

# Cuentos y Leyendas de los Zapotecos

By PAUL RADIN

Professor of Anthropology  
Black Mountain College, N. C.

## I

### THE ZAPOTEC GRAMMAR AND DICTIONARY OF JUAN DE CORDOBA

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 1578, 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 Tehuano and Serrano-Nexitzo is this true today.<sup>1</sup>

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 Miahuatlán, 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 Talea cluster of pueblos or of the so-called Rinconada<sup>2</sup> (Santa Cruz, San Pedro, Tepanzacoalco [?], etc., to the north and northwest of Istlán) are as close to the *Valle* as they are to the Sierra dialects. This greater approximation

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup>: "Supongo tambien que assi en el Valle como en la Cierra, en cada pueblo ai diversidad accidental en el modo de hablar; pero en substancia el que supiere la lengua de *Zaachilla* savrá entenderá, y será entendido en todo el Valle, y quien supiere la lengua de Cajonos, saurá, entenderá y será entendido en todo la Cierra de Villa Alta, el Rincon y Yagauila, etc."

If we may thus assume that, even although mutually unintelligible, the *Zaachilla* 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 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 *Tlacoahuaya* 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, 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 *Zaachilla*, the "seat" of the so-called "kings" of the Zapotecs. 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 comparative or generalized Valle 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 aviso tercero," he says, "que se a de notar. Que para cada vocablo de los nuestros, se hallaran aplicados muchos desta lengua, y la razon es, porque aunque siempre el vno dellos es el mas proprio y principal, con todo esso los demas como sinonomas a el sirven. Y los *Yndios* en sus *platicas* usan 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 tanta su diferencia que casi no usan de todos ellos, aunque algunas vezes aplicandolos a otros significados, tomandolos en un pueblo para una cosa, y en otro para otra, y mudando, trocando ó 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 mesmo vocablo en diuersas terminaciones ó letras, y mudadas tambien en el medio, paraque cada vno halle alli el uocablo del pueblo donde se hablare. Y asi nadie se turbe quando encontrare 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 Zapotecs, more particularly upon their written language. It meant that, in large measure, the written language was to become an artificial postconquest creation, differing

<sup>3</sup> *Gramática de las Lenguas Zapoteca-Serrano y Zapoteca del Valle*. Reprinted by F. Belmar, Oaxaca, 1891.

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*<sup>4</sup> 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 Zapotecas) nengun pueblo ay 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 assi todas las de mas, y lo otro enque *aunque hablen vnos mesmos vocablos vnos los toman por una cosa, y otros por otra. Y por estas razones los que tratan, 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 letras que esta en su cartapacio, o que percibio quando le oyo hablar al yndio, porque sepan que el que mas sabe de nosotros desta lengua ignora muchos secretos y mutaciones y modos della*, los quales muchos dellas yo cierto ignoraua hasta que la obediencia fue causa que pudiesse 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 mencion de la diuersidad de las sillabas y letras y pronunciacion, falta agora (para que de todo tratemos y demos fin a dubdas) declarar *que sea el efecto que hace el acento y bibeza de pronunciacion, en las letras y sillabas*. Y luego se tratara 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 mudança del acento, o con mudarles, añadirles o quitarles vna sola letra, o vna aspiracion en el modo del pronunciar, protrayendo la boz o acortandola, significar distintissimas cosas*. . . .

"Para lo segundo que apuntamos. s. que sea la causa de las distintas pronunciaciones? de donde prouienen las dubdas? A esto se responde que en los yndios procede de vna 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 echado de ver. V.g. En cetoba dizen chzi, aguzando la lengua, y en zachilla dizen chi, la boca llena, otros vocablos assi en otros pueblos. . . . *Ynferese de lo dicho que no es marauilla que algunos de nosotros que deprendemos la lengua arremos assi en la pronunciacion como en el auer percebido unas letras por otras oyendo las mal pronunciar a los yndios, o entendiendolas nosotros de otra manera, y por esso no se espantaran algunos si hallaren algunas cosas assi aqui como en el vocabulario, que no las hayan hasta agora bien entendido.*" [119-121.]

". . . Quanto a los diptongos estos yndios tienen muchos, assi porque la diction lo pide como porque ellos en su hablar blandean con la lengua y algunas vezes pronuncian como en la garganta, de suerte que liquidando las letras, las hazen parecer vnas a otras, de donde prouiene el percibir los oyentes vnas letras

<sup>4</sup> I am quoting from León's reprint. E. Seler'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 qual luego diremos. Los diphtongos que tienen, son ae, ao, ey, ye, ou. . .

"Acerca del hazer simbolizar vnas letras con otras, por razon de la blanda pronunciacion ya dicha, es de notar que las letras que hazen parecer vnas a otras son, V.g. la a con la o. . . La b [con] la p. . . La c simbolizan con la g. . . Ytem con la z. . . La d toman pro t. . . La e pro y, . . . la g hablan como q. . . La h hazen v, vt vue, vui, pro hue, hui. La o pro hu, vt oa pro hua. La y semejan a la e. . . La o pronuncian como u. . . A la r, hazen que sirua de t, vt torobaya pro totobaya. Ciroo pro citao. A la s, bueluen en x, vt liloxia pro tilosia. . . En estas faltas caemos mucho mas nosotros en las mas dellas que no los yndios porque las aprehendemos assi al reues.

"Tambien ay en esta lengua como arriba diximos duplicacion de letras, assi vocales como consonantes. Y vnas son para abiuar el sonido de la sillaba o diction, y otras para protraerle blandamente, y otras para dar el acento en cada vna dellas. Y tambien entre algunas de ellas se les entremete vna h por aspiracion para les fortificar el sonido. Las letras que se duplican son las siguientes. Primeramente dos aa. Dos cc. Dos ee. Dos yy. Y dos ij. Dos ll. Dos nn. Dos oo. Dos pp. Dos tt. Ponemos exemplos dellas 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 comensela, saluo en los verbos y nombres acabados en a, que les dan toda la sillaba entera. s. ya, para que se distinga de la otra a que precedio. Y aun en estos muchas o las mas vezes se la comen y sincopizan." [36.]

