Incipient Literacy: From Involvement to Integration in Tojolabal Maya

Jill Brody

I. Introduction

With the development of writing systems and the spread of literacy, authors in Latin American Indian communities are now beginning to produce written works in their native languages.[1] When indigenous authors present material from the oral tradition of these communities (folktales, etc.) in the written medium, there arises an ideal environment in which to examine possible differences between spoken and written narrative for languages without a written tradition. Some of these differences are explored here through a comparison of two versions of a folktale by native speakers of the Mayan language Tojolabal.[2] What I hope to show is that Tojolabal folktales, as part of the Tojolabal oral tradition, exhibit elaborate and artistic structure; that the spoken form is carefully constructed and emphatically not defective; and that features identified by Chafe (1982) as characteristic of spoken language are transferred from the primary spoken medium into the secondary written medium. In the course of this exploration of some of the differences between spoken and written Tojolabal in a lab-like situation of minimal contrast, I hope to suggest some new directions for the exploration of orality and literacy not as "gross typological constructs" but in terms of the "understanding of speaking and writing in human life on the basis of soundly empirical, cross-cultural investigations" (Bauman 1986:10).

The story presented in two versions below is from the ample Tojolabal oral tradition. It is a well-known folktale of the community, and provides an account of the reason behind the major yearly pilgrimages of many Tojolabal people to Santo Tomás in Oxchuk and to San Bartolomé in Venustiano Carranza. These pilgrimages are in general part of a larger complex of religious activities and in particular part of a yearly supplication for rain.

The two recountings originate from different storytellers. The written version was inscribed by a man who is bilingual and fairly comfortably literate

in both Spanish and Tojolabal; he learned to write Spanish in school and he learned to write in Tojolabal from Protestant missionaries. The oral version is a transcription of a taped oral presentation by another bilingual man who enjoys a good reputation as a storyteller, but who has very little experience of literacy in either Spanish or Tojolabal.

The recountings represent two versions of what both narrators recognize as the same story. Several similarities and differences between the two versions are discussed below. Of course, some of the differences between them arise from the fact that the stories were told by two different people. The differences brought out in the discussion below, however, are those which derive principally from the medium: oral presentation as opposed to written presentation. It is certainly too ambitious to claim the ability to distinguish between all traits of individuality on the one hand and all oral/written differences on the other. However, the data analyzed here as a case study are representative of the differences between oral and written presentations in Tojolabal that I have generally observed in the examination of an extensive corpus of material both written and transcribed from tapes.

Although the two versions of the folktale are related by different storytellers, there are other considerations that facilitate a direct comparison. Most analyses of spoken and written language have involved extremes of difference in the material, such as comparisons between unplanned, unrehearsed dialogue and carefully crafted prose (e.g., Chafe 1982; an exception is Tannen 1982). These varieties of language use can be expected to differ in a number of ways, since they represent distinct genres, each with particular communicative tasks. The fact that the data examined here are from the same genre makes them more directly comparable. The choice of the folktale as opposed to other genres (such as conversation, for example) further constrains possible differences. This can be traced to the requirements of the genre: not only is content restricted, there being recognized stories frequently told in the community, but there is also a set structure for folktales. So while spoken language is generally characterized by a lack of planning as compared with written language (Ochs 1979, Redeker 1984), folktales represent a highly planned form of speech. The fact that the folktales compared here are both well known and highly structured results in a situation where the oral and written versions should differ minimally with respect to planning. In Ochs's terms, the oral version would be a sample of planned spoken discourse. Chafe (1982) has noted similarities between written language and ritual language in nonliterate traditions, with the latter demonstrating "content, style, and formulaic structure which remains constant from performance to performance" (1982:49). In Tojolabal, the folktale as a genre falls in an intermediate category between colloquial speech and ritual speech (Brody 1986a). A final consideration in selecting the folktale genre is

that many stories contain elements from traditional Mayan belief, and thus the genre represents at least in part an enduring Mayan tradition.

Some studies have compared spoken and written language in the context of an extensive and highly developed literary tradition (Chafe 1982, Tannen 1982), a situation that is not directly comparable to literacy in Tojolabal. More pertinent to the situation explored here are studies that have examined the development and spread of literacy in situations of "restricted literacy" (Goody 1968; Scribner and Cole 1981:238). However, the focus of that work has been on the way in which social hierarchies and institutions affect the development and distribution of literacy and how intellectual processes differ between individuals with exclusively oral experience and those who are literate. In some ways, the situation described here is also one of restricted literacy, in that writing and reading have been recently introduced and are not widespread in the Tojolabal community. However, the focus in the analysis here is not on the social and intellectual aspects of literacy, but rather on its individual and linguistic dimensions. I offer the term "incipient literacy" as descriptive of the Tojolabal situation, to bring out the possibilities and limitations inherent in the new and potentially powerful tool of literacy.

Literacy in Tojolabal must be viewed as an individualized phenomenon, because it is not established in the Tojolabal community as it is, for example, among the Vai, the African community described by Scribner and Cole (1981). Nor is literacy in the modern Mayan community closely associated with religion, as it is for the situations of "restricted literacy" described by Goody (1968), though literacy in the ancient hieroglyphic writing certainly was (Schele and Miller 1986). Only a few Tojolabal speakers are literate in their language; there is little to read, and there are few to write for. The potential does exist for the use of Tojolabal to develop the type of role that "restricted literacy" plays in the Vai community. However, literacy in Tojolabal is currently so restricted as to be really only a potential in the community. On the level of the individual literate in Tojolabal, the linguistic consequences of incipient literacy can be therefore examined in relative isolation from the social. For example, it is expected that fewer of the kinds of differences between spoken and written texts found by Chafe (see below) would be present in the absence of a tradition of literacy. In the absence of widespread, well established literacy and a set Tojolabal literary style, the effect of written tradition upon spoken Tojolabal must be minimal. There is doubtless influence from general literacy, those complex interrelations between the spoken and the written discussed by Ong (1982), Finnegan (1977), Goody (1968, 1987), and Heath (1983), in particular from Spanish, the language of literacy in the dominant Mexican political entity. The effects of this influence might be established through comparing a text like the written one analyzed here with one written by an individual who was monolingual

and literate in Tojolabal; however, cultural realities make this an unlikely combination of characteristics.

Given the conditions described above, it might be expected that the two versions of the folktale would be nearly identical renderings. However, it is clear from the synopses in Section II below (see also the full texts in the Appendices) that this is not the case. In order to investigate and distinguish which features may be distinctive to oral delivery and which may be factors of the written medium, it is first necessary to elucidate those features that are inherent in the genre of the folktale. The organization of Tojolabal folktales has three major aspects: structure, content, and delivery. These three aspects are partially congruent with categories developed by Hymes (1981) in analysis of Chinookan folktales: poetic form, rhetorical form, and vocal realization, respectively; they are discussed in Section III. Differences in all three areas are traced to the spoken origin of the folktale in the context of the Tojolabal speech community. In section IV, the implications of Chafe's (1982) categories of integration and involvement features in spoken and written language are applied to this Tojolabal data. While the examples used are drawn from the test case of the two versions of the folktale that appear in the appendices, the features discussed here are characteristic of a large corpus of spoken and written texts as a whole, and are not idiosyncracies of these two particular renditions.

II. Synopses of the Two Versions of the Folktale

These synopses relate only the action and the characters of the two folktale versions. Complete presentations of the two versions are included in the appendix.

A. *Spoken Version*

Sto. Tomás began to fight with San Bartolomé. They hit each other and fought with fire. Then Sto. Tomás became angry and wanted to demolish the volcano. He sought advice, taking along the younger sibling San Carlos, and San Mateo. They went to meet with the Padre Eterno. He calmed them down, advising them not to kill people in vain, because if the volcano were to be destroyed, then all would be finished, and that would be a shame. So Sto.Tomás obeyed, and Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé fought only between themselves. When the fight was over, it turned out that it happened because of what Sto. Tomás stole from San Bartolomé. When the fight was over, then the pilgrimages were begun.

B. *Written Version*

San Bartolomé went to Sto. Tomás' house and destroyed it. This angered Sto. Tomás, so he went to San Bartolomé's house, where there is a big volcano, and tore it down in order to kill all the people living there. Sto. Tomás saved humanity when the god "who really orders" fashioned a new creation to replace the current one. The new creation of people had only one hand, leg, and eye. When Sto. Tomás saw it he kicked it, proclaiming the new creation inferior because it was incomplete. Thus Sto. Tomás merits worship by pilgrimage. Sto. Tomás also saved the people when the ash fell, by having it fall cold.

III. Comparison of the Two Versions of the Folktale

A. *The Organization of Tojolabal Folktales*

There is a characteristic form and organization to folktales in Tojolabal; this structure is part of what defines the folktale as a genre (Brody 1986b). In Hymes' terms (1981:322), poetic form is the organization of a Chinook narrative into verse, line, stanza, and scene. The units I will discuss for Tojolabal are different but also function to structure the folktale narrative: formulaic framings, the recapitulation, and the denouement. For Hymes, the rhetorical structure of Chinookan texts has to do with the organization of action into a three-stage sequence of first outset, then ongoing action, and finally outcome (322). For purposes of the discussion of the Tojolabal folktales, I want to deal with content in a very general sense—the events related and the characters participating in the folktale. It is in terms of delivery or presentation that the oral and written versions of the story differ most. Hymes includes a wide range of "voice" features under his category of vocal realization, including quotation, onomatopoeic sounds, expressiveness variously manifested, and audience response (322). A set of similar and overlapping features constitutes what I label as "delivery" features in Tojolabal, including stylistic features used by the storyteller, responses by the audience, sentence length, and the use of fillers, hesitation words, or conjunctions. The focus is on how these features are interactive, calling upon the relationship between the storyteller and audience in the moment of the performance.

B. *Structure*

The structure of Tojolabal folktales is not dependent on literacy, since the basic structure found in the written version is also present in the spoken version. I will not attempt here a complete treatment of folktale structure in Tojolabal, but rather will discuss several structural features shared by the two

versions: 1) formulaic openings and closings that frame the story and mark what they enclose as a folktale, 2) the retelling of the story at the end as a recapitulation, and 3) the explanatory denouement that presents the moral of the story near the end. These are present, to different degrees, in both versions of this tale.

