

**Click here to view
current issues**
on the Chicago Journals website.

Amotomanco (Otomoaco) and Tanpachoa as Uto-Aztecan Languages, and the Jumano Problem Once More

Author(s): Rudolph C. Troike

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Apr., 1988), pp. 235-241

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1265598>

Accessed: 05-01-2022 19:51 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of American Linguistics*

- _____. 1980. Five Studies Inspired by Nahuatl Verbs in *-oa*. *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Copenhague*, vol. 19. Copenhagen.
- CORTÉS Y ZEDEÑO, GERÓNIMO THOMÁS DE AQUINO. 1765. *Arte, vocabulario, y confesionario en el idioma Mexicano, como se usa en el Obispado de Guadalajara*. Puebla.
- GARCÍA DE LEÓN, ANTONIO. 1976. *Pajapan. Un Dialecto Mexicano del Golfo*. México: Departamento de Lingüística, INAH.
- GUERRA, JUAN. 1692. *Arte de la lengua Mexicana según la acostumban hablar los indios en Todo el Obispado de Guadalajara, Parte del de Guadiana, y del de Mechoacán*. México. [Republished by Alberto Santoscoy with the following title: *Arte de la lengua Mexicana que fue usual entre los indios del Obispado de Guadalajara y de parte de los de Durango y Michoacan, Guadalajara, 1900.*]
- HENDRICHES PÉREZ, PEDRO R. 1946. Cuatro dialectos de la lengua nahua. Por tierras ignotas, viajes y observaciones en la región del Río de las Balsas, vol. 2, pp. 78–129. México: Pan American Institute of Geography and History.
- HILL, JANE H., AND KENNETH C. HILL. 1986. Variable developments of *-āškā* ‘possession’ in modern Mexicano (Nahuatl). *IJAL* 52:404–10.
- KAUFMANN, TERRENCE. 1979. Field notes from San Pedro Tlalcuapan, Tlaxcala.
- KEY, HAROLD, AND MARY KEY. 1953. *Vocabulario Mejicano de la Sierra de Zacapoxtla, Puebla*. México.
- KIMBALL, GEOFFREY. 1980. *A Dictionary of the Huazalinguillo Dialect of Nahuatl with Grammatical Sketch and Readings*. Latin American Studies Curriculum Aids. Baton Rouge, La.: Center for Latin American Studies, Tulane University.
- SISCHO, WILLIAM R. 1979. Michoacán Nahuatl. *Modern Aztec Grammatical Sketches*, ed. Ronald W. Langacker, pp. 307–80.
- TUGGY, DAVID H. 1979. Tetelcingo Nahuatl. *Modern Aztec Grammatical Sketches*, ed. Ronald W. Langacker, pp. 1–140.
- WOLGEMUTH, CARL. 1981. *Gramática Náhuatl del Municipio de Mecayapan, Veracruz*. México: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

AMOTOMANCO (OTOMOACO) AND TANPACHOA AS UTO-AZTECAN LANGUAGES, AND THE JUMANO PROBLEM ONCE MORE

On the basis of his justly famed work, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico* (1934), Carl Sauer is often credited with having assigned the little-known Concho and Suma of Chihuahua and the Jumano of West Texas to the Uto-Aztecan family. In fact, of the Concho he says (1983:59) that “Kroeber has determined their linguistic affinity with Cahita and Opata” and merely provides some additional documentary commentary and tribal names possibly bearing on the question. Concerning the Suma and Jumano, he only states rather obliquely (1983:65), “In the following records a discussion is presented relating these people to the south and probably to Uto-Aztecan peoples.” He cites four words obtained by Spanish explorers in 1581 but does not discuss them.

Conversely, Kroeber, in discussing the Suma and Jumano the same year, says of them, “Sauer sees them as probably Uto-Aztecan. I incline to his opinion, on

the basis of the words and names he cites; but reserve is indicated" (1934:15). Thus each credits the other with regard to identifying the affiliation of one or the other of these languages.

