

ASPECTS OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION IN A MAYA HAMLET^{1*}

Richard and Sally PRICE
Yale University

This paper first explores the principles which structure coparticipation in selected activities in a Tzotzil community in southern Mexico. In these activities, coparticipation is highly patterned, relatively invariant from one person to the next, and structured mainly by kinship ties, residential proximity, and the developmental cycle of the domestic group. Certain kinship ties, which normally involve coresidence at some point in the life cycle, are found to go far toward explaining joint participation in such activities as men's and women's work, household ceremonies, and recreation, although each of the activities studied tends to emphasize some kinds of relationships more than others. Second, the paper describes and analyzes quantitatively a number of socio-economic variables, revealing that even in this apparently homogeneous hamlet individual men rank remarkably consistently on each of these variables and that position in the general rank order implies genuine differences in styles of life.

Our otherwise modest findings may be of special interest because they are based on an exhaustive enumeration of the relevant social and economic ties for every member of the community. For example, a consideration of the brother tie in recreational drinking groups is based on lists of actual drinking "partners" for each man, and such groupings were often elicited not only for 1965, but back through time, so that the dynamics of group formation and disinte-

* This paper was written and submitted for publication in its present form in 1966.

¹ Five months of field work during the summers of 1965 and 1966 were supported by fellowship 5-F1-MH-22,007-04 of the National Institute of Mental Health (to R. Price). We are very grateful to Frank Cancian, George A. Collier, A. Kimball Romney, Renato and Michelle Rosaldo, and Evon Z. Vogt for criticizing earlier versions of this paper. They are, however, in no way responsible for its shortcomings.

gration could be analyzed.² The more observationally oriented (but similarly quantitative) techniques recently used by Nash (1964) to analyze frequencies of social interaction in another Maya community could have provided an important complement to our enumerations, which are more frequently drawn from interviews. Note that the interaction patterns we describe and the principles we infer are based largely on statistical rather than normative data, and that our discussion is therefore in no way intended as a complete description of "social structure".³

THE COMMUNITY

Muktahok, a hamlet of 200 Zinacanteco Indians, is located just outside the boundary of Zinacantan, in the *municipio* of Ixtapa, Chiapas, Mexico. Until the mid-1930's, when it received its *ejido*,⁴ Muktahok was part of a vast ranch, and each man gave one week's work in every four in return for the privilege of farming an unlimited quantity of marginal land. Within a 20-minute walk of the Pan American highway, Muktahok has easy access to both lowland Ladino towns, where much of its maize and coffee is sold, and to the hamlets of Zinacantan, stretching several thousand feet above, from which come many musicians, "shamans", and other ritual specialists, as well as *compadres* and kin.

² The quantitative data on which this paper is based include: 1) six community censuses taken for all households at periodic intervals over the past 25 years (five by the schoolteacher, one by the authors) and corrected by use of complete genealogies and charts of all changes in household composition and housemoving during this period; 2) complete lists of baptismal *compadres* for all adults as of 1965, as well, as 3) lists of coparticipants for each individual in the community in all activities discussed. Certain cases of unusual kinship categories (stemming from adoption, remarriage, and so forth) were included in more common types for purposes of presentation. For example, when such an assimilation did not seem to bias our analysis of a particular activity, we considered step-sons as sons.

³ Unfortunately, time in the field was insufficient to press very far toward a more qualitative analysis of the relationships studied, but we hope that the figures and brief discussion which we present may be of use toward that end to other students of Maya communities. Certain interesting social networks could not be studied—some, such as joking, because of lack of time, and others for technical reasons. For example, we had hoped to explore the influences on the choice of baptismal *compadres*, but it proved impossible to elicit sufficiently accurate data on the farming groups, drinking networks, etc., which existed at the time the choices were made.

⁴ *Ejido* refers to land taken from large landholders and given to landless communities, in a land reform program with origins in the Mexican revolution (see Edel, 1966).

The community is closely knit socially; 96% of people married between 1949 and 1965 who had lived permanently in Muktahok before marriage took spouses who had also grown up in Muktahok. The average household has "close kin"⁵ in a fourth of the other households, and is tied to another fourth by *compadrazgo* of baptism or marriage (the only types of *compadrazgo* in Muktahok). The twelve named patrilineages, though exogamous, have no corporate functions, and there is no consistent pattern of marital exchange. Housemoving is frequent, and precludes the formation of lineage "neighborhoods", as are found in parts of Zinacantan. Numerous activities are community-wide: funerals, bull-butcherings expeditions, recreational activities from basketball to dry-season deer hunting, frequent meetings to discuss *ejido* or school affairs, annual *K'in Krus* ceremonies,⁶ and so forth. The many ethnographic sources on Zinacantan are as applicable to Muktahok as to any of the outlying hamlets of the *municipio* of Zinacantan, and may be consulted for further details (e.g. Vogt 1966 and Vogt n.d.).