Both versions of the story open with typical folktale beginnings: the spoken version begins with *oj kal jun kwento...* "I will tell a story..." and the written version with *ja kristiano jumasa waxyalawe7 ke…* "People say that...." The formulaic beginning of the spoken version is clearly more personally oral, with the storyteller announcing that he is about to speak the story. The formula initiating the written version literally places the folktale in the collective mouths of the community; this feature reinforces the point made above that these folktales represent shared cultural knowledge. The written version ends with the typical folktale termination *ti ch'aka* "Then it is finished." The speaker of the oral version was interrupted after sentence #23; he continues to speak on related topics, and when he is finished speaking, he too uses the typical termination.

The synoptic recapitulation of the story is part of the terminal structure of the Tojolabal folktale. Both versions of the tale in effect tell the story twice; the first time through includes all the detail, with the second pass being sketchier than the first. The detailed first telling of the spoken version is from sentence #1 to #18, and the synoptic recapitulation is from sentence #19 to #23.

19.   k'e7 ja skorajae7.
       They got angry.

20.   syama sb'aje7.
       They fought each other.

21.   *entonse* komo ja7 el ja pagre eterno ye7n ya7 kulan kani.
       Then since it is that the Padre Eterno came out, he made them calm down.

22.   mi oj ya7 sb'aje7 *jach* wa xsjem ja bolkan i.
       They won't fight each other in order to destroy the volcano.

23.   yajni ya7 kulane7 *antonse* ja7 ti xa ochie7 k'u7anel ja kristiano.
       When he calmed them down, that's when the people began the pilgrimage.

The written folktale version offers a very brief synopsis in the final sentence #20.

20.   *ti ch'ak a* ja lo7il *jastal* k'e7iye7 tiro ja san bartolo i sok ja santo tomas i
               sok ja *jastal* waxkoltani ja santo tomas i.
       The story is then finished how San Bartolomé and Sto. Tomás began to fight
               and how Sto. Tomás helps.

The relating of a narrative with a recapitulation at the end is a manifestation on the level of the story of the aesthetically prized characteristic of repetition (which I have discussed elsewhere in detail [Brody 1986a]).

Both the oral and the written versions of the account of Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé illustrate another important structural feature of Tojolabal folktales: the characteristic indication of the story denouement. Longacre (1982) has discussed the various ways in which the peak or climax of a story is typically indicated (e.g., change in verb tense, shorter sentences, gathering together of participants, etc.). The climax, however, is not as apparent in the material under consideration here as is the denouement. This latter section is where the reason behind all of the activities related is put forth, and the "moral" of the story is given.

The denouement in Tojolabal folktales can in part be understood as incorporating the functional units of evaluation and result isolated in spoken narratives by Labov and Waletsky (1966).[3] The evaluation functions in "suspending the complicating action" (35); the result resolves these complications. Evaluation in Labov and Waletsky's spoken narratives is largely personal, where the emphasis on some parts of the story as more important than the rest conveys the storyteller's attitudes and feelings about what has occurred, although an outside figure may be introduced to provide evaluation of a more highly embedded nature (39). The main function of evaluation is to highlight the purpose or moral of the story—why the story was told and what it means, and this is carried out by the denouement in both oral and written Tojolabal folktales. For the Tojolabal folktales, however, the evaluation is not made in reference to speakers' attitudes, nor is it made by outsiders. Rather, evaluation is in relation to cultural tradition, and is made by reference to the community. Recourse to tradition as explanatory of actions related in the narrative resolves that action and gives the point of the story. In the written version the action of the main story ends, rather abruptly, with sentence #15. The remainder of the tale consists of the denouement (#16-19, with #20 as recap), containing the reasoning behind carrying out the pilgrimage to Sto. Tomás: that he helped the people when San Bartolomé wanted to destroy them, and also when the ash fell.

16.   *pwes ja7ch* waxyalawe7 ke ja7 b'*iyuj* jel t'ilan ja k'uanel i *porke* ja santo
              tomas i ye7n b'i mero waxkoltani.
        Well, thus they say, that for this reason (it is said) that the pilgrimage is very
              necessary, because (it is said) it is really Sto. Tomás who helps.

17.   *ja7ch* b'i ja yora ko7 ja k'ak'al ta7an ja najate7.
        Thus it was (it is said) when the hot ash fell long ago.

18.   ye7n b'i cha mero koltani ja santo tomas i.
        (It is said) it was also Sto. Tomás who really helped.

19.   ja7 b'i *yuj* che7e xa ko7 ja k'ak'al ta7an i.
           For this reason the ash was already cold when it fell (it is said).

In the spoken version, the recounted events are presented directly as justification for the pilgrimage.

18.   yajni lamxi ja pleyto jaw i *este yuj* b'i wan yelk'ajel *jas* waxyelk'an yuj ja
               san bartolo.
           When the fight settled down, um (it is said) it was because he is robbing
               what he robs from San Bartolomé.

The denouement occurs just before the recapitulation, and is indicated linguistically by the occurrence of several explanatory-type expressions in consecutive sentences. These explanatory expressions are the relative pronouns *jas* and *jastal* "how," the conjunction *ja7ch* / *jach'* / *jachuk* "thus, in this way," the borrowed Spanish conjunction *porke* "because," and the Tojolabal relational noun *yuj*,[4] also translated as "because." These words occur (in italics) in the written version in sentences #16, #17, #19, and #20; in the oral version, they occur (in italics) in sentences #14, #16, #17, #18, and #22. Note that they all appear toward the end of the story. In the written folktale, the action of the main story ends, rather abruptly, with sentence #15. The remainder of the tale consists of the denouement (#16-19, with #20 as recap), which explains (indirectly) that it is important to go on pilgrimage to honor Sto. Tomás because, as recounted, he saved the people from San Bartolomé, and he also saved them when the ash fell. In the spoken folktale, there are two denouements, one in sentences #14-18 for the first pass through the story (sentences #1-18), and the second in sentence #22 for the recap (#19-23).

14.   *porke* ta wa7yi7 ja bolkan i ti ch'ak unabes a.
           Because if you destroy the volcano, then it will be finished for once and for
               all.

15.   i lastima."
           And it would be a shame."

16.   *jachuk* k'okxi.
           Thus he obeyed.

17.   ja7 kechan wa syama sb'aje7 *jach'* entre ye7nle7.
           Thus they just fought between themselves.

18.   yajni lamxi ja pleyto jaw i *este yuj* b'i wan yelk'ajel *jas* was xyelk'an yuj ja
               san bartolo.
           When the fight settled down, um (it is said) it was because he is
               robbing what he robs from San Bartolomé.

19.   k'e7 ja skorajae7.
        They got angry.

20.   syama sb'aje7.
        They fought each other.

21.   *entonse* komo ja7 el ja pagre eterno ye7n ya7 kulan kani.
        Then since it is that the Padre Eterno came out, he made them calm down.

22.   mi oj ya7 sb'aje7 *jach* wa xsjem ja bolkan i.
        They won't fight each other in order to destroy the volcano.

23.   yajni ya7 kulane7 *antonse* ja7 ti xa ochie7 k'u7anel ja kristiano.
        When he calmed them down, that's when the people began the pilgrimage.

Thus we can see that in terms of general structural elements, the oral and written versions are very similar, although their particular manifestations are somewhat different. Other structural similarities that could be mentioned include typical ways of introducing characters, indicating dialogue, and locating the story in past time (Brody 1986b). The structural pattern of Tojolabal folktales is not dependent on writing; it is present in and basic to the spoken folktale.

C. Content

One of the most striking differences between these two versions of the folktale is their difference in content: each mentions events that the other neglects. For example, the written version discusses the creation by God and the destruction by Sto. Tomás of other generations of people, which is not mentioned in the spoken version, while the spoken version brings out Padre Eterno's role as peacemaker, a point not included in the written version. When I discussed the story with the storytellers, each one knew that the events mentioned by the other were part of the folktale, but had chosen not to include them in his own particular performance. In addition, there were other parts of the story that both tellers knew, but which neither included in his presentation. For example, while both versions discuss the fight between Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé, only the spoken one makes reference to a theft as the reason for the fight. Neither version includes the information (which both storytellers certainly knew) that Sto. Tomás stole some squash seeds from San Bartolomé, and that this theft was the precipitating event of their feud. Ruz (1982) records a number of other elements of the entire story. Another category of shared cultural knowledge unnecessary for the Tojolabal storytellers to relate, and yet crucial for interpretation by outsiders, is that pilgrimages honor the saint to whom they are made, and that it is important to so honor a saint in order to insure continued protection and patronage.

The differences in content derive, I believe, from the fundamentally oral nature of Tojolabal narrative (despite the fact that one version was written) and

the high degree of shared knowledge in Tojolabal society (Brody 1986b, forthcoming b). This tale is from the repertoire of common shared Tojolabal cultural knowledge; *everyone* knows this story, and *everyone* knows that the fight began because Santo Tomás stole squash seeds from San Bartolomé. Details may be left out because hearers can be presumed to be familiar with them. Each telling, whatever elements it includes, stands for the whole folktale, and is presented within the structure of a whole folktale (see section III. A). Differences in content at different performances of a folktale are also manifestations of the storyteller's creativity as a performer engaged with his audience in the interactive creation of the folktale at each telling. Jacobs describes a similar situation for myth-telling among the Clackamas Chinook (1959:5):

> Each myth, and each phrase within a myth, functioned in a raconteur-audience-community relationship of shared participation, because literary creativity resided as much in the community as in the storyteller of the evening. That which was familiar to all was treated with an extreme of selectivity as well as with a special kind of stylization. Only a few features of a situation or actor were chosen for mention; they were worded succinctly and in traditional manner. The narrator's terse phrases were, in current terminology, coded signals. Audience members reacted by decoding, reconstructing, filling in.

Differences in content do not imply defectiveness. Rather, performers of Tojolabal folktales may be operating on another aesthetic metric, also noted for Chinookan by Hymes (1981:322)—the ability to capture the essence of the tale in a short performance. This succinctness is satisfying in an atmosphere of shared knowledge—the encapsulated folktale invokes the whole tale, even the whole mythic world. Recounters of Tojolabal folktales are able to depend on shared knowledge within the community for the interpretation of their performances. Neither spoken nor written versions are incomplete. In oral performance, the storyteller does rely on an interactive relationship with his audience, as detailed in the following section.

