YUROK AND NEIGHBORING KIN TERM SYSTEMS

BY

A. L. KROEBER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

Volume 35, No. 2, pp. 15–22

YUROK AND NEIGHBORING KIN TERM SYSTEMS

BY

A. L. KROEBER

THE FIVE LITTLE ETHNIC GROUPS that carry the northwest California culture in its most developed form—the Yurok, Wiyot, Tolowa, Karok, and Hupa—seem to possess almost identical institutions of marriage, society, wealth, and law;[1] yet their kinship systems are of different types. Spier, for instance, in his classification of North American kinship systems into eight types,[2] assigns the tribes as follows:

Yurok: "Salish" type
Wiyot: "Eskimo" type
Tolowa: "Iroquois" type
Karok and Hupa: "Mackenzie Basin" type

These terms are perhaps in certain respects unfortunate, and the classification is to be taken as merely descriptive, without genetic implication. Yet it does suggest a much greater differentiation of plan of kinship designation than of plan of society, and is borne out by Gifford's full original data.[3] The often discussed general problem is therefore touched, of how far social organizations and kinship terminologies tend to be correlated. Accordingly, the salient features of the systems will be reviewed.

Yurok.—The uncle-aunt-nephew-niece terminology coincides exactly with that of English. That the grandfather and grandmother terms also correspond to ours is less surprising because, out of sixty-eight Indian peoples in California there are some fourteen others (besides Yurok) whose grandfather-grandmother terminology thus corresponds; but it is probably significant in connection with the last feature. The Yurok further refuse to include collateral relatives of parents-in-law and children-in-law within the range of their four terms for these, covering such affinities by the word ne-kwa, which seems primarily to denote the

[1] Handbook of California Indians, chaps. 1–8; Goddard, Life and Culture of the Hupa, UC–PAAE 1; Waterman, Yurok Geography, UC–PAAE 16; and works there cited. There is less intertribal uniformity in rituals than in social institutions; but then, no two Yurok major rituals, nor two Karok ones, are alike. Even recorded differences in social practice are not always certain. Thus Waterman failed to find house names among the Tolowa (AA 27:528, 1925), but I was told by the Yurok that they named Tolowa individuals after their houses and believed that the Tolowa did the same among themselves.

[2] The Distribution of Kinship Systems in N. Am., UW–PA 1, 1925.

[3] California Kinship Terminologies, UC–PAAE 18, 1922.

child-in-law's parent or "co-parent-in-law." This exclusion is unusual in California. Another exclusion is that of uncles' and aunts' ~~siblings~~ spouses. Alone in California the Yurok and Wiyot refuse to recognize these as relatives.[4] For siblings two quite diverse plans of nomenclature are in use, according as the sibling is spoken of or to. In reference, brother and sister are distinguished without allusion to age, but with different terms according as they are a male's or a female's brother or sister. This gives a set of four terms quite unusual in this part of the world. In address the speaker's sex is ignored but relative age and sex of the sibling are expressed—as in most of North America—except that in Yurok the younger brother and sister are merged into one. All cousins, cross or parallel, first, second, or third, are brothers and sisters.

This system is clearly of what Spier calls the "Salish" type: terms for uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, grandparent, older sibling, younger sibling, with all cousins named siblings. So far as the actually Salishan systems merge farther than Yurok, it is probably because their dialects, at least on the coast, express sex-gender by affixes, so that a term like grandparent automatically appears as either grandfather or grandmother. According to Spier, this system is common to all the Salishan, Wakashan, and Chimakuan tribes; to the Yurok; and possibly to the Alsea of the Oregon coast between the Yurok and Salish.[5] Obviously this distribution is the result of a single historic growth. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Yurok system is connected in origin with a type of system of which the recent center lies in Washington and British Columbia. In view of Yurok general culture being so prevailingly northern in quality, this finding may not seem so startling; but the situation is not a simple one because the other tribes of Yurok culture except the Wiyot do not possess kinship systems fundamentally of "Salish" type; and because the Tolowa and other Athabascans separate the Yurok geographically from the Alsea and Salish.

