NOTES AND REVIEWS

Grammar, Style, and Meaning in a Maya Manuscript

1. Introduction. This well-illustrated and extensively annotated book[1] presents the latest in a series of translations of Yucatec Maya texts that Munro Edmonson (ME) has produced, including his 1982 translation of the Chilam Balam of Tizimin. The present work includes 6,498 lines of Maya text, with facing English gloss, laid out in two columns and divided into numbered "chapters" that ME has inferred from the text. The footnotes, shown on the bottom of each page, contain helpful comparative references to other works, and many interesting speculations and interpretations by ME. A long introduction outlines ME's view of Maya literature, history, and the thematic content of the texts. Four appendixes provide important information for the reader interested in working through ME's version of the text in comparison with those of other scholars (appendix A), in relation to the geographical sites he interprets as a "ceremonial cycle" (appendix B), in relation to the Mayan calendar (appendix C), and in relation to the calendrically central events of "seating the *katun*." A 26-page index provides a valuable tool for working with the text, and the 38 illustrations, reproduced photographically from the original, show both the script of the manuscript and the drawings that were part of it. In all, this is a major contribution to scholarship on the Maya, which makes accessible an invaluable corpus of information for linguists, anthropologists, and historians. ME's (1982) translation of the Book of Chilam Balam of Tizimin, also in the Texas Pan American Series, has the same basic format as the more recent work. A shorter but still substantial introduction precedes 5,514 lines of well-annotated Maya text with facing gloss, followed by an appendix summarizing the calendar and a useful index. The two works will remain basic references for research on Maya language and culture.[2]

In the introduction to the Chumayel, ME outlines a general view of the development of Maya language and literature, based on his research. He posits two dialect areas for sixteenth-century Maya, an eastern dialect, identified primarily with the Itza lineage of Chichen Itza (mod. *či' č'e'en 'ii/a*), and a

[IJAL, vol. 54, no. 3, July 1988, pp. 331-69]
Permission to reprint a note or review printed in this section may be obtained only from the author(s).

331

western dialect, identified with the Xiu lineage. Chumayel, the place of origin of the Chilam Balam of Chumayel, was a Xiu town, as evidenced in the negative terms in which the Itza are described in the manuscript (p. 2). Moreover, the Chumayel shows three times as many Spanish borrowings as does the Tizimin, which corresponds to the fact that the Spanish advanced into the Yucatan peninsula from the west (p. 3). These generalizations are suggestive, but considerably more research on Maya language will be required to substantiate the dialect boundary ME posits. He observes that nearly half of the language of the text conforms to the description of "classical Yucatec Maya" presented by McQuown (1967)[3] (p. 3); the remainder is apparently either more modern, or more archaic. Classical Maya, as ME rightly notes, is substantially different from modern Maya. This is so particularly in general vocabulary, some of the derivational morphology, and the inventory and word order of particles. At the same time, there are many basic features, at all levels, that remain constant, and a knowledge of modern Maya is an invaluable asset in translating classical documents, just as it is for epigraphers working on pre-Conquest glyphic texts. ME slightly overstates the difference between the modern and classical languages, but this could be due to the difficult and esoteric character of these particular texts. Early post-Conquest letters, unquestionably composed in the sixteenth century, can be read much more easily, from a modern perspective, than parts of the Chilam Balam texts, suggesting that it is not just the language that has changed, but the discourse genres as well. ME's translations have helped make this clear, by making the Chilam Balam texts more accessible to close analysis.

In this review I shall examine ME's edition of the Chilam Balam of Chumayel (henceforth "the Chumayel"). I begin in 2 with the overall organization and translation of the text, starting with (2.1) the chapters, then (2.2) the grammatical basis of lines and segmentation of lexical items, (2.3) two constructions and their meanings, and (2.4) a subjunctive verbal mode apparently indexing prophetic address. My concern throughout is to specify the relation between the Maya forms, so far as they can be identified, and ME's transliteration and translation of them. In 3 the role of style in the Maya text is explored, beginning (3.1) with the semantic couplet and ME's proposal that couplets be used as a tool in translation. Sections 3.2-3.3 illustrate other forms of grammatical parallelism in the Chumayel. In the accounts of the *may* ceremonies (3.2), syntactic and semantic parallelism are used together in a list of place-names, many of which are accompanied by etymologies deriving them from descriptions of inaugural acts performed there. For part of the ceremony, these acts consist of naming events, in which native nobles "nominated" places. In the description of the *hab* '(365-day) year' ceremony (3.3), a different principle of style is at work. Referents are introduced into the discourse in a cyclic fashion, in repeating series ordered according to the spatial quadrants East > North > West > South.

One of the difficult questions facing translators of Mayan texts, hieroglyphic as well as romanized, is how to determine the generic categories relative to which

---

[3] There is what must be a typographical error in the bibliography, since McQuown (1967) Classical Quiche is cited, rather than (1967) Classical Yucatec. The text makes clear that it is the latter that ME intends.

interpretation is to be framed. Labels such as "historical," "prophetic," "calendrical," "mythological," and "ritual" are commonly attested in studies of Mayan literature, and trade on perceived differences of discourse form and content. The examples in 3 provide a context for examining some of the generic diversity in the Chumayel, while showing the close links between grammatical and stylistic analysis, transliteration, and translation.

Unavoidably, this review is selective in the choice of issues and examples treated. For reasons of length, my remarks are confined mainly to the first third of the text, corresponding to the sixteenth century in ME's chronology. I have not examined the entire text in the same detail, but having worked with ME's (1982) translation of the Tizimin, and perused the remainder of the Chumayel, I consider the treatment of the lines under discussion to be a fair indicator of the whole work. ME has taken the position that Maya literary and historical narrative is organized centrally, if not uniquely, by principles of semantic couplets, identified and interpreted without reference to grammatical structure (because not formally based; see 3.1 below), and moreover that these couplets are the key to translating the sometimes enigmatic language of the texts. This is a perilous stance for any translator to take: it amounts to separating translation from the grammar of the original language and anchoring it instead to a single, relatively vague discourse device. The result is a translation whose accuracy is in places open to substantial question. Rather than attempting to list out every infelicity, I shall simply illustrate the kinds of problems to which this approach is heir, and the kinds of solutions available in a more systematic framework. At the same time, I try to show something of the historical, cultural, and linguistic import of the texts for students of Middle America.

It will be evident that this review proceeds from assumptions different from ME's. I assume that no appeal to semantic organization can take the place of an accurate grammatical analysis of the object language. ME's attempt to separate these two in fact leaves him with a "semantics" based solely on lexical items. The related claim that Maya style can be reduced to the couplet is an oversimplification: important though couplets may be under certain circumstances, they are part of a larger system of Maya style, which does govern aspects of grammatical form and does affect the semantic structure of the text. It is worth stating explicitly that the translation is, in places, very difficult. Lacking a comprehensive description of "classical Maya" grammar (McQuown 1967), and given the significant changes between the classical and modern language, many problems of interpretation arise. To complicate matters, the texts are esoteric—sometimes semantically opaque and grammatically nonstandard. As a result, any set of hypotheses is open to criticism, making explicitness of statement all the more necessary.

2. Chapter, line, and word in the Chumayel.

2.1. Chapters. One of the most salient characteristics of ME's version of the Chumayel text is that it is chunked into chapters with descriptive titles which ME has inserted as a guide to the reader. The titles summarize the main theme of the text and are numbered 1-46. Each chapter corresponds to a period in the

Mayan calendar according to ME's interpretation, and this period is shown in bold print at the beginning. In addition to their Mayan coefficients, ME has split up the chapters into the (Gregorian) centuries to which they apparently correspond, eighth through nineteenth. It is this Gregorian linear time that provides the organizing principle of the chapters, since ME has more or less totally reordered the original manuscript. This is perhaps the single most audacious feature of the work. Although he does not address the question, it appears that some of his chapters are segmented in accordance with signs or layout features of the original manuscript, while some have been individuated on the basis of inference. The periodization of the chapters is entirely inferential, and ME has provided a very useful concordance in Appendix A for readers interested in reconstructing the original order of segments.

In order to appreciate the great discrepancy between ME's version and the original manuscript, consider the first ten chapters. In ME's text, his chapters 1–10 correspond to the following original folios: 1 (40), 2 (42), 3 (42), 4 (53), 5 (53), 6 (54), 7 (57), 8 (54), 9 (57), 10 (57). Conversely, the first ten folios from the original correspond to the following chapters in ME's version: 1 (15), 2 (12), 3 (16), 4 (27), 5 (39), 6 (23), 7 (32), 8 (30), 9 (29), 10 (41).[4]

Nowhere in the Chumayel does ME make explicit the evidence or rationale for so fundamentally altering the original of which his work is a translation (or more accurately, a reorganization). For this, readers must turn to his earlier translation of the Chilam Balam of Tizimin (1982), where he addresses the question of chronology.[5] The Book of Tizimin "constitutes an outline history of Yucatan from the seventh century to the nineteenth, with explicit coverage of each *katun* (approximately twenty years) from 1441 to 1848" (1982:xi). ME sees Mayan historical consciousness as dominated by "a sense of cyclical repetition and by a profound faith that correct calendrical calculation will enable the priests to predict the fate of the next cycle" (1982:xi). This is what ME calls "prophetic history," in which "the history of any one *katun* may be taken as equivalent to that of any other with the same number. There is no linear order in prophetic history" (1982:xii).[6] Given the twin premises that the text under review is historical, and that it has no inherent linear sequence across its chapters, ME's reordering is presumed to be irrelevant to the correct interpretation of the discourse. If anything, it would greatly clarify the objective sequence of events described in the text, while filtering out variation due to recopying and scribal

---

[4] The actual numbers of the original folia are listed by ME but not reproduced here. What I have done is list out in sequence the first ten of the original folia that ME has translated.

[5] This earlier translation has also been chunked into chapters and reordered in the manner of the Chumayel.

[6] This statement alludes to the Mayan calendar, a complex system I shall not attempt to sketch. ME states his own interpretation of the calendar in several places, including the introduction to the Chumayel (1986:7–14) and the appendix to the Tizimin (1982:195). See also Sharer (1983:chap. 16).

error.[7] If these premises turn out to be false, however, then the text has been jumbled rather than restored.

A further factor encouraging the reordering is ME's observation that the manuscripts of the books of Mani, Tizimin, and Chumayel contain versions of the same texts, with minor variations, but IN DIFFERENT ORDERS. The implication is that discrepancies are reflective of the individual and partly accidental histories of the manuscripts, while their commonality is indicative of their shared object, the prophetic Ur History of the Maya. As evidence of the plausibility of his approach, ME (1982:xiii) presents a table summarizing the generalization that, when reordered, the earlier chapters show very few Spanish borrowings, followed by an exponential increase throughout subsequent chapters. This makes sense under the reasonable assumption that the chapters corresponding to later periods would show proportionately more Spanish, as Yucatec society was increasingly transformed during the colonial period.

It would be most useful to work out the details of Nahuatl and Spanish borrowings in the several Books of Chilam Balam, and compare these with the incidence and identity of borrowings in nonliterary texts, such as letters, agreements, and bureaucratic documents. The latter are relatively less opaque to translation than the prophetic texts and have the great advantage of being, for the most part, securely dated (although problems of translation and dating still arise). ME mentions no comparative evidence in support of his premise that Spanish should increase in the text according to the period UNDER DESCRIPTION, as opposed to the period in which the relevant portion of the TRANSLITERATION took shape. He does not address the possibility that local versions may reflect spatially or temporally local histories, rather than accidental departures from a single grand Prophetic History. Nor does he examine critically the paradox inherent in his claim that he can capture the distinctiveness of Maya historical representations by imposing on them the ideologically loaded concept of linear periods. The boldness of his proposals and his erudite knowledge of the textual corpus are sufficient to warrant the attention of students of Mayan and Mesoamerican history. The proposals are not always convincing, however, and ME will have to spell out his analytic framework in more detail to persuade the skeptics. In my opinion, there is a lack of explicit historical, linguistic, or anthropological theory in this approach, which leaves it vulnerable to doubt, despite the wealth of empirical knowledge from which it derives.