In 1965 Muktahok had thirty-nine households, ranging from young married couples without children to one three-generation, thirteen-person unit. In contrast to many Zinacanteco hamlets, Muktahok lacks the compound *sitio* (see Vogt 1961); yards are unfenced and land within the living area of the hamlet is communally, not patrilineally, owned.

Children normally live with their parents until marriage, when the couple traditionally comes to live in the home of the groom's parents; 84% of men now living in Muktahok lived in their fathers' houses when first married, for periods ranging from several months to more than a decade, and 79% of men established their first independent household "near" that of their father.⁷ Married brothers usually continue to live close to one another, even after their father's death, although by the time their own sons are of working age, they may move farther apart, and the cycle may begin anew. Many of the men who have not held to this residence pattern had no father or brothers;

⁵ Parent, child, sibling, parent's sibling, or sibling's child.

⁶ The *K'in Krus* ceremony is a complex of rituals occurring in May, led by a shaman. In other Zinacanteco hamlets, it is performed by the members of both localized patrilineages and waterhole groups. (See Vogt 1965:47-48.)

⁷ For statistical purposes, "near" and "far" in reference to residential proximity have quantitative definitions in this paper. "Near" means within 50 meters, while "far" means greater than 50 meters away. The average house in Muktahok is "near" only five of the 38 other houses.

most of these went to live in or near their father-in-law's household. (In fact, the most compact and influential grouping of households in Muktahok today consists of a man and his two married sons in one household, flanked by the households of his two married daughters, whose husbands are both without parents.)

PRINCIPLES OF COPARTICIPATION

Farming Groups

Muktahok men practice swidden agriculture, farming maize with some beans and squash — both in land surrounding the community and, to a lesser extent, in rented “Hot Country” fields several thousand feet below (see Vogt n.d. and Stauder 1966 for descriptions of Zinacanteco maize farming, and Price 1968 on local land use). Men usually work the fields they own alone or with coresident sons; farming in larger groups is reserved for Hot Country. Three rental and labor arrangements are practiced in Hot Country, where groups of men rent land together, choosing one man to negotiate with the Ladino land-owner for the entire group's fields. If the group includes members of only one household, the land is worked in common, and the harvest never divided. If the renting group includes members of several households, they may either divide the land immediately, with each household group working independently or, especially if the household heads are brothers, work the land in common, dividing the harvest according to the amount of labor invested. A large renting group often includes some households choosing the second alternative, some the third. Even when the members of a renting group divide the land and work independently, they cooperate closely in a number of ways. Together, they choose the ranch where they will rent, send their most respected member to strike the bargain with the landowner, hire a shaman for the ceremony they hold in common in the field, transport the harvest, and jointly pay the landowner in maize after the harvest.

The household is an indivisible economic unit, and junior males always work with the farming group of the household head in both owned and rented fields. Thus, both before marriage and during the post-marital period in the boy's father's house, every boy farms with his father and coresident brothers. When a married son moves into

an independent household, he invariably continues to participate in the father's Hot Country renting group, although he and his father do not necessarily continue to farm the land in common. Except in rare cases of extreme interpersonal conflict, brothers continue to rent land together for many years after their father's death, and the renting group splinters only as the sons of each brother become old enough to work, with each brother then forming the nucleus of a new group as the cycle begins again. The changing composition of renting groups through the domestic cycle may be seen in the mean age of heads of households who rent with *all* of their brothers who live in independent households (31.4 years), with only *some* of these brothers (48.5 years), and with *none* of them (58.1 years). The only men in Muktahok who do not follow this cycle of rental groups based on domestic cycle are men who have no living father, brothers or sons. One third of current rental groups either include such "extra" men or, rarely, are formed from the fusion of two very small father-brother-son-groups.

Women's Work Groups

Trips for water and firewood provide by far the most frequent opportunity for women from different households to socialize. During most of the year, the women of each household carry water in earthenware jugs on tumplines several times a day from waterholes five to twenty-five minutes away. But during the four driest months, two-hour trips to the river once or twice a day provide the only water. The household supply of firewood, the only cooking fuel, must be replenished several times a week, as groups of women, armed with billhooks and axes, fell branches and small trees in their husbands' fallow fields — up to an hour and a half away. These expeditions, like dry-season trips to the river for water and washing, normally take three to four hours. On routine trips to nearby waterholes, as few as two women or girls may go alone, but for washing, visits to farther waterholes, and all woodgathering expeditions, groups more usually include 6, 8, or more.

