TABLE 1. English, Totomayan and Huave

	7	77	W	Y7
11	Zoque	Totonac	YUCATEC	HUAVE
all	mumu	paks	tulakal	meawan
ashes	kuy-ham	$lka^{p}ka^{p}$	$ta^{p}an$	ngwiat
bark	naka	$qu^{q}cqa^{q}$	u-pac-ce?	o-pang
belly	¢ek_	paan	nak	o-tieng
big	miha	$\lambda anka^{\gamma}$	nohoc	na-tang
black	uik	¢i°¢a°qa	$e\vec{k}$	na-mbeor
blood	ni? pin	$qa^{9}l$ - ni^{9}	kik	kieh
bone	pak	lukut	bak	o-laa¢
burn	ne?m-	lkuy	elel	nkatitit
cloud	?0?na	puk - lni^{o}	muyal	oik
cold	pakak	ga?wi?wi?	si? is	na- $kind$
come	min-	min	talel	(im)iin
die	ka?-	nii-	kimil	ndeow
drink	nu	$qu^{q}ta$	ukul	
ear	kowi	4	fikin	-nganeow
Cai	nowi	taqaan	jikin	o-laag
earth	nas	$ti^{\gamma}ya^{\gamma}t$	lu? um	iit
eat	$wi^{9}k$ -	wa? –	hanal	ie t
egg	poka	$qaa^{\gamma}lwaa^{\gamma}t$	he^{γ}	o- mb
eye	witim	$ar{l}aqastapu$	wic	o-niiaq
fat	¢anga?	mantiika (Span.)	¢a¢	¢apay
feather	pik	$pa^{\gamma}qa^{\gamma}$	kukum	o-limb
fire	hukitik	lkuyat	ka?ak	biimb
fish	koke	8-kii ⁹ ti ⁹	kay	kiet
five	mohsa?y	ki¢is	ho?	kokiaw
fly	sitiht	qusa	ſiknal	-hlil
	000000	Awara	junitar	-10000
foot	$ne^{\gamma}\eta$	tuwan	ok	o-leah
give	ϕi^{γ} -	maa?staa?-	¢'a	iic
good	?oye	λaan	u¢	na- $hneah$
green	¢uh¢uh	staqni?nki?	ya°a∫	na- $teaik$
hair	way	$ya^{\widehat{ ho}}hni^{oldsymbol{ ho}}$	\$0°0\$	o-ndea¢
hand	ki?	makan	kab	o-wi∫
head	ko-pak	a°q-∫aaqa	pol	o-wij o-mal
hear	maton-	a∙ q-juuqa qa∫-mata	$u^{\gamma}yik$	
heart	¢okoy	naku?	puksiikal	-ngeay
	heme¢	dinka		o-meea¢
heavy	nemeç	<i>grand</i>	aal	na-im
I	?ih	kit	te-n	∫ike
ice	¢atuh	miki	yelo (Span.)	yelo (Span.)
know	mus-	ka ^ş ¢ii-	ohel	ndiy
leaf	?ay	$tu^{p}waa^{p}n$	le^{γ}	op
lie	?iŋgek	ma^{γ} -	cital	peaaw
liver	$pa^{\gamma}t$	-l-wa?ka?ka?	taman	ik
long	p_{iy}	$lmaa^{\gamma}n$	cowak	na-hal
man	pin	$ci^{\gamma} \int ku^{\gamma}$	(ib	na-fey
many	wiwi	łuuwa?	ya?ab	fowiy
meat	sis	lii-wa?	bak	o-nih
			ar west	0 10010