D. Delivery

Since the Tojolabal folktale is originally a spoken genre of language, features of the actual delivery and performance of these stories in cultural context must be appreciated. The setting for telling folktales is a small group. There are no particular restrictions on the time or season for storytelling. The delivery of folktales can be seen as a performance, but this performance is not a solo. As Furbee-Losee (1976; see also Furbee 1988) has pointed out, overt reply is a significant feature of large categories of Tojolabal speech. Folktale speech events in Tojolabal require overt responses from the audience. The importance of the audience is overtly acknowledged in the oral version of this folktale, where the audience is actually addressed, in line #1, as *ermano*

"brother."[5] Folktale presentations are interactive group performances. Audience interaction with the storyteller includes making appropriate back-channel responses, exclamations, clarifications, and comments (as noted by Brody 1986a for Tojolabal, Burns 1983 for Yucatec, and Maxwell 1982 for Chuj). These contributions are an integral part of the event, making the performance a group production. Although neither of the versions analyzed here includes audience participation, the oral version can be seen to reflect the accommodation to audience responses in the use of relatively shorter sentences.

Determination of sentence boundaries is always a difficult and perhaps impossible task in a language without a written tradition. For the folktales analyzed here, sentence breaks were made in the written text by the author, and were marked in the transcription of the spoken version according to the co-occurrence of syntactic and prosodic breaks. While both versions contain approximately the same number of sentences, it is noteworthy that the average sentence is nearly twice as long in the written version (11.7 words per sentence) as in the spoken one (average 6.3 words per sentence). The number of clauses per sentence does not differ greatly (1.6 for the written version, 1.3 for the spoken; see section IV below). As noted by Tannen (1982), the greater length of the written sentence is likely to derive from the leisure the writer has to compose it, as opposed to the urgency of speech. Sentences and clauses in the oral version commonly begin with fillers, hesitation words, and conjunctions; indeed, these words are among the most definitive indicators of sentence and clause boundaries. Examples of these are *este* (#2, #18), *antonse* or *entonse* (#5, #12, #21), and *pes* (#7). These words are all borrowed from Spanish, and occur with high frequency in Tojolabal spoken by both bilinguals and monolinguals (Brody forthcoming a). The filler *este* has no semantic content; *entonse*/*antonse* (Sp. *entonces*) "then" and *pes* (Sp. *pues*) "well, then" function not only as fillers but also as temporal conjunctions and as discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987). As temporal conjunctions, the conjunctions borrowed from Spanish help to sequentialize the action. As fillers in spoken language, these words allow speakers to gain time to gather their thoughts, to make dramatic pauses, and to exhibit personal style. As discourse markers, these words function in both spoken and written Tojolabal as markers of transitions on the level of discourse.

For example, each use of the borrowed Spanish conjunction *pwes* in the written version (in sentences #5, #8, #9 and #16) can be seen to initiate a new topic in the narrative. The topic of sentence #4 was the destruction of Sto. Tomás' house; sentence #5 begins with *pwes* and changes the topic to Sto. Tomás' reaction to the incident:

4.   spojo b'i ja snaj ja santo tomas i.
        (It is said) he destroyed Sto. Tomás' house.

5.   *pwes* waxyalawe7 ke yajni b'i yila poj ja snaj ja santo tomas i jel b'i k'e
               skoraja.
         Well, they say that when (it is said) he saw his house demolished, (it is said)
               that Sto. Tomás got very angry.

The interaction of the storyteller and his audience is reflected in several aspects of the delivery of the folktales, including the length of sentences and the use of discourse markers. The shared knowledge of the audience is another factor that the storytellers rely on, whether the medium of relation of the folktale is oral or written, as pointed out in the preceding section (III.C).

E. Conclusions

Minimal differences between the spoken and written versions of the tale of Santo Tomás and San Bartolomé would be expected, given that the two versions relate the same story, participate in the same genre, and exist in a context relatively free from literate influence. Structure is highly similar in the oral and written versions. Content diverges not as a factor of literacy but rather because of a high degree of shared cultural knowledge and the absence of a strong value placed on exact repetition of stories. It is in delivery that most of the medium-related differences can be found. These have to do with presence vs. absence of remarks made to an addressee, the use of hesitation fillers, and the length of sentences.

The lack of an immediate and responsive audience must be one of the major differences between speaking and writing, and it is hardly surprising that this should be reflected in the two versions of the folktale. The use of hesitation fillers in spoken language may allow the speaker to gain time to complete a thought. A major function of these fillers in conversation is to hold the speaker's turn, to prevent the listener from jumping in. This function is much less important in storytelling, however, since even though the listener does make responses, these are not directed at taking over the storytelling role. Greater sentence length and less frequent use of fillers definitely reflect the greater amount of time available to the writer as opposed to the speaker. In the following section, these features of delivery will be discussed in relation to Chafe's (1982) features of involvement and integration.

IV. Discussion: Involvement & Integration in Incipient Literacy

Although this pilot study offers only a simple comparison between two versions of a single folktale, some instructive directions for future work are suggested on applying Chafe's (1982) important metric of features of involvement and integration in spoken and written language.

In comparing spoken and written language, Chafe has isolated two dimensions or axes along which speaking and writing differ: involvement to

detachment, and fragmentation to integration. Integration is accomplished through the use of "nominalizations, increased use of participles, attributive adjectives, conjoined phrases and series of phrases, sequences of prepositional phrases, complement clauses, and relative clauses" (Tannen 1982:8); fragmentation is the lack of integrative features. Involvement features include monitoring of the communication channel; concreteness and use of detail; emphasis on action and people, especially first-person, including speakers' mental processes; direct quotation; fuzziness; and use of emphatic particles. Features of detachment include all means of distancing from involvement, such as the passive in English. Chafe notes that spoken language is relatively high in involvement and low in integration, while writing is relatively high in detachment and low in fragmentation.

Examination of the two folktale versions presented here in terms of involvement features reveals some differences: the spoken version uses first-person orientation, shows heavier use of pause fillers as monitors of the communication channel, and incorporates somewhat more specific detail. The spoken version incorporates first-person involvement in its opening frame,

1.   *oj kal jun kwento ermano* komo jastal k'e7 ja tiro sok ja san bartolo ja santa
            toma.
        I will tell a story, brother, how Sto. Tomás started a fight with San
            Bartolomé.

while the written version defers in its frame to the voice of "the people":

1.   *ja kristiano jumasa waxyalawe7* ke jun ek'ele7 k'e7iye7 b'i tiro ja santo
            tomas i sok ja san bartolo.
        People say that one time, (it is said) Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé began to
            fight.

As monitors of the communication channel, borrowed conjunctions in their function as pause fillers qualify as indicators of involvement. The spoken version of the folktale uses eight borrowed conjunctions, while five occur in the written version; more about these below. An example of a borrowed conjunction as pause filler is found in sentence #2 from the spoken version:

2.   este k'e tiro.
        um com-BEGIN-3a FIGHT
        Um, they began to fight.

Specific detail is seldom greatly elaborated in Tojolabal folktales, in that they are so much a part of shared community knowledge that the details, well known by most people, may be suppressed in particular performances (see above section I, also Brody forthcoming b). Other involvement features appear in both spoken and written versions; for example, the written version actually includes more actors than does the spoken version, a characteristic which could be interpreted as indicating a stronger orientation toward people.

Both folktale versions include direct quotations. The written version contains four usages of the emphatic expression *mero* (Sp. *mero*) "really," an indication of involvement, while none appear in the spoken version. Thus the two folktale versions exhibit a comparable level of use of involvement features.

Integration features are, however, more problematic; these features are relatively absent in the spoken version of the folktale, but are present only to a limited degree in the written version. This is partly a feature of the particular structure of Tojolabal grammar. High use of nominalizations and participles (features defined by Chafe 1982 as indicating integration) characterize the Tojolabal language in all speech genres (Furbee, personal communication), and hence cannot be viewed as diagnostic of integration for this language. Attributive adjectives are uncommon in general in Tojolabal; there are very few adjectives as a word class, and their frequency of occurrence is not high. This makes adjectives difficult to use in Tojolabal as a diagnostic of integration. Nonetheless, there is higher adjective use in the written as opposed to spoken language, with three (*niwan* "big" #7, *k'ak'al* "hot" #17 and #19) in the written version, and one (*k'ox* "littlest" #9) in the spoken version.

Sentence complexity is also a feature of integration. As discussed above (section III.D), the written version has longer sentences, with a slightly higher number of clauses per sentence. The written version does exhibit more conjunctions, complement clauses, relative clauses, and strings of prepositional phrases than does the spoken version.[6]

In the spoken version there is a tendency for clauses to be related to one another through parallel construction. Sentences #3 and #4 exhibit syntactic, semantic, and phonological parallelism (see also sentences #8, #10, and #11 from the spoken version):

3.   wa xsk'ana smak' sb'aje7
        They wanted to hit each other.

4.   puro sok k'ak' ya7 sb'aje7.
        They fought each other with fire only.

Ochs (1979) noted parallelism as characteristic of unplanned spoken discourse (see also Tannen 1982). Parallel construction is an important structural device in Tojolabal, especially in ritual speech (Brody 1986a, 1988; Furbee 1988). It relates contiguous sentences or clauses both structurally and semantically, and can be seen to function as an oral means of cohesion and integration.

As mentioned above (section III.D), many of the conjunctions borrowed from Spanish function as discourse markers, in which function they are promoting the integration and cohesion of the narrative. The example cited in section III.D above of *pwes* indicating change of topic is a clear use of a

borrowed conjunction as a discourse marker of cohesion, linking one part of the narrative to the next. Although it appears contradictory to point to the same items as evidencing now integration, now involvement (as in the example shown earlier in this section), discourse markers are in their essence notoriously multifunctional (Brody forthcoming a, Schiffrin 1987). In sum, there is somewhat greater use of integration features in the written version than in the spoken. However, the problems in applying linguistic features from Chafe's list to Tojolabal—as in the relative lack of attributive adjectives in Tojolabal and the presence of integrative parallelism—point to the need to adapt the list to the particular structures and usages of particular languages. The list of features as it stands provides guidelines, but is probably too general and is biased toward English.