For women, just as for farming men, the household is the basic work unit. Before marriage, daughters always carry water and wood with their mother, their coresident sisters, and the rest of their

mother's group (see below).⁸ Upon marriage, a girl almost always goes to live with her husband's parents and does all household work under the direction of her mother-in-law. Although she now carries water and wood with this new group, a girl may, once a week or so, instead accompany her mother's group, and in some cases the two groups even work together from time to time as long as they have a common member. Once her husband establishes an independent household, even if it is close by his father's, the young wife again joins the group of her mother and sisters. A few women, having rejoined their mother-sister group, also occasionally carry water and wood with their mother-in-law (who in contrast to the mother in 9 of 10 cases now lives close by). Eighty per cent of women who live in independent households and who have a mother and/or sisters who also live independently carry water or wood daily with at least some of them (and in most cases all of them). Of the twenty per cent who do not regularly carry water and wood with their mother-sister group, a number still accompany them occasionally (though they normally go with the group of their mother-in-law in some cases, with their own daughters in others).

Unlike male sibling sets, whose solidarity in terms of work disintegrates through time, with middle-aged brothers no longer farming together, sisterbased work groups remain relatively stable, and once women have moved into independent households, the above figures are similar for all age groups. Thus, as long as they have living sisters, most women continue to carry water or wood with them daily, as they did before marriage. As women age and their sisters die, they work with their unmarried daughters, their coresident daughters-in-law, and those of their daughters who are already living independently of their mothers-in-law. Currently, one out of every four women in Muktahok has no living sisters and is in this final stage of the female work cycle.

Sister solidarity in work groups not only continues much longer than that of farming brothers but also spans considerably more geographical distance; for, while brothers tend to be neighbors, sisters are usually dispersed throughout the community. On the other hand, although kinship ties predominate over those of proximity, residential proximity is the key secondary principle in those cases in which only part of a potential mother-sister-daughter group works

⁸ Although the size of work groups varies from day to day and the whole group is usually not together during quick trips to nearby waterholes, we have analyzed the groups in terms of their maximal memberships.

together. In each of the nine mother-daughter or sister-sister dyads who currently do *not* carry water and wood together, the two women live "far" from each other.⁹

Curing Ceremonies

Complex curing ceremonies, replete with shamans, visits sacred points the community, ritual meals, and so forth, are held whenever an individual is seriously ill — perhaps once or twice a year in an average household (see Vogt n.d. and Silver 1966 for descriptions of Zinacanteco curing). For a fairly grave illness, every household invites at least six adults plus their children, while several invite as many as fourteen. On the afternoon before the ceremony, either the husband or wife visits each household to invite the guests and remind the women to arrive early to prepare the tortillas. Table 1 presents a summary of the percentages of several categories of kin that are invited to curing ceremonies.¹⁰ (Please read now note 10, which explains how to read Tables 1-4.)

TABLE 1
CURING CEREMONIES *

	<i>percentage invited</i>	
F/S	8/8	100%
B/B	23/30	70%
WF/DH	23/24	96%
WB/ZH	12/46	26%
WZH/WZH	6/26	23%
FB/BS	3/17	18%
MB/ZS	0/24	0%
<i>compadres</i> of baptism	2/84	2%
others	23/931	2%

* Table 1 tabulates relationships between household heads, and includes all households except the 4 in which elderly widows live with a married son (since it is unclear whether the dead husband or the married son should be counted as the "head"). The ties indicated are directional -i.e. if two households invite each other, the tie is counted as 2/2; if only one of the two invites the other, it is counted as 1/2.

⁹ The difference from the expected value is significant at the .05 level by Fisher's exact test.

¹⁰ In this paper, the following abbreviations are used in kinship dyads: F (father), M (mother), S (son), D (daughter), B (brother), Z (sister), H (husband), and W (wife). In Tables 1-4, the percentage of dyads which in-

Note that curing ceremonies, unlike weddings or housebuilding rites (see below) include few non-kin (friends, *compadres*, or neighbors). There is no variation dependent on whether the man, the wife, or one of their immature children is the "patient". (The absence of the child's "godparents" in curing ceremonies contrasts with their important role in their godchild's wedding.) During a child's courtship, the "fiancé" is invited to all his future in-laws' curing ceremonies. If, during post-martial residence in the father's household, either the son or his wife becomes ill, the young wife's parents—but not her other kin—are invited in addition to the usual guests of the household.

Birth ceremonies, conducted by a midwife, occur anytime from a day to a week after delivery, and although involving distinct rituals, include the same guests as would be invited for a major curing ceremony.

In both curing and birth ceremonies, one of the women present must supervise the preparation of the ritual meal, and in every household, the oldest living mother (or step-mother)—whether the man's or the woman's—performs this function. If neither spouse has a mother, either the couple invites any of several elderly women, or the woman herself supervises the meal. In all cases, age is important; the eight women who ever serve in this capacity are among the nine oldest women in the community.