"... Y no menos es necessario advertir, enque los rasgulos que estuieren sobre las letras vocales, son los acentos para aguzar aquella sillaba, y es tan necessaria esta advertencia, que es todo el toque de el entender y hablar desta lengua, porque sin ellos un mesmo vocablo significa destintissimas cosas. . ." [Vocabulario, Aviso X.]

"Es el quinto aviso, para dar por el á entender, que algunos principiantes que dependen esta lengua, se turban, paralogizan, y equiuocan, acerca de la pronunciacion della, tomando vnas letras por otras. Y la razon desto es, porque quando oyen hablar á los Indios, ó leen lo que escriuen, las perciben assi, no advirtiendole bien en la causa de su confuso entender. El qual procede, ó de auer lo leydo assi mal escripto, (porque como los Indios no sabian escriuir, ni tampoco saben nuestra orthographia, ni aun apenas la suya, los que dellos lo saben no saben poner por escripto lo que dizen por palabra, con las proprias letras que pide la diction ó sententia, y por esso disparatan y ponen vnas letras por otras, loquel nosotros les hemos de enseñar como las demas cosas nuestras que ellos ignoran, y no ellos a nosotros,) ó por auerlo oydo assi mal pronunciar. Este mal pronunciar procede de una de dos cosas, ó de la falta de los intrumentos conque se forma y pronuncia la boz, ó del vso de la patria: y que esto sea assi ninguna prueua ha menester, pues la experiencia se muestra en nosotros. Aliende de que estos naturales Zapotecas tienen vn tal modo de pronunciar quando hablan, que hazen simbolizar ó semejar vnas 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 assi mismo con diligencia no examinare, si tal letra se puede conpadecer ó no con el tal vocablo, no podra dexar de equiuocarle como esta dicho, y quedarse ha con aquel yerro por verdad. Y por esso no se ha de turbar el estudiante quando oye hablar al Indio, y percibe vna letra por otra, sino el que quisiere hablar esta lengua bien, á de tener atencion á la pronunciacion de los Indios, y procurar de

hablar como ellos, aunque en realidad no sea aquella la letra que en la pronunciación suena como esta dicho. Y si alguno quisiera alegar contra esto, y tomare 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 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 indicted 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.<sup>5</sup> 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 pronunciación 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 rasgullos . . . son los acentos para aguzar aquella sílaba" and that without them "un mesmo 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 entremete una h por aspiración 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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 leer los impresos antiguos españoles*, Sevilla, 1861, Parte IV, Cap. VIII, "De los acentos" (pp. 182-183); Real Academia Española, *Gramática de la Lengua española*, Madrid, 1928, pp. 530, 542; Romero Navarro, *Gracian, El Criticón*, University of Pennsylvania, 1938-1940, Introducción, Vol. I, p. 54; A. Coster, *Fernando de Herrera, Algunas Obras*, p. xviii.

vowel doubling, "unas son para abiuar<sup>6</sup> el sonido . . . otras para protraerle 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 diferencia o mudança del acento . . . protrayendo la boz o acortandola*, 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<sup>7</sup> 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 Córdoba 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" (*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 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 interchange 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 then just as it does now, my surmise is that what baffled all these early recorders were these tones.<sup>8</sup>

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.

<sup>6</sup> *avivar*.

<sup>7</sup> Strangely enough Córdoba uses the grave and the acute accents in his *Vocabulario* and the circumflex and the breve in the *Arte*, but the two sets are definitely equivalent.

<sup>8</sup> How easy it is to miss tones when you are not looking for them, the history of Indian linguistics in the United States amply demonstrates. Thirty years ago Prof. Boas could still teach that the North American Indian languages contrasted with many other areas by the total absence of pitch accent!

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, however, 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 particulas, porque no hazen sino arrojar vocablos y sueltos. vt v.g. Para dezir fuy Huaxaca, y en el camino encuentre con vnos que me quisieron robar y yo lleuaua vn palo, y tome el palo en la vna mano, y en la otra vna piedra, y tirele vna pedrada, y arremeti contra el y dile de palos, y eche a huyr escondiendome, etc. Dizen assi: Coaayaneza nizee laolaa, laonezaca pechelaya peniciani, peçaca quicahaxooni xitenia, chicacochagachooñaaya nazeniyaga, cerobiñaaya coxenიაque, quelaogaa peccaya quieque chicapichelaxooa penicani cotiñaaya 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 *barbareria* and that he should have been more than puzzled that "en esta lengua mientras mas conjunciones pusieremos mas, escurecemos la sentencia." (p. 122.)

The first thing then that the missionaries must have taught their Indian neophytes was how to get rid of this *barbareria* 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.

Thus 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.<sup>9</sup>

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 problems 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 Spanish conjunctions and prepositions the explanation is to be sought in a specific trait of Zapotec and not in any semi-irrational fondness by the Zapotecs 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 *raka* 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.<sup>10</sup>

## II

### THE MODERN ZAPOTEC LANGUAGE

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

<sup>9</sup> 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 edición, 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 remarks 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 who states that "los verbos zapotecas no llegan á seiscentos. Carecen de voz pasiva y del participio" (p. 149), is either careless in his phraseology or — and this is far more likely — thinking in a completely unphilological fashion.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. bibliography in Jiménez 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.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. note 9.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. article quote in note 1, and "A Preliminary Sketch of the Zapotec Language," *Language*, 1930, pp. 64-85.

<sup>14</sup> "The Development of Affixes in a group of monosyllabic Languages of



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 forms of the verb and noun in many of the Valle dialects seem to end in consonants or very weak whispered vowels, and that in the first and second persons the vowels *-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 *i + 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,<sup>15</sup> 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 Teotitlán 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."<sup>16</sup> Now this may be true for Teotitlán. No such division into two groups is known to me, however, in the other towns of what

---

Oaxaca," *Language*, 1926, Vol. II, pp. 46-61, 119-133; "Tone Patterns and Verb Forms in a Dialect of Zapotec (Teotitlán del Valle)," "The Zapotecan Linguistic Group," *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1933, pp. 1-38, and 1934, pp. 111-130.

<sup>15</sup> "Notes on the Chatino Language," *American Anthropologist*, 1913, Vol. XV, pp. 78-86.

<sup>16</sup> "Zapotec Tone Patterns," etc., p. 238.

