

**A LINGUISTIC SKETCH
OF
JICALTEPEC MIXTEC**

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS PUBLICATIONS
IN
LINGUISTICS AND RELATED FIELDS

PUBLICATION NUMBER 25

EDITOR

Irvine Davis

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Alan C. Wares

Iris M. Wares

CONSULTING EDITORS

Doris Bartholomew

Eugene Loos

Robert E. Longacre

William R. Merrifield

Kenneth L. Pike

PUBLISHER

Benjamin F. Elson

**A LINGUISTIC SKETCH
OF
JICALTEPEC MIXTEC**

**by
C. Henry Bradley**

**A Publication of the
SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA**

Norman

© Summer Institute of Linguistics 1970
diciembre, 1970 primera edición
Esta edición consta en 500 ejemplares
Derechos reservados
por el
Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, A.C.
Hidalgo 166. Tlalpan, México 22, D.F.
5C 0-024

EDITOR'S NOTE

This sketch of Jicaltepec Mixtec was submitted in 1965 as a thesis to the faculty of the Graduate School of Cornell University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It is published here in essentially its original form with the conviction that it contributes significantly to our knowledge of the Mixtecan languages of Mexico, and is a worthy addition to the growing body of modern descriptive and comparative studies dealing with these languages dating back to the pioneering efforts of Kenneth L. Pike a quarter of a century ago.

Irvine Davis

Editor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.	PHONOLOGY	4
1.1.	Phonological Constituents	4
1.2.	Phonemes	5
1.3.	Syllable Patterns	14
1.4.	Microsegment Patterns	17
1.5.	Macrosegment Patterns	19
2.	MORPHOPHONEMICS	23
2.1.	Morph Shapes	23
2.2.	Nontonal Morphophonemics	24
2.3.	Tonal Morphophonemics	27
3.	PARTS OF SPEECH	37
3.1.	Markers	39
3.2.	Verbs	43
3.3.	Nouns	47
3.4.	Pronouns	49
3.5.	Numerals	51
3.6.	Adverbs	51
3.7.	Modifiers	52
3.8.	Interjections	52
4.	GRAMMATICAL PATTERNS	53
4.1.	Words and Word Patterns	53
4.2.	Phrases and Phrase Patterns	56
4.3.	Clauses and Clause Patterns	65
4.4.	Sentences and Sentence Patterns	69
5.	TEXT	72
5.1.	Text Transcribed	72
5.2.	Grammatical Analysis	84
6.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	96

LIST OF TABLES

1a. Clustering of UPCs into Phonemes--Consonants	6
1b. Clustering of UPCs into Phonemes--Vowels and Nonsegmentals	7
2. Classes of Consonants	10
3. Classes of Vowels	12
4. Nonsystematic Limitations of Consonant-Vowel Sequences	15
5. Distribution of Consonants, Vowels, and Tones before Microsegments	20
6. Distribution of Consonants, Vowels, and Tones after Microsegments	21
7. Active Verb Stems Indicating Aspect	27
8. Tone Patterns Indicating Aspect	29
9. Constraints on Tone Sequences	30
10. Permitted Sequences of Preverbs	42
11. Polite Personal Pronouns	49
12. Demonstrative Pronouns	50

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In my early training in descriptive linguistics Kenneth L. Pike had much influence. Later, as I began to teach techniques of linguistic analysis, Richard S. Pittman gave some very useful instruction. But I am most deeply indebted to Professor Charles F. Hockett who has guided my graduate training as Chairman of my Special Committee and under whose direction this thesis has been written. Other members of this committee whose influence cannot be overlooked are Professors Frederick B. Agard, John M. Roberts, and Robert A. Hall, Jr. (who substituted for F. B. Agard during the preparation of and examination on the thesis).

I also wish to acknowledge Cornell University and the United States Government for financial aid: Cornell University for both a Graduate Scholarship and Teaching Assistantship (Spanish) in the 1961-62 academic year and the U. S. Government for a National Defense Foreign Language Fellowship for the 1962-63 academic year and the summer of 1963 (when much of the early work for this thesis was done).

In addition, I am indebted to Drs. Benjamin F. Elson and Richard S. Pittman for relieving me of duties in the SIL-Mexico Branch and at the University of North Dakota during the two years of graduate study and for a subsequent year to prepare this thesis.