*Weddings*¹¹

Weddings in Muktahok are the only activity studied in which complete bilaterality structures the invitation lists.¹² The groom's

interact in a given activity is based on the total number of days that *could* interact. Thus, a tabulation of 2/4 F/S dyads means that there are, in Muktahok, 4 F/S dyads in which both men *ever* participate in the activity in question, and that the members of 2 of these dyads actually interact with each other in that activity. Each table indicates whether it tabulates reciprocal ties (in which each dyad is counted once) or directional ones (in which each dyad is counted from the point of view of each member). Regardless of whether the dyads were counted once (reciprocally) or twice (directionally), they are always presented *in the tables* as reciprocal dyads, since we found no significant differences according to direction; e.g. in a wife's brother/sister's husband tie, the WB invites the ZH to his curing ceremonies in as many cases as the ZH invites the WB. The categories of dyads presented in the tables are those for which the percentage of interaction is high in most activities.

¹¹ See Collier n. d. en Zinacanteco weddings.

¹² Twenty-seven guest lists were analyzed.

and bride's parents invite separately — from 10 to 25 on each side — and the guests remain in two distinct groups throughout the ceremony, becoming each others' *compadres* near its conclusion. But on each side, whether few or many people are invited, mother's and father's kin (and within these groups, male and female relatives) are equally represented. In addition to kin, godparents of the bride and groom are always invited, as are certain older respected members of the community who attend all weddings. A few *compadres* and unrelated friends may come, and ritual specialists and musicians must also be present, but come from neighboring hamlets.

Housebuilding Ceremonies

New houses, depending on roof type, require varying cash and labor expenditures and call for somewhat different ceremonies. Only for tileroofed houses is wage labor used (often the same men who are hired for agricultural work — see below); musicians may attend, and a shaman usually presides over the new house ceremony, burying a chicken in the floor. Tarpaper roofs, considerably cheaper than tile, are a recent innovation; construction is especially easy and the following ceremony is small and has no shaman. The construction of thatch-roofed houses — the traditional and still most common type — requires no cash outlay. The amount of labor needed for this house type is comparable to that necessary for tile, but the work is lighter and is arranged as work exchanges rather than wage labor. Ceremonies with shamans for thatched houses (the rule twenty years ago) are becoming rare, especially when an old house site is reused. Regardless of house type, a ritual meal is always held after completion of construction, to which all men who have helped at any stage are invited.

Even though land is not owned by the patrilineage, residence patterns tend to produce groupings of patri-kin, and a man's father, brothers, and sons form the core of the housebuilding group.¹³ Other than these particular relatives, the man's and woman's kin (e.g. father's brother, father's brother's son, brother's or sister's son, etc.) are equally represented, with frequency of attendance dependent on genealogical closeness. Housebuilding groups are notable for the frequent inclusion of *compadres*, neighbors, and other unrelated friends. At the ritual meal, however, male relatives are always

¹³ The sample consists of twenty housebuildings.

accompanied by their wives; *compadres* and friends only sometimes bring wives; and paid laborers always come alone.

Informal Drinking Partners

Heavy non-ritual drinking occurs fairly frequently, especially on Sundays and at fiestas. Informal drinking sets up an important network of community-wide ties; when we elicited the names of the men each individual most often seeks out as drinking partners (though he may never drink with the entire group at any one time), the mean number of names given for an individual was nine, including men from one out of four of the other households in the community. Even though men participate frequently in informal drinking with most of their own and their wife's male "close kin" and the husbands of female "close kin" (see note 5), a full 52% of drinking partners are neither these kin nor *compadres*.

TABLE 2
INFORMAL DRINKING PARTNERS *

	<i>percentage who are drinking partners</i>	
F/S	4/4	100%
B/B	16/17	94%
WF/DH	15/15	100%
WB/ZH	27/35	77%
WZH/WZH	4/15	27%
FB/BS	6/11	55%
MB/ZS	6/13	46%
<i>compadres</i> of bapstim	35/44	80%
others	78/666	12%

* The sample includes all dyads in which both men ever engage in informal drinking (n = 41 men); each dyad is counted only once.

Note that a man drinks with almost every man with whom either he or his wife has ever lived in one household as well as the husbands of women with whom he has ever lived in one household. Father's brother, the next most frequent kin category men drink with, is considerably less important. Drinking is the activity in which

a man participates most frequently with his wife's fathers and brothers. *Compadres* of baptism and marriage account for 30% of all drinking partners, but though a man drinks with a high percentage of his *compadres* of baptism, he does so with fewer than a third of his *compadres* of marriage. This confirms our general observation that ties between a man and his baptismal *compadres*, who are few and chosen by mutual agreement, are much stronger than those with his numerous marriage *compadres*.¹⁴

Fighting

Fistfights between men in Muktahok are usually settled with the payment of liquor to a local arbitrator, though more rarely they involve knives or guns and result in jail sentences in Ladino towns. For each man, we elicited the names of men with whom he has had fights.

