R. Zuidema

American social systems and their mutual similarity

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 121 (1965), no: 1, Leiden, 103-119

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

AMERICAN SOCIAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR MUTUAL SIMILARITY

It is my intention to show the similar structural basis of specific social systems from Peru and Brazil, on the one hand, from Mexico and South America, on the other, and, finally, from North and South America. As far as South America is concerned, however, to the extent to which I require a social system in order to study North American phenomena, I shall confine myself to Peru.¹

All the systems of which I am now thinking are based on the concept of the local group, i.e., the group consisting of all the people who live in a definite area, whether they are kinsmen or not. For this reason, I use the word clan as little as possible. In this connection, one thinks primarily of groups which are either endogamous or exogamous, either matrilineal or patrilineal. I want, however, to avoid this 'either this' or 'either that'. Moreover, one contrasts the concept of the clan with, for example, that of the village, the family or the tribe. A feature of the systems I am discussing is, however, that no essential difference is seen between local groups of varying size. A group can be a subdivision of another but still react in the same way to the world outside.

First, I want to describe the most essential features of the Peruvian social system, a system which the present-day Indians have preserved in its entirety from pre-Spanish days. This system is based on the idea of three contrasting relationships: The first is that of an endogamous group, *Collana*, towards the world outside it. All ancestors of *Collana* people also belonged to *Collana*. Endogamy notwithstanding, a *Collana* man can, however, make an exogamous marriage. The second is that his children then belong to another group, *Payan*. The concepts of endogamy and exogamy are thus seen not so much as features of a particular group, but rather as individual relationships in respect of

---

¹ This lecture was read to the Nederlandse Ethnogenkring (The Netherlands Ethnological Circle) on 14th December 1963. With the exception of the data relating to parallel descent, which will be the subject of a future article, all the data about Peru are taken from "The Ceque System of Cuzco", R. T. Zuidema, thesis, 1964.

that group. And the third is that the entire non-related world outside is called *Cayao*. On these three relationships: *Collana* towards the world outside, *Collana* to *Payan*, and *Collana* + *Payan* towards the world outside, the Incas built the whole organization of their Empire.

By using as an example the present-day Indians, we can see how this system operates in practice. In the small village of Puquio in South Peru, there are three strata: the whites, designated as *Collana*, constitute the core of the village and, in the village, they occupy the place of the former Inca overlords. Next to them are the mestizos, the people of mixed blood, *Payan*. Finally, there are the Indians, *Cayao*.

Alongside this organization there is yet another which, to the first conception of the relationship between *Collana*, *Payan* and *Cayao*, adds a second, namely, the division of the village into four ayllu, four local groups, each having its own territory, each being to a great extent endogamous, and each having its own social organization and autonomous political organization. The first ayllu is called *Collana*, because there the whites are the best represented; the second, *Payan*, contains the majority of the mestizos; while in the third, *Cayao*, and, lastly, in the fourth, which has a different name in each village, most of the Indians are found. *Collana* and *Payan* form one moiety, the upper moiety; *Cayao* and the fourth ayllu form another, the lower moiety. Thus, as with the strata within each ayllu, there exists a relationship between the ayllu, and the ayllu together also form an organization.

The question now is: why should this organization be formed with four ayllu and not, for instance, with three, if it was to comprise *Collana*, *Payan* and *Cayao*? The answer is connected with a third conception which is given expression by this type of

(the arrow points from the class of the father towards that of his son)

organization. Here the village is not an organization open to the outside, such as in the first conception, and partly in the second also, but a closed endogamous one. The ayllu are seen *as if* they are exogamous matrilineal marriage classes connected through the asymmetric marriage with MoBroDa. The reason for this lies, in my opinion, in the need for the endogamous organization to be seen in the way that, as we know from the Incas, the princely families, for example, tried to realise it: in terms of the smallest possible endogamous group. But exogamous marriage classes must also exist within it.