There are several ways in which the genre of Tojolabal folktales can be seen to select for particular features on the involvement-detachment and fragmentation-integration continua. The overall heavy use of involvement features in the written version may be due to the cultural emphasis on certain aspects of involvement in the genre of folktales, such as audience response. As a feature of detachment, the reportative particle *b'i* is characteristic of folktales,[7] and functions to distance the speaker from what is related in the tale. However, the story structure itself mitigates against fragmentation, as does the fact that the stories are well known and repeatedly told, and hence are always planned discourse. Thus the Tojolabal evidence corroborates Tannen's (1982) findings for English that individual genres in particular languages may have their own specific configurations of involvement and integration features, rather than involvement only being found in speech and integration only in writing.

One interpretation to be drawn from the general distribution of involvement features as shared by both oral and written language, and integration features as more representative of written language, is that involvement is prior to integration. This is hardly surprising, since fundamentally speech is prior to writing. In these language samples from a cultural situation where literacy is not strongly established, the written version of the folktale evidences a higher level of integration features, but about the same use of involvement features in comparison with the spoken version. What appears to have occurred in the transferral of the Tojolabal tale to the written medium is that a number of the indicators of involvement that characterize oral delivery have been carried over. This provides evidence for the operation of an hypothesized sequence in the development of literacy: 1) language use in non-literate situations is characterized by high involvement; 2) with the advent of literacy, written language in the incipient literacy stage is characterized by continuing use of involvement features; 3) the loss of involvement features begins and the use of integration features develops as a literary style.[8] More data from other situations of incipient literacy will be necessary to further test this hypothesis.

A valuable kind of information can be gained through analysis of spoken and written texts that are very narrowly comparable, such as those discussed here. Anthropological linguists have frequently stressed the importance of true performances (Bauman 1977, Sherzer 1983), for which stories written by native speakers would not qualify. However, these written stories are valuable in that they represent an outgrowth of the oral tradition, and are some of the first attempts at accommodation to literacy in these languages. Additionally, as we have seen here, the comparison between written and oral versions of a story can reveal important similarities and differences between the two media for newly literate people.

Louisiana State University

Notes

[1]Prominent among these are the works of the Tzeltal-Tzotzil Maya Writers Cooperative, Sna Jtz'ibajom, in San Cristobal de las Casas, Chiapas, Mexico.

[2]Tojolabal Maya is spoken in the *municipios* of Las Margaritas and Altamirano in Chiapas, Mexico, in the lower highlands near the border with Guatemala; it is probably most closely related to the Guatemalan Mayan language Chuj. Tojolabal has not been studied as extensively as its highland Chiapas neighbors Tzeltal and Tzotzil, though it is of equivalent cultural and linguistic richness (Brody 1982, Furbee-Losee 1976). Mayan cultures are well known for their storytelling traditions (Bricker 1974, Burns 1983, Gossen 1974, Laughlin 1977).

[3]These are often fused in narrative (Labov and Waletsky 1966:35).

[4]*y-uj*: 3rd-person possessive prefix-relational noun of agency.

[5]The spoken version of the folktale was elicited and recorded by the author of the written version.

[6]Conjunctions (both borrowed from Spanish and native Tojolabal)—eight in the spoken version: #1, #4, #5, #7, #12, #15, #21, #23; fourteen in the written version: #1, #5, #6, #8, #9, #11 (three), #14 (two), #16, #18, #20 (two). Complements considered here are aspectless embedded clauses, and those with *ke* complementizer (Brody 1982)—three in the spoken version: #6, #11, #13; four in the written version: #1, #5, #9, #16. Relative clauses— three in the written version: #8, #10, #15; one in the spoken version: #18. String of prepositional phrases—one in the written version: #2.

[7]The spoken version of Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé analyzed here is peculiar in that the reportative particle *b'i* does not appear.

[8]It would be interesting to see if this were the distribution of involvement and integration features for situations of "restricted literacy" as well; I would predict that it would be.

References

Bauman 1977   Richard Bauman. *Verbal Art as Performance* . Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bauman 1986   _____. *Story, Performance, and Event*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bricker 1974   Victoria R. Bricker. "Some Traditional Mayan Speech Genres." In Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, eds., *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 368-88.

Bright 1982   William Bright. "Poetic Structure in Oral Narrative." In Deborah Tannen, ed., *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. pp. 171-84.

Brody 1982   Jill Brody. "Discourse Processes of Highlighting in Tojolabal Maya Morphosyntax." Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington University.

Brody 1986a   _____. "Repetition as a Rhetorical and Conversational Device in Tojolabal (Mayan)." *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 52:255-74.

Brody 1986b   _____. "Tojolabal Maya Folktales: Discourse Structure and Variation." Paper presented at the 1986 meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Brody 1988   _____. "Discourse Genres in Tojolabal Maya." In Jill Brody and John S. Thomas, eds., *Aspects of Tojolabal Maya Culture and Language*. Baton Rouge: Geoscience Publications. In press.

Brody forthcoming a   _____. "Particles Borrowed from Spanish as Discourse Markers in Mayan Languages." *Anthropological Linguistics*.

Brody forthcoming b   _____. "Context and Shared Knowledge in Tojolabal Conversation." In Louanna Furbee, ed., *Mayan Voices: Mayan Text and Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

Burns 1983   Alan F. Burns. *An Epoch of Miracles: Oral Literature of the Yucatec Maya*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Chafe 1982   Wallace L. Chafe. "Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature." In Deborah Tannen, ed., *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. pp. 35-54.

Finnegan 1977   Ruth Finnegan. *Oral Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Furbee-Losee 1976   Louanna Furbee-Losee. *The Correct Language: Tojolabal*. New York: Garland.

Furbee 1988   _____. "To Ask One Holy Thing: Petition as a Tojolabal Maya Speech Genre." In Jill Brody and John S. Thomas, eds., *Aspects of Tojolabal Maya Culture and Language*. Baton Rouge: Geoscience Publications. In press.

Goody 1968   Jack Goody, ed. *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goody 1987   _____. *The Interface between the Written and the Oral*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gossen 1974   Gary H. Gossen. *Chamulas in the World of the Sun*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heath 1983   Shirley Brice Heath. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communitites and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes 1981   Dell Hymes. "Discovering Oral Performance and Measured Verse in America Indian Narrative." In Dell Hymes, ed., *"In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 309-41.

Jacobs 1959   Melville Jacobs. *The Content and Style of an Oral Literature: Clackamas Chinook Myths and Tales*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Labov and Waletzky
  1966   William Labov and Joshua Waletzky. "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience." In June Helm, ed., *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle: American Ethnological Society. pp. 12-24.

Laughlin 1977   Robert Laughlin. *Of Cabbages and Kings: Tales from Zinacantan*. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, 23. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Longacre 1982   Robert Longacre. *The Grammar of Discourse*. New York: Plenum.

Maxwell 1982   Judith M. Maxwell. "A Simplified Code: Chuj (Mayan) as Written by Native Speakers." *Journal of Mayan Linguistics*, 4:3-10.

Ochs 1979   Elinor Ochs. "Planned and Unplanned Discourse." In Talmy Givón, ed., *Discourse and Syntax, Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 12. New York: Academic Press. pp. 51-80.

Ong 1982   Walter J. Ong. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen.

Redeker 1984   Gisela Redeker. "On Differences Between Spoken and Written Language." *Discourse Processes*, 7:43-55.

Ruz 1982   Mario H. Ruz. *Los Legítimos Hombres: Aproximación Antropológia al Grupo Tojolabal*. México, D.F.: Centro de Estudios Mayas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Schele and Miller
  1986   Linda Schele and Mary Ellen Miller. *Blood of Kings: Dynasty and Ritual in Maya Art*. Fort Worth: Kimball Art Museum.

Schiffrin 1987   Deborah Schriffin. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scribner and Cole
  1981   Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole. *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sherzer 1983   Joel Sherzer. *Kuna Ways of Speaking*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Tannen 1982   Deborah Tannen. "Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives." *Language*, 58:1-21.

Tedlock 1983   Dennis Tedlock. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Text 1. Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé (oral)

l.   *oj kal jun kwento ermano* komo jastal k'e7 ja tiro sok ja san bartolo ja santa toma.
        I will tell a story, brother, how Sto. Tomás started a fight with San Bartolomé.

2.   *este* k'e tiro.
        Um, they began to fight.

3.   wa sk'ana smak' sb'aje7
        They wanted to hit each other.

4.   puro sok k'ak' ya7 sb'aje7.
        They fought each other with fire only.

5.   *antonse* tajki ja santa toma i.
        Then Sto. Tomás got mad.

6.   ja7 wa sk'ana sjema ja bolkan i.
        What he wants to do is to demolish the volcano.

7.   pes el ja santa toma yi7aj a7b'al.
        Well, Sto. Tomas went to ask advice.

8.   ek' yi7 ja ijtz'inal i.
        He went by to pick up the younger sibling.

9.   ja7 k'ox ijtz'inal ja san karlos i.
        It is San Carlos who is the youngest.

10.   ek' yi7 ja san mateo.
        He picked up San Mateo.

11.   ek' b'a sta7 sb'aje7 ja b'a pagre eterno.
        They went to meet with the Padre Eterno.

12.   *entonse* el ja pagre eterno.
        Then the Padre Eterno came out.

13.   ye7n ya7 kulan ke "miyuk lom oj jach'ak ja kal kunintik i."
        He calmed them down, [saying] "No, you will not do in our dear children for no
                reason."

14.   *porke* ta wa7yi7 ja bolkan i ti ch'ak unabes a.
        Because if you destroy the volcano, then it will be finished for once and for all.

15.   i lastima."
        And it would be a shame."

16.   *jachuk* k'okxi.
        Thus he obeyed.

17.   ja7 kechan wa syama sb'aje7 *jach'* entre ye7nle7.
        Thus they just fought between themselves.

18.   yajni lamxi ja pleyto jaw i *este yuj* b'i wan yelk'ajel *jas* wa xyelk'an yuj ja san
                bartolo.
        When the fight settled down, um (it is said) it was because he is robbing what he
                robs from San Bartolomé.

19.   k'e7 ja skorajae7.
        They got angry.

20.   syama sb'aje7.
        They fought each other.

21.   *entonse* komo ja7 el ja pagre eterno ye7n ya7 kulan kani.
        Then since it is that the Padre Eterno came out, *he* made them calm down.

22.   mi oj ya7 sb'aje7 *jach* wa sjem ja bolkan i.
        They won't fight each other in order to destroy the volcano.

23.   yajni ya7 kulane7 *antonse* ja7 ti xa ochie7 k'u7anel ja kristiano.
        When he calmed them down, that's when the people began the pilgrimage.