2.2. Grammar, line, and word. In preparing this and his earlier translations, ME compiled a slip file from earlier dictionaries and textual sources as well as elicitation from a modern Maya speaker. The file contains approximately 30,000–40,000 slips, with three times that many individual entries. This he condensed into a root dictionary with about 4,000 entries (pp. 3–4). ME mentions no files

---

[7] It is widely appreciated that the Mayan texts in their extant form date mostly from the nineteenth century, having been recopied successively throughout their long history. ME displays an authoritative knowledge of the individual histories of the manuscripts from which he worked.

on the syntax or phrase structure of the texts, although in the bibliography, basic grammars are cited. In general his approach to the language is primarily lexical. For example, he adduces the particle *ix* (modern orthography *iš*) to illustrate a solution to a lexical problem. The graphic form *Ix* (or its equivalent *Yx*, *ix*) appears in ME's notes as "... a particle meaning 'she who, little, too, shoo!,' a noun for 'scales,' the day name for 'jaguar,'... a verb for 'spoil' or something like 'lie in'" (p. 4). The discrepancies among the alternatives are striking and can pose real problems for the translator.[8] At the same time, these alternatives obviously correspond to syntactically distinct items that could be readily distinguished by examining their linguistic contexts. A root dictionary without grammatical frames to distinguish homophonous but different items can multiply the appearance of polysemy. ME rightly points out that many instances of the particle are best read as the conjunction 'and', as in:[9]

(1) *la   ix   u   katunil cimc   i*
    Dm conj poss pro noun   noun(?) sf

'And that (was) the katun of death'.

However, what he fails to note is that this conjunction is an enclitic, which always follows another lexical item or syntactic constituent. This fact is noted in the Motul and Cordemex dictionaries and is obvious from early colonial bureaucratic texts (Hanks, forthcoming). Just like its modern descendant *xan, ix* is barred from occurring in constituent-initial position.[10] ME's statement that phrases are "introduced by 'and'" (p. 4) is therefore potentially misleading, since the Maya form does not occur in "introductory" position.

On the other hand, it is noun-phrase-initial position that is occupied by the genderlike particle *ix* (modern *š-*) that occurs in many names and in some phrases, such as:

(2) *Ix   Chel*
    fem N

'Fem rainbow' (name of goddess of the rainbow)

(3) *ix   ma   pic   tz'ul   u   kaba*
    fem Neg N   N   Pro 3 N

'No skirt foreigner (was) their name' (p. 4)

---

[8] This is representative of the sort of problems one faces in working with these texts, and not just a fluke of accidental homophony. One consequence is the wildly different translations proposed by scholars for one and the same stretch of discourse.

[9] Abbreviations: Dm 'demonstrative', conj(unction), fem(ale gender), N(oun), NP(hrase), Part(icle), Perf(ect), Pro 1 'first-person pronoun', poss(essive) pro(noun), Opt(ative mode), sf 'suffix'. Numbered examples retain ME's colonial orthography. In breakdown and discussion I have used the modern system, as in McQuown (1979). The only point of confusion between the two is the letter *k*, which represents a glottalized velar stop in colonial but a plain velar stop in modern.

[10] In colonial sources, one attests all three conjunctions, *-ix, -ixan*, and *xan*. The conditions under which variants arise are unclear to me, and the historical derivation of the modern form could be other than suggested.

This simple fact of the order of elements calls into question some of ME's line breaks, where he has put the particle in line-initial position but glossed it as a conjunction (for instance, lines 1423, 1432, 1443, 1445, 1449, 1457, 1467, 1469, 1471, 1475, 1485, 1487, 1489, 1512). The grammatical evidence forces it to be either one or the other, but not both.

Later, in discussing Maya poetry, ME makes the surprising assertion that *nohoch* 'great, large' and *hach* 'very' are both nouns in Maya (p. 18). The former is a standard adjective that usually precedes a noun, as in *nohoch can* 'great teacher ([or teachings])' (line 2543). The latter is an intensifying particle that occurs in preverbal (or preverb phrasal), prenominal (or prenoun phrasal), or preadjectival positions, as in:[11]

(4) *u   hach   çatal*
    3d pro Intnsv Vb

'(s)he really forgives' (line 2455)

(5) *hach   inw   iitz'in   ex*
    Intnsv Pro 1 noun   Equasional pro 2
    Really my   younger brother   you pl

'You are really my younger brothers'

(6) *hach   nohoch*
    Intnsv adj

'Really large'

I know of no evidence modern or classical that either of these forms is a noun.[12]

ME's transliteration of the Chumayel text is presented in a clear, easy-to-read orthography based on the original script. He points out that the manuscript contains numerous errors of transcription and fails to indicate tones, which are distinctive in Yucatec lexicon and grammar.[13] Word boundaries are inaccurate and often inconsistent in the original. While ME's interpretations inevitably involve hypotheses about tone, he does not make these explicit, nor does he insert tones in his transliteration. This is reasonable given the absence or inconsistency of marking in the colonial sources and the difficulty of demonstrating continuity with tones in modern Maya. Still, some notes on the grammatical

---

[11] I use the term "particle" somewhat loosely in this review to denote lexical items with all or most of the following features: (*i*) cannot be possessed, although they may take suffixal pronouns; (*ii*) cannot be inflected for tense or aspect; (*iii*) cannot be derived; (*iv*) syntactic distribution statable as proclitic or enclitic to major grammatical categories, Verb, Verb Complex, Noun, NP, Adjective, Adverb or to an utterance as a whole (initial, final, sole word in utterance); (*v*) function semantically as operators or "function words" rather than standard referring items.

[12] It is a feature of adjectives in Maya, as in many languages, that they can be used to stand for a noun, meaning roughly 'the big one', but this is hardly evidence for ME's claim.

[13] The tonal system is outlined in McQuown (1979). In addition to lexical distinctions between short neutral, rising, low, and "broken" nuclei, tone shifts mark such grammatical processes as voice changes in verbs and possession in certain nouns.

(and therefore phonological) forms ME is assuming would be useful to readers familiar with the modern language. In particular, it would help clarify the grammatical rationale for the word boundaries that ME has inserted.

Unsurprisingly, colonial Maya manuscripts use spacing and capitalization in ways not always consistent with linguistic boundaries between words, morphemes, and grammatical constructions. In preparing the transliterations of the Tizimin and Chumayel, ME has inserted his own spaces and capital letters but has not altered the linear sequence of letters or words (see ME 1982:xiii). (It is only at the level of "chapters," anywhere from about fifteen to several hundred lines long, that sequential order has been altered.) This is a reasonable procedure which could aid the reader in seeing the structure ME posits, as well as the fit between lines and grammatical units (even though ME considers this fit to be coincidental to the semantic scansion). Moreover, since 38 pages of the original are photographically reproduced in excellent 3.5 by 2.5 inch plates throughout the text, the reader can actually compare the transliteration with the original scripted version. This is very helpful and makes the task of working with the book much more rewarding and enjoyable than would otherwise be the case.

Many of the spaces that ME has inserted into the text are straightforward morpheme boundaries, as in the underlined portions of (7):

(7) _Can ahau katun_   Katun 4 Ahau
       U _buluc tz'it katun_ c u xocol   Was the eleventh part of the
                                              katun to be counted (lines
                                              421–22)

Can 'four', _ahau_ 'Ahau' (lit. ruler), _buluc_ 'eleven', _tz'it_ 'part', and _katun_ 'Katun' are readily recognizable stems. The nonunderlined parts of the second line in this pair are as follows: _u_ is the third-person, nonplural pronoun, marking possession in the first token and subject of a verb in the second;[14] _c_ is the 'incompletive' aspect prefix and _xocol_ is the passive stem _xoc_ 'read, count' (mod. _šó?ok_) followed by the -_Vl_ intransitive stem formative. ME is consistent throughout the text in separating person inflection from the stems to which it attaches.[15] He is

---

[14] Maya pronominal affixes display a "split ergative" alignment: the prefixal series, usually called the A set, signals possessor, subject of transitive, and subject of intransitive in the incompletive aspect; the suffixal series, usually called the B set, marks equational, object of transitive, and subject of intransitive completive and optative. Both series function both as pronominal indexes, unaccompanied by lexical arguments in the same sentence, and as agreement markers cross-indexing overt NPs. The A set forms _?in_ 'I', _?a_ 'you', and _?u_ 'he, she, it' occur preconsonantally and alternate with _?inw-_, _?aw-_, and _?uy-_, _y-_ prevocalically. Unfortunately, in his transliteration, ME separates the pronoun root from the glide in the prevocalic series. Since the glide -_w-_ is written _u_ in the colonial sources, this results in a proliferation of the _u_ grapheme that can be slightly confusing. See McQuown (1967), Pó?ot Yah and Bricker (1981), and Robertson (1984) for a fuller treatment of Maya pronouns.

[15] Although there are frequent glitches, such as in lines 675, 678, 687, 688, 749, 790, 920, 1191, 1374, 1382, 1383, 1384, fifteen tokens between 1167-1690, 1921-22, 2662, 2663, and 2989-90, where the third plural _ob_ is joined to the preceding words instead of separated.

---

relatively consistent in separating preverbal auxiliaries such as the aspect markers. However, some auxiliaries, such as _h_ marking past intransitive, ME treats as part of the verb. So in the line _Hulom kuk_ 'Come is (the) quetzal (bird)', the first word is _h ul om_ [pst intrns-root-derivational] 'it (has?) come', but the auxiliary element is run together with the verb.

Suffixal morphology is less consistently handled. ME's guiding principle appears to be to separate words and clearly inflectional elements such as person markers and phrase-final deictic enclitics, while he runs together stem derivational elements, as in:

(8) _Lay t u men tz'iban lae_ =   That is because it was written there
       T u men ma kuchuc   because it wouldn't have happened
      T u kin u meyah   at the time of the making
        Lae hun ob   of these books.
     Lay picilthan ob lae: These are millenial words here
       U ti al katabal u chi   For the examination
    Maya uinicob i   Of the Maya people (here) (lines 3011–17)

The underlined portions of (8) are morphologically complex: _tz'ib-_ is the root for 'write', and -_an_ forms the stativized participle (mod. -_á?a-n_ 'passive-statv'); _kuch_ is the root for 'arrive' and -_Vk_ the optative/perfective stem formative; _picilthan_ is composed of _pic_ variously interpretable as '8,000', 'many', or 'bound (as a book)' with a stem formative -_il_ and compounded with the nominal root _than_ 'speech, language'; _kat_ is the root for 'ask, request', -_ab_ a passivizing suffix, and -_Vl_ (or perhaps -_al_) the intransitive incompletive stem formative; _uinic_ is the noun for 'man' and -_ob_ the third-person plural morpheme (which should be separated according to ME's normal practice). With the exception of the plural marker, these segmentations are well motivated and consistent. Others are not.

For instance, the form _ta muk_ 'while, at the same time' is consistently split as shown, but there is no evidence, to my knowledge, that either of the two hypothetical parts occurs elsewhere, and the word occurs as a single entry in the colonial dictionaries (cf. Cordemex 769). The terminal suffix _i_ which occurs with past intransitive stems is sometimes joined together with the stem (e.g., _emi ob_ 'they came down' [line 196]) but more often split apart (e.g., _oc i_ '(it) came').[16] The nouns _ba tab_ 'chief, ruler, captain' (e.g., lines 320, 2641) and _ba cab_ which ME glosses 'fathers of the land [a class of gods]' (e.g., p. 6) are regularly split as shown, but these are not accepted segmentations, to my knowledge, and ME offers no justification for them.[17] Example (9) shows the paired particles in two ways, once split and once joined.