TABLE 3
FIGHTING*

	<i>percentage who have fought</i>	
F/S	1/4	25%
B/B	7/17	41%
WF/DH	6/14	43%
WB/ZH	12/31	39%
WZH/WZH	5/16	31%
FB/BS	0/14	0%
MB/ZS	1/12	8%
<i>compadres</i> of baptism	7/43	16%
others	37/551	7%

* The sample includes all dyads in which both men are known to have ever had a fistfight (n = 38 men); each dyad is counted only once.

Note that men fight most often with the same types of kin with whom they participate in most other activities. (But although percentage of dyads who have fought is fairly uniform among the kin

¹⁴ Marriage *compadres* were not included in the tables both because they were consistently less important in the activities studied and because our lists of marriage *compadres* were complete for only 12 men.

categories in Table 3, the underlying tensions in each type of relationship undoubtedly stem from quite different sources.) In fact, well over half of the men who have fought together are regular informal drinking partners, and all 161 fights described to us occurred while the participants were drunk. The tabulation of fighting dyads suggests a contrast between *compadrazgo* and close kinship relationships; although men drink with baptismal *compadres* as much as with close kin, they fight with only a third as often.

Children's Visiting

Although children, before they are old enough to work, stay with their mothers most of the time, they also spend part of every day at other households. Table 4 depicts the percentage of households in which the children regularly visit given kin. (Children visit a mean of four other households fairly regularly.)

TABLE 4
CHILDREN'S VISITING*

	<i>percentage visited</i>	
F/S	6/7	86%
B/B	14/33	42%
WF/DH	20/23	87%
WB/ZH	22/42	52%
WZH/WZH	14/25	56%
FB/BS	4/11	36%
MB/ZS	2/10	20%
<i>compadres</i> of baptism	9/86	10%
others	12/903	1%

* The table counts the 30 households with young children as potential visitors and all 39 households as potential hosts. The relationships tabulated are between the children's father and the head of the household that the children might visit. A dyad with young children in both households is counted twice (2/2) if the children of both households visit each other, and only once (1/2) if the children of just one of the households visit the other household.

Note that three-fourths (76/103) of the households visited are those of the children's grandparents or the parents' siblings (the first 5 categories listed). Residential proximity joins kinship in

influencing visiting patterns; children visit three-fourths of "near" parents' siblings, but less than half of those who live "far".¹⁵ Furthermore, excluding the houses of grandparents or parents' siblings, children visit 23% of "near", but only 6% of "far" households. And it is worth mention that although only 9/86 parents' baptismal compadres are visited, eight of these nine are the visitors' god-parents.

Summary

In a number of activities, the individual's position in the domestic cycle is a crucial determinant of which kin ties are most important. For example, in Hot Country farming, brothers are more likely to participate in a single renting group if their father is alive and they have no grown sons of their own. A woman, too, changes work companions according to whether she is: *a*) unmarried and living with her mother; *b*) newly married and temporarily living with her mother-in-law, *c*) established in her own household without daughters-in-law, or *d*) living with her daughters-in-law. Furthermore, attendance at curing ceremonies for any individual depends partially on whether he is: *a*) engaged (in which case the fiancé comes); *b*) married and living with his parents or husband's parents (when many of man's kin, but only the parents of his wife attend), or *c*) living independently (when many people from both the man's and woman's families are invited).

One might be tempted to interpret the data on men's activities as an expression of traditional Zinacanteco patrilineal ideology, even though patrilineages in Muktahok—in contrast to those in the hamlets of Zinacantan proper—control no resources, such as land. For, a man's father, brothers, and sons are his most constant companions in those work, recreation, and ritual ties which we studied, as well as in a number of minor activities not discussed above (e.g. year-round nighttime hunting). Note, however, that although kinship structures all these activities, it does so only within an extremely narrow range. In fact, the single criterion of coresidence, as linked to the developmental cycle of the domestic group, provides an alternative and perhaps more direct interpretation. It is precisely those people (or the spouses of those people) with

¹⁵ See note 7. This difference is significant at the .01 level by the Chisquare test.

whom a man or his wife has once lived in the same household who form the core of his network of social interaction throughout life. For example, a man living in his own house interacts with those genealogically close patri-kin who have never lived with him (FB, FBS, and so forth) far less frequently than with members of his wife's family of orientation (or their spouses).¹⁶

Residential proximity proved to be a secondary influence on local social interaction. It is interesting to compare the importance of this principle in the structuring of Amatenango social organization (Nash 1964). In Amatenango, "...next door residents even though distantly related, interact with greater frequency than close relatives, such as one's sister, who may live no more than a block away" (Nash 1964: 357-58). And the range of people with whom the Amatenango woman interacts is particularly limited by residential proximity (*Ibid.*). This, of course, contrasts with Muktahok, where close kin ties are far more important in daily interaction than residential proximity, and where women carry on most of their extra-household social interaction with sisters scattered about the community. The functions, largely of social control, which Nash attributes to the neighborhood group in Amatenango (1964: 352, 358) seem to be performed in Muktahok by the community as a whole, and it seems likely that this is mainly a reflection of the relative sizes of the two communities.