If one views the relationship between the classes as asymmetric, i.e., according to the example of *Collana-Payan*, then there must be three classes, and father and son must belong to different classes. The classes are, therefore, matrilineal. Lastly, the group is kept the smallest through marriage with MoBroDa. With this explanation, origin myths or organizations, such as those of Puquio, and the kinship system are in agreement: the former because they always speak of three marriage classes; the latter through its terminological equalization of ego with FaFaFa and of MoBroDa with father-in-law. In this theoretical scheme of myth and kinship system there is, however, no possibility of moiety opposition because of the essential equality of the three classes. It is probably for this reason that in the actual organizations, yet a fourth ayllu occurs.

What is now the practical value of the conception of the ayllu as matrilineal marriage classes? Its value relates to the rules of inheritance of land. Men as well as women can inherit land: a man from his father; a woman from her mother. If a man marries a woman from another ayllu, the dwelling place of the new family depends upon which spouse brings in most land. If it is the wife who does so, then the family goes to live in her ayllu, and her children belong to it. The relationship between the ayllu of the husband and that of the wife, seen from their personal standpoint, is one of matrilineal marriage classes. If, however, the wife goes to dwell with her husband, then the relationship is one of patrilineal marriage classes.

This view of the exogamous relationship between persons of different local groups is, in my opinion, a fundamental feature of *all* the systems that I shall now compare with each other.

In South America at any rate, there frequently occurs a type of

kinship system which is the same as that upon which the Incas based their system. It is the type with parallel descent, i.e., patrilineal descent for men, matrilineal descent for women. And husband and wife, moreover, use different kinship terms. Those of the husband fit into a social system with *matrilineal* marriage classes, as described above; those of the wife, into a systems of *patrilineal* marriage classes. The representation of the ayllu in Puquio as matrilineal marriage classes, was thus really a half truth: it applied only to the men. For the other half of the inhabitants of Puquio, the ayllu are like patrilineal marriage classes. Up to now, these kinship systems with parallel descent are known to me only in South America. There, they are certainly also found among the Chibcha and the Kogi in Columbia, the Apinayé and Canella in East Brazil, and the Sirioné in East Bolivia.

The description I have given here of the ayllu organization in Peru, now enables a stand to be taken on the hoary controversial question: is the ayllu a clan or not, or has it ever been? According to the Inca theory, i.e., as given in their mythology, an ayllu always recognizes one ancestor. This datum was interpreted by the people who described Inca culture as meaning that all members of an ayllu must descend from this ancestor. In reality, all the relevant facts show that, for the Incas, and for the presentday Indians, the members of an ayllu do *not* regard everyone in it as kinsmen. Ayllu are dwelling groups, in the same way that villages or provinces are — or the whole Inca Empire. A person belongs to an ayllu because he has inherited a portion of its land and because he lives in it. A person does not, however, always reside in the ayllu in which he owns land and, in such a case, through parallel descent, he cannot be descended from the ancestor of the ayllu where he does in fact dwell. Only the hereditary chief of the ayllu maintains this fiction fully through patrilocal marriage. Therefore, the recognition of one ancestor for an ayllu, or another local group, and of the chief as his descendant, is the Peruvians' formulation of the unity and the identity of the group in its relationship to another group.

In the foregoing, I saw the following as essential features of the Peruvian system of organization of local groups: 1) the three conceptions of this organization, 2) the nature of the actual relationships between these groups; 3) the discrepancy between mythology and the actual organization — the first admitting to a tripartition; the second, to a quadripartition. To account for this situation, I do not intend, in the first instance, to give a theoretical explanation by means of Peruvian data exclusively, such as I have endeavoured to do earlier.

Now I want to show how all these features are again found in the Mexican and North American social systems. It will then become clear why there is the situation in Puquio where three strata occur in four ayllu, but that each of the ayllu is, nevertheless, identified with a different stratum.

NORTH AMERICA

In Mexico and North America, the essential features of the Peruvian system are given expression in organizations consisting of 7 groups, or, as developments of them, of 9 or 13 groups. I am also able to show for North America the importance of the number 7 in these organizations. I shall, therefore, discuss North America first.

The 7-partition, and the 9- and 13-partitions as developments of it, occur, among others, in the following tribes: the Pawnee, a Caddo tribe of the prairie; the Natchez, the Cherokee and other tribes of the South East; different Sioux tribes, such as the Osage, Winnebago, Hidatsa, Mandan, and Crow, who from the southeast spread over the prairie and further north; the Zuni; and possibly the Hopi.