Kroeber's identification of the Concho, found in his short but influential monograph, *Uto-Aztecan Languages of Mexico* (1934), is based on three terms recorded by the Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition of 1581, viz. *sanate* 'corn', *bate* 'water', and *yolly* 'people' (taken from Hammond and Rey 1928:275), which he uses to place the Concho in his Cáhita-Opata-Tarahumar subgroup (1934:14):

Sanate for maize corresponds to my Opata sunut, even to the absolutive suffix -t. . . . Bate, water, is my ^mbat. Again the absolutive is evident. Yolli, people, corresponds not with my Opata or Buckingham Smith's Eudeve-Heve-Dohema Opata dohme, but with Cáhita (and Varohío?) yore'me. . . . It can be inferred that Concho was a distinct language within the Ca-Op-Tar group, mostly closely related to Opata, and perhaps most different from Tarahumar.

In discussing the Suma and Jumano, Kroeber merely cites four terms given by Sauer (1934:65) from the same source, as follows (1934:15):

The words are abad, water; teoy or tooy, maize; aguacate, beans; parba, porba, or payla, copper. None of these are patently Uto-Aztecan, though abad is certainly suggestive; especially in view of the Concho sources varying between bate and bad for water. . . . The list rings definitely more Uto-Aztecan than Athabascan, but none too sonorously Uto-Aztecan at that. Under the circumstances a probability of Uto-Aztecan affiliation can be posited, but hardly an opinion as to place within the family.

Kroeber further notes that "The list of forty personal names cited by Sauer does not help much, partly because the etymologies are unknown, partly because of the probability of poor copying"—a comment which, as will appear later, turns out to be somewhat ironic.

In a survey of extinct languages of northwest Mexico, Miller (1983:332) has more recently taken up the question of the affiliation of the Concho and the Suma and Jumano. With respect to Concho, he takes a more conservative stance than Kroeber. While accepting the word for 'water', he notes that the term for corn could have diffused with agriculture, and the vowels being different, "the Concho word does not provide very good evidence." Further, he observes, "The last word, *yolly*, Kroeber links with *yoli* and *yorí*, which is the word for 'white man' that has diffused throughout most of the Sonoran languages—not at all convincing evidence." He concludes, "Most commentators since Kroeber have assumed a Uto-Aztecan connection for Concho, but I do not think the evidence allows us to say more than maybe."

Regarding the Suma and Jumano, Miller cites Sauer and Kroeber, and observes (1983:332):

But the evidence is skimpy. Only the words for 'water', 'beans', ['corn'] and 'copper' have been recorded. Only 'water', *abad*, looks plausible. Unlike Concho, we cannot even say that the evidence is suggestive.

Kelley (1947 [1986]) has provided the most detailed summary of the ethno-historic data surrounding the Jumano and their possible congeners along the Rio Grande from the junction with the Rio Conchos in the Big Bend area upriver to near El Paso. Amplifying on Scholes (1940), he convincingly distinguishes between the Jumano (including, by implication, the Suma), a nomadic buffalo-hunting Southern Plains group who wintered along the Rio Grande in this area, and the Patarabuey (a name given by Spanish slavers), who lived in settled villages along the river. Inferences about their possible linguistic relationship rest solely on the symbiotic association between the two groups, and the fact that a Patarabuey native who had been taken captive to work in the mines in southern Chihuahua was able to serve as an interpreter for the Spanish with the Jumano. Both Scholes and Kelley observe that the interpreter could have been bilingual, and beyond this we have not a single word of Suma or Jumano to judge the linguistic affiliation of these groups, despite two centuries of contact with the Spanish. Except by possible implication, therefore, the Jumano will not figure further in this discussion.

Amotomanco (Otomoaco). Most of our information on this area, and the information utilized by Sauer and Kroeber, comes from the accounts of two Spanish *entradas* to New Mexico, the Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition in 1581 and the Espejo expedition in 1582. The most important sources for the Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition are a diary by Hernán Gallegos (translated by Hammond and Rey 1927) and a later report by Baltasar de Obregón (Hammond and Rey 1928). For the Espejo expedition there is a diary by Diego Pérez de Luxán (Hammond and Rey 1929) and a report by Espejo himself (Bolton 1916). Following the Rio Conchos through the territory of the Concho Indians, about fifty miles above the junction of the river with the Rio Grande both expeditions encountered a group called the Cabris (Gallegos) or Passaguates (Luxán) who were “friends of the Conchos and Patarabueyes, because they speak all three languages” (Hammond and Rey 1929:54). About twenty-five miles above the junction, after descending to the river flood plain, the explorers encountered the Patarabueyes, whose language “seemed different” from that of the Cabris, although “they understand one another.”