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."<sup>17</sup> 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 incipiative, continuative, perfect, and frequentative. In Type A it is zero, *ka-*, *gu-*, *ri-*; in Type B, *gu-*, *ka-*, *ba-*, *ru-*; in Type C, *tcí-*, *ka-*, *gwe-*, *ri-*; and in Type D, *g-*, *ka-y*, *gu-t-*, *r-*. 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<sup>v</sup>-* perfect and, for that matter, the *gu-* future (his incipiative), that for *ra-*, the series is *gu-*, *ga-*, for *ri-* either *gu-*, *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 *ru-*, *ri-*, and *ra-*, 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 unpermissible 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 *tcí-* incipiative, 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

<sup>17</sup> "The Zapotecan Linguistic Group," p. 11.

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.<sup>18</sup> The one cardinal error in that paper is its neglect of the Spanish elements in the language, both the lexigraphic 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<sup>o</sup>*- 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.<sup>19</sup>

### 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 Teotitlán 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

<sup>18</sup> 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 Talixtac. However, that paper is so full of typographical errors that it can only be used with the greatest of circumspection.

<sup>19</sup> My remarks in *Language*, Vol. VI, 1930, p. 79, are to be corrected accordingly.

aspiration (‘) into a true spirant and the presence of an  $\bar{a}$  vowel ( $a$  as in English *hat*) and a weakly umlauted  $\ddot{u}$ . The latter vowel, while not entirely unknown in Valle 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 Mitleyenos in short speak a typical Valle 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.<sup>20</sup>

## IV

## ZAPOTEC FOLKTALES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MITLA

IN her paper entitled "Zapoteca and Spanish Tales of Mitla, Oaxaca,"<sup>21</sup> 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 1912-1913 I had no difficulty in collecting thirty-one Mitla folktales, eleven from one informant, all of them obtained incidentally to my work with him. I had to stop collecting them, unfortunately, but my Mitleyeno 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.<sup>22</sup>

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.<sup>23</sup> It should be remembered that the Indians are

<sup>20</sup> 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).

<sup>21</sup> *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 45, pp. 279-318.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. my *El Folklore 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

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.<sup>24</sup>

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.<sup>25</sup>

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*,<sup>26</sup> the Ibero-Americana Series of the University of California,<sup>27</sup> 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

---

*Introducción* abounds in misstatements 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 I, 3. *conocidos* not *desconocidos*.

" " 4. should read *La mayoría fueron Indios de Oaxaca*.

" " 9. *La mayoría*, not *Todos*.

" " 13-14. Omit everything from *Como... parte de* and substitute *Todos*.

" " 15-16. Omit everything from *pero es... fuentes posibles*.

" " 22-23. Omit everything from *desechaba... compuestos*.

" II, 15. Add *y sobre los fenómenos naturales* after *los ídolos*.

" " 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. At best ten of the tales represented "materiales puramente literarios."

<sup>24</sup> 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).

<sup>25</sup> The remarks Beals makes about the Mixe may be taken as an excellent example (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15).

<sup>26</sup> "Folktales from Oaxaca," Vol. 28 (1915), pp. 251 ff.

<sup>27</sup> No. 9, 1935, *An Historical Legend of the Zapotecs*.

respect. At best it influenced their style of narration. The Zaachila informant was much less influenced. All the informants were recording tales heard repeatedly in Zapotec. Frequently their Spanish indicates clearly that we are dealing with a direct rendering from the Zapotec.<sup>28</sup>

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 first four creation myths. They are predominantly, overwhelmingly so, of European origin, with the exception of the creation myths. (II) Those that are really novelettes based in part on themes from the folktale 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 remodeled 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. Mixtures and contaminations of all types occur. As an example of such a mixture, let me cite the historical legend about Kosixwesa.<sup>29</sup>

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, fully 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 folktale 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."<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> This was far more apparent in the original manuscript sent Prof. Espinosa. He, unfortunately, felt it necessary to correct the Indians' Spanish.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. note 6.

<sup>30</sup> *op. cit.*, p. 278.

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 so rich 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.<sup>81</sup>

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 *Kosixwesa* particularly well represented. Apart from these *leyendas* we find the well-known Spanish tales of Juan Loco and Pedro Guardamal, a typical *conejo* tale and a folktale-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 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.

---

<sup>81</sup> 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.

## CUENTOS DE MITLA

## PREFACE

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.

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.

ɣ is the velar sonant.

ñ is *ng* in *sing*.

č is Czech *č*.

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'i\*dan loxcpizya'ani'. 2. djek rla'sni' cotca'gune' yika'a danyere. 3. djekru vene' tex vengyina vizuɸni' yek pidasvi-zya'a tcivara' yä'l djekru vevi'ini otro vasuɸni' vengyinx. 4. tci-

*Translation: I. El Cuento de Conejo.* 1. Un<sup>1</sup> labrador tiene daños<sup>2</sup> en sus frijolares. 2. Entonces<sup>3</sup> quería<sup>4</sup> como haré<sup>5</sup> [paraque] coja<sup>6</sup> este conejo.<sup>7</sup> 3. Entonces hizo un mono de cera, fué-á-ponerlo<sup>8</sup> en 'la cabecera<sup>9</sup> del frijolar y cuando amaneció la noche<sup>10</sup> entonces fué-á-ver<sup>11</sup> adonde<sup>12</sup> le puso mono. 4. Cuando

<sup>1</sup> te, tex, article form of the numeral *one*.

<sup>2</sup> ru'i\*dan, Zapotec auxiliary (*hacer*) plus Spanish noun.

<sup>3</sup> djek, djekru, djekti, correlative conjunction. -ru, -ti, unquestionably demonstratives whose exact force is not clear to me.

<sup>4</sup> rla's, full form rla'se; gunalaze pf., syulaze ft., kanalaze cont., galaze subj. It is really the verbalized form of the noun *corazón*, la'se. -ni, inan. indef. obj.

<sup>5</sup> Verbal compound tea, subj. of *rya*, *to go*, and of *rune'*, *to do*.

<sup>6</sup> yika'a, subj. (*rka'a* pr., *kwa'a* pf., *zika'a* ft., *kaka'a*, cont.)

