

# UC Berkeley

## Anthropology Faculty Publications

**Title**

Miwok Lineages

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8gz9w616>

**Journal**

American Anthropologist, 46(3)

**Author**

Gifford, Edward Winslow

**Publication Date**

1944-09-01

Peer reviewed

## MIWOK LINEAGES

By E. W. GIFFORD

THE anthropologist who presents generalizations without supporting data should have no complaint when some colleague casts doubt on the validity of his generalizations, as Dr. Mischa Titiev has done in his paper on *The Influence of Common Residence on the Unilateral Classification of Kindred*.<sup>1</sup> Therein, referring to my paper on *Miwok Lineages and the Political Unit in Aboriginal California*,<sup>2</sup> he writes: "These selections make it painfully clear that the more Gifford talks about Miwok lineages the less light he throws upon the unilateral relationship by blood that so appealed to Lowie. Instead, he repeatedly affirms the overwhelming importance of locale and common residence."<sup>3</sup>

Titiev expects too much of natives when he complains<sup>4</sup> that "Lowie neglects to tell us by what means he, or Gifford, or the natives, make this fine distinction," i.e., between clans and lineages. He has a right to expect it from Lowie or Gifford, but not from the Miwok who know only their own institution. Beyond I present some of the basic Miwok data upon which my formulations were based.<sup>5</sup>

Re-examination of the materials upon which the generalizations in my 1926 paper were made gives no warrant for altering these generalizations. It does seem high time to publish the principal materials which throw light "upon the unilateral relationship by blood that so appealed to Lowie."<sup>6</sup>

At the time I wrote *Miwok Moieties*<sup>7</sup> I knew nothing about lineages among the Miwok. The presence of lineages obtruded itself in 1923. Then I proceeded to go through the names of individuals, mostly deceased, which I had recorded earlier, chiefly in connection with the god-impersonating cult, and obtain their relationship and lineage affiliation, so far as informants could recall. To these were added names of some living persons with their lineage affiliation. By this means lists of members were compiled for 80 lineages (*nena*). Many of these lists comprise only one or two names. For a number of lineages (*nena*) or ancestral places (*nena*) no individuals were remembered. It should be recalled that all lineage names are place names.

Herewith I present the recorded membership in the twenty lineages (*nena*) for which I have the longest lists of members. These lists, although all incomplete, testify overwhelmingly to the importance of the patrilineal blood tie, which presumably must have been equally strong in the ancient days when

<sup>1</sup> AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, vol. 45, 1943, pp. 511-530.

<sup>2</sup> AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, vol. 28, 1926, pp. 389-401.

<sup>3</sup> Titiev, p. 521.      <sup>4</sup> Titiev, p. 513.

<sup>5</sup> AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, vol. 28, 1926, 389-401.      <sup>6</sup> Titiev, p. 521.

<sup>7</sup> University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 12, 1916, pp. 139-194.

each ancestral place (*nená*) was inhabited as the Miwok assert. In other words, the primary factor was kinship, not common residence. People lived together because they were related. The hypothesis that a heterogeneous and unrelated aggregation started to live together has no foundation in Miwok concepts or data. The burden of proof for such an hypothesis rests with the proponent.

Since the coming of Caucasians the Miwok have adopted the practice of counting the offspring of Caucasian fathers and Miwok mothers as members of the lineage (*nená*) of the Miwok stepfather. This is the only case I know of in which departure from strict patrilineality has taken place.

In the following lists the distinction between lineal and collateral lines was not always clear in the informants' minds, so some collaterals may be listed as lineals and *vice versa*. On the other hand the patrilineal connection always was clear, informants insisting that lineage membership like moiety membership could be only through the father. A number of the ancestral places (*nená*) listed below are shown on Professor A. L. Kroeber's map of Maidu and Miwok villages.<sup>8</sup> When Kroeber's map was compiled, it was not possible to distinguish between ancestral places (*nená*) and other village sites.