---

[16] This observation bears strictly on those tokens of orthographic _i_ which represent the morpheme described (mod. -_ih_). Other tokens undoubtedly represent the enclitic particle _i_ (mod. _i?_) which ME consistently, and justifiably, sets off.

[17] One unfortunate feature of the index is that neither _batab_ 'chief' nor _bacab_ '(class of) god' is listed in the Maya form. Rather, references are scattered around in the categories that ME perceives these words to belong in, such as 'chiefs', 'gods', 'yearbearers', and 'Drama'. The result is that it is very frustrating to try to use the index to locate instances of

(9) *U kaknabil:*   And the sea itself
    Num ya lae: The suffering is that.
  Ciy y alabal canal lae: Just the judgment of heaven it was
                                    (lines 1254–55)

The joined form is by far the more common in the book, although the two particles clearly are distinct, since both occur independently (cf. Cordemex:429 and scores of instances of *e* in the Chumayel). In line 828 the phrase *Ti u ma nah ob: can i:* 'Where they bought words dear' should be . . . *manah* . . . , since the root is *man* 'buy' and the suffix is the past transitive formative *-ah.* Line 1710 consists of *U uayas ba ba c in* 'shaped by whatever I am'. The gloss and segmentation suggest that ME reads the *in* as the first-person pronoun, since there is no other first-person reference in the phrase. But this is impossible, because the pronoun *?in-* 'I' is prefixal not suffixal. *babacin* is more likely to be a reduplicated form of the particle *bakin,* or perhaps *bakina,* or *baki* (Cordemex:28, mod. orthography), although the meaning is in any case problematic.

The particle *cuchi* indicates that the event described by a sentence took place prior to the day of utterance (Cordemex:344). It is either a single morpheme or a combination of *cuch* with the suffix *-i.* Line 2240 unjustifiably segments it as *c uchi e,* a form with no obvious source. ME splits the modifier *halach* 'true' in *hal ach uinic* 'true man, governor' in line 2383, which may or may not be etymologically valid, but there is no evidence that it fits the general criterion of being two distinct words or a stem and an inflectional category. In line 2838, the word *utzul* 'goodness, good' is erroneously split into *u tzul;* the morpheme boundary falls between the root *utz* 'good' and the stem-forming suffix *-Vl.* In 2667, the verb *chuc* 'complete, reach, attain' is printed *Ch ucci,* but should be *chucci* or *chuc ci,* since it is the CVC root followed by a stem-forming suffix *-i* (the root-final consonant is doubled, a fairly common scribal practice).

ME glosses the word *tulis* as 'return', but this is unlikely and contributes to some questionable translation. Consider:

(10) *Be hokol u*   There appeared the moon;
    T u bin u   The moon left.
  Tulis i   It returned,
    Uil u uchac   And the moon of the moon
  C uchie   There occurred
    Tulis kik   The return of the blood (lines 669–74)

This passage occurs in a section of text in which what appears to be a period of strife and "bad blood" is described. What it says is that the moon came and went—time passed—in strife. ME's gloss of the underlined form as an intransitive verb is without apparent motivation; there is no root *uil* meaning 'return'

---

the Maya terms in the text. One is forced to shuttle back and forth through the other classes of 'chiefs', 'gods', and so forth that abound in these texts. It would have been much easier and less controversial simply to show the Maya terms and let the reader infer the classes to which they apparently belong.

nor any word *tulis* with this meaning, at least in the sources familiar to me. A more conservative gloss would be 'full, whole', the standard meaning of *tulis* in both classical and modern Maya (see Cordemex:818). In the modern language, this modifier is applied to the full moon. The 'moon of the moon' is an aberrant gloss forced by ME's interpretation of *Uil* as the noun *u-il* 'moon' (root *-il* formative). It is more likely that this is the subjunctive, future particle *-i-uil,* erroneously split off from its *-i-* insert in the preceding line (see 2.4). *C uchi e* in the next line is again missegmented and should be *cuchi e,* the past particle. An alternative scansion would then be to make each line simply a clause:

(10') *Be hokol u*   Thus the moon came out,
    T u bin u   The moon went (away).
  Tulis iuil u   The moon would have been full
    Uchac cuchie   when it occurred,
  Tulis kik   Full blood (lines 669–74)

The significance of 'full blood' remains unclear, but it is equally if not more unclear what 'the moon of the moon' or 'the return of the blood' might mean in a fuller account.

As these examples make plain, there is an inevitable connection between the grammatical form of the original text and the word boundaries, line breaks, and gloss in the transliteration and translation. The result of underanalyzing the grammar is not only an inconsistent transcription, but—potentially worse—morphemes can be misidentified all too easily, with unfortunate consequences for the translation.

2.3. Two descriptions: God and baptism. In this section, I illustrate two cases in which key grammatical constructions are misidentified, resulting in dramatic distortion of the import of the Maya text. Thematically the examples are related, since the first deals with the Maya description of the Christian God, and the second describes the baptism of Maya people by the early missionaries. These are intrinsically important examples because of the enormous social and historical significance of the religious conversion during the early colonial years (see, for instance, Farriss 1984). References to these matters are found throughout the documentation of the period as well. From a grammatical perspective, the examples are quite different. The first shows a relational expression, *t-u-sin-il* 'in its totality', and the second a clause, *y-ocol$_1$ ha$_2$ t-u-pol uinic-ob$_3$* (lit.) 'water$_2$ enters$_1$ on the head(s) of men$_3$' (i.e., they are baptized with water).

In more than one instance, ME translates the form *tuçinil e* as 'lies', where it should be glossed 'in its totality, omnipotent' (Cordemex:826). ME has identified the form with *tuç* 'lie' (mod. *tùus*), but the *-in* remainder is not a recognizable morpheme here. The form *tuçinil* is well attested, however, and fits ideally in these contexts. It is evidently structurally parallel to *t-u-lac-al* 'all, everything', with the segmentation *t-u-çin-il* (*t-* is a reduced variant of the relational particle *ti* 'to, at', the pronoun prefix marks grammatical possessive; and *-Vl* harmonizes with the preceding stem vowel, according to the regular pattern). The word is specifically associated with the omnipotence of God in the Motul citations in the

Cordemex dictionary. It is grammatically parallel to a whole series of relational expressions in Maya, including *tuláakal* 'all (in its totality)', *tumèen* 'by (passive), because (in its doing)', *tuyorail* 'at the time (at its hour)', *ţyó?olal* 'for, on behalf of', *tuk'iinil* 'at the time', *tutaánil* 'in front of (at the front side)', *tupàačil* 'behind (at the back of)', *tutohil* 'toward (at its straight)', *tuţeél* 'beside (at its side)', and *tučùun* 'at the foot, base of'. ME translates:

(11)   *C en Chilam Balam*   I who am Spokesman of the Jaguar
    Ca in tzolah u than hahal ku When I recount the word of the True God
       Tuçinil e y okol cab e   And the lies of this earth.
                                          (lines 578–580)

The proper gloss would then be 'when I recount the word of True God of everything on the earth'. Another instance occurs in the prophecy of Tzin Yabun in chapter 13, who exhorts the Itza to embrace the 'majesty, father, creator of *everything*':

(12) *lo e tulacal*   That is all
      Y anil   that exists:
    Ah tepal e   The ruler
      Yum e   and Father
    Y ah ch'aabul caan   Creator of heaven
      Y etel luum tuçinil And the lying earth (lines 1347–52)

A little later in this segment of discourse, the Spanish term *Dios* 'God' is used in apparent coreference with this set of epithets, which lends further evidence that the referent is the Catholic god introduced by the Spanish, whose singularity and ubiquity were among the features most emphasized by the missionaries. The gloss 'lies' is unmotivated and distorts the import of the text, which should refer to 'the creator of heaven and all the earth'.

The second illustration of grammatically implausible translation comes from the period 13 Ahau, in chapter 24, entitled "The Inquisition in the East." This segment recounts the arrival of the Catholic missionaries, and the subjugation of the Maya to Spanish civil and religious institutions. Tribute had to be paid, the first governor Francisco de Montejo was installed, and the *padre ob* 'fathers' arrived, four years after the first Spanish (cf. Farriss 1984:24). It is well known that from the first, the Franciscan missionaries undertook to baptize the native population, traveling through towns and preaching as they went. The Maya were obviously very impressed by the missionaries, and by the ceremony of baptism, which they apparently requested of the priests. In a letter to the crown from Maya nobles dated March 19, 1567, the priests are praised for, among other things, baptizing the nobles and their children (Hanks 1985:line 32; 1986). The Maya expression for baptism is *oc ha* (mod. *?ok ha?*) literally 'enter water', which is usually used in collocation with the noun *pol* (mod. *pòol*) 'head'. In descriptions of the missionaries' actions, one finds *c uy oc-s-ic ha t-u-pol ob* 'they baptize them' (where the *-s-* derives a causative, *-ic* indicates transitive incompletive, *ha* is the direct object, and *tupolob* 'on their heads' is a locative phrase), or its grammatical equivalent in a different tense or aspect. The relation

is transparent, since the ceremony of baptism includes pouring water over the head of the person being baptized. With this background, consider:

(13) 2347. *D° 1549*   A.D. 1549
              Hab   Was the year
            Y an c uchi   Of the settlement
      2550.   *Ca hul i*   And arrival
            Padreob   Of the fathers.
            Can p'el hab huluc   Four years after the arrival
            tz'ulob c uchi   of the foreigners.
      2553. *Ti jx hop'i*   Then they sailed
            Y ocol haa   Over the water
            Tu pol uinicob i   To the P'ool people.
      2556.   *Ti cahal cah t u men* That was the settlement of
            padreob   the city by the fathers

Lines 2347–52 give a straightforward description of the arrival of the fathers dated A.D. 1549, four years after the 'foreigners' (Spaniards). (ME's segmentation of *c uchi* in 2349, 2352 should be corrected to *cuch i* 'in the past', see above.) Line 2553 is where the interpretation goes awry. Instead of reading these lines as a description of the missionaries' undertaking to baptize people, which fits both linguistically and historically, ME has interpolated a sailing voyage, presumably reading 'water' as 'ocean'. This interpretation breaks the thematic continuity of the discourse, which is describing the changes brought about by the Spanish in Maya society, not the voyage that brought them to the area. More important, there is a grammatical flaw in each of the last four lines of ME's gloss.

There may exist a verb *hop* 'with the meaning 'sail', although it is not familiar to me. What is attested in the dictionaries, and thoroughly well known from the modern language, is the verb *hop* ''to begin'. This may be used as a main verb or as an auxiliary element, in which case it is followed by a main verb, as in *hop'u šimbal* 'he began to walk' (lit. *began* he-walk). *-i* is the familiar (if troublesome) past intransitive suffix, right where it would be expected for this construction. This suggests that the following line be read as a main verb with its own subject, 'it₁ enters water₁' (water enters), or as a possessive noun phrase 'the entering of water'. In either case, this phrase acts as the grammatical subject of the verb *hop'i*; it is the entering of water, or baptism, that began upon the arrival of the fathers.[18] ME's 'over the water' forces him to posit scribal error, since *ocol*

---

[18] Compare line 1084 *Ca hop'i u hetz' luumob* 'Then began the seating of the lands'. This also shows the intransitive verb followed immediately by a phrase that functions as its grammatical subject. The translation 'Then they began to seat lands' is equally possible, treating 'began' as an auxiliary and 'they seat lands' as the main verb with an incorporated object. The corresponding transitive form occurs in line 1107, *Ca u hetz'ah cabob i:, Ca ix ti hetz' luum nahob i* which I gloss 'then they seated the lands', 'Then they seated earth'. The *-ah* terminal marks the first verb as past transitive. The form *-nah-*, which ME has mistaken to be the noun 'house', is actually a suffix signaling past objectless voice, which Bricker (1978) calls "antipassive." It indicates that *luum* is incorporated.

means 'enter' while *okol* means 'over'. Were it *y okol ha*, 'over the water' would be the most likely reading, but this is not what he has transliterated. *t-u-pol uinic ob* can be read as 'the Pool people' only by ignoring Maya grammar, since if the gloss were correct, we would expect *ah pol ob* [Agentive prefix + place + plur], *ah pol uinicob*, or perhaps *u uinicil pol* [it's$_1$ people Pol$_1$] 'the people of Pol'. It is by far more straightforward to recognize this as the standard possessive phrase 'on the heads of men', just as we would expect if baptism is the object of description. Finally, line 2556 is glossed as an independent sentence with no grammatical relation to what precedes it. It can more easily be read as two circumstantial phrases 'from town to town' and 'by the fathers'. The form *cahal cah*, which ME has glossed as 'the settlement of the city', is identical to the well-attested reduplicated expression *cah-al cah* 'from town to town' (Cordemex:281). This too occurs in the descriptions of the priests in the letter to the crown (Hanks 1985:line 56) and fits with the fact that the priests did travel from town to town converting natives by baptism. A better translation therefore would read, 'Then began the pouring of water on the heads of the people, from town to town, by the fathers', or more idiomatically, 'Then began the baptism of the people, from town to town, by the priests'. The discrepancy between this more plausible gloss and the one ME provides is a good indicator of the uncertainty of translation without grammar.