70.   *ti ch'ak a.*
        Then it is finished.

Text 2. Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé
(written)

1.   *ja kristiano jumasa waxyalawe7* ke jun ek'ele7 k'e7iye7 b'i tiro ja santo tomas i sok
                ja san bartolo i.
        People say that one time, (it is said) Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé began to fight.

2.   ja san bartolo i k'ot b'i masan b'a snaj ja santo tomas il b'a oxchuk.
        San Bartolomé arrived (it is said) in Sto. Tomás' house in Oxchuk.

3.   ti b'i swajel ja san bartolo.
        (It is said) then San Bartolomé went.

4.   spojo b'i ja snaj ja santo tomas i.
        (It is said) he destroyed Sto. Tomás' house.

5.   *pwes* waxyalawe7 ke yajni b'i yila poj ja snaj ja santo tomas i jel b'i k'e sokoraja.
        Well, they say that when (it is said) he saw his house demolished, (it is said) that
                Sto. Tomás got very angry.

6.   cha waj b'i ja santo tomas il man b'a snaj ja san bartolo i.
        (It is said) that Sto. Tomás also went to San Bartolomé's house.

7.   ay b'i jun niwan witz ja tiw i.
        It is said there is a big volcano there.

8.   *pwes* ja santo tomas i sjema b'i ko7n ja witz jaw i b'a oj cham spetzanil ja ma7tik
                kulan ja b'aya ja san bartolo i.
        Well, (it is said) that Sto. Tomás tore down that volcano so that all of those living
                where San Bartolomé is will die.

9.   *pwes* waxchayalawe7 ke ja santo tomas i ye7n b'i mero waxkoltani ja7 yuj mey
                lach'aktik.
        Well, they also say that it's Sto. Tomás who really (it is said) helps so that we're
                not done in.

10.   jun ek'ele7 ja diyos ma7 mero wask'ulan mandar i ti xa b'i ay yuj ja jlok'oltik i.
        One time the god who really orders, then (it is said) he had made by his order our
                substitute [generation].

11.   pero jasa kechan b'i jun yok sok jun sk'ab' sok jun sat.
        But it turns out that (it is said) [that they had] only one foot and one hand and one
                eye.

12.   yajni b'i yila ja santo tomas i jun ta b'i patada ya7yi7.
        It is said when Sto. Tomás saw it, (it is said) he gave it a kick.

13.   ti b'i yala a "jas ya7teluk ja it i.
          Then (it is said) he said, "What is this good for?

14.   kechan jun yok sok sk'ab' i jun sat.
          He just has one foot and hand and one eye.

15.   b'a waj slaj ja kuntikil jumasa tz'ikan yoj sk'ab'ie7?'
          How can he equal our children who are complete in their hands and feet?"

16.   *pwes ja7ch* waxyalawe7 ke ja7 b'i *yuj* jel t'ilan ja k'uanel *porke* ja santo tomas i
                   ye7n b'i mero waxkoltani.
          Well, thus they say, that for this reason (it is said) that the pilgrimage is very
                   necessary, because (it is said) it is really Sto. Tomás who helps.

17.   *ja7ch* b'i ja yora ko7 ja k'ak'al ta7an ja najate7.
          Thus it was (it is said) when the hot ash fell long ago.

18.   ye7n b'i cha mero koltani ja santo tomas i.
          (It is said) it was also Sto. Tomás who really helped.

19.   ja7 b'i *yuj* che7e xa ko7 ja k'ak'al ta7an i.
          For this reason the ash was already cold when it fell (it is said).

20.   *ti ch'ak a ja* lo7il *jastal* k'e7iye7 tiro ja san bartolo i sok ja santo tomas i sok ja
                   jastal waxkoltani ja santo tomas i.
          The story is then finished how San Bartolomé and Sto. Tomás began to fight and
                   how Sto. Tomás helps.

Introduction to Texts

　　　　Below are four folktales from the Tojolabal Maya tradition. The first two are spoken and written versions of the tale of Sto.Tomás and San Bartolomé that were analyzed above in "Incipient Literacy: From Involvement to Integration in Tojolabal Maya." Here they are presented with a fuller morphological breakdown.

　　　　Two additional folktales are also presented, with similar linguistic analysis. The folktale *"ja winik b'uk'ji yuj ayin"* was written out by the same author who wrote the written version of "Sto. Tomás." This version shares the basic characteristics of structure, content, and delivery with the written version of "Sto. Tomás." One interesting structural feature of *"ja winik buk'ji yuj ayin"* is that the recapitulation takes the form of a testimonial of reported experience. The story *"birjin"* was transcribed from tape. It also shares many of the basic structural characteristics with the spoken version of "Sto.Tomás," though it lacks the recapitulation and formulaic closing. Delivery features of the presentation of this folktale include much vocal expressiveness in the quoted speech, especially near the end. Both *"ja winik b'uk'ji yuj ayin"* and *"birjin"* are succinct in their content; each story has other episodes in other versions ("*birjin*" was discussed in this regard in Brody 1986b).

　　　　Abbreviations and conventions of transcription follow the texts.

Text 1. Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé (oral)

1.   oj k-al-0 jun kwento ermano komo jastal 0-k'e7-0
          fut le-SAY--3a ONE STORY BROTHER how how com-BEGIN-3a

ja tiro sok ja san bartolo ja santa toma.
det FIGHT with det SAN BARTOLO det SANTO TOMAS
I will tell a story, brother, how Sto. Tomás started a fight with San
        Bartolomé,

2.   este 0-k'e7-0   tiro.
       um com-BEGIN-3a FIGHT
       Um, they began to fight.

3.   wa x-s-k'an-a-0   s-mak'-0s-b'aj-e7.
       pro inc-3e-WANT-tvm-3a 3e-3e-refl-3pl
       They wanted to hit each other.

4.   puro sok k'ak' 0-y-a7-e7   s-b'aj-e7
       ONLY with FIRE com-3e-GIVE-3a 3e-refl-3pl
       They fought each other with fire only.

5.   antonse 0-tajk-i-0   ja santa toma=i.
       then com-BECOME ANGRY-ivm-3a det SANTO TOMAS=npt
       Then Sto. Tomás got mad.

6.   ja7-0 wa s-k'an-a-0   s-jem-a-0 ja bolkan=i.
       cl-3a pro 3e-WANT-tvm-3a 3e-DEMOLISH det VOLCANO=npt
       What he wants to do is to demolish the volcano.

7.   pes 0-el-0 ja santa toma 0-y-i7-aj-0   a7b'al.
       well com-EXIT-3a det SANTO TOMAS com-3e-TAKE-tvm-3a ADVICE
       Well, Sto. Tomás went to ask advice.

8.   0-ek'--y-i7-0   ja ijtz'inal=i.
       com-PASS--3e-TAKE-3a det YOUNGER SIBLING=npt
       He went by to pick up the younger sibling.

9.   ja7-0 k'ox   ijtz'inal   ja san karlos=i.
       cl-3a YOUNGEST CHILD YOUNGER SIBLING det SAN CARLOS=npt
       It is San Carlos who is the youngest.

10.   0-ek'--y-i7-0   ja san mateyo.
     com-PASS--3e-TAKE-3a det SAN MATEO
     He picked up San Mateo.

11.   0-ek'=b'a=s-ta7-0   s-b'aj-e7 ja b'a pagre eterno.
     com-PASS=loc=3e-MEET-3a 3e-relf-3pl del loc PADRE ETERNO
     They went to meet with the Padre Eterno.

12.   entonse 0-el-0   ja pagre eterno.
     then   com-EXIT-3a det PADRE ETERNO
     Then the Padre Eterno came out.

13.   y-e7n 0-y-a7-0--kulan ke "miyuk lom
     3e-indpn com-3e-GIVE-ea--DO sub NO FOR NO REASON

     oj ja-ch'ak-0 ja k-al k-unin-tik=i.

fut 2e-FINISH-3a det le-dim le-CHILD OF MAN-pl=npt
He calmed them down, [saying] "No, you will not do in our dear children
                for no reason.

14.   porke ta w-a7--y-i7-0   ja bolkan=i
        because if 2e-GIVE--3e-TAKE-3a det VOLCANO=npt

        ti ch'ak-0 unabes=a.
        then FINISH-3a ONCE AND FOR ALL=clt
        Because if you destroy the volcano, then it will be finished for once and
                for all.

15.   i lastima-0."
        and SHAME-3a
        And it would be a shame."

16.   jachuk 0-k'ok-x-i-0.
        thus com-OBEY-mid-ivm-3a
        Thus he obeyed.

17.   ja7-0 kechan wa x-s-yam-a-0   s-b'aj-e7
        cl-3a only pro inc-3e-GRAB-tvm-3a 3e-refl-3pl
        jach' entre y-e7n-le7.

        thus BETWEEN 3e-indpn-3pl
        Thus they just fought between themselves.

18.   yajni 0-lam-x-i-0   ja pleyto jaw=i este
        when com-CALM-mid-ivm-3a det FIGHT THAT=npt um

        y-uj=b'i   wan y-elk'ajel-0 jas wa x-y-elk'an-0
        3e-relN-rpt prog 3e-STEAL-3a WHAT pro inc-3e-STEAL-3a

        y-uj ja san bartolo.
        3e-relN det SAN BARTOLO
        When the fight settled down , um (it is said), it was because he is robbing
                what he robs from San Bartolomé.

19.   0-k'e7-0 ja skoraja-e7.
        com-BEGIN-3a det ANGER-3pl
        They got angry.

20.   0-s-yam-a-0   s-b'aj-e7.
        com-3e-GRAB-tvm-3a 3e-refl-3pl
        They fought each other.

21.   entonse komo ja7-0 0-el-0   ja pagre eterno
        then since cl-3a com-EXIT-3a det PADRE ETERNO

        y-e7n 0-y-a7-0--kulan--kan=i.
        3e-indpn com-3e-MAKE-3a--SIT--STAY=npt
        Then since it is that the Padre Eterno came out, he made them calm down.

22.   mi oj 0-y-a7-0   s-b'aj-e7 jach wa x-s-jem-0
       neg fut com-3e-MAKE-ca 3e-refl-3pl thus pro inc-3e- DESTROY

       ja bolkan=i.
       det VOLCANO=npt
       They won't fight each other in order to destroy the volcano.

