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THE ZAPOTEC GRAMMAR AND DICTIONARY OF JUAN DE CÓRDOBA

One of the major accomplishments of the Spanish missionaries to Mexico in the sixteenth century were the amazingly accurate grammars and dictionaries of the Indian languages that some of them wrote. Among these certainly the Arte en la Lengua Zapoteca and the Vocabulario en la Lengua Zapoteca by Juan de Córdoba, both published in 1588, must be considered as ranking with the very best. The Arte has been available since Nicolás León's reprint of 1886. The Vocabulario has only now (1942) been made available through the enterprise of Señor Wigberto Jiménez Moreno. All Zapotec students owe Señor Jiménez Moreno a deep debt of gratitude for this facsimile reproduction of this exceedingly rare book as well as for his valuable and scholarly introduction. Now that both the Arte and the Vocabulario are at our disposal, it should be possible to form some idea both of the character of the Zapotec language when first encountered by the Spaniards, its phonetic and its grammatical construction, as well as to understand the nature of the changes it has undergone since the sixteenth century.

The first question we naturally ask is What dialect do Córdoba's Arte and Vocabulario represent? The answer seems simple enough in terms of the present-day Zapotec. It is the Valle dialect. But what subdialect? Even today there are innumerable Valle subdialects. Was this true in Córdoba's time and, if so, was the line of demarcation between them the same that holds true today? In Córdoba's time, for instance, all nouns and verb stems ended in a vowel. That holds practically for no Valle dialect or subdialect today. Only in Tehuantepec and Serrano-Nextitlán is this true today.1

This and other features, into which we cannot enter here, make it fairly clear that the Zapotec dialects, with the possible exception of that of Mixuahtlán, were much closer in the sixteenth century than they are now. We should probably not be far from the facts then if we postulated only two major dialects for the Zapotec of the Conquistadores, one embracing all the Valle subdialects and including those of Tehuantepec, and the other, all those of the Sierra Juárez and Villa Alta. Nor, as I have just pointed out, must we make the contrast between these two dialects too sharp. For instance, the subdialects of the Tulea cluster of pueblos or of the socalled Rincónadá2 (Santa Cruz, San Pedro, Tepanzacoacoalco [?], etc., to the north and northwest of Istlán) are as close to the Valle as they are to the Sierra dialects. This greater approximation

1 I see no reason for abandoning the grouping of the present-day dialects that I gave in 1925 in my article "The Distribution and Phonetics of the Zapotec Dialects" in the Journal de la Société des Américanistes, N.S., Vol. XVII, 1925, pp. 26-76.

2 Not to be confused with the so-called Rincón.
of the two dialects in earlier times is confirmed by the statement made much later (1703) by Fray Gaspar de los Reyes: "Supongo también que así en el Valle como en la Sierra, en cada pueblo un diversidad accidental en el modo de hablar; pero en substancia se supiere la lengua de Zoechila sabrá entender, de todo el Valle, y quien supiere la lengua de Cajonos, sabrá entender y será entendido en todo la Sierra de Villa Alta, el Rincons y Yagauila, etc."

If we may thus assume that, even although mutually unintelligible, the Zoechila and Cajonos dialects were not really far apart, it is clear that the Valle subdialects must have been represented little more than minor differentiations. Under these circumstances the question of what subdialect Córdoba’s Vocabulario represents is indeed of little consequence. The determination of this point is important for an entirely different reason. Does the Vocabulario really represent any particular dialect?

For some time, I must confess, I thought it did, that the subdialect in question was Tlachochahuaya because I presumed he had been connected with the famous church there. I am quite convinced now that this is wrong and that, on the contrary, y, the subdialect of no one particular pueblo is reflected either in the Vocabulario or the Arte.

It would be nice to feel that this implies that Córdoba is giving us the most widely known and most generally used dialect, that of Zoechila, the "seat" of the so-called "kings" of the Zapotecos. Unfortunately there is no warrant for this belief. A fairly close inspection of the Vocabulario forces me to the conclusion that it represents a somewhat inconsistent attempt to give us a kind of generalized dialect, one that would probably be understood by the people of most of the Valle pueblos. Such an attempt would necessitate the ironing out of phonetic differences between the dialects and the standardization of the grammar. This was, in fact, imperative if the language was to be of any service to the missionaries. Córdoba himself seems to indicate this in the Aviso III of his Vocabulario. "Es el auido tercer," he says, "que se a de notar. Que para cada vocablo de los nuestros, se hallaran aplicados muchos deste pueblo, y la razón es, porque aunque siempre el uno dellos es el mas propio y principal, con todo ello los demas como sinonimos al el siruen. Y los Yndios en sus platicas vien por elegancia de todos, porque este es su modo de hablar. Y tambien porque aunque cada pueblo difiera uno de otro en la lengua, no es tanto su diferencia que casi no vien de todos ellos, aunque algunas veces aplicandolos á otros significados, tomandoles en un pueblo para una cosa, y en otro para otra, y mudando, trocando á queando letraz en algunos dellos, puesto que todos se entienden, como el Castellano que camina por Castilla. Y esta es vue de las razones por donde van aqui muchos vocablos acabados, vn mismo vocablo en diversas terminaciones ó letraz, y mudadas tambien en el medio, para que cada uno halle alli el vocablo del pueblo donde se hablae. Y así nadie se turbe quando encontre con ellos."

In using Córdoba, it must always be borne in mind, consequently, that in no particular pueblo was the Zapotec of his Vocabulario ever spoken and that, in all probability, no individual except the Spanish priests and those Indians indoctrinated and taught by them, ever used it. I do not, I hope, have to stress the influence such a fact must have had upon the language of many Zapotecos, more particularly upon their written language. It meant that, in large measure, the written language was to become an artificial postcontact creation, differing markedly from the spoken tongue. Thus the texts obtained today represent, in many ways, this artificial language, and if we find the grammar there simplified and somewhat poverty-stricken in forms as compared with the spoken speech or the constructions and forms the people actually know, we must not be surprised.

This much being made clear, let us see what light the Vocabulario and Arte throw on the sound structure of sixteenth century Zapotec. It will be best to quote all the pertinent passages in the Arte and the Vocabulario in order to show the reader the difficulties involved.

"Es agora de notar que entre todos los pueblos que hablan esta lengua (digo aun los que son meros Zapotecos) nengun pueblo sy que no diffiera del otro poco o mucho, lo uno en poner vnas letraz por otras, s. la a por e, y la e por y. Y asi todas las de mas, y lo otro en que aunque hablen unos mismos vocablos unos los toman por una cosa, y otros por otra. Y por estas razones los que tratten, assi si este arte como el vocabulario no se turben quando hallaren algun vocablo, no en el significado que ellos le deprendieron, ni con las letraz que esta en su cartapacio, o que percibiero quando lo oyo hablar al yndio, porque sepan que el que mas sabe de nosotros desta lengua ignoro muchos secretos y mutaciones y modaz della, los quales muchos dellos yo cierto ignoraua hasta que la obediencia fue causa que pusiesse mano en este arte. . . . Vine a entender muchas cosas que no entendia. Y aunque esta lengua parece muy barbara, no lo es tanto que no tenga muchas cosas y en las mas buen orden y concierto.

"Por que ya arriba queda hecha mención de la diversidad en las sillabas y letraz y pronunciazion, falla agora (para que de todo tratemos y demos fin a doctos) acer en decir que el arte que hace el efecto que hace la pronunciacion, en las letraz y sillabas. Y luego se tratará de las causas de la differentia de la pronunciacion. Para lo cual es de notar, que ay muchos vocablos en esta lengua que son sola la differentia o mudanza del acento, o con mudarles, añadirles o quitarles una sola letra, o una aspiracion en el modo del pronunciar, proteyendo la voz o acortandola, significar distintisimas cosas . . .

"Para lo segundo que apuntamos, s. que sea la causa de las distintas pronunciaciones? de donde la provienen las dubidas? A esto se responde que en los yndios procede de una de dos cosas, o de la grossedad de la lengua, o del vso de la tierra, para lo de la lengua, no es necessaria la prueba como luego diremos. Para lo del vso de la tierra tampoco, pues los religiosos que tratan con los yndios lo auran echedo de ver. V.G en cetoba dizen chi, aguzando la lengua, y en zatchilla dizen chi, la boca lena, otros vocablos asi en otros pueblos. . . . Ynferese de lo dicho que no es maraullo que algunos de nosotros que depenemos la lengua arremos asi en la pronunciacion como en el auter percebido unas letraz por otras oyendo las mal pronunciar a los yndios, o entendiendo nosotros de otra manera, y por eso no se esperanaron si hallaren algunas cosas asi aqui como en el vocabulario, que no las hayan hasta agora bien entendidas. [19-121.]

...Quanto a los disphonquis estos yndios tienen muchos, asi porque la diccion lo pide como porque ellos en su hablar blandean con la lengua y algunas vezes pronuncian como en la garganta, de suerte que liquidadando las letraz, las hacen pazer unas a otras, de donde proviene el percebir los oyentes vnas letraz

---

3 Gramatica de las Lenguas Zapoteca-Serrano y Zapoteca del Valle. Reprinted by F. Belmar, Oaxaca, 1891.

4 I am quoting from León’s reprint. E. Seic’s highly derogatory remarks about the accuracy of this reprint are quite unjustified. I have carefully compared it with a facsimile reproduction of the original and find that the errors in reproducing the Zapotec forms are minimal. The typographical mistakes in the Spanish can easily be corrected by anyone who knows Spanish. León does, however, leave out the accent marks both over the Zapotec and the Spanish vowels.
of the two dialects in earlier times is confirmed by the statement made much later (1703) by Fray Gaspar de los Reyes: "Supongo tambien que aisi en el Valle como en la Cierra, en cada pueblo se diversidad accidental en el modo de hablar; pero en substancia el que supiere la lengua de Zaochilla sabra entender, sera entendido en todo el Valle, y quien supiere la lengua de Cajones, sabra entender y sera entendido en todo la Cierra de Villa Alta, el Rincon y Yagaualia, etc."

If we may thus assume that, even although mutually unintelligible, the Zaachilca and Cajones dialects were not really far apart, it is clear that the Valle subdialects must have been represented little more than minor differentiations. Under these circumstances the question of what subdialect Cordoba's Vocabulario or the Arte or the Artes represent is perhaps of little consequence. The determination of this point is important for an entirely different reason. Does the Vocabulario really represent any particular dialect?

For some time, I must confess, I thought it did, that the subdialect in question was Tlacochahuaya because I presumed he had been connected with the famous church there. I am quite convinced now that this is wrong and that, on the contrary, that subdialect of no one particular pueblo is reflected either in the Vocabulario or the Arte.

It would be nice to feel that this implies that Cordoba is giving us the most widely known and most generally used dialect, that of Zaachila, the "seal" of the socalled "kings" of the Zapotecos. Unfortunately there is no warrant for this belief. A fairly close inspection of the Vocabulario forces me to the conclusion that it represents a somewhat inconsistent attempt to give us a kind of conglomerate, a谷lerealized, one that would probably be un misunderstood by the people of most of the Valle pueblos. Such an attempt would necessitate the ironing out of phonetic differences between the dialects and the standardization of the grammar. This was, in fact, imperative if the language was to be of any service to the missionaries. Cordoba himself seems to indicate this in the Artes III of his Vocabulario. "Es el aulo tercero," he says, "que se a de notar. Que para cada vocablo de los nuestros, se hallaran aplicados muchos de los tipos de la raiz, porque aunque siempre el uno dellos es el mas propio y principal, con todo eso los demas como sinonimos a el siruen. Y los Yndios en sus platicas van por elegancia de todos, porque este es su modo de hablar. Y tambien porque aunque cada pueblo diera uno de otro en la lengua, no es tanto su diferencia que casi no vian de todos ellos, aunque algunas vezes aplicandolos a otros significados, tamandolos en un pueblos para unaa cosa, y en otro para otra, y mudando, trocando e quitando letras en algunos dellos, puesto que todos se entienden, como el Castellano que camina por Castilla. Y esta es vna de las razones por donde van aqui muchos vocablos acabados, vn mismo vocablo en dias tercias terminaciones 6 letras, y mudadas tambien en el medio, para que cada uno halle alli el vocablo del pueblos donde se habele. Y asi nadie se turbe quando encontrare con ellos."

In using Cordoba, it must always be borne in mind, consequently, that in no particular pueblo was the Zapotec of his Vocabulario ever spoken and that, in all probability, no individual except the Spanish priests and those Indians indoctrinated and taught by them, ever used it. I do not, I hope, have to stress the influence such a fact must have had upon the language of many Zapotecos, more particularly upon their written language. It meant that, in large measure, the written language was to become an artificial postconquest creation, differing markedly from the spoken tongue. Thus the texts obtained today represent, in many ways, this artificial language, and if we find the grammar there simplified and somewhat poverty-stricken in forms as compared with the spoken speech or the constructions and forms the people actually know, we must not be surprised.

This much being made clear, let us see what light the Vocabulario and Arte throw on the sound structure of sixteenth century Zapotec. It will be best to quote all the pertinent passages in the Arte and the Vocabulario in order to show the reader the difficulties involved.

"Es agora de notar que entre todos los pueblos que hablan esta lengua (digo aun los que son meros Zapotecos) nengun pueblo sey que no diffiera del otro poco o mucho, lo uno en poner vnas letras por otras. s. la a por e, y la e por y. Y asi todas las de mas, y lo otro enque aunque hablen unos mismos vocablos unos los toman por una cosa, y otros por otra. Y por estas razones los que transeren, asi se este arte como el vocabulario no se turben quando hallaren algun vocablo, no en el significado que ellos le dependieren, ni con las letras que esta en su cartapacio, o que percibi quando le oyo hablar al yndio, porque sepan que el que mas sabe de nosotros desta lengua ignara muchos secretos y mutaciones y modos dellos, los quales muchos dellos yo cierto ignoraua hasta que la obediencia fue causa que pusiese mano en este arte. ... Vine a entender muchas cosas que no entendia. Y aunque esta lengua parece muy barbara, no es tanto que no tenga muchas cosas y en las mas buen orden y concierto."