In North America, the theoretical scheme of the 7-partition likewise appears to be based on the equation of ego with FaFaFa. Therefore, there is also a system of three matrilineal marriage classes. Within them, however, ego may not marry MoBroDa, but must marry a special category, FaFaSiDaDa. By this limitation, the matrilineage of ego then becomes a part not only of one marriage circle of three lineages, but of three marriage circles² as follows:

Man A marries woman B, his son B marries woman C, and grandson C marries woman A. The sister's son of A, who thus also belongs to A, does not, however, marry as does his MoBro, but follows the marriage circle A-D-E-A, and his SiDaSo, also A, follows the marriage circle A-F-G-A. The SiDaDaSo finally marries as ego again in B. This

² The starting point for these conclusions is an article by Floyd G. Lounsbury: "A Semantic Analysis of the Pawnee Kinship Usage", *Language*, Vol. 32, 1956, No. 1, pp. 158-194. In the Pawnee kinship system, ego and FaFaFa occupy the same place. Now, Lounsbury says (pp. 181-182) that in the literature only two systems are known which lead to a cycle of three generations. The first would include a circular connubium between three 'sibs'. The second, the prescribed marriage with a twice removed cross-cousin. According to Lounsbury, the first system would not be possible for the Pawnee, because they

SiDaDaSo appears to be the same person as ego's patrilineal great-grandson, i.e., the one whose father belongs to C and whose grandfather belongs to B. Lineage A therefore has three marriage classes; the other lineages are also thus subdivided. This makes a total of 21 marriage classes.

So far the system corresponds admirably, though we ask ourselves what is the reason for all this effort. It seems to me to be the same as in Peru: the patrilineal succession of the chieftainship and the desire to keep the chiefly families as small as possible.³ For this reason, people would be prepared to accept a chief's preference for marriage with his FaFaSiDaDa and not his MoBroDa. With the first, as the matrilineal granddaughter of a sister of his grandfather, who had also been a chief, he would be certain that she was 'of good family'. MoBroDa could, however, be the child of a misalliance of her father who, because he had not been a chief, was lower in rank anyway. The reason for marriage with FaFaSiDaDa, however, makes the scheme that is based thereon a practical impossibility! In A, SiSo is lower in rank than ego, the chief, and SiDaSo, lower still. It is therefore apparent that in the actual organization with 7-partition, the three marriage classes within

---

do not have a sib organization. Now, this does not seem to me to be the point. In any case, marriage with MoBroDa is forbidden. But, says Lounsbury, marriage with a twice removed cross-cousin is well known in the ethnology of the South of the United States. Among the Cherokee there existed the preferential marriage with a FaFaSiDaDa or an equivalent. This means, and here I quote a note of Lounsbury's which he added to his argument: "It is obvious that if such a rule were consistently in operation, the society could consist of seven and only seven lineages. Perhaps it is not fortuitous that the Cherokee have seven sibs." Lounsbury did not elaborate this proposition further. In the schemes Ia and Ib I did this in two ways in order to bring more to the fore the consequences of the system.

- ³ Lounsbury says of the Pawnee (p. 186, op. cit.): "While rank was inherited in the male line, the family structure and kinship groupings were based on connections in the female line." Notwithstanding the smallness of the village communities, there existed a fundamental difference between the nobles and the non-noble. All ranks, such as those of chiefs and priest, were reserved for the nobility and were inherited patrilineally.

Although with the later Cherokee, chieftainship was inherited matrilineally, this was not always the case at the time of their first contact with the whites in the 18th century. Then, the son usually inherited from the father. See, William S. Willis, Jr.: "Patrilineal Institutions in South Eastern North America", *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Summer, 1963, pp. 250-269. Willis' data concerns not only the Cherokee, but also the Choctaw and Creek, peoples with the same organization as the Cherokee.

In another matrilineal and matrilineal tribe also discussed here, the Mandan, the chieftainship continues in the patrilineal line. (Alfred W. Bowers, "Mandan Social and Ceremonial Organization", 1950, p. 34).

Scheme I a and b.

Marriage with fafasidada. This requires 7 lineages, not less and not more. Vertical columns, indicated by letters, represent matrilineal lineages. Numbers indicate patrilineal descent.