Upon being asked the name of their language, the Indians responded “Amotomanco,” according to Gallegos (Hammond and Rey 1927:16). Luxán says the group were called “Otomoacos” (Hammond and Rey 1929:55) and uses this term for other communities upriver along the Rio Grande (though he distinguishes the Abriaches at the mouth of the Rio Conchos, who “speak a different language, although they are friends and understand one another” [p. 58], and further up the Rio Grande, the Caguates, “who are intermarried with the Otomoacos and have almost the same language” [p. 67]). These people were described as semiagricultural and as living in typical North Mexican mud-plastered houses, an observation confirmed by Kelley’s (1947 [1986]) archaeological excavations. They raised beans and squash and some corn, but hunted and gathered wild foods as well. Their use of fish, among other things, distinguishes them from the Pueblos to the north.

The four “Suma-Jumano”—properly Amotomanco (Otomoaco)—terms cited by Sauer and discussed by Kroeber and Miller come from Gallegos’s *Relación* of the Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition, which is preserved in the Archivo General de las Indias in Seville. Sauer notes (1934:86) in his bibliography of sources that he had compared a transcript of the AGI manuscript with the English translation published by Hammond and Rey (1927). Nevertheless, a typological error seems to have crept into his rendition of the form for ‘beans’ as *aguacate* (= ‘avocado’ in Spanish), creating a ghost-form which may have negatively affected subsequent treatment of the term. As given in Hammond and Rey (1927:17), the relevant text is as follows: “They call water ‘abad’; corn ‘teoy’; and beans ‘ayaguat’.”

Both Kroeber and Miller, though readily accepting Concho *bate* as good Uto-Aztecan, are reluctant to extend the same acceptance to Amotomanco *abad*, Kroeber calling it “suggestive” and Miller “plausible.” Yet apart from the problem of the initial *a-*, which could represent a demonstrative prefix (Langacker 1977), it would appear to be as legitimate a reflex of PUA **paa*, with absolutive suffix (voicing of medial **t* to [r], [l], or [d] is widespread in Uto-Aztecan [Miller 1967:9, table 3]), as is the Concho form. Indeed, the fact that it is not identical to the Concho form would tend to give it more independent status for comparative purposes.

With regard to the other forms, if we ignore the usual etymon for ‘corn’, SUA **sunu*, reflected in the Concho term, and look elsewhere, a surprising solution—and with it, a curious conundrum—begins to appear. In Aztec, apart from the better-known (*teo*)*sentli/sintli*, there is also the term *tlaolli*, found in Classical Aztec as well as in modern dialects lacking the *tl*, e.g., Zacapoaxtla *tago:l* (Key and Key 1953:80). Campbell and Langacker (1978:263, no. 33) give **tlayool-* (?) ‘corn’ [= **ta-36* in Miller et al. 1987] as Proto-Aztec. It is possible to see a reflex of a pre-Aztec **tayo* in Amotomanco *teoy*, but it is even more possible to see a reflection of a /*tlayoli*/, with palatalization of the *-li* to *-y* and derivation from a deaffricated /*t*-dialect or simplification of /*tl*/ through borrowing.

While this might at first seem rather speculative, the identification is strengthened when we consider the corrected form for ‘bean’, *ayaguat*. Siméon’s Nahuatl dictionary (1885 [1984]:17) contains the entry “*ayacotli o ayecotli*. Frijoles muy grandes, como habas” (very large beans, like broad-beans). Given a *t*-dialect source, such as that from which most Nahuatl loans in Spanish originated (e.g., *chocolate*, *tomate*, *mesquite*), and the fact that orthographic *-co/-cu-* after a vowel and preceding a consonant reflects phonemic /*kʷ*/, we have as a possible original model a form such as */*ayakʷte*/. Allowing for voicing and lenition of the /*k*/ and the introduction of an epenthetic vowel before the /*t*/ (rather than the usual metathesis of [k] and [w]), the derivation of the Amotomanco form becomes quite feasible. Clearly the perpetuation of Sauer’s ghost-form has prevented the recognition of this possible identification.