*Nena Aiyisa* or *Aiyismisú*.—*Generation 1*.—Siweno ♂, his brother Chawichu. *Generation 2*.—Toktokolu ♂ and Umuye ♀, offspring of Siweno ♂. *Generation 3*.—Offspring of Toktokolu ♂: Akaino ♂, Bosaya ♀, Mayengo ♀, Tolkachu ♀. Tunuka or Land Moiety *nená*.

*Nena Aplá* or *Aplachi*.—*Generation 1*. Hoho ♂. *Generation 2*. Offspring of Hoho ♂: Engeto ♂, Solasu ♂. *Generation 3*. Offspring of Solasu ♂: Sanuye ♀. Offspring of Engeto ♂: Liktyue ♀, Etumüye ♀, Ukunulumaiye ♀, Pasatu ♂. *Generation 4*. Offspring of Pasatu ♂: Anawuye ♂, Kulmuye ♀, Wassusma ♀, Hehemuye ♀, Moemu ♂, Etumu ♂, Molimö ♂, Hoyichalu ♂. Tunuka or Land Moiety *nená*.

*Nena Chummeto*.—*Generation 1*. Talulu ♂, Yutne ♂, Chiwela ♂. *Generation 2*. Offspring of Talulu ♂: Malkuyu ♂, Takenga ♂. *Generation 3*. Offspring of Malkuyu ♂: Hokoyu ♂. Offspring of Takenga ♂: Takuchma ♀, Taipa ♂, Tuche ♂. Kikua or Water Moiety *nená*.

*Nena Hangitwuye* or *Hangituwe* (number 55 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1*. Hahiyo ♂ and his brother Kulapayak or Tupit ♂. *Generation 2*. Offspring of Hahiyo ♂: Lüchmu ♂, Tepaite ♂. Offspring of Kulapayak ♂: Yanapayak or Kopetme ♂, Chototo ♂, Sapsapü ♂. Kikua or Water Moiety *nená*.

*Nena Hochhochmeti* (number 74 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1*. Real or collateral patrilineal siblings: Etu ♂, Nochuuku ♀, Lutelu ♂, Sitpu ♂, Ta'kawa ♂, Chistu ♂, Chulu ♂, Wilanu ♂, Hiwanguye ♀. *Generation 2*. Offspring of Etu ♂: Salayu ♂, Akulu ♂. Another patrilineally related group for which I lack precise connection comprised the offspring of two brothers. The offspring of one brother were Chiwino or Joe Ignacio and his sister Lucy; that of the other brother was Lumchuno or Joe. Tunuka or Land Moiety *nená*.

<sup>8</sup> A. L. Kroeber, *Handbook of Indians of California* (Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78, pl. 37, 1925), p. 445.

*Nena Kawinucha* (number 52 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Yokaa ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Yokaa ♂: Tolsowe ♂, Tusuwe ♂, Taktekayu ♂, Kaliska ♂. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Tolsowe ♂: Pucheyu ♀, Tünü ♂. Offspring of Taktekayu ♂: Pachuka ♂. Offspring of Kaliska ♂: Chipu ♂. *Generation 4.* Offspring of Pachuka (Abraham Lincoln). Other living members of the nena besides Abraham Lincoln and his offspring in 1923 were the following, all related patrilineally to the above: Tuchulu ♂ of West Point, Calaveras County; Tuchulu's sister (Mrs. Elmer Falls); others living at Sheep Ranch, Calaveras County. Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Kesa* (number 73 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Cheweksu ♂ and his brother Tumakalu ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Cheweksu ♂: Tikmu ♂, Telumi ♂, Hümüta ♀. Patrilineally related to the above were the following living in 1923: Bob Maas, Willie Maas, Mrs. Jasper, Short Mike's wife, Joe Dixie's wife. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