TABLE 1—0	ontinued
TOTONAC	Yue
13	

	_		37	TT 77
	Zoque	TOTONAC	YUCATEC	HUAVE
mountain	$po^{\gamma}mna$	sipih	pu? uk	peat
mouth	rannaka	kilni?	çi?	o-mbeay
name	niy	tapaa-kuwiit	kaba?	nit
neck	kini	pi∫-ni?	kal	o- nik
	_	saasti?	tumben	haya¢
new	home	saasa,	tantoen.	rayay
. 1.	/ 0		$a ec{k} a b$	o-ngwria¢
night	¢u?	$ci^{p}sni^{p}$		o-rigio tale
nose	kini	kinkan	ni^{γ}	o-∫ing
\mathbf{not}	$ha^{\eta}n$	niinta?	ma^{γ}	ngo
one	tumi	-tum	hun,	nop
person	pin	ci∫ku?	winik	nipilan
	•	-		
rain	tuh	siin	$ca^{q}ak$	na-hoet
red	¢apas	$\phi u^{\gamma} \phi u^{\gamma} q u$	cak	na-kan¢
river	ni^{2}	gałtuucuguh	ukum	lam
		tihi?	be	tiiid
road	$tu\eta$		mod	o-∫iic
root	wa ti	tanqa-∫iiqa	поц	0-5000
		Inc. least	8u8	wiiit
sand	$wa^{p}na$	kukuh	wa ⁹ alik	-sah
say	nim-	-wan		
see	ken	u?k∫ila	wiljik	-haw
seed	tim- buh	$tal\phi i^{o}$	nek	o-saab
\mathbf{short}	kono	a ⁹ k-¢uu	kom	toko¢
			,	
sit	poks-	wila-	kutal	¢otoh
$_{ m skin}$	naka	fuuwa?	oŧ	o-taag
sleep	? iŋ-	l-tata-	wenel	-meay
\mathbf{small}	ciks	a?k-¢uu	cican	kiceec
smoke	hokoh	hini?	bu¢'	na-sop
SHIOKE	nonon	100101.	5 407	1000 GO P
snake	¢an	luuwa?	kan	ndiik
_		l-tukuuni-	lom-	-h¢ol
stab	to¢		$wa^{\gamma}tal$	lomboh
stand	tenay-	kahyah		
star	ma¢a	$sta^{\gamma}ku$	ek	o-kas
stone	ϵa^{γ}	ciwi∫	tunic	kang
			1.	٠,
sun	hama	$ci^{\gamma}cini^{\gamma}$	kin	$n_i t$
\mathbf{swim}	hem-	f- $kiwaatnam$	$tahal\ ha^{g}$	-hrok
tail	ye? ŋu	s-tahan	ne	o- wil
that	te?a	aa? ma ? h	lelo?	ayiin
this	yi?wi	yu? ma ?	$lela^{o}$	aag agiy
QIII.	gr wr	y		0 0 0
thou	mih	wi ? \int	te- c	i- ke
three	$tuka^{\gamma}y$	$-tu\tilde{r}tu$	of	aroh
	to¢	sii?ma?qaat	ak	o- niw
tongue		tagan	k_0	o-liek
tooth	tiq	Ligaria	ce?	[iil
$_{ m tree}$	kuy	$ki^{p}wi^{p}$	cer) iti
A	an od=	fa , 2 a ,	ka?	ih-
two	me¢a	-tu?y	fimbal	-hiy
walk	wit - u^p	tuwanii-?a?n		
warm	pih-	ci ⁹ ci	$ki^{o}nal$	neoraar
wash	¢e?−	$ca^{\gamma}qaa^{\gamma}$	$p_{o^{\gamma}}$	-han¢
water	ni^{9}	$cu^{p}cut$	ha^{γ}	iyow

		TABLE 1—C	ontinued	
	Zoque	TOTONAC	YCCATEC	HUAVE
what	tiyi	ntuu	ba°af	ngin
where	nhuta	nii	$tu^{\mathfrak{p}}uf$	niing
white	popo	s- $napapa$	sak	raan
who	$^{\circ}iwi$	tii	ma°a∫	hane
wing	sah	paqan	ſik	o-l imb
woman yellow	yomo pu ⁹ ¢i	puskaat s-mukuku	ċup kan	na-htah maril (Span.)

MORRIS SWADESH

One omitted comparison may be pointed out to illustrate the use of the strict semantic criterion. Zoque ken 'see' is compared with English 'see' and not with the archaic and dialectal ken, a variant of know. We recognize that a semantic change from 'see' to 'know' is fairly natural and that ken: ken represents a better comparison than most of those listed above. It probably was one of the 200 English-Zoque similarities found by Wonderly, but we pass it by because it does not meet the requirements of our test.