<sup>7</sup> An old stem for *conejo* [?], -re is the demonstrative *éste*.

<sup>8</sup> vizuɸni pt. from *ruzube*. The *vasuɸni* in sentence 3 is the pt. of the *ra-* form and has a semireflexive-middle connotation.

<sup>9</sup> yek, abs. form. Literally it means *cabeza*.

<sup>10</sup> This is the literal translation. Informant translated it as *al otra noche*.

<sup>11</sup> vevi'ini, probably misheard for vivi'ini. It is the irregular pt. passive of *ruiya*, *ver*, *mirar*.

<sup>12</sup> 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.



vidzün de \*kunexwa otro zuga'a venginx. 5. djekru räpni', "cir-la'slup gakve'ilup cteneti'i; \*pois nax esteroyanlu co'kape tex lox lup." 6. \*mas tcigudapni' viyidiga'kni 'na'oni. 7. djekru gudapni' ste\*lad sigakse viyitigak. 8. djekru räp \*kunexwa, "este ruyā gukwani'ä' ste\*lad." 9. djekti nayabicreni' tcividzün \*labrador djekru räp \*labrador, "onda \*pikaru, lupga ru'n \*dan ri'i! 10. \*pes nax azyanälup!" 11. tcividzün näni \*kunexu djekru bakwadu'ini.'

12. kadu'ini' \*kunexu tcividzün tex \*kwiyo't räp, "cikayunlup ri'i?" 13. djekru viri'i \*kunexu räp, "nikalayanlup ri'i kaväze xyä'et

llegó<sup>13</sup> un conejo adonde está-parado<sup>14</sup> el mono de cera. 5. Entonces le dijo,<sup>15</sup> "[que] cosa-quieres-tú<sup>16</sup> [paraque] lo conoces<sup>17</sup> éste es mío<sup>18</sup>; pues ahora verás-tú<sup>19</sup> como te doy-bofetadas<sup>19a</sup> unas [en] la cara tuya." 6. Mas cuando golpeó<sup>20</sup> quedó-pegado<sup>21</sup> su mano. 7. Entonces golpeó otro lado,<sup>22</sup> lo mismo quedó-pegado. 8. Entonces dijo conejo, "verás como te pateo<sup>23</sup> otro lado." 9. Entonces se están-revolcando<sup>24</sup> cuando llegó labrador entonces dijo labrador, "Anda, pícaro, tú<sup>25</sup> haces daño aquí! 10. Pues ahora ya-te-voy-á-llevar!"<sup>26</sup> 11. Cuando llegó con el conejo entonces lo amarró.<sup>27</sup>

12. Está amarrado<sup>28</sup> conejo cuando llegó un coyote diciendo, "qué estás-haciendo aquí?" 13. Entonces salió<sup>29</sup> conejo diciendo, "ni sabes-tú<sup>30</sup> [que] aquí estoy-esperando<sup>31</sup> que venga<sup>32</sup> la niña [que] está<sup>33</sup> aquí paraque yo-me-

<sup>13</sup> vidzün, pt. from rdzüne (ridzüne).

<sup>14</sup> zuga'a, ft. from ruga'a but with indef. significance.

<sup>15</sup> räpni, full form räbe. In the plural the stem for *hablar* (rni'e) is regularly used.

<sup>16</sup> ci-. Mitla has preserved the old relative lost in many other dialects.

<sup>17</sup> gak-ve'i-lup, subj. form rak, *hacerse*, and -ve'i, *conocer*. The -lup is tú.

<sup>18</sup> An exceedingly unusual type of composition, probably modern. c-, passive prefix, -te-, demonstrative *éste*, neti'i, yo, mío.

<sup>19</sup> estero-yan-lu. estero, meaning unknown. In Zaachila there is a stem yan'u'u, *verás*.

<sup>19a</sup> k'ape, subj. from rgape. The k- is a contraction for ga + ga.

<sup>20</sup> gudapni, from rgape', pt. gudape'.

<sup>21</sup> viyidiga'k-, from riyidiga', passive indef. Córdoba has -gidi. The -ga, -gak- a common suffix, meaning not clear.

<sup>22</sup> ste + Sp. *lado*. To be analyzed as s- poss. prefix and -te-, *aquel*, i.e., *that one's, the other's*.

<sup>23</sup> gukwani'ä, ft. subj. from rkwani'ä.

<sup>24</sup> na-, pr. momentaneous, yabice, subj. from rabice, -reni, *ellos*, i.e., *conejo and el mono de cera*.

<sup>25</sup> lup, tú, -ga, intensive.

<sup>26</sup> a-, probably Sp. *ya*, zyanä' ft., from ryanä' pr., wanä' pt., tcanä' subj., the latter a contraction of k + yanä' (?).

<sup>27</sup> ba-, pt., from ra-kwadu'. This may be further analyzed into -kw-, verbal prefix, and r-adu', stem.

<sup>28</sup> kadu'ini, intr. reflex. cont.

<sup>29</sup> viri'i, pt., from ri'e, ri'i, gyiri'i ft., yiri'i subj., kari'i cont.

<sup>30</sup> ni-, Sp. *ni*; -kala-, meaning not clear; yan from rane', *saber*.

<sup>31</sup> kaväze (for kaväze'), cont. from raväze pt., guläze ft., kwäze subj. The -e' represents the contraction of the -e of the stem and -e', first sing. pronom. affix.

<sup>32</sup> xyä'et, subj. from ryä'ete, vyä'ete pt., zyä'ete ft.

<sup>33</sup> yu-, subj. of verb *ser*, re'i, *agui*.

\*la \*ninya yu're'i te' yutcina'ini'? 14. rla'slup yutcna'lupni'i? 15. egudaná' xyenlup tcludu'u re'e." 16. "yo'za," räp \*koyot. 17. djekru zäxwe \*kunexu bya'antix \*koyot \*lugar cten \*kunexu. 18. tcivizün \*labrador djekru yule'kni' te valro' djekru vaza'lni' \*kuyot ovaxl. 19. "zasenalni!"