2.4. A subjunctive of prophecy. One of the recurrent problem words in the Chumayel is *uil*, or *iuil*, an enclitic particle that is glossed as 'subjunctive, dubitative, future' in the sources (Cordemex:923, Martinez Hernandez 1929:472, folio 227, 903–4, folio 448; cf. n. 11). This is one of the many particles which are absent from the modern language and pose some of the most difficult problems of interpretation. ME's treatment is in several cases open to question. In lines 435–40, for instance, we find:

(14) *T u kin i*	It is time
Uil u uatal kin e	As the sun is rising
Yum e	My fathers,
Ti y okçah ych ah tepal	That the face of the ruler will be lifted
Ua lo	Perhaps soon

The underlined portion of this example ME apparently interprets as a preverbal auxiliary meaning something like 'as, during'. Both the scansion and the gloss suggest this, since the *i-uil* particle cited above would require a translation more in line with the irrealis-subjunctive than the indicative statement 'it is time'. Furthermore, the subjunctive particle is an enclitic not a proclitic (Cordemex:923 and Martinez Hernandez 1929:904), which indicates that it should belong to the preceding line.[19] If ME is positing such an auxiliary, it would be worth making

[19] Cf. the alternation *xan, ixan* for the conjunction 'and', also an enclitic. There appears to have been a small class of enclitics in early colonial Maya that had a postconsonantal (perhaps bound) alternaht, showing inserted *-i-*, and an independent or postvocalic form of the shape CVC.

this clear and giving some independent evidence. No preverbal auxiliary *uil* 'as, during' is in the Cordemex or Motul dictionaries, to my knowledge, nor in the other textual sources with which I am familiar. *tukuni* is literally 'in the time of' (an adverbial phrase; cf. *t-u-sin-il* 'in its totality') not 'it is time' (a predication). A more conservative reading is possible, therefore, in which the particle is the subjunctive enclitic. This would fit better with the linguistic context and with the conveyed meaning of the pair *ual o* in the final line. The scansion and gloss would then be:

(14') *T u kin iuil*	In the time, it will be,
u uatal kin e	of the rising sun
Yum e	father,
Ti y okçah ych	Then he$_1$ will show compassion
ah tepal ual o	the ruler$_1$

The last two lines in this scansion have Adverb Verb Subject word order, and say that the ruler will show compassion during the time frame established in the preceding lines. The initial *ti* indicates a locative/temporal focus, as evident from its occurrence before the main verb. The verb complex is a third-person causative derivation from *ok* 'to cry, weep', which, when combined with *ich* 'eye', forms the idiom 'to show compassion' (Cordemex:603). Similar compounds based on 'weep' and conveying 'mercy, compassion' occur frequently in sixteenth-century letters from Maya nobles to the Spanish crown (Hanks 1986; 1987). ME's reference to 'face rising up' misses the idiom and has no obvious basis in the language. It seems to reflect the mistaken belief that the root *ok* of *yokol* 'above, atop' can be used as a verb taking the noun 'eye' as its object. But this root is a relational noun with no *-s-ah* causative derivation. Possibly, the appeal to vertical movement in the preceding line leads ME to posit a tenuous couplet whose common idea is verticality, but this is no justification for positing non-existent forms and impossible grammatical relations.

Another example of *iuil* arises in the sermon of the prophet Kauil Ch'el, chapter 21. This portion of the text runs from line 2215 through line 2242 and apparently prophesies the coming of suffering from the north and the west. The final lines bring the 'sermon' to a close, summarizing it in what appear to be ironic terms:

(15) *Be ci oltzil i*	Thus delighted
Uil tan tun tepal c	May be the ruling capital,
uchie	Really perhaps over the lordship of the
Cij uil y okol y ahaulil cabob e	lands
Kahcun a u ol ah ytza e	Remind your hearts, O Itza (2239–43)

ME's scansion breaks apart the particle *i-uil*, assuming that is what it is, and suggests that the *uil* form precedes the auxiliary *tan* 'progressive, ongoing'.[20] As I

[20] ME may be interpreting the *i* in the first line as the residuum of the suffix *-il*, therefore positing *ci oltzilil* 'delight, happiness'. This is quite plausible, although if so, the *-i* should be joined to the noun in the transliteration, rather than separated from it. In any case, the

have pointed out, the particle is grammatically linked to what precedes it and belongs on these grounds in final position in the top line. The separation of *c-* from *uchi* in the middle lines is without grammatical basis, since this can only be read as the particle *cuchi*, which contains no morpheme boundary after the first segment. ME obviously reads it as the intransitive verb *uch* 'to occur, arrive', preceded by the incompletive aspect marker *c-*, but this is impossible for two reasons: (*i*) the resulting form is ungrammatical because it lacks the required pronominal prefix between the aspect marker and the verb stem—the proper form would be *c-uy-uch*;[21] (*ii*) if the initial *c-* were in fact the incompletive marker, then the expected suffix would be -*Vl*, giving *c-uy-uch-ul* 'it occurs'; the formative -*i(h)* marks past in opposition to the tenseless incompletive, and *c-uy-uch-i* is ungrammatical.[22] A sounder scansion would be:

(15′)	*Be ci oltzil iuil*	So it would have been happy
	tan tun tepal cuchi e	During the rule then
	Cij uil	It would have been happy
	y okol y ahaulil cabob e	Upon the lordship of the lands.
	Kahcun a u ol ah ytza e	Remind your hearts, O Itza.

The final line is clearly an imperative delivered to the addressees of the sermon.

My gloss of the subjunctive particle *i-uil* in this context as 'it would have been' is based on the combination of this particle with *cuchi* in the next line. The Motul dictionary (Martinez Hernandez 1929:472, 904) cites the following examples:

(16) *in   ɔaah iuil   tech   cuchi yanaci   tene*
      Pro1 Vb   Part Pro2 (Dat) Part Vb-Opt   Pro1

      'I would have already given it to you (if) I had it'

(17) *Uchi uil   cimicen   ca   yolte   Dios cuchi*
      Past Part Vb-Perf-Pro1 Comp Pro3-Vb-Opt N   Part

      'I would have died days ago (if) God had wanted it (so)'

The *uil* particle occurs often unaccompanied by *cuchi*, indicating future or irrealis, and *cuchi* is used on its own to indicate 'past, completed'. Notwithstanding the independence of the two items, in examples like these, they appear

---

uil particle in initial position in the second line is an ENCLITIC and should be in final position in the top line rather than where it is. This is analogous to ME's unfortunate tendency to put the conjunction *ix*, also an enclitic, in initial position in his lines.

[21] It is true that many apparent verbs figure in these texts without the expected prefixal pronouns. However, this is not the case when the verbal auxiliary is the bound form *c-* 'incompletive'. This aspect marker attaches ONLY to a pronoun attached to a verb stem.

[22] Another peculiar suggestion by ME occurs in a footnote to line 2296, where he suggests that the expected order of morphemes in the verb complex *be u han ex ob* 'thus they eat you (pl)' would be *be u han ob ex*, with the third-person plural *ob* preceding the second plural suffix *ex*. This suggested order is ungrammatical, since the suffixes are ordered not by their case function but by the person features, and 1st precedes 2d precedes 3d, to my knowledge invariantly.

---

to function as components in a two-clause If construction. Instead of 'If *x*, then *y*', these convey '*x* would have been the case, if *y* had been (but it wasn't)'. In (16) they are apparently in the same clause, and in (17) they are in different clauses, (*i*-)*uil* always preceding *cuchi*. The two leftmost verbs in these examples appear to be in the past (general in 16 and distant in 17). They encode the nonexistent consequence of the condition, what would have been so. The rightmost verbs are both optative/irrealis, and they encode the counterfactual If clause.

In the first 3,000 lines of the Chumayel, *i-uil*, *uil* occurs six times by my count (lines 435, 517, 572, 672, 2239, 2241). With the exception of 672, these are all in discourse labeled *profeciado*. The prophecies of Na Puc Tun (chapter 9) and Tzin Yabun (chapter 13) lack any tokens of *i-uil*. The semantic range of the particle includes futurity, uncertainty, doubt, and that which is hoped for. In two cases it is followed by *cuchi* (672, 2239), perhaps indicating counterfactual conditionals like the ones from the Motul. Unfortunately, the tense-mode pairings in these examples are different, since we get: [Vb$_{\text{equational}}$ *iuil* . . . [Vb-Opt *cuchi*]] (672); and [Adv *iuil* [. . . Vb-Progressive *cuchi*]] (2239). Because of this difference it is unclear whether the same counterfactual reading obtains, and it would take more evidence than can be presented here.

In cases where the two particles combine, one wonders whether the 'prophetic' discourse of 'sermon' was not in part a commentary on the past, not only as an objective record of what did occur but what could have, or might have occurred, as well. It is quite possible that *i-uil* is associated with the discourse genre ME calls "prophetic sermon," although it would take more evidence to show it. In modern Maya, one of the distinctive features of ritual language is precisely the combination of particles *bin* 'reportedly, it is said', *bakan* 'evidently, apparently', and *šan* 'also'. Together, these frame the entire discourse of shamanic prayer as invoking a set of individuals and events which the shaman cannot quite vouch for, which he knows only indirectly and by secondhand reports from dreams and spirit encounters (Hanks 1984).[23] Without suggesting any substantive relation between these forms and the colonial *uil*, it is clear that particles are used in Maya discourse as both phrasing devices and keys that indicate the modality or evidentiary status of the text.[24]

It would be fruitful to examine the distribution of such particles in the Books of Chilam Balam, relative to one another, to the distinctions between prophecy and reported, quoted, and direct speech, and to other indicators of tense-aspect. This might provide linguistic evidence that prophetic sermons make up an identifiable genre of speech in the classical language, while shedding light on the sense of history that they express. It is clear from the examples that a proper

---

[23] The particles are also used as a means of achieving alliteration, being repeated sometimes five or more times in a single utterance. This does not appear to be the case in the prophetic sermons of the Chumayel.

[24] The "incantations" that Roys (1965) translated also contain many noteworthy particles used as phrasing devices (Hanks, forthcoming). The fullest description of particles and particle compounding is in McQuown (1967:242–47).

interpretation of the language of prophecy will require a grammatical analysis of constructions not just single lexical items or given themes.