23.   yajni 0-y-a7-0--kulan-e7   antonse ja7-0 ti=xa
       when com-3e-MAKE-3a--SIT DOWN-3pl then cl-3a then=now

       0-och-i-e7   k'u7anel ja kristiano.
       com-BEGIN-ivm 3apl PILGRIMAGE det PEOPLE
       When he calmed them down, that's when the people began the pilgrimage.
       ...

70.   ti 0-ch'ak-0=a.
       then com-FINISH-3a=clt
       Then it is finished.

Text 2. Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé (written)

1.   ja kristiano jumasa wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7   ke jun ek'ele7
       det PEOPLE genpl pro inc-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl sub ONE OCCASION

       0-k'e7-i-e7=b'i   tiro ja santo tomas=i
       com-BEGIN-ivm-3apl=rpt FIGHT det SANTO TOMAS=npt

       sok ja san bartolo=i.
       with det SAN BARTOLO=npt
       People say that one time, (it is said) Sto. Tomás and San Bartolomé began
              to fight.

2.   ja san bartolo=i 0-k'ot-0=b'i masan b'a s-naj
       det SAN BARTOLO=npt com-ARRIVE-3a=rpt UNTIL loc 3e-HOUSE

       ja santo tomas il b'a oxchuk
       det SANTO TOMAS HERE loc OXCHUK
       San Bartolomé arrived (it is said) in Sto. Tomás house in Oxchuk.

3.   ti=b'i s-wajel ja san bartolo.
       then=rpt 3e-GO det SAN BARTOLO
       (It is said) than San Bartolomé went.

4.   0-s-poj-o-0=b'i   ja s-naj ja santo tomas=i.
       com-3e-BREAK-tvm-3a=rpt det 3e-HOUSE det SANTO TOMAS=npt
       (It is said) he destroyed Sto. Tomás' house.

5.   pwes wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7 ke yajni=b'i
       well pro inc-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl sub when=rpt

0-y-il-a-0poj-0   ja s-naj   ja santo tomas=i
com-3e-SEE-tvm-3aBROKEN-3a det 3e-HOUSE det SANTO
           TOMAS=npt
jel=b'i 0-k'e-O s-koraja.
MUCH=rpt com-BEGIN-3a 3e-ANGER
Well, they say that when (it is said) he saw his house demolished, (it is
           said) Sto. Tomás got very angry.

6.   cha=0-waj-0=b'i ja santo tomas il man b'a s-naj
        rep=com-GO-3a=rpt det SANTO TOMAS HERE UNTIL loc 3e-HOUSE

        ja san bartolo=i.
        det SAN BARTOLO=npt
        (It is said) that Sto. Tomás also went to San Bartolomé's house.

7.   ay-0=b'i jun niwan witz ja tiw=i.
        BE-3a=rpt ONE BIG WOODS det THERE=npt
        It is said there is a big volcano there.

8.   pwes ja santo tomas=i 0-s-jem-a-0=b'i=ko7n
        well det SANTO TOMAS=npt com-3e-DESTROY-tvm-
                 3a=rpt=DOWNWARD

        ja witz jaw=i b'a oj cham-0 spetzanil ja ma7-tik
        det WOODS THAT=npt loc fut DIE-3a ALL   det rel-pl

        0-kulan-0 ja b'aya-0 ja san bartolo=i.
        com-LIVE-3a det BE THERE-3a det SAN BARTOLO=npt
        Well, (it is said) that Sto. Tomás tore down that volcano so that all of
                 those living where San Bartolomé is will die.

9.   pwes wa x=cha=y-al-aw-0-e7 ke ja santo tomas=i
        well pro inc=rep=3e-SAY=tvm-3a-3pl sub det SANTO TOMAS=npt

        y-e7n=b'i mero wa x-koltan-i-0
        3e-indpn=rpt REALLY pro inc-HELP-ivm-3a

        ja7-0 y-uj mey la-ch'ak-tik.
        cl-3a 3e-re1N neg 2a-FINISH-2apl
        Well, they also say that it's Sto. Tomás who really (it is said) helps so that
                 we're not done in.

10.   jun ek'ele7 ja diyos ma7 mero wa
        ONE OCCASION det GOD rel REALLY pro

        s-k'ulan-0--mandari=i ti=xa=b'i ay-0 y-uj
        3e-MAKE-3a--ORDER=npt then=now=rpr BE-3a 3e-re1N
        ja j-lok'ol-tik=i.
        det le-REPLACEMENT-1pl=npt
        One time the god who really orders, then (it is said) he had made by his
                 order our substitute [generation].

11.   pero jasa   kechan=b'i jun y-ok
        but it-turns-out-that ONLY=rpt ONE 3e-FOOT

sok jun s-k'ab' sok jun s-sat.
and ONE 3e-HAND and ONE 3e-EYE
But it turns out that (it is said) [that they had] only one foot and one hand
        and one eye.

12.   yajni=b'i 0-y-il-a-0   ja santo tomas=i
      when=rpt com-3e-SEE-tvm-3a det SANTO TOMAS=npt

      jun=ta=b'i patada 0-y-a7--y-i7-0.
      ONE=com-rpt KICK com-3e-GIVE--3e-TAKE-3a
      It is said when Sto. Tomás saw it, (it is said) he gave it a kick.

13.   ti=b'i 0-y-al-a-0=a   "jas y-a7tel-uk-0 ja it=i.
      the=rpt com-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-clt WHAT 3e-USE-sbj-3a det THIS=npt
      Then (it is said) he said, "What is this good for?

14.   kechan jun y-ok sok s-k'ab' i jun s-sat.
      ONLY ONE 3e-FOOT and 3e-HAND and ONE 3e-EYE
      He just has one foot and hand and one eye.

15.   b'a wa x-s-laj-0   ja k-untikil jumasa
      HOW pro inc-3e-EQUAL-3a det le-CHILDREN genpl

      tz'ikan-0 y-ok--s-k'ab'-7?"
      COMPLETE-3a 3e-FOOT--3e-HAND-3pl
      How can he equal our children who are complete in their hands and feet?

16.   pwes ja7ch wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7   ke ja7-0=b'i y-uj
      well thus pro inc-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl sub cl-3a=rpt 3-re1N

      jel t'ilan-0   ja k'uanel=i   porke ja santo tomas=i
      VERY NECESSARY-3a det PILGRIMAGE=npt because det SANTO
            TOMAS=npt

      y-e7n=b'i mero wa x-koltan-i-0.
      3e-indpn=rpt REALLY pro inc-HELP-ivm-3a
      Well, thus they say, that for this reason (it is said) that the pilgrimage is
            very necessary, because (it is said) it is really Sto. Tomás who
            helps.

17.   ja7ch=b'i ja y-ora 0-ko7-0   ja k'ak'al ta7anja najate7.
      thus=rpt det 3e-TIME com-FALL-3a det HOT ASH det LONG AGO
      Thus it was (it is said) when the hot ash fell long ago.

18.   y-e7n=b'i=cha mero 0-koltan-i-0 ja santo tomas=i.
      3e-indpn=rpt=rep REALLY 3a-HELP-ivm-3a det SANTO TOMAS=npt
      (It is said) it was also Sto. Tomás who really helped.

19.   ja7-0=b'i y-uj   che7e-0=xa 0-ko7-0   ja k'ak'al ta7an=i.
      cl-3a=rpt 3e-re1N COLD-3a=now com-FALL-3a det HOT ASH=npt
      For this reason the ash was already cold when it fell (it is said).

20.   ti 0-ch'ak-0=a ja lo7il jastal 0-k'e7--iy-e7
          then com-FINISH-3a=clt det STORY how com-BEGIN-ivm-3apl

          tiro ja san bartolo=i sok ja santo tomas=i
          FIGHT det SAN BARTOLO=npt with det SANTO TOMAS=npt

          sok ja jastal wa x-koltan-i-0 ja santo tomas=i.
          and det how   pro inc-HELP-ivm-3a det SANTO TOMAS=npt
          The story is then finished how San Bartolomé and Sto. Tomás began to
                 fight and how Sto. Tomás helps.

Text. 3   ja winik b'ujk'ji yuj jun ayini

1.   ja bankil-al   jumasa wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7
          det OLDER BROTHER-ndr genpl pro inc-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl

          jun s-lo7il-e7 ja b'a najate7.
          ONE 3e-STORY-3pl det loc LONG AGO
          The elders tell a story of long ago.

2.   0-ajyi-0 jun winik ke jel tzatz-0 wa
          com-BE-3a ONE MAN sub VERYSTRONG-3a pro
          x-y-a7-a-0   s-b'aj.
          inc-3e-GIVE-tvm-3a 3e-refl
          There was a man who was confident that he was very strong.

3.   mi=b'i wa x-s-na7-a-0 ja s-b'ej ja xiwel=i.
          neg=rpt pro inc-3e-KNOW-tvm-3a det 3e MEANING det 3e fear=npt.
          It is said he did not even know the meaning of fear.

4.   ti 0-waj-0 atnel b'a s-ti7 niwan tzoman ja7.
          then com-GO3a BATHE loc 3e-EDGE BIG GATHERED WATER
          Then he went to bathe at the edge of the sea.

5.   jasa   yajni   wan-0 atnel=i
          but it turns out when prog-3a BATHE=npt

          ti=b'i 0-jak-0   jun niwan ayin=a.
          then=rpt com-ARRIVE-3a ONE BIG ALLIGATOR=clt
          But it turns out that when he was bathing, then it is said, a big alligator
                 arrived.

6.   ja=xa winik jaw=i jutz'in=b'i
          det=now MAN THAT=npt QUICKLY=rpt

          0-b'uk'-j-i-0--ko7
          com-SWALLOW-pas-ivm-3a--DOWNWARD

          wego y-uj ja ayin=i.
          NOW 3e-re1N det ALLIGATOR=npt
          As for that man, it is said he was right away swallowed down quickly by
                 the alligator.

7.   wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7   ke ja yajni ti=xa ay-0 b'a
            pro inc-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl sub det when then=now BE-3a loc

            y-oj   s-lukum ayin   ja winik jaw=i 0-jak-0
            3e-INTERIOR 3e-STOMACH ALLIGATOR det MAN THAT=npt com-
                 ARRIVE

            s-k'ujol wego ke ti y-i7oj   ja s-kuchulo.
            3e-HEART NOW sub loc 3e-POSSESSION det 3e-KNIFE
            They say that when that man was inside the alligator's stomach, then
                 he realized right away that he had his knife with him.