As against the 10 approximate similarities in Zoque-English, we find a number perhaps only slightly larger between Zoque and Totonac, but they include several which show simpler and more complete agreement, to wit:

min- wi?k- pik	min wa?- pa?qa? (cp. also Tot. paqaan 'wing')
koke	skii?ti
maton	qa[-mata
kini	kinkan
tumi	-tum
to¢	-tukuuni-
$yi^{9}wi$	$yu^{q}ma^{q}$
ti¢	$ta\phi an$
kuy	$ki^{9}wi^{9}$
¢e?-	$ca^{\gamma}qaa^{\gamma}$
	wi?k- pik koke matoŋ kini tumi to¢ yi?wi ti¢ kuy

The list is not only more convincing in appearance but contains within it some first suggestions of a plausible phonologic theory. p t m n w y correspond exactly, Both i and a of Zoque correspond to a of Totonac, and Z. ou correspond to T. u. Z. k equals T. q, except before i where T. has only k, and there may be other valid cases of k = k. Z. ℓ may correspond either to T. ℓ or k. From these relationships we can reconstruct three consonants $\not\in k \ q$ for the presumed common period, which in most positions remain distinct in Totonac but give respectively $\not\in \not\in k$ in Zoque; in addition there may have been an original rounded k^{ω} which gives k in both languages but may be reflected in a rounding influence on vowels (Z. koke 'fish' from reduplicated *kwakway, T. kii- from *kway). A general search of the Totonac and Zoque vocabularies corroborates and only slightly amends these phonologic formulations. By corroboration of a phonologic theory is meant the discovery of still other elements in the compared languages whose phonemes correspond according to the formulations being tested. In the case of ZoqueTotonac, the total number of presumptive cognates, found by the author in vocabularies of perhaps 2000 words, hardly exceeds sixty (as compared with Wonderly's 200). Some of the phonologic correspondences are represented by a number of examples, others by very few, for example only three good instances of d = k. The important thing is not so much the number of examples as their phonologic consistency. Nor need we be concerned that an examination of 20 times the vocabulary gives only six times as many cognates, since our first list of 97 items of meaning covers precisely the area of maximum conservatism.

We do not need proof of correct phonologic formulas in order to test the validity of the historic connection between the languages. All we need is concrete assumed equivalences whose statistical weight can be reckoned in the computation of the chance factor. The method of accomplishing this can now be explained and demonstrated. For the strictest calculation of the chance factor, we would need to obtain statistics on the relative frequency of each phoneme of each language or to otherwise allow for the differences. For the present purposes, a method of safe approximation will be used, that is, a calculation which errs on the side of discounting rather than emphasizing possible relationship.

Our first problem is to calculate the chance factor, granted the circumstances of the present case. The typical minimum stem form in both languages is CVC, with only demonstratives and formative elements falling below it. Some of our vocabulary elements are more complex. For the sake of uniformity, we can disregard any elements which fall below a CVC complexity and consider only the first CVC of elements which go beyond this. We need to know how many different possible distinct CVC formations may enter into our comparisons. This is determined partly by the number of consonants and vowels in each language and partly by the phonologic correspondences which are assumed to be possible.

Zoque has six vowels, a e i o u i, and 11 independent consonants, p t ¢ k ? s h m n w y; six others, $b d g \tilde{n} c f$, occur as the result of certain phonologic assimilations and contractions. Totonac has three vowels, a iu, and 17 consonants, ntkadcx? hs [lm nlwy, some of which may interchange in response to augmentative-diminutive symbolism. Because of diminutive symbolism-e.g. kinkan 'nose' may be a diminutivized form derived from reduplicated *qinqan—it is safe to count only 10 independent consonant phonemes, with an eleventh, namely glottal stop, independent except in the post-vocalic position.

In making comparisons between the two languages either i or a of Zoque may correspond to Totonac a. The Zoque contrast between i and a therefore has no significance for comparative purposes. We can state this as i + a = a, and may call such a set of phonemes a synophon. There are two other vocalic synophons, e+i=i and o+u=u. The consonantic synophons are ten: p t m w y? hs, n = n + l, $\phi + k = \phi + k + q$. The number of possible CVC complexes, in terms of synophons, is therefore $10 \times 3 \times 10$, or 300.

Given an item of meaning expressed by a given CVC in one of the compared languages, there is 1 chance in 300 that the same meaning will be expressed by the same CVC in the second language. Or, at least, this would be the case if all the consonantic synophons were of approximately equal frequency and if the