3. Style in translation.

3.1. **The couplet.** In the Chumayel and the Tizimin, ME has presented the text broken down into quite short lines on the basis of his perceptions of semantic parallelism. The result is to emphasize the verselike quality of the language, while making the text easier to read and work with than would be the case if the original lines were retained. Lines in the original, handwritten manuscript stretch across the page or column, conforming to the margins and layout of accompanying illustrations rather than to the structure of the discourse. One may disagree with ME's scansion, or phrasing, as I shall show, but it has in its favor heuristic utility.[25] The scansion is guided by ME's method of presenting the text as a series of parallel couplets. His premise is that ALL formal (ritual, ceremonial, literary) discourse in Maya is cast in couplets, such that a proper scansion will reveal the parallelistic structure AA', BB', CC', ... between lines (Edmonson 1970; 1973; 1982; 1986:17). Consider the following lines, which ME cites to exemplify the two-part unit:

(18) *Hulom kuk*   Come is the quetzal; [A]
     Ulom yaxum   Come is the blue bird. [A'] (p. 17)

The ubiquity of this structure in Maya discourse is motivated, according to ME, by the dualism intrinsic in Maya thought, a theme constantly emphasized in his work.

Other scholars working on Mayan discourse have found the couplet to be an important stylistic device in a variety of genres in Tzeltal, Tzotzil, Quiché, and Tojolobal, among others.[26] Lounsbury (1980) showed that coupletlike relations link some clauses in the hieroglyphic Inscriptions at the Temple of the Cross in Palenque and provide a structure within which ellipsis and reference maintenance can be understood. Lounsbury's work gives powerful evidence that parallelism across lines in discourse was a feature of pre-Conquest Maya texts and can aid substantially in the interpretation of these texts. ME, one of the central proponents of the couplet, has been careful to make clear that whereas some traditions are based on FORMAL parallelism (phonological, morphosyntactic, and syntactic) between lines, Maya couplets may be based on SEMANTIC links, with no necessary overlay of formal parallelism whatsoever. Thus, the following makes up a "perfectly strong couplet ... without any syntactic parallelism" (ME 1986:18):

---

[25] The term "scansion" is used here to denote the overall phrasing of the discourse into line units, according to regularities of sound (metrical, rhyme), grammatical structure (morphological, syntactic), or semantics (equivalence, contrast, inclusion, etc.).

[26] Becquelin Monod (1979; 1981) on Tzeltal, Bricker (1974) on Tzotzil and Yucatec Maya, Gossen (1974; 1985) on Tzotzil, and Norman (1980) on Quiche. See Brody (1986) for a study of parallelism in Tojolabal conversation and Haviland (1987) for Tzotzil.

(19) *Yax coc ay mut*   The center priest Coc Ay Crier
     U u ich ti y ahaulil   Was the face in the lordship.

In his earlier work, ME enunciated the thesis that the couplet structure can actually guide translation by helping the analyst to chunk an otherwise very difficult discourse into manageable units. Following the model of Nahuatl *difracismos* or 'kennings' worked out by Garibay (1953; and see Léon-Portilla 1985), ME considers many couplets to be veiled metaphors for some third concept, unmentioned but understood. So, the coming of the quetzal and the bluebird cited above is a veiled reference to the activities of the Itza and Xiu, predominant ruling families in pre-Conquest Yucatan.

ME strives for literality in his translations, as he asserts (1982:xv; 1986:19), but the difficulty of finding a literal sense amidst the couplets and hidden tropes is obvious. In the earlier work, he addresses the complexity of scansion and great difficulty of translation directly, saying that the texts are " ... purposely obscure. They are not intended to make sense to outsiders—and they don't" (1982:xiv). This statement contrasts sharply with the comprehensive claims ME makes for the couplet as the fundamental device of all Maya formal discourse. The evidence from other texts in classical and modern language does not support such a claim. Rather, couplets, of various kinds, are part of a larger system of style showing a range of parallelistic structures (Hanks 1984; 1986; 1987; forthcoming; cf. Tedlock 1983). For the present review, the most important point is that by proposing the couplet as both the product and the tool of interpretation, ME has produced a translation full of bold and imaginative proposals, but very far from literal. For readers familiar with colonial Maya language, this will be obvious; for those looking for a reliable translation, it is potentially misleading.

From a methodological perspective, the duality of the couplet, as both a TOOL and a PRODUCT of interpretation, is potentially circular. Since the link between the two lines is purely semantic, rather than being based on demonstrable features of form, and since no independent principles are adduced to explain the range of semantic relations involved, nor any constraints on how they may combine, the translator is left to rely on an intuition about what is a couplet and what is not. Given this, scansion by the couplet method becomes possible, but remains unreliable. In contrast to ME, Lounsbury's (1980:107ff.) use of parallelism in the glyphic inscriptions is based squarely on an independent analysis of the syntax of the paired phrases and the identity of their parts. Given such analysis, the hypothesis that two lines form a couplet has recognizable consequences that can be verified and used to falsify or corroborate the interpretation. The obvious problem for ME's approach is that intuitions may differ, and what is needed is a way of deciding or at least evaluating among competing claims.[27]

---

[27] Norman (1980), by contrast, presents a carefully worked out and explicit account of couplet parallelism in Quiché ritual language, addressing the grammatical as well as the semantic relations between paired.lines. Unfortunately, the gemlike structure that Norman demonstrates for his texts does not carry over to Yucatec style, which, as ME has observed, is less rigidly constrained.

ME's translations nowhere address this problem, and by asserting that the parallelism in Maya discourse is NOT grounded in grammatical form, he effectively rules out a grammatical justification for the scansion. This is unfortunate, because it weakens the translation and, I believe, misrepresents the facts of Maya style.

ME's handling of Maya grammar casts doubt on his claim that proper scansion is "totally dependent upon semantics" (p. 18). Example (19) is offered as a "perfectly strong couplet," but without any evidence or explanation. The translation appears accurate to me, but if this is so, then the two lines form a simple equational sentence 'NP (is) NP'. We are left to wonder at what level of linguistic or cultural organization the two are a couplet. A clue comes from ME's observation that "the linkage between the lines is dependent upon a degree of synonymy or antinomy between two or more key words, . . ." (p. 18). Possibly, ME means to suggest that in example (19) the first NP is to a degree synonymous with the second, but this is false. The relation between two NPs in apposition is one of coreference (or reference plus predication) not synonymy. If one reads "*4 Ahau* (was) *the name of the katun* (period)," there is no equivalence of MEANING between the two italicized phrases, no poetic parallelism. Rather, an identity of reference is established. A great many of ME's lines are linked together by such simple grammatical relations as possession, apposition, and predication, but his claim that everything is cast in couplets forces him to present them as poetic constructions instead of straightforward grammatical ones. This overgeneralizes the concept of a couplet, to the point of obscuring the cases in which stylistically significant parallelism really is in play.

ME's attempt to constitute Maya poetry entirely out of the couplet derives from his view that discourse can be divided into two categories, the literary and the nonliterary. Literary language consists entirely of poetry (Edmonson and Bricker 1985:59); nonliterary documents (such as letters and bureaucratic texts) apparently play no role in ME's understanding of Maya style and are absent from his comparative references (in the work under review). The problem with this approach is that it elevates a set of unexamined assumptions about linguistic style and communicative function to the level of a guiding principle. Since the text is all Literature and Literature is all Poetry and Poetry is all Couplets, there is no need to critically consider the limits of the couplet as a device, nor the problematic genre categories on which the analysis rests (cf. Hanks 1987). ME observes in a number of places that Maya style is more varied and gradient than his assertions would suggest, but these observations serve mainly as foils and do not appear to bring the main theme or method of scansion by couplets into question.

Here I shall illustrate some other forms of organization found in the Chumayel. One point is to throw open the question of phrasing and to show why no single device such as the couplet can possibly provide the sole guide to translation or even scansion. By "phrasing," I mean the segmentation of the written text into grammatical units, lines, and multiline constructions. As a number of scholars have observed in relation to other American languages, the hierarchical ordering

of discourse into recurrent segments is a central part of narrative and rhetorical organization (Hymes 1981; 1982; 1987, Silverstein 1986, Tedlock 1983, and Woodbury 1987). The manner of grouping is potentially an indicator of genre. In modern Maya, for instance, the ritual speech of at least some shamans is performed entirely in breath groups, a phrasing device distinctive of these genres (Hanks 1984). The principles of organization proposed by different scholars have included pause phrasing (Tedlock 1983) and prosodic phrasing (Woodbury 1987) in oral performance, as well as various grammatical and thematic phrasing for both oral and written texts (Hymes 1981; 1982; 1987 and Silverstein 1986). Easily accessible Mayan examples include Brody (1986), Fought (1985), Gossen (1985), Hanks (1986; 1987), Norman (1980), and Tedlock (1983). These different treatments have made distinct, sometimes conflicting, proposals about what governs phrasing in discourse of different types, but they all illustrate the centrality of the phenomenon. The main theoretical background from which the study of grammatical parallelism derives is Russian formalism and Prague-school linguistics, including Jakobson (1960; 1985; cf. Caton 1987 and Friedrich 1979:455ff. for an insightful critique) and Tynianov's (1981) brilliant studies in verse structure and semantics. In all of this work the recurrence of (partially) equivalent units in discourse links grammatical structure and meaning at the level of local units, to larger constructions (couplets, stanzas, episodes, sections). This linkage provides an alternative to the view that the semantic interpretation of Maya literary discourse (or any other kind of discourse) can be understood and translated without close attention to the grammar.

3.2. Descriptive style in the *May* ceremonial circuit. This section illustrates the discourse in which a ritual survey of the land is reported. The survey was executed by Maya nobles and describes itself as *tzol peten*, which can be glossed variously as 'counting out, ordering, explaining' '(the) country, island, region'. The language is diagrammatic in the sense that it lists out the places surveyed, evidently in the order in which they were actually visited by the nobles. In addition, it reports events that occurred in these places. The events were of two kinds, speech events in which the place was named, which I shall call "nominations," and other, nonverbal but presumably ritual activities in which the nobles engaged. Both kinds provide motivations for the place-names and are therefore etymologies, or at least etymologizing. Rather than any single device, therefore, this example shows the combination of a particular prose style with line-to-line parallelism, encoding embedded quotation, and reported speech, which in turn functions as a (metalinguistic) commentary on the place-names in the region.

The text in lines 771–1080 is the record of a ceremonial circuit which names 171 towns around the western part of the Yucatan peninsula. ME calls this the ceremonial of the *may* and links it to the Mayan calendar in an interesting and challenging interpretation (pp. 27–28). In appendix B, he has listed the names of the towns in alphabetical order, along with a number indicating their placement in the original sequence and a map showing their locations. This is another excellent feature of the book, which makes it easier to compare the pacing out of

the circuit in this text with the very similar pacing out of boundary markers in such works as the chronical and land survey of Yaxkukul (Barrera Vasquez 1984). There are two minor problems in the map: (*i*) location number 152, the town of Yaxkukul, is listed but not shown on the map; (*ii*) there is one location on the map, just south of Merida, which lacks a number to key it to a name (the location prevents it from being Yaxkukul, unfortunately). In all likelihood, the place called "Yaxkukul" in the chronicle and survey, and the "Yaxkukul" of the Chumayel, are in fact the same place, since the former is connected by road to the town of Sicpach and Tixkokob (Barrera Vasquez 1984:102–4), and in the Chumayel, these same towns are listed in positions 151 and 153, respectively (lines 1051ff.). The main difference between the two documents at this general level is that the Chronicle and Survey bear on landmarks and boundaries local to the town of Yaxkukul, whereas the Chumayel depicts a much greater circuit in which Yaxkukul is but a single entry. The only common reference in the two circuits is Yaxkukul itself.

When we look at the discourse which reports this circuit, there are significant differences of composition between the Yaxkukul survey and the Chumayel. The former reports the activity of *tzol pictun* 'count(ing) boundary markers', executed by Ah Macan Pech, governor. It is cast primarily in the first person (as in line 154, *noholtan yn binel tzol pictun* 'Southward I go counting boundary stones'), in small prose cycles consisting of a statement of (roughly) (*i*) the direction in which the narrator is proceeding, (*ii*) the name of the next goal toward which he is going, (*iii*) the names of accompanying nobles, (*iv*) the location of boundary markers relative to landmark features of the terrain, and (*v*) the place at which accompanying nobles parted his company (Hanks 1987:70). (20) shows two cycles.