Another consideration which may be of significance is that according to Sapir both Yurok-Wiyot and Salish-Wakash-Chemakuan speech are derived from a proto-Algonkin base.

Wiyot.—Spier somewhat doubtfully affiliates the Wiyot system with the Eskimo type, in which otherwise he includes only the Algonkins of

[4] No doubt because occasionally they marry them under the levirate. At least one such marriage is on record.

[5] Spier mentions several other partial adherents to the type; and includes the Tinneh of the lower Yukon, whose resemblances are perhaps secondary or superficial. The Alsea system (Farrand, AA 3:244, 1901) shows both Salish and non-Salish features, besides special traits. The recorded terms are for: f, m, sn, d; gpar, gch; o b, o sis, y b, y sis; f b, m sis, cross u–a (i.e., single term for m b and f sis, that is, par of cross-cousin); b sn, b d, sis ch (the nepotic terms not complementary to the avuncular); cross-cousin; (parallel cousins are siblings, but their children np–nc); (relatives by marriage not given).

New Jersey, New England, and New Brunswick. The Eskimo resemblances appear to be secondarily fortuitous. Fundamentally, the system seems allied to Yurok. The grandparent-grandchild, nephew-niece, spouse-of-uncle-and-aunt terminology is the same in plan. That for siblings-in-law is the same with a reduction from three to two terms. That for cousins is partly the same: all second and fourth cousins are siblings, as among the Yurok; for all first and third cousins there is a special term. Wiyot specializations in major features are two. All full siblings, irrespective of age, sex, or sex of speaker, are denoted by a single term. This is presumably a reduction from a fuller set of terms. For uncles and aunts there are four words: f's br, f's sis, m's br, m's sis. This classification may be presumed to be derived from the Athabascans who, with the Yurok, completely surround the Wiyot, and who share this plan with the majority of California tribes. The fact that for nephews-nieces the Wiyot follow the logically inconsistent Yurok scheme, shows that there has been a blending of two plans.

It seems reasonable therefore to assume that the Wiyot system is at bottom of Yurok-"Salish" type and has been spottily modified, partly by influencings from quite alien systems, and partly by independent internal developments of both growth and reduction.

Tolowa.—The Tolowa system—"Iroquois," according to Spier—is fundamentally different from Yurok and Wiyot. Sex of lineage is expressed instead of ignored. There are four terms for uncles and aunts and four for grandparents, kin through the father being always distinct from those through the mother. The reciprocals, in spite of some irregularities, follow the same plan: there are words for son's child, daughter's child, man's brother's child.[6] Siblings are four: o br, o sis, y br, y sis; plus a generic term for brother and a reference word for man's sister—evidently an idea-loan from the Yurok. Cousins are siblings only if parallel; cross-cousins are denoted by three terms: male, man's female, woman's female cross-cousin. For siblings-in-law there are four terms, on the scheme of man's brother-in-law, plus two special terms for sibling-in-law's spouses of the same sex as oneself. Parent- and children-in-law designations take in siblings of the proper relatives.

A greater contrast than this from the Yurok system would be hard to find. Yurok, except for cousins, carefully distinguishes lineal from collateral relatives, but merges collateral and grandparental ones. Tolowa is most concerned with keeping apart relatives through a male from relatives through a female, whether they be grandparents-grandchildren, uncles-nephews, or cross-cousins.

[6] Aci is man's sister's son and woman's nephew; actre, man's sister's daughter and woman's niece. The logically inconsistent second meaning of each term is evidently a product of Yurok ideas: actce in Hupa is sister's daughter.