"Por que ya arriba queda hecha mención de la diversidad de las sillas y letras y pronunciacion, falta agora (para que de todo tratemos y demos fin a demas el arte como el efecto que hace el arte en la pronunciacion, en las letras y sillas, y luego se trata de las causas de la diferencia de la pronunciacion. Para lo cual es de notar, que ay muchos vocablos en esta lengua que son sola la diferencia o mudanza del acento, o con mudardes, añadirdes o quitardes unas sola letra, o una aspiracion en el modo del pronunciar, protraiendo la voz o acortando, significa distintissimas cosas.

"Para lo segundo que apuntamos, s. que sea la causa de las distintas pronunciaciones? de donde proleveland las dubidades? A esto se responde que en los yndios procede de vna de dos cosas, o de la grossed de la lengua, o del vso de la tierra, para lo de la lengua, no es necesaria la prueba como luego diremos. Para lo del vso de la tierra tampoco, pues los religiosos que tratan con los yndios lo auan echado de ver. V.g. En cetoba dizn chzi, aguzando la lengua, y en zachilna dizen chi, la boca llena, otros vocablos asi en otros pueblos. ... Ynferese de lo dicho que no es maravilla que algunos de nosotros que deprendemos la lengua arremes asi en la pronunciacion como en el acento percibi vnas letras por otras oyendo las mal pronunciando a los yndios, or entendiendo nosotros de otra manera, y por eso no se espantaran algunos si hallaren algunas cosas asi como en el vocabulario, que no las havan hasta agora bien entendido. [19-121]"

"...Quanto a los diptongos estos yndios tienen muchos, asi porque la diccion lo pide como porque ellos en su hablar blandeando con la lengua y algunas vezes pronunciando como en la garganta, de suerte que liquidando las letras, las haven percibi vnas a otras, de donde prouelve el percer los oyentes vnas letras


footnote 4: I am quoting from León's reprint. E. Seiler's highly derogatory remarks about the accuracy of this reprint are quite unjustified. I have carefully compared it with a facsimile reproduction of the original and find that the errors in reproducing the Zapotec forms are minimal. The typographical mistakes in the Spanish can easily be corrected by anyone who knows Spanish. León does, however, leave out the accent marks both over the Zapotec and the Spanish vowels.
por otras, de lo cual luego diremos. Los diphthongs que tienen, son ae, ao, ey, yo, ou, ...

"Acerca del hacer simbolizar unas letras con otras, por razón de la blanda pronunciación ya dicha, es de notar que las letras que hacen parecer unas a otras son, V.g. la a con la o. ... La b [con] la p. ... La c simbolizan con la g. ... Yem con la x. ... La c y pro to. ... La e pro y, ... la g hablan como q. ... La h hacen v, y ve u, vui, pro hae, vui. La o pro h. ... La y semejan a la e. ... La o pronuncian como u. ... A la r, hazen que sirua de t, v torobaya pro torobaya. Ciroo pro citoa. A la s, abuelan en x, v liexia pro lioxia. ... En estas faltas caemos mucho más nosotros en las mas delias que no los yndios porque las aprehendemos asi al rees.

También ay en esta lengua como arriba diximos duplicacion de letras, así vocales como consonantes. Y unas son para abrirla el sonido de la sillaba o dictio, y otras para pretraherle blandamente, y otras para dar el acento en cada una delas. Y también entre algunas de ellas se les entreme una h por aspiración para les fortificar el sonido. Las letras que se duplican son las siguientes. Primeramente dos a. Dos cc. Dos ee. Dos yy. Y dos i. Dos ll. Dos nn. Dos oo. Dos pp. Dos tt. Pormemos ejemplos delias y los acentos sobre las que los ouieren de tener. ..." [72-74]

"Pues es agora de notar, que como todos los verbos y nombres desta lengua se acaban en vocales aquella, y, del pronombre, ya, no es menester pronunciarla ni la pronunciacion los yndios quando hablan, sino comensela, salvo en los verbos y nombres acabados en a, que les dan toda la sillaba entera. s. y. ya, para que se distinga de la otra a que precedio. Y aun en estos muchas o las mas veces se la comen y sincopan. [36]"

"... Y no menos es necesario aduertir, en que los rasgulos que estuvieren sobre las letras vocales, son los acentos para aguzar aquella sillaba, y es tan necersaria esta aduertencia, que es todo el toque de el entender y hablar desta lengua, porque sin ellos un mismo vocablo significa destintissimas cosas. ..."

[Vocabulario, Aviso X.]

"Es el quinto aviso, para dar por él entender, que algunos prinicipantes que deprenden esta lengua, se turban, paralogizan, y equivoican, acerca de la pronunciacion de los, tornando unas letras por otras. Y la razon de esto es, porque cuando oyen hablar al los Indios, o leen lo que escriuen, las perciben asi, no aduertien bien en la causa de su confuso entender. El qual procede, ó de aver lo leydo así mal escrito, (porque como los Indios no sabian escriuir, ni tampoco saben nuestra ortographia, ni aun apenas la suya, los que dellos lo saben no saben poner por escrito lo que dizen por palabra, con las proprias letras que pide la dictio ó sentencia, y por eso disparatan y ponen unas letras por otras, loqual nosotros les hemos de enseñar como las demas cosas nuestras que ellos ignoran, y no ellos a nosotros), ó por averlo oyo así mal pronunciar. Este mal pronunciar procede de una de dos cosas, ó de la falta de los instrumentos conque se forma y pronuncia la boz, ó del vso de la patria: y que esta sea así ninguna prueva ha menester, pues la experiencia se muestra en nosotros. Aliente de que estos naturales Zapotecas tienen vn tal modo de pronunciar quando hablan, que hazen simbolizar ó semejan unas letras a otras, de donde tambien proceden estas dificultades. Finalmente el que de nosotros ouiere de deprender esta lengua, y no supiere bien la ethimologia, origen, nacimiento y significacion de los vocablos, y asi mismo con diligencia no examine, si tal letra se puede compadecer ó no con el tal vocablo, no podra dexar de equiuocarle como esta dicho, y quedarse ha con aquel yerro por verdad. Y por eso no se ha de turbar el estudiante quando oye hablar al Indio, y percibe una letra por otra, sino el que quiere hablar esta lengua bien, ó de tener atencion à la pronunciacion de los Indios, y procurar de
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hablar como ellos, aunque en realidad no sea aquella la letra que en la pronunciacion suena como esta dicho. Y si alguno quisiera alegar contra esto, y tomarle en su favor y defensa las doctrinas ó cartillas impresas, responderemos con acatamiento de los autores, que tambien ellos se pudieron engañar informandose de los Indios, y no perciendon bien sus pronunciaciones, como los demas nos hemos engañado antes de agora en algunas cosas." [Vocabulario, Aviso V.]

And these statements represent all we know and shall probably ever know about the phonetics of the Zapotec of Córdoba's time. Let us see how far they take us.

Córdoba was evidently aware of the inadequacies of his transcription of the sounds. "Don't worry about these transcriptions," he tells prospective students of the language, "but listen to the Indians and try to speak the way they do." To judge from the sounds of today the main difficulties lay in the recording of the vowels, in recognizing first the pitch accent and second the existence of two types of vowels, those without a glottal catch and those with it. How has he indicated these facts, if he has indicated them at all?

There is really nothing definite either in his Vocabulario or his Arte to justify us in assuming that he was aware of the existence of pitch accent in the language. Yet he is, as the quotations given above amply prove, insistent upon the importance of remembering the accent marks above the vowels. But what, if anything, did these accents mean in sixteenth century Spanish? Apparently their use was so inconsistent and chaotic at that time that Spanish philologists refuse to attach much significance to them.

At best they can be taken to mean, in Spanish, just one thing; namely, that a stronger stress fell upon vowels that had them than upon vowels without them. Señor Moriano insists that whatever the accent used — grave, circumflex, or acute — the value was always the same, namely "cargando la fuerza de la pronunciacion sobre la vocal acentuada." (p. 183.) But the question naturally arises as to whether they meant the same thing in Zapotec.

I do not think they always did. I believe that what Córdoba means when he says that "los rasgulos ... son los acentos para aguzar aquella sillaba" and that without them "un mismo vocablo significa destintissimas cosas," he is referring to glottalized and unglottalized vowels. He clearly realized the presence of the glottal catch between doubled vowels when he states that "entre algunas de ellas se les entreme una h por aspiracion para les fortificar el sonido."

We may assume then that Córdoba recognized the existence of the glottal catch and its importance. This does not mean, however, that all accented vowels indicate glottalized vowels or that intervocalic h always represents the glottal catch.

Let us now turn to the question whether the accent mark could possibly, in Córdoba's transcription, represent something beside a marked stress or glottalization.

In his discussion of the diphthongs, quoted above, Córdoba says "ellos en su hablar blandean con la lengua y algunas vezes pronuncian como en la garganta, de suerte que liquidando las letras." Similarly, he says, in commenting upon this
por otras, de lo cual luego diremos. Los diphtongos que tienen, son ae, ao, ey, ye, ou, ... "Acerca del hazer simbolizar unas letras con otras, por razon de la blanda promunicacion ya dicha, es de notar que las letras que hazen parecer unas a otras son, V.g. la a con la o. ... La b con la p. ... La c simbolizan con la g. ... Yem con la z. ... La z toman pro z ... La e pro y ... " La g hablan como q. ... La h hazen v, v, v, v, v, hue, hu, la o pro h, v, v, v, v, hua. La y semejan a la e. ... La o pronuncian como o. ... A la s, hazen que sirua de t, vtorobaya pro toto. Ciarro pro citao. A la s, bulbuen en x, vltolaxia pro tilolaxia. ... En estas faltas caemos mucho mas nosotros en las mas delas que no los yndios porque las apprehendemos asi al reuses.

"Tambien ay en esta lengua como arriba diximos duplicacion de letras, asi vocales como consonantes. Y unas son para abrirs el sonido de la sillaba o dictio, y otras para preteracher blandamente, y otras para dar el acento en cada una delas. Y tambien entre algunas de ellas se les entreme una h por aspiracion para les fortificar el sonido. Las letras que se duplican son las siguientes. Primero diximos aa. Do cc. Dos ee. Dos yy. Y dos iy. Dos ll. Dos no, Dos oo. Dos pp. Dos tt. Porrenemos ejemplos delas y los acentos sobre las que los ouieren de tener. ..." [72-74]

"Pues es agora de notar, que como todos los verbos y nombres desta lengua se acaban en vocales aquella, y, del pronombre, ya, no es menester pronunciarla ni la pronuncian los yndios quando hablan, sino comensella, salvo en los verbos y nombres acabados en a, que les dan toda la sillaba enter. s. ya, para que se distinga de la otra a que precedio. Y aun en estos muchas mas las vezes se la comen y sincopen. [36]

"Y no menos es necesario aduertir en que los rasgulos que esceluen sobre las letras vocales, son los acentos para aguzar aquella sillaba, y es tan necesaria esta aduertencia, que es todo el toque de el entendtter y hablar desta lengua, porque sin ellos un mismo vocablo significa distintísimas cosas. ..." [Vocabulario, Aviso X]

"Es el quinto aviso, para dar por el á entender, que algunos principiantes que deprenden esta lengua, se turban, paralogizan, y equivoican, acerca de la pronunciacion dells, tomando unas letras por otras. Y la razon deste es, porque quando oyen hablar á los Indios, leen lo que escriuen, las perciben asi, no aduertiendo bien en la causa de su confuso entender. El qual procede, de á auer lo leydo asi mal escrito, (porque como los Indios no sabian escriu, ni tampoco saben nuestra ortographia, ni aun apenas la suya, los que dellos lo saben no saben poner por escrito lo que dizen por palabra, con las propias letras que pide la diction á sententia, y por eso disparatan y ponen unas letras por otras, loqual nosotros les hemos de enseñar como las demas cosas nuestras que ellos ignoran, y no ellos a nosotros) ó de auerlo oydio asi mal pronunciar. Este mal pronunciar procede de una de dos cosas, ó de la falta de los instrumentos que se forma y pronuncia la boz, ó del vso de la patria: y que esto sea assi ninguna prueva ha menester, pues la experiencia se muestra en nosotros. Aliente de que estos naturales Zapotecas tienen vn tal modo de pronunciar quando hablan, que hazen simbolizar ó semejar unas letras a otras, de donde tambien proceden estas dificultades. Finalmente el que de nosotros ouiere de deprendar esta lengua, y no supiere bien la etimologia, origen, nacimiento y significacion de los vocablos, y asi mismo con diligencia no examinare, si tal letra se puede compadecer ó no con el tal vocablo, no podra dexar de equiuocarle como esta dicho, y quedarse ha con aquel yerro por verdad. Y por eso no se ha de turbar el estudiante quando oye hablar al Indio, y percibe una letra por otra, sino que quisiere hablar esta lengua bien, ó de tener atencion á la pronunciacion de los Indios, y procurar de haber como ellos, aunque en realidad no sea aquella la letra que en la pronunciacion suena como esta dicho. Y si alguno quisiera alegar contra esto, y tomarle en su favor y defensa las doctrinas ó cartillas impressas, responderemos con acatamiento de los autores, que tambien ellos se pudieron engañar informándose de los Indios, y no percibiendo bien sus pronunciaciones, como los demas nos hemos engañado antes de agora en algunas cosas." [Vocabulario, Aviso V.]

And these statements represent all we know and shall probably ever know about the phonetics of the Zapotec of Córdoba's time. Let us see how far they take us.

Córdoba was evidently aware of the inadequacies of his transcription of the sounds. "Don't worry about these transcriptions," he tells prospective students of the language, "but listen to the Indians and try to speak the way they do.

To judge from the sounds of today the main difficulties lay in the recording of the vowels, in recognizing first the pitch accent and secondly the existence of two types of vowels, those without a glottal catch and those with it. How has he indicated these facts, if he has indicated them at all?