What sort of scenario can be constructed to account for these Aztecoïd forms in the Big Bend area of Texas, so far off the beaten path of trade? If it is assumed that the forms represent borrowings, then Nahuatl(l), perhaps via

Nahuatl(l)-speaking traders (*pochteca*) from Central Mexico, could be suspected as a first source. Kelley (1947 [1986]) provides no particular archaeological support for this interpretation, though it is not necessarily the case that contact of the sort that might lead to the adoption of corn and a particular type of beans into the agricultural system would leave clear archaeological evidence (note that the term involved is not the usual Nahuatl one for bean, *etl*, nor the general Sonoran term *muuni*). The contact could have been more indirect, however, since the Aztec empire did extend nearly to the southern border of Coahuila (Barlow 1949). Borrowings, of course, are subject to the vagaries of the contact situation and cannot be expected always to preserve regular phonological correspondences.

A second possibility, since some of the Otomoacos (including the interpreter for the expeditions) had been captured to work in the mines in southern Chihuahua, is that they could have had contact with Nahuatl speakers (Tlaxcalans) during their sojourn there, and learned something of the language. When the explorers came, the Otomoacos may have tried to impress the Spanish with their knowledge of the more prestigious Nahuatl (or a variety thereof) by using terms they remembered. Or the interpreter, being one of these, could have proffered the terms as ones the Spanish, some of whom knew Nahuatl, might understand.

The least likely scenario would build from the problematic origin myth of the Mexica (Aztecs) that they had been nomadic "Chichimec" hunters and gatherers prior to their entry into the Valley of Mexico, and that they had come from northern Mexico (usually identified in the northwest). There was a corridor of "Chichimec" groups extending down through the middle part of Mexico from Chihuahua and Coahuila south to Queretaro, any or all of whom might conceivably have been Aztecoïd but for whom we have not a single word to provide a linguistic identification. However, the Amotomanco term for 'water' is clearly non-Aztecan, and also unlikely to be borrowed, so that this is not a viable explanation.

In sum, the Amotomanco word for 'water', *abad*, as a basic vocabulary term which fits the general picture of Sonoran phonological correspondence, seems a reasonable basis for admitting the language at least tentatively into the Sonoran cluster of Uto-Aztecan languages. The other two terms, *teoy* 'corn' and *ayaguate* 'beans', now appear to be Nahuatl (or at least Aztecoïd) loans, either prehispanic, reflecting direct or indirect contact with the Aztec or Toltec empire, or, more likely, postcontact, reflecting contact with Tlaxcalans (or conceivably Spaniards speaking pidginized Nahuatl as a lingua franca) while working as captive laborers in the mines in southern Chihuahua. Thus, while the terms are Uto-Aztecan, ironically as loans they would not constitute evidence for the linguistic affiliation of Amotomanco with Uto-Aztecan.

With respect to the fourth Amotomanco term cited by Sauer, *porba* or *payla* 'copper', no comparable forms have been found. It is probably a loanword from some Puebloan group, whence the object (a bell) to which it referred had come. Gallegos (Hammond and Rey 1927:21), in describing an Otomoaco dance, also gives an additional expression: "They raise their hands toward the sun and sing a

dance tune, '*ayia canima*'.” Unfortunately, no translation is provided, so that nothing further can be said about it without a comparative study of song lyrics. In any event, none of the terms discussed here can be attributed to the Suma or Jumano.

Tanpachoa. The Gallegos narrative includes reference to another native term which has not been previously cited in the literature. Upriver on the Rio Grande just beyond the Otomoaco, the Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition encountered a group who were apparently culturally very similar to the Otomoaco but who spoke a different language. Gallegos in his diary reports, “Many natives accompanied us as far as this valley . . . they told us that further on was another language, a nation of people who were their enemies. After two days we came to another nation. . . . They told us this by means of signs, because we did not have an interpreter for this nation” (Hammond and Rey 1927:21–22). The editors erroneously identify them with the Caguates of Luxán’s diary, but they must have been the Tanpachoa (Hammond and Rey 1929:69). Gallegos further remarks: “These people call the arrow ‘ocae’, the name given to the bamboo by the Mexicans.”

The similarity of the Tanpachoa form to Nahuatl *acatl* ‘reed, cane’, (Mexican Spanish *acate*) was sufficiently evident to Gallegos to move him to comment on it. It is interesting that he should do so, since the PUA etymon of *acatl*, **paka* (Miller, 1967:52, no. 344, with regular loss of initial **p* in Aztecan) has the meaning ‘arrow’ in Mono, Comanche, Tubatulabal, and residually in Southern Paiute, while ‘reed’ is the regular meaning in Nahuatl and most of Southern Uto-Aztecan. However, it is difficult to support a Nahuatl derivation for the term. If it were borrowed from Nahuatl, one would expect the meaning to be ‘reed’; if it were an inherited PUA term, meaning ‘arrow’, it should have an initial *p*-. Thus the Aztecan resemblance must be regarded as fortuitous.