(20) 181. *lakintan u binel*   Eastward it goes
           layli nolo yn lak e   still (the) Nolo (people) are my
                                       companions(s)
      183. *la/ tulah u kuchul*   until it arrives
           yok chen chac abal   at (lit. over) Chen Chac Abal
      185. *ti yan mul tun i*   There there is a stone mound
           ca/ manac   Then it passed (by).
           [...]   [...]
      208. *lakintan u binel*   Eastward it goes
           layli nolo yn lak e   still (the) Nolo people (are) my
                                       companions(s)
      210. *latulah u ku/chul*   until it arrives
           yokol chen chac hil   at (lit. over) Chen Chac Hil
      212. *ti yan pic tun i*   there there is a boundary stone
           ti c in pattic ah nolob/ there I leave off (the) Nolo people
      214. *ti c in chic ah euan ob i* there I take up (the) Euan people.

In the section of the survey from which these two cycles were taken, the first-person narrator describes the nobles as his 'companions', a standard phrasing

for accompaniment.[28] Although the counting expression *tzol pictun* 'count boundary stones' does not occur, the text is explicit that the path ('it' in lines 181, 186, 208, 210) leads from marker to marker.

The Chumayel circuit, on the other hand, is cast in the third person and reports the travel of the nobles without any mention of *pictun* boundary markers or the act of 'counting' (with an exception to be illustrated). There is a strong periodicity in the Chumayel text, due to the recurrence of the connective particle *ca* 'that, then' in line-initial position in 68 lines out of the 309 total in this part of the text. In 13 cases, it is accompanied by *tun*, a concessive particle 'so, then'. The three verbs of motion that predominate the description are *tal* 'come', *bin* 'go', and *kuch* 'arrive'. They are all always inflected for third-person plural (with the exception of one first-person plural in line 941) and lack any prefixal subject marker (expected *u-* 'he, they'), which suggests that they are in the past tense, as ME's glosses reflect, as in *Ca tun kuch ob Ninum* 'then they reached Ninum' (line 787).

Rather than count out markers, the Chumayel text appears to report a series of naming events. This is of obvious interest to a study of language in sixteenth-century Maya culture, but it is unfortunately the point on which ME's translation begins to break down. To see this, we can begin with a strip of discourse in which the narrator summarizes the force of the text. At this point, seventy-one towns have already been visited, and immediately following this the succession of names is picked up again. The narrator pauses to report:

(21) 924. *Tan u ximbaltic ob: y ila*   When they explored to see
           ob
           Ua utz: lay peten: Whether this country was
                                           good
           Ua u nahma cahtal ob: Whether it was really
           uay lae: suitable that they live here
           Tzol peten u kaba   The Ordered Country was its
                                           name
      928. *T u than ob*   They told
           Ca yumil   Our father
           Ti Dios   Who is God.
           Lay tzol peten.   It was he who ordered the
                                           country;
           Lay sihes y okol cab t u   It was he who created the
           lacal   whole earth around,
           La yx tzol xan::   So he ordered it too

[28] Actually, in modern Maya, one would expect a first-person plural on the verb, rather than singular, as in *noholtan k-bin yéetelö'ob* 'We went southward (me) with them'. The first-person singular probably reflects the superordinate rank of the narrator, who was governor of the region surveyed.

934.	*He ob la e*	But really it is they
	Kabansah peten u cah ob:	Who named the lands of their towns
	Kabansah ch'een u cah ob:	Who named the wells of their towns
	Kabansah ca cab u cah ob	Who named the villages of their towns
938.	*Kabansah luum u cah ob*	Who named the fields of their towns

I have retained ME's gloss and line breaks. Lines 924–28 report that the nobles (they) visited and visually inspected the area (*peten*), after which they are said to have addressed God, whom the narrator describes as 'our' father. Lines 932–33 apparently summarize the creation of the world by this God, as a 'counting of the country' (counting and ordering are alternative glosses of the act described by *tzol*) and 'giving birth to the earthly world' ('create' is literally the causative formation of *sih* 'to be born, given as gift').

It is at lines 933–38 that ME's gloss appears to go astray. While 933–34 can be read as the gloss suggests, I believe a more plausible reading is one which involves switch-reference from God in the preceding lines to the nobles who are doing the circuit on foot. 934 would be read as simply 'those ones', meaning the nobles, and 933 would be 'they too counted (ordered)'. This implies that the nobles are engaged in an act called *tzol peten* 'count out (order) country', which is the same act that God engaged in when he created the world. In the following lines, which clearly form a quatrain, the action of the nobles is described as 'naming' places. ME's gloss of the underlined form *cah* as 'town' is undoubtedly wrong and results in another ungrammatical structure. The gloss reflects the reading under which 'town' is possessor, and the lands, wells, villages, and fields are possessed—hence 'the town's well, the well of the town'. But for this to work, the form would have to be *u ch'een cah* 'its-well town', where the prefixed pronoun ATTACHES TO THE POSSESSUM, NOT TO THE POSSESSOR.[29] If *ch'een u cah* meant anything, it could only be '(a) well (was) their town', but this is senseless. It is also precluded by ME's implicit claim that the four lines are all relative clauses subordinated to the subject of 934 'they' (since a relative clause cannot contain an internal independent predication, such as 'who named it a well was their town'). The key to revising this passage is the term *cah*.

In both classical and modern Maya there is a present progressive formation that nontransitive active verbs can enter into, with the structure [Verb Apro-*cah*], where *cah* (modern *ká?ah*) is an auxiliary that follows the verb and attracts the subject marker. For instance:

hanal in ká?ah   'I am (in the process of) eating' [eat I-prog]
šòok u ká?ah   'He is (in the process of) reading' [read he-prog]

---

[29] This is the standard possessive structure in all Mayan languages, not only Yucatec, [Apro₁-N N₁] where the Apro is coreferential with the rightmost N and refers to the possessor, and the N to which it attaches is the possessum.

The Motul and other relevant sources cite the construction, proving its existence in sixteenth-century Maya (Cordemex:281; cf. also lines 525, 527, 537 of the work under review). If the main verb is transitive, as in *cukabansic peten* 'he names, appoints (a) region', then it must obligatorily undergo either passivization or antipassivization in order to meet the restrictions of the progressive auxiliary. (This is clear in the modern language, and consistent with classical examples cited in the Cordemex.) For verbs formed with the causative suffix *-s-*, like *kaban-s-* 'caused to be named', the antipassive is formed by substituting the terminal formative *-ah* for the expected *-ik* (see Bricker 1978 and Pó?ot Yah and Bricker 1981:xii). A following noun is then treated grammatically as an incorporated form, which is obligatorily unmodified, as the nouns in this segment of text are. Thus, what the last four lines say is

'They were (in the process of) naming region(s),
they were naming well(s),
they were naming village(s),
they were naming land(s)'

where 'they' refers to the nobles reintroduced as subject in 934–35. Under this reading, what the ceremonial circuit consists of mainly is an ordered series of naming events.

When we turn to the preceding and following discourse where these events are described in sequence, it is evident that naming is in fact what is going on in at least part of the text. The following is a representative example (eleventh nomination, p. 83):

(22)	*Ca kuch ob kikil:*	Then they reached Kikil
	Ti u canah ob: kik nak i:	There they had bloody guts
	Kikil u kaba uay e:	Kikil was the name then
	C u than ob:	That they called it (lines 807–10)

The scansion and gloss of this passage at a lexical level are well motivated, with the exception of the underlined form. This morpheme is obviously the deictic adverb 'here', which is often attested in the classical sources and still used today (Cordemex:916). ME has glossed it 'then', but this suggests erroneously that the spatial meaning of the adverb varies with a temporal one. While other spatial adverbs do have temporal uses in Maya (as in most languages), *uay e* 'here' is not one of them. Line 809 can only mean 'Kikil (is) the name (of) here' or 'Kikil (is) its name here'. The refrain '*X* is the name of here' occurs twenty-two times throughout this section (779, 782, 793, 799, 806 ['here' omitted], 809, 816, 830, 834, 839, 844, 852, 858, 868 ['is the name' omitted], 883 ['is the name' omitted], 908 ['here' omitted], 927 ['here' omitted], 994, 1012, 1022 ['here' omitted], 1025 ['here' omitted], 1060). Rather than reduce all of these lines to reports about some past time, it is more sound grammatically to recognize that they state the names of a succession of places, each of which is a 'here'. The narrator is literally walking the reader from place to place, diagramming the movement of the nobles, from 'here to here, to here'. Although the linguistic

devices are different, the same diagrammatic progression characterizes the Chronicle of Yaxkukul.[30]

In eight cases, the name phrase is followed by the verb of speaking *c-u-than-ob* 'they say' (780, 782, 793, 800, 810, 840, 868, 884, 1012). ME's gloss '*X* was the name then that they called it' suggests that the text is reporting a general fact of usage, that some place *P* has the name *X*. A more literal gloss would show the naming expression in quotation, "Kikil is the name (of) here, ... Buc Tzotz is the name of here," followed by the verb of speaking, 'they said'. What is reported are not general facts of usage but particular utterances. The corresponding steps in the ceremonial circuit consist of individual speech acts, or 'nominations', whereby the nobles SAID THAT the names were "such and such." This does not preclude there already existing a common usage of these names for these places; not all nominations dub the place for the first time. Rather, for whatever cultural reason, the invocation and reaffirmation of certain place-names was part of the official visit that the narrative reports. It is noteworthy that seven of the eight instances of quoted speech precede the summary in line 935, which suggests that the activity described as *kabansah* 'nominate' may be linked most closely to the first 159 lines in the section. Curiously, in line 1012, which displays the identical structure "'*X* is the name here," they said', ME decides it IS a case of quotation and glosses it "'This is its name," they said'.[31] Unfortunately, he offers no reason for the change in translation. The preceding seven cases are all translated as direct speech rather than quotation, which compounds the misglossing of the adverb 'here' as 'then' and is a further departure from literality.

In addition to reporting speech, the narrative reports certain other, nonverbal activities that the nobles engaged in during their visits. These contribute to the nominations by motivating the place-names, giving each a descriptive etymology. *Kikil* in the preceding example is a good illustration of this. The narrative reports that the nobles arrived in the place, got 'bloody guts' (a standard expression for dysentery) and then said '*Kikil* is the name here'. The form *kik-il* means 'bloody' in Maya, which implies that the dysentery of the nobles is what motivates the place-name. Right after this, it says:

(23) *Ca kuch ob: panab haa:*   Then they reached Panab Ha
    Ti u panah ob ha i: Where they dug for water
   Ca tal ob cuchucil: haa: Then they came to Cuchucil Ha
    U cuch ob: t u tamil haa i: They carried them deep into the
                    water (lines 811–14)

[30] Rather than reporting that a third-person group of subject(s) went from 'here' to here', the Yaxkukul survey reports that 'I', the governor, went from place to place. See example (20).

[31] Actually, ME's scansion of 1011–12 leads him to split off the name, *Pacax ua*, from the nomination. Instead of "'*Pacax ua* is its name here," they said', he posits "'*Pacax ua; This is its name,*" they said'. This results in grammatically isolating the name and forces ME to interpolate the demonstrative 'this', which is not present in the Maya.

In analogous fashion, the place-name Panab Ha is motivated by the fact that when they arrived there, the visiting nobles dug for water; *pan-ab* is the passive (or perhaps optative or instrumental) formation of the verb *pan* 'to dig' and the name means 'dug (for) water'. When they got to Cuchucil Ha they performed the act encoded in the name, they 'carried (a burden) to the deep water'; *cuch-uc-il* 'carry-Optative-stem formative', *ha* 'water'. These examples show also that a description of the actional basis of the names need not be accompanied by a quotation of the speech act but can stand in its stead. There is no mention in the text of anyone SAYING Panab Ha or Cuchucil Ha. Rather, the nobles arrived and ENACTED the name by engaging in the practice which it describes, according to the conventions of reference and description in this culture.[32]

One of the etymologies that ME appears to have misglossed is the town of Ix Macculum, the eighty-sixth place cited in the list. It is introduced without any deictic 'here', nor statement that 'such and such' was its name.