Finally, we found that the *compadre* bond is especially frequent between drinking partners. (It is also an important tie between employers and their agricultural wage laborers, between men involved in economic transactions, and so forth —almost always with the "higher status" person [employer, money lender, etc.] serving as godfather for the children of the "lower status" person [wage-laborer, money borrower, etc.]) *Compadrazgo* is notably unimportant in curing ceremonies, Hot Country renting groups, and fighting. Consistently, the strength of the relationship between baptismal *compadres* far overshadows that between marriage *compadres*.

¹⁶ Our data do not allow us to test how much former coresidence determines interaction patterns, and how much these are based on specific kinship distinctions. To do this, we would need to contrast the patterns of people who had coresided and those who had not *within* each class of kin dyad. In fact, there are almost no cases of a relevant kinship relation in which some of the pairs have lived together in a household and some have not.

STRATIFICATION

In this section we examine variations among individual men on a number of socio-economic variables. Rank orders of men are found to be remarkably consistent on all of these variables (e.g. scale and type of agricultural operation, level of participation in civil and religious offices, extent of *compadrazgo* ties, and so forth). This finding, as well as the nature and extent of variations within the general rank order suggest that stratification may be a crucial feature of the local social system.

Table 5 (below) presents a ranking of 25 of the community's household heads on each of nine variables. The 14 household heads who are not included in the table are all those under 30 years of age, since these men are generally too young to have participated fully in the activities included. For example, none of these 14 has had the opportunity to complete the three religious cargos required of men in Muktahok (see below), and only two have as yet become godparents for children in more than a single family. It is important to note that the 25 men who are included in the table distribute randomly by age on each of the nine variables.

Each of the men is scored either "high" (+), "medium" (blank), or "low" (—) on seven of the variables. For the first two variables, however, only "high" and "not high" were distinguishable. The five cases in which data were lacking on one of man's scores have been indicated. The following paragraphs describe the nine variables, and explain the divisions into "high", "medium", and "low".

1. *Cargos*. Since the 1930's, Muktahok has maintained its own religious "cargo" system, modeled after the one in Zinacantan Center (see Cancian 1965). Four positions must be filled each year, and although the expenses of each are identical, one is designated as "senior" (*bankilal*) and connotes special authority and prestige. Every man is drafted three times, beginning a few years after marriage, and thereafter at 5-8 year intervals; the selection of cargo holders for each of the four positions is the responsibility of the community's elders. The first column of Table 5 scores men "high" if they have served one or more senior cargos, "not high" if they served three junior cargos. The four men for whom no score is given are those who have not taken all three cargos.

2. *Civil Positions*. The two most important civil positions in Muktahok are President of the Ejido Commission and President

of the Annual Fiesta Committee. There are no expenses involved in either office. Men who have ever served in one or both of these is scored "high"; all others are scored "not high".

3. *Maize Production.* Maize provides the major source of income to all but a few men in Muktahok. Those men who earn much money in construction jobs on the highway or in the state capital are young men and therefore do not appear in the rankings. Men whose households harvest 13-35 *fanegas* of maize per year (worth approximately \$100 - \$280 US¹⁷) are scored "high"; those harvesting 6-9 *fanegas* (\$48 - \$72 US) are scored "medium"; and those harvesting 2-5 *fanegas* (\$16 - \$40 US) are scored "low". The number of *fanegas* harvested by each household represents the arithmetic mean of independent estimates by three informants.

4. *Wage Labor.* Because of the wide range in maize production, different households require very different amounts of labor. The men in households which annually produce only a few *fanegas* often spend up to 70 days at scattered times throughout the year working for wages at \$.40 US per day (plus meals). Households with especially large production hire these men to help in their extensive maize fields, while households with moderate production may or may not hire some labor, depending upon the number of men in the household. We have scored employers of wage labor "high", wage laborers "low", and men who neither hire labor nor work for wages "medium".

5. *Compadres of Baptism.* Parents in Muktahok generally choose a couple to be godparents to three of their children in a row; the couple is asked to be godparents for one child (thus becoming *compadres* with the child's parents) and automatically serves in the same capacity for the next two children born. Thus, the number of baptismal *compadres* each couple has is partly a function of the size of their family. To eliminate this bias, we have counted only those *compadres* for whose children a given couple serves as godparents. In the table, men who serve as godfather in three or more families are scored "high"; those who do so in two families are "medium"; and those who are godfathers in one or no families are "low". (Through an oversight, we neglected to elicit *compadrazgo* data on one of the men.)

¹⁷ See Cancian 1965:65 for definitions of units of measure used locally for maize.