There is really nothing definite either in his Vocabulario or his Arte to justify us in assuming that he was aware of the existence of pitch accent in the language. Yet he is, as the quotations given above amply prove, insistently upon the importance of remembering the accent marks above the vowels. But what, if anything, did these accents mean in sixteenth century Spanish? Apparently their use was so inconsistent and chaotic at that time that Spanish philologists refuse to attach much significance to them. At best they can be taken to mean, in Spanish, just one thing; namely, that a stronger stress fell upon vowels that had them than upon vowels without them. Señor Moriano insists that whatever the accent used — grave, circumflex, or acute — the value was always the same, namely "cargando la fuerza de la pronunciacion sobre la vocal acentuada." (p. 183.) But the question naturally arises as to whether they meant the same thing in Zapotec.

I do not think they always did. I believe that what Córdoba means when he says that "los rasgulos son los acentos para aguzar aquella sillaba" and that without them "un mismo vocablo significa distintísimas cosas," he is referring to glottalized and unglottalized vowels. He clearly realized the presence of the glottal catch between doubled vowels when he states that "entre algunas de ellas se les entreme una h por aspiracion para les fortificar el sonido."

We may assume then that Córdoba recognized the existence of the glottal catch and its importance. This may not be true, however, because all accented vowels indicate glottalized vowels or that intervocalic h always represents the glottal catch.

Let us now turn to the question whether the accent mark could possibly, in Córdoba's transcription, represent something besides a marked stress or glottalization.

In his discussion of the diphthongs, quoted above, Córdoba says "ellos en su hablar blandean con la lengua y algunas vezes pronuncian como en la garganta, de suerte que liquidando las letras." Similarly, he says, in commenting upon this

6 Cf. on this subject the following references which I owe to the kindness of my friend Prof. E. Buceta of the University of California: Felipe Moriano, Arte de leen las impresiones antiguos espanoles, Seville, 1801, Parte IV, Cap. VIII, "De los acentos" (pp. 182-183); Real Academia Española, Gramática de la Lengua espaol, Madrid, 1938, pp. 539, 542; Romero Navarro, Gramacia, El Criticón, University of Pennsylvania, 1938-1940, Introducción, Vol. I, p. 54; A. Coster, Fernado de Herrera, Algunas Obras, p. xvi.
vowel doubling, "unas son para abluar" el sonido... otras para prostrále blandonamente y otras para dar el acento." In still another passage we are told that "es de notar que ai muchos vocablos en esta lengua que con sola la difencia o mudanza del acento... prostrando la boca o acortando, significan distintissimas cosas."

The first thing to be noticed here is that the "difference" in accent, not merely its change in position, is important. From which we must assume, I suppose, that whatever may have been the case for Spanish, for Zapotec the acute and the grave marks had distinct values. But Córdoba gives us no clue as to what these were. It would be nice to assume that one indicated the glottalized, the other simply a stressed unglosllatized vowel. Yet even then we would be faced with the difficulty of determining which accent indicated the first and which the second. For the present the case seems hopeless and we shall have to content ourselves with having made it highly likely that in Córdoba's time the two fundamental sets of vowels, glottalized and unglottalized existed, that Córdoba recognized them and attempted to indicate the first by the use of a accent.

But let us go back to the question of the existence of pitch accent. Did he have the slightest suspicion of it, whether he expressed it by symbols or not? The only statement he makes that could possibly be taken to imply it is the "prolonging" (protrayendo) or "cutting off" (acortando) of the voice, mentioned just above. Since he has just mentioned the shortening and lengthening of sounds and gives accent another function what does he mean by these words? Unfortunately the terms are used in connection with dipthongs and the doubling of vowels. Yet, even if these terms were taken to imply the presence of pitch accent we would not be helped very much, for Córdoba developed no method for indicating when vowels were to be "prolonged" and when "shortened" or "cut off." So the evidence that Córdoba heard tones in Zapotec is really nil. All that can be said is that he and all the earlier recorders of the language were plainly baffled by something in the sound system over and above the interchanges of surds and sonants, the various changes that one and the same sound seems to undergo, the rendering of the glottal catch, the contrast between long and short vowels or consonants, etc. Since Zapotec must have had tones just as it does now, my surmise is that what baffled all these early recorders were these tones.

This failure to record vowel pitch would, of course, have been fatal if in Zapotec, pitch were phonemic. But it is not today, and I doubt very much whether it was in Córdoba's time. Only rarely, very rarely indeed, are there words or forms depending exclusively for their meaning upon the pitch of their vowel or vowels. But there are not a few that depend for their meaning either upon the presence or absence of the glottal catch or the lengthening or doubling of the vowel. This Córdoba recognized and attempted, as best he could, to indicate.

However inadequate Córdoba's recording of the sounds of the language was from our point of view, his analysis of the grammar amply makes up for it. It is so accurate and complete that there is really little that one can add to it.

---
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There is little indeed that he missed and if it were taken out of the framework in which he put it—the famous Latin grammar of Nebrija—and presented in modern fashion, it would satisfy the demands of the modern philologist among us. The few remarks I shall therefore make will be confined to the light Córdoba throws upon the grammatical structure of the Zapotec of his time and the hints his analysis gives us about the reasons for the marked influence Spanish, from the very beginning, seems to have had upon its structure.

In comparing contemporary with sixteenth century Zapotec, one fact emerges immediately, the amazing persistence of practically the whole intricate structure of the verb, with all its multiple forms and all its irregularities. This holds even for those subdialects that seem to have suffered most, like Tehuano-Juchiteco. As might have been expected, some affixes have been lost, the distinctions between certain forms blurred and the meaning of some elements forgotten. But the change in the "conjugation" of the verb is far less than is the case for English or French or German, for instance. What has been lost, here, or, falling into desuetude, is the elaborate type of stem composition and what has been fundamentally transformed is the syntax. Both of course, stem composition and syntax, are inextricably interrelated. There can be little question that the cause for this marked transformation is to be sought in the influence of Spanish grammar.

In sixteenth century Zapotec — and this still holds to some degree — the interdependence of the different parts of the sentence was expressed by a subtle interplay of absolute and relative forms of the verbal and nominal stem, with their various affixes. Formal independent conjunctions were poorly developed and few in number. Córdoba in his Arte commented upon this at some length. "Generalmente," he states, "no habla es suelta no atada, ni encadenada con conjunciones o particulas, porque no hacen sino arrojar vocablos y sueltos. v t g. Pasa desay fuy Huaxaca, y en el camino encontre con vos que me quisieron robar y yo lleuaua vn palo, y tome vno el palo en la vna mano, y en la otra vnas yiente vna pedrada, y arremeti contra el y dille de palo, y eche a huyr escondiendo, etc. Dizen assi: Coaayanea nizee laolaa, laoneza paccha pechelalaya penici, pecaca quichaxooni xetina, chichachagchoaayna nazeniya, cerobhaya coxenaique, queelagaa pecaya quieme chipichchelaayoa poinici cofinaa yaga ciani, etc. He aqui muchas noticias juntas sin conjunciones, y nosotros siempre hablamos con ellas atando unas razones a otras. . . ." (pp. 121-122.)

Small wonder then that he should regard this as a barbaria and that he should have been more than puzzled that "en esta lengua mientras mas con

---

The first thing then that the missionaries must have taught their Indian neophytes was how to get rid of this barbaria in their language, to extend the use of their independent conjunctions, use them more frequently, and supplement them by adopting Spanish ones. One has only to glance at the first Mitla text in this collection to see what happened. Not only were the Spanish conjunctions added but they frequently displaced the few Zapotec ones. Where this did not hold true two things happened. The Zapotec conjunctions were either given a more precise meaning or, on the contrary, a vaguer connotation. In a somewhat similar way the Spanish prepositions played havoc with the meanings and uses of the Zapotec ones.

The distortions produced by the efforts of the missionaries to remodel Zapotec in this respect have been numerous and profound. The fact remains, nevertheless, to judge from my own experience in the study of the various Zapotec dialects and subdialects, that while, in narratives and normal con-
vowel doubling, "unas son para abuarâ el sonido... otras para protuberar blandamente y otras para dar el acento." In still another passage we are told that "es de notar que ai muchos vocablos en esta lengua que con sola la diversión o mudanza del acento... protroyendo la bos o acortándole, significan distintíssimas cosas."

The first thing to be noticed here is that the "difference" in accent, not merely its change in position, is important. From which we must assume, I suppose, that whatever may have been the case for Spanish, for Zapotec the acute and the grave marks had distinct values. But Córdoba gives us no clue as to what these were. It would be nice to assume that one indicated the glottalized, the other simply a stressed unglottalized vowel. Yet even then we would be faced with the difficulty of determining which accent indicated the first and which the second. For the present the case seems hopeless and we shall have to content ourselves with having made it highly likely that in Córdoba's time the two fundamental sets of vowels, glottalized and unglottalized existed, that Córdo- bana recognized them and attempted to indicate the first by the use of an accent.

But let us go back to the question of the existence of pitch accent. Did he have the slightest suspicion of it, whether he expressed it by symbols or not? The only statement he makes that could possibly be taken to imply it is the "prolonging" (protroyando) or "cutting off" (acortando) of the voice, mentioned just above. Since he has just mentioned the shortening and lengthening of sounds and gives accent another function what does he mean by these words? Unfortunately the terms are used in connection with diphthongs and the doubling of vowels. Yet, even if these terms were taken to imply the presence of pitch accent we would not be helped very much, for Córdoba developed no method for indicating when vowels were to be "prolonged" and when "shortened" or "cut off." So the evidence that Córdoba heard tones in Zapotec is really nil. All that can be said is that he and all the earlier recorders of the language were plainly baffled by something in the sound system over and above the interchanges of surds and sonants, the various changes that one and the same sound seems to undergo, the rendering of the glottal catch, the contrast between long and short vowels or consonants, etc. Since Zapotec must have had tones just as it does now, my surmise is that baffled all these early recorders were these tones.

This failure to record vowel pitch would, of course, have been fatal if in Zapotec, pitch were phonemic. But it is not today, and I doubt very much whether it was in Córdoba's time. Only rarely, very rarely indeed, are there words or forms depending exclusively for their meaning upon the pitch of their vowel or vowels. But there are not a few that depend for their meaning either upon the presence or absence of the glottal catch or the lengthening or doubling of the vowel. This Córdoba recognized and attempted, as best he could, to indicate.

However inadequate Córdoba's recording of the sounds of the language was from our point of view, his analysis of the grammar amply makes up for it. It is so accurate and complete that there is really little that one can add to it.
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There is little indeed that he missed and if it were taken out of the framework in which he put it — the famous Latin grammar of Nebrija — and presented in modern fashion, it would satisfy the demands of the most fastidious philologists among us. The few remarks I shall therefore make will be confined to the light Córdoba throws upon the grammatical structure of the Zapotec of his time and the hints his analysis gives us about the reasons for the marked influence Spanish, from the very beginning, seems to have had upon its structure.

In comparing contemporary with sixteenth century Zapotec, one fact emerges immediately, the amazing persistence of practically the whole intricate structure of the verb, with all its multiple forms and all its irregularities. This holds even for those subdialects that seem to have suffered most, like Tehuano- Juchiteco. As might have been expected, some affixes have been lost, the distinctions between certain forms blurred and the meaning of some elements forgotten. But the change in the "conjugation" of the verb is far less than is the case for English or French or German, for instance. What has been lost, heard, or fallen into desuetude, is the elaborate type of stem composition and what has been fundamentally transformed is the syntax. Both of course, stem composition and syntax, are inextricably interrelated. There can be little question that the cause for this marked transformation is to be sought in the influence of Spanish grammar.

In sixteenth century Zapotec — and this still holds to some degree — the interdependence of the different parts of the sentence was expressed by a subtle interplay of absolute and relative forms of the verbal and nominal stem, with their various affixes. Formal independent conjunctions were poorly developed and few in number. Córdoba in his Arte commented upon this at some length. "Generalmente," so he states, "su habla es suelta no atada, ni encadenada con conjunciones o partículas, porque no hacen sino arrojar vocablos y sueltos. Vg v.s. Para desafuir Huaxaca, y en el camino contraste con vos que me quisieron robar y yo leuaua vn palo, y tome el palo en la vna mano, y en la otra vna vara, y en vna pedrada, y arremeti contra el y dir di algo, y echе a buyo escondiendome, etc. Dizen asй: Coayaayne niace laolaa, laoneca pechaxa penici, pecca quicahaxo xtenia, chicohacaghoopayna nazeniya, cerasbaxa coxeniaque, quelagaa pecaya quieque chicapielu-xaooa pecani cotiay a y cian, etc. He aqui muchas noticias juntas sin conjunciones, y nossos siempre hablamos con ellas atando unas razones a otras."

Small wonder then that he should regard this as a barbararia and that he should have been more than puzzled that "en esta lengua mientras mas conjunciones pusiernos mas, escureceremos la sentencia." (p. 122.)

The first thing then that the missionaries must have taught their Indian neophytes was how to get rid of this barbararia in their language, to extend the use of their independent conjunctions, use them more frequently, and supplement them by adopting Spanish ones. One has only to glance at the first Mitla text in this collection to see what happened. Not only were the Spanish conjunctions added but they frequently displaced the few Zapotec ones. Where this did not hold true two things happened. The Zapotec conjunctions were either given a more precise meaning or, on the contrary, a vaguer connotation. In a somewhat similar way the Spanish prepositions played havoc with the meanings and uses of the Zapotec ones.