Hupa.—Spier puts Hupa into a California division of his "Mackenzie Basin" class. This class differs, however, from his "Iroquois," chiefly in that cross as well as parallel cousins are called siblings. This is also the chief feature in which Hupa differs from Tolowa, some regrouping of grandchildren, nephew-nieces, and siblings-in-law excepted. This drawing of cross-cousins into the group of siblings-parallel cousins is evidently due to Hupa imitation of Yurok, since all other California Athabascans—Lassik, Wailaki, and Kato as well as Tolowa—possess two special terms, unt and tset, for man's male cross-cousin and woman's female cross-cousin.[7] Hupa seems simply to have discarded these.

Karok.—This is also "Mackenzie Basin" in essentials, according to Spier. More specifically, however, it shows both Tolowa-Hupa and Yurok resemblances. Evidently it was originally a system of one of these types which has been somewhat illogically modified to agree partly with the other. As the Athabascan systems much more than the Yurok agree with those of north and central California generally, where the Karok have their Hokan speech-relatives, it can only be inferred that the Karok changes have been toward the Yurok type, not away from it.

Features of Athabascan or generic Californian type are:

Four uncle-aunt terms: f's br, f's sis, m's br, m's sis; with four reciprocals of type of man's br's ch, but including some irregularities. Most of northern and central California has the same four for uncle-aunt.

Three grandparental terms, f's f and m being merged, m's f and m distinct. Most of California has four terms, of which the Karok three seem a reduction.

Four siblings: o br, o sis, y br, y sis. Forty-six of seventy-five California systems follow this plan.

Spouses of uncles-aunts denoted by sibling-in-law terms, as in Tolowa and Hupa. Fairly common in California, especially for f's sis's husband being called brother-in-law. Yurok and Wiyot treat such spouses as outside the kinship designations.

Yurok features of the Karok system are:

Terms for grandson and granddaughter instead of son's child and daughter's child.

All cousins called siblings.

Siblings of parents-in-law not called parents-in-law; similarly for children-in-law.

It thus appears that there are two basic types of kinship designation in the northwest California culture: the Yurok-Wiyot and the Tolowa-Hupa-Karok.

The first of these is fundamentally similar in plan to the Salish-Wakash systems. In view of the evident connections in general culture between the two groups of tribes, the not very great distance separating them, and the partial link afforded by the Alsea, the two occurrences of the type of system may be set down as derived from a common source. This source is more likely to have been among the Salish-Wakash than

[7] Other cross-cousins are variously disposed of and there are occasional special terms like Tolowa ontdesi, man's female cross-cousin, but the primary and distinctive meaning of unt and tset is clear from the comparison.

among the Yurok-Wiyot on account of the much greater populousness and extent of the former.

The Tolowa-Hupa-Karok system is widespread in peripheral northern and central California. Spier classes this tract as occupied by Iroquois and Mackenzie Basin systems. As these however are similar, differing chiefly in that the former possesses special terms for cross-cousins, they may in the present connection be treated as one. Contrasted with this type of system, inner central and north California has systems of the "Omaha" class. The range of these corresponds with Gifford's "Central California Valley" area,[8] whereas the Iroquois-Mackenzie distribution in and about California is nearly the same as Gifford's "Mountain" or peripheral area. The ethnic groups in this Mountain or Iroquois-Mackenzie area are: all the California Athabascans; the northeast Hokans, namely, Karok, Shasta, Achomawi, Yana, Washo; Yuki; of Penutians, only the northern Maidu and southern Yokuts, that is, the extreme marginal members of the group;[9] and the bordering Shoshoneans.[10] It seems impossible to say whether the Athabascans were the contributors or the recipients of Iroquois-Mackenzie systems in California. On the one hand, some distant northwest and southwest Athabascans fall in this class; but on the other hand, the type extends also through Basin, Plateau, and Plains to the Great Lakes region and Atlantic coast. It is evidently an ancient, fundamental type of kinship system which has come to be widely but irregularly distributed through most of the continent, and in it most Athabascans participated. Its spread in California, and the variety of its adherents there, argue that it is rather old in this area too.

