

(25 other languages without names)

Sources: Bright 1967, Harvey 1972, Longacre 1967, McQuown 1955, Swadesh 1968.

1.14.1. Naolan. Naolan was spoken in Naolan, near Tula in southern Tamaulipas. It was all but extinct when Weitlaner (1948b) collected the only known material, 43 words and phrases, in 1947. He compared it to Otopamean languages, some so-called Hokan languages, and some UA languages, finding that "the few correspondences are distributed almost equally among the three linguistic groups" (1948b:217) (my translation, LC), and concludes, "the author of this work is inclined to consider this language as belonging to the Uto-Aztecan group and within that it seems to be nearer the Cahita subgroup" (1948:218) (my translation, LC). On the other hand, Bright (1955) thought Naolan belonged to the Hokan-Coahuiltecan languages, perhaps to be identified with Janambre or Tamaulipeco, while Swadesh (1968) placed it in the Hokan-Coahuiltecan group, with closer connections with Tonkawan. I see little to recommend any of these proposals. For now the language should be considered unclassified and more study of available material done in order to relate it to larger groupings, if possible. Indications in Weitlaner's discussion suggest equating Naolan with Mazcorros, or perhaps with Pizones as a less probable candidate. Of the 43 words

and phrases, six are loans from Spanish, five are loans from other indigenous languages, and another four are probably loans also. This leaves little native material to work with. I suspect Weitlaner's choice of UA and Cahita connections was based on -su·na "corn". Miller (1967, #102) presents *sunu as PUA, however cognates are found only in southern UA languages (Papago huun, Tarahumara sunu, Aztec siin-, etc.) and are almost certainly loans from OM (see Campbell and Langacker 1978, and Campbell and Kaufman 1977). The only other similar form is PUA *-punku "dog" and Naolan bo·kam "coyote", but this is strained. Consequently the evidence for connecting Naolan with UA is quite weak.

1.14.2. Maratino. Swanton (1940:122-4) published the scant material available on Maratino. Swadesh (1963, 1968) called the language Tamaulipeco or Maratín and classified it with UA. I find little to recommend this. Maratino chiguat (čiwat) "woman" is an obvious borrowing from Aztec siwatl (cf. PUA *suma or *sup^{wa}), as is peyot "peyote" from Aztec peyotl. Swadesh's other 20 odd compared forms are not very compelling in their phonological or semantic similarities.

1.14.3. Guaicurian. Though we have no reliable gauge for the possible larger affiliations of the Guaicurian family, historical information gives reasonably good indications of which languages within the family must have been more closely

related:

Guaicura

Guaicura

Callejue

Huchiti

Cora (not the UA Cora)

Huchiti

Aripe

Periúe

Pericú

Pericú

Isleño

(after Massey 1949:303; see also Robles Uribe (1964).

We need a concentrated search for the colonial grammars and dictionaries which have disappeared. All potential information from place names, colonial reports, etc. should be catalogued and studied, too.

1.14.4. Alagüilac. Brinton's (1887) identification of Alagüilac as Pipil has generally been accepted, although I showed (Campbell 1972b) that there are serious problems with Brinton's identification. Juarros (1808) said Alagüilac was spoken at San Cristóbal Acasaguastlan and "Mejicano" (Nahua) at San Agustín Acasaguastlan. Brinton's assembled evidence for the interpretation of Juarros' Alagüilac as Pipil (Nahua)

included four manuscript pages dating from 1610 to 1637 and an 1878 word list from San Agustín Acasaguastlan. But notice that in San Agustín Acasaguastlan "Mejicano", not Alagüilac was spoken (see also Estrada Monroy 1972:50). For San Cristóbal Acasaguastlan a 1769 report says, "la lengua materna de (este curato en la cabecera es el Chortí, pero que en los otros poblados y trapiches solo se habla el Alagüilac" (Estrada Monroy 1972:29). Thus it is clear that Alagüilac was considered something other than either Mejicano (Nahua) or Chortí. Furthermore, Brinton's data contain many examples of tl, a feature limited to the tl-dialects of Mexico, which could not have reached Guatemala in pre-Conquest times. Thus the Nahua Brinton found had to be either from the resettled Tlaxcallan auxiliaries of the Spanish conquerers of Guatemala or from clerics trained in Nahuatl (see Heath 1972:27).

Since Alagüilac cannot be either Nahua or Chortí, I suggest a possible Xincan connection. It seems preferable to attempt to relate it to known languages than to assume it had no relatives. The proximity of place names of Xincan origin support the possible Xincan affiliation (see Campbell 1978).

1.15. New languages

Recently four heretofore unknown languages have been discovered in Guatemala. They are Teco, a Mayan language of

the Mamean subgroup (Kaufman 1969a), Sipacapa and Sacapultec, of the Quichean subgroup of Mayan (Kaufman 1976b, Campbell 1977), and Jumaytepeque Xinca (Kaufman and Campbell forthcoming).

1.16. MA Late Arrivals

Apache, Carib, and Kickapoo are all recent arrivals in MA. The Apachean bands are Athapaskan (see Krauss, this volume) and entered Mexico after 1500.

Kickapoo, a Central Algonquian language closely related to Fox, with speakers also in Kansas and Oklahoma, is spoken in la Ranchería Nacimiento (Colonia de los Kikapú), Coahuila, Mexico. The Mexican variety is considered conservative (see Voorhis 1971). In 1667 the Kickapoo were reported in Wisconsin. In 1775 they were granted land concessions in present-day Texas. They began going to Mexico in 1839, near Morelos, Coahuila. In 1864 they petitioned for permission to stay and were granted Nacimiento, which had been abandoned by Seminoles in 1861. (Gibson 1963, Latorre and Latorre 1976.)

Black Carib (also called Garífuna) is spoken by about 30,000 in Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and pockets in Nicaragua. It is an Arawakan language. The forebears of Central American Black Carib were deported from St. Vincent in the British West Indies in January of 1797. Thus Central American

Carib is a close offshoot of 'Island Carib' women's speech of 300 years ago, and hence of that spoken by the Lesser Antilles' pre-Carib inhabitants, the so-called Ignéri. These islands were invaded by Caribs who claimed descent from the Galibi, a Carib-speaking tribe of Guiana. They failed, however, to establish their language, so that the language remained basically that of the Arawakan substratum, but with a men's jargon where Carib morphemes could be substituted for Arawakan equivalents. The women's speech has not changed much over 300 years, but Central American Black Carib has largely leveled out the men's forms. That is how "Black Carib" can be an Arawakan language, but carry a name that suggests a Carib affinity. The first African ancestors of the Black Caribs came to St. Vincent in 1675. (See Taylor 1948, 1951, 1952, 1954, 1956.)

1.17. Fake Languages

1) Aguacatec II was made up by Stoll's (1958:244) maid. Stoll mentions 300 words she produced, but he presented only 68 forms, saying the others were too suspicious (of course many of his 68 are also highly suspicious). Consequently, no one before or after Stoll has ever found anything remotely similar to Aguacatec II. Aguacatán is the center of Aguacatec, a Mayan language of the Mamean subgroup. There are no non-Mayan languages near this part of Guatemala and since it is

near the most probable location for the Proto-Mayan homeland, it is unlikely that there have ever been any non-Mayan languages in this area (barring paleoindian).

2) Pupuluca of Conguaco. Colonial sources say Pupuluca or Populuca was spoken in Conguaco and nearby towns. But Pupuluca (Popoloca, Popoluca) is the common designation of a number of languages from Nicaragua to Mexico, coming from Nahua "to babble". Stoll (1958:31-4) found among Berendt's manuscripts a word list from a language called Popoluca and he assumed it was from Conguaco. The Popoluca of the manuscript, however, was from Oluta, Veracruz, a Mixe language, which accounts for why Stoll was able correctly to recognize its relation to the Mixe of Oaxaca. To this day we do not know what the Pupuluca of Conguaco was, and no native document, place name, nor surname has yet been discovered -- we only know it was not Oluta Popoluca. Geography suggests that it may have been a variety of Xinca, perhaps close to Yupiltepeque Xinca.

3) Subinhá. Catherine the Great's project of collecting samples of all the world's languages received lists from the Audience of Guatemala in 1788-9, including one titled Subinhá and said to be from Socoltenango, Chiapas. Though it was thought to be a separate Mayan language, examination of numerals shows every other one to be Tzeltal alternating with

Tojolabal (Tzeltal for even numbers, Tojolabal for odd) (Kaufman 1974b.)

2. MA as a Linguistic Area

Areal linguistics involves the diffusion of structural features of language across genetic boundaries. Central to the notion of a linguistic area (also called convergence area, diffusion area, Sprachbund, adstrata, etc.) is striking structural similarities among genetically unrelated languages spread over a wide geographical area. Mesoamerica has only recently been recognized as a linguistic area (Campbell 1976b, 1977a, Kaufman 1973, 1974b), and therefore it is yet too early to present an exhaustive definition of MA areal features. Of those presented here, some are shared by most MA languages, but by others outside MA as well; some are restricted in their distribution within MA. This preliminary list is presented here to demonstrate the existence of the MA area and to stimulate more research in it.

2.1. Phonology

Some widely distributed phonological phenomena of MA are: 1) devoicing of final sonorants (l, r, w, y), (Mayan, Nahua, Xinca, Cacaopera, Totonac, Tarascan, Sumu, etc.); 2) voicing of obstruents after nasals (most OM, Tarascan, MZ, Huave,

Lenca, Xinca, Jicaque, Tlapanec, etc.); 3) vowel harmony (Xinca, Lenca, Jicaque, Huave, Mayan (more limited), etc.); 4) stress rule: $V \rightarrow \check{V} / _ _ C(V)\#$ (Xinca, Lenca, Jicaque, etc.); 5) general similarities in inventories: (a) contrastive voiced stops (and affricates) almost absent (barring a few OM languages, Cuitlatec, Tlapanec, and Tequistlatec (where they can be explained)); (b) a lateral affricate is shared by some Nahua dialects, Totonac, and Tequistlatec, otherwise it is lacking; (c) only Totonacan and Mayan have post-velar (uvular) stops; (d) contrastive voiced spirants are lacking (barring the Zapotec lenis/non-geminate series); (e) aspirated stops and affricates occur in Tarascan, some OM languages, and Jicaque; (f) glottalized consonants occur in Tepehua, Jicaque, Tequistlatecan, Mayan, Xincan, Lencan and most OM languages; (g) distinctive stress is very rare (only in Tequistlatecan, Cuitlatec, and perhaps Cacaoopera); (h) tonal contrasts are found in all OM languages, Huave, Tlapanec, Cuitlatec, and some Mayan languages (Yucatec, Uspantec, and the San Bartolo dialect of Tzotzil).

2.2. Grammatical Features

1) inalienable possession of body parts and certain kin terms (almost all MA languages); 2) possession of one noun by another has the form *his-noun₁*, the *noun₂*, meaning the *noun's₂*

noun₁, e.g. *his-dog the man* for "the man's dog" (very widespread in MA); 3) vigesimal numeral systems (most MA languages); 4) numeral classifiers (many Mayan languages, Tarascan, Totonac, Aztec, etc.); 5) absolutive noun affixes (a suffix on unpossessed and otherwise affixally isolated nouns (UA, Mayan, Paya, Misumalpan, etc.)); 6) verbal aspect is more important than tense; 7) noun objects may be incorporated into the verb (limited in some Mayan languages (Yucatec, Mam), Nahua, Totonac, etc.); 8) directional morphemes (away from or toward) incorporated into the verb (Mayan, Nahua, Tarascan, some OM, Totonac, etc.); 9) locatives derived from body parts, e.g. "stomach = in, inside" (Mayan, Nahua, Tarascan, Totonacan, OM, etc.); 10) copula (form of the verb "to be") is typically lacking or quite restricted; 11) noun plurals (as affixes) are absent or limited largely to human referents (Mayan, Nahua, Tarascan, OM, etc.); 13) positional (or stative) verbs differ in form (morphological class) from intransitives or transitives (Mayan, OM, etc.).

2.3. Semantic

Lexical compounds and semantic doublets are widespread in MA. Some examples are: door - mouth of house, bark - skin or back of tree, eye - fruit or seed of face, knee - head of leg, boa - deer-snake, moon - grandmother, finger

ring - coyol-hand (coyol is a species of palm tree), witch - owl, witch - sleep, witch - old man, cramp - associated in some way with deer, fiesta - (big) day (ceremonial occasions), root - hair (of tree), twenty - man, lime(stone) - (rock-) ashes, writst - neck of hand, egg - stone-bird, river - water, gall bladder - bitter, wife - inalienably possessed "woman".

Finally, aspects of ethnography of communication are also widespread. For example, whistle speech is shared by Amuzgo, Mazatec, Otomí, several Zapotec groups, Mopan, Chol, Totonac, Tepehua, some Nahua dialects, and Mexican Kickapoo. A very stylized form of ritual language and oral literature, involving among other things paired couplets of semantic associations, is very wide spread with remarkably similar form (Quiché, Tzeltal, Tzotzil, Yucatec, Nahuatl, Ocuiltec, Amuzgo, Popoloca, Totonac, etc.). This is called Huehuetlatolli in Nahuatl, é'ono:x in Quiché.

The obvious need is for more detailed study of the MA area. These features should be studied to see to what extent they have been diffused. Additional features should be sought and identified. New descriptive material on the lesser-known MA languages should be investigated for areal phenomena. The area's geographical limits should be defined and its sub-areas investigated.

3. Distant Genetic Relationships

Perhaps the major emphasis in American Indian linguistic studies has been the reduction of genetic diversity to manageable schemes. This emphasis led to a number of poorly founded proposals of distant genetic relationship, often proposed initially as hunches or long-shots to be tested more fully in subsequent investigations. Too frequently, however, these preliminary proposals were taken as established and unquestioningly repeated in later literature. Sapir's skepticism about areal diffusion is well known. Statements like, "nowhere do we find any but superficial morphological inter-influencings" and "we have not the right to assume that a language may easily exert a remolding morphological influence on another" (Sapir 1921:215-20) led American Indianists to interpret possible far-reaching areal similarities as evidence for remote genetic connections. To take just one example, McQuown (1942:37-8) launched the now widely accepted Macro-Mayan hypothesis on the basis of:

The only other language family besides Totonacan of Mexico that has this glottalized series is Mayan, and this fact together with other significant details suggests to us the probable genetic relation of

Totonac-Tepehua with Mayan; but the relatively small number of coincidences in vocabulary indicates to us that this kinship is quite distant.

(My translation, LC).

But, since many other MA languages have glottalized series (as seen above) and because glottalization can easily be diffused areally, the Macro-Mayan hypothesis had a shaky origin. And though several have investigated the Macro-Mayan hypothesis in recent years (see Kaufman 1964d, Campbell 1973b, McQuown 1943, 1956b, Swadesh 1961, 1967, Wakefield 1971, Brown and Witkowski 1977, Jacks 1972, Arana 1964b, etc.) little has come of it but lists of potential cognates and a few rather weak phonological matchings. Recent investigation has shown that in fact most of the proposed cognates are identifiable loan words, and the others are problematical (not semantically equivalent, onomatopoeic, not phonologically similar, etc.) (Campbell and Kaufman 1977). The Macro-Mayan hypothesis is quite typical of most of the other proposals of remote relationship.

A detailed reexamination of the various distant genetic proposals, taking into account the areal phenomena and what is now known about MA loan words, calls most of these proposals seriously into question. Since it is obviously impossible

to present a detailed evaluation of each here (but see Campbell and Kaufman 1977), I present a brief examination of the Xinca-Lenca hypothesis as a case study not unlike the other proposals and then only report the results of the reexamination of the others.

Lehmann (1920:767) was the first to suggest the Xinca-Lenca genetic relationship, though his hypothesis included also MZ, Tequistlatec, and Chumash-Salinan (the latter two now generally considered Hokan). Though Xinca and Lenca are almost universally reported as related, Lehmann's is the only direct evidence for the hypothesis ever presented. It was (modern Xinca in parentheses):

Xinca	Lenca	
ical (?ik'ał)	etta, ita	one
bi-al, pi-ar, pi (pi?)	pe	two
vuaal-al, hual-ar (wał(a))	laagua, lagua	three
iri-ar (?irya, hirya)	heria, erio, sa, aria, eslea	four
uŷ (u:y)	cuy (winter)	water
suma (sas ^h ma "in the dark")	ts'ub (Nacht)	night
ts'ama (s ^h ma)	ts'ana-uamba (Morgen(graue))	dark, black
ti-tzuma (ti-s ^h ma "in the dark)	saba	shade

Xinca	Lenca	
xusu	shushu	dog
ojo (?oho)	hoo, oiguin	cough
au, aima (?ayma)	ama, aima	maize
xinak (šinak)	shinag	bean

"One" is not sufficiently similar phonologically. The numerals two through four are widely borrowed in this part of Central America (Campbell and Kaufman 1977). "Water/winter" (even if "rainy season" is intended) are not sufficiently similar semantically and they are so short that chance could explain any similarity. "Cough" is onomatopoeic and similar forms are found throughout MA and the world (cf. Proto-Mayan *?oxb', PMZ *?ohu, Tepehua ?ux?u-, Quechua uhu-, etc.). "Dog" has similar forms widespread in American Indian languages (cf. Paya šušu, Patwin čuču, Alsea su, Yana su:su, Tlapanec suwa:, PUA *čú, etc.). Three of Lehmann's twelve forms involve the same Xinca etymon, "dark, black", and additionally the three involve lack of semantic and phonological similarity to the Lenca forms with which they were paired. Finally, the terms for "maize" and "bean" are borrowed in both languages; "bean" is from Proto-Mayan *kinaq', Western Mayan činak'; "maize" is widely borrowed (cf. Cacaopera-Matagalpa ayma, Sumu ama, Subtiaba ima, Tarascan ema, eme, Proto-Mayan *?e?m, etc.). It is safe to conclude that Lehmann's evidence does not support

the proposed Xinca-Lenca hypothesis.

The other hypotheses (investigated in detail in Campbell and Kaufman 1977) are merely reported here.

1. Macro-Mayan (Mayan, Totonacan, and MZ). The hypothesis is too weak to embrace, but may be worthy of further research (see discussion above).

2. Mayan-Tarascan. This is supported only by Swadesh 1966; absolutely no evidence supports it and it should be abandoned.

3. Maya-Chipaya (Mayan and Chipaya-Uru of Bolivia). This was proposed by Olson (1964, 1965) and has been widely accepted (see Stark 1972, Hamp 1970, etc.). Though initially the hypothesis seems well supported by cognates and sound correspondences, reexamination reveals that the evidence all dissolves, involving such problems as non-recurring sound correspondences, erroneous Mayan forms based on non-cognates, loans, onomatopoeia, etc. Campbell (1973c) shows the hypothesis to be extremely weak and unfortunately misleading to anyone not familiar with Mayan.

4. Maya-Chipaya-Yunga (Maya-Chipaya and Yunga of Peru). This was first launched by Stark (n.d., 1972) and has been supported by Hamp 1967, 1970. This hypothesis shows a fairly clear relationship between Chipaya-Uru and Yunga, but is even weaker than the Maya-Chipaya hypothesis in the evidence pre-

sented in support of a Yunga connection with Mayan.

5. Maya-Araucanian. This was also framed by Stark (n.d., 1970) and supported by Hamp 1971. All its evidence can be explained away as accident, onomatopoeia, vague semantic and phonological similarities, etc. The hypothesis is too weak to warrant further attention for the time being.

6. Mexican Penutian. Mexican Penutian includes different language families for different scholars, MZ and Huave for Sapir (1929), these plus Mayan and Totonac for Greenberg (1956), these plus UA for Whorf (1935). As generally conceived today it includes Aztec-Tanoan, Macro-Mayan, and others, and belongs to Macro-Penutian. Since most of these components are tenuous classifications themselves, it seems far too premature to project these questionable entities into even more far-flung classifications. Thus for now I denounce Mexican Penutian.

7. OM-Huave. Swadesh (1960, 1964a, 1964b, and 1967:96) has consistently maintained that Huave has OM affinities, and Longacre (1968:343) is inclined to accept this classification. The only substantive evidence presented so far in favor of this hypothesis is that of Rensch (1966, 1973, 1976). While the evidence is not yet totally convincing, it is certainly strong enough to suggest the hypothesis be given much further study.

8. OM-Tlapanec-Subtiaba. Rensch (1966, 1973, 1976, 1977) has also supported an OM relationship for Tlapanec-Subtiaba, and Suárez (1977) has independently come to the same conclusion. Since the evidence presented so far is rather limited, a cautious conclusion is that the hypothesis deserves further attention, but it is too early at present to evaluate it properly; a wait-and-see attitude is in order.

9. Jicaque-Subtiaba. Oltrogge (1977) relates Jicaque to both Tequistlatec and Subtiaba, and following Rensch, suggests an OM relationship, though he also allows for the possibility of an exclusive Hokan affiliation or a broader Hokan-OM grouping. His Jicaque-Tequistlatec evidence is quite good, but his Jicaque-Subtiaba evidence is very weak.

10. Jicaque-Hokan. Greenberg and Swadesh (1953) proposed the Hokan affinity for Jicaque, though their 68 lexical forms, indiscriminately chosen from the two Jicaque languages, came far short of demonstrating the relationship. The relationship has largely and uncritically been accepted in the literature. In a recent study (Campbell 1974a) with more accurate and extensive Jicaque data I concluded (independently of Oltrogge's (1977) recent study) that the evidence for a Jicaque-Tequistlatec connection is reasonably strong. This, then, circumstantially links Jicaque with the

other Hokan languages, since Tequistlatec is generally considered Hokan. But, given the controversial nature of the Hokan classification generally, it is safer to suggest (that while the entire Hokan grouping requires much further work), that the Jicaque-Tequistlatec relationship, regardless of the ultimate outcome of Hokan questions, will probably stand. Some probable cognates and sound matchings (potential correspondences) are:

Proto-Jicaque	Tequistlatec	
* $(p) \pm p^h \pm h$	-abi	ash, dust
$\acute{c}' \pm k$	-šigo	beard
* $p \pm l \pm k$	aš-pela?	many
* $k' a \acute{c}$	-hwá \acute{c}'	blood
* $\acute{c}uh$	-šuih	blue
* $k^h ele$	-ga \acute{c}	bone
*-pe	-bi?	to burn
*pehy	-bi?e	egg
* $p \pm neh$	ifun $\acute{c}i$	fat
kewan	-guwe?	husband
hep ^w e	-webo?	iguana
*amah	-amá \acute{c}'	land
setel	gi $\acute{c}ala?$	seed
polok	-bi \acute{c}'	skin
*wele	-balay-	to speak

Proto-Jicaque	Tequistlatec	
* $(\acute{c}) \pm \acute{c} \pm h$	$\acute{c} \acute{c} \acute{c} e?$	squirrel
*pe	-bik	stone
peyom	-š-piyami	coati, agouti
*pelam	-bá \acute{c}	tongue
*-pa?	-ba-	to wash
* $p^h e$	-fuh-	white
- ∇k	-k'	1st and 2nd per pl
l	l	
p	b	
p	f	
$\acute{c} (')$	š	
k	g	
m	m	

(For the detailed reasons behind these judgements concerning these various proposals, see Campbell and Kaufman 1977, where each hypothesis is evaluated in detail.)

4. MA Linguistic Prehistory

Linguists have a variety of techniques for getting information about culture history (the comparative method, classification and subgrouping, linguistic migration theory, dialectology, philological techniques, loan words, linguistic homeland (Urheimat), the cultural implications of reconstructed

lexicon of proto languages, Wörter and Sachen, toponyms, and linguistic paleontology generally). In this section I simply report the major hypotheses and tentative conclusions of the recent work in MA linguistic prehistory (references listed below).

1. The archaeological Olmecs spoke MZ languages.

(Campbell and Kaufman 1976.)

2. Both the MA culture area (co-tradition) and MA linguistic area were shaped by the same forces, by extensive Olmec influence and by extensive trading from Olmec formative times onward.

3. The principal bearers of Classic Lowland Maya civilization were Cholan speakers. Cholan was most important in the development of Mayan hieroglyphic writing.

4. The Mayan homeland was in the Cuchumatanes, near Soloma, Guatemala.

5. Monte Alban was always Zapotecan in speech.

6. Teotihuacan was not built by Nahua speakers; the Nahua speakers' arrival coincides more closely with the fall of Teotihuacan than with its rise.

7. The strongest candidate for the builders of Teotihuacan is the Totonacs.

8. The OM homeland was probably in the Tehuacan Valley (about 5,000 B.C.).

9. Proto-Mayan, Proto-Mixtecan, and Proto-Mixe-Zoquean, among others, already had a rather full complement of Mesoamerican cultigens, including the maize-complex, beans, and squash, etc.

10. Pipil left central Mexico around 900 A.D., migrating to Central America, and consequently had nothing to do with events in Kaminaljuyú, Cotzumalhuapa (until very late), or Quiché territory.

11. The epi-Toltec Nahua influence in Quichean languages came from the Gulf Coast dialects, not from Pipil nor from central Mexico.

12. Pokomam was split off Western Pokomch' by the intrusion of the Rabinal lineage of the Quiché after 1250 A.D. and pushed into former Xinca territory. Pokomam had nothing to do with Classic Chalchuapa nor Kaminaljuyú.

13. The Xinca were not agriculturalists until their contact with Mayan speakers. Their geographical territory once included all of eastern Guatemala below the Motagua River.

14. There were no pre-Conquest Pipiles in the Motagua Valley.

15. The MZ were the inventors of the Mesoamerican calendar and hieroglyphic writing; there was strong MZ influence in the early development of Mayan hieroglyphic writing.

16. The Mangué migration to Nicaragua took place after 600 A.D. from Chiapas, while the Subtiaba migration to Nicaragua from Guerrero was even later, about 1200 A.D.

17. The Lenca homeland was probably in central Honduras; SL reached El Salvador about 1 A.D. and is responsible for Classic Quelepa.

18. Quichean dialect boundaries correspond exactly with pre-Conquest political units as reconstructed from ethno-historical accounts.

For details, see Amador & Casasa 1974; Campbell 1970, 1972a, 1972b, 1976c, 1977, 1978; Campbell and Kaufman 1976, 1977; Josserand 1975; Kaufman 1964a, 1969b, 1973, 1976a; Longacre and Millon 1961; McQuown 1964; Merrifield 1966, etc.

5. Outstanding Needs and Directions for Future Research

Individual needs have been pointed out for languages and areas throughout this paper. In this section I will concentrate on general needs.

1) More full-fledged grammars and dictionaries are needed.

2) More comparative and historical work, including subgrouping of most of the families, should be done.

3) Potential genetic relationships should be examined more closely.

4) More attention should be given to areal diffusion,

loan words, and language contacts. The non-Uto-Aztecan vocabulary of Nahuatl and the non-Mayan vocabulary of Huastec should be examined and its origins determined. The same should eventually be done for all MA languages. The MA linguistic area needs more rigid definition.

5) The moribund languages of MA should be studied fully and as exhaustively as possible (Ocuiltec, Matlatzinca, several UA languages of northern Mexico, Itzá, Uspantec, etc.).

6) Available documentary material needs to be fully utilized; this requires training in philological techniques and should involve training in the colonial (so-called classical) languages, Nahuatl, Classical Yucatec, Classical Quiché, Cakchiquel, etc. It also involves searching archives and private collections for missing and as yet unknown colonial sources.

7) More attention should be devoted to MA writing systems by linguistically sophisticated scholars.

8) Questions of MA prehistory toward which linguistics may help provide solutions deserve careful consideration.

9) We should marshal our resources in several ways. One is to train native speakers to prepare dictionaries, grammars, texts, etc. Another is to prepare ourselves and our students with a strong background for solid work in the area, including not just descriptive and historical linguistic methods, but

philology, classical languages of the area, Old Spanish, and in related anthropological fields. Another way is to practice our craft courteously, making the results of our work available to native groups and foreign scholars, especially in Latin America. When the opportunity presents itself, we can help train students of our Latin American colleagues. In this way we may be able to dispel some of the often very justified resentment toward foreign, especially North American scholars now so common in Latin America. Also, we can support regional newsletters and workshops such as now exist among Mayanists, Uto-Aztecanists, Hokanists, and appears to be about to begin among Otomangueanists. Finally, we can help to ensure the accuracy of materials published, and encourage potential sources for the publication of accurate material.

In summary, the most critical need is for good linguists to do good work.

Bibliography

- AA = American Anthropologist.
- AL = Anthropological Linguistics.
- CIS-INAH = Centro de Investigaciones Superiores del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. Mexico.
- CLS = Chicago Linguistics Society.
- HMAI = Handbook of Middle American Indians. Robert Waucope, general editor. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- ICA = International Congress of Americanists.
- IJAL = International Journal of American Linguistics.
- INAH = Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. Mexico.
- JSA-P = Journal de la Société des Américanistes, Paris.
- Lg = Language.
- P-APS = Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society.
- RMEA = Revista Mexicana de Estudios Antropológicos.
- SIL = Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- UNAM = Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Adelung, Johann Christoph, and Vater, Johann Severin
1806-18 Mithridates, oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde, mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in beynahe fünf hundert Sprachen un Mundarten. 4 volumes. Berlin.
- Almstedt, Ruth F.
1972 Pronouns and possession in Cuitlatec. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, San Diego.

- Almstedt, Ruth F.
1974 Cuitlatec: an example of linguistic salvage, the Cuitlatec verb. Paper presented at the 1974 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico.
- Amador Hernández, Mariscela, and Patricia Casasa García
1974 Un análisis cultural de juegos léxicos re-construidos del proto-otomangue. Paper presented at the 1974 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico. (To be published in *Investigaciones actuales en lenguas otomangues*, by CIS-INAH.)
- Arana Osnaya, Evagelina
1953 Reconstrucción del proto-totonaco. *Huastecos, Totonacos y sus veninos*, ed. by I. Bernal and Davalos Hurtado. RMEA 13.123-30.
1958 Afinidades lingüísticas del cuitlateco. ICA 33.560-72.
1964a La posición lingüística del huave. ICA 35. 2.471-5.
1964b Posibles relaciones externas del grupo lingüístico maya. *Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia* 13. 111-34.
- Arana de Swadesh, E., ed.
1975 *Las lenguas de Mexico, I and II*. Mexico: INAH.
- Arroyo, Victor Manuel
1966 *Lenguas indígenas costarricenses*. San José: Editorial Costa Rica.
- Aschmann, Hermann Peter
1953 Los dos niveles de composición en el verbo totonaco. RMEA 13.119-22.
1962 Vocabulario totonaco de la Sierra. Serie de vocabularios Indígenas "Mariano Silva y Aceves" 7. SIL: Mexico.

- Aschmann, Hermann Peter
1973 *Diccionario Totonaco de Papantla. Serie de vocabularios y diccionarios Indígenas "Mariano Silva y Aceves" 16*. SIL: Mexico.
- Aschmann, H.P. and W.L. Wonderly
1952 Affixes and implicit categories in Totonac verb inflection. IJAL 18.130-45.
- Bartholomew, Doris
1965 The reconstruction of Otopamean. Unpublished University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation.
- Beals, Ralph L.
1932 The comparative ethnology of Northern Mexico before 1750. *Ibero-Americana* 2. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1933 The Acaxee: a mountain tribe of Durango and Sinaloa. *Ibero-Americana* 6. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boas, Franz
1912 Phonetics of the Mexican language. ICA 18. 107-8.
1913 Notes on the Chatino language of Mexico. AA 15.78-86.
1917 El dialecto Mexicano de Pochutla, Oaxaca. IJAL 1.9-44.
1930 Spanish elements in modern Nahuatl. *Todd Memorial Volume: Philological Studies*, 1.85-9. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Boas, Franz and José María Arreola
1920 Cuentos en Mexicano de Milpa Alta. *Journal of American Folklore* 33.1-24.
- Bogarín, Benavides J.
1972 A restricted grammar of Bribri. Universidad de Costa Rica, Licentiate thesis.
- Bower, Bethel
1948 Stems and affixes in Tepehua numerals. IJAL 14.20-1.

- Bower, Bethel, and Barbara Erickson
1967 Tepehua Sentences. AL 9.9.25-37.
- Bright, William
1955 A bibliography of the Hokan-Coahuiltecan languages. IJAL 21.276-85.
1967 Inventory of descriptive materials. HMAI 5.9-62, ed. by N. McQuown. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1970 On linguistic unrelatedness. IJAL 36.288-90.
- Brinton, Daniel G.
1884a A grammar of the Cakchiquel language of Guatemala, translated from a manuscript in the Library of the American Philosophical Society. P-APS 21.345-412.
1884b On the language and ethnologic position of the Xinca Indians of Guatemala. P-APS 22. 89-97.
1886 Notes on the Mangué, an extinct dialect formerly spoken in Nicaragua. P-APS 23.238-57.
1887 On the so-called Alagüilac language of Guatemala. P-APS 24.366-77.
1888 On the Chane-abal (four-language) tribe and dialect of Chiapas. AA (old series) 1.77-96.
1891 The American race: a linguistic classification and ethnographic description of the native tribes of North and South America. New York.
1892a Observations on the Chinantec language of Mexico. P-APS 30.22-31.
1892b On the Mazatec language of Mexico and its affinities. P-APS 30.31-9.
1892c Chontales and Popolucas, a contribution to Mexican ethnography. ICA 8.556-64.

- Brinton, Daniel G.
1895 The Matagalpan linguistic stock of Central America. P-APS 34.403-15.
- Brown, Cecil H., and Stanley R. Witkowski
1977 Aspects of the phonological history of Mayan-Zoquean. Unpublished paper, Northern Illinois University.
- Campbell, Lyle
ms. La Lengua Pipil. (To be published by the Ministry of Education, El Salvador.)
1970 Nahua loan words in Quichean languages. Chicago Linguistics Society 6.3-13.
1972a Mayan loan words in Xinca. IJAL 38.187-90.
1972b A note on the so-called Alagüilac language. IJAL 38.203-7.
1973a The philological documentation of a variable rule in the history of Pokom and Kekchí. IJAL 39.133-4.
1973b Distant genetic relationship and proposed Mayan affinities. Unpublished paper (60 pp.).
1973c Distant genetic relationships and the Maya-Chipaya hypothesis. Anthropological Linguistics 15.3.113-35.
1974a The Jicaque-Hokan hypothesis. Unpublished paper.
1974b Quichean palatalized velars. IJAL 40.59-63.
1975a La dialectología pipil. América Indígena 35.833-44.
1975b Subtiaba 1974. IJAL 41.80-4.
1975c Cacaopera. AL 17.4.146-53.
1975d El estado actual y la afinidad genética de la lengua indígena de Cacaopera. La Universidad,

- revista de la Universidad de El Salvador, Enero-Febrero, 45-54.
- 1976a The last Lenca. *IJAL* 42.73-8.
- 1976b Distant genetic relationship and diffusion: a Mesoamerican perspective. Paper presented at the 1976 ICA, to be published in proceedings.
- 1976c The linguistic prehistory of the southern Mesoamerican periphery. *Las fronteras de Mesoamérica. 14a mesa redonda, Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología*, 1:157-83.
- 1977 Quichean linguistic prehistory. *University of California Publications in Linguistics*, 81.
- 1978 Quichean prehistory: linguistic contributions. *Mayan linguistics 2*, ed. by Nora England.
- In press Quichean linguistics and philology. *Approaches to language: Anthropological Issues*, ed. by W. McCormack (from *World Anthropology*). The Hague: Mouton.
- Campbell, Lyle, Anne Chapman, Karen Dakin
1978 Honduran Lenca. *IJAL* (in press).
- Campbell, Lyle and Terrence Kaufman
1976 A Linguistic look at the Olmecs. *American Antiquity* 4.80-9.
- 1977 Linguistic diffusion and Mesoamerican prehistory. Unpublished manuscript.
- Campbell, Lyle and Ronald Langacker
1978 Proto-Aztec vowels. *IJAL*.
- Campbell, Lyle and David Oltrogge
1977 Proto-Jicaque. Paper presented at the 1977 Yuman and Hokan workshop, Salt Lake City, Utah.

- Campbell, Lyle, Pierre Ventur, Russell Stewart, and Brant Gardner
1978 Bibliography of Mayan languages and linguistics. (To be published by Institute of Mesoamerican Studies, SUNY, Albany.)
- Constenla Umana, Adolfo
1975 *La lengua guatusa: fonología, gramática, y léxico*. Unpublished licentiate thesis, Universidad de Costa Rica, San José.
- Conzemius, Eduard
1922 The Jicaques of Honduras. *IJAL* 2.163-70.
- 1928 Los indios payas de Honduras. *JSA-P* 20. 253-360.
- 1929 Notes on the Mískito and Sumu languages of Eastern Nicaragua and Honduras. *IJAL* 5. 57-115.
- 1932 Ethnographic survey of the Mískito and Sumu Indians of Honduras and Nicaragua. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, *Bulletin* 106.
- 1938 Les tribus indiennes de la Côte des Mosquitos. *Antropos* 33.910-43.
- Dávila, Garibi, J.I.
1935 Recopilación de datos acerca del idioma coca y de su posible influencia en el lenguaje folklórico de Jalisco. *Investigaciones Lingüísticas* 3.248-302.
- 1942 Algunas afinidades de las lenguas coca y cahita. *El México Antiguo* 6.47-60.
- 1947 Un interesante manuscrito en una de las lenguas indígenas, desaparecidas de Jalisco? *ICA* 27.337-53.
- 1951 Es el coca un idioma taracahita? Homenaje al Dr. Alfonso Caso, ed. by A. Pompa y Pompa, pp. 143-51. Mexico: INAH.

- Dennis, Ronald, Margaret Royce de Dennis, and Ilah Flemming
1975a El alfabeto TOL (Jicaque). Yaxkin 1.12-18. Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia.
- 1975b Vocabulario comparativo del TOL (Jicaque). Yaxkin 1.19-22. Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia.
- Dennis, Ronald K., and Ilah Flemming
1976 TOL (Jicaque): los sustantivos. Las fronteras de mesoamérica. 14a mesa redonda, Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología, 2:375-80.
- Diebold, A. Richard
1962 Bilingualism and bi-culturalism in a Huave community. Unpublished Yale University Ph.D. dissertation.
- Escalante Hernández, Roberto
1962 El Cuitlateco. Mexico: INAH.
- 1963 Material lingüístico del oriente de Sonora: Tonichi y Ponida. Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia 16. 149-78. Mexico.
- 1975 Tipología de las lenguas de México. Las lenguas de Mexico, I, ed. by E. Arana de Swadesh, 91-127. Mexico: INAH.
- Estrada Monroy, Agustín
1972 Lenguas de 12 provincias de Guatemala en el Siglo XVIII. Guatemala Indígena 7.23-70.
- Fernández de Miranda, María Teresa, and Roberto J. Weitlaner
1961 Sobre algunas relaciones de la familia mangué. AL 3.7.1-99.
- Flemming, Ilah and Ronald K. Dennis
1977 TOL (Jicaque): phonology. IJAL 43.121-7.
- Foster, Mary L.
1969 The Tarascan language. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 56. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Freeze, Ray
1975 A fragment of an early Kekchí vocabulary. University of Missouri monographs in Anthropology, 2. Columbia, Missouri.
- Friedrich, Paul
1969 On the meaning of the Tarascan suffixes of space. IJAL, memoir 23.
- 1971a Dialectal variation in Tarascan phonology. IJAL 37.164-87.
- 1971b The Tarascan suffixes of locative space: meaning and morphotactics. Language Science Monographs, 9. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Gibson, A.M.
1963 The Kickapoos: Lords of the middle border. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gilberti, Maturino
1559 Diccionario de la lengua tarasca o de Michoacán, ed. by Antonio Peñafiel (1901 reprinting of original: Vocabulario en lengua de Mechoacán). Mexico.
- Greenberg, Joseph H.
1956 General classification of Central and South American languages. Men and cultures: 5th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, 791-94. Philadelphia.
- Greenberg, Joseph, and Morris Swadesh
1953 Jicaque as a Hokan language. IJAL 19.216-22.
- Gudschinsky, Sarah
1959 Proto-Popotecan: a comparative study of Popolocan and Mixtecan. IJAL, memoir 15.
- Hamp, Eric P.
1967 On Maya-Chipayan. IJAL 33.74-6.
- 1970 Maya-Chipaya and typology of labials. CLS 6.20-2.

- Hamp, Eric P.
1971 On Mayan-Araucanian comparative phonology. IJAL 37.156-9.
- Harvey, H.R.
1968 Chatino and Papabuco in the historical sources. IJAL 34.288-89.
- 1972 The Relaciones Geográficas, 1579-1586: Native languages. HMAI 12.279-323, ed. by Howard Cline.
- Hasler, Juan A.
1966 La posición dialectológica del tepehua. Summa Antropológica: homenaje a Roberto J. Weitlaner, ed. by A. Pompa y Pompa, 533-40.
- Heath, G.R.
n.d. Outline of Sumu grammar. Unpublished manuscript. Bluefields, Nicaragua.
- 1927a Notes on Miskito grammar and on the other Indian languages of Eastern Nicaragua. AA 15.48-62.
- 1927b Grammar of the Miskito language. Herrnhut.
- 1950 Miskito glossary, with ethnographic commentary. IJAL 16.20-34.
- Heath, G.R., and W.G. Marx
1961 Diccionario Miskito-Español, Español-Miskito. Tegucigalpa: Imprenta Calderon. Honduras.
- Heath, Jeffrey
1977 Uto-Aztecan morphophonemics. IJAL 43.27-36.
- Heath, Shirley Brice
1972 Telling tongues: language policy in Mexico. New York: Teachers College Press. (Spanish translation: La política del lenguaje: de la colonia a la nación. Instituto Nacional Indigenista, México. (1972).)
- Hendrichs Pérez, Pedro R.
1939 Un estudio preliminar sobre la lengua Cuitlateca de San Miguel Totolapan, Gro.

- El México Antiguo 4.329-62.
- 1946 Por tierras ignotas, viajes y observaciones en la región del Río de las Balsas. Vol. 2. Pan American Institute of Geography and History, 83. Mexico.
- 1947 Breve informe del idioma cuitlateco. ICA 27. 289-95.
- Hervas y Panduro, Lorenzo
1800 Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, Vol 1: Lenguas y naciones americanas. Madrid.
- Holt, Dennis
1975a Paya as a Chibchan language. Unpublished manuscript. UCLA.
- 1975b Paya phonology. Unpublished manuscript, UCLA.
- 1975c Paya vocabulary. Unpublished paper, UCLA.
- 1976 Pano-Tacanan as a Macro-Chibchan phylum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Anthropological Association, San Francisco.
- Holt, Dennis, and William Bright
1976 La lengua paya y las fronteras lingüísticas de mesoamérica. Las fronteras de mesoamérica. 14a mesa redonda, Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología, 1:149-56. Mexico.
- Hopkins, A. Nicholas C.
1977 Otomanguean bibliography. CIS-INAH.
- Hoyo, Eugenio del
1960 Vocablos de la lengua quinigua de los indios Borrados del Noreste de México. Humanitas, Anuario del Centro de Estudios Humanísticos, Universidad de Nuevo León, 1.1.489-515. Mexico.

- Hoyo, Eugenio del
1965 El cuadernillo de la lengua de los indios Pajalates (1732) por Fray Gabriel de Vergara, y El confesionario de indios en lengua coahuilteca. Publicaciones del Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Serie: Historia, 3. Monterrey.
- Jacks, Lewis
1972 Macro-Mayan cognate sets. Unpublished paper, University of Southern Illinois, Carbondale.
- Jaquith, James R.
1970 The present status of the Uto-Aztecan languages of Mexico. Occasional publications in Anthropology, Linguistic Series, 1. Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley.
- Jijón y Caamaño, Jacinto
1943 Las lenguas del sur de Centro América y el Norte y Centro del Oeste de Sud-América. El ecuador interandino y occidental, 3:390-661. Quito: Editorial Ecuatoriana.
- Jiménez Moreno, Wigberto
1943 Tribus e idiomas del norte de México. RMEA 3.131-33.
- Johnson, Jean, and Irmgard Johnson
1954 Opata of Tonichi, Sonora. Vocabularies of languages of the Uto-Aztecan family, collected by Harold Key. University of Chicago Library Microfilm collection of manuscripts on Middle American Cultural Anthropology, no. 38, pp. 390-7.
- Josserand, J.K.
1975 Archaeological and linguistic correlations for Mayan prehistory. ICA 41.501-10.
- Juarros, Domingo
1808 Compendio de la historia de la ciudad de Guatemala. Guatemala.

- Kaufman, Terrence
1964a Mixe-Zoquean subgroups and the position of Tapachulteco.
- 1964b Mixe-Zoque diachronic studies. Unpublished manuscript.
- 1964c Materiales lingüísticos para el estudio de las relaciones internas y externas de la familia de idiomas Mayanos. Desarrollo Cultural de los Mayas, ed. by E. Vogt, 81-136. Special publication of the Seminario de Cultura Maya. Mexico.
- 1964d Evidence for the Macro-Mayan hypothesis. Unpublished paper.
- 1965 Philological methods in New World languages. Unpublished paper.
- 1969a Teco - a new Mayan language. IJAL 35.154-74.
- 1969b Some recent hypotheses on Mayan diversification. Working paper 26a, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California. Berkeley.
- 1972 El proto-tzeltal-tzotzil. Centro de Estudios Mayas, Cuaderno 5. UNAM. Mexico.
- 1973 Areal linguistics and Middle America. Current Trends in Linguistics 11.459-83, ed. by T. Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1974a Middle American languages. Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1973 ed.
- 1974b Idiomas de Mesoamérica. Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, Pub. 33. Guatemala.
- 1976a Archaeological and linguistic correlations in Maya-land and associated areas of Meso-America. World Archaeology 8.101-18.
- 1976b New Mayan languages in Guatemala: Sacapultec, Sipacapa, and others. Mayan linguistics

- 1.67-89, ed. by Marlys McClaran. American Indian Studies Center, UCLA.
- Kaufman, Terrence, and Lyle Campbell
1977 Xinka handbook: a comparative grammar and dictionary of the Xinkan languages. Unpublished manuscript.
- Kelley, David H.
1962a A history of the decipherment of Maya script. AL 4.8.1-48.
1962b Fonestismo en la escritura maya. Estudios de cultura Maya 2.277-317. Mexico: UNAM.
1966 Kakupacal and the Itzas. Estudios de Cultura Maya 7.255-68. Mexico: UNAM.
1976 Deciphering the Maya script. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kroeber, A.L.
1915 Serian, Tequistlatecan, and Hokan. University of California Publications in American archaeology and ethnology 11.279-90.
1931 The Seri. Southwest Museum Papers 6. Los Angeles.
1934 Uto-Aztecan languages of Mexico. Ibero-Americana 8. Berkeley.
1939 Cultural and natural areas of native North America. University of California publications in American archaeology and ethnology 38.1-242.
1940 Language history and culture history. The Maya and their Neighbors, ed. by C.L. Hays, 463-70. New York.
1943 Classification of the Yuman languages. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 3. Berkeley.
1944 The historical position of Chicomuceltec in Mayan. IJAL 10.159-60.

- Langdon, Margaret
1974 Comparative Hokan-Coahuiltecan studies: a survey and appraisal. (Janua Linguarum, series critica 4.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Lastra de Suárez, Yolanda
1973 Panorama de los estudios de lenguas yuto-aztecas. Anales de Antropología 10.377-86. Mexico: UNAM.
1975 Panorama de los estudios de lenguas yuto-aztecas. Las lenguas de Mexico I, ed. by E. Arana de Swadesh, 155-231. [Not the same as Lastra 1973] Mexico: INAH.
- Latorre, Felipe A., and Dolores L. Latorre
1976 The Mexican Kickapoo Indians. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lehmann, Walter
1920 Zentral America. Berlin: Museums für Völkerkunde zu Berlin.
- León, Nicolás
1903a Familias lingüísticas de México. Anales de Museo Nacional 7.279-335. Mexico.
1903b Vocabulario en lengua cuiclateca de San Miguel Totolapan, Gro. Anales del Museo Nacional 7.304-7.
- Lombardo, Natal
1702 Arte de la lengua tequima, vulgarmente llamada ópata. Mexico.
- Longacre, Robert E.
1957 Proto-Mixtecan. IJAL 23, supplement.
1966 On the linguistic affinities of Amuzgo. IJAL 32.46-9. (Reprinted in Summa Antropológica en homenaje a Roberto J. Weitlaner, ed. by A. Pompa y Pompa, 541-60. Mexico: INAH.)
1967 Systemic comparison and reconstruction. HMAI 5:117-60, ed. by N. McQuown. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Longacre, Robert E.
1968 Comparative reconstruction of Indigenous languages. *Current Trends in Linguistics* 4:320-60. Ed. by T. Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton.
- Longacre, Robert and Rene Millon
1961 Proto-Mixtecan and Proto-Amuzgo-Mixtecan vocabularies. *Anthropological Linguistics* 3.4.1-39.
- Loukotka, Čestmir
1968 Classification of South American Indian languages. UCLA Latin American Center, Reference series, 7. Los Angeles.
- Lounsbury, Floyd
1974a On the derivation and reading of the ben-ich prefix. *Dumbarton Oaks Conference on Meso-american Writing Systems*, ed. by E. Benson, 99-143. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks.
- 1974b Pacal. Primera mesa redonda de Palenque, part 1:ii. Pebble Beach, California: Robert Luis Stevenson School.
- Lounsbury, Floyd and Michael D. Coe
1968 Linguistic and ethnographic data pertinent to the "cage" glyph of Dresden 36c. *Estudios de Cultura Maya* 7.269-84. Mexico: UNAM.
- Lumholtz, Carl
1902 Unknown Mexico. New York.
- McClaran, Marlys
1973 Mexico. *Current Trends in Linguistics* 10. 1079-99, ed. by T. Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton.
- McQuown, Norman
1940 A grammar of Totonac. Unpublished Yale University Ph.D. dissertation.
- 1942 Una posible síntesis lingüística Macro-Mayance. *Mayas y Olmecas. Segunda reunión de Mesa redonda sobre problemas antropológicos de México y Centro América*, 37-8.

- Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología.
- McQuown, Norman
1945 Fonémica del Cuitlateco. *El México Antiguo* 5.205-7.
- 1955 The indigenous languages of Latin America. *AA* 57.501-70.
- 1956a The classification of the Mayan languages. *IJAL* 22.191-5.
- 1956b Evidence for a synthetic trend in Totonacan. *LG* 32.78-80.
- 1960a Middle American linguistics: 1955. *Middle American Anthropology* Vol. 2:12-36. Special symposium of the American Anthropological Association. Washington: Pan American Union.
- 1960b American Indian and general linguistics. *AA* 62.318-26.
- 1964 Los orígenes y la diferenciación de los Mayas según se infiere del estudio comparativo de las lenguas mayanas. *Desarrollo cultural de los Mayas*, ed. by E. Vogt, 49-80. Seminario de Cultura Maya. Mexico: UNAM.
- 1967 History of studies in Middle American linguistics. *HMAI* 5.3-8.
- 1975 American Indian linguistics in New Spain. ms.
- Mántica, Carolos
1973 El habla Nicaragüense. Managua: Editorial Universitaria Centroamericana.
- Mason, J. Alden
1936 The classification of the Sonoran languages. *Essays in Anthropology in honor of A.L. Kroeber*, 183-98. Berkeley.
- 1940 The native languages of Middle America. *The Maya and their neighbors*, 52-87. ed. by C.L. Hay. New York.

- Massey, William C.
1949 Tribes and languages of Baja California. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 5.272-307.
- Membreño, Alberto
1897 *Hondureñismos: Vocabulario de los provincialismos de Honduras. Segunda edición.* Tegucigalpa: Tipografía Nacional.
- Mendizábal, Manuel Othon de, and Wigberto Jiménez Moreno
1937 *Distribución prehispánica de las lenguas indígenas de México.* Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia. Mexico.
- 1939 *Clasificación de las lenguas indígenas de México. Razas y lenguas indígenas de México,* ed. by Jorge A. Vivo. Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, Pub. 52.
- 1944 *Mapas lingüísticos de la República Mexicana.* Mexico.
- Merrifield, William R.
1966 *Linguistic clues for the reconstruction of Chinantec prehistory. Summa Antropológica en homenaje a Roberto J. Weitlaner,* ed. by A. Pompa y Pompa, 579-96. Mexico: INAH.
- Miller, Wick R.
1967 *Uto-Aztecan cognate sets.* University of California Publications in Linguistics, 48. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moser, Edward and Mary Moser
1961 *Vocabulario Seri: Seri-Castellano, Castellano-Seri. Serie de vocabularios indígenas "Mariano Silva y Aceves" 5.* Mexico: SIL.
- Nordell, Norman
1962 *On the status of Popoluca in Zoque-Mixe.* IJAL 28.146-9.
- Norman, William
1977 *Dictionary of Colonial Cakchiquel and Quiché.* ms.

- Norman, William and Lyle Campbell
1978 *Is a Proto-Mayan syntax possible? Mayan Linguistics 2,* ed. by Nora England.
- Olson, Roland D.
1964 *Mayan affinities with Chipaya of Bolivia. I, Correspondences.* IJAL 30.313-24.
- 1965 *Mayan affinities with Chipaya of Bolivia. II, Cognates.* IJAL 31.29-38.
- Oltrogge, David, F.
1971 *Texts in Jicaque. According to our ancestors,* ed. by Mary Shaw, 379-83. SIL publications in linguistics and related fields, 32. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- 1976 *La etnoentomología de algunas categorías de la orden himenóptera entre los Jicaques. Las fronteras de mesoamérica. 14a mesa redonda, Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología,* 1:379-92. Mexico.
- 1977 *Proto Jicaque-Subtiaba-Tequistlateco: a comparative reconstruction. Two studies in Middle American comparative linguistics, 1-52.* SIL: University of Texas, Arlington Press.
- Orozco y Berra, Manuel
1864 *Geografía de las lenguas y cartas etnográficas de México.* Mexico.
- Pérez González, Benjamín
1975 *Clasificaciones lingüísticas. Las lenguas de México I,* ed. by E. Arana de Swadesh, 19-89. Mexico: INAH.
- Pike, Kenneth L., and Milton Warkentin
1961 *Huave: a study of syntactic tone with low lexical functional load. A William Cameron Townsend,* 627-42.
- Pimentel, Francisco
1874 *Cuadro descriptivo y comparativo de las lenguas indígenas de México.* Mexico.

- Radín, Paul
1916 On the relationship of Huave and Mixe. AA 18.411-21. (Also JSA-P 11.489-99 (1919).)
- 1924 The relationship of Maya to Zoque-Huave. JSA-P 16.317-24.
- 1925 The distribution and phonetics of the Zapotec dialects: a preliminary sketch. JSA-P 17.27-76.
- 1929 Huave texts. IJAL 5.1-56.
- 1930 A preliminary sketch of the Zapotec language. LG 6.64-85.
- 1933a Notes on the Tlappanec language of Guerrero. IJAL 8.45-72.
- 1933b Mixe texts. JSA-P 25.41-64.
- 1935 An historical legend of the Zapotecs. Ibero-Americana 9. Berkeley.
- 1943-4 Cuentos y Leyendas de los Zapotecos. Tlalocan 1.3-30, 134-54, 194-226.
- 1944 The classification of the languages of Mexico. Tlalocan 2.259-65.
- 1946 Zapotec texts: dialect of Juchitan-Tehuano. IJAL 12.152-72.
- Reid, Aileen A., and Ruth G. Bishop
1974 Diccionario Totonaco de Xicotepec de Juárez. Serie de vocabularios y diccionarios indígenas "Mariano Silva y Aceves" 17. Mexico: SIL.
- Reid, Aileen A., Ruth G. Bishop, Ella M. Button, and Robert E. Longacre
1968 Totonac: from clause to discourse. SIL publications in linguistics and related fields 17. Norman, Oklahoma: SIL.
- Rendón, Juan José
1971 Relaciones externas del llamado idioma

- papabuco. Anales de Antropología 8.214-31. Mexico: UNAM.
- Rensch, Calvin R.
1966 Comparative Otomanguean phonology. Unpublished University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation. (To appear as Language Science Monograph Series, 14, Indiana University.)
- 1968 Proto-Chinantec phonology. Papeles de la Chinantla, 6, serie científica 10. Mexico.
- 1973 Otomanguean isoglosses. Current Trends in Linguistics 11.295-316, ed. by T. Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1976 Typological and genetic consideration in the classification of the Otomanguean languages. Paper presented at the 1976 ICA, Paris. To be published in proceedings.
- 1977 Classification of the Otomanguean languages and the position of Tlapanec. Two studies in Middle American comparative linguistics, 53-108. SIL Publications in Linguistics, 55. University of Texas, Arlington Press.
- Ritzenthaler, Robert E., and Frederick A. Peterson
1956 The Mexican Kickapoo Indians. Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology, 2.
- Rivet, Paul
1924 Langues de l'Amérique Central. Les langues du Monde, ed. by A. Meillet and M. Cohen, 597-712. Collection Linguistique Publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris.
- Rivet, Paul, E.G. Strosser-Péan, and C. Loukotka
1952 Langues du Mexique et de l'Amérique Centrale. Les langues du monde (Nouvelle édition), 1067-97, ed. by A. Meillet and M. Cohen. Paris.
- Robertson, John S.
1976 The structure of pronoun incorporation in the Mayan verbal complex. Unpublished Harvard University Ph.D. dissertation.

- Robertson, John S.
1977 A proposed revision in Mayan subgrouping. IJAL 43.105-20.
- Robles Uribe, Carlos
1964 Investigación lingüística sobre los grupos indígenas del estado de Baja California. Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia 17.275-301.
- Robles Uribe, Carlos and Roberto D. Bruce
1975 Lenguas hokanas. Las lenguas de Mexico, I. ed. by E. Arana de Swadesh, 130-53.
- Sapir, Edward
1913-19 Southern Paiute and Nahuatl, a study in Uto-Aztecan. JSA-P 10.379-425; 11.443-88. (Also in American Anthropologist 17.98-120, 306-28 (1915).)
1920 The Hokan and Coahuiltecan languages. IJAL 1.280-90.
1921 Language. New York: Brace.
1925 The Hokan affinity of Subtiaba in Nacaragua: American Anthropologist 27.402-35, 491-527.
1929 Central and North American languages. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th edition, 5:138-41. (Reprinted in Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture, and personality, ed. by David G. Mandelbaum. University of California Press (1949).)
- Sauer, Carl
1934 The distribution of aboriginal tribes and languages in northwestern Mexico. Ibero-Americana 5. Berkeley.
- Schmidt, Wilhelm
1926 Die Sprachenfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde. Heidelberg.
- Schultze-Jena, Leonhard
1938 Indiana, III: Bei den Azteken, Mixteken und Tlapaneken der Sierra Madre del Sur von

- Mexico. Jena.
- Smith, T. Buckingham
1861a The Opata language. Historical Magazine 5. 236. New York.
1861b A grammatical sketch of the Heve language. Shea's Library of American Linguistics, no. 3. New York.
1862 Vocabulary of the Eudeve, a dialect of the Pima language, spoken in Snonora. Historical Magazine 6.18-19. New York.
- Smith-Stark, Thomas C.
1976 Some hypotheses on syntactic and morphological aspects of Proto-Mayan (*PM). Mayan Linguistics 1.44-66, ed. by Marlys McClaran. American Indian Studies Center, UCLA.
1977 Notes on Proto-Mayan verb morphology. Mayan Linguistics 2, ed. by Nora England.
- Squier, Ephraim George
1853 Observations on the archaeology and ethnology of Nicaragua. Transactions of the American Ethnological society, 85-158. New York.
- Stairs, Emily, and Barbara E. Hollenback
1969 Huave verb morphology. IJAL 35.38-53.
- Stark, Louisa R.
n.d. Glottochronology and the prehistory of western South America. Unpublished paper.
1970 Mayan affinities with Araucanian. CLS 6. 57-69.
1972 Maya-Yunga-Chipayan: a new linguistic alignment. IJAL 38.119-35.
- Stoll, Otto
1958 Etnografía de Guatemala. Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, pub. 8. (Spanish translation of Zur Ethnographie der Republik Guatemala, Zürich, 1884.)

- Stone, Doris
1949 Los grupos mexicanos de América Central y su importancia. *Antropología e Historia de Guatemala* 15.165-87.
- Suárez, Jorge A.
1972 La clasificación del Papabuco y del Solteco. *Anuario de Letras, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Centro de Lingüística Hispánica* 10. 219-32.
- 1973 On Proto-Zapotecan phonology. *IJAL* 39.236-49.
- 1975 Estudios Huaves. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Departamento de Lingüística (Colección Científica, Lingüística, 22.) Mexico.
- 1977 El tlapaneco como lengua otomangue. Unpublished paper, UNAM.
- Swadesh, Morris
1959 Mapas de clasificación lingüística de México y las Américas. UNAM, Instituto de Historia, Pub. 51, Antr. Ser. no. 8.
- 1960 The Oto-Manguetan hypothesis and Macro-Mixtecan. *IJAL* 27.9-29.
- 1963 El tamaulipeco. *RMEA* 19.93-104.
- 1964a Algunos problemas de la lingüística otomangue. *Anales de Antropología* 1.91-123.
- 1964b Interim notes on Oaxacan phonology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 20.168-89.
- 1966 Porhé y Maya. *Anales de Antropología* 3.173-204. Mexico: UNAM.
- 1967 Lexicostatistic classification. *Handbook of Middle American Indians. Vol. 5: Linguistics*, ed. by N. McQuown, 79-116.
- 1968 Las lenguas indígenas del noreste de México. *Anales de Antropología* 5.75-86. Mexico: UNAM.

- Swadesh, Morris
1969 Elementos del Tarasco antiguo. UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. Mexico.
- Swanton, John R.
1940 Linguistic material from the tribes of Southern Texas and Northeastern Mexico. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 127. Washington.
- Tax, Sol
1960 Aboriginal languages of Latin America. *Current Anthropology* 1.430-6.
- Taylor, Douglas
1948 Loanwords in Central American Carib. *Word* 4.187-95.
- 1951 The Black Carib of British Honduras. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, 17. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation of Anthropological Research.
- 1952 Sameness and difference in two Island Carib dialects. *IJAL* 18.223-30.
- 1954 Diachronic note on the Carib contribution to Island Carib. *IJAL* 20.28-33.
- 1956 Languages and ghost-languages of the West Indies. *IJAL* 22.180-3.
- Thaeler, A.D.
n.d. Miskito grammar. Nicaragua: Board of Christian Education.
- Thomas, Cyrus and John R. Swanton
1911 Indian languages of Mexico and Central America and their geographical distribution. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 44. Washington.
- Thomas, Norman D.
1974 The linguistic, geographic, and demographic position of the Zoque of southern Mexico. *Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation*, 36. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young

- University Press.
- Thompson, J. Eric S.
1943 Pitfalls and stimuli in the interpretation of history through loan words. *Philological and Documentary Studies I*. Middle American Research Institute, pub. 11. Tulane University.
- Troiike, Rudolph
1959 A descriptive phonology and morphology of Coahuilteco. Unpublished University of Texas Ph.D. dissertation.
1963 A contribution to Coahuilteco lexicography. *IJAL* 29.295-8.
- Turner, Paul
1967 Seri and Chontal (Tequistlateco). *IJAL* 33.235-9.
1969 Proto-Chontal phonemes. *IJAL* 35.34-7.
1977 Pluralization of nouns in Seri and Chontal. *Hokan Studies*, ed. by M. Langdon and S. Silver. The Hague: Mouton.
- Turner, Paul and Shirley Turner
1971 Chontal to Spanish-English, Spanish to Chontal dictionary. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Von Hagen, V. Wolfgang
1943 The Jicaque (Torrupan) Indians of Honduras. *Indian notes and monographs* 53. New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation.
- Voorhis, Paul H.
1971 Notes on Kickapoo whistle speech. *IJAL* 37. 238-43.
- Wakefield, Walter
1971 The external relationships of the Mayan family: a review and assessment of proposals and evidence. Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas.

- Warkentin, Milton and Clara Warkentin
1947a *Diccionario huave-español*. SIL: Mexico.
1947b "The holy bells" and other Huave legends. *Tlalocan* 2.223-4.
1952 *Vocabulario huave*. SIL: Mexico.
- Waterhouse, Viola
1969 Oaxaca Chontal in reference to Proto-Chontal. *IJAL* 35.231-3.
- Weathers, Mark L.
1976 Tlapanec 1975. *IJAL* 42.367-71.
- Weitlaner, Roberto J.
1936-9 Notes on the Cuitlatec language. *El México Antiguo* 4.363-73.
1948a *Lingüística de Atoyac, Gro.* *Tlalocan* 11.
1948b Un idioma desconocido del Norte de México. *ICA* 28.205-27.
- Weitlaner, Roberto J., and Irmgard Weitlaner de Johnson
1943 Acatlan y Hueycantenango, Guerrero. *El México Antiguo* 6.140-202.
- Wilson, Jack L.
1970 Oclusivas sonoras nasalizadas en bribri. *Revista de la Universidad de Costa Rica* 29. 159-63.
1974 Análisis fonológico del bribri. *América Indígena* 34.341-53.
- Wheeler, Alva
1972 Proto Chibchan. *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages*, ed. by Esther Matteson, 93-108. (*Juana Linguarum*, series practica, 127.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Whorf, Benjamin L.
1935 The comparative linguistics of Uto-Aztecan. *AA* 37.600-8.
1937 The origin of Aztec. *AA* 39.265-74.

- Whorf, Benjamin L.
 1943 Loan words in ancient Mexico. Tulane University, Middle American Research Institute, Pub. 11, no. 1. (Reprinted in *Studies in Linguistics* 5.49-64 (1947).)
- 1946 The Milpa Atla dialect of Aztec, with notes on the Classical and Tepostlan dialects. *Linguistic structures of native America*, 367-97, ed. by Harry Hoijer. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 6. New York.
- Whorf, Benjamin L., and George L. Trager
 1937 The relationship of Uto-Aztecan and Tanoan. AA 39.609-24.
- Wonderly, William L.
 1949 Some Zoquean phonemic and morphophonemic correspondences. IJAL 15.1-11.
- 1953 Sobre la propuesta filiación lingüística de las familias zoqueana y mayense. *Huastecos, Totonacos y sus vecinos*, ed. by I. Bernal and Davalos Hurtado. RMEA 13.105-13.

A Glance from Here On

Eric P. Hamp

It goes without saying that the contributions to this volume are rich both in detail and in coverage. The striking thing is the difference with which the separate stocks and areas present themselves, quite apart from the individuality of focus and temperament that each author understandably brings to his task. We see here a whole continent in a spectrum of stages of scholarly elaboration, of transparency and tractability, of lacunae and needs, and occasionally of neglect. We wish to glance ahead at what the future may hold for us, or at least at what we may reasonably ask of the future. To do so, it seems essential to take a running account of what may be the texture of past accomplishment, and this is impressively mirrored in the sort of presentation that each of the foregoing chapters has lent itself to.

Certain fields are very large, have been worked over a considerable time, and are, relatively speaking, evenly populated with accomplishment. These fields lend themselves readily to a species of annalistic conspectus. A notable example of this is the--largely--far North, covered in a broad sweep by Krauss. His account must be read, of course, as a continuation of his ample stock-taking in *Trends* of a decade ago. For understandable reasons his coverage is fullest and deepest for Alaska, and the news of the recent USSR contacts are extremely welcome. It is to be hoped that in the richly studied Eskimo field our knowledge of the dialectology within Canada will soon and rapidly be refined. Meantime Krauss gives us a fine report on Yupik, where excellent active work proceeds month by month. It is imperative that Bergsland, the master