8.   pes ti=b'i 0-s-le7-a-0   modo jastal oj s-k'ul-uk-0
            well then=rpt com-3e-SEEK-tvm-3a WAY how fut 3e-DO-sbj-3a

            b'a y-ojol s-lukum   ja ayin=i.
             loc 3e-INTERIOR 3e-STOMACH det ALLIGATOR=npt
            Well then it is said that he looked for a way to do it in the stomach of the
                 alligator.

9.   wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7   ke ok'-el-al 0-el-0 y-uj
            pro inc-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl sub CRY-vdr-ndr com-EXIT 3e-re1N
            ja s-kuchulo ja b'a s-naj=i.
            det 3e-KNIFE det loc 3e-SHEATH=npt
            They say that with difficulty he took his knife out of its sheath.

10.   ja=xa yajni ti=xa yaman-0 y-uj=i ti=b'i
            det=now when then=now GRIPPED-3a 3e-re1N=npt then=rpt

            0-s-t'aj-a--y-i7-0   ja s-lukum ja ayin=i
            com-3e-SPLIT-tvm--3a-TAKE=3a 3e-STOMACH det ALLIGATOR=npt
            As for when he then had it grasped, he then split open the stomach of the
                 alligator.

11.   pwes ja=xa winik jaw=i   jel=xa jaman-i-0
            well det=now MAN THAT=npt VERY=now OPEN- ivm-3a

            0-y-il-a-0   ja satk'inal ja yajni 0-el-0=ta
            com-3e-SEE-tvm-3a det WORLD det when com-EXIT-3a=already

            b'a y-oj   s-lukum ja ayin=i.
            loc 3e-INTERIOR 3e-STOMACH det ALLIGATOR=npt
            Well that man, the world looked very open to him when he got out of the
                 alligator's stomach.

12.   jach 0-waj-i-0   ja lo7il s-b'a winik
            thus com-GO-ivm-3a det STORY 3e-loc MAN

            0-b'uk'-j-i-0   ayin=i.
            com-SWALLOW-pas-ivm-3a ALLIGATOR=npt
            Thus goes the story of the man swallowed by the alligator.

13.   ja7-0 y-uj wa x-y-al-aw-0-e7   ja kristiano jumasa
           cl-3a 3e-re1N pro inc-3e-SAY-tvm-3a-3epl det PEOPLE genpl

           ke mi lek-uk-0 oj ajy-uk-0 och-el atnel ja b'a
           sub neg GOOD-sbj-3a fut BE-sbj-3a ENTER-ndr BATHE det loc

           s-ti7 niwan tzoman ja7=i sok ja b'a s-ti7 niwan
           3e EDGE GATHERED WATER=npt and det loc 3e-EDGE BIG

           ja7=i   porke ja7-0 jel xiwel ja s-b'aj ja b'a ay-0
           WATER=npt because cl-3a VERY FRIGHT det 3e-refl det loc BE-3a

           ti pakan-0--ek' ja tan ayin=i.
           loc LYING-3a--PASS det DAMN ALLIGATOR=npt
           That is why all the people say that it is not good to go bathe by the edge
                   of the sea or by the edge of the river, because it is quite
                   frightening by where the alligator lies.

14.   jach 0-k-ab'-0   s-lo7lta-j-el ja b'a lado s-pat
           thus com-1e-HEAR-3a 3e-TALK-prt det loc SIDE 3e-BACK

           margarita ay-0=b'i jun winik ti 0'waj-0 no7x-jel
           MARGARITAS BE-3a=rpt ONE MAN loc com-GO-3a SWIM-prt

           b'a jun s-ti7 niwan ja7.
           loc ONE 3e-EDGE BIG WATER
           Thus I heard tell that by the back side of Las Margaritas there (is it is said)
                   a man who went to swim at the edge of a river.

15.   pes ja winik jaw=i 0-b'uk'-j-i-0=b'i ayin.
           well det MAN   THAT=npt com-SWALLOW-pas-ivm-3a=rpt
                   ALLIGATOR
           Well that man was swallowed by an alligator.

16.   ja=xa yajni wan-0 b'uk'-jel=i
           det=now when prog-3a SWALLOW-prt=npt

           wa x-s-wetal-0-a7an ja b'a y-oj s-ti7
           pro inc-3e-KICK-3a-pl det loc 3e-INTERIOR 3e-MOUTH

           ja tan ayin=i.
           det DAMN ALLIGATOR=npt
           As for when he was being swallowed, he kicks a lot inside the mouth of
                   that damn alligator.

17.   jachuk 0-lejb'a-j-0--jan b'a jwera
           thus com-SPIT OUT-pas-ivm-3a--STAY loc OUTSIDE
           Thus he was spit out.

Text 4. birjin (oral)

1.   ja najate7 ay-0=b'i jun birjin.
    det LONG AGO BE-3a=rpt ONE VIRGIN
    Long ago (it is said) there was a virgin.

2.   wa x-s-k'ul-an-0   y-alaj-il s-chenek'.
    pro inc-3e-MAKE-tvm-3a 3e-MILPA-ndr 3e-BEAN
    She made her milpa of beans.

3.   i ja y-alaj-il ja s-chenek'=i jel
    and det 3e-MILPA-ndr det 3e-BEAN=npt VERY

    s-ch'ak-0--chan.
    3e-FINISH-3a--ANIMAL
    And her milpa of beans was really being done in by animals.

4.   i mi 0-s-na7-a-0   jasu7a ja wan-0
    and neg com-3e-KNOW-tvm-3a WHAT det prog-3a

    y-a7-jel--y-i7-0.
    3e-GIVE-prt--3e-TAKE-3a
    And she didn't know what was doing it in.

5.   i 0-s-k'ul-an-0   jun manya.
    and com-3e-MAKE-tvm-3a ONE ARTIFICE
    And she made an artifice.

6.   0-s-k'ul-an-0   jun pigura jach puro chab'ek'.
    com-3e-MAKE-tvm-3a ONE FIGURE THUS PURE BEE'S WAX
    She made a figure out of bee's wax.

7.   0-y-al-a-0   ja tan chich=i ke
    com-3e-SAY-tvm-3a det DAMN RABBIT=npt sub

    wa x-s-k'ul-an-0--pensar   ke kristiyano-0.
    pro inc-3e-MAKE-tvm-3a--THINK sub PERSON-3a
    The damn rabbit said that he thought that it was a person.

8.   pero mi kristiyano-uk-0 sike   kechan pigurado ay-0.
    but neg PERSON-sbj-3a but rather ONLY FASHIONED BE-3a
    But it wasn't a person but rather it was only fashioned.

9.   i mi=xa   0-och--jan-i-0.
    and neg=now com-BEGIN--APPROACH-ivm-3a
    And he didn't begin to approach.

10.   mi=xa 0-och--jan-i-0.
    neg=now com-BEGIN--APPROACH-ivm-3a
    He didn't begin to approach.

11.   wa x-xiw-i-0.

              pro inc-FEAR-ivm-3a
              He was afraid.

12.   i deayi 0-och--jan-i-0.
         and then com-BEGIN--APPROACH-ivm-3a
         And then he began to approach.

13.   0-jak-0   s-k'um-uk-0.
         com-ARRIVE-3a 3e-SPEAK-sbj-3a
         He came up to speak to it.

14.   "mach' ay-a" wa x-y-ut'-a-0 ja tan pigura.
         WHO   BE-2a pro inc-3e-SCOLD-tvm-3a det DAMN FIGURE
         "Who are you?" he asked the damn figure.

15.   "mach' ay-a."
         WHO BE-2a
         "Who are you?"

16.   i mi x-k'um-an-i-0.
         and neg inc-SPEAK-vdr-ivm-3a
         And it doesn't speak.

17.   deayi este wa x-s-mak'-a-0.
         then um pro inc-3e-HIT-tvm-3a
         Then, um, he hit it.'

18.   i 0-kan--nok'an-0   ja jun s-k'ab=i.
         and com-STAY--STUCK-vdr-3a det ONE 3e-HAND=npt
         And one of his hands stayed stuck.

19.   i cho=0-y-a7-a-0--y-i7-0 otro.
         and rep=com-3e-GIVE-tvm-3a--3e-TAKE-3a OTHER
         And he gave it to him again.

20.   "mi=k'a x-a-sijb'un-0--k-i7-0 ja jun j-k'ab'=i
         neg=con inc-2e-RELEASE-3a--le-TAKE-3a det ONE le-HAND=npt

         este oj cho=k-a7-a-0--aw-i7-0 jun-uk-0.
         um fut rep=1e-GIVE-tvm-3a--2e-TAKE-3a ONE-sbj-3a
         "If you don't release my hand, um, I'm going to give you another one.

21.   cho=ay-0 jun j-k'ab'" x-chi-i-0.
         rep=BE-3a ONE 3e-HAND inc-SAY-ivm-3a
         And I have another hand," he said.

22.   i cho=0-y-a7-a-0--y-i7-0 otro.
         and rep=com-3e-GIVE--vm-3a--3e-TAKE-3a OTHER
         And he gave him another one.

23.   cho=0-kan--nok'-an-0 ja jun s-k'ab'=i.
         rep=com-STAY--STUCK-vdr-3a det ONE 3e-HAND=npt
         And his other hand stayed stuck.

24.   entonses cho=0-s-wet-a-0.
    then   rep=com-3e-KICK-tvm-3a
    Then again he kicked him.

25.   tambien cho=0-kan--nok'-an-0 ja y-ok=i.
    ALSO rep=com-STAY--STUCK-vdr-3a det 3e-FOOT=npt
    His foot again also stayed stuck.

26.   "mi=k'a x-a-sijb'un-0 ja k-ok=i   pwes
    neg=con inc-2e-RELEASE-3a det 1eFOOT=npt well

    cho=ay-0 otro k-ok."
    rep=BE-3a OTHER le-FOOT
    "If you don't release my foot, well, I have another foot."

27.   ti=xa cho=0-s-wet-a-0=a otra welta.
    then=now rep=com-3e-KICK-tvm-3a=clt OTHER TIME
    Then he kicked him again.