6. *Maize Loans*. Small amounts of maize (usually 1-5 *almudes* - see note 17) may be borrowed without interest. While almost all loans occur between worker and employer, *compadres* of baptism, or close kin, certain men never need to borrow maize and others are apparently never asked to loan it. In Table 5, men marked "high" loan maize to certain other men in the community; those scored "medium" neither lend to nor borrow from anyone, and those marked "low" borrow maize from one or more of the lenders.

7. *Maize Sales*. Occasionally men with little maize from their own harvests ask to buy a few *almudes* from men who have a surplus. Like maize loans, these transactions are considered as favors, and most often occur between worker and employers, two *compadres*, or two kinsmen. In the table, men who sell to others are marked "high"; those who neither buy nor sell are "medium"; and those who buy maize are "low".

8. *Land Rental*. Each year a number of fields owned by Muktahok men are rented out at \$3.20 US per *almud* planted (equivalent to about one hectare in area) to other local men who wish to expand their maize operations beyond the limits of their own fields. There are always more potential lessees than willing lessors, and generally it is those men who can offer wage labor or other economic favors in addition to the rental fee who obtain the land. Men who regularly rent extra land are scored "high", those who neither rent nor rent out land "medium", and those who usually rent out some of their own land "low".

9. *Money loans*. Loans of money, like maize loans and sales, are considered as favors, and no interest is charged if both men live in Muktahok (though rates over 100% per annum may be charged to other Zinacantecos). Amounts generally ranging from \$1 - \$8 US are most often borrowed from an employer, *compadre*, or kinsman, and are generally paid back within a year. In Table 5, money lenders are marked "high", borrowers "low", and those who do neither "medium".

Table 5 has been crudely scaled, i.e. arranged from most to least by both row and column totals — from top to bottom, and from left to right, respectively. Note that men in the top nine positions generally have taken senior cargos, annually produce a mean of 22 *fanegas* of maize, hire agricultural wage labor, serve as godfathers in three or more families, lend both maize and money, sell maize,

TABLE 5

RANK ORDER OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS¹⁸

Household Heads	cargos	civil positions	maize production	wage labor	compadres of baptism	maize loans	maize sales	land rental	money loans
1	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+, -
4	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+, -
6	+	+	+	+	+	+			+
7	0		+	+		+	+	+	+
8	+		+			+	+		+
9	+	+	+	+	-		+		
10	+			+	+				
11		+		+	+		+	-	-
12				+	-	+	+, -		+
13			+		+				
14	+		+				+		-
15	+				-		-		-
16	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
17	0			-	0	-	-		-
18	0					-	-	-	-
19						-	-	-	-
20	+		-	-	-		-	-	-
21				-	-		-	-	-
22	0		-		-	-	-	-	-
23			-	-	-		-	-	-
24			-	-	-		-	-	-
25			-	-	-		-	-	-

+ = senior cargo/civil position/13-35 fanegas of maize/hires labor/godfather in 3 or more households/lends maize/sells maize/rents land/loans money.

- = 2-5 fanegas of maize/works for wages/godfather in 1 or fewer households/borrows maize/buys maize/rents out land/borrows money.

0 = data lacking.

¹⁸ The size of landholdings controlled by each household does not correlate with the general rank-order. Although four of the five largest landholders are among the top six men in Table 5, landholdings distribute randomly for all others. Some men with very little land rank high in the table, while others with three or four times as much are among the lowest in the rank order. For a discussion of the variations in landholdings and the means by which households obtain their land, see Price 1968.

and rent extra land. If we assign a value of +1 to "high" scores, 0 to "medium" (and "no data"), and -1 to "low", the mean score per man in this group is +7.0. Men in the next seven positions are only sporadically "high" in the various rankings and have a mean score of +0.9. The lowest nine men have almost no "high" scores; their mean is -5.3.

The highest ranking men could fairly be styled Muktahok's "entrepreneurs". They seem to display strong motivation to expand agricultural production, propensity to take small economic risks, marked ability to handle people, and willingness to do steady physical labor. Furthermore, they seem particularly responsible, and elicit general respect in the community regardless of their age. In contrast, the lowest ranking men, who own on the average about as much land as the "entrepreneurs" (though they less frequently acquired it through their own initiative), lead a hand-to-mouth existence, renting out much of their land, hiring themselves out as field labor when cash is needed (sometimes on their own rented-out land), and growing barely enough to feed their families (a mean of only 5 *fanegas*). They are never selected for prestigious civil and religious positions and although they enjoy completely normal social relations on a personal basis, are not afforded the general respect given men who rank higher on our variables.

In analyzing the social structure of Muktahok, with its small population, its emphasis on participation by everyone in community activities, its abbreviated cargo system with required service and uniform expenses, and its relatively egalitarian distribution of land, many of the variables which could serve as indices of prestige and socio-economic stratification in other Zinacanteco hamlets are irrelevant. Nevertheless, the rankings on the variables in Table 5 are quite consistent, indicating the presence of significant stratification in Muktahok. This consistent arrangement of rankings would contrast with that in many other societies in which, for example, certain individuals enjoy economic success, others hold the greatest political authority, still others specialize in ritual roles, and so forth. In Muktahok there seems to be no such discrepancy between success in these different areas; the various rank orders tend to duplicate rather than complement each other. (It is also clear, however, that success in any one ranking rarely guarantees or precludes success in any other.)

What data we have on the practices of individuals through time indicate that men rarely change their positions in the general rank

order as they grow older and move through different stages of the domestic cycle. For example, all men who now hire wage labor (and only these men) were already so when they were first married. Civil positions and senior cargos have also been held by men at all stages of the domestic cycle and at all ages. Even when men had not fully participated in some of the activities ranked in Table 5 (e.g. when they had taken only one or two cargos), they had usually already begun the wage labor and rental practices, the patterns of economic transactions, and so forth that later contributed to their position in the general rank order of Table 5. This stability of individual men's positions in the general rank order can be seen in data from 10, 20, and even 30 years ago.

Before 1935, however, when Muktahok was part of a large ranch and had no *ejido*, not all of the same ranking scales (variables) would have been relevant, since the bases for prestige, economic success, and so forth were presumably quite different. We know that wage labor was then practiced much as it is today, but there was no cargo system, the structure of civil offices was different, and because of non-ownership of land and only limited time for household agricultural production, the economic basis of Muktahok was distinct from that of the present, which centers on agricultural production by households on individually controlled land.

Over the past few years, the economic opportunities open to the community's men, and perhaps even certain measures of prestige for young men, have again begun to undergo changes. Despite Muktahok's growing population, there is no possibility for an addition to its *ejido*, since all privately owned ranches within the legal distance of the community are too small to be expropriated for the *ejido* program. Young men are therefore faced with a land shortage more severe than any experienced by their fathers and grandfathers — during either the ranch or the early years of the *ejido*. A few of the men in their twenties have taken construction jobs outside the community, which pay four times the wages of agricultural labor in Muktahok, rather than attempting to make a living solely on their limited *ejido* fields. The contact with Spanish speaking co-workers and the exposure to Ladino towns and cities which these men are experiencing are already beginning to alter traditional attitudes toward agriculture, religious and civil positions in the community, education, and so forth.

It seems likely, then, that the variables we have used in Table 5 were not all relevant when Muktahok was a ranch (before 1935) and that they will need to be either replaced or complemented by

others in order to explore prestige, socio-economic stratification, and so forth in the near future. For this reason, it would be impossible to test the continuity of any family's position in the rank order through successive generations, since we are limited to a 30-year period (1935-1965), when the measurable bases for prestige and economic success in the community were relatively stable. Our data on these rankings through time, even within this period, are not adequate to trace father-son continuity of position in the hierarchy, but we do know that brothers tend to occupy very similar positions in our rank-order. Unfortunately, our data do not allow us to determine how much this similarity of rank depends on the father's position and the influence he had on his sons' standing in the community, and how much on the similarity in motivation (e.g. *n* Achievement) which we think we perceive between brothers in Muktahok.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CANCIAN, Frank

- 1965 *Economics and Prestige in a Maya Community: the religious cargo system in Zinacantan*. Stanford.

COLLIER, Jane F.

- 1968 *Courtship and Marriage in Zinacantan*. Tulane University. *Middle American Research Institute*, Publ. 25. New Orleans.

EDEL, Matthew

- 1966 El Ejido en Zinacantan. In E. Z. Vogt (ed.): *Los Zinacantecos: un pueblo Tzotzil de los Altos de Chiapas*, pp. 163-82. México, D. F.

NASH, June

- 1964 *The Structuring of Social Relations: an activity analysis*. *Estudios de Cultura Maya*, vol. iv, pp. 335-59. México, D. F.

PRICE, Richard

- 1968 *Land Use in a Maya Community*. *International Archives of Ethnology*. In press.

SILVER, Daniel

- 1966 *Shamanism in Zinacantan*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

STAUDER, Jack

- 1966 Algunos Aspectos de la Agricultura Zinacanteca en Tierra Caliente. In E. Z. Vogt (ed.): *Los Zinacantecos: un pueblo Tzotzil de los Altos de Chiapas*, pp. 145-62. México, D. F.

VOGT, Evon Z.

- 1961 Some Aspects of Zinacantan Settlement Patterns and Ceremonial Organization. *Estudios de Cultura Maya*, vol. 1, pp. 131-45. México, D. F.
- 1965 Ceremonial Organization in Zinacantan. *Ethnology*, vol. 4,1, pp. 39-52.
- 1969 *Zinacantan, a Maya Community in Highland Chiapas*. Cambridge.

VOGT, Evon Z. (ed.)

- 1966 *Los Zinacantecos: un pueblo Tzotzil de los Altos de Chiapas*. México, D. F.