*Nena Kotolosaku.*—*Generation 1.* Luyu ♂ and Chumetokti ♂ (both father's father's brothers of informant Yohetu ♂). *Generation 2.* Offspring of Luyu ♂: Osoi ♂, Yukukukuye ♀. *Generation 3.* Laseyu ♂ (father of informant Yohetu ♂), his brother, and his sisters Polneye ♀, A'a'me ♂, Nachamila ♀, Tokolasik ♀, Wasekuye ♀. *Generation 4.* Offspring of Laseyu ♂: Yohetu ♂ or Tom Williams,<sup>9</sup> Lamni ♂, Johanna Whitaker ♀. Offspring of brother of Laseyu ♂: Charta ♀, Wi'nuye ♀. Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Kotoplana* (number 65 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Putsume ♂ and his brother Situtuyu ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Putsume ♂: Yokaa ♂, Mangila ♂, Topopoyu ♂, Tokoang ♂, He'eluye ♀, Tokoak ♀, Lingugse ♀, Kusetu ♂, Ukulnuye ♀, Sitki ♂, Sukukiye ♀, Taukiyak ♂, Chilikna ♂. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Sitki ♂: Waketnu ♂, Muchkuye ♀. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

*Nena Pakanu.*—*Generation 1.* Yotimö ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Yotimö ♂: Yotimö ♂ (junior), Hesutu ♂, Hesutuye ♀, Mu'ata ♂, Tiwütuye ♀. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Yotimö ♂ (junior): Amayeta ♂, Heluya ♀, Momosu ♂. Two other individuals related patrilineally were Chasepu ♂ and Tukespaye ♀. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

*Nena Pangasa or Pangasemanu* (number 78 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Tunaa ♂ and his brothers Mose TUYA ♂ and Chokochcha ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Tunaa ♂: Nomasu ♂, Talalu ♂, Miltaye ♀. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Nomasu ♂: Chilawi ♂, Chuttoko ♂, Tukubi ♂, Pelisu ♂, Kanatu ♂, Uhubita ♂, Pilekuye ♀, Kusetu ♀, Hupaye ♀. *Generation 4.* Offspring of Pelisu ♂: Ache ♀. Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Pepeleno.*—*Generation 1.* Chuktoko ♂ and his sister Pukuna ♀. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Chuktoko: Mükü ♂, Sokawa ♂, Mukuye ♀, Hotamuye ♀. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Mükü ♂: Patiwö ♂, Tolsowe ♂, Samtuye (Victoria) ♀. *Generation 4.* Offspring of Patiwö ♂: Harry Davis ♂, Yachalu ♂, Mochilü ♂. Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Pota or Potachi* (number 69 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Hoyichalu ♂ and his brother Hayepugu ♂, respectively father's father and father's father's brother to informant Helemuye (Susie Williams). *Generation 2.* Susie Williams' paternal uncles and aunts: Susanna ♀, Elki ♂, He'eluye ♀, Liptuye ♀, Polo ♂, Ewüme ♂, Sunumpcha ♀, Lasisko ♂, Chumutuye ♀, Lupuni ♂. *Generation 3.* Helemuye or Susie Williams, an

<sup>9</sup> For his portrait, see E. W. Gifford, *Miwok Myths* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 12, pl. 6), 1917.

informant; Old Walker ♂, tachi (older brother) of Helemuye ♀; Sam Casoose Domingo ♂, chale (younger brother) of Helemuye ♀. *Generation 4.* Various individuals standing in relation of üpsa (brother's child) to informant Helemuye ♀: Sam Casoose Domingo's offspring, Charlie Cosner ♂, Jeff Davis ♂, Lanu ♂. *Generation 5.* Charlie Cosner's daughters and son. Others from the above nena, related patrilineally, but not placed exactly, were: (1) Potba or Potpaya ♂, a hayapo (chief) slain in Amador County before the whites came; (2) his sister Potbaye ♀; (3) Eapü, collateral brother of Potba ♂; (4) Hiwilu ♂; (5) Tülemuyak ♂; (6) Chaksepuye ♀, daughter of Tülemuyak ♂. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