20. \*kunexu tcividzü'ni ja tex yaxkbitsela'ts, \*kunexu zoxp xya'a oyaxk kayaxwe vitsela'ts. 21. djekru räp \*kuyot, "\*anda lup ciga'k na're' vasye'ilup \*pues nax si'ini sawelup." 22. djekru räp, \*kunixu, digu'unlu zi'k, bavii' yanlup citcul rda'a' bitsisre'." 23. "vaza'le tex yidonu," räp \*koyot. 24. djekru vaza'le \*kunexu tex tevixsis latsčöel

caso-con-ella<sup>34</sup>? 14. Quieres casarte con ella<sup>35</sup>? 15. Paraque traes,<sup>36</sup> tu pescuzo eches<sup>37</sup> este<sup>38</sup>?" 16. "Sí," dijo coyote. 17. Entonces corriendo<sup>39</sup> conejo, se quedó<sup>40</sup> coyote lugar su.<sup>41</sup> 18. Cuando llegó labrador entonces puso<sup>42</sup> una lumbrada<sup>43</sup> entonces lo echó coyote en la llama.<sup>44</sup> 18a. Coyote ganó que se salió de la llama.<sup>45</sup> 19. Luego el va siguiéndolo.<sup>46</sup>

20. Conejo cuando llegó bajo un tunillo,<sup>47</sup> conejo está-sentadito<sup>48</sup> arriba del palo está-comiendo<sup>49</sup> tuna. 21. Entonces dijo coyote, "Anda-tú, porqué me engañaste<sup>50</sup>?; pues ahora sí te comeré." 22. Entonces dijo conejo, "No hagas así; mira<sup>51</sup> verás que bueno esta tuna que yo como."<sup>52</sup> 23. "Tira una [paraque] vosotros vemos,"<sup>53</sup> dijo coyote. 24. Entonces tira<sup>54</sup> conejo una tuna ma-

<sup>34</sup> yutcina'ini, subj. from rutcina' which itself is a compound of a verb -tci- and the noun -na', *mano*.

<sup>35</sup> -lupni, *tú á ella*.

<sup>36</sup> te-, *éste*; gudanä, from ridaná'. However this stem generally is contracted into riätinä.

<sup>37</sup> tcludu'u. I do not understand this form. The translation *eches* is certainly incorrect.

<sup>38</sup> re'e is *éste* as contrasted with re'i, *aquí*, but the information frequently confused them.

<sup>39</sup> This is not the usual stem for correr which is r-june. It is probably related to a Serrano form ri-ya.

<sup>40</sup> bya'antix, from rya'ane and -tix, verbal suffix, meaning not clear.

<sup>41</sup> ctene, possessive, third sing., can be placed before or after noun.

<sup>42</sup> yulek-ni, apparently from a form ribeke.

<sup>43</sup> val-ro, *fuego-grande*.

<sup>44</sup> lo-, *cara de*, commonly used with the meaning of *en, á*.

<sup>45</sup> The Mitla text of this sentence was unfortunately omitted. It runs as follows: 18a. \*kuyot veni \*yan biri'yalni' lovaxl. bi'ri-, from rie; -yal, suffix, meaning not clear.

<sup>46</sup> zas-, *luego*; senal ft., from renal.

<sup>47</sup> yaxk-, *tree*; bitsela'ts, bitsis, *tuna*.

<sup>48</sup> zoxp, pt. from rzuba, the z- of the ft. contracting with the -z- of the verb stem.

<sup>49</sup> kayaxwe, cont. from rawe or ra'we. It is one of the most irregular verbs in the language.

<sup>50</sup> vasye'i, pt. from rasye'i.

<sup>51</sup> bavii', pt. from ravii' (rawii'), *ver, mirar*.

<sup>52</sup> r-da'u', irregular first sing. indef. from rawa.

<sup>53</sup> yidonu, irreg. first pl. subj. from rina.

<sup>54</sup> vaza'l, pt. from rza'le.

djek räp \*kuyot, "djipwenakni'i, vaza'l ste! 25. djekru vaza'l \*kunexu ste yuda'mza \*kuyot ste čoel. 26. "durti rla's," räp \*kuyot, "vits 'sla'ts," 27. djek vazalni'i tex vits rla'tsč'c'c nenro'o \*kuyot vixgasne'e niñgyen \*kuyot. 28. \*mientras garäxl \*kuyot gyiri'i vitsis niñgyenni'i, \*mientras kunexu baju'nä zä.

29. bi-a'inti \*kuyot naya'bic naya'texp. 30. tcix ven \*kuyot \*yain viri'i vitsila'ts nimbaxye'ni. 31. djekru senali \*ractr cte \*kunexu. 32. tci vidzä'lni' \*kunexu azoxp kayapni te \*panal. 33. djekru räp \*kuyot, "nasini, sawelup!" 34. "diya'olu naxre'e kwanäx rebyuic \*swe'l; ri'i kwanä, azyäle tceko'e yetcti'l \*kom bä'l yida'unu. 35. paldi rebyuicre xuin \*lisyon kwa-i yak're watyälni." 36. djekru zä \*kunexu.

37. ayuk ctcec zä \*kunexu kabä'sti \*kuyot, djekru watyälne \*kuyot yaxk yek \*panal. 37A. tcivire-itc väs \*panal yudaovya'o riväxsga'

dura y dijo coyote, "que buena<sup>55</sup> tira otra!" 25. Entonces tira conejo otra [y] lo tragó-también<sup>56</sup> coyote la otra madura. 26. "Luego, quiero<sup>57</sup> más," dijo coyote, "tuna madura. 27. Entonces tira una tuna verde en su boca del coyote [y] se atoró<sup>58</sup> en el gañote del coyote. 28. Mientras quería coyote sacarlo<sup>59</sup> tuna en el gañote mientras conejo corrió; se fué.

29. Se quedó coyote está revolcándose.<sup>60</sup> 30. Cuando hace coyote ganar salió la tuna en el gañote. 31. Entonces lo siguió<sup>61</sup> rastro del conejo. 32. Cuando lo encontró el conejo está sentado cuidando un panal. 33. Entonces dijo coyote, "Ora sí, te como á tí!" 34. "No me comes,<sup>62</sup> este estoy-cuidando<sup>63</sup> los muchachos<sup>64</sup> [en] la escuela; aquí cuida ya vengo<sup>65</sup> voy-á-traer<sup>66</sup> pan con carne [para-que] comemos.<sup>67</sup> 35. Si no los muchachos<sup>68</sup> estudian lección, coge este palo lo pegar."<sup>69</sup> 36. Entonces se-fué conejo.