The distortions produced by the efforts of the missionaries to remodel Zapotec in this respect have been numerous and profound. The fact remains, nevertheless, to judge from my own experience in the study of the various Zapotec dialects and subdialects, that while, in narratives and normal con-
versation, this older syntax of the language is frequently discarded, good native linguistic informants had no difficulty in recalling this older structure and they seemed always quite clear and definite about the fundamental point involved, the contrast between the absolute and the "dependent" or non-absolute forms of all nouns and verbs.9

I have left for the end the question of Spanish loanwords. As everyone knows Zapotec is studded with them. The larger issue of why so many Spanish words were adopted as well as the whole exceedingly interesting and instructive problem connected with the history of this incorporation, cannot concern us here and I shall confine myself to just one type of borrowing so characteristic of modern Zapotec; namely, the combination of the Zapotec verb runi (to make, to do) with the Spanish infinitive. Here as in the case of the adoption of English conjunctions and prepositions the explanation is to be sought in a specific trait of Zapotec and not in any semi-irregular fondness by the Zapotecos for the infinitive of specific Spanish verbs. It was an outstanding characteristic of old Zapotec, one of great vitality and vigor, one which modern Zapotec retains in part, to form many verbs by combining the verbs runi and naka with a noun. The Spanish infinitive was felt as such and used accordingly. It was thus merely a continuation of a fundamental old Zapotec type of word composition and is not a new formation due to Spanish influence.10

II

THE MODERN ZAPOTEC LANGUAGE

This Zapotec language as spoken in the nineteenth century and today has been described principally by F. Belmar,11 A. Molina,12 myself,13 and J. de Angulo.14

9 It is difficult for an outsider to know what to say about the description of Tehuano grammar given by Arcadio G. Molina in his Principios generales para aprender a leer, escribir y hablar la lengua Zapoteca, segunda edicion, Oaxaca, 1899. No such complete approximation to Spanish was spoken by any of my Juchiteco or Tehuano informants. I suspect that only thoroughly hispanicized individuals use Señor Molina’s Tehuano. If I remember correctly, however, it is the one largely employed in the interesting Journal called Neza. My Spanarks are in no sense intended as a criticism of or a reflection upon the correctness of their presentation of the language and we can only felicitate scholars like Sr. Andrés Henestrosa and the members of the “Academia de la Lengua Zapoteca” for their efforts to keep Zapotec a living language capable of developing a literature of its own in the twentieth century. What I contend, however, is that for philological purposes, Molina’s description of Tehuano is only of limited service. Manifestly a scholar with a zeal for an “els verbos” has no lenguas & seiscientos. Carcan de voir passiva y del participio” (p. 149), is either careless in his phraseology or — and this is far more likely — thinking in a completely unphilological fashion.

10 Let me add that the resemblance of runi + Spanish infinitive to such typical Spanish constructions as ser, estar, and haber with the past participle probably had some influence in generalizing and popularizing this type of construction.

11 Cf. bibliography in Jimenez Moreno’s edition of Córdoba, op. cit. Let me add that Belmar’s studies of Mixe, Chontal, and Mazateca are of a much higher order than his Zapotec works.

12 Cf. note 9.

13 Cf. article quote in note 1, and “A Preliminary Sketch of the Zapotec Language,” Language, 1930, pp. 64-85.


16 “Zapotec Tone Patterns,” etc., p. 298.
While Belmar must be given his due place in the history of Zapotec studies for his enthusiasm in editing older sources, his qualifications for accurate linguistic investigations do not appear to have been very high, and he must be used with great caution. Of Molina we have already spoken. There then remain the sketches of de Angulo and myself. Since our results are so different, it is best to give an outline of the analysis each of us obtained.

De Angulo starts with an hypothesis — incidentally the same hypothesis which underlies Belmar’s work — that Zapotec was originally a monosyllabic language. He seems to have arrived at it from the study of the subdialects of Miahuatlán. I think our evidence is overwhelmingly against such an hypothesis but with that subject we have no concern here. What does concern us, however, is the influence this hypothesis has had upon de Angulo’s recording of the language, i.e. in so far as I can control this recording. What it has led him to do is to disregard completely the terminal vowels of innumerable stems. Now it so happens that certain in number of the verb and noun in many of the Valley dialects seem to end in consonants or very weak whispered vowels, and that in the first and second persons the verbs -a(e) and -u can superficially be interpreted as affixed pronouns. One need only obtain a verb or noun with the pronominal affix of the third person or the first and second persons with the independent pronouns for these forms to realize that the stem ends in a vowel, that it has been elided for the third person and contracted with the pronominal affixes for the first and second persons. Similarly it could be shown that there exist a whole class of verbs of the type 1 + consonant + vowel and, in all probability, other classes beginning in a-, e-, and o-, plus consonant plus vowel.

De Angulo thus assumes or, at least, operates with only four types of stems, vowel + consonant, consonant + vowel, consonant + vowel + consonant, or vowel + vowel. Where he is forced to admit the existence of bisyllabic stems ending in a vowel, he either passes over the matter or regards them as examples of stem plus an affix of some kind or another. Since, likewise, he pays only sporadic and inconsistent attention to the vowel ending, that is, whether it is glottalized or unglottalized, it will be seen at once how different is his description of the phonetic structure of Zapotec stems from that of Córdoba, Boas, and myself. The evidence from all the dialects and subdialects where de Angulo can be controlled is so overwhelmingly against his description of the phonetic structure of Zapotec that one naturally is suspicious of the correctness of his recording of the Miahuatlán dialect which no one recorded before him, in view of the theory he has postulated. Has he not been misled, under the influence of a compelling hypothesis, into disregarding weak terminal vowels?

In discussing the tone patterns de Angulo is at his best although here too he seems to be under the influence of a specific hypothesis dangerous in the extreme. For instance, in discussing the subdialect of Tectitlán del Valle, he says, “... In its use of pitch tone it presents a very typical problem in the evolution of tone from a functional, variable, morphological factor to a fixed, independent, semasiological entity.” Now this may be true for Tectitlán. No such division into two groups is known to me, however, in the other towns of what
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Tlalocan
dea Angulo calls the Little Valley or in any of the towns investigated. Skepticism consequently is quite justified.

de Angulo's sketch of the grammar is admittedly of the sketchiest type. It had to be considering the broad objects he had in mind. Yet what he does say diverges so greatly from what Córdoba found in the sixteenth century and I found in 1912-1913 that it is necessary to present his findings at some length.

De Angulo quite correctly notes the fact that in Zapotec there are no specific forms for the possessive pronoun. I and my, thou and thine, he and his are identical. From this fact he draws the inference that "the noun is treated fundamentally as if it were a verb in so far as it must be attached to a person. You cannot say foot alone, but must say my foot, your foot, etc." It is here that his theorizing has led him to a clearcut error. Had he taken the trouble he would have discovered that in Zapotec you can say most emphatically foot, head, etc. If one fact in Zapotec has been demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt from Córdoba's time onward, it is the existence of an absolute form for both verbs and nouns.

In the treatment of the verb, de Angulo has a very special fourfold grouping all of his own. The basis for the arrangement being the nature of the prefix for what he calls the inceptive, continuative, perfect, and frequentative. In Type A it is zero, ka-, gu-, ri-; in Type B, gu-, ka-, ba-, ru-; in Type C, ti-, ka-, gua-, ri-, and in Type D, g-, ka-y, ri-. That this grouping leaves no place for a large number of verb stems must be clear to anyone who knows Córdoba's and my analysis of the Zapotec verb. What could have led de Angulo to reject the patent fact that the form of the perfect, for instance, depended upon the indefinite (his frequentative and Córdoba's present); that the indefinite ru-prefix necessarily entailed the bi-or b- prefix perfect and, for that matter, the gu-future (his inceptive), that for ra- the series is gu- gua-, for ri- either gu- gua-, or bi-, gu-a-, or re-, ke-, and ge-? Certainly nothing is to be gained by the chaos of forms he gives us. The only explanation is that his analysis of the verb is hopelessly inadequate. Had it been more complete he could not have possibly missed the fact that most verbs can take ru- and ri-, that a fair number can take ru-, ri-, and re-, and a few take all four forms. His failure to recognize this simple fact makes his treatment of the verb somewhat meaningless and invalidates his whole analysis. Similarly his restriction of the temporal prefixes to only four is quite arbitrary and belied by the facts. Reference to the forms Molina and I gather will make this quite clear. Small wonder then that he finds three distinct forms for the continuative, n-, k-, r-!

De Angulo finds aspect rather than tense the dominating factor in the verb. The importance of aspect is clear but that of time is just as clear. To rule out the future or the present tense just because it also has an aspectual connotation is utterly unfathomable and de Angulo has been led to strange errors by doing so.

We come last to the question of stem composition. This de Angulo does not once mention. He refers only to composition in the sense of the compounding of a stem with affixed. It is this strange oversight that has prevented him from realizing, for instance, that his ti- inceptiv, of Type C, is simply a form of the verb to go.

In short it seems evident that de Angulo's acquaintance with the language is of a strangely undisciplined kind. And this, added to the amazing fashion in which he allows hypotheses to dictate what forms are to be stressed and what are

17 "The Zapotekan Linguistic Group," p. 11.
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to be neglected or left out completely, makes it impossible to accept with any confidence his presentation of Zapotec.

For my own presentation of the language I must refer to the article in Language mentioned above. On the whole I still adhere to what I stated there although it contains errors of detail and I should now rephrase a number of passages. The one cardinal error in that paper is its neglect of the Spanish elements in the language, both the lexicographical as well as the grammatical, and its failure to make clear what forms of the verb, for instance, are in common use, what forms semi-modal and what forms known yet and used today. It is one of the characteristics of Molina's little grammar that he gives these forms which he feels are used today in conversation. For such purposes and for ordinary epistolary communications that is possibly enough. The great merit of Molina is just this and through it we are able to see the extent to which Spanish grammatical forms and concepts have permeated Zapotec. My tendency was to forget that, after all, Zapotec today is a mixed language and to be somewhat influenced by my historical knowledge of the facts. This is a very serious defect, of course, and led at first to my rejecting the clearcut fact that today, in many subdialects, the old g- prefix, for instance, to all interests and purposes, functions as a subjunctive. It is likely that the expression of sex gender in the pronouns, the verbs, and the nouns that I found in certain subdialects is due to an extension of older tendencies under the specific stimulus, however, of Spanish.

III

THE SUBDIALECT OF MITLA

Mitla belongs to the Valle dialect of Zapotec. All Mitleyenos questioned insisted that there was only one other town where the identical subdialect was spoken, San Pedro Quiatoni. Quiatoni is quite some distance away but in pre-Conquest days the lands owned by Mitla and Quiatoni impinged upon one another. Apart from Quiatoni no other town speaks exactly the same subdialect. That of Tlacolula, the nearest town of any importance, is fairly different. The subdialect of Tzicitlan which is much farther away than Tlacolula is phonetically much closer.

Whether all the somewhat specific phonetic traits of Mitla are historically old, it is, of course, difficult to say, but some certainly are not. The very common elision of the terminal stem vowel is, we know, post-Conquest, although he too commented upon its tendency to be "eaten up," as he phrases it. Córdoba is definite in insisting that at his time all stems ended in vowels. And they still do in all the dialects except Valle. But in no subdialect of the Valle I investigated was this tendency so marked as at Mitla nor did it result in so complete an unvoicing of the terminal consonant as there. Apart from this trait the characteristic features of the Mitla speech are the frequent development of the

18 On page 79 the subjective and objective pronouns have been reversed. I would also like to correct a typographical error in my earlier paper on "The Distribution," etc. (Paris, 1925). On page 72, through an oversight the forms for I have been given for thou in all cases except Sant' Ana, San Antonio, San Antonio de la Cal, San Baltazar Chichicap, Santiago Matatlan, Mitla, and Taliatlac. However, that paper is so full of typographical errors that it can only be used with the greatest of circumspection.

19 My remarks in Language, Vol. VI, 1930, p. 79, are to be corrected accordingly.
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de Angulo calls the Little Valley or in any of the towns investigated. Skepticism consequently is quite justified.

De Angulo's sketch of the grammar is admittedly of the sketchiest type. It had to be considering the broad objects he had in mind. Yet what he does say diverges so greatly from what Córdoba found in the sixteenth century and I found in 1912-1913 that it is necessary to present his findings at some length.

De Angulo quite correctly notes the fact that in Zapotec there are no specific forms for the possessive pronoun. I and my, thou and thine, he and his are identical. From this fact he draws the inference that "the noun is treated fundamentally as if it were a verb in so far as it must be attached to a person. You cannot say foot alone, but must say my foot, your foot, etc."17 It is here that his theorizing has led him to a clearcut error. Had he taken the trouble he would have discovered that in Zapotec you can say most emphatically foot, head, etc. If one fact in Zapotec has been demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt from Córdoba's time onward, it is the existence of an absolute form for both verbs and nouns.

In the treatment of the verb, de Angulo has a very special fourfold grouping all of his own. The basis for the arrangement being the nature of the prefix for what he calls the inceptive, continuative, perfect, and frequentative. In Type A it is zero, ka-, gw-, ri-; in Type B, gw-, ka-, ba-, ru-; in Type C, tci-, ka-, gw-, ri-; and in Type D, gw-, ka-, ri-, tci-. That this grouping leaves no place for a large number of verb stems must be clear to anyone who knows Córdoba's and my analysis of the Zapotec verb. What could have led de Angulo to reject the patent fact that the form of the perfect, for instance, depended upon the indefinite (his frequentative and Córdoba's present); that the indefinite ru-prefix necessarily entailed the bi- or b'- perfect and, for that matter, the gw-future (his inceptive), that for ra-, the series is gw-, gw-, for ri- either gw-, gi- or bi- gi-, for re-, be-, and ge-? Certainly nothing is to be gained by the chaos of forms he gives us. The only explanation is that his analysis of the verb is hopelessly inadequate. Had it been more complete he could not have possibly missed the fact that most verbs can take ru- and ri-, that a fair number can take re-, ri-, and re-, and a few take all four forms. His failure to recognize this simple fact makes his treatment of the verb somewhat meaningless and invalidates his whole analysis. Similarly his restriction of the temporal prefixes to only four is quite arbitrary and belied by the facts. Reference to the forms Molina and I gather will make this quite clear. Small wonder then that he finds three distinct forms for the continuative, n-, k-, r-!

De Angulo finds aspect rather than tense the dominating factor in the verb. The importance of aspect is clear but that of time is just as clear. To rule out the future or the present tense just because it also has an aspectual connotation is utterly unpermissable and de Angulo has been led to strange errors by doing so.

We come last to the question of stem composition. This de Angulo does not once mention. He refers only to composition in the sense of the compounding of a stem with affixes. It is this strange oversight that has prevented him from realizing, for instance, that his tci-inceptive, of Type C, is simply a form of the verb to go.