*Nena Sala* (number 87 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Metikla ♂ and his brother Pati ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Metikla ♂: Wuyi ♂, Poochi ♀. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Wuyi ♂: Wunuti ♂, Nachichto ♂, Yutu ♂. *Generation 4.* Offspring of Wunuti ♂: Chiyingo (Jimmy Bill) ♂. Offspring of either Nachichto ♂ or Yutu ♂: Chintiye ♂. Patrilineally related to the above are the following: *Generation 1.* Ongili ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Ongili ♂: Aselu or Patakasü ♂. Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Selumeti.*—*Generation 1.* Leyati ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Leyati ♂: Lokni ♂, Tatmö ♂, Toni ♂, Nimo ♂, Chokeye ♀. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Lokni ♂: Puta (Sitni or George Anderson) ♂, Lupu ♂, Awanata ♂, Nikiti (Nelson Edwards) ♂, Petno ♂, Situtu ♂, mother of Elmer Falls. *Generation 4.* Offspring of Nikiti ♂: Archie Edwards ♂, Walter Edwards ♂. Offspring of Puta ♂: Kukse ♂, Mike Anderson ♂. Unallocated as to generation is the mother of Witchuna ♂. Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Senenu or Senenchi.*—*Generation 1.* Neplü ♂ and his paternal half brother Panahachu or Papina ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Panahachu ♂: Yuskolu ♂, Wipsuye ♀. Another group connected patrilineally with the above: *Generation 1.* Kulya ♂, Esege ♀. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Kulya ♂: Tom Dixie ♂, Joe Dixie ♂. Unplaced: Istu ♂, a relative of Esege ♀. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

*Nena Siksikino* (number 75 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Hunipte ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Hunipte: Muliya ♂, Wenitu ♂, Chukpaye ♀, Eskeye ♂, Umlutuya ♂. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Muliya ♂: Posala ♀. Offspring of Eskeye ♂: Machumpaye ♀, Yaluta ♀. Offspring of Umlutuya ♂: La'uyu ♂, Loiyetu ♂, Loiyetuye ♀. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

*Nena Tulana* (number 47 on Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Three brothers: Suletu ♂, Kuchuyak ♂, Tumakayu ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Kuchuyak ♂: Kuchume ♂, Telumu ♀. Offspring of Suletu ♂, or Tumakayu ♂, or both: Iskemu ♂, Siitu ♂, Kutuchanati ♀, Semeke ♀, Hatawa or Wüchki ♂. A patrilineally related but unplaced female was Yutkiye. Tunuka or Lang Moiety nena.

*Nena Umemchi.*—*Generation 1.* Siblings Apanta ♂, Paselenu (Mary) ♀, Tusimi ♂, Tiputa ♀, Polayu ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Tusimi ♂: Sokono ♂, Tuikuye ♀. Living in 1923, patrilineally related, but not placed exactly in relation to above: Matilda ♀, Jasper children (3 girls, 1 boy). Kikua or Water Moiety nena.

*Nena Wakache* (number 64 of Kroeber's map).—*Generation 1.* Noksu ♂, Ka'uwu ♂. *Generation 2.* Offspring of Noksu ♂ and (or) Ka'uwu ♂: Sakati ♂, Tiwolu ♂, Kilikila ♂, Tungelu ♂, Yulestu ♂, Osmokse ♂. *Generation 3.* Offspring of Kilikila ♂: Epeta ♀, Namino ♂, Kuyunu ♂. Tunuka or Land Moiety nena.

I am quite aware of the incompleteness of the data here presented. But the very fact that most of the names of individuals were originally obtained in

connection with a study of Miwok ceremonies, before the lineages were known, and then subsequently utilized successfully in a lineage study seems to point to the soundness of the generalizations concerning lineages. The lack of connection between certain groups of individuals in certain lineages is due to my not having inquired as to detailed relationships.

Titiev's paper is essentially one of definitions plus an attempt to establish theoretical evolutionary sequences, in which he is partially successful from a logical standpoint. Thus, his supposed sequence from lineage to clan to phratry sounds reasonable enough. Not so happy is his attempt "to show that the earliest sense of relationship arises from coresidence."<sup>10</sup> This only raises the question of why individuals in the most primitive societies are coresidents. The obvious answer would seem to be "because they are members of one fundamental human group, the family, and consequently blood relatives." This takes us right back to Dr. Titiev's starting point. It does seem as though he is tilting at a windmill when he attempts to substitute coresidence as the primary basis instead of blood relationship.

Kinship reckoning and coresidence are two universals in human affairs. All kinship systems are bilateral, having terms to designate relatives through both males and females. As Titiev says, quoting Leslie A. White: "A kinship nomenclature is a mechanism whose function is the classification of relatives." The author's two aims are set forth as follows: "We shall endeavor to trace the origin of this mechanism and to explain the part it plays in the development of lineages, clans and phratries."<sup>11</sup> In his concluding section Titiev writes: "I have tried to show that the earliest sense of relationship arises from coresidence."<sup>12</sup> He evidently regards this as the fulfillment of his endeavor to trace the origin of kinship nomenclature. He has evoked one universal as the cause of the other universal. To me, this proceeding is unconvincing, especially when, to support it, the author marshals applications of kinship terms, which, from the world viewpoint, are secondary or aberrant.

On page 515, Titiev states: "and it can be readily shown that in numerous primitive societies ties of kinship are actually established by virtue of common residence *rather* than by common descent." I have italicized the crucial word *rather*. If he had written *as well as* it would have been a bit less objectionable.

Some statements in Titiev's paper are, to say the least, a bit obscure. Thus in his introductory section (p. 511) he writes: "Throughout this paper we shall be concerned primarily with the question of classification, particularly in societies where relationships are counted unilaterally." This statement seems to refer to a non-existent situation, for in what society are relationships counted on one side of the family only? Do not all peoples have bilateral relationship systems which have designations for relatives through both males and females? If there is no such entity as a unilateral kinship system, how can one

<sup>10</sup> Titiev, p. 530.

<sup>11</sup> Titiev, p. 511.

<sup>12</sup> Titiev, p. 530.

justify an "attempt to trace the development of lineages, clans and phratries, from a postulated common ancestral form of unilateral kinship classification?"<sup>13</sup> Apparently the social evolutionist, like the ultra-diffusionist, creates his hypotheses to fit his needs and with little regard for existing realities.

In his attempt to break down the fundamental idea of kinship as expressed in systems of relationship the world over, Titiev seeks to elevate to primacy the extension of these terms beyond their original applications. Thus (p. 511, footnote 3) he says: "Among ourselves we may classify as brothers men who have the same parents, members of a fraternal order, and fellow religionists." Does he really consider for a minute that the two latter applications are original? Or that, in ancient China the system of kin classification was originally reckoned by the possession of a common name or place of residence rather than by blood relationship? Does he really think that two unrelated Chinese with the same family name, or with the same place of residence, regard themselves as more closely related than two brothers who have the same family name? This sort of attempt to transpose the primary and the secondary—to make the tail wag the dog—is surely scientifically and logically unsound. The fictitious extension of kinship terms to non-relatives ceases to be kinship classification; those who practise such extension are not so naïve but what they realize it to be an extension beyond the original application.

All is grist to Titiev's mill. Thus he cavils: "But what are 'genealogically traceable ties of blood relationship?'" "A genealogy is a test of an informant's memory and not a test of blood."<sup>14</sup> What of it? It is the only tool available. The same criticism can be leveled in lesser degree at our own recorded genealogies—they are not tests of blood either.

Again, it would be interesting to have examples to support the statement that "there is no evidence that the natives under consideration have the slightest interest in consanguinity."<sup>15</sup> What natives are without kinship terms expressing the concept of consanguinity?

Titiev arbitrarily delimits his problem by by-passing the matrilineal half of kinship: "For purposes of simplification I shall develop my hypothesis in terms of groupings through males."<sup>16</sup>

No one can quarrel with Dr. Titiev when he proposes "to define the evolutionary approach as 'a study of chronological changes of form in any aspect of culture.'"<sup>17</sup> But that a typological series selected from various contemporary peoples cannot be a real evolutionary, chronological series is as true in social organization as in material culture.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

<sup>13</sup> Titiev, p. 523.

<sup>14</sup> Titiev, p. 513.

<sup>15</sup> Titiev, p. 512.

<sup>16</sup> Titiev, p. 523.

<sup>17</sup> Titiev, p. 523.