37. Ya hace rato<sup>70</sup> se fué conejo, está-esperando<sup>71</sup> coyote, entonces le pegó coyote palo [en] la cabeza [de] panal. 37A. Cuando se alborotaron<sup>72</sup> avispas de

<sup>55</sup> dji, que; -pwen, Sp. *bueno*; -nak-, pr. of verb *ser*; -ni'i, 'lo.

<sup>56</sup> yudam-za, irreg. pt., from *rabie*; -m-, probably -b- before -za-; -za, *también*. Full form *zani'*.

<sup>57</sup> rla's, for rla'se', indef. first sing.

<sup>58</sup> vixgasne'e, pt. from *ri(ri')gase*. It is a reflex. middle form.

<sup>59</sup> gyiri, subj. from *rie*, *salir*.

<sup>60</sup> nayabic, pr. momentaneous from *rayabice*.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. note 46.

<sup>62</sup> di-, negative adverb; -yao, irreg. second sing. subj., with imperative force from *rawa*.

<sup>63</sup> kwanä, cont. from some stem like -banä (?), or is it a contraction of *g(a)-*, subj. with -(a)pe, the reg. stem for *cuidar* (?). Quite unclear to me.

<sup>64</sup> re-, common but not necessary plural prefix.

<sup>65</sup> a-, Sp. *ya*; ft. from *riyäle*.

<sup>66</sup> tce-, ft. subj. of *ir*; -ko'e (for ka'e), stem of *coger*.

<sup>67</sup> yida'unu, cf. note 53.

<sup>68</sup> re-byuic-re, *estos los muchachos*. The use of two -re is rather unusual.

<sup>69</sup> watyälni, imper. from *ratyäle*.

<sup>70</sup> a-, Sp. *ya*; yuk, pt. from *rake*, *hacer*; -c-, possessive; -tcec, *rato*.

<sup>71</sup> kabä'sti, cont. from *rabä'se*; -ti, suffix expressing long past time.

<sup>72</sup> vire-itc, pt., probably from *rire-itce*.

\*kuyot. 38. *djekru nayabincagatiþ* \*kuyot loyux. 39. *vietla \*kunexu djekru vajun* \*kuyot lo rimañga.

40. *tcividzñ* \*kuyot lo te \*layune a \*kunexu sobigax ro'nise. 41. *djekru räþ* \*kunexu, "jetigundilu naxre, kuknä na're; yidunu nisri' te' yiri'i \*keis niyu' ja nisri' yida'uxnu." 42. "yo," *räþ* \*kuyot nisya \*asta tizviredzya'a cki'i \*kuyot rokti vade't \*fin \*kuyot.

## II

## JUAN OSO

1. te \*tirador ve'iñjigab \*sekamp \*kon tcäelni'. 2. *tcividzün' daxn räþ* \*tiradorga lo tcäelni', "ri' i gurex, azyelo tcawiye kati yune \*ga'an yirikax te vitsün'e." 3. "yoza," *räþ* yuna'ago. 4. *zäti* \*tirador neznene daxnga.

5. *aguk etcex zä* \*tirador tcivisünx te \*osa bwawi'ini lo yulna'a. 6. *djekru*, "yo'u," *räþni* *djekru vadzüþ* jaxyeni' yulna'a zenäni' yulnaga \*par cpilxyä'ini.

7. *tci vitsün* \*tirador otro zobiya'a yulna'a aruti yulna'a kwarä'l. 8. \*tiradorga rvedja'a rvedjidix ruiti yulna'a xun \*kontest. 9. ro'-

---

panal, le picaron las avispas coyote. 38. Entonces se está revolcando coyote en la tierra. 39. Mientras conejo, entonces corrió coyote á los animalitos.<sup>73</sup>

40. Cuando llegó coyote á la laguna está conejo sentadito<sup>74</sup> [en] la boca del agua. 41. Entonces dijo conejo, "Nada no me hagas,<sup>75</sup> ayuda me; vamos á beber agua paraque salga<sup>76</sup> el queso que está<sup>77</sup> en bajo este agua [paraque] lo comamos." 42. "Sí," dijo coyote y lo tomó-agua<sup>78</sup> hasta que se reventó<sup>79</sup> su barriga coyote hasta dió fin<sup>80</sup> coyote.

*Translation: II. Juan Oso.* 1. Un tirador pensó se fue-á-campcar con su esposa. 2. Cuando llegó [en] el cerro dijo el tirador á su esposa, "Aquí siéntate, ya vengo; voy-á-ver hasta donde voy-á-ganar que salga un venado." 3. "Sí," dijo la mujer. 4. Se fué el tirador entre el cerro.

5. Ya hace rato se fué el tirador cuando llegó un oso, vió la mujer. 6. Entonces, "vámonos," dijo, entonces lo cargó en el pescuezo la mujer, se fué 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.

---

<sup>73</sup> ri-, plural prefix (re); man (mani), *animal*; -ñga, inanimate form of the demonstrative *ese*.

<sup>74</sup> sobi-, cf. note 48; -gax, demonstrative adverb *allá*.

<sup>75</sup> gun, subj. from *runc*, *hacer*; -di-, negative adverb.

<sup>76</sup> yiri'i, subj. from *rie*.

<sup>77</sup> ni-, *que, el que*. Really a nominal prefix; -yu, subj. cond. of *estar*.

<sup>78</sup> nis- (nisa), *agua*; -ya, *beber*.

<sup>79</sup> tiz-, I don't understand this; *viredzya'a*, pt. from *riredzia'a*, which can be analyzed into -re-, iterative prefix and -dzia'a probably related to -tyäze, *romper*.

<sup>80</sup> vadet, pt. from *rudedi, dar*, and Sp. *fin*.

one \*tiradorga \*por tcälni' zi'ini \*par la'tcni. 10. tcividzün ni'i roli'sni ro'onxne.