With this type of system, then, the Yurok-Salish system came into collision around the lower Klamath river at one time or another. Every one of our five tribes shows the result of the collision. Tolowa and Yurok appear the least altered, on the whole, from their original plans; but they too show traces of modification toward each other.[11] Wiyot has taken over the Athabascan uncle-aunt terminology; Hupa, the Yurok plan of calling all cousins siblings. Karok is a "Mountain" or Mackenzie-Iroquois system nearly half made over on the Yurok plan. There are of course tribal specializations also, and it cannot always be decided whether these are an indirect by-product of system-collision disturbance or mere local luxuriances unconnected with the two basic systems.

[8] Map 24, p. 203.

[9] All other Penutians, plus the Hokan Pomo, constitute the Valley group.

[10] Except in southern California, where kinship follows other trends throughout—Spier's Yuman type.

[11] The Tolowa instances have been cited. The most likely Yurok addition under Athabascan influence is the set of address terms for o br, o sis, y sibling, though these have not displaced the other-pattern reference terms for siblings.

But the accidental nature of these specializations as compared with the essential features of the two systems involved, is usually fairly clear.[12] "Accidental" in this connection of course means not causeless, but of minor pattern significance; "essential," of major, older, or persistent pattern significance.

So far, then, our unraveling of the history of kinship designation among the five northwestern California tribes. Their actual societal organizations and practices are uniform almost to identity. Their kin terminologies, on the contrary, appear to go back to two quite different fundamental types or patterns. These have traceably influenced each other at a good many points, but are still distinct, Yurok-Wiyot against the others. Whether formerly there were also two systems of social organization, there seems no indication, one way or the other. In the present connection, it does not matter. Whether two organizations blended into one, or whether there always was only one, there exists only uniformity now; but in terminology, there was and is duality. Evidently practice and the categories of thought and speech do not have to go together. Of these two systems it would be idle to call one cause and the other effect, and certainly misleading to infer from one to the other. The Tolowa and Hupa "Iroquois-Mackenzie" type of terminology evidently coexists as satisfactorily with northwestern marriage and social institutions as does the Yurok-Wiyot type. After all, there is no reason why this should not be. Kinship terminologies are part of language; and that this can and often does go its own way independently of the history of culture, is a commonplace. The substantial cultural identity of Athabascan Hupa, Algonkin Yurok, Hokan Karok is a classic example of the principle. Why anyone should hold that kinship terms necessarily occupy a special and exceptional place in speech in "reflecting" culture with minimum distortion, is hard to see, except for the wish fathering the notion.

To return from this reasoning about generalities, we have in the present situation at any rate this that is positive and specific: the prob-

[12] Such specializations, as distinct from contact-influence modifications, appear to be the following. *Yurok:* the cross-sibling reference terms; extension of word for co-parent-in-law to include other three-step relations by marriage; perhaps the exclusion of siblings of parents- and children-in-law from the terms for these. *Wiyot:* special term for first and third cousins only, parallel or cross; reduction of sibling-in-law terms to two; separate term for paternal half-sibling only; probably the reduction of sibling terms to a single one. *Tolowa:* supernumerary term for brother; extra cross-cousin term; separate term for wife's sister's husband and for husband's brother's wife. *Hupa:* three asymmetric sibling-in-law terms (two sisters-in-law), different from Yurok three (two brothers-in-law). *Karok:* grandparental asymmetry (f's par, m's f, m's m); perhaps the supernumerary terms for brother and for sister. (These supernumeraries, with the Tolowa one, and Wiyot having only a single term for all siblings, suggest a reconstruction of original Yurok-Wiyot as having two terms, for "brother" and "sister," from which Wiyot has reduced and Yurok expanded. The seven or eight Yurok sibling terms following two different plans indicate a condition of instability and transiency in this part of the Yurok system.)

able outline of the history of two kin-term systems of somewhat fundamentally different pattern and type, the geographical distribution of which indicates that they originated separately in distinct areas, came into collision in northwest California, somewhat modified each other there by reciprocal influencing, but still remain essentially different in plan. In short, the patterns have had each a history of its own as a pattern, just as the languages in which they occur have had each a history of its own. The maintenance of the separate patterns is of particular interest because the social organization patterns of the peoples involved have remained or become extremely uniform.