(24)   *T ix macculum:*   To Ix Mac Ulum
    962.   *Ti u ma cah ob than i:*   Where they did not settle the word;

Line 961 conveys that the nobles arrived in a place called (Ix) Macculuum, and 962 motivates this name with the statement that they performed some act there whose description corresponds to segments of the name. Just like Panab Ha and many of the other names, the etymology is framed by the relational particle *ti* 'to, at, from' and the anaphoric particle *i* 'there (aforementioned)'. These are interpreted as coreferential with the immediately preceding place-name and flank the clausal description proper. ME's translation and spacing of the Maya indicate that he has interpreted the *ma* form to be the negative particle (mod. *má?* (*ah*) 'not') and the *cah* form, perhaps, to be an instance of the word *cah* 'reside, settle (in a place)' (mod. *kàah, kahakbal* 'residing'). In any case, *cah* must be the verb, because *ob* immediately follows it, as it should, assuming it marks plural subject.[33] The morphemes *u-* ... *ob* '3d ... plural' form the unit 'they'. *than* can only be an unincorporated noun here, because it occurs after the verb complex, whose limits are indicated by the prefixal and suffixal pronouns. The problem is that *cah* 'settle (in a place)' is a positional verb that cannot take a direct object without being morphologically derived and is not, to my knowledge, associated with speech. Moreover, the negative particle *ma* never intervenes between an A set pronoun and the verb or noun to which it prefixes. The order would have to

[32] These conventions are pragmatic as well as narrowly semantic, a distinction ME misses by OPPOSING semantics to grammar, rather than treating it as A PART OF grammar. In order to match the actions with the place-names, it is necessary to know not only what the words mean in a semantic sense, but also to know the practice of using these specific words to describe those acts. It is certain that the descriptions are not the only ones that could fit the events they portray, and that actions other than these would fit the characterizations encoded in the names. The pairing of name with action therefore rests on both grammar and conventions of use.

[33] The plural morpheme could also appear on an independent NP functioning as a core argument to the verb, if there were one. The point here is that since there is no independent NP, the verb gets plural marking.

be *ma u cah ob* for the negative reading to be grammatically possible. The correct segmentation is *mac ah*, not *ma cah*, and the expression is *mac than*, which the sixteenth-century Motul dictionary cites with the meaning 'to interrupt, cut off with speech' (cited in the Cordemex:485). The *ah* suffix is the familiar one for past transitive verbs, and the proper gloss is therefore 'There they broke off speech' or 'There they interrupted speech'.

All of the place-names in the text are related to verbs of motion, either immediately or recoverable in preceding discourse. Between lines 771-924, where the narrator summarizes, all of the names are preceded by explicit motion verbs, in relation to which they indicate the goal or point of arrival. In 945-1018, a list of fifty-one names is presented without any intervening verb phrases, but even here, the list is preceded by the phrase 'then we arrived' and the names are interpretable as so many more places to which the nobles went.[34] Subsequently, verbs of motion are reintroduced, starting with *hok ob* 'they went out (to)' in line 1019 and continuing with *bin ob* 'they went', *kuch ob* 'they arrived', and *tal ob* 'they came'. The importance of this fact is that it indicates that the nobles actually visited these places, whether or not they nominated them, or performed actions of which the name is a description. This section of the Chumayel diagrams an actual journey, just as the Chronicle of Yaxkukul diagrams a journey around the perimeter of the town. In modern Maya ritual practice, shamans engage in the same process of traveling, step by step, the road to the spirit referents to which they appeal in curing, binding space, and making offerings. The result is a similar diagrammatic representation of a spatial progression through a sequence of references (Hanks 1984).

3.3. Etymology and parallelism in the *Hab* 'year' ceremonial. In chapter 15, entitled "The Ceremonial of the Hab," another series of near etymologies occurs. ME (pp. 23-24) describes the ceremony as taking place over ten days at the transition between one *hab* 'year (365 days)' and another. Unlike the etymologies in the *May* ceremonial circuit, which motivate place-names by describing the actions performed there, these motivate the types of agent in the ceremony, by describing the role they played: the 'measurers' measured, the 'red tree shrubs' spread red tree around, and the 'sweepers' swept. The passage in question occurs in the middle of a longer description, which starts with a list of the ritual objects, ordered according to their color coefficients in the sequence Red (East; 1435-50), White (North; 1451-61), Black (West; 1462-79), and Yellow (South; 1479-91).[35] This is followed immediately by the description of the categories of person who participated (1498-1510), and then a list of the official *hool poop* 'counselors' (lit. 'head of [the] mat [of authority]') who did (1511-44). The counselors are

each identified with a directional quadrant, and the directions are presented in the same order as were their corresponding colors, E > N > W > S. Following this, another series of objects is introduced, including 'bees (or honey)', *luch* 'gourd (cups)', and flowers; these are described in both color and directional terms (e.g., 'little *red* honey bees in the *east*'). This new list runs from lines 1545-67 and recapitulates the same order Red-East, White-North, Black-West, Yellow-South.[36] If one looks at the entire chapter, then, what is depicted is a four-part cycle of objects ordered by their colors, followed by a description of the categories of participants, a four-part cycle of counselors ordered by cardinal location, and another cycle of objects ordered by color, where the color-direction associations remain constant (cf. Fought 1985 for sketch of cyclicity in Chorti literature, and in the Dresden Codex; MacLeod [forthcoming] describes other, calendrically anchored counting ceremonies in Maya). It is in the description of participants, flanked by identically ordered lists, that the near-glosses occur. The passage reads:

(25) 1498. *Ca hop' talel ah p'is*   And the Surveyors began to come
     (luum) lay ah p'is te   there to P'iz Te
 1500.   *Y ah p'i(s . . .) lub ob*   And P'iz Te is their stopping place.
     Ca tun tali chac te: aban.   And then came the Red Tree Shrubs
         Chac tetic u(. . .)b ob: and Chac Te is their stopping
                 place.

     Ca tali uac hab nal hoch   Then came the Six Year Corns
 1504.   *Xiu tic u lub ob =*   And Xiu Tic is their stopping place.
     Ta muk u talel: mis cit   While there came the Sweeper lords
     ahau:
         Mis tic u lub ob: And Mis Tic was their stopping
                 place.

 1508. *Ta muk u talel y ah p'is*   While there came the Surveyors
     Ul u lub ob   And reached their stopping places
 1510. *Heklay coch. lub*   Open there was a wide stopping place
     C u p'isc i: which was measured there.

In every other line starting at 1498, a group of actors is identified with what appears to be a descriptive phrase. These are the leftmost lines, all of which begin with a connective element, *ca* 'then', *tamuk* 'while', or *heklay* 'which' (rel pro; cf. below). Starting with the coming of the Red Tree Shrubs, the immediately following lines identify actions performed by the actors. These are the indented lines, each of which contains a clause. It is clear that each is a clause because *tic* is transparently composed of suffixes used to derive denominal transitive verbs, and *u lub ob* is the direct object of the derived verb.[37] ME has translated these lines as NAMES of the 'stopping places' of the people, but he

---

[34] This is a problematic portion of the text, because it is the first time that the narrator shifts into the first-person plural, implying that he made the trek with the other nobles. After this, it shifts back into third-person report.

[35] The associations between colors and directions indicated by the parenthesized terms are well known to Mayanists and unambiguous (Sharer 1983:chap. 14), even though the direction terms are not mentioned in the text.

[36] Actually, there is a problem with the association between black and west in this final list. ME has translated the direction as West, which it must be according to the color and sequential order of appearance. The Maya transliteration, however, says *lakin* 'East'.

[37] The suffixes are *-t-ic* 'denominal transitive stem formative-incompletive transitive'. It is noteworthy that the verbs so derived in this section lack the prefixal ergative pronoun

notes in a footnote to 1500 that all of the place-names are actually "puns"; *p'is te* means 'measuring rod', *p'is-ic* 'to measure (it)', *chac te* means 'red tree', *chacte-tic* 'to red tree it' (gloss uncertain), *xiu* 'grass', *xiu-tic* 'spread grass (in an area)', *mis* 'broom, sweeping', *mis-tic* 'sweep (it)'. The term *lub* in this context evidently means 'resting place', although elsewhere it can mean a unit of time of about an 'hour' or a unit of distance roughly equal to the league (4 km.) (Cordemex:463). A more revealing gloss would therefore be:

(25')   Ca tun tali chac te: aban   And then came the Red Tree Shrubs.
              Chac te tic u(. . .)b ob: to red tree their stopping place.
          Ca tali uac hab nal hoch   Then came the six year corns
1504. Xiu tic u lub ob =   to spread grass in their stopping
                                                            place.
          Tamuk u talel mis cit ahau   While the Sweeper lords came
              Mis tic u lub ob: to sweep their stopping place.

On this reading, what is being described are the preparations of the so-called 'stopping places' or 'rest stops' of the ceremony, executed by nobles whose categories suit them to the job. The key relationship is the one between the descriptor of the categories of actors—measurers, 'red tree shrubs' (?), sweepers— and the acts they performed in the resting areas. Whatever the precise understanding of these acts, they are the epitomizing ones from which the role labels derive.

Line 1510 appears to mistake the relative pronoun *heklay* 'which, these ones' for a form of the verb *hek* "open', but this leaves unexplained the would-be stem formative *-lay* (the demonstrative *lay* would not occur immediately postverbally followed by an adjective such as *coch* 'broad, expansive'). This relative pronoun is common in sixteenth-century Maya and is in the dictionaries (Cordemex:196 cites Motul).[38] The revised gloss would then read 'while the measurers came and reached their stopping places, which were of great extent (far apart), (and) they measured them'. This gloss is more realistic on grammatical grounds and yields a more intelligible reading of the whole passage.

ME is right when he argues that scansion must rest on phrasing devices, such as the parallel couplet, and his work has brought needed attention to the relation between such devices and the semantic and discourse level units that they sustain. Rhetorical organization in these terms has important consequences for translation and cultural interpretation. What the text "says" is determined partly by the culturally meaningful style in which it is presented. In the *Hab* ceremonial circuit in the Chumayel, style is regimented in cycles based on the cardinal directions, with many redundant features linking lines locally (such as repeating

---

[?u- which would normally mark agent of the subordinate clause, as in *tali u xiu tic* 'he came to spread grasses'. The reason for this is unclear to me.

[38] In lines 2159-60, two more instances of the relative pronoun are glossed as 'divide up', but this forces an unjustified transitive reading with none of the expected morphological markings.

complementizers, particles, parallel clause structures). The tendency to etymologize is strong in both ceremonial circuits discussed here. This suggests that the ritual enactments described were events whose broader function was to ESTABLISH names and EPITOMIZE certain kinds of performance, fixing the semantics of the words that describe the acts. More research is required, however, before this can be asserted with certainty.

4. Conclusion. In the preface to his translation of the Chilam Balam of Tizimin, ME (1982:xv) observed that the language of this text, particularly the older portions of it, is "terse but elegant ... meant to be read and pondered rather than skimmed over or recited." Working with his translation, it is obvious that ME has pondered the Chumayel at length and achieved many insights into its meaning. His interpretation of the text is grounded in a global vision of Maya language and history. It is also fairly obvious that he has not recited the texts, not attempted to give them an oral reading from which interpretation would begin. Tedlock (1983) has shown that such an oral reading may be necessary to an accurate and revealing interpretation of the Popul Vuh creation myth, in Quiche Mayan. Working with sixteenth-century Yucatec Maya documents, I have demonstrated that significant oral components are grouped into verse series, indicating lines of regular length, with end rhyme and notable alliteration (Hanks 1986; 1987; forthcoming). It is at least possible that the Chilam Balam texts would yield a clearer interpretation if they were read aloud, rather than being treated as lapidary inscriptions to be pondered without the accompaniment of sound.

There are two sides to the question. The first is whether or not the texts were composed IN ORDER TO BE READ ALOUD; whether an oral reading is pragmatically reasonable as a point of departure. This is a substantive question about the culture of Maya language, and it is not obvious at present how to answer it. Historical sources report that Maya nobles read aloud in clandestine meetings during the sixteenth century, to the displeasure of the Spanish. This suggests an oral reading but leaves unspecified which portions of a text like the Chumayel would be so performed. The relation between oral and written texts has received sufficient attention in the literature that ME could spell out in more detail his position on the nonorality of the texts under study.

The second aspect is methodological, namely, whether or not a PHONETIC discourse can be reconstructed from the graphic record and analyzed according to the grammatical conventions of Maya language. Phoneticism in this sense implies a grammatical analysis. Scholars have made major advances in the study of Mayan epigraphy by relating glyphs to phonetic readings (Justeson and Campbell 1984 and references cited therein). In too many cases, it appears that ME's commitment to nonorality in the first sense reinforces a commitment to aphoneticism in the second. It is true that the texts are not grammatically parsed, and that they omit tone, length, and glottalization in vowels. But these features are UNAVOIDABLY part of any interpretation. A translation necessarily implies a set of decisions about phonetic form, as well as grammatical segmentation. ME's translations would be more convincing if they were argued in terms

of the structure of Maya language, starting with phonology but including morphology and syntax. This has led to advances in Mayan epigraphy, where the obstacles are obviously greater, and it would lead to advances in the translation of post-Conquest texts as well. It is simply not possible to say what the text means without attending to the linguistic structure of the language.

Such an approach would call into question the belief that the couplet is the single most central device in Maya discourse style, by demonstrating the presence of other linguistic and stylistic devices, while productively engaging grammar in the task of translation. It would lead to a more defensible treatment of word and morpheme boundaries, as well as the order of constituents both within words and across them. It would lead to a closer description of such features as the repetition of the plural morpheme ob in verse series, the cyclic repetition of lines in prose descriptions of ceremonial circuits and surveys, and the many foregrounded syntactic parallels between lines. These features are all lost in translation and banished by the assertion that lexical semantics is the guiding dimension, and grammatical form is inconsequential. A more explicit theory of style would recognize that the couplet is merely the most simple expression of the principle of verse parallelism, namely, a single parallel with two members. A more demanding linguistic check on the translation would force a better treatment of quoted versus direct discourse, as well as epithets for places and individuals, and the description of historical events. That is, it would produce a more convincing history, along with a better scansion.

The books of Chilam Balam, as ME has pointed out, are internally diverse. They contain stretches of text that appear to be descriptive narrative, prophetic "sermons" evidently addressed by individual Maya priests to actual audiences, lists of dates and correspondences, reports of ceremonial performances, exhortations, puns, and other tropes. This diversity is one of the first facts that must be taken into account in the interpretation of the discourse. One cannot answer the question of whether the texts are oral or nonoral, nor what kinds of stylistic devices and constructions govern them, without first realizing that they are internally complex. Any attempt to reduce Maya style to a single device is only credible if based on a demonstration that this device operates systematically across discourse genres, something of which there is no evidence. It is far from clear even what the relevant genres are in Yucatec Maya. A major question raised by the text under review is therefore: what ARE the genres of discourse that make up the corpus of Chilam Balam texts, and how do they relate to other genres of which we have documentary or ethnographic evidence? In the light of this question, the stylistic and grammatical devices that can be demonstrated in the texts can be related to culturally meaningful categories. The research required for this will build on ME's foundational contributions but cannot afford to rest on his assumptions.

WILLIAM F. HANKS, *University of Chicago*

REFERENCES

BARRERA VASQUEZ, ALFREDO. 1984. Documento Numero 1 del deslinde de tierras en Yaxkukul, Yucatan. Coleccion Cientifica, Linguistica, no. 125. Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia.

——; JUAN RAMON BASTARRACHEA MANZANO, AND WILLIAM BRITO SANSORES. 1980. Diccionario Maya Cordemex. Mérida: Ediciones Cordemex.

BECQUELIN MONOD, AURORE. 1979. Examin de quelques paires sémantiques dans les dialogues rituels des Tzeltal Bachajon (langue Maya du Chiapas). Journal de la Société des Américanistes 66:235-63.

——. 1981. Des Pieds et des mains. Analyse sémantique des concepts en tzeltal (Maya du Chiapas). Centre National de Recherche Scientifique, Paris. La Linguistique 17, no. 2:99-118.

BRICKER, VICTORIA R. 1974. The ethnographic context of some traditional Mayan speech genres. Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking, ed. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, pp. 368-88. London: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1978. Antipassive constructions in Yucatec Maya. Papers in Mayan Linguistics, ed. Nora C. England, University of Missouri Miscellaneous Publications in Anthropology, no. 6, pp. 3-24. Columbia: University of Missouri.

BRODY, JILL. 1986. Repetition as a rhetorical and conversational device in Tojolabal (Mayan). IJAL 52:255-74.

CATON, STEVEN C. 1987. Contributions of Roman Jakobson. Annual Review of Anthropology 16:223-60.

EDMONSON, MUNRO S. 1970. Metáfora maya en literatura y en arte. Verhandlungen des XXXVIII Internationalen Amerikanistenkongresses (Stuttgart-München, 1968) 2:37-50.

——. 1973. Semantic universals and particulars in Quiche. Meaning in Mayan Languages: Ethnolinguistic Studies, ed. Munro S. Edmonson, pp. 235-46. The Hague: Mouton.

——. 1982. The Ancient Future of the Itza: The Book of Chilam Balam of Tizimin. Austin: University of Texas Press.

——. 1986. Heaven Born Mérida and Its Destiny: The Book of Chilam Balam of Chumayel. Austin: University of Texas Press.

——, AND VICTORIA A. BRICKER. 1985. Yucatecan Mayan literature. Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians, ed. Munro S. Edmonson, vol. 3, pp. 44-63. Austin: University of Texas Press.

FARRISS, NANCY M. 1984. Maya Society under Colonial Rule: The Collective Enterprise of Survival. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

FOUGHT, JOHN. 1976. Time structuring in Chorti Mayan narratives. Mayan Linguistics, ed. Marlys McClaren, pp. 228-42. Los Angeles: University of California American Indian Study Center.

——. 1985. Cyclical patterns in Chorti (Mayan) literature. Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians, ed. Munro S. Edmonson, vol. 3, pp. 147-70. Austin: University of Texas Press.

FRIEDRICH, PAUL. 1979. Poetic language and the imagination: a reformulation of the Sapir hypothesis. Language, Context and the Imagination, pp. 441-512. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

GARIBAY, ANGEL MARÍA. 1953-54. Historia de la literatura náhuatl. Mexico: Porrúa.

GOSSEN, GARY H. 1974. Chamulas in the World of the Sun: Time and Space in a Maya Oral Tradition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

——. 1985. Tzotzil literature. Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians, ed. Munro S. Edmonson, vol. 3, pp. 65–106. Austin: University of Texas Press.

HANKS, WILLIAM F. 1984. Sanctification, structure and experience in a Yucatec Maya ritual event. Journal of American Folklore 97:131–66.

——. 1985. Letter of Maya nobles to the Spanish Crown, March 19, 1567, Archivo General de Indias, Mexico 359. [Unpublished transliteration and translation of document, 138 lines in Maya; Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.]

——. 1986. Authenticity and ambivalence in the text: a colonial Maya case. American Ethnologist 13:721–44.

——. 1987. Discourse genres in a theory of practice. American Ethnologist 14:64–88.

——. Forthcoming. Elements of Maya style. Word and Image in Mayan Culture: Explorations in Language, History and Representation, ed. William F. Hanks and Don S. Rice. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

HAVILAND, JOHN B. 1987. How to talk, some Tzotzil ways (or: Ritual speech without ritual). Paper presented at the Conference on Discourse in Sociocultural Context, University of Texas, Austin, April 9–11.

HYMES, DELL, 1981. In Vain I Tried to Tell You: Studies in Native American Ethnopoetics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

——. 1982. Narrative form as a grammar of experience: Native Americans and a glimpse of English. Journal of Education 164:121–42.

——. 1987. A theory of irony and a Chinookan pattern of verbal exchange. The Pragmatic Perspective, ed. Jef Verschueren and Marcella Bertuccelli-Papi, pp. 293–337. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

JAKOBSON, ROMAN. 1960. Closing statement: linguistics and poetics. Style in Language, ed. Thomas Sebeok. Cambridge, Mass: The M.I.T. Press.

——. 1985. Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time, ed. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

JUSTESON, JOHN S., AND LYLE CAMPBELL, eds. 1984. Phoneticism in Mayan Hieroglyphic Writing. Albany: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, State University of New York.

LÉON-PORTILLA, MIGUEL. 1985. Nahuatl literature. Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians, ed. Munro S. Edmonson, vol. 3, pp. 7–43. Austin: University of Texas Press.

LOUNSBURY, FLOYD G. 1980. Some problems in the interpretation of the mythological portion of the hieroglyphic text at the Temple of Cross at Palenque. Third Palenque Roundtable, 1978, pt. 2, ed. Merle Greene Robertson, pp. 99–115. Austin: University of Texas Press.

MACLEOD, BARBARA. Forthcoming. The 819-day-count verb: a soulful mechanism. Word and Image in Mayan Culture: Explorations in Language, History and Representation, ed. William F. Hanks and Don S. Rice. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

MARTINEZ HERNANDEZ, JUAN. 1929. Diccionario de Motul, Maya-Español Atribuido a Fray Antonio de Ciudad Real. Mérida: Talleres de la Compania Tipografica Yucateca.

McQUOWN, NORMAN A. 1967. Classical Yucatec (Maya). Handbook of Middle American Indians, vol. 5, Linguistics, pp. 201–47. Austin: University of Texas Press.

——. 1979. A modern Yucatec Maya text. Mayan Texts II, ed. Louanna Furbee Losee, pp. 38–106. IJAL Native American Texts Series, no. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

NORMAN, WILLIAM M. 1980. Grammatical parallelism in Quiche ritual language. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, pp. 387–99.

PO'OT YAH, ELEUTERIO, AND VICTORIA R. BRICKER. 1981. Yucatec Maya Verbs (Hocaba Dialect), with Grammatical Introduction. New Orleans: Center for Latin American Studies, Tulane University.

ROBERTSON, JOHN S. 1984. From symbol to icon: the evolution of the pronominal system from common Mayan to modern Yucatecan. Language 59:529–40.

ROYS, RALPH L., trans. and ed. 1965. Ritual of the Bacabs. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

SHARER, ROBERT J., ed. 1983. The Ancient Maya, by Sylvanus G. Morley and George Brainerd. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

SILVERSTEIN, MICHAEL. 1986. The culture of language in Chinookan narrative texts; or, on saying that . . . in Chinook. Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause, ed. Johanna Nichols and Anthony C. Woodbury. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TEDLOCK, DENNIS. 1983. The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

TOZZER, ALFRED M., trans. and ed. 1941. Relacion de las cosas de Yucatan, by Fray Diego de Landa. Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.

TYNIANOV, YURI. 1981. The Problem of Verse Language, trans. and ed. by Michael Sosa and Brent Harvey. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis.

WOODBURY, ANTHONY C. 1987. Rhetorical structure in a central Alaskan Yupik traditional narrative. Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric, ed. Joel Sherzer and Anthony C. Woodbury, pp. 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ZIMMERMANN, GÜNTER. 1970. Briefe der indianischen Nobilität aus Neuspanien an Karl V um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Munich: Kommissionsverlag Klaus Renner.