However, the word could well represent a reflex of PUA **hu* ‘arrow, wood’ (Miller, 1967:17, no. 9 and Miller et al. 1987:54–55, no. *hu*-03; cf. Tepehuan *úyi*, Hopi *ho:hi*), compounded with some second element. The strongest evidence for this comes from Tarahumara of the upper Rio Conchos, where the word for ‘arrow’ is /wáka/ (Bennett and Zing 1935:115), which favorably compares with /okae/. Though a borrowing could be involved, it seems unlikely for such a basic implement. As matters stand, the similarity can be considered at least strongly suggestive of a Uto-Aztecan affiliation for Tanpachoa.

The evidence linking Concho, Amotomanco, and Tanpachoa to Uto-Aztecan, and more specifically to Sonoran, is indeed very tenuous, consisting of a single word apiece (if Miller’s critique of the Concho evidence is accepted). Nevertheless, taken together, they are mutually reinforcing both in the consistent direction of their similarities and the plausibility of a block of contiguous languages belonging to the same family. With regard to the Suma and Jumano, however, unless comparative analysis can shed some light on the personal names compiled by Sauer, no direct linguistic basis can be found for determining their affiliation, so that the “Jumano problem” must continue to remain unresolved.

RUDOLPH C. TROIKE, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

REFERENCES

- BARLOW, R. H. 1949. *The Extent of the Empire of the Culhua Mexica*. Ibero-Americana 28. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BENNETT, WENDELL C., AND ROBERT M. ZINGG. 1935. *The Tarahumara: An Indian Tribe of Mexico*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BOLTON, HERBERT E. 1916. *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, 1542-1706*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- HAMMOND, GEORGE P., AND AGAPITO REY. 1927. *The Gallegos Relation of the Rodriguez Expedition to New Mexico*. Santa Fe, N.M.: El Palacio Press.
- . 1928. *Obregón's History of Sixteenth Century Exploration in Western America*. Los Angeles: The Quivira Society.
- . 1929. *Expedition into New Mexico Made by Antonio de Espejo, 1582-1583, as Revealed in the Journal of Diego Pérez de Luxán, a Member of the Party*. Los Angeles: The Quivira Society.
- KELLEY, J. CHARLES. 1947 [1986]. *Jumano and Patarabueye: Relations at La Junta de los Rios*. Anthropological Papers, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, no. 77. Ann Arbor: Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan.
- KEY, HAROLD, AND MARY RITCHIE DE KEY. 1953. *Vocabulario Mejicano de la Sierra de Zacapoaxtla, Puebla*. Mexico City: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- KROEBER, A. L. 1934. *Uto-Aztec Languages of Mexico*. Ibero-Americana 8. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- LANGACKER, RONALD W. 1977. *An overview of Uto-Aztec grammar*. Studies in Uto-Aztec Grammar 1. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- MILLER, WICK R. 1967. *Uto-Aztec Cognate Sets*. UCPL 48. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1983. *A note on extinct languages of Northwest Mexico of supposed Uto-Aztec affiliation*. *IJAL* 49:328-47.
- ; ET AL. 1987. *Computerized Data Base for Uto-Aztec Cognate Sets*. Salt Lake City: Department of Linguistics, University of Utah.
- SAUER, CARL. 1934. *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico*. Ibero-Americana 5. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- SCHOLES, FRANCE V. 1940. *Documentary Evidence Relating to the Jumano Indians*. Contributions to American Anthropology and History, no. 34. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution.
- SIMÉON, RÉMI. 1885 [1984]. *Diccionario de la lengua Nahuatl o Mexicana*. 4th ed. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

A NOTE ON MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SPEECH IN KOASATI

Geoffrey Kimball (*IJAL* [January 1987]) has concluded that the male forms in Koasati described by Haas (1944) were/are status markers, and not used exclusively by males. I cannot make any definitive judgment on the issue, but I would like to contribute the perspective of a Koasati speaker as it was reported to me during fieldwork I conducted on the Alabama and Koasati languages in