In short it seems evident that de Angulo's acquaintance with the language is of a strangely undisciplined kind. And this, added to the amazing fashion in which he allows hypotheses to dictate what forms are to be stressed and what are

---
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to be neglected or left out completely, makes it impossible to accept with any confidence his presentation of Zapotec.

For my own presentation of the language I must refer to the article in Language mentioned above. On the whole I still adhere to what I stated there although it contains errors of detail and I should now rephrase a number of passages. The one cardinal error in that paper is its neglect of the Spanish elements in the language, both the lexicographic as well as the grammatical, and its failure to make clear what forms of the verb, for instance, are in common use, what forms semi-moribund and what forms known yet and used today. It is one of the characteristics of Molina's little grammar that he gives these forms which he feels are used today in conversation. For such purposes and for ordinary epistolary communications that is possibly enough. The great merit of Molina is just this and through it we are able to see the extent to which Spanish grammatical forms and concepts have permeated Zapotec. My tendency was to forget that, after all, Zapotec today is a mixed language and to be somewhat influenced by my historical knowledge of the facts. This is a very serious defect, of course, and led at first to my rejecting the clearcut fact that today, in many subdialects, the old g- prefix, for instance, to all interests and purposes, functions as a subjunctive. It is likely that the expression of sex gender in the pronouns, the verbs, and the nouns that I found in certain subdialects is due to an extension of older tendencies under the specific stimulus, however, of Spanish.18

III

THE SUBDIALECT OF MITLA

Mitla belongs to the Valle dialect of Zapotec. All Mitoleynos questioned insisted that there was only one other town where the identical subdialect was spoken, San Pedro Quiatoni. Quiatoni is quite some distance away but in pre-Conquest days the lands owned by Mitla and Quiatoni impinged upon one another. Apart from Quiatoni no other town speaks exactly the same subdialect. That of Tlacolula, the nearest town of any importance, is fairly different. The subdialect of Yotolán which is much farther away than Tlacolula is phonetically much closer.

Whether all the somewhat specific phonetic traits of Mitla are historically old, it is, of course, difficult to say, but some certainly are not. The very common elision of the terminal stem vowel is, we know, post-Conquest, although he too commented upon its tendency to be "eaten up," as he phrases it. Córdoba is definite in insisting that at his time all stems ended in vowels. And they still do in all the dialects except Vallé. But in no subdialect of the Vallé I investigated was this tendency so marked as at Mitla nor did it result in so complete an unvoicing of the terminal consonant as there. Apart from this trait the characteristic features of the Mitla speech are the frequent development of the

17 "The Zapotecan Linguistic Group," p. 11.

18 On page 79 the subjective and objective pronouns have been reversed. I would also like to correct a typographical error in my older paper on "The Distribution," etc. (Paris, 1925). On page 72, through an oversight the forms for I have been given for thou in all cases except Sant' Ana, San Antonio, San Antonio de la Cal, San Beltazar Chichicapa, Santiago Matatlán, Mitla, and Tlatlaxtac. However, that paper is so full of typographical errors that it can only be used with the greatest of circumspection.

19 My remarks in Language, Vol. VI, 1930, p. 79, are to be corrected accordingly.
aspiration (') into a true spirant and the presence of an á vowel (a as in English hat) and a weakly uumlaut ü. The latter vowel, while not entirely unknown in Valé dialects, is extremely rare. It is quite common, however, in the Sierra Juárez and Villa Alta, dialects.

That any of the specific characteristics of Mitla are due to other than normal causes is extremely unlikely. I mention this because Prof. Boas, among others, expected the language to show traces of Aztec influence. None were discovered.

The Mixtecos in short speak a typical Valé dialect, one which has in fact retained, to an extraordinary degree, all the basic traits of the very complicated Zapotec grammar in spite of the fact that it has incorporated into its structure numerous Spanish loanwords and not a few Spanish constructions.20

IV

ZAPOTEC FOLKTALES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MITLA

In her paper entitled "Zapoteca and Spanish Tales of Mitla, Oaxaca,"21 Mrs. Parsons states that "story telling as an art has little vogue in Mitla which is not Mestizo even to be a nursery for Spanish tales nor indio enough to have preserved its Indian tales, a condition that probably holds among most of the Indian or idioma-speaking towns of Mexico." (p. 278). With all due respect to Mrs. Parsons, she was wrong on all points. In 1912-1913 I had no difficulty in collecting thirty-one Mitla folktales, eleven of which were obtained incidentally to my work with him. I had to stop collecting them, unfortunately, but my Mixteco informant knew many more. A Talea and San Mateo Cajonos informant told me over thirty apiece, and my Amatlán, Juchitán, and Zaachila informants were inexhaustible, although I had to stop recording texts because of the pressure of other work just when they were beginning to warm up. Either some fundamental change has taken place in Oaxaca since 1912 — and I know of no evidence for that — or there is something basically wrong about the methods employed by recent investigators.22

The meagerness of folktales among the Zapotecos or, for that matter, among any of the Indian peoples of Oaxaca or Mexico in general is a myth. The question of whether any pre-Columbian folktales have survived is another matter. Still I was able to collect at least forty-five essentially aboriginal folktales out of a total of one hundred and forty-two and that number should probably be increased, for not all the animal and human stories are necessarily of Spanish-European origin.23 It should be remembered that the Indians are

20 Not too much weight should be attached to Spanish "official" Zapotec where Spanish loanwords have practically overwhelmed the language as in the texts given by Parsons (Mitla, 552-559).
22 R. Beals in a paper entitled "Problems of Mexican Indian Folklore" in The Journal of American Folklore (Vol. 56, pp. 14-15) claims that among the Mixe of Oaxaca all types of folktales, pre-Conquest, autochthonous post-Conquest, or European, are lacking. This is a most amazing statement in view of the fact that in 1917 I published twenty-eight folktales from the Juquila-Mixe.
23 Cf. my El Folkslore de Oaxaca (Anales de la Escuela Internacional de Arqueología y Etnología Americanas, New York, 1917). I would like to take this occasion to, once and for all, disclaim all responsibility for the Introducción to this volume written by Prof. Aurelio M. Espinosa. This was written without my knowledge or consent, and I did not see it until the book appeared. The as very likely to tell a stranger at first only the stories he thinks the latter can understand, i.e. European tales. Only after repeated attempts and when all his misgivings have been overcome will he proceed to the older "pagan" material.

Not a little of the older indigenous folklore unquestionably exists, but it is rarely, if ever, free of European accretions. Their presence must not, however, be assessed too heavily. In most cases they are incidental and unimportant, in others significant but not disturbing, while in still others it may interfere markedly with the plot of the story. Frequently the style in which the tales are told is Spanish where the subject-matter is overwhelmingly Zapotec. The reverse, of course, holds too. The subject-matter and the manner of telling Indian may be Spanish. Only the most careful study of these and similar points and a thorough knowledge of the material, Spanish and Indian, will make discussions of this subject fruitful and helpful.24

The vast majority of the folktales are unquestionably European in origin. But a blanket statement like that means little indeed. Here again only a type of investigation that has, up to the present, been at best barely adumbrated, can furnish us with the facts required for significant inference and deductions. For anyone to attempt to draw inferences now, as Beals has done in the article just cited, is sheer madness and cannot but help lead to error upon error both in facts and interpretation.25

But leaving aside controversial questions for the moment, let us see what we do find. The only large collection of Zapotec folklore so far made is the one I published in 1917. A few more were published later in The Journal of American Folklore,26 the Ibero-Americana Series of the University of California,27 and at least sixty are still in manuscript. All in all there are somewhere over two hundred. They were obtained under conditions which make for authenticity. Sixty were told to me in text and the rest written down in Spanish by Zapotec-speaking individuals who had spent practically all their life in their native villages. Three, those from Talea, San Mateo Cajonos, and Zaachila, were at the time students at the Escuela Normal in Oaxaca. Since some of the very best of the clearly pre-Columbian material was obtained from them, there is no need for worrying about the influence of the Escuela upon them in this

Introducción absounds in misstatements which Prof. Espinosa could have spared himself if he had properly used the Introducción which I sent him. In justice to myself the reader of El Folkslore is asked to make the following corrections:

Page 1, 3. conocidos not desconocidos.
Page 1, 4. should read La mayoría fueron Indios de Oaxaca.
Page 1, 13. read La mayoría, la Todo.
Page 1, 15-14. Omit everything from Como... de and substitute Todos.
Page 1, 15-16. Omit everything from pero es... fuentes posibles.
Page 1, 22-23. Omit everything from desechar... comuestos.
Page 1, 35. Add y sobre los fenómenos naturales los tipos.
Page 1, paragraph 2. Omit this whole paragraph which extends to page iii, 6.

The facts of the case on page ii, paragraph 2, are completely misrepresented. A good deal of the material presented "materials purporting "materials presented "materials collected by Paul Radin in Oaxaca, for example, are almost certainly tales recently acquired from primary school readers" (Beals, op. cit., p. 12). The mistake makes the Mixe be taken as an excellent example (cf. op. cit., pp. 14-15).
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aspiration (') into a true spirant and the presence of an á vowel (a as in English hat) and a weakly unmarked ü. The latter vowel, while not entirely unknown in Vallee dialects, is extremely rare. It is quite common, however, in the Sierra Juarez and Villa Alta, dialects.

That any of the specific characteristics of Mitla are due to other than normal causes is extremely unlikely. I mention this because Prof. Boas, among others, expected the language to show traces of Aztec influence. None were discovered.

The Mitleynos in short speak a typical Vallee dialect, one which has in fact retained, to an extraordinary degree, all the basic traits of the very complicated Zapotec grammar in spite of the fact that it has incorporated into its structure numerous Spanish loanwords and not a few Spanish constructions.

IV
ZAPOTEC FOLKTALES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MITLA

In her paper entitled “Zapoteca and Spanish Tales of Mitla, Oaxaca,” Mrs. Parsons states that “story telling as an art has little vogue in Mitla which is not mestizo enough to be a nursery for Spanish tales nor indio enough to have preserved its Indian tales, a condition that probably holds among most of the Indian or idioma-speaking towns of Mexico” (p. 278). With all due respect to Mrs. Parsons, she was wrong on all points. In 1910-1911 I had no difficulty in collecting thirty-one Mitla folktales, eleven of them obtained incidentally to my work with him. I had to stop collecting them, unfortunately, but my Mitleyno informant knew many more. A Talea and San Mateo Cajonos informant told me over thirty apiece, and my Amatlán, Juchitán, and Zaachila informants were inexhaustible, although I had to stop recording texts because of the pressure of other work just when they were beginning to warm up. Either some fundamental change has taken place in Oaxaca since 1912—and I know of no evidence for that—or there is something basically wrong about the methods employed by recent investigators.

The meagerness of folktales among the Zapotecs or, for that matter, among any of the Indian peoples of Oaxaca or Mexico in general is a myth. The question of whether any pre-Columbian folktales have survived is another matter. Still I was able to collect at least forty-five essentially aboriginal folktales out of a total of one hundred and forty-two and that number should probably be increased, for not all the animal and human stories are necessarily of Spanish-European origin. It should be remembered that the Indians are

very likely to tell a stranger at first only the stories he thinks the latter can understand, i.e., European tales. Only after repeated attempts and when all his misgivings have been overcome will he proceed to the older “pagan” material.

Not a little of the older indigenous folklore unquestionably exists, but it is rarely, if ever, free of European accretions. Their presence must not, however, be assessed too heavily. In most cases they are incidental and unimportant, in others significant but not disturbing, while in still others it may interfere markedly with the plot of the story. Frequently the style in which the tales are told is Spanish where the subject-matter is overwhelmingly Zapotec. The reverse, of course, holds too. The subject-matter and the manner of telling Indian may be Spanish. Only the most careful study of these and similar points and a thorough knowledge of the material, Spanish and Indian, will make discussions of this subject fruitful and helpful.

The vast majority of the folktales are unquestionably European in origin. But a blanket statement like that means little indeed. Here again only a type of investigation that has, up to the present, been at best barely adumbrated, can furnish us with the facts required for significant inference and deductions. For anyone to attempt to draw inferences now, as Beals has done in the article just cited, is sheer madness and cannot but help lead to error upon error both in facts and interpretation.

But leaving aside controversial questions for the moment, let us see what we do find. The only large collection of Zapotec folklore so far made is the one I published in 1917. A few more were published later in The Journal of American Folklore, the Ibero-Americana Series of the University of California, and at least sixty are still in manuscript. All in all there are somewhat over two hundred. They were obtained under conditions which make for authenticity. Sixty were told to me in text and the rest written down in Spanish by Zapotec-speaking individuals who had spent practically all their life in their native villages. Three, those from Talea, San Mateo Cajonos, and Zaachila, were at the time students at the Escuela Normal in Oaxaca. Since some of the very best of the clearly pre-Columbian material was obtained from them, there is no need for worrying about the influence of the Escuela upon them in this

Introduction abounds in mistranslations which Prof. Espinosa could have spared himself if he had properly used the Introduction which I sent him. In justice to myself the reader of El Folklore is asked to make the following corrections:

Page 1, 3. conocidos not desconocidos.

Page 4, should read La mayoría fueron Indios de Oaxaca.

Page 8, La mayoría, no Todos.

Page 15-14. Omit everything from Como... parte de and substitute Todos.

Page 15-16. Omit everything from pero es... fuentes posibles.

Page 22-23. Omit everything from desechable... comuestos.

Page 25. Add y sobre los fenómenos naturales after los tidós.

Page 25, 26. Omit this whole paragraph which extends to page iii, 6.

The facts of the case on page ii, paragraph 2, are completely misrepresented. A text is not a list of “materials purporting” “materials presented.” A text is a list of “materials presented” “materials presented” “materials presented.”

Then, possibly, we will not have an accredited scholar like Beals make such superficial and incorrect statements as that “a number of the tales collected by Paul Radin in Oaxaca, for example, are almost certainly tales recently acquired from primary school readers” (Beals, op. cit., p. 12).

The facts of which Beals makes the Mixe may be taken as an excellent example (cf. op. cit., pp. 14-15).
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respect. At best it influenced their style of narration. The Zaachila informant was much less influenced. All the informants were recording tales heard repeatedly. Frequently their Spanish indicates clearly that we are dealing with a direct rendering from the Zapotec.28

The two hundred odd tales can be divided, provisionally, into a number of following types: (I) Those that are folktales in the accepted sense of the term. All the animal and most of the human tales belong to this category as do the four creation myths. They are predominantly, overwhelmingly so, of European origin, with the exception of the creation myths. (II) Those that are really novels based in part on themes from the folktales proper. They are both European and aboriginal in origin. (III) Those that deal with the encounters and adventures of natural objects—sun, moon, stars, clouds, trees, stones, etc. They are unquestionably pre-Columbian, although they have unquestionably become impoverished as to details and plot and largely remodelled stylistically. (IV) Those that deal with adventures and encounters between people, and which, ultimately, must have come from one of the many collections of monks' tales or popular humorous tales of the Middle Ages. (V) Legends about the ancient times and about ancient peoples and places. They represent an unbelievable potpourri. They are definitely post-Columbian, but unquestionably contain numerous authentic details about old customs and beliefs. Naturally my five divisions are not watertight. Mixture and contaminations of all types occur. As an example of such a mixture, let me cite the historical legend about Koixuesa.29

In short, the situation that confronts us concerning the sources and elaboration of the material is a very complex one. It is evident that, for the Zapotecs, the situation must have been complex long before the Spaniards arrived. After all, there were early Mixtec penetrations, invasions, and conquests, and later, Aztec penetrations and invasions. The Spanish conquest was merely the last and most thoroughgoing. We must remember, likewise, the nature of the aboriginal social organization of the Zapotecs, with its well developed classes, and the special rôle played by the priests. The folk, as such, probably knew little about the religious-ritualistic myths, and, in the main, only confused and incomplete versions could possibly have survived the destruction of the priests' power and functions. But there is no reason why the non-religious folktales should not have survived, albeit in a new dress. This, it seems to me, is what the high percentage of aboriginal Zapotec folktales in the collection I made in 1912-1913 is. By thirty percent, demonstrates.

Judging from the fact that, apart from Simatlán, only from Villa Alta informants—Talea, San Mateo Cajonos, and Yalalag—could aboriginal folktales be obtained, it seems likely that they may be unusually difficult to procure in the towns of the Valle. Unquestionably they exist. Their presence in Simatlán is enough to prove it. For that reason too much importance must not be attached to the present apparent contrast between the Valle and the Sierra Juárez and Villa Alta materials. Mrs. Parsons' experience at Mitla should make us pause. "Had I not returned for a second visit to Mitla I would have been persuaded that no Indian folk tale had survived. . . . Then on my second visit we found Miguel Méndez . . . and heard his tales of Sus Ley and of Lightning which in spite of Spanish insertions are proper Indian tales, and Miguel told them too like an Indian.30

31 This was far more apparent in the original manuscript sent Prof. Espinosa. He, unfortunately, felt it necessary to correct the Indians' Spanish.

32 Cf. note 6.

33 op. cit., p. 278.
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Nevertheless one should expect to find marked differences not only between the folktales of the Valle and the mountain towns (Sierra Juárez and Villa Alta) but between different towns of the Valle, particularly such as had such a past and so definite an individuality as did Mitla and Zaachila, for instance. It might therefore be of interest to compare the folktales of the two towns.31

The material from Zaachila, while not extensive, contains examples of types I, II, IV, and V with the legends about the former glories of Zaachila and its great hero-king Koixuesa particularly well represented. Apart from these le- yend we find the well-known Spanish tales of Juan Loco and Pedro Guarda- mal, a typical censtro tale and a folktales novelette, entitled Un Casado, that it is best to interpret as a combination of a European and aboriginal themes. I have no examples of type III but I know they exist.

The Mitla material is rich in examples of types I, II, IV, and V. Type III is missing as it is in the Zaachila material. I should be very much surprised, however, if an investigation devoted exclusively to the study of folktales would not reveal them in considerable numbers. They are always the most difficult tales to obtain. Individuals are afraid to tell them, among other things, partly for fear of being accused of being idolators, partly, I suspect, for fear of being laughed at, and last, because it is difficult to persuade them that a stranger really wants them. Chance also plays a rôle and, of course, the particular interests of the informant. That Mrs. Parsons should not have obtained any of the more typical European tales and that in my own material they should be so well represented, demonstrates clearly how careful one must be in stating that a particular type of tale is not present.

Mrs. Parsons' Mitla material contains one type of story that I never encountered, dealing exclusively with Biblical and Christian themes. I do not believe, for a moment, that they are a peculiarity of Mitla. In 1912-1913 I doubt whether I would have taken the trouble to record them. I certainly would not have encouraged anyone to tell them to me or collect them for me. Their absence in my collections is consequently of no significance except as indicating a personal prejudice.

Summing up, a comparison of the Zaachila and the Mitla tales makes it fairly clear that, on the one hand, each town has retained a number of specific aboriginal tales or legends and, on the other hand, each shares in common a number of tales predominantly of European origin but by no means exclusively.

So. As an example of the latter the novelette of the Faithless Wife called Un Casado in Spanish is well worth studying. It is equally popular in both towns but its distribution is, I suspect, much larger. Yet it must have originated in one town and then spread to the others.

31 Based on my manuscript materials for Zaachila and for Mitla on the published materials of Mrs. Parsons and my own published and unpublished data. For Mitla Mrs. Parsons' work Mitla, Town of the Souls (Chicago, 1936) is of prime importance.
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Nevertheless one should expect to find marked differences not only between the folktales of the Valle and the mountain towns (Sierra Juárez and Villa Alta) but between different towns of the Valle, particularly such as had during a past and so definite an individuality as did Mitla and Zaachila, for instance. It might therefore be of interest to compare the folktales of the two towns. 

The material from Zaachila, while not extensive, contains examples of types I, II, IV, and V with the legends about the former glories of Zaachila and its great hero-king Koixuesa particularly well represented. Apart from these leyendas we find the well-known Spanish tales of Juan Loco and Pedro Guardama, a typical conojo tale and a folktales-novelette, entitled Un Casado, that it is best to interpret as a combination of European and aboriginal themes. I have no examples of type III but I know they exist.

The Mitla material is rich in examples of types I, II, IV, and V. Type III is missing as it is in the Zaachila material. I should be very much surprised, however, if an investigation devoted exclusively to the study of folktales would not reveal them in considerable numbers. They are always the most difficult tales to obtain. Individuals are afraid to tell them, among other things, partly for fear of being accused of being idolators, partly, I suspect, for fear of being laughed at, and last, because it is difficult to persuade them that a stranger really wants them. Chance also plays a role and, of course, the particular interests of the informant. That Mrs. Parsons should not have obtained any of the more typical European tales and that in my own material they should be so well represented, demonstrates clearly how careful one must be in stating that a particular type of tale is not present.

Mrs. Parsons' Mitla material contains one type of story that I never encountered, dealing exclusively with Biblical and Christian themes. I do not believe, for a moment, that they are a peculiarity of Mitla. In 1912–1913 I doubt whether I would have taken the trouble to record them. I certainly would not have encouraged anyone to tell them to me or collect them for me. Their absence in my collections is consequently of no significance except as indicating a personal prejudice.

Summing up, a comparison of the Zaachila and the Mitla tales makes it fairly clear that, on the one hand, each town has retained a number of specific aboriginal tales or legends and, on the other hand, each shares in common a number of tales predominantly of European origin but by no means exclusively so. As an example of the latter the novelette of the Faithless Wife called Un Casado in Spanish is well worth studying. It is equally popular in both towns but its distribution is, I suspect, much larger. Yet it must have originated in one town and then spread to the others.
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88 This was far more apparent in the original manuscript sent Prof. Espinosa. He, unfortunately, felt it necessary to correct the Indians' Spanish.
89 Cf. note 6.
90 op. cit., p. 278.
CUENTOS DE MITLA

PREFACE

The following texts were collected in 1915 in Oaxaca, Oax., from a native of Mitla named Felipe Castellanos, now deceased. Castellanos was an unusually able linguistic informant but his knowledge of Spanish was not very good.

Although I have tried to record the texts as accurately as I could, my purpose in collecting them was not primarily linguistic and I am quite aware of their phonetic shortcomings. No attempt has been made to normalize the sounds.

For the sound values cf. my two articles mentioned before. In addition it will be well for the reader to bear in mind the following:

The tones are not recorded.

Italicized letters indicate unvoicing.

x in initial position is German ch in Ich, and before a consonant or in final position in a strong palatal breath.

γ is the velar sonant.

ñ is ng in sing.

ć is Czech c.

y is always slightly palatalized.

v is bilabial and is frequently assimilated to Spanish b.

The Spanish translation is literal and is, of course, quite unidiomatic. It is presented more or less as the informant gave it to me.

I

EL CUENTO DE UN CONEJO

1. te *labrador ru'í* dan loxchipizya'ani. 2. djk rla'sni' cotca'gune' yika'a danyere. 3. djkru vene' tex vengyina vizupni' yek pidasvi-

yiza' te ticavara yá'yl djkru vejvìni' otro vasupni' vengynix. 4. tci-

Translation: 1. El Cuento de Conejo. 1. Un1 labrador tiene daños2 en sus frijolares. 2. Entonces3 quería4 como harf5 [paraque] coja5 este conejo6. 3. En-

tonces hizo un mono de cera, fué-á-ponerlo7 en la cabecera8 del frijolero y cuando alcanzó la noche9 entonces fué-á-ver11 adonde12 le puso mono. 4. Cuando

1 te, tex, article form of the numeral one.

2 ru'i*dan, Zapotec auxiliary (hacer) plus Spanish noun. 

3 djk, djkru, djkru, correlativa conjunction. -ru, -ti, unquestionably demonstrating whose exact force is not clear to me.

4 rla's, full form rla'se; gunalaza pf, syualaze ft, kanalaza cont, galaza subj. 

5 It is really the verbalized form of the noun corazon, la'se, -ni, indef. obj. 

6 Verbaly compound tca, subj. of rya, go, and of rune, to do.

7 yika'a, subj. (rka'a pr, kwa'a pf, zika'a ft, kaka'a, cont.)

8 An old stem for conejo [?] -re is the demonstrative áte.

9 vizupni' pt. from ruzube. The vasupni in sentence 3 is the pt. of the ra-form and has a semireflexive-middle connotation.

10 like, absol. form. Literally it means cabeza.

11 This is the literal translation. Informant translated it as al otro noche.

12 vejvìni, probably misheard for vivvìni. It is the irregular pt. passive of ruuya, ver, mirar.

13 I feel confident otro is a Zapotec stem and not a greatly re-interpreted Spanish otro. It is probably to be analyzed as ot + ro, the -ro being a variant of adverb -ru.
The following texts were collected in 1912 in Oaxaca, Oax., from a native of Mitla named Felipe Castellanos, now deceased. Castellanos was an unusually able linguistic informant but his knowledge of Spanish was not very good.

Although I have tried to record the texts as accurately as I could, my purpose in collecting them was not primarily linguistic and I am quite aware of their phonetic shortcomings. No attempt has been made to normalize the sounds.

For the sound values cf. my two articles mentioned before. In addition it will be well for the reader to bear in mind the following:

The tones are not recorded.

Italized letters indicate unvoicing.

x in initial position is German ch in Ich, and before a consonant or in final position in a strong palatal breath.

γ is the velar sonant.

á is ng in sín.

č is Czech č.

γ is always slightly palatalized.

v is bilabial and is frequently assimilated to Spanish b.

The Spanish translation is literal and is, of course, quite unidiomatic. It is presented more or less as the informant gave it to me.

EL CUENTO DE UN CONEJO

1. te *labrador ru'i* dan loxcipy'a'ani'. 2. djejk sla'sni' cotca'gune' yika'a danyere'. 3. djejk venu' te'x vengyina vizupni' yek pidaivzya' tcivara' yá'l djejkuv evi'ní' oto vasi'ni' yengyiní. 4. tcivi


1 te, tex, article form of the numeral one.
2 ru'i' dan, Zapotec auxiliary (hacer) plus Spanish noun. Spanish.
3 djejk, djejk, djejk, correlative conjunction. -ru, ti, unquestionably demonstratives whose exact force is not clear to me.
4 sawa', full form rla' se; gunalaze pf., syulaze ft., kanalaze cont., galaze subj.
5 It is really the verbalized form of the noun coxn. cora', la' ni. inn. indef. obj.
6 Verbal compound tca, subj. of roua, to go, and of rone', to do.
7 yika'a, subj. (kwa' a pr., kwa' a pf., zika'a ft., kala's, cont.)
8 An old stem for conejo [r], -re is the demonstrative éte.
9 vasi'ni' pt. from ruzube. The vasupni in sentence 3 is the pt. of the ra-form and has a semireflexive-middle connotation.
10 yek, abs. form. Literally it means cabeza.
11 This is the literal translation. Informant translated it as al otro noche.
12 vevi'ni', probably misheard for vivi'ni', it is the irregular pt. passive of ruya, ver, mirar.
13 I feel confident otro is a Zapotec stem and not a greatly re-interpreted Spanish otro. It is probably to be analyzed as ot + ro, the -ro being a variant of adverb -ru.
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24. yuculín, subj. de ruculín, which itself is a compound of a verb -ti and the noun -lla, mano. 25. lluni, tu a ella. 26. se, está, gudaná, from ridaná. However this stem generally is contracted into rídán. 27. scudun'ue. I do not understand this form. The translation es is certainly confused with rei, aqui, but the information frequently confused them.

28. rei is a contrasted with rei, aqui, but the information frequently confused them.

29. This is not the usual stem for correr which is r-june. It is probably related to a serrano form ri-ya.

30. bya-anix, from yanae and -tie, verbal suffix, meaning not clear.

31. Cente, possessive, third sing., can be placed before or after noun.

32. yulek-nil, apparently from a form ribeke.

33. val-ro, fuega-grande.

34. lo, cara de, commonly used with the meaning of en, a.

35. The Milpa text of this sentence was unfortunately omitted. It runs as follows: 18a. kyot veni yen buri yalnil lovaal. bri're, from rie; yali, suffix, meaning not clear.

36. rax, luego; senal ft., from renal.

37. yaxas, tree; bitula's, bitias, tuma.

38. zo'ok, pt. of ruba, the z- of the ft. contracting with the -z- of the verb stem.

39. kayaxues, cont. from rawe or ra'we. It is one of the most irregular verbs in the language.

40. yase'el, pt. from rawe'el.

41. bavii, pt. from ravi'el (rawii), ese, mirar.

42. r-da'el, irregular first sing. indef. from rawa.

43. yidounu, irreg. first pl. subj. from rina.

44. vaza'il, pt. from raza'el.

45. yuta'na, tu a ella.

46. te, está, gudaná, from ridaná. However this stem generally is contracted into rídán.

47. scudun'ue. I do not understand this form. The translation es is certainly confused with rei, aqui, but the information frequently confused them.

48. rei is a contrasted with rei, aqui, but the information frequently confused them.

49. This is not the usual stem for correr which is r-june. It is probably related to a serrano form ri-ya.

50. bya-anix, from yanae and -tie, verbal suffix, meaning not clear.

51. Cente, possessive, third sing., can be placed before or after noun.

52. yulek-nil, apparently from a form ribeke.

53. val-ro, fuega-grande.

54. lo, cara de, commonly used with the meaning of en, a.

55. The Milpa text of this sentence was unfortunately omitted. It runs as follows: 18a. Kyot veni yen buri yalnil lovaal. Bri're, from rie; yali, suffix, meaning not clear.

56. rax, luego; senal ft., from renal.

57. yaxas, tree; bitula's, bitias, tuma.

58. zo'ok, pt. of ruba, the z- of the ft. contracting with the -z- of the verb stem.

59. kayaxues, cont. from rawe or ra'we. It is one of the most irregular verbs in the language.

60. yase'el, pt. from rawe'el.

61. bavii, pt. from ravi'el (rawii), ese, mirar.

62. r-da'el, irregular first sing. indef. from rawa.

63. yidounu, irreg. first pl. subj. from rina.

64. vaza'il, pt. from raza'el.

65. dji, que, -pwen, Sp. bueno, -nak, pr. of verb ser; -ni', 'o.

66. yudam-zu, irreg. pt. from rabe; -zu, probably -b- before -za-; -za, también. Full form zani.

67. ria's, for ria'se, indef. first sing.

68. vixages, e, pt. from ri'el/gase. It is a reflex. middle form.

69. gyiri, subj. from rie, salir.

70. nayábe, pr. momentaneous from rayabice.

71. Cf. note 45.

72. di-, negative adverb; -yao, irreg. second sing. subj., with imperative force from rawa.

73. wana, cont. from some stem like -bana (?) or is it a contraction of g(a)-, subj. with -a(pe), the reg. stem for cuidar (?). Quite unclear to me.

74. re-, common but not necessary plural prefix.

75. a-, Sp. ya; ft. from rialé.

76. tce-, ft. subj. of ir; -ko'e (for ka'e), stem of coger.

77. yídaru, en, Sp. note 53.

78. re-byxic-re, estos los muchachos, used in the second two -ts of the verb. The use of -ts of the verb is rather unusual.

79. watuyalí, imper. from rayalé.

80. a-, Sp. ya; yuku, pt. from raku, hacer; -c, possessive; -tce, rato.

81. kabá'sti, cont. from raba'se; -ti, suffix expressing long past time.

82. vire-etc, pt. probably from rire-itce.
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la *nyina yu're'ti' te' yucina'ini'14. ria'salu*p yutca'nalu*pa'ai15. cegudana'xyenalu tuçud'u're'.16. "yo'za", râp *kuyot.17. djek' u zaxwe *kunexu bya'anta*gx *kuyot *lugar cten *kunexu.18. ticvidźn *labrador djekru yule'kni' te valro' djekru vaza'lini' *kuyot ovaxl.19. *zasenali!

20. *kunexu ticvidźn *ja te yaxkibitsela'st, *kunexu zo*x*p xy'a* oya'x kayaxue vitsela'st.21. djekru râ*p *kuyot, *anda lu*p ciga'k na're'vesye'lu*p pues nax si'ni* sawelu*p.22. djekru râp, *kunixu, digu'unlu zi'k, bavi'i yanalu pitcul rda'a' bitsi'se'.23. "vaza'le te yidono, râp *koyot.24. djekru vaza'le *kunexu tex tevixtla'si tzocel

34 yutca'ini, subj. from rutca' which itself is a compound of a verb -tei- and the noun -na', mano.
35 lujun, tu a ella.
36 te*, dite; gudaná, from ridaná'. However this stem generally is contracted into rikiná.
37 tucud'u. I do not understand this form. The translation eches is certainly confused.
38 re* is dite as contrasted with re'i, aqui, but the information frequently confused them.
39 'xu'xu'x. This is not the usual stem for correr which is rjune. It is probably related to a Serrano form ri-yá.
40 bya'anta, from ra'ane and -tix, verbal suffix, meaning not clear.
41 cten, possessive, third sing, can be placed before or after noun.
42 yulek-ni, apparently from a form ribeke.
43 val-ro, fuego-grande.
44 lo-, cara de, commonly used with the meaning of en, d.
45 The Mitla text of this sentence was unfortunately omitted. It runs as follows: 18a. *Kuyot veni *yan biri'yalini' lovaal. *bir', from rie; *yal, suffix, meaning not clear.
46 za$, luego; senal ft., from renal.
47 yaxk'-, tree; bitsela'st, bitsis, tana.
48 zo*x*p, pt. from rubs, the -z- of the ft. contracting with the -z- of the verb stem.
49 kayaxue, cont. from rawe or ra'we. It is one of the most irregular verbs in the language.
50 yave'i, pt. from raye'i.
51 bavi'i, pt. from ravi' (rawii'), ser, mirar.
52 r-da'ul, irregular first sing. indef. from rawa.
53 yidono, irreg. first pl. subj. from rina.
54 vaza'li, pt. from rza'le.
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djek râp *kuyot, "djipwenakini', vaza'lst!25. djekru vaza'li *kunexu ste yuda'mza *kuyot ste chol.26. "durti ria's", râp *kuyot, "vuts ria's",27. djekru vaza'lini' tex vits ria'tse'cte nenro'o *kuyot vixgas-ne'e niphery *kuyot. 28. *mientras garáxi *kuyot giri'i vitis nipheryn'ni', *mientras kunexu baju'nà zá.
29. bi'aini *kuyot naya'bi'c naya'tep.30. tcix ven *kuyot *yain vitiri'is vitsila'st nimbayxe'ni'. 31. djekru senali *ractr cte *kunexu. 32. tci vidzáni' *kunexu azox*p kaya'pni te *panal. 33. djekru râp *kuyot, "nasini, sawelu*p!34. "diy'a'olu nazr'e re kwanãx rebyucí *swel, ri'í kwanã, aya'le tco'o ye'tc'ítik* kom báli' yida'unu. 35. paldi rebyucíre xu'ni *lisyon kwa'i yak're wataylní'. 36. djekru zá *kunexu.

37. ayuk ctece zá *kunexu kabá'sti *kuyot, djekru wataylne *kuyot yaxk ye*t *panal.37a. ctece-irc vás *panal yuda'oyu*a'ri'vixaga'


37. Ya hace rato50 se fué conojo, está-esperando51 coyote, entonces le pegó coyote palo [en] la cabeza [de] panal. 37a. Cuando se alborotaron52 avispas de

52 dji, que; -pwen, Sp. bueno; -nak, pr. of verb ser; -ni'll, 'o.
53 yudam-za, irreg. pt. from rabie; -m, probably -b before -za; -za, tam- bien. Full form zani.
54 ria's, for ria'se, indef. first sing.
55 vixgas-e, pt. from ri'ri'gase. It is a reflex. middle form.
56 gyiri, subj. from rie, salir.
57 kayabic, pr. momentaneous from rayabice.
58 Cf. note 45.
59 di-, negative adverb; -yao, irreg. second sing. subj., with imperative force from rawa.
60 kwaná, cont. from some stem like -baná (?), or is it a contraction of g(a) -, subj. with -a(pe), the reg. stem for cuadat (?) Quite unclear to me.
61 re-, common but not necessary plural prefix.
62 a-, Sp. ya; ft. from riayle.
63 tee-, ft. subj. of ir; -ko'e (for ka'e), stem of coger.
64 yida'unu, cf. note 53.
65 re-buycic-re, estos loz muchacos. The use of the two-car is rather unusual.
66 wataylní, imper. from ratayle.
67 a-, Sp. ya; yu', pt. from rakte, haces; -c, possessive; -tecce, rato.
68 kaba'sti, cont. from raba'se; -ti, suffix expressing long past time.
69 vire-irc, pt., probably from rire-ircce.
*kuyot. 38. djekru nayahincnagatip *kuyot loyux. 39. vietla *kunexu djekru vajun *kuyot lo rimaña.
40. tcividzín *kuyot lo te *layune a *kunexu sibigax ro'nise. 41. djekru ráp *kunexu, “jegundilu naxrc, kukán na're; yidunu nisir’ te’ yiri'i "keisi nivu' ja nisir’ yida’uxunu.” 42. “yo,” ráp *kuyot nisya *asta tizviredzya’a cki *kuyot roki vade’t *fin *kuyot.

II

JUAN OSO
5. aguk ctcez ze *tirador tcivisünx te *osia bwa’wiini lo yulna’a. 6. djekru, “yo’u,” rápni djekru wadžüp jaxyen’i yulna’a zenäni yulnaga *par cipilyá’ini.
7. tci vitsün *tirador otro zobiya’a yulna’a aruti yulna’a kwareni’.
8. *tiradorga rvedjda’a rvedjidix ruiti yulna’a xun *kontest. 9. ro’panal, le picaron las avispas cote. 38. Entonces se está revolviendo cote en la tierra. 39. Mientras como, entonces corrió cote á los animalitos.82
40. Cuando llegó cote á la laguna está como sentado* en la boca del agua. 41. Entonces dijo cote, “Nada no me hagas,” ayuva me; vamos á beber agua para que salga* el queso que está* en bajo el agua [paraque] lo comamos.” 42. “Sí,” dijo cote y lo tomó-agua* hasta que se reventó* su barriga cote hasta dió fin* cote.

5. Ya hace rato se fue el tirador cuando llegó un osito, vió la mujer. 6. Entonces, “vámonos,” dijo, entonces lo cargó en el pescuezo la mujer, se fue con ella, esa mujer, para su cueva. 7. Cuando llegó el tirador adonde está-sentada la mujer ya no está la mujer estuvo. 8. El tirador grita-grita, ya no está la mujer paraque haga-contestar.

78 ri`, plural prefix (re); man (maní), animal; -ña, inanimate form of the demonstrative es.
79 sohi, cf. note 48; -gas, demonstrative adverb allá.
80 gun, subj. from rune, hater; -di-, negative adverb.
81 viri, subj. from rie.
82 ni`, que, el que. Really a nominal prefix; -yu, subj. cond. of estar.
83 nis- (nis), agua; -ya, beber.
84 tiz, I don’t understand this; viredzya’a, pt. from riredzia’a, which can be analyzed into -re-, iterative prefix and -dia’a probably related to tyáze, romper.
85 vade, pt. from rudedi, dar, and Sp. fin.


80 This must be a mistake for madre.
81 Apparently some phrase such as “So it was, etc.” is to be supplied.
II
JUAN OSO

1. te *tirador ve'iiqjab *sekamp *kon tcailni'. 2. tcividzin daxmi råp *tiradorga lo tcailni'. "ni'i gurex, azleyo tcawiyi katj yune *ga'an yirikax te vitsin'e.' "3. "yoza', råp yuna'a'ago. 4. zati *tirador nezmena darama.

5. aguk ctcex za *tirador tcivisiun te *osa bwaawi'ino lo yulna'a. 6. djekru, "yo'u', råpni djekru vadzi'ip jaxye'ni yulna'a zenani' yulnaga *par cpiqija'ini.' 7. tci vitsin *tirador otro zobiya'a yulna'a aruti yulna'a kwari'ì. 8. *tiradorga rvedja'da rvedjidxi ruti yulna'a xun kontest. 9. ro'-panal, le picaron las avispas coyote. 38. Entonces se está revolcando coyote en la tierra. 39. Mientras conoje, entonces corrió coyote a los animalitos.87

40. Cuando llegó coyote a la laguna está conoje sentado86 [en] la boca del agua. 41. Entonces dijo conoje, "Nada no me hagas",85 ayuda me vamos a beber agua paraque salga86 el queso que está87 en bajo esta agua [paraque] lo comamos.42. "Si", dijo coyote y lo tomó-agua86 hasta que se reventó86 su barriga coyote hasta dió86 coyote.


5. Ya hace rato se fue el tirador cuando llegó un oso, vió la mujer. 6. Entonces, "vamosnos", dijo, entonces lo cargó en el pescuero la mujer, se fue con ella, esa mujer, para su cueva.


87 ri-, plural prefix (re); man (maní), animal; -ta, inanimate form of the demonstrative sein.
88 sobi-, cf. note 48; -gax, demonstrative adverb allá.
89 gun, subj. from runci, hazer; -dri, negative adverb.
90 virii, subj. from rici.
91 ni-, que, el que. Really a nominal prefix; yu, subj. cond. of estar.
92 nis- (nis) 'agua'; -ya, beber.
93 tiz, I don't understand this; virebzya'an, pt. from virebdziza'a, which can be analyzed into -re-, iterative prefix and -dzia'a probably related to -tyaze, romper.
94 vadet, pt. from rudedii, dar, and Sp. fin.
95 This must be a mistake for madre.
96 Apparently some phrase such as "So it was, etc." is to be supplied.


48. *maz vi’iñga nyaladzucni. 49. vaza’lhinìi *skwil; ro’k veni *enkarxi’i lox *maistr. 50. “tendjuic vadi’it judjini’ *edsakoni ci’inà tceyanalaxt ni’i. 51. *pues djejku byu’ini ‘skwel *mas nyaladuclinìi. 52. nune’ici’i cin’i’i zàni’i rovazy’ya’a nitex xwerere’zàni ye’k[res’a]nìi. 53. djej *mazala vajaxl *maistr d’ite lox cgusa’-ini tcàjí’ilirevèng’i jët *motunàni yâpni *rāp maistr lox reguzangà.