○ = woman;
 □ = man;
 □ = siblings;

— = marriage;
 — = descent.

a lineage represent three strata. But it is then impossible for SiDaDaSo, who in the scheme belongs to the same marriage class as ego, to be of the same rank as the latter. Nevertheless, the scheme is the principal means of bringing to light the following facts about the actual organizations.

The Zuni provide a clear example.⁴ In their village, there were originally 19 clans. In their cosmic system, 18 of these, in groups of three, were associated with six directions: North, South, East, West, and Above and Below. Under the scheme of the 7-partition, these clans thus correspond to the three marriage classes of each of the lineages. In the Zuni system, the 19th clan alone belonged to the centre. This clan was far and away the largest, and to it the chief belonged.

The Osage give the following explanation⁵ in their origin myth of the creation of the 13-partition: the tribe originally consisted of two groups, A and B, each of which was divided into seven clans. Later, many foreigners came to live among them who, as group C, were also subdivided into seven clans. B and C combined, B being left with only two clans and C with five. A possessed seven sacred pipes, but $(B + C)$ had none. A therefore gave them one pipe with the right to make seven out of it. A then had six pipes left, and so six clans, but was the foremost group. Between A, B and C there thus existed a relationship approximating to the strata *Collana*, *Payan* and *Cayao* in Peru.

The Mandan, in agreement with the Osage, had two moieties in their villages: one of six clans, called "The moiety of the original inhabitants of the village", and one of seven clans, "The moiety of the foreigners". Here a clan from the one moiety always formed a phatrie with a clan of the other. Consequently, there were six phatries of which one had an extra clan.⁶

Though we have now seen that the 13-partition in North America corresponds with the 7-partition, there is still much that is obscure. In the Osage myth, why should two clans of B combine with five of C? Why has the most prominent moiety only six clans, or six pipes? These

⁴ See, F. H. Cushing: "Outline of Zuni Creation Myths", XIIIth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, p. 368.

A. L. Kroeber, "Zuni Kin and Clan", Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. XVIII, pp. 39-207.

⁵ See, J. O. Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology", XVIth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, p. 233.

⁶ Alfred Bowers, op. cit., p. 29.

Scheme II a and b.

Marriage with fafasidada. This requires 7 lineages, not less and not more. Vertical columns, indicated by letters, represent matrilineal lineages. Numbers indicate patrilineal descent.

○ = woman;
 □ = man;
 ┌─┐ = siblings;

— = marriage;
 └─┘ = descent.

questions can be satisfactorily answered from examples which I shall give later of the 13-partition in Mexico.

From the examples of organizations with 7- and 13-partition, it appears that in a village one clan was always placed centrally. Thus, the Mandan say that each of the 13 clans stemmed from a different village where it was the most prominent. According to the Mandan, formerly they had lived in 13 villages.⁷ The chiefs of the village belonged to the central clan and the succession was patrilineal, despite the fact that the clans continued to be matrilineal. Probably endogamous marriages were permitted in the central clan. The interpretation which it appears the Mandan give about the creation of their organization, is that originally they formed different local endogamous groups. Through contact with other groups and through exogamous marriages, matrilocality and therefore also matrilineality, would then have exerted their influence. The relationship of the central clan to the other clans of the moiety of the original inhabitants of the village and to the clans of the moiety of the foreigners is the same as the relationship in Puquio of *Collana*, the endogamous core-ayllu of the village, to *Payan*, the ayllu of the other people of the upper moiety, and to the lower moiety, the moiety of the non-related people from outside.

Lastly, I must go into the extension of the tripartition into the quadripartition; this also existed within the 7-partition. This was effected by permitting, alongside marriage with FaFaSiDaDa, the alternative of marriage with MoFaSiDaDa⁸ — we have this data from the Cherokee at any rate. In the theoretical scheme, this produced the result that: to the asymmetric connubium between three marriage classes, a fourth was added; that the relationship between two lineages with asymmetry became symmetrical; and that the lineages themselves then consisted of four marriage classes, not three. Therefore, a man's marriage became part of the connubium between four lineages. The other three were unaffected. But the Cherokee also say this. In their

⁷ See, R. Lowie, "Social Life of the Mandan and Hidatsa", A.P.A.M.N.H., Vol. XXI, 1917, pp. 7-8.

According to Morgan, however, the Mandan originally lived in seven villages each of which had seven clans bearing the same names as the villages. See, John R. Swanton, "The Indian Tribes of North America", p. 277.

In this connection, it is possibly useful to mention that the Skiri, one of the four Pawnee tribes, first lived in 15 villages and later in 13. (Lounsbury, op. cit., p. 185).

⁸ See, W. H. Gilbert, Jr., "Eastern Cherokee Social Organizations", in: F. Eggan, *Social Anthropology of North-American Tribes*, 1955, p. 296.

I have also worked out these marriage rules in the schemes IIa and IIb.

village organization of seven clans, a man only acknowledges relationship with kinsmen from three of the clans, but not from the remaining three. Allied to this is the fact that the seven clans also were divided into one moiety of four clans, to which the central clan of the chief of the internal authority belonged, and another of three clans to which the war chief belonged — the chief who was responsible for external relations.

The social system of the Natchez is also a good example of this development within the 7-partition. They had organizations with seven clans; maintained symmetric marriage relations between two clans without brother-sister exchange;⁹ and had a system of four strata called: the suns, the nobility, the honoured ones and, finally, the stinkards. It is a very noteworthy parallel with the Inca social system that here also there was a fourth stratum which, in organizations like those of Puquio, was identified with the fourth ayllu. This ayllu, too, bears a pejorative name, such as, enemies, slaves, beggars, or lice.

THE MEXICAN SYSTEM

These external features of the 7- and 13-partition in the North American tribes already mentioned, we again find in old Mexico as well as in present-day Mexico.¹⁰ And we also find there the two points of departure which led to the reconstruction of the system in North America.

The first point is the relationship like that of *Collana*, *Payan* and *Cayao* in Peru. The present-day Mixe Indians of South Mexico also divide the population of a village into two groups: the original inhabitants, who regard each other as legitimate kinsmen, and those originating from outside who are considered by the first group as their illegitimate kinsmen.¹¹ The second point is the terminological equation of ego with FaFaFa.¹²

⁹ See, J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong, "The Natchez Social System", Proceedings of the XXIIIth International Congress of Americanists, 1928, pp. 553-562, and Mary R. Haas, "Natchez and Chitimacha Clans and Kinship Terminology", A.A. 41, 1939, pp. 602-603.

¹⁰ With regard to present-day Mexico, Mr. R. A. M. van Zantwijk pointed out to me some examples from villages where he had done fieldwork.

¹¹ See, Searle S. Hoogshagen and William R. Merrifield, "Coatlan Mixe Kinship", S.W.J.A., Vol. 17, No. 3, 1961, pp. 219-225.

¹² The clearest example pointing to this equation is given in Molina's Aztec dictionary. According to Molina, in the kinship system, *icuh* means younger brother or sister; *icuh tontli* means great-grandchild — *tontli* is a diminutive. Terminologically, therefore, younger brother is equated with great-grandson.

For Mexico, I shall limit myself to the examples of the 13-partition and, drawing on two recent articles, shall examine the position of the *calpolli*, the counterpart of the ayllu.

According to the chronicler Alva Ixtlilxochitl, the Kingdom of Texcoco, one of the three kingdoms which together constituted the core of the Aztec Empire, was initially divided into 13, later 14, feudal city states which, however, existed alongside the territory which was directly subordinate to Tezcoco.¹³

He gives an idea of their mutual organization in his description of the 14 chiefs when they attended upon their overlord. They were in a hall which was divided into three compartments as follows:

Two of the chiefs, Nos. 1 and 4, were the holders of exceptional offices. No. 1, the Chief of Teotihuacan — the old capital of the Empire which flourished from $\pm$ 300 A.D. to 600 A.D.— was the supreme judge of all noble persons in the Empire; No. 4, the chief of Otompan, held the same position as regards all non-noble persons. These data justify our drawing two conclusions: the first is that the six chiefs in the inner chamber were more important than the eight outside it; the second, that the first seven chiefs were more important than the last seven.

X (the king)	
1	8
2	9
3	10
4	11
5	12
6	13
7	14

The place in the hall occupied by the 14 towns accorded with their position in respect of Tezcoco. The two groups of three towns formed, as closed units, to the North and South of Tezcoco, the core of the Empire. The one group of four, with Otompan, was situated to the East, in the mountains; the other group of four, to the West, on the shore of the Lake of Tezcoco. Of these 14 towns, the position of Teotihuacan was, however, exceptional for another reason which we learn from another chronicle.¹⁴ In this, the city is manifestly identified with the king himself. Its chief was the only one exempt from the obligation of doing, as the other chiefs did in turn, a month's duty in the Royal Palace. Now the Mexican ceremonial calendar consists of 13 months of 20 days. Setting aside Teotihuacan for the moment, it then appears

¹³ See, Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, "Obras Historicas", 1952 edition, Vol. II, pp. 165, 168, 176.

¹⁴ Quoted in a note by Ixtlilxochitl, op. cit., pp. 176-177.

that here also, the half with the six towns was more important than the half with the seven.

A further illustration of the significance of the number 13 in this data of Ixtlilxochitl is provided in this description of the Toltec Empire. The Tezcocoan and Aztec kings believed that they stemmed from the Kings of Tula, and probably they grafted many of their own theoretical conceptions about culture and political organization onto those of this great Empire which flourished on the Plateau roughly between 900 A.D. and 1,200 A.D. From this description, we can conclude that the Empire was organized in provinces reproduced schematically as follows:¹⁵

¹⁵ See Ixtlilxochitl, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 11-73.

From the nature of the description, we can draw various other conclusions. On their journey from their land of origin to their future capital, the Toltecs consisted of seven groups with seven chiefs. En route, each of the chiefs in turn left behind a number of followers in a new province as colonists. When all seven groups had had their turn, they started afresh. Two chiefs were more important than the rest and their turn came last. First they populated the seven outer provinces, and after that the six inner provinces and, finally, Tula itself. There was, therefore, always one outer province linked to one inner province, because they had colonists from the same group. Through the particular position of Tula, there were, however, only six inner provinces corresponding to the seven outer provinces and it must be obvious that here a solution was sought like that of the Mandan, where the six phatries consisted of two clans, but where there was one with three. We have already found the relationship of two important chiefs and five of less importance, in the composition of one of the Osage moieties.

Ixtlilxochitl says that when the Toltecs arrived in Tula, they married off the daughter of one of the two principal chiefs to the youngest son of a foreign but mighty king. This son became the first King of the Toltecs. The succession is thus in a matrilineal lineage. He was succeeded, however, in the male line, by six other kings each of whom reigned a Mexican century, i.e. 52 years. The parallel with the Inca Empire is very striking, because in Cuzco there were: 10 outer ayllu, 10 inner ayllu, 10 kings, all of whom belonged to one of the inner ayllu and each of whom reigned a Peruvian century, i.e., 100 years.

Finally, with regard to the calpolli in Mexico, I dare not venture a general characterization at the moment. There are some examples of organization in which the place of the calpolli agrees with that of the clan in North American organization and with the ayllu in the Peruvian, for example: those dealing with the organization of the pre-Spanish city of Tezcoco;¹⁶ those of the neighbouring village of Chiauhltla as shown in a 16th century marriage register;¹⁷ and those

¹⁶ J. B. Pomar, "Relación de Tezcoco", 1941 editino, pp. 6-7.

¹⁷ Pedro Carrasco, "El barrio y la regulación del matrimonio en un pueblo del valle de México en el siglo XVI".

Revista Mexicana de Estudios Antropológicos, Tomo XVII, 1961, pp. 7-26.

of the somewhat further removed present-day village of San Bernardino Contla.¹⁸

In Tezcoco there were six calpolli. Each one founded its own village outside the city. Indeed, it was the policy of the Tezcocoan kings that all six calpolli should be dispersed throughout the whole empire. Chiauhitla, one of the communities so founded, reflected this situation. It consisted of 11 calpolli: five in the village to which the nobility belonged and six in the surrounding countryside. In Chiauhitla, we can thus distinguish three groups of calpolli: the calpolli that founded Chiauhitla; the other calpolli of the village itself; the calpolli outside the village. A situation, therefore, like that of a Mandan village. We can discover the ideas which were probably behind this calpolli-organization from the description by Nutini of the neighbouring community of Contla. Contla consists of seven hamlets. Each hamlet is identified with the principal exogamous patrilineal clan there and, in three cases, this clan bears the same name as the hamlet. The six other clans are, however, also represented in each hamlet. The hamlets are almost entirely endogamous. The association of the hamlet with one clan would, however, lead one to the conclusion that marriage with women outside the hamlet is matrilineal. Comparing the position in both villages, I therefore presume that the local hamlets in Contla correspond to the local calpolli in Chiauhitla. In Chiauhitla, the Spaniards noted only the locality to which husband and wife belonged. It is therefore possible that they did not notice the existence of exogamous clans, because, probably as in Contla, the principal clan in a calpolli had the same name as the calpolli.

A feature of the calpolli in pre-Spanish organizations, is the belief of the people belonging there to that they are of different ethnic origin. According to the inhabitants of Contla, this is the reason for their clan exogamy. And probably it is for this reason that the Mexican peoples give so much thought to their past. They describe their social and political organization by means of the historical adventures of different peoples, their tribes and their divisions, and their mutual contacts. The North American peoples, for example the Mandan, also did it in this way. For a Peruvianist this is noteworthy, because in Peru the social system was first described by way of theoretical con-

¹⁸ Hugo G. Nutini, "Clan Organization in a Nahuatl Speaking Village of the State of Tlascala, Mexico", A.A. 1961, Vol. 63, pp. 62-78.

ceptions, such as, for example, the terms *Collana*, *Payan* and *Cayao*, but almost nothing was said about the historical development which led to a specific system. So, we know that society in Puquio is built up with three population groups: the whites, the mestizos, and the Indians, but we know nothing at all, for instance, about where the whites in the ayllu *Cayao* came from. Now, a Mexican would be able to say immediately from which village his family had originated. We can now, however, presume that the whites in the ayllu *Cayao* originated in the ayllu *Collana* — either from the same village or from another one — and that, for example, the Indians in the ayllu *Collana* originated in the ayllu *Cayao*.

Now that we have discovered the similar basis of the Mexican and Peruvian forms of organization, the clearer do the differences become. In old Mexico, for example, the social system was supported by a well-developed religious system with numerous individual gods and a very complicated calendar. In Peru, on the other hand, we find elaborate ancestor worship — the art of mummification was highly developed — but the number of gods appears to have been very limited.

But, again, a point of agreement is, that in Cuzco the ceque system — a religious system with the help of which I was able to describe the social organization in Cuzco — was, at the same time, a calendar system, and in Mexico also systems of the ceque type were known in which the important calendar number 52 played a prominent role.¹⁹

In the foregoing, I hope I have been able to show the unity which, in my opinion, the American social systems I have described form; a unity, such as, for example, is to be seen in the Australian systems. Nevertheless, we must ask ourselves in how far these systems are limited to America. In 1962, in a proposition accompanying my thesis, I advanced the claim that the Peruvian system based on tripartition showed great structural affinity with the old Indo-Germanic systems such as Dumézil sees based on tripartition.²⁰ A short time later, at the Americanists Congress in Mexico, I heard a lecture by Paul Kirchhoff in which he pointed to the great affinity between the Mexican calendar, based on a year of 13 months, each of 20 days, and the South East Asian calendars based on 12 months of 20 days. He gave no opinion

¹⁹ See, for example, the "Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca", 1947 edition, in Mexico, Lámina XIX, and in § 311 of the text where the 52 mountains that encircle the region of the Moquixicas-Quauhtinchantlacas, are named.

²⁰ Georges Dumézil, "L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens", 1958.

on the possibilities of contact, but did not think it possible that Siberian and North American peoples played a role.

The significance of the number 13 in North America appears to me in great part to refute this argument. Nevertheless, I decline to make a guess on this point of trans-Pacific contacts. I only wanted to refer to the problem. I quite believe that there are arguments with which it can be shown that the systems that have been discussed here existed in America 2,500 years ago, possibly even 5,000 years ago and that there are indications from the earlier date which make possible a contact between the sedentary problems of America and East Asia.

R. T. ZUIDEMA