father-in-law’s death they were likely to become the head of the household (McCaa 1999). As far as rulership was concerned, they sometimes happened to succeed to the throne (Lockhart 1992: 72).
The female counterpart of -mon was constructed by adding the modifier cihua-, or a woman, to the stem: the result was -cihuamon, or “a daughter-in-law.” Molina has the absolutive form “Ciuamontli. nuera muger de su hijo” and verbs “Ciuamontia. nino. tomar nuera, casando alguno a su hijo” and “Ciuamoncaua. nite. acompanhar a la nouia” (Molina 1977 II: 22v). The last one means literally “to abandon someone by making her a daughter-in-law” which suggests that it was employed by bride’s relatives when they accompanied her to her husband’s home. According to Frances Karttunen, in the twentieth-century Morelos the possessed form -cihuamon was still used for a daughter-in-law, but the absolutive meant “girlfriend, fiancée” (Karttunen 1992a: 34). Caterina Pizzigoni notes the term in the late colonial “Testaments of Toluca” (Pizzigoni 2007: 19, n. 6). Similarly to -mon, both sexes could form a reference point for -cihuamon.

The term -mon became a basis for creating other terms for in-laws by combining it with terms for consanguineal kin. Thus, for the father in-law (-mon + -ta), Molina has “montatli. suegro, padre dela muger casada” (Molina 1977 II: 59v). Before the Conquest, a nobleman, involved in polygynous relationships, had to have numerous fathers in-law. The “Crónica Mexicayotl” indicates indirectly that the fathers of various categories of spouses could have been called with this term. The tlatoani Moquihuixtli was married to a sister of Axayacatzin, the tlatoani in Tenochtitlan, and due to the position of her family this marriage was certainly considered very if not the most prestigious of all his relationships. However, Moquihuixtli apparently broke it off, provoking war with Axayacatzin. One of his allies, his teuctlatoani named Teconal Huitznahuatl:

\[ynî \ ychpoche \ catca \ yn \ ichpoch \ quimacacyn \ moquihuixtli \ ynic \ mitohua \ ymonta \ catca\]
\[yn \ moquihuixtli, \ yn \ teconal \ huitznahuatl\] (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 138),

had a daughter, and he gave his daughter to Moquihuixtli, so that it is said that Teconal Huitznahuatl was Moquihuixtli’s father-in-law (ibid.: 139).

The marriage to a daughter of Moquihuixtli’s subordinate, even though a teuctli, was certainly valued less than the interrupted one. The term -monta survived into the late colonial period: it can still be found in a testament from the Valley of Toluca dating to 1737 (Pizzigoni 2007: 120).
The female counterpart of -monta is -monnan, Molina has “Monnantli. suegra, madre dela muger casada” (Molina 1977 II: 59v). It is more frequently attested than “father-in-law” (12 to 5 cases in my sample). It is also to be found in late texts, the latest among the “Testaments of Toluca” dating to 1737 (Pizzigoni 2007: 120). In mundane documents mothers-in-law act as those who pass their rights to their sons-in-law (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 93), lend money to their daughters-in-law (ibid.: 99) and receive bequests (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 130). Similarly to -nan and -ta, -monnan and -monta are also sometimes put in a doublet (e.g. Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 221; Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 112).

Other terms for consanguineals could have been combined with mon- in order to specify the relation with an in-law. In Chimalpahin’s “Annals” the term -ixhuiuhmon is to be found:

çan ce ynehuan yquac o no teochihualoc yca Epistula yn fray Thomas de libera Santo Domingo teopixqui Amaquemecan chalco ychan ypiltzin Marcos de libera. yxhuimontzin yn tlacatl Don juan de sandoual tequanxayacatzin (Chimalpahin 2006: 166)

At that time just one other person was ordained together with him, as subdeacon, fray Tomás de Ribera, a Dominican friar from Amaquemecan Chalco, child of Marcos de Ribera, grandson-in-law of the lord don Juan de Sandoval Tequanxayacatzin (ibid.: 167).

It can only be presumed that -ixhuiuhmon describes the relationship with a granddaughter’s husband.

The same source has -machcihuamon, literally “nephew-daughter-in-law,” that is, as Lockhart assumes, “niece-in-law” (Lockhart 1992: 80). However, Chimalpahin employs the term for a daughter-in-law:

when he arrives in Spain he will find only his daughter-in-law named doña Mariana de Ibarra, who was the spouse of his child don Francisco de Velasco who died in Spain (ibid.: 177).

6.2.2. Same-generation in-laws

Apart from the terms based on mon-, Molina has “Vexiuhtli. consuegro, o consuegra,” “Vexiuhyotl. parentesco de afinidad” (Molina 1977 II: 157r) and “Teuexiuuh. consuegro o consuegra” (ibid.: 111v). -Huexiuuh is quite rare: my sample consists of four attestations, the earliest one from Book 6 of the “Florentine Codex” (Sahagún 2012 VI: 135), one from the “Testaments of Culhuacan” (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 150) and the latest two from a 1610 testament (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 81). The passage from the “Florentine Codex” suggests that -huexiuuh may have been used not only for fellow parents-in-law, but for fellow in-laws in general, because an old man refers with the term “antovexiuhtzitziooan,” or “you who are our fellow in-laws,” to both parents and -huanyolque of his relative’s (or daughter’s) husband.

In classical Nahuatl, there were three terms for same-generation in-laws: -huepol, -huezhui and -tex. The first one is glossed by Molina as “Vepulli. cuñada de varon, o cuñado de muger” and he also has “Vepol lotl. parentesco de afinidad y cuñadez” (Molina 1977 II: 156v). Lockhart concludes that the term described a same-generation in-law of the opposite sex than ego: a man’s sister-in-law and a woman’s brother-in-law (Lockhart 1992: 74). This involved two kinds of relationship: with a sibling’s spouse on the one hand and with a spouse’s sibling on the other hand. The former meaning is to be found in Juan de San Antonio’s letter: the wife of Juan Quauhtliztactzin is called his brothers’ -huepol (San Antonio 1997: 222). The same relationship, but this time from the point of view of a woman, comes up in a testament from Colhuacan: Auh yu icpauh catca y nicuihtzin Antonatzin yu inamic ocatca nohuepoltzin Juo pabba, or “And as to the yarn that belonged to my younger sister Antonia, who was the wife of my brother-in-law Juan Bautista” (Cline, León Portilla 1984: 148-149). As far as the connotation “a spouse’s sibling” is concerned, in Juan de San Antonio’s letter Juan speaks of his aunt’s -huepolztitzinhuan negotiating with his representatives – the ecclesiastics – and it is hardly possible she had multiple husbands living
at the same time (San Antonio 1997: 228-230). They had to be her husband’s brothers. On the other hand, in a 1580 testament a testator named Ana Tiacapan explains how a certain house fell into her hands. She says that her deceased husband, Baltasar, left it on a deathbed to her younger sister and herself, bequeathing the house through oral, instead of written statement. According to Ana Tiacapan, Baltasar said:

niquitohuan ca oncete y omenti y nohuepoltzitzinhuan qui (sic) yehuanti quimomachiltiae ypanpa ca çequi onpa huala yn tetzintli yn tezcacohuac yhuan yn tonacayotl yn oca monec yn qualoc ynic mochiuh yn caltzintli auh ynic canel inchantzinzco (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 56)

I declare that there are two sisters-in-law of mine who know about this because part of the stone (to make the house) was brought from Tezcacoac, and the food that was used and eaten when the house was built; because of it it is their home (ibid.: 57).

Interestingly, the testament seems to indicate that both Baltasar’s sister-in-law (the sister of his wife) and his wife (!) are included in the category of -huepoltzitzinhuan. If this was confirmed by other examples, it would have meant that the class -huepol covered all persons of the opposite sex but from the same generation as ego affiliated with ego through marriage, the spouse included.

Jerome Offner suggests that the fact of gathering the opposite-sex in-laws under the same category may correlate with the social condemnation of sexual relationships between in-laws whose spouses are alive. At the same time it would point to possible marriage partners in frames of the practice of levirate, put in operation after the death of a spouse (Offner 1983: 212). In-laws of the same sex as ego were differentiated according to gender by means of terminology. -Huezhui is glossed in the dictionary of Molina under “Vezuatli. cuñada de muger” and “Vezui. no. mi cuñada [dize la muger]” (Molina 1997 II: 157r). The former gloss is repeated by Horacio Carochi (2001: 302). There are only two attestations of -huezhui in my sample. The earliest one is to be found in the “Testaments of Culhuacan”:

---

170 S.L. Cline and M. León-Portilla translated nohuepoltzitzinhuan as “my brothers-in-law.” Because of this mistake they could not understand the logic of the last phrase: “auh ynic canel inchantzinzco” and rendered it as “(they know about it) because (Tezcacoac? the house?) is their home.”
And inasmuch as it was my inheritance, my sisters-in-law María Salomé and Petronila bought it; they gave me six tomines (ibid.: 183).

Of two possible relations described by -huezhui here: a sister of the testator’s husband or the wife of the testator’s brother, the former makes a more plausible option, because no brothers of the testator are mentioned throughout the document, while her deceased husband appears there several times. The latest attestation comes from the “Bancroft Dialogues”:

\[ ca otimaxitico in ipan in matzin in motepetzin, in oncan ixtlahuiz popohuiz inic toconmotequipanilhuiz in tlacatl tlatoani, yhuan in mohuepoltzitzinhuan in mohuezhuatzitzinhuan in mitzonmacopaitztilitiazque, ihuan in mocuitlapiltzin in matlapaltzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 124) \]

you have arrived in your city, where it will come to fruition that you will serve the lord ruler, and your brothers- and sisters-in-law and your vassals will be looking up to you (ibid.: 125).