28.   entonses ti 0-kan--pegado juntiro ja s-chan-il
    then then com-STAY--STUCK REALLY det 3e-FOUR-ndr

    ja s-k'ab'=i sok ja y-ok=i.
    det 3e-HAND=npt and det 3e-FOOT=npt
    Then really all four of his hands and feet stayed stuck.

29.   entonses ti=xa 0-jul-0 ja birjin=a.
    then then=now com-ARRIVE-3a det VIRGIN=clt
    Then the virgin arrived.

30.   0-y-il-a-0 ke ti nok'-an-0 ja s-koronda=i.
    com-3e-SEE-tvm-3a sub loc STUCK-vdr-3a det 3e-ENEMY=npt
    She saw that her enemy was stuck there.

31.   entonses ti 0-y-i7-a-0--k'e7e.
    then then com-3e-TAKE-tvm-3a--UP
    Then she took him up.

32.   0-waj--s-lut-0 b'a chikero
    com-GO--3e-IMPRISON-3a loc PIGPEN
    She went and locked him up in the pigpen.

33.   "oj=ma wa7-an-0" x-7ut-j-i-0=b'i ja tan chich=i.
    fut=Q EAT-vdr-3a inc-SCOLD-pas-ivm- 3a=rpt det DAMN RABBIT=npt
    "Do you want to eat?" the damn rabbit was asked.

34.   "oj=o"   x-chi-i-0.
    fut=fterm inc-SAY-ivm-3a
    "Yes," he said.

35.   "entonses oj waj--k-i7-0--kon=i ja wa-wa7-el=i"
    then fut GO--1e-TAKE-3a--DOWN=npt det 2e-FOOD-ndr=npt

x-chi-i-0.
inc-SAY-ivm-3a
"Then I'll go bring your food down," she said.

36.   entonses komo ay-0=b'i jaman-0 xet'an jachuk=i
       then since BE-3a=rpt OPEN-3a PIECE thus=npt

       ja ti 0-el-0=a ja tan chich=i.
       det then com-EXIT-3a=clt det DAMN RABBIT=npt
       Then since there was a little opening like this, then the damn rabbit
               escaped.

37.   entonses s-waj--el-0=a ke s-ta7-a-0   ja
       then   3e-GO--EXIT--3a=clt sub 3e-MEET-tvm-3a det

       tan ok'il=i.
       DAMN COYOTE=npt
       Then on his departure, he encountered the damn coyote.

38.   este 0-s-lo71-a-0 ke ja b'a el-0=i   jel=b'i
       um com-3e-DECEIVE-tvm-3a sub det loc EXIT-3a=npt VERY=rpt

       ja wa7-el=i.
       det FOOD-ndr=npt
       Um, he deceived him that where he'd left from, (it is said) there was a lot
               of food.

39.   entonses ja tan ok'il=i 0-s-k'u7-an-0.
       then det DAMN COYOTE=npt com-3e-BELIEVE-tvm-3a
       Then the damn coyote believed him.

40.   0-waj--y-il-0-e.
       com-GO--3e-SEE-3a-term
       He went to see.

41.   entonses ti=b'i yajni jaw=a.
       then   then=rpt when THAT=clt
       Then (it is said) that's the way it was.

42.   pwes b'a ayi 0-lap-j-i--y-i7-0 asedor ja
       well loc then com-PUT-pas-ivm--3e-TAKE-3a SKEWER det

       s-top ja tan okil=i.
       3e-ASS det DAMN COYOTE=npt
       Well then she put a skewer in the damn coyote's ass.

43.   entonses ti=to k'ul-aji-0--librar=a.
       then then=already MAKE-vdr-3a--FREE=clt
       Then he was set free.

44.   "jas y-uj ja lom ja-lo7l-ay-on
       WHAT 3e-AGENCY det FOR NO REASON 2e-DECEIVE-tvm-3a

jachuk=i.
thus=npt
"Why did you deceive me like that?"

45.   porke jel 0-k-i7-a-0 ja bida=a" x-chi-i-0
    because VERY com-1e-TAKE-tvm-3a det LIFE=clt inc-SAY-ivm-3a

    ja tan ok'il=i.
    det DAMN COYOTE=npt
    Because I really took a lot of abuse," said the damn coyote.

46.   entonses yajni jaw=a.
    then   when THAT=term
    Then that's that.

47.   "pwes jas y-uj porke jaw-e7n mi x-a-k'an-a-0
    well WHAT 3e-relN because 2e-indpn neg inc-2e-WANT-tvm-3a

    ja wa-wa7el=i" x-chi-i-0=b'i.
    det 2e=FOOD=npt inc-SAY-ivm-3a=rpt
    "Well why, because *you* didn't ask for your meal," (it is said) he said.

48.   "pwes wa x-j-k'an-a-0 pero mi x-ajyi-0--k-i7-0.
    well pro inc-1e-WANT-tvm-3a but neg inc-BE-3a--1e-TAKE-3a
    "Well I wanted it, but I didn't get it.

49.   kastigo 0-ajyi-0--k-i7-0" x-chi-i-0=b'i.
    PUNISHMENT com-BE-3a--1e-TAKE-3a inc-SAY-ivm-3a=rpt
    What I got was punishment," (it is said) he said.

50.   entonses yajni jaw=a.
    then   when THAT=term
    Then that's that.

51.   "pwes bweno si=ta oj cho=wa7-an-0 mas la7"
    well GOOD if=con fut rep=EATndr-3a MORE COME!
    "Well good, if you want to eat more, come on!"

52.   jun=b'i sete--ja7 jachuk=i ti=b'i
    ONE=rpt CIRCLE--WATER thus=npt then=rpt

    x-y-il-aw-0-e7=i jun keso=a.
    inc-3e-SEE-tvm-3a-3epl ONE CHEESE=term
    (It is said) [there is] a puddle like this, then (it is said) they saw a cheese.

53.   pero mi keso-uk-0.
    but neg CHEESE-sbj-3a
    But it wasn't a cheese.

54.   ja7-0=b'i nan luna.
    cl-3a=rpt MOTHER MOON

It was (it is said) Mother Moon.

55. "entonses ta oj ch'ak--aw-u7-0-e ja ja7 it=i
  then if fut FINISH--2e-DRINK-3a-term det WATER THIS=npt

  entonses ti oj j-ta7-0-otik--k'ot=a ja keso=i"
  then then fut 1e-FIND-3a-1epl--ARRIVE=term det CHEESE=npt

  x-ut-j-i-0=b'i ja tan ok'il=i.
  inc-SCOLD-pas-ivm-3a=rpt det DAMN COYOTE=npt
  "Then if you finish up this water, then we will find the cheese," the damn
     coyote was told.

56. "jaw-e7n=i niw-an-a.
  2e-indpn=npt BIG-ndr-2a
  "You're big.

57. oj=xa och-uk-0 ja b'a wa-lukum=i" wan-0
  fut=now ENTER-sbj-3a det loc 2e-STOMACH=ntp prog-3a

  x-ut-j-i-0=b'i
  inc-SCOLD-pas-ivm-3a=rpt
  It will go into your stomach," he was being told.

58. bweno entonses ti=b'i cho=0-y-u7-a-0 ja ja7=i
  GOOD then then=rpt rep=com-3e-DRINK-tvm-3a det WATER=rpt

  ja tan ok'il=a.
  det DAMN COYOTE=term
  Good, then the damn coyote drank the water again.

59. i ja y-e7n ja tan chich=i cho=wan-0.
  and det 3e-indpn det DAMN RABBIT=npt rep=prog-3a
  And the damn rabbit, he did too.

60. entonses yajni "mi=ni modo.
  then when neg=emp WAY
  Then, "No way

61. oj b'ojt-uk-on" x-chi-i-0=b'i
  fut EXPLODE-sbj-1a inc-SAY-ivm-3a=rpt
  "I'll explode," (it is said) he said.

62. "miyuk=xa a7-a-0--i7-0 t'un s-moj."
  NO=now GIVE-tvm-3a--3e-TAKE-3a A LITTLE 3e-COMPANION
  "No, take a little more."

63. "a mi=ni=a."
  ah neg=emp=term
  "No, really."

64. entonses ti-b'i wa--x=cho=och-0=a ja tan ok'il=i.
  then then=rpt pro-inc=rep=BEGIN-3a=clt det DAMN COYOTE=npt
  Then (it is said) that old coyote began again.

65.   entonses ti=xa   yajni ja jaw=a.
           then   then=now when det THAT=clt
           Then thats how that was.

66.   "pwes mi=xa=ni=a."
           well neg=now=emp=term
           "Well, really no!"

67.   entonses ti=b'i 0-waj--kulan-0=a b'a jun laja ton
           then   then=rpt com-GO--SITdr-3a=clt loc one FLAT STONE

           ja tan ok'il=i.
           det DAMN COYOTE=npt
           Then (it is said) the damn coyote went and sat on a flat stone.

68.   0-waj-0=to=b'i=y-ab'-i-0 "waj b'ojom"
           com-GO-3a=still=rpt=3e-HEAR-tvm-3a WHOOSH BOOM

           x-chi-i-0   ja s-lukum jan tan o k'il=npt.
           SAY-ivm-3a det 3e-STOMACH det DAMN COYOTE=term
           (It is said) that he heard it go, "Whoosh boom," said the stomach of
                 the damn coyote.

69.   0-b'ojt-i-0.
           com-EXPLODE-ivm-3a
           It exploded.

70.   i ja tan chich=i wan-0 tze7ej.
           and det DAMN RABBIT=npt prog-3a LAUGH
           And the damn rabbit was laughing.

71.   i 0-brinko-0--ek'=e.
           and com-JUMP-3a--PASS=term
           And he jumped off.

Abbreviations

       -            morpheme boundary
       =   clitic boundary
       --   compound

   1,2,3a   first, second, third person absolutive
   1,2,3e   first, second, third person ergative
   clt   clause terminal
   com   completive aspect
   con   conditional
   fut   future
   fterm   future terminal
   genpl   generic plural
   inc   incompletive aspect
   indpn   independent pronoun
   ivm   intransitive verb marker

loc	locative
ndr	nominalizer
neg	negative
npt	noun phrase terminal
pas	passive
pl	plural
pro	progressive
prog	progressive
prt	participle
Q	question
refl	reflexive
rel	relative
relN	relative noun
rep	repetitive
rpt	reportative
sbj	subjunctive
sub	subordinator
term	terminal
tvm	transitive verb marker
vdr	verbalizer