41. Pues entonces empezó ese hombre a llorar diciendo, “No lave, yo tengo la culpa [porque] te llevé [y] te dejé sola. 42. Pues ahora llegaste vamos [que] vimos hijo tuyo. 43. Pues ahora nos vamos al cura para que se bautice.”

44. Entonces fué a ver a confesar lo que le pasó. 45. Entonces dijo al cura, “Vas te a bautizar mi hijo porque el sea a bautizar.” 46. “Sì,” dijo el cura; 46a. el mismo cura hay el padrino. 47. Se lloró. 48. Pero es mucho tembló era muy bravo. 49. Lo puso [en] la escuela; hay lo encargó al maestro. 50. “Por vida tuya, dale un poco educación [a] mi hijo porque es muy bravo.” 51. Pues entonces entró en la escuela pero es muy bravo. 52. Por una cosa que hacen luego va le da un cuesco [que] se sangra la cabeza de sus compañeros. 53. Entonces mejor mandó el maestro razón a su familia que van a traerlo porque no hay modo en que hacerlo, dijo el maestro a su familia. 54. Entonces se lo llevaron a su casa y pues dijeron sus padres a


68. Alíf estaba él una noche cuando empezaron a pensar adentro. 69. Mientras él me caso luego, “Si yo hago a cenar!” 67a. Entonces dijo, “Qué cosa quieres? 68. Espera mientras empiezo de cenar paraque me digas a ver que cosa quieres.” 69. Entonces se fué a pensar [y] se están cayendo los huesos en la esquina de la casa.84 70. Entonces hizo se presentar un muerto. 71. Entonces dijo al Juan, “Quieres que tú saques me de una pena que yo tengo.” 72. Entonces dijo Juan, “Bieno, si dices así, pero no leas [y] espera a que yo acabe de cenar paraque enseñés a mi adonde hay el dinero el que lo ente-

83 So translated by informant, but the verb is not the regular one for dormir.

84 This sentence is not quite clear.


48. *maz vi’iugu na’alakulnu. 49. vaza’lnini’i *skwil; ro’k veni *eñkarxu lox *maistr. 50. “tendjuic vadi’it judji’n *eduksioñ ci’inä tceynalax tni’i. 51. *pues djekru byu’ini’i *skwil *nas yalañalu’quini. 52. nune’izi’iri’i suin’i’i raviyakxa’a nitex xwerere’rza’ini yek res’xini. 53. djek *mazla vajaxl *maistr d’i’tc lox cgusa’-ni’i tça’li’irecveniñi’i jecto *muntun’i’i rapi’i ri’ maistr lox reguaxanga.


48. Pero ese muchacho era muy bravo. 49. Lo puso [en] la escuela; hay lo encargó al maestro. 50. “Por vida tuya, dales un poco educación [a] mi hijo porque es muy bravo.” 51. Pues entonces entró en la escuela pero es muy bravo. 52. Por una cosa que hacen luego va le da un cuese [que] se sangra la cabeza de sus compañeros. 53. Entonces mejor mandó el maestro razón a su familia que van a traerlo porque no hay modo en que hacerlo, dijo el maestro a su familia. 54. Entonces se lo llevaron a su casa y pues dijeron sus padres a


66. Allí estaba él una noche cuando empezaron a pensar adentro. 67. Mientras él ni hace caso luego, “Si yo hago a cenar!” 67a. Entonces dijo, “Qué cosa quieres?” 68. Esperó mientras empiezo de cenar paraque me digas a ver qué cosa quieres.” 69. Entonces se fué a penar [y] se están cayendo los huevos en la esquina de la casa. 70. Entonces hizo se presentar un muerto. 71. Entonces dijo al Juan, “Quieres que tú saques me de una pena que yo tengo.” 72. Entonces dijo Juan, “Bueno, si dices así, pero no laes [y] espere a que yo acabe de cenar paraque enseñas a mi adonde hay el dinero que lo ente-

88. So translated by informant, but the verb is not the regular one for dormir.

89. This sentence is not quite clear.
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lu.” 73. djekru ráp veñgutiyu, “*pues nax kwá’elup tiopé *varil mexl nenyure’e tyika’olú;” ctenuli. 74. “*nada *mas ki-ilú tiop
tcan *mic ninaážé tegake *
liv lxɔ *dios.” 75. “yo,” ráp *xuañ, “katiyu’ reni; uru’ *sen otro yu’ revarliga?” 76. djekru voli’ (?) veñgutia *sen djekru záeni gunitexolni’.

77. tcvarya’al djek *venibis crenbalni’i rábeni, “zikti byaet te ven’; biyadene’ *storb lowe yäl;” viyáyteni vaka’al. 78. “*pues nax nuni’telu tiop *mos xyetá’en ri’i teyeri’i tiop *varil neyup nenri’i, yo rápiñgá.” 79. djekru gudí’*en *mos otro *mexl virli’ *revarliga *kohn cigitñi’u tyukja rednigja yaj *mic lxomi. 20. kwa’i vicos listga. 81. djek ráp *xuañ, “naxzini, rembal, cogak mëxre.” 82. djek ráp vicos, “kwa’eni tctenuli;” xiyka’enakeni ruxni’ *import *egwendremic. 83. “yo,” rafi, “pal naxlux zik.” 84. “*pues nax yxi’át recugzane teyi’ka’i reni’ mexga vitla naxre yuñlu *mandad yaktci’i te *woston rcine *par saná.” 85. djek ruvem bicos *mandad guktce’i te *woston nina’x tci-
vidjiop *libr. 86. djek ráp *xuañ, “ciguná’ *xugirii tenimo’o tsvi-
djiop *rop, nik ralde.” 87. “yo,” ráp bijoc, “*per zagega giyáshuln-
i?” 88. “zakani, remboxi, tegakwic icoca’.” 89. djek ruktce’i jvostení, djekru pya’eni” *konform. 90. sinátiire cguzani’ mexl *par roli’sni’. 91. djek ráp *xuañ, “naxzini, kolyiní’i yeki tevaza’a-
Este fue el cuento de los dos barriales [de] dinero aquí en este lugar y lo cojas; tuvo es. 74. Nada mas pagas dos, tres misas que [aúna] quedaban paraque me libra á Dios.” 75. “Sí,” dijo Juan, “adonde son esos; pon la señía adonde hay esos barriales?” 76. Entonces echó35 el muerto la señía y se fue, se despareció. 77. Cuando amaneció entonces le avisó á su padrino diciendo, “Así llegó un muerto; me vino á estarbol al noche; me vino á quitar el suelo. 78. Pues ahora me das dos mozos que vengan escabar aqui paraque salga dos barriales, los que hay aqui, asi dijo éste.” 79. Entonces escarban los mozos adonde hay esos barriales [de] dinero [y] salió con los papeles paraque sepan los santos que paguen sus misas á él. 80. Cógió el cura la lista. 81. Entonces dijo Juan, “Ora sá, padrino, como se va á hacer [con] este dinero?” 82. Entonces dijo el cura, “Cógoelo, es tuyo; yo cojo loque me importa de las misas.” 83. “Sí,” dijo él, “si dices así.” 84. “Pues ahora que vengan mis padres paraque cogen ellos el dinero y me haces tu mandado hacer un bostón que necesito paraque ando con él.”


83 Not quite clear.
86 i.e., echar la bendición.
lu.” 73. djekru râp veñgîtuya, "*puces nax kwâ'clu piopia *varîl mexl nenyure'e tayiuka'olu; ctenuluni. 74. *nada *mas ki-iujl tiop tcañ *mic ninaâzê tegake *livr lox *dios." 75. "yo, râp *xuâñ, "katiyu' reni; uru' *sen otro yu' revarîlga" 76. djekru voli'i (?) veñgûtiga *sen djekru zäeni gunîtelomzi'.

77. tciwaryâ'l djek *venibis cremlalni' râbeni, "zikti byâet te ven'; biyadene' *storb lowe yâl; viyâtye' teñi vaka'l. 78. *puces nax kuni'telu tiop *mos yaeyâ'en ri' têyeri' tiop *varîl neyup nenri'i, yo râpînga." 79. djekru gudî'ê *remos otro mexl virii' *revarîlga *koh cgit dni' tuykja redzàfnyaj *ajt *mic loxni. 20. kwâ'li vicos *listga. 81. djek râp *xuâñ, "naazini, rembal, cogak mexlre." 82. djek râp vicos, "kwâ'eni ctenuluni; viyâka'enakê ruñxni *import *cgwendremic. 83. "yo, râdni, "pal nauxlu zik." 84. "*puces nax yáâ'ît reçugzane teyîka' reni' mexlga vitla naxre yunlu *mandad yaktci'i te *woston rkine *par sañáa.

85. djek ruvem bicos *mandad guktce'i te *woston nina'xi tciwidjio *libr. 86. djek râp *xuâñ, "cigunâ' *xugîtri* tenino'o tciwidjio *rop, nik rlazine. 87. "yo, râp bijoc, "*per zegaka gjiyâshûni?" 88. "zakani, rembok, tegakwic'cika'ok." 89. djek ruktce'i jvosto'eni, djekru yâ'eyeni *konform. 90. sinâtire cguzanî' mexl *par roli'sni'. 91. djek râp *xuâñ, "naazini, kolyîlini' yeka tevaza'a-raste." 73. Entonces dijo el muerto, "Pues ahora me saques dos barriles [de] dinero aquí en este lugar y lo coyes. eu es. 74. Nada más pagas dos, tres misas que [aí]n quedaban paraque me libra à Dios." 75. "Si," dijo Juan, "adonde son esos; pues la señâ a donde hay esos barriles?" 76. Entonces echó el muerto la señâ y se fue, se desapareció.

77. Cuando amaneció entonces le avisó á su padrino diciendo, "Asi llegó un muerto; me vino á estarbol al noche; me vino á quitar el sueño. Pues ahora me das dos mozos que vengan escarbar aquí para que salga dos barriles, los que hay aquí, así dijo éste. 79. Entonces escarban los mozos adonde hay esos barriles [de] dinero [y] salió con los papeles para que sepan los santos que pague sus misas á él. 80. Cogió el cura la lista. 81. Entonces dijo Juan, "Ora si, padrino, como se va á hacer [con] este dinero?" 82. Entonces dijo el cura, "Cojelo, es tuyo; yo cojo lo que importa de las misas." 83. "Si," dijo él, "si dices así." 84. "Pues ahora que vengan mis padres paraque cogen ellos el dinero y me haces tu mandado hacer un bostón que necesito paraque ande con él."

85. Entonces hizo el cura lo mandar [y] se hizo un bastón que pesa doce libras. 86. Entonces dijo Juan, "Que quiero esto jugueté, uno que pesa doce arrobas, ése quiero!" 87. "Si," dijo el cura, "pero que puedes levantarlo?" 88. "Si," puedo, padrino, paraque yo sepa que cosa tengo." 89. Entonces lo hicieron el bastón y se quedó conforme. 90. Se lo llevaron sus padres dinero para su casa. 91. Entonces dijo Juan, "Ora si, échenme á mi cabeza* porque ya me voy


63 Not quite clear.
66 i.e., echar la bendición.
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138. tcviđjiün *serpient djkru *kon tex *voston vatyëxl *xuán maqiga vagul* *xuán. 139. djkvi dzuxn rex *yigant djk sas watiyäxl *xuán ste *vostonas yek *yigant vagu‘saní *yigant. 140. sas vucuinxi nem ste *kwarta djiivitsin *mer vendjab. 141. djk råpi ni, "cigaxyu‘inu roludjeri *pues nan xika‘alu‘up." 142. djk råp


This and the preceding sentence are somewhat jumbled.
Tlalocan

naxre." 164. djek ráp reix, "*pues nax abyá'unlu *lugar ri *koñ
gutna'ilup te ji'indja'apá."

165. djek bya'en *xuan *konform recdi'ite *reix. 166. vatcñ'a
ni'i te jindja'ap *reix ro'k'íi vade'it *fin *cwert *xuan. 167. bya'oní
*lugar ga djeuki vacalni *rasoñ lox recguzaní kati vadi-it *fin *cwert-
ní. 168. djeuki wix revénga vivi'ire viyumbe'ire egulismi. 169. djeuki
rowaduc rowadje'b la's revénga, sigaksá *reix. 170. djeuki ráp *reix
lox revénga, "sunak xi'tu, re'i xya'itu *koñ ji'itu." 171. djeuki ráp
revénga "*wenduc *wendje-ib, xyanu re'i *per soxp lixru laxctnu."
172. "jet nakdi," ráp *reix, re'i *mazru yu'ìuts nigidjidja'ak laxstu,
gyika'etu' kwá-ástu 'chetenu'; dinatu' cteneni." 173. kwáp revénga
bya'enre *syudaxga, djeuki bya'en revénga *asta nadjix.

y virtud que dío Dios á mi. 164. Entonces dijo el rey, "Pues ahora ya quedaste
en lugar aquí con te cases una de mis niñas."

165. Entonces se quedó Juan conforme las palabras del rey. 166. Se casó
él á una muchacha del rey hasta ha dicho fin su suerte de Juan. 167. Quedó
en ese lugar y mandó razón á sus padres hasta donde dijo fin su suerte. 168.
Entonces fueron ellos á ver, á conocer su nuera. 169. Entonces quedaron, se
alegraron muchísimo el corazón de ellos, también del rey. 170. Entonces dijo
el rey á ellos, "No se vayan, aquí quedan Vds. con tu hijo." 171. Entonces
dijeron ellos, "Bueno, muy bueno, nos quedaremos aquí pero tenemos nuestras
casas en nuestro pueblo." 172. "No lease," dijo el rey, "aquí hay más, cual-
quiera laque los gusten Vds. el corazón, cogen [y] van á vivir con Vds.; no
creyan que es mío." 173. Digan que sí ellos, se quedaron en esa ciudad, y se
quedan ellos hasta el día.

[To Be Continued]