Here again the husband’s sisters are meant. The words are spoken to a Tenochca princess who enters Texcoco in order to marry the local tlatoani and his siblings are expected to occupy an inferior position in relation to her. In both examples cited above the root of the term is -huezhua instead of -huezhui. Lockhart believes it to be a reanalyzed possessive suffix, having originated in the secondary absolutive form (-hui turning to -hua in order to facilitate the absolutive suffix and returning as -hua to the possessed form of the noun) (Carochi 2001: 304, n. 2).

-Text is glossed by fray Andrés de Olmos as notex – mi cuñado (Olmos 2002: 25). Molina has “Textli. cuñado de varon, o massa de harina” (Molina 1977 II: 112v). Carochi specifies that while the term for a brother-in-law has the long vowel, in the word for flour “e” is short (Carochi 2001: 472).
The texts confirm that -tex was employed only with the male reference point. It was used to describe two kinds of relationship – either with a wife’s brother (e.g. Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 221), or with the sister’s husband:

notlaçootzin ma quezquilhuiit mopaltzinco toyeca ca ça quihuitzintli (sic) camo miactin niquipian nopilhua ca ça yeuhuatl y noxiuhuato ca çan icelto ca çan i teyxtin y motetzin y xihuatzin (Lockhart 1991: 70-71),

My dear older brother, let us be under your roof for a few days – only a few days. I don’t have many children, only my little Juan, the only child. There are only three of us with your brother-in-law Juan (ibid).

Lockhart claims that he once saw -tex employed for the female cousin’s husband (Lockhart 1992: 499, n. 75). Since both -(te)iccauh (“younger sister of a man”) and -hueltiuhe (“elder sister of a man”) described female cousins as well, perhaps -tex was understood as the husband of either -hueltiuhe or -(te)iccauh, rather than of “sister” in the European meaning of the term. In modern Nahuatl de la Huasteca -tex is still used with its original connotation: “a brother-in-law of a man.”

A very rare term is -ome, referring to a brother-in-law of ego’s wife (Hinz, Hartau, Heimann-Koenen 1983: XVII). It can be found in the 1540 “Aztekischer Zensus,” for example:

yzca yyome y viznavatl ytoca fr(ancis)co moçavhqui in izivauh ytoca agna teyacapa ha(m)o teoyotica monamictia (ibid.: 17)

Here is a brother-in-law of Huitznahuatl’s wife named Francisco Mozauhqui, whose wife is named Ana Teyacapan. They are not married in holy wedlock.

The lack of the Christian sacrament suggests that the registered household functioned more or less in accordance with the precontact pattern. The fact that married sisters could live together

\[172\] Translation mine.
justifies the necessity of describing the relation between their husbands with a separate term. -Ome is still to be found in the early seventeenth-century Chimalpahin’s “Annals”:

ynin omoteneuhtzino Sancta cruz. ca ymaxcatzin yehuantin yntlaquetzaltzin yn tocniuhtzitzinhuan yn toteyccauhtzitzinhuan Juan Morales yhua yn iyome Bernabe de S. Jeronimo cuechihuque (Chimalpahin 2006: 252)

This said holy Cross was the property of and was raised by our friends and younger brothers Juan Morales and Bernabé de San Gerónimo, who are married to sisters and are skirt makers (ibid.: 253).

Lockhart does not exclude the possibility that -ome is simply the numeral “two” employed with a possessive prefix (Lockhart 1992: 499, n. 73).

Judging from the texts, the Spanish loanwords “cuñada” and “cuñado” (“sister-in-law” and “brother-in-law” respectively) entered the Nahuatl terminological system c. 1700. I have found both terms in the testaments from the Valley of Toluca. The former comes up in a 1710 document: yhuà oc tlaco yaxca nocunyada Josepha de la crus, or “and the other half is the property of my sister-in-law Josefa de la Cruz” (Pizzigoni 2007: 134); the latter, in a 1734 will: yhua maquili NicCahu[i]... Nocuyado ytoca D,{n} Juan de la Cruz, or “I leave it to my brother-in-law named don Juan de la Cruz” (ibid.: 211). At the same time, the native -huepol disappears from the “Testaments” after 1711 (ibid.: 19). As Lockhart notes, the rules of classification regarding same generation in-laws differ among the Spanish and the Nahuatl systems. The latter was based “primarily on the distinction between same-sex and opposite-sex relationships” (Lockhart 1992: 84), while the former employed the same term for all siblings of one’s spouse, distinguishing only the sex of the referent by means of a respective suffix (-a for women, -o for men). As in the case of -sobrina and -sobrino, the actual transformations of family relations must have been associated with introducing new categories into the terminological system. Again, this process did not affect all Nahuatl-speaking communities in the same way. Today’s Nahuatl de la Huasteca preserved the precontact rules of classification, distinguishing, by means of terminology, among the same-sex and opposite-sex siblings-in-law.173 In 1970’s Morelos the verb huehpollhuia, “to be in

love with one’s brother-in-law,” was used (Karttunen 1992a: 84). Nevertheless, it has to be emphasized that in my database -huepol and -huezhui are to be found only in the sixteenth-century sources and there is no attestation of -tex after 1639 (Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 221).

7. RELATIVES

7.1. -TLACAMECAYO

The concept of tlacamecayotl has been discussed by many scholars and is perceived as one of the key terms for understanding the Nahua kinship system. Susan Kellogg renders this word literally as “the rope of people”: it is composed of the roots tlaca- (“man”), meca- (“rope”) and the abstract ending -yotl. The European concept of the “line of descent” was quickly associated with a “rope” by the researchers and additionally reinforced by an entry found in fray Alonso de Molina’s dictionary: mecahuia, “to fall while tied” (Kellogg 1986: 106). This led to interpreting tlacamecayotl as “expressing a cognatic descent concept”:

It expresses the relationship between an ancestor and his or her descendants, traced through one or more connecting links. Such descent lines seem to have been the basis for shallow descent groups (ibid).

Kellogg’s interpretation follows the general line of thinking presented by Edward Calnek. He translated tlacamecayotl as “a line [rope] of men, a lineage” (Calnek 1974: 198) and stated that the concept included only lineal relatives. In spite of focusing on the presumed meaning “lineage” and pointing to a great-great-grandparent (of either sex) as the source of the kin group, Calnek observed that tlacamecayotl is defined in relation to ego (ibid.: 199).

Calnek’s point of view was extensively discussed by Jerome Offner, who proposed another translation of tlacamecayotl – “human cordage.” Offner accepted ego as the center of relationships described by the term tlacamecayotl, at the same time denying the role of a common ancestor. The results of his research question the existence of descent groups in the
precontact Nahua society. Moreover, as his analysis of Nahuatl kin terms shows, most of them described both lineal and collateral kin, contradicting Calnek’s statement on the lineality of *tlacamecayotl* (Offner 1983: 199-200). Offner’s definition of the term is the following:

it is an Aztec conceptualization of an entity with a structure resembling a personal kindred: It is ego-centered; it is bilateral; and it specifies one’s lineal and collateral relatives (ibid.: 200).

One of the most interesting suggestions made by Offner is that the relationships included in *tlacamecayotl* were submitted to the criterium of ego’s personal benefit. Kin ties classified within this category were directly affecting ego’s position in the society. The relatives were expected to support him or her in various aspects of life and with various media of which power and wealth were perhaps the most significant (ibid).

James Lockhart considers the majority of Offner’s findings valid. He states that the absolutive *tlacamecayotl* means “lineal consanguineal kin relationships in general” and he denies seeing in it a concept, which organized the Nahua household (Lockhart 1992: 495, n. 60). Kellogg criticizes Offner’s idea of including both lineal and collateral ties in *tlacamecayotl*, indicating that collateral kin were, in texts, distinguished by adding the modifier *huecapan*, or “distant,” to the terms for lineal relatives (Kellogg 1986: 120). As the bulk of attestations gathered in this work shows, this is not true – *huecapan* accompanied kin terms only if real precision was called for. Another element of the “descent group” hypothesis that does not stand up to the facts is the idea of a common ancestor, identified as *mintonli*. - *Minton* described all consanguineals from G4: not only great-great-grandparents (and collaterals) but also great-great-grandchildren (and collaterals).

As far as the analysis of the term itself is concerned, “rope” is not the only option available here. As I have demonstrated above (see: 6.1.5. -mecauh group), the root *meca-* is likewise tightly associated with consanguineal kinship and as such does not connote descent specifically. Perhaps a better way to approach *tlacamecayotl* would be to interpret it as “a state (or quality) of being consanguineally related to people.” The chapter 1 of Book 10 of the “Florentine Codex,” on which all the studies of this term are based, is entitled: *vncan moteneoa in imiuhtcatiliz in iieliz in iehoantin tlacamecaiotica miximati* (Sahagún 2012 X: 1), or “where is mentioned the form, the state of those who are related to each other through
consanguineal ties.” Consequently, the next chapter is entitled “grado de afinidad” (ibid.: 7). A disturbing fact is that the chapter on consanguineals does not include terms for siblings, while the chapter on affinals lists among them the older brother. The rest of the terms for siblings is entirely missing from the list in Book 10. Two explanations of this fact are possible: either the terms for siblings were inadvertently omitted or the Nahua concept of consanguinity differed from ours in that it did not include relatives from G0. Offner seems to opt for the former as he focuses on the social role of *tlacamecayotl* as the group of support, considering ego’s benefits from ties with siblings (and affinals) significant (Offner 1983: 200-201). I am tentatively inclined to the latter. The prototype of the chapter 1 in the “Primeros Memoriales” does not include siblings in the *tlacamecayotl* either (Sahagún 1997b: 251), which could have easily been corrected in the later version if the omission was inadvertent. The attestations of the possessed -*tlacamecayo* that I have collected do not show any evidence for including siblings into this category. Finally, from my analysis of Nahuatl kin terms it seems clear that the concept of ties within G0 differed from the understanding of ties between ego and his/her consanguinal relatives from G- or G+. While the latter involved the transmission of vital essence, the former lacked this “biological” component, focusing instead on responsibility. On the other hand, I have not been able to trace any explicit notion of transfer in the case of aunts, uncles, nephews and nieces who are included in the *tlacamecayotl* together with -*nan*, -*ta*, -*pil*, -*ixhuiah*, etc. This leaves the problem still unresolved.

As I have already mentioned, the possessed form -*tlacamecayo* is not uncommon. In a colonial document Kellogg found a contemporary translation of the term into Spanish, “deudos muy cercanos” (Kellogg 1986: 109). Lockhart defines -*tlacamecayo* as “the kindred in that sense of the particular possessor” (Lockhart 1992: 495, n. 60). The suffix of inalienable possession, -*yo*, suggests the literal translation: “consanguineal ties with people, which are one’s inherent part.” As the evidence shows, the connotation of -*tlacamecayo* differed depending on the grammatical number. When in singular, the term obviously referred to kindred, either in the sense of ties between relatives or in the collective sense (a group of relatives). Fray Alonso de Molina renders the term as “parentesco”:

*ynaço ytlacatcapo, aço yhuanyolqui: cenca vel quintlatemolizque, ytechpa ynitlacamecayo,*
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Si son (por ventura) entre sí deudos, o parientes, examinandolos bien acerca del parentesco que se han (Molina 1569: 46r).

And in a sixteenth-century lawsuit from Tenochtitlan one of the parties states: *yn ica in totlacamecayo in tocol ytoca toculitecatl mopilhuati matlactin qnchiuh* (Kellogg 1986: 108), or “regarding our kin ties, our grandfather named Tocuiltecatl had children, he engendered ten.”

On the other hand, the meaning “a group of relatives” may already be an adaptation to the European system. The evidence for such an adaptation is seen in Molina’s dictionary, which glosses *tlacamecayotl* as “abolorio de linage o de generacion” (Molina 1977 II: 115v).

As observed by Kellogg, although the Spanish term “linaje” cannot be perceived as synonymous with the anthropological “lineage,” it did connote “people who traced common lineal descent” (Kellogg 1995: 178). The eighteenth-century dictionary of Academia Real Española glosses “generación” as “lineage,” “succession of generations ‘en linea recta’” and “nation.” In this context, a very interesting example can be found in a sixteenth-century translation into Nahuatl of the story of Judas. As established by Justyna Olko, it was made directly from a printed version of the “Leyenda de los Santos,” a Spanish version of the “Legenda Aurea” – probably, from the 1554 edition published in Toledo (Olko 2012a). In the original text the mother of Judas says:

Paresciome esta noche que paria un hijo malo que era comienço de la destrucciô de nuestra generaciô.

The Nahua interpreters rendered these words as:

*In axcan yohuac. Onicte*ñemic. *I nictlacatilia yn oquichpiltontli Cenca tlavelliloc ytech pehua ytech tzinti. Inic polihuia y totlacamecanyo yn JucDiôyotl*

last night I had a dream that I would give birth to a very evil little boy, with him begins the destruction of our lineage, the Jewish entity (ibid).

\footnote{http://ntlle.rae.es, consulted May 25, 2013.}
As can be seen, the translation is very faithful, save for the word JuDiōyotl which does not have its counterpart in the original. Arguably, it was added in order to point to the interpretation of the word *rotlacamecanyo* – here: a nation – which otherwise wouldn’t be understood properly. This text may thus show a process of equalling the semantic content of the Nahuatl *-tlacamecayo* with that of the Spanish “linaje” or “generación.” In the early seventeenth-century Chimalpahin’s writings the process is already completed, as the annalist speaks of the alleged plans of rebel black slaves regarding white women:

> ye nemizquia quinhuapahuazquia ypampa yn ihcuac huehueyazquia ca niman quinmocihuauhtizquia yehuantin in tliltique ynic huel hualmotlilticacuepazquia yn innepilhuatiliz yn intlacamecayo yn intlacaxinacho (Chimalpahin 2006: 220).

they would live and they would bring them up, because when they grew up the blacks would take them as wives so that their procreation, their lineage [or: nation, J.M.], their generation would turn black (ibid.: 221).

In the following example, the discussed term forms part of the compound word *-tlacamecayotlahuiz*, “one’s lineage insignia,” that is – “coat of arms”:

> oncan ytech pilcatiah çouhtia ce tliltic tepitzin camixatzintli, ytech icuiliuhtia yn itlacamecayotlahuiztzin yn iarmastzin omoteneuhtzino miccatzintli arçobispo visurrey (Chimalpahin 2006: 208).

from it went hanging and was displayed a little black shirt on which were painted the insignia of the said deceased archbishop and viceroy's lineage, his coat of arms (ibid.: 209).

While the original meaning of the singular *-tlacamecayo* might have been limited to “consanguineal ties,” in plural the term always refers to people who are related to ego by means of these ties. As the following examples show, the term was employed for both ascendants and descendants of ego, which contradicts Kellogg’s statement on the relationship with the ancestors as the focus of the discussed concept (Kellogg 1995: 177-178):

He procreated, he bequeathed it to his children, his consanguineal kin.\textsuperscript{175}

*ypanpa cecan ytech moyollallitiua yn felipe yn icolhua catca po poliuhtoc pedro cochpin miguel lazaro juana xoco yehuantzin yn itlacamecayohua y felipe de stiago* (Kellogg 1986: 108).

So that everyone will understand, Felipe's grandparents were Pedro Poliuhtoc, Pedro Cochpin, Miguel Lazaro, Juana Xoco, they were his tlacamecayohua [= consanguineal kin, J.M.] (ibid).

*auh yn yehuatl yn omotecateneuh yn mexica pilli yn itoca cuitlachtzin yn ixquichtin yn ompa ytech quiçato tullam yn ipilhuan yn ixhuihuan yn itlacamecayohuan* (Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc 1997: 116)

From this mentioned Mexica nobleman named Cuitlachtzin issued in Tollan all his descendants, his consanguineal kin.\textsuperscript{176}

The translation “consanguineal kin” is tentative. It should be noted here that either referring to grandparents or descendants, the kin terms employed (*ipilhuantzitzin, icolhua, in ipilhuan in ixhuihuan*) make clear that the statements concern consanguineals. There is no need to explain it further by means of *-tlacamecayohuan*. This fact suggests that the latter term is used to stress the specific quality of these relatives. If my hypothesis regarding the transmission of vital essence among *-tlacamecayohua* was to be accepted, the quality stressed could be the “vital essence relationship” (in analogy to the European “blood relationship”) from which particular rights (e.g. inheritance) stemmed.

\textbf{7.2. -TLACAYO}

The term *-tlacayo* is based on the noun *tlacatl*, “a person, human being,” plus the suffix *-yo*, indicating inalienable possession (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 51). It can be literally translated as “a person who is an inherent part of one,” but in today’s Nahuatl de la Huasteca

---

\textsuperscript{175} Translation mine.  
\textsuperscript{176} Translation mine.
it means “one’s body.” It suggests that the term may refer to consanguineal ties. It occurs several times in the “Testaments of Culhuacan” in contexts that invoke the connotation of “close relatives” (see: Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 51), for example:

\[ \text{onecico yn yehuatl yna\' catca Simon moxixicohua ytoca m\' justina yhuan mochintin ohuallaque yn itlacayohuan cihuatl aquitoque ma ticcaquican yn testamento yn quitlallitia micqui} \] (Cline, León-Portilla 1984: 158-160)

appeared the widow of Simón Moxixicoa, named María Justina, and all the relatives of the woman came and said, “Let us hear the testament that the deceased ordered” (ibid.: 159-161).

The same connotation (assuming that the Nahua noblemen were consanguineally related to each other) can be deduced from the description of the Texcoca nobility in the “Bancroft Dialogues”:

\[ \text{in amo çan tlapohualtin oncatca tlatoque pipiltin in itlacayohuan in tlacatl moyetzicateca Acolmiztli Neçahualcoyotl, niman ye in xocoyotl Acatmapichtli [sic!] Neçahualpilli, niman ye in chichimecapipiltin} \] (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 146).

There were innumerable rulers and nobles who were relatives of the former lord Acolmiztli Nezahualcoyotl, and also the son Acamapichtli Nezahualpilli and the Chichimeca nobles (ibid.: 147).

### 7.3. -HUANYOLQUI

Fray Alonso de Molina glosses “Teuayulqui. deudo o pariente de otro” (Molina 1977 II: 111v), “Pariente por sangre. teuanyolqui. vanyolcatl” and “Pariente por casamiento. ciuateuanyolqui. ciuauyolcatl. ciutatica vanyolcatl” (ibid. I: 92v). As observed by James Lockhart, “deudo” is a term which can not only describe consanguineals and affinals, but also other categories of people associated with ego (Lockhart 1992: 495, n. 56). In the “Confessionario mayor” Molina consequently employs “deudo” and “pariente” as the

---

translations of -huanyolqui (e.g. Molina 1569: 14v, 47r), but he also makes some interesting differentiation. On f. 12v he states “nocniuh anoço nohuanyolqui,” thus excluding friends from the category of -huanyolque. On ff. 12v-13r he excludes a wife: “anoço nonamic, anoço nohuanyolqui,” on f. 51r a sister-in-law of a man: “yuanyolqui, anoço yuehpol,” on f. 60v parents: “yta, ynan, ynanoço yhuanyolqui” and on ff. 58v-59r neighbors: amo yeuatin yezque ynical nauac tlaca cocoxqui: amono yehuatin yezque ynihuanyolq (“y no lo seran sus vezinos del enfermo ni tampoco sus deudos o parientes”). It would suggest that Molina wants to use the term -huanyolqui only for consanguineals. As far as affinals are concerned, Molina’s entries imply that only a man could have acquired new -huanyolque after having been married, but the usage of this term with the modifier cihua- is not attested in the “Confessionario mayor.”