With respect to the history of the ethnic cultures and populations here discussed, some inferences are also possible, although only tentative ones. The "Algonkin"-speaking Yurok-Wiyot need not be derived from the great Algonkin body east of the Rocky mountains. They may more likely represent a branching off from the also "Algonkin"-speaking Salish-Wakash, drifting south along the coast. This would go far to explain the strange local focus of northwest coast culture in northwest California. It would also check with their territorial holdings: nearly a hundred miles of ocean frontage, only about half that distance up the Klamath. Upstream, they came to adjoin the Karok, who are the northwesternmost members of the northern division of Hokans, and the former historic affiliations of the Karok in general would therefore have been toward the south and inland. The Karok could thus hardly have contributed much specific northwest coast culture. The Athabascans of course are admittedly intrusive in California. The Yurok now divide the Tolowa and Oregon Athabascans from the Hupa and California ones. It would be venturesome to try to decide whether the Yurok had forced a wedge up the Klamath, splitting an originally continuous Athabascan body into two, or whether the Yurok-Wiyot were there first and were then engulfed by incoming Athabascans. There is too much likelihood of local shiftings and readjustments blurring the picture, thus defeating the reconstruction of its original. But there is one partial hint: the Tolowa kin terms seem less influenced by the Yurok system than are the Hupa ones. This looks as if the Tolowa might have come to their specific present habitat the more lately. That in turn suggests their closing in on the coast after the Yurok were established about where they are now, and, with their south Oregon coast kinsmen, occupying the last stage of the route over which the Yurok had previously come to the mouth of the Klamath. But this inference rests on a slight clue and may not be pressed.

The most significant conclusion of the foregoing discussion seems to be this. Kin-term systems, like everything else organized in culture or speech, have essential or basic patterns. Like all other patterns these

are subject to modification from within and without. There is always a sufficient number of such "accidents" to disguise the basic pattern more or less. The determination of this is indispensable, however, if we wish to deal with the relatively more meaningful aspects of our phenomena. Evidently, the essential features of the pattern are also likely to be the ones which have the greatest historic depth. The search for them therefore implies a willingness and ability to view data historically. Without such willingness, it is as good as impossible to separate the significant from the trivial or temporary and local fluctuations; and the work done becomes merely sociological, an affair of schemes instead of an approximately true story. In proportion, moreover, as fundamental patterns are uncovered, their relation in space or time or structure to other patterns tends to become clearer. Patterns in different aspects or parts of culture may inter-influence each other heavily, whereupon they tend to aggregate into greater patterns; or they may influence each other relatively little, each essentially going its own way for a long time even within one culture.

Among the five tribes here dealt with, I believe it is reasonably clear that for some time there have been operative two kin-term patterns, but only one pattern of social institutions, although this is quite complex, as shown by the adjusted coexistence of "full" and "half" marriage, with patrilocal and matrilocal residence, respectively. It would be absurd to assert that such a dissociation of kinship and institutional patterns was normal or perhaps even frequent. We know of examples to the contrary, even in America and more abundantly in Oceania, where the correspondence of the two kinds of patterns is much greater, even almost neat. But it would be as unwarranted to argue such occurrences into a universal, as the present one. Kinship systems are more than imperfect reflections of social organizations, or tools for reconstituting these. They are also thought-systems, and as such have a historic existence and an interest of their own. On account of their compactness and potential self-sufficiency, they lend themselves admirably to historic understanding in their own right. The time for an attack on the problem of their relation to coexistent institutions is, on the whole, after some insight into their history has been attained, not before.

I hope at some future time to return to this subject in a wider geographical frame.