Finally, I am grateful to my wife, Barbara, who has patiently typed several versions of the dissertation from copy which only the author should have to read, and to my colleague in the study of Mixteco, Anne Dyk, who has also helped with the typing.

Charles Henry Bradley

O. INTRODUCTION

The Mixtec language is spoken by approximately 250,000 people in the western half of the state of Oaxaca, in the neighboring portion of Guerrero further to the west, and to the north in a small part of southern Puebla, Mexico. Its closest congeners are Cuicateco and Trique which, together with Mixtec, form the Mixtecan language family. At an early stage Mixtecan separated from Popolocan, thus splitting one of the main branches of the Otomanguean family. Later, the other three Mixtecan languages, in turn, became differentiated from each other.¹

Mixtec itself is not the monolithic unity that its name suggests. On the contrary, a number of mutually unintelligible dialects (probably about two dozen) constitute the language. Those that have been studied are Xayacatlán and Huajuapán (northern); Peñoles and Tilantongo (eastern); Yosondúa, San Miguel, Molinos, San Esteban, Santo Tomás, and Mixtepec (central); Metlatonoc (western); Ayutla (southwestern); Jicaltepec and Chayucu (southern); and Apoala and San Juan Coatzacoapan and Cuyamecalco (northeastern)—a Mixteco speaking island completely surrounded by speakers of Mazatec and Cuicatec. Very likely these two villages have descended from a Mixtec outpost in alien territory dating from the time of Mixtec domination several centuries before the coming of Cortez. Still to be studied are: Chigmecatitlán (northern); Huiltepec (eastern); Amoltepec (east central); Nuyoo-Yucuilté and Itundujía (south central); Silacoyapan-Juxtlahuaca (west central); Colcoyán (western); Tututepec (southeastern); and Zacatepec (southern).

Shortly after the conquest several Spanish friars studied the Mixtec spoken in the east-central region; two published works resulted. Fray Francisco de Alvarado's dictionary with grammatical notes (1593) was the first published. Dating from the same early period, the grammar—in the Latin mold—by Fray Antonio de los Reyes was reissued in 1888. There may be other and valuable contributions from this early post-conquest period hidden in the various uncatalogued collections of manuscripts in different places, one of which is the Brown University collection.

¹This picture of the development of the Mixtecan languages comes from Robert E. Longacre, Proto-Mixtecan and "Swadesh's Macro-Mixtecan Hypothesis." For a different view of the positions of Trique and Amuzgo within the Mixtecan family, see E. Arana's Relaciones Internas del Mixteco-Trique and M. Swadesh's "The Oto-Manguean Hypothesis and Macro Mixtecan." Sarah Gudschinsky (in Proto-Popotecan) discusses Popolocan, its relationship to Mixtecan, and the position of both in the Otomanguean family.

Earlier, less detailed studies dealing with Mixteco and its relation to other members of the Otomanguean family include Pimentel's Cuadro Descriptivo y Comparativo de las Lenguas Indígenas de Mexico, Seler's "Notice sur les langues Zapotèque et Mixtèque," L. Ecker's "Relationship of Mixtec to the Otomian Languages," L. Schultze-Jena's Indiana III: Bei den azteken, mixteken und tiapaneken der Sierra Madre del Sur von Mexiko, and N. McQuown, "The Indigenous Languages of Latin America." W. Jiménez Moreno summarizes most of this work in "Diversidad Interna del Mixteco y su Afiliación al Macro-Otomangue."

Recent publications by various members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics have concentrated on the central area, specifically with the language as it is spoken in San Miguel, and have dealt with questions of phonology, principally tone, (Mak 1950, 1953, 1958; K. L. Pike 1945a, 1946, 1947b, 1948, 1953; and Stark 1947). A part of the phonological system of the southern dialect is described by Bradley (1957) and the tone system of the western dialect by Overholt (1961). Phonological studies in other dialects are: Hunter and E. V. Pike, 1969 (Molinos); Pankratz and E. V. Pike, 1967 (Ayutla); and E. V. Pike and Cowan, 1967 (Huaquapan). K. L. Pike (1945b, 1947a) describes two interesting results of contact with Spanish, and Dyk has completed the survey of San Miguel Mixtec with a dictionary (1951, updated with Stoudt, 1965) and a collection of texts (1959). Some aspects of the grammar appear in K. L. Pike (1944 and 1949) and Merrifield and Stoudt (1967), but no systematic and complete grammatical description has been published for any of the dialects. (For an unpublished description see Daly, 1966.) The comparative study of Mixtec itself (Longacre and Mak, 1960) as well as further investigation into variations among the dialects (Holland, 1959; and Bradley, 1967 and 1968) has begun.

The main purpose of this study is to fill the one major gap in the literature on the Mixtec language by describing the grammar of one important dialect of that language--that of Jicaltepec (hereinafter abbreviated JM)--systematically and completely. It also has the subsidiary aim of collecting in one place and within a unified theoretical framework phonological information about Mixtec that previously has been available only in a number of diverse publications. In brief, it is a sketch. As such it outlines the major aspects of the language, giving a picture of the whole but without complete details.

The theoretical orientation within which JM is described is that language structure is dual and that it is hierarchical.²

All languages have two strata: a phonological one and a grammatical one. Morphophonemics is the way in which elements of the grammatical stratum are represented by those of the phonological one.

Each of these strata is hierarchical in nature, containing, at its smallest size-level, basic elements that combine with each other to form units at the next larger size-level. For JM, then, phonological constituents combine to form phonemes which, in turn, combine to form syllables which combine to form microsegments which combine to form macrosegments in the phonological stratum, and morphemes combine to form words which combine to form phrases which combine to form clauses which combine to form sentences in the grammatical stratum. Although macrosegments and sentences may not be the largest size-level for each stratum respectively, they represent the top levels described here.

There seem to be two possible approaches in describing the hierarchical structure of a language. In one, small-size forms are combined to build larger ones. This approach appears to favor the speaker and is mildly generative in emphasis. In the other, larger forms are broken into smaller constituents until the elementary forms

²Charles F. Hockett, "Linguistic Elements and their Relations," Language 37 (1961), 42-48.

are reached. It appears, therefore, to favor the hearer by the introduction of parsing. The approach taken here is to classify the basic elements first and then to describe the patterns--constructions or rules--required for building larger composite units until all such forms are fully described. In one sense this order of presentation can be called predictive. By applying the patterns, forms of ever larger size are built so that at the larger size-levels representations of whole utterances are found.

In describing the grammatical stratum, constituent phrase structure is supplemented by the use of transformations. Although in the original formulation, N. Chomsky considered transformations as a separate entity, they are here considered as a kind of construction. According to Hockett a construction is a "pattern for building composite forms of a specific form class out of ICs of specific form classes." (1958:164) Some of Chomsky's transformations build larger forms from smaller ones; others rearrange the constituents of a composite form; and still others change the class of a form. It appears, therefore, that transformations differ from other constructions only slightly.

At the beginning of this decade the theoretical viewpoint represented here is not as acceptable as it was at the beginning of the last. Linguistic theory has developed in some very interesting and important ways in the five years since this sketch was written. Nevertheless, it is presented not so much as a contribution to general linguistic theory as a contribution to knowledge of the Mixtec languages.

The corpus of data upon which this study was made has been collected over the period of time from 1949 to the present, first by my colleague, Howard Klassen (1949-1955), and later by me (1956-1964). This corpus now contains some 15,000 lines of running text consisting of folklore, explanatory narrative, history, current beliefs and practices, and conversation; elicited utterances that were responses to directed questions phrased in Spanish during informant sessions; and non-elicited, disconnected expressions written down at the various times they were uttered, either because of their novelty to me or my wife or because we did not understand them. Over this period of more than fifteen years a number of informants have contributed not only of their time and wisdom but also of their ingenuity and patience in passing on the intricacies of their language to foreign ears. Those worthy of special mention are the late Julio García Hernández, Norberto García García, Porfirio García Zamora, the brothers López--Higinio, Lufs, and Pascual, Agustín Hernández, and Anatolio Torres Torres. Not to be excluded, though, are the rest of the 300 or so adult inhabitants of Jicaltepec who have been, to slow students, patient teachers of their language and way of life.