Lockhart translates -huanyolque as “those who live with one.” He states that the term is used mainly in plural (ibid.: 72), but in my sample 19 of 48 attestations are in singular. As far as its actual meaning is concerned, Lockhart hypothesizes that, at least in plural, the term “could include anyone in one’s household or persons closely allied with one in other ways” (ibid). Alternatively, Susan Kellogg interprets huanyolcayotl as the concept for consanguineal relationships (with the exception of cihuatehuanyolque). She is inclined to interpret the root yoli included in the term as having to do with existence or even coming into being (engendering life) instead of cohabitation. She writes:

As a kinship category, huanyolque embraced kin beyond the household; it was an important category through which the kin who celebrated life-cycle events were brought together. This category of relatives appears to be Ego-defined and would therefore have been theoretically different for each person within a nuclear or extended family grouping (Kellogg 1995: 174-175).

The written evidence seems to support Kellogg’s claims. In a sixteenth-century Tlaxcalan document don Julián’s -huanyolque are responsible for carrying out his last will (Anderson, Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 52). In the “Bancroft Dialogues,” similarly to the “Confessionario mayor,” the categories of -huanyolque and parents are put separately (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 114, 116). The same occurs in the “Florentine Codex,” where the former are, additionally, identified with uncles and aunts.
The mother, the father, the parent, the parent of the nobleman, the old men, the old women know not yet of it, nor do any of the kinsmen – one's aunt, one's uncle – know yet in what manner the begotten one may perish (ibid).

On the other hand, in Book 4 one comes across the statement: *ic çan yca mellaquao, in joaniolque, in jtaoan*, or “so seldom did his kin, his parents, trouble themselves” (Sahagún 2012 IV: 10), where *itahuan* stands either for parents or for family elders, lacking (inadvertently?) the complementing *inanhuán*. A sixteenth-century prayer to the Virgin Mary arranges *-huanyolque* and “friends” in a doublet (Burkhart 2001: 119), though one cannot be certain if this alludes to their similar meaning or rather to being complementary to each other.

In the seventeenth-century sources the term appears less frequently than in the sixteenth century and in the eighteenth century it is entirely absent. In the “Exercicio Quotidiano” *-huanyolque* form a doublet with the term for “parents,” which can also be used with the meaning of “the elders of the family.” Within this phrase it can be interpreted as either synonymous with or complementary to *in-nan in-ta*:

*a uh inin ca toneixcuitil, yhuan tonahuatil inic ticchihuazque in tlein quimonequiltia dios, in manel inmetequipachol mochihuaz in tonanhuán in tohuanyolque* (Sahagún 1997a: 158),

And this is an example and an obligation for us: that we may do what God wishes even though sorrow may befall our parents and relatives (ibid).

Chimalpahin uses the term in a very general way, to describe the undifferentiated group of relatives who took part in the funeral of executed blacks:

*a uh yn intlacnacayo oncan quincallaquique yn contadoria tlatziita ça moch quechcotontia oncan quinquimilloto yn inhuayolque tliltique* (Chimalpahin 2006: 224).
They put their torsos in the royal accounting office, down below, and the relatives of all the blacks whose heads were cut off went there to shroud them (ibid.: 225).

In another place he describes with this term kin who have a common grand-grandfather (ibid.: 166), as well as nephews and grandchildren of the viceroy Luis de Velasco, at the same time excluding his sister from the group (ibid.: 176). A seventeenth-century document lists “parents,” “sister” and unusually spelled -huanyolcahuan as separate categories (Anderson, Berdan, Lockhart 1976: 198).

It can be gathered from the attestations that the use of the term varies depending on both an author and a reference point. -Huanyolqui seems to be general enough to describe an undifferentiated group of people presumed by the author to be close to their “relative.” Probably, at the same time it is often considered too general to include parents – the closest kin. The emphasis seems to be put on consanguineal ties, but one cannot entirely exclude affinals from the area covered by -huanyolque.

7.4. -COTONCA -HUILTECA

The doublet -cotonca -huilteca is glossed by fray Alonso de Molina under “Nocotonca, nouilteca. mi proximo, o pedaço, o miembro mio,” “Nocotoncauan, nouiltecauan. mis proximos” (Molina 1977 II: 72v), “Nouilteca, nocotonca. mi proximo” and “Nouiltecauan, nocotoncaua. mis proximos” (ibid.: 74r). He also includes all these variants with the 1st person plural possessive prefix, to- (ibid.: 148v, 151r). The doublet is composed of the words -cotonca, or “a part of something,” for example “icotonca intlamateualiztli,” or “a part of the penance” (ibid.: 33v) and huiltequi, which in Molina’s dictionary appears with the indefinite object prefix, tlahuiltequi, “to go the shortest route, to cross” (ibid.: 145r). Thus, the literal meaning of the difrasismo is “one’s part, he or she who crossed one (lay across one).” Helga Rammow interprets it as “he or she who has been cut off one” – huiltequi derives from tequi, “to cut” – and notes that the doublet is willingly employed for offspring (Rammow 1964: 42). She cites a passage from Chimalpahin’s “Memorial breve”:

auh yece ca cenca huecauhtica yn aqyique yn amocotoncahuan amoxelihucayohuan yn aciihui (Chimalpahin 1998: 94)
pues hace ya mucho tiempo que allá llegaron [a establecerse] quienes se dividieron y separaron de vosotros (ibid.: 95),

which she translates as “Aber erst nach langer Zeit werden sie, die eure Abkömmlinge sind, dort ankommen” (Rammow 1964: 42, n. 6). Here, however, the Rafael Tena’s translation given above seems much more relevant, because in the preceding sentence Huitzilopochtli warns the Mexica that the land he is giving to them has already been populated by others. The “Codex Chimalpahin” contains the single word -cotonca employed in the context of dividing the migrating groups: auh ca yncotoncahuan yn michhuaque yn Mexica (Chimalpahin 1997 I: 186-187), “the Michhuaque have separated from the Mexica.”

In my sample, the doublet -cotonca -huilteca appears only in Sahaguntine texts and in Molina’s “Confessionario mayor.” The latter author renders it in accordance with his dictionary as “proximo,” although he also once includes the translation “deudos” (Molina 1569: 15r) and once “deudos y parientes” (ibid.: 34). In the “Florentine Codex” and “Primeros Memoriales” the doublet is most often employed for people from beyond the narrowly defined family. Similarly to the attestations of -cotonca in Chimalpahin’s writings, it describes a division of an ethnic group: in tamjme, çan in cotoncaoa, in viltecciaioan, in teuchichimeca, or “Tamime were only an offshoot, a branch, of the Teochichimeca” (Sahagún 2012 X: 171). In the “Primeros Memoriales” a judge says to the commoners:

\[ y iehoa i, inic aca in amocotoca in amovilteca, inic motequipachoa in oq’polo in iaxca in itlatq’ \] (Sahagún 1997b: 216)

One of your relatives, one of your kin, is afflicted because he has lost his property, his possessions (ibid)

apparently using the doublet with the meaning of “those who come from the same group as you (i.e. one of you, commoners)” and not, as proposed by Thelma Sullivan and Henry B. Nicholson, “your relatives.” In a speech to a newborn the metaphor can even extend further, indicating mankind:
omjtzalmhoali in motatzin, in tlacatl, in tloque, naoaque, in teiocoianj, in techioanj, otimaxitico in tlalticpac: in vnca quhijovia, in vncan qujciav in mocotoncaoan, in movilttecaoaan: (Sahagún 2012 VI: 167-168)

Thy beloved father, the master, the lord of the near, of the nigh, the creator of men, the maker of men, hath sent thee; thou has come to reach the earth, where thy relatives, thy kinsmen suffer exhaustion, where they suffer fatigue (ibid).

As the “Confessionario mayor” shows, -cotonca -huilteca is sometimes employed for actual relatives. Likewise, in Book 10 a sister-in-law of a woman is called “tecotonca, teuilteca” (Sahagún 2012 X: 8). However, the majority of its attestations refer neither to consanguineals nor to affinals, but more generally to people who share some common characteristics. Therefore, I would not classify this doublet as a kinship term.

7.5. -CETCA AND -ONCA -ECA

The doublet -onca -eca has been discussed by Helga Rammow. According to her, the first component is based on the verb ca, “to be,” plus a directional prefix on- and it means “there is” or “there are.” The second one, still according to Rammow, derives from eco, “to arrive” (Rammow 1964: 42), which indeed sometimes changes the last vowel to a, for example in causative ecahuia (Karttunen 1992a: 75). However, the analysis of this doublet proposed by James Lockhart seems much more convincing. He points out that the particle -ca is used in ordinal sense with numerals, rendering: ome + ca (onca, “second”), ei + ca (eca, “third”), nahui + ca (nauhca, “fourth”), etc. Consequently, the doublet would mean “one’s second, one’s third.”

178 This sheds new light on another kin term that includes the particle -ca: -cetca. It appears in the dictionary of fray Alonso de Molina under “cetca. no. mi deudo, hermano o hermana” (Molina 1977 II: 18v) and “nocetca. mi deudo cercano, assi como hermano o hermana. &c.” (ibid.: 72v). Lockhart saw it with the meaning of “wife” and he concludes that it was a general term for “any kind of kin, including probably affinal” (Lockhart 1992: 500, n. 86). He suggests that it may be etymologically related to the verb

---

178 James Lockhart, personal communication, Jan 11, 2013.
cetia, “to unite,” which is confirmed by the Molina’s gloss: “icetca inome atoyatl. junta de dos rios” (Molina 1977 II: 32r). However, cetia is apparently derived from the numeral ce, “one,” which, arguably, also provides the etymology of -cetca (“one’s first”).

Following her etymological analysis, Rammow interprets the doublet -onca -eca as “ancestors and descendants” (Rammow 1964: 43). For example, a midwife expresses her concern as to whether a newborn would live long enough to know his family:

noxocoiouh cujx vel achi tiictlaliz tonatiuh, cujx titolvil, titomaceol: cujx ymjxco, imjcpac titlachiaz in mocollvan, in mocioan, in moncaoan, in mecaoan: auh cujx mjjxco, mocpac tlachiazque ( Sahagún 2012 VI: 168).