11. djekru xyu'ugona'ga cpilyä'e \*os. 12. aguk ctceç rveçdzne' \*os yulnaga djekru guyu' te ji'nx yulnaga ji'ixne \*os. 13. rix \*os rika'a cirak yunaga \*mantener \*mas, \*vestid je'eti. 14. ayuk \*tiemp xyu' yuna'a ayuro'op ciñga'ini räp iñgoli'iga lox enani, "naxn ci-kwent tsunu nenri'itis la' je'eti la'tcnu?" 15. djekru räp yunaga lo jiñga'ini, "ai, xi'ina, yu'u la'tcnu tcäle. 16. \*pues daxn nax cdadilu tcono, tcivitsün manri'i yulaxne naxre syetnä'ini naxre \*par rolnisxni ri'i." 17. "ambax nan," räp ñgoxliya, "palgazi'k guzaklu' tyove'ä siru texonu \*par laxtcnu."

18. djekru rivex gunaga ro'onxne yunaga xi'ina. 19. \*asta tis yuni's ñgoli'iga. 20. djek vala'ts ñgoxli tciri-ä'ät mañgo rcalni'i \*puertoga riyu'uni otro yu'u yunaga. 21. djek bwaovi'i ñgoxliga lox \*osga djek räpni'i lox cnani, "la' mañga nak cdade?" 22. "ex," räp, "la'ni yulaxn naxre nikni'dzunu' re'i." 23. "\*pues nax xyonu \*par la'tcnu." 24. "ai, lujini," räp yuna'ga, "\*kisyer naxre xyonu \*per coxyenu xyiri'nu?" 25. \*pues naxre rcale ri'i te'yeri'inu." 26. "yo," räp yunaga. 27. djekru valana'ini gyi'roga. 28. tci guyuwex viyax-pini'i viyixndiyaxk \*os. 29. sas \*konformi viyaxp gyixga viri'ini \*kon cnani'i.

---

9. Empez a llorar el tirador para su esposa [y] se fué para su pueblo. 10. Cuando llegó en su casa empieza [otra vez] á llorar.

11. Entonces está la mujer en la cueva del oso. 12. Ya hace tiempo lo llama del oso la mujer, entonces tuvo un hijo la mujer, su hijo el oso. 13. Va el oso, trae cosas [para] la mujer [de] mantener más [porque] vestido no tiene. 14. Ya hace tiempo [que] está la mujer, ya está grande su hijo [y] dijo el hombrecillo á su mamá, "Ahora, porqué estamos aquí, no más que no tenemos nuestro pueblo?" 15. Entonces dijo la mujer á su hijo, "Ai, hijo mío, tenemos nuestro pueblo [y] tengo esposo. 16. Pues al cerro me dijo tu papá vámonos cuando llegó este animal [y] me robó [y] me trajo para su casa aquí." 17. "Bueno, mamá," dijo el hombrecillo, "si es así le pasa [aquí] mientras que yo crezca otro poquito paraque nos vamos para nuestro pueblo."

18. Entonces se sienta la mujer llorando, la mujer<sup>81</sup> del hijo. 19. Hasta que creció el muchachito.<sup>82</sup> 20. Entonces lo tanteó el muchacho cuando llega el animal, abre la puerta [y] entra adonde está la mujer. 21. Entonces lo vió el muchachito al oso y dijo á su mamá, "Que ese animal es mi papá?" 22. "Sí," dijo, "ese es que me robó; por eso estamos aquí." 23. "Pues ahora nos vamos para nuestro pueblo." 24. "Ai, hijo mío," dijo la mujer, "yo quisiera [que] nos vayamos pero como vamos hacer que salgamos?" 25. "Pues yo abro aquí para-que salgamos." 26. "Sí," dijo la mujer. 27. Entonces lo empujó la piedra grande. 28. Cuando sonó se cayó [y] lo oyó el oso. 29. Luego conforme cayó la piedra [y] se salieron [él] con su mamá.

---

<sup>81</sup> This must be a mistake for *madre*.

<sup>82</sup> Apparently some phrase such as "So it was, etc." is to be supplied.

30. zāza'ni'i lo ne's tci vidjālñi'i te \*matcet djek \*mazru rba'a lasxni'i räpni'i lox cnani'i, "nax si'ni ayu'uj \*valore." 31. agu'k zāza'reni' tcivirika \*os rzā'ep na'ini räp, "katca'tu? 32. kolxek kol-tco'oxyonu!" 33. djek vaza'äb ñgoxli'ya \*madjed räpni', "re'ti, gudavixk studje'n te' xyeknu xyonzagnu cpiyā'älu." 34. djekru \*mazela biye'k \*os.

35. sas sätireni' \*kon jnani'. 36. dji vidzüni' rolisni djek räpni'i lox tcä'elni', "konlu? 37. cikayu'nlux, cikwent' winälux naxre daxn uc zenä te mañga naxre binäni naxre cpiyā'elni. 38. nax bawi'iyāñ. 39. xaguni'is tejiñgane, ci'in \*osyani. 40. \*pues nax coyakinax?"

41. \*pues djekru gwa nixyiga vix ro'on räpni, "jet cina'k naxkare'e rapedoxl wanälup vasa'enelup ctäblup. 42. \*pues nax xabyi'ätlux gyidonu gyivi'inu ci'inlu. 43. \*pues nax tcodonu bicos te' tiobinisi'. 44. djekru vi'yanni' lox vicodoxlni'i lokni guzakni. 45. djek räpni' lobicos, "gutyobinislü ji'ino \*porke la'ini yadni'tiobinis. 46. "yo'," räp vicos. 46A. layak vicos guk crema'lni. 47. zitreni'.

48. \*maz vi'iñga nyalazducni. 49. vaza'lnini \*skwil; ro'k veni \*eñkarxu lox \*maistr. 50. "tendjuic vadi'it dudji'n \*educasioñ ci'inä tceyalaxts ni'i. 51. \*pues djekru byu'ini \*skwel \*mas nyalas-duicni'. 52. nune'izi ciru'in sasni zä'ini rovxkya'a nitex xwerere'-zä'ini ye'k resa'xni. 53. djek \*mazla vajaxl \*maistr di'itc lox cguza'-ini tcäji'ireveñgani' jet \*moti yunäni'i räp \*maistr lox reguzaxnga.

