(25 other languages without names)
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 Janamble or Tamaulipas, 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 Maxcorros, 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 chigut (Kiwat) "woman" is an obvious borrowing from Aztec siwati (cf. PUA *suma or *suwa), 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. Guadicurian. Though we have no reliable gauge for the possible larger affiliations of the Guadicurian family, historical information gives reasonably good indications of which languages within the family must have been more closely
related:

Guaiacu

Cuelleje

Huchiti

Cora (not the UA Cora)

Huchiti

Aripe

Perejilé

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 informa-
tion 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 Cristó-
bal 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" (Estra-
da Monroy 1972:29). Thus it is clear that Alagüilac was con-
sidered something other than either Mejicano (Nahua) or
Chortí. Furthermore, Brinton's data contain many examples of
†1, a feature limited to the †1-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 conquerors of Guatemala
or from clerics trained in Nahuatl (see Heath 1972:27).

Since Alagüilac cannot be either Nahua or Chortí, I sugges-
t a possible Xincan connection. It seems preferable to
try 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
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 Igneri. 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 basic-
ally that of the Arawakan substratum, but with a men's jargon
where Carib morphemes could be substituted for Arawakan equiva-

tlents. 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.

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

---

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

1.16. MA Late Arrivals

Apache, Carib, and Kickapoo are all recent arrivals in
MA. The Apachean bands are Athapaskan (see Krauss, this vol-
ume) 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 Wiscon-
sin. 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 Seminole
in 1861. (Gibson 1963, Latorre and Latorre 1976.)

Black Carib (also called Garifuna) is spoken by about
30,000 in Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, and pockets in Nicara-
gua. 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
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 Oaxuta, 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 Socotenaango, 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, Cacaparoa, 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: \( V \rightarrow V / _{\text{C(V)}}^\text{C(V)} \) (Xinca, Lenca, Jicaque,
etc.); 5) general similarities in inventories: (a) contrast-
ing 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 Totonac 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, Xinca, Lenca, and most OM languages;
(g) distinctive stress is very rare (only in Tequistlatecan,
Cuitlatec, and perhaps Cacaopera); (h) tonal contrasts are
found in all OM languages, Huave, Tlapanec, Cuitlatec, and
some Mayan languages (Yucatec, Uspantec, and the San Bartolo
dialect of Tzotsil).

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-noun\(_1\), the noun\(_2\), meaning the noun's\(_2\)
noun\(_1\), e.g. his-dog the man for "the man's dog" (very wide-
spread 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 un-
possessed and otherwise affixally isolated nouns (UA, Mayan,
Paya, Mixtecalpan, 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-slime, 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 Nahuatl 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, #'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 manage-
able 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 unques-
tioningly repeated in later literature. Sapir's skepticism about
areal diffusion is well known. Statements like, "nowhere do
we find any but superficial morphological inter-influencing"
and "we have not the right to assume that a language may easily
exert a remodeling 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, onomatopoetic, 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–Lencan 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–Lencan genetic relationship, though his hypothesis included also MZ, Tequistlatec, and Chumash–Salinan (the latter two now generally considered Hokan). Though Xinca and Lencan 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 (tik’a)   etta, ita
bi-al, pi-ar, pi (pi?)  pe
vuaal-al, hual-ar (wa’a)  laagua, lagua
iri-ar (?irya, hirya)   heria, erio, sa, aria, eslea
u’y (u:y)      cuuy (winter)  water
suma (saosta “in the dark”)  ts’ub (Nacht)  night
ts’ama (st’ma)  ts’ana-uamba (Morgen(grauen))
ti-tzuma (ti-st’ma “in the dark”)  saba  shade
Xinca
xusu
ojo (ʔojo)
au, aima (?ayma)
xinak (?iŋak)

Lenca
shushu
hoo, oiguin
ama, aima
shinag

"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 onomatopoetic and similar forms are found throughout MA and the world (cf. Proto-Mayan *ʔoxb', PMZ *ʔohu, Tepehua ?uxʔu-, Quechua uhu-, etc.). "Dog" has similar forms widespread in American Indian languages (cf. Paya ſušu, Patwin ūtu, Alsea su, Yana su:su, Tlapanec suwa:, PUA *tu, 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 ſinaq'; "maize" is widely borrowed (cf. Cacapara-Matagalpa aya, Sumu ama, Sumbia ima, Tarascan ema, eme, Proto-Mayan *ʔeʔm, 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-
present 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Jicaque</th>
<th>Tequistlatec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(p)į̊pʰ̃h</td>
<td>-abí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ě'ik</td>
<td>-šigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pi̊l̃k</td>
<td>am-pelaʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*k'əːk</td>
<td>-hwáʔ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʕůh</td>
<td>-šůh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kʰ ele</td>
<td>-gaʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-pe</td>
<td>-biʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pehy</td>
<td>-biʔe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pî̊neh</td>
<td>ifůggi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kewan</td>
<td>-gůweʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hêpʰe</td>
<td>-weboʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*amah</td>
<td>-amáʔ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settel</td>
<td>gi̊falaʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polok</td>
<td>-biʔ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wele</td>
<td>-balay-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto-Jicaque Tequistlatec

*s(খ)į̊h | têkeʔ | squirrel
*pe | -bik | stone
peya | -ŋ-piyami | coatí, agoutí
*pelam | -báʔ | tongue
*paʔ | -ba- | to wash
*pʰe | -fůh- | white
-Vk | -k' | 1st and 2nd per pl

l | l |
p | b |
p | f |
( | ʔ |
| | ʃ |
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 Quichéan languages came from the Gulf Coast dialects, not from Pipil nor from central Mexico.

12. Pokomam was split off Western Pokomáchí 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 Mangue 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 Lencan homeland was probably in central Honduras; SL reached El Salvador about 1 A.D. and is responsible for Classic Quichea.

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


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 sub-grouping 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 Nahua 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, Usantec, 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 Otomanganists. 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.
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A Glance from Here On

Eric F. 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