My youngest one! Perhaps thou wilt live for a little while! Art thou our reward? Art thou our merit? Perhaps thou wilt know thy grandfathers, thy grandmothers, thy kinsmen, thy lineage. And perhaps they will come to know thee (ibid).

As can be seen, Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J.O. Anderson rendered the doublet as “kinsmen, lineage.” Since the Spanish “Historia general” does not translate it, they based their suggestion on fray Andrés de Olmos’ “Arte” (ibid.: 168, n. 3), treating somewhat literary his entry “parientes de algunos que salen de un tronco” which gathers many terms for “relatives” but also for “neighbors” or “those who are like me” (Olmos 2002: 178). Nevertheless, Dibble and Anderson did not develop a single way of rendering the doublet. Apparently, sometimes they did not even recognize it: in Book 5 they took in tonca in teca, or “our seconds, our thirds” to be in tocal in tecal, or “our house, people’s house” ( Sahagún 2012 V: 154, n. 4). The text lists: “in tonca, in teca: in tauj, in totla, in tomach, in toueltiuh” (ibid.: 154), or “our seconds, our thirds: our aunt, our uncle, our nephew, our female cousin.” In Book 6 a child in calmecac tries to establish his position by referring to his powerful and wealthy parents and -onca -eca ( Sahagún 2012 VI: 214). Arguably, -cetca and -onca -eca as employed for relatives, reflected the generational distance from ego – the grade of kinship. The former is used for wife and siblings (a direct link) while the latter for uncle, aunt, nephew and cousin (indirect link, relatives separated by one generation).
7.6. -PO TERMS

The necessarily possessed term -po can be translated as “one’s equal, another like oneself” (Karttunen 1992a: 200). Frances Karttunen suggests that it can be a preterit-as-present verb, whose basic form would hypothetically be poa, “to be, become like someone.” The term is combined with various nouns: for example, notlacapo (tlacatl + -po), “a human being like myself” and nocnopoh (icnotl + -po), “someone poor like me” (ibid.: 201). Of these combinations, -huampo, -cihuapo and -tlacatcapo are translated by fray Alonso de Molina by means of Spanish kin terms and this qualifies them to be discussed here.

-Huampo or -huanpo contains the relational word -huan, “together with” (Karttunen 1992a: 81), therefore, it can be translated as “one’s companion of the same nature.” Horacio Carochi glosses the term as “ser vno de la mesma naturaleza, estado, ó condicion que otro” (Carochi 2001: 312). Molina has “Touampo. nuestro proximo” (Molina 1977 II: 151r) and he also translates -huampo by means of the word “pariente”:

\[
\text{Auh iniquac aca mouampo anoço aquin mocniuh oqcemitoca: omonehtolitica, inic ytlæ qualli yectli quitequipanoz quichiuaz, auh intehuatl çan otiquellelti, çan otic tlacahualti?}
\]

O porventura, estoruaste a algun pariente o amigo tuyo, que no pusiesse en effecto ni cumpliesse el bien que auia propuesto de hazer, o el voto o promessa q auia hecho? (Molina 1569: 100v)

It has to be stressed, however, that this is an isolated example. The remaining attestations from the “Confessionario mayor” are rendered with the term “prójimo,” or “a neighbor” (in a Christian sense). This meaning is likewise seen throughout the “Exercicio quotidiano” (Sahagún 1997a). I have not found the term -huampo employed with the sense of “consanguineal” or “affinal” in the Nahua-authored literature.

When combined with the modifier cihua-, or “a woman,” -po transforms into -cihuapo. This term is glossed by Molina as “Nociuapo. muger como yo, o mi compañera y parienta” (Molina 1977 II: 72v) and “Teciuapo. compañera de muger, o hermana suya, o
I have found only two attestations of this term. The first one comes from Molina’s “Confessionario mayor”: *auh yniuac tictecah mouepol, yn mociuahu yciu apo*, which he translates as: “y despues que tuuiste parte con tu cuñada hermana de tu muger” (Molina 1569: 32v). A man’s sister-in-law is defined as his wife’s -*cihuapo*, here apparently understood as “sister.” In the “Bancroft Dialogues” -*cihuapo* likewise accompanies -*huepol* (“a sibling-in-law of the opposite sex”), but it seems to have a different meaning than the one suggested by Molina:

\[
\text{in oncan ompopohuiz in oncan onixtluahui inic nechonmoyollaliliz, yhuan inic}
\text{comacopaitzi tilitlaque in ihuepoltzitzinhuan in ichuapotzitzinhuan, ihuan in}
\text{icuitlapiltzin in iatlapaltzin (Karttunen, Lockhart 1987: 120).}
\]

where it will come to fruition that she will console me, and her (little) brothers-in-law and sisters (sisters-in-law) and her vassals will be looking up to her (ibid.: 121).

These words are spoken by the *tlatoani* of Texcoco who asks the *tlatoani* of Tenochtitlan for his daughter’s hand. Since -*cihuapo* unambiguously connotes a female and it is juxtaposed in a doublet with -*huepol*, it can be concluded that it was meant here to be its complement: a sibling-in-law of the same sex as the reference point. However, this relationship was normally covered by the term -*huezhui* (as far as Molina’s example is concerned, the regular terms for a woman’s sister were -*pi* and -*iuc*). Karttunen and Lockhart hypothesize that -*cihuapo* might have sounded friendlier (ibid.: 51), but there is no reason to use a friendly sounding term when scolding a sinner. Although the material is too scarce to draw any firm conclusions, on the basis of -*cihuapo*’s etymology one can suggest that the term was simply meant to stress the similarity between the two women. The sin was even bigger if a man had sex with a woman almost identical (because of their close blood relationship) to his wife; and the life of a future queen of Texcoco will be much more pleasant if she is surrounded by women so similar to herself. Most likely, as in the case of -*cotonca -huilteca*, -*cihuapo* was not a kin term, but a more general designation, sometimes employed for kin relations.
The third term, \textit{-tlacatcapo} has been found only in Molina’s “Confessionario mayor.” The phrase “\textit{ynaço ytlacatcapo, aço yhuanyolqui}” is translated by Molina as “\textit{Si son (por ventura) entre si deudos, o parientes}” (Molina 1569: 46r). The first element of the word, \textit{tlacateca} is based on the preterit/ agentive form \textit{tlacatqui}, “(s)he was born.” Therefore, the term can be interpreted as “the one who was born like me,” suggesting that it describes a consanguineal relationship. A further suggestion of the same kind is made by Molina who presents an alternative: \textit{-tlacatcapo} or \textit{-huanyolqui}. The latter term refers to a close relative, perhaps a housemate (see: 7.3. -huanyolqui). In the sixteenth-century documents from Tlaxcala the term \textit{-tlacatcaicniuh} is employed. Since in this region \textit{-icniuh} was apparently understood as an equivalent of \textit{-po} (Sullivan 1987: 40), \textit{-tlacatcaicniuh} would be a variant of \textit{-tlacatcapo}.

\section*{8. COMADRE AND COMPADE}

The Spanish terms “\textit{comadre}” and “\textit{compadre}” describe the relationship between biological parents of a child and his or her godparents – both parties employ it in reference to each other. They entered the Nahuatl terminological system as loanwords quite early, for they appear in fray Alonso de Molina’s “Confessionario mayor.” \textit{-Comadre} and \textit{-compadre} were not kin terms strictly speaking, because the relationship they described was bound neither through blood nor through marriage, but rather through baptism. Nevertheless, I have decided to include them in the present discussion for two reasons. Firstly, many ritual kin terms associated with baptism were, in both Spanish and Nahuatl terminological systems, based on actual kin designations (e.g. \textit{teoyotica} -\textit{pil}, \textit{teoyotica} -\textit{ta}, -padrino, etc.), which implied a certain degree of conceptual equivalence between the kinship and the ritual spheres. Secondly, in colonial Mexico \textit{-comadre} and \textit{-compadre} were treated as kin, at least as far as the marriage rules were concerned:

\textit{aço aca yequimonamictiznequi yhuayolqui, yn ontlamampan yteyccaugh, yça teyxhuiuan, ynanoce ontlamapan yhuepol, anoço ytlah, anoço yyahui, yn anoce y compadre, yn anoce y comadre, yn anoce aca occetlacatl, acht o quitenehuiliteoyotl,}
o si alguno dellos se qere casar co su parienta e segudo grado de cosanguiniad, o en segudo grado de afinidad, o con su tio, o tia, o con su copadre: o comadre: o que aya dado primero a otra palabras de casamiento (Molina 1569: 49v).

Hugo Nutini stresses that in Mesoamerica the social role of the institution of *compadrazgo* is in many aspects similar to the role of kinship (Nutini 1976: 20). It is likely that the reason it was so willingly adopted by the Nahuas was the need to compensate for the disruption of family life after the Conquest and following epidemics (Cline 1986: 71).

Molina includes neither *-comadre* nor *-compadre* in the Nahuatl-to-Spanish part of his dictionary, but in the Spanish-to-Nahuatl part he glosses “compadrazgo” as *compadreyotl*, “Compadre. lo mismo” (Molina 1977 I: 28r) and “Comadre. lomismo” (ibid.: 27v). Moreover, he has the native term *nohuehuepo* glossed as “el que es viejo como yo, o mi compadre, o mi comadre” (Molina 1977 II: 74r). The editors of the online Nahuatl dictionary developed at Wired Humanities Projects cite the attestation of *-comadre* from a 1577 testament from Xochimilco.\(^{179}\) Frances Karttunen and James Lockhart mention the even earlier verb *moconpadretia*, “to become compadres,” found in a 1553 text (Karttunen, Lockhart 1976: 59). Regarding the eighteenth-century “Testaments of Toluca,” Caterina Pizzigoni remarks: “those so named [compadre and comadre, J.M.] might be called on for help or to raise children, but do not appear as heirs” (ibid.: 20). However, a 1639 document from Azcapotzalco proves that compadres did inherit from each other at times:

\[
\begin{align*}
Ocsen & \text{tlamantli niquitoa ytechcacopa yn caltzintli Amelco onechmocaguilili} \\
& \text{noconpadretzin don Domingo Erera} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Rojas Rabiela, Rea López, Medina Lima 2000 III: 221)

I declare another thing, concerning the little house in Amelco which my compadre, don Domingo Herrera, left to me.\(^{180}\)

In today’s Nahuatl de la Huasteca -*comadre*, spelled -*comaleh*, apart from retaining its original meaning, is also extended to describe the relationship between mothers of a married couple (Spanish “consuegra”). Moreover, *tocomaleh*, or “our comadre,” is employed to greet

\(^{179}\) [http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso](http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso), consulted Jan 4, 2013.

\(^{180}\) Translation mine.
married women with respect. Similar connotations (“compadre,” “consuegro,” “a married man greeted with respect”) are ascribed to the term -compadre, spelled -compah or -compaleh.\(^{181}\)

## CONCLUSION

An attempt to analyze systematically Nahuatl kin terms, as employed in colonial written sources, revealed the complexity and dynamics of the terminological system. Alterations and innovations induced by the contact with the Spanish language and culture were to be expected – after all, it is thanks to this contact that the colonial terminology can be studied today. Apparently, however, the system was heterogeneous even before the Conquest. Differences are detectable in space, due to regional diversity of Nahuatl and in time, as the language and culture were submitted to historical processes. The impact of the latter is particularly manifest in sibling terminology, which had begun to transform itself well before the arrival of the Spaniards and continued along previously established lines in spite and, at the same time, because of the major shift in the cultural panorama. Although dynamic, the terminological system of the Nahuas was not chaotic. It was governed by an internal logic that limited the number of ways in which both innovations could be adapted and transformations could occur. This logic, which stood at the very basis of the concept of kinship, also allowed for kin terms to be employed as metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>NATURE</th>
<th>SOCIETY</th>
<th>RELIGION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-pil</td>
<td>man’s child (in sing.); either man’s or woman’s children (in pl.); a younger consanguineal or affinal kin under the charge of the ref. point</td>
<td>nobleman of direct descent; important personage; member of the community; tlatoani’s vassal; one’s student or</td>
<td>Quetzalcoatl (our “child”); impersonator of a deity; worshipper of a deity; sacrificial victim in regard to both his captor and the deity</td>
<td>anybody (regardless of gender and status) addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{181}\) [http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso](http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso), consulted Jan 4, 2013.
<p>| -cibuapil   | daughter               | listener                  | woman addressed by another woman |
| -oquichpil  | son                    |                          | man addressed by a woman          |
| -coneuh     | woman’s child; a younger member of the family | member of the community (tender manner of speaking) | a person being in intimate relations with a woman, addressed by her politely |
| -ichpoch    | (grown) daughter       | female member of the community | woman |
| -telpoch    | (grown) son            |                          | man                                   |
| -xocoyouh   | the youngest child; a younger consanguineal kin under the charge of the ref. point |             | anybody addressed in a tender and informal manner |
| -yacapan    | the eldest child; a younger consanguineal kin under the charge of the ref. point | |
| -ta         | father; elderly man in the household | fire in regard to people | counselors of a political leader; nevertheless in regard to the tlatoani; the elders of the community; leader in regard to his subjects |
| -nan        | mother; elderly woman; the one in charge of young women in the household; concubine; ext. stepmother | bedrock in which precious stones are found; bed of the ravine; sky in regard to celestial bodies; also an artifact: a cradle in regard to the baby | Fertility goddesses in regard to people; protector-deities of altepetl; the name of a mountain; a creator-goddess in regard to other deities |
| -nan -ta    | parent; the elders of the household; ancestors | those who deliver a speech in regard to their audience; ruler in regard to his subjects/altepetl | creative-destructive deities in regard to the people; Huehuetoltl in regard to other deities; the one |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-techiuhcauh</td>
<td>lineal ascendant</td>
<td>those who pass oral tradition to subsequent generations; authorities in regard to their subjects; counselor in regard to a political leader (or gen. to high-ranked person)</td>
<td>who provides the Sun with sacrificial victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ixhuiuh</td>
<td>grandchild; (sibling’s or cousin’s grandchild?); descendant; an heir who claims his rights from his grandparents</td>
<td>nobleman who cannot directly trace his descent from the source of nobility</td>
<td>an elder who pronounced a huehuetlatolli or an advisor addressed by his listener (“disciple”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-col</td>
<td>grandfather, grandfather’s brother or cousin, ancestor</td>
<td>both officials in charge of tribute and land, and land workers in regard to their masters</td>
<td>tenant addressed by his master, elderly commoner addressed by a nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ci</td>
<td>grandmother, a source of heir’s rights</td>
<td>fertility goddess; a goddess important for the Mexica identity (Toci)</td>
<td>elderly female commoner addressed by a nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mach</td>
<td>man’s nibling, an heir who claims his rights through collateral ties, ext. nibling-in-law</td>
<td>[possible usage, the meaning not established]</td>
<td>tlatoani addressed by those whom he defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tla</td>
<td>uncle, aunt’s husband</td>
<td>a person to whom another one is indebted: ally; merchants in regard to tlatoani; noblemen in regard to the community</td>
<td>one who had granted favors addressed by his debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ahui</td>
<td>aunt, uncle’s wife, adoptive mother?</td>
<td>caretaker [?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-iccauh</td>
<td>man’s younger sibling or cousin</td>
<td>a dependent of the same social class as his master [?]; title of respect: a nobleman in regard to another nobleman</td>
<td>man (or woman?) addressed by a member of the same class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-teiccauh</td>
<td>man’s younger sibling or cousin branch of a ravine</td>
<td>one’s charge of the same class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ach</td>
<td>elder brother (or cousin?), the oldest child, ext. brother-in-law</td>
<td>servant [?]</td>
<td>one who accompanies an -ixipila right before the sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-achcauh</td>
<td>man’s elder brother (or cousin?)</td>
<td>one in charge of young men or women in military, schools and temples; a man distinguished from among his class</td>
<td>a principal deity in regard to other deities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te/fachcauh</td>
<td>man’s elder brother or cousin</td>
<td>one in charge of young men or women in schools; a man distinguished from among his class; any [?] warrior or youth at school</td>
<td>a principal member of groups addressed by other members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hueltiuh</td>
<td>man’s elder (?) sister or cousin, great-grandmother, ext. sister-in-law</td>
<td>mediator between two altepetl in regard to her community of origin</td>
<td>item charged with magical power by an officiant; female mediator between the human and the supernatural (tlamacazqui) in regard to the one who sends her; “brujas” in regard to a person whose vital essence they incorporate [take over? absorb?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oquichtiuh</td>
<td>woman’s elder brother (or cousin?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>the one who delegates his vital essence to a “diosa-bruja”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pi</td>
<td>woman’s elder sister or cousin, the oldest daughter</td>
<td>female tutor of a noble lady; any [?] woman in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Extended meanings of Nahuatl kin terms in precontact contexts.
Table 4 presents all the kin terms that can be found with an extended meaning in the spheres other than family ties. As can be seen, these terms are limited to four classes discerned in the present study: 1) children and parents, 2) grandchildren and grandparents, 3) niebies, uncles and aunts and 4) siblings and cousins. The terms for distant consanguineals, affinals and relatives do not extend beyond their primary meanings. The term -namic, which, apart from “spouse,” is also employed for a “match,” was most likely extended in the opposite direction: to rather than from the family sphere. Not all the kin terms from the four mentioned classes are attested as metaphors. For example, -tlacyehua is missing among terms for children indicating their relative age and -iuc – among terms for siblings and cousins. Perhaps their metaphorical usages are yet to come up in sources that have not been included in the present study. -Pil(l)u forms a separate case, because the words for “one’s nobleman” and “woman’s nibling” have proved to be homonyms rather than the primary and secondary meanings of the same term.

I have distinguished five major spheres in which extended terms appear: family, nature, society, religion, and address. They do not include specific colonial contexts (such as Christian religion or Spanish administration), which will be discussed separately below. In the family sphere, the ways in which terms for parents and children are used, seem to point to a household as a chief organizational unit because they are at the same time employed for the elders of a household and their younger charges. A Nahua “family,” as sketched by kin terms, is a large and complex unit: terms for siblings, grandparents, grandchildren and perhaps also uncles, aunts and niebies, cover a range of collateral ties. I do not consider these usages to be “extensions” as they are sometimes called by researchers. By “extension” I understand employing the same term to name at least two distinct concepts in a local system. For example, the term -nan means “mother” but under particular circumstances it is extended to “stepmother” otherwise called -chahuanan. There are no particular terms for cousins in the Nahuatl system, wherefore we must assume that they were conceptually included in the same class as siblings. Perhaps we could define -(te)iccanaun, -hueltiuan, etc. as “children of my -nanhuan or -tahuuan,” i.e. of all the elders in the household, be they my actual parents, uncles or other collateral kin. Similarly, -colhuan and -cihuan would be “the parents of my -nanhuan and -tahuuan,” while -ixhuiahuan would stand for “the children of my charges.” I do not mean these definitions to be accurate or exhaustive, they are just meant to show that once we get rid of European pre-assumptions and start to describe Nahuatl concepts with Nahuatl terms, our
perspective changes. The image of kin relations that arises from semantic fields of discussed terms correlates with a model of a compound household, known from the Tenochtitlan area, rather than with Texcocan nuclear households. It is a multi-generational unit where one is raised by the elders including his own parents together with their siblings or cousins, as well as by his grandparents along with their collateral relatives.

For the majority of terms contained in Table 4 it is possible to identify a logical principle that underlies all or almost all usages of a given term, by comparing them with each other as well as considering them within the cultural context in which they operated. These logical principles differ from what we deal with in English, Polish, Spanish or other Indo-European languages. Taking the parents-children terminology as an example, the dictionary of the Real Academia Española\(^\text{182}\) gives the following metaphorical glosses for “padre”:

- macho en el ganado destinado a la procreación;
- cabeza de una descendencia, familia o pueblo;
- origen, principio;
- autor de una obra de ingenio, inventor de otra cosa cualquiera,

“madre”:

- en los hospitales y casas de recogimiento, mujer a cuyo cargo está el gobierno en todo o en parte;
- causa, raíz u origen de donde proviene algo;
- acequia principal de la que parten o donde desaguan las hijuelas;
- heces del mosto, vino o vinagre, que se sientan en el fondo de la cuba, tinaja, etc.

and “hijo”:

- obra o producción del ingenio;
- cosa que procede o sale de otra por procreación; p. ej., los retoños o renuevos que echa el árbol por el pie, la caña del trigo, etc.;
- persona que ha tomado el hábito religioso, con relación al fundador de su orden y a la casa donde lo tomó;

These semantic fields make it clear that in Spanish the relationship between “parents” and “children” is based on hierarchy. “Parents” are not only the “origin” – which results from their biological function – but they also “govern,” which is very much cultural. At the same time, “children” are subordinate to their “parents” but they are also the loved ones. In Nahuatl, the relationship between rulers and their subjects is described with the parents-children dyad as well, which cause a dangerously comfortable feeling that we are dealing with a familiar procedure. Nevertheless, as the present study has shown, it is not the family hierarchy or political hierarchy that account for such a usage of these terms, but rather the local belief that the tlatoani was providing his altepetl with vital essence in a similar way to parents who were transferring the same essence to their children. As one can easily see in Table 4 all the terms for “children” have a connotation of “receivers,” whereas all the terms for “parents” have a connotation of “senders.” They only differ in details: -pil is a “regular receiver” while -xocoyouh is a “cherished receiver” or -ta is a “hot sender” while -nan is a “cold and humid sender.” The same concept of transferring vital essence seems to underlay the usages of the terms for grandparents and grandchildren. Larger generational distance correlates with the weakening transmission: while “fathers” use breath or blood as media, “grandfathers” communicate by means of earthly goods; pipiltin are noblemen par excellence, while teixhuihuan’s noble ancestry is cloudy.

In the introductory part of the study, I addressed methodological problems that arise from employing Alfredo López Austin’s model of three animistic entities for understanding what I call “vital essence.” The identification of what exactly was sent by the kin and people or beings metaphorically designated as kin, requires a separate study. Along with tonalli and yolia, there are many other Nahuatl terms that seem to refer to a kind of “cosmic force.” Perhaps the best known is teotl, defined by the colonial friars as “god,” by the modern researchers, however, considered rather in terms of essence, force, or even “mana” (Hvidtfeldt 1958: 82-84). Another group of words: -tlaço, -mauiz, -mahuizyo and -tleyo referred, according to the Spaniards, to the concept of fame, respect or esteem (viewed, obviously, from the European perspective), but, as I have suggested in 1.1.2. Hierarchy among children, they likely connoted more esoteric meanings as well. Of these terms, of special interest is -tleyo, recently analyzed by Justyna Olko, who pointed to its etymological association with
tletl, “fire” (Olko 2014, in press). Temperatures – hot and cold – is a recurring theme as far as vital essence is concerned. The concept of such a dichotomy as the basic principle of life was developed by López Austin and, from the point of view of the kinship terminological system, it seems much more viable than the animistic entities hypothesis. The heat, associated with fire, Sun, masculinity and fatherhood, and the cold, associated with water, growth, femininity, death and motherhood were complementary to each other. Nevertheless, their respective domains cannot be structured in pairs of simple binary oppositions, as López Austin suggests (López Austin 2000: 160). Death and life, for example, are both characteristic of the cold domain, sometimes identified with the underworld, where bodies are buried, but from where plants sprout as well. Native terminology referring to these concepts is yet to be identified and analyzed. As far as the research on hot essences is concerned, tonalli and -tleyo form a good point of departure. For cold essences López Austin employs the doublet itzmolincayotl celicayotl (actually, it is -itzmolinc -celica, “one’s growing thing, one’s sprouting thing” in the “Florentine Codex”), but this is obviously a metaphor and one would expect here something more explicit. -Itzmolinc -celica is often juxtaposed with other doublets-metaphors, such as -totonca -iamanca, “one’s hot thing, one’s soft thing” or -tzopelica -ahuiaca “one’s sweet thing, one’s fragrant thing” and all three are described as attributes of various deities (see e.g. Sahagún 2012 VI: 51). In what ways all these terms were positioned in regard to each other, what was the nature of the concepts they referred to and if any of them could be employed for “vital essence” transferred by the kin – all these questions have to be left for future research.

Unlike the terminology referring to parents and children, the analysis of the terms for siblings and cousins has rendered more complex results, mainly because this group apparently includes several phases of the development of the terminological system. The terms of the simplest form: -ach, -iuc and -pi, seem to be the oldest in the set, not only because of their connotations outside the kinship sphere, but also because they were early enough to become the basis for other terms (especially those for generationally distant consanguineals: -iucton, -pipton, -achtion). The general rules of the Nahuatl terminological system discern the sex of relatives older than ego (e.g. -col and -ci), but ignore the sex of younger relatives (e.g. -ixhuiuh). The sixteenth-century variant did not conform to this pattern, but perhaps -ach, -iuc and -pi are reminiscent of it. However, one should also remember about the term -mimi whose connotation remains unknown and which in the texts from the studied area had been
preserved only in the form -minton. Arguably, further on three pairs of terms were added to the system: -hueltiuh and -oquichtiuh, -achcauh and -iccauh and -te/iccauh and -teiccauh. The terms began to be differentiated according to the sex of the reference point (note that the archaic -ach did not underwent this process!) and I am inclined to think that by the time of contact something was beginning as regards the sex of the primary referent. Although -iccauh and -teiccauh (“younger sibling/ cousin of a man”) are seemingly ungendered, they rarely refer to women if compared to a quite common term -hueltiuh (“elder? sister/ cousin of a man”), so one may sense a growing tendency to employ the former only for brothers/ male cousins and the latter for sisters/ female cousins. The emerging emphasis on the sex of the primary referent younger than ego in the terminological system is likewise seen in the “new” terms for children: -ichpoch and -telpoch. It conforms to a general concern with gender manifest in Nahua culture, which tended to view the aberration from strictly defined masculinity and femininity as dangerous. The topic discussed here calls for a linguistic analysis and the above is just meant to demonstrate the need to study Nahuatl sibling/ cousin terminology from a diachronic perspective. The fact that this group of terms had gone through a complex transformation and by the time of contact was probably undergoing further changes, had implications for the metaphoric usage of sibling/ cousin terminology as well.

Generally speaking, the main logical principle that underlies the usages of the terms for collateral consanguineals differs from what we have seen in the case of lineal consanguineals. While the latter are involved in the transmission of vital essence, the former remain in the area of social obligations. Instead of sending precious essence, “elder brothers” assist or take responsibility, “elder sisters of women” give example and “uncles” render favors. On the other hand, “younger siblings” and “nephews/ nieces” accept the support of their relatives. In most cases, the relations between collaterals do not seem to require a connection of two separate domains, being limited to either the earth (our altepetl/ household) or the world beyond (foreign altepetl/ households). However, it does not mean that contact or communication, which is essential for the relationship between lineal consanguineals, is entirely absent from the relations between collaterals. -Hueltiuh and -oquichtiuh are involved in the process of mediation: the former is a liminal category that incorporates a part of the latter’s vital essence in order to facilitate the communication between himself and another “world.” It is possible that a more thorough study would reveal the aspects of communication
and the transmission of precious essence, so crucial to the worldview of the Nahuas, among the principles that governed the extension of other terms for collateral consanguineals. Another option is that the fact that the repertoire of the kin terms that connoted direct transmission (either strong or weak, depending on a generation involved) was enriched with the concept of indirect transmission (through a mediator), was at some point an innovation which overlapped the pre-existing system. For now, nothing more can be said based on the sources studied in the present work.

Obviously, although the above-described logical principles are easily discernible from the studied material, they did not govern all the extensions of kin terms in Table 4. Some of these extensions seem to be secondary, based on well-established metaphors. For example, the term -nananhuan employed for “concubines” or women who served the unrelated men both economically and sexually, was probably derived from tenanhuan, or “the elder women (i.e. those who had children) in the household.” Tenanhuan, on its part, was well explicable with the principle of transmission: they were women who contributed to the household not only biologically (some of the members were their actual children), but also by passing the oral tradition to young people. But the connotation of “elder women” became so common, that regardless of its origin, it started to be extended on its own. The same happened with the word teachcauh, understood as a young warrior or a telpochcalli member. It is based on -achcauh, “the principal or distinguished one among equals.” Arguably, it had originally been employed to name “the masters of youths” in temples or schools, but after some time it was extended to all the members of educational institutions.

From the network of metaphorical meanings and logical principles that stood behind them, one can also conclude on the Nahua concept of kinship. If the name “parents” was ascribed to those who transferred vital essence, this was because such was the role of actual, biological parents. At the same time, the roles of relatives were apparently conceived of as a tight knot of biological and social elements. For instance, the concept of the transfer of vital essence from parents to children leaned on both the biological bond between them and the process of raising the offspring which included crucial, from the point of view of the society, transmission of oral tradition. Sometimes, terminological extensions point to contemporary family patterns or those that may have existed in the past: “the (elder?) sister of a man” is understood as a “mediator” probably because at some point in the Nahua history there was a
tendency for women to marry out. The terms tepilhuan, teixhuihuan and temachhuan provide a more direct reference to the social reality: they refer to three categories of potential heirs, whose rights arise directly from parents (or: “parents”?), “grandparents” and “uncles” respectively.

An important area in Table 4 is address. The forms of address based on kin terms were employed according to the same rules as the respective forms of reference. It means that the concepts of “reciprocity” and “inversion” often employed by the researchers to explain the extensions of kin terms in direct speech are not valid. Calling somebody “my child!” does not recur to the inverted hierarchy, stressing a high position of an addressee, because a hierarchy was not an organizing concept in Nahua terminological system. “Child” was not a “subordinate,” but a “receiver”: -pil employed in the vocative simply marked the recipient of discourse. In many instances it was not even polite – merely neutral – therefore, in order to avoid misunderstandings I suggest to use the term “direct speech” instead of “polite speech” in reference to kin terms-based forms of address. Similarly, although the discussed forms of address were reciprocal within the frames of the system to which they belonged, they were not reciprocal in a hierarchical way as we have tended to understand them. A ruler could address his subject nopiltzine, but this did not mean that the subject would always call the ruler notatzine. The relation important for selecting the appropriate term was the one between a sender and a receiver of vital essence rather then the one between a ruler and his subject. It is conspicuous that the majority of kin terms-based vocatives are derived from the terms for relatives younger than ego: children, grandchildren and younger brothers. Table 4 lists the connotations of these vocatives but it does not show that only 26 out of 338 attestations in my database are based on the terms for relatives older than ego. The reason for this is that in most cases there was a need to mark the “listener” or “receiver.” The tone of the speech was, in turn, marked with a chosen term: “child” for a neutral tone, “grandchild” for more reverence or “the youngest child” for intimacy and tenderness.

Forms of address based on kin terms have a particular grammatical form: they are almost always combined with the 1st person singular possessive prefix. It has to be stressed that among the vocatives attested in the database (excluding contact-induced innovations) only 9 have prefixes other than no- and some of them are questionable as far as transcription or translation is concerned. It suggests that no- had frozen to the stem and began to be used as
a marker of direct speech rather than a possessive prefix. This fact, in turn, results interesting when one considers the avoidance of primary terms in conversations between relatives. Perhaps relatives tended to avoid kin terms-based forms of address because they were so inevitably charged with their metaphoric meanings that, at least on some occasions, they would not have been understood as kin terms sensu stricte. How could a young nobleman refer to a tlatoani who was at the same time his grandfather, nocoltzine, if he was using this term in regard to an official who guarded his cultivated lands? Wasn’t it better to call the royal grandfather the same way as every other nobleman called him – nopiltzintzine, i.e. “o lord”? Under such circumstances each form of address should initially be assumed not to be a kin term. Only the context and background information can provide us with a clue whether in this particular case an actual kin is involved.

Both the forms of address and the forms of reference appear in various grammatical forms and these grammatical forms often affect their connotations. In direct speech, the ending -tze is employed to indicate less distance, while -tzine charges the term with reverence. The advisers of rulers or teuctlatoque are usually described as a group and called -tahuan whereas the singular -ta most often describes deities. We can easily tell when the term -col is meant to connote an actual grandfather or a land official, because in the former case it will have a reverential ending -tzin that would be omitted in the latter case. These examples could be further multiplied. Possessive prefixes can also transform the meaning of the term, as has already been indicated in the discussion of vocatives. Along with no-, such properties characterize the prefixes te- and to-, that often change kin terms into titles. For example, tetatzin should be understood as a “man who has the status of a father,” i.e. an elder in a household or in a community. Tepiltzin, on the other hand, is a nobleman who can directly trace his descent from a status-legitimizing ancestor. While the prefix te- is indefinite, to-refers to “us,” i.e. “our community.” It seems that the two prefixes operate more or less in the same manner and the only difference between titles they form part of is that to-stresses the importance of the described concept for “us.” Thus, Tecí, “one’s grandmother,” would be a goddess venerated in any place (the place is not really important), but Toci, “our grandmother” would have her shrine in our altepetl and “we” would like to stress this fact by naming her Toci rather than Tecí. This hypothesis, however, should be further cross-checked against more ethnohistoric data.
The terms listed in Table 4 tend to enter with each other into doublets. These doublets are shown in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ci</th>
<th>col</th>
<th>coneuh</th>
<th>iccauh</th>
<th>ixhuiuh</th>
<th>pil</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>teiccauh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achcauh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>he of the same position as the ref. point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahui</td>
<td>high-level attendant (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci</td>
<td></td>
<td>grand-parent, ancestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col</td>
<td></td>
<td>grand-parent, ancestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ancestor, subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hueltiuh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dependant relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parent, etc. (see Table 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pil</td>
<td>child (of both parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>descendant, nobleman, respectful manner of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>techiuhauh</td>
<td>grand-father, ancestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father, ruler’s counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telpoch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“naturalised com-patriot” (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xocoyouh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tender manner of speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Doublets.**

There are two main principles of reading doublets composed of kin terms: the juxtaposed terms either deliver an entirely new meaning or one of them is meant to precise the connotation of the other. The former is seen in such *difrasismos* as -pil -ixhuiuh (“one’s child, one’s grandchild”) whose basic meaning is “one’s descendant” or -achcauh -iccauh (“one’s elder brother, one’s younger sibling”), which describes someone of the same status or nature as a reference point. An example of the latter is -techiuhcauh -col, where the meaning of the
first component ("one’s ancestor or lineal ascendant") is refined by the second component ("one’s grandfather") and the entire set is to be understood as “one’s grandfather.”

Terminological systems are never static and their students should always expect incongruities resulting from historical processes. But, as shown in the present study, in the case of Nahua kin terms we deal with a major change, which is a result of contact with Spanish language and culture. Most importantly, it should be stressed that the nature of sources available to us undoubtedly accounts for deformations in the overall picture. In the first decades after the Conquest particularly, alphabetic writing was controlled by Spanish friars who themselves produced a great deal of the material. Therefore, some terms and specific ways of their use can only be found in ecclesiastical literature and it is quite likely that they did not filter into the spoken language of the Nahuas. Some ways of use apparently entered the vocabulary of literate natives but they still might have been unknown to the common people. For this reason, the overrepresentation of religious contexts in Table 6 may not reflect the exact nature of transformations taking place in common language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SOCIETY</th>
<th>RELIGION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-pil</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>vassals of Spanish authorities</td>
<td>Jesus (the Son); Christians in regard to God, pope and the Holy Church; members of religious orders in regard to their patrons; something founded in regard to its founder</td>
<td>natives addressed by priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-coneuh</td>
<td>son (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christians in regard to God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ichpoch</td>
<td>daughter (including little girls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-telpoch</td>
<td>son (including little boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yacapan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>in plural: parents</td>
<td>the Spanish king</td>
<td>God the Father; male saints; friars; priests in regard to the natives; founders of religious orders in regard to their followers; God and saints as patrons (&quot;owners&quot; of one’s land); God in regard to a dying person</td>
<td>God the Father, God and priests addressed by the natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Virgin Mary in regard to her worshippers (also as their intercessor); Eve; the Holy Church in regard to Christians; female saints;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
founders and patrons of religious orders in regard to their followers; the Virgin Mary and saints as “owners” of one’s land

-teiccauh

Basilians in regard to San Basilio (who was himself a friar); cardinals in regard to the pope

Christians addressed by San Agustin; devils addressed by Lucifer; Melchor and Baltasar (the Magi) addressed by Gaspar

-teachcauh

a senior member of a confraternity in regard to other members

Gaspar addressed by Melchor and Baltasar (the Magi)

-namic

the Holy Church in regard to an archbishop

Table 6. Metaphoric usages of kin terms in colonial contexts.

Contact with Spanish culture affected the Nahua terminological system in many ways. Table 6 lists only new connotations of those Nahuatl terms that had existed before the Conquest (questionable -namic included) and that were extended outside the kinship sphere. A large part of innovations consisted of loanwords (such as -hermano or -tio) that tended to replace the original vocabulary. Modifiers – teoyotica, tlamampan or huecapan – were used to adjust Nahua terminology in relation to Spanish ideas. Other transformations involved terms not employed as metaphors, such as -cihuauh or -tlacamecayo: they were adapted to suit the Spanish concepts of “mujer” and “linaje” respectively. Table 6 also shows several terms that subtly changed their connotations within the kinship sphere, following Spanish patterns. The column “religion” clearly demonstrates that these patterns were likewise taken into account when extending kin terms. However, the process in question was not a simple replacement of the Nahuatl classification system by the Spanish one. Although many ways in which terms were used gradually disappeared, some persisted, coexisting with innovations. It will probably never be possible to trace all the modifications of the meaning of these terms step by step, but one can imagine a slow process of convergence occurring in the minds of speakers. As Table 6 shows, in spite of different conceptual systems, some ways to understand specific terms were similar enough in both cultures to guarantee the survival of indigenous concepts (though always slightly altered), for instance, naming the members of religious orders their patron’s -pilhuan.
In the colonial period new connotations of kin terms were often expressed by means of traditional preconquest language resources. The prefix no- was still a common marker of direct speech and the prefixes te- and to- served to create “titles,” which is particularly striking when one compares such forms as totatzin (“a priest”) or totlaçonantzin (“the Virgin Mary”) to pre-Christian forms, e.g. tota (“fire”) or tonantzin (“creative female deity”). Arguably, the elements tlaço- and mahuiz- changed their meanings significantly under Spanish influence. They arose from a contextual framework of the Nahua worldview, were preciousness, respect or fame were associated with the concept of divine essence. After the introduction of Christianity tlaço- had become, at first, associated with the Christian concept of “holiness” but then, as time passed, this connotation started to weaken and finally the two words ended up as mere honorifics. Other vocabulary important for the precontact Nahua resulted useless in reference to the new: in -nan in -ta, -techiuhcauh, or the majority of the terms for collateral consanguineals were not extended to describe concepts related to Spanish religion or colonial rule. Nevertheless, it does not mean that they stopped to be used metaphorically. As seventeenth-century Nahuatl incantations reveal, many terms were still employed at that time with meanings that reflected the underlying conception of circulating essences.
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