30. Iba andando en el camino cuando encontró un machete y más contento está diciendo á su mamá, "Ora sí ya tengo valor." 31. Ya hace lejos, iba andando, cuando vieron el oso lo estaba con la mano diciendo, "Adonde vas? 32. Regresen, vámonos!" 33. Entonces lo enseñó el muchachito el machete [y] dijo, "Ven acá, arrímate otro poquito paraque regresemos [y] nos vamos otra vez para tu cueva." 34. Entonces más regresó el oso.

35. Luego se fueron [él] con su mamá. 36. Cuando llegó en su casa entonces dijo á su esposo, "Adonde estás? 37. Que estás haciendo porque llevaste me [en] el cerro luego llevó un animal [y] me trajo á su cueva. 38. Ahora, mira verás. 39. Ya está grande mi hijo, hijo del oso. 40. Pues ora, qué hacemos?"

41. Pues entonces empezó ese hombre á llorar diciendo, "No lease, 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 paraque se bautise." 44. Entonces fué á ver á confesar loque le pasó." 45. Entonces dijo al cura, "Vas te á bautizar mi hijo porque el sea á bautizar." 46. "Sí," dijo el cura; 46a. el mismo cura hay el padrino. 47. Se fueron.

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

54. djek tsinätireveñgani roli'sni, djekru räp reveñga lox jrembaxlni' sikti ruxni'. 55. "pues nax gyika'a luni' te' yulu'ilu tudje'n \*porke mbiosa'an nuni'i \*skwel \*alperdid viye'neni' nen \*yuskwel." 56. "pues nax yika'ani'i yidonu cogunäni," räp crembalni'. 57. djekru ko'oveñgani' räp veñga loxcguzani', "abyanäni' yidonu cogonäni. 58. djekru zireveñga \*par roli'sni'i, djek räp veñga lox ci'imbalni', "\*xuan, cikwent tilux ndickeriyenlutcu tudje'in." 59. \*pues nax yuonlu \*oridaser ctidza \*porke naxre' naxcimbalelux." 60. \*pues la'ini räpni', "yo, rembal vozoveçti'idzlux lokx niyeni-ilu." 61. \*pues gunaveñga tibakeni' \*yapemod gun \*mandad, \*pur \*yälperdid kayu'ni' yel rly'a \*retrast tis niyinya'istisni'. 62. djekru räpeñga, "a-i, \*xuan, ctsalo-e tinagune \*uwant \*kon lux." 63. djek räpeñga loxni' nen \*kwatre rok yak \*ckwartlu." 64. "yo," räpni'. 65. te' na'mbeñga ne'eñ \*kwartiga rudru'indi \*uwant ritcu'u ne'eñga yu'ini.

66. rok tsigoxl te' gucin djiguzlox \*pe'nkaya'k ne'eñga. 67. vetla la'ini \*ni laxyu'ini sas, "kayaoctcexini'!" 67A. djek räpni', "cirlaxslu? 68. gulä's, lursi yaoctce'ä te' yeni'ilu \*par jirla'slu." 69. djekru zen'u'uti katexp restit \*skinyu yu'. 70. djek ve'ni \*presentar te' veñgut. 71. djek räpni' \*juanre, "rladze kwä'elu naxre tex \*pe'iñ niyu'a." 72. djekru räp \*juañ, "\*wen, balzi'kna'lu jetnakidi, \*per guläxs gulujäsi gaoctce-e te' gulu-ilup naxre kayu'u mexl nakini' wakwa'ts-

---

su padrino pues así hace. 55. "Pues ahora lo coges tú paraque lo enseñas un poco porque fuimos á dejar en la escuela [y] puras perdidas fué hacer en la escuela." 56. "Pues ahora lo cojo; vimos que es loque hago," dijo el padrino. 57. Entonces lo cogió [y] dijo el á sus padres, "Ya se quedó conmigo, vimos que es loque hago con él. 58. Entonces se fueron ellos para su casa y dijo él á su hijado Juan, "Porqué no tienes tantito pensamiento un poco? 59. Pues ora haces me obedecer loque te dijo porque tú eres mi hijado." 60. Pues el le dijo, "Sí, padrino, le voy á obedecer loque me dices." 61. Pues vió él no entiende modo de hacer mandado, luego puras perdidas estaba haciendo, puras, quebrando los trastes [y] cualquiera cosa que él agarra. 62. Entonces dijo él, "Ai, Juan, me parezca que no te aguanto contigo." 63. Entonces le dijo á él, "En ese cuarto hay que va á ser tu cuarto." 64. "Sí," le dijo. 65. [Así hace el cura] porque sabe que en ese cuarto ninguno aguanta á dormir<sup>83</sup> en esa casa.

66. Allí estaba él una noche cuando empezaron á penar adentro. 67. Mientras él ni hace caso luego, "Si yo hago á cenar!" 67a. Entonces dijo, "Qué cosa quieres? 68. Espérate mientras empiezo de cenar paraque me digas á ver que cosa quieres." 69. Entonces se fué á penar [y] se están cayendo los huesos en la esquina de la casa.<sup>84</sup> 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 lease [y] espérate á que yo acabe de cenar paraque enseñas á mí adonde hay el dinero elque lo ente-

<sup>83</sup> So translated by informant, but the verb is not the regular one for *dormir*.

<sup>84</sup> This sentence is not quite clear.

lu." 73. djekru räp veñgutiya, "\*pues nax kw'elup tiopa \*varil mexl nenyure'e tayika'olu; ctenluni. 74. \*nada \*mas ki-ijlu tiop tcan \*mic ninazäbe tegake \*livr lox \*dios." 75. "yo," räp \*xuañ, "katiyu' reni; uru' \*sen otro yu' revarilga?" 76. djekru volii' (?) veñgutiga \*sen djekru zäeni guniteloxni'.

77. tcivarayä'l djek \*venibis crembalni'i räbeni, "zikti byäet te ven'; biyadyene' \*storb lowe yä'l; viyätye'tcni vaka'l. 78. \*pues nax kuni'itclu tiop \*mos xyetä'en ri'i teyeri'i tiop \*varil neyup nenri'i, yo räpiñga." 79. djekru gudä'en \*remos otro yu' mexl viri'i \*revarilga \*koñ cgitsni' tyukja redzañga γaj \*mic loxni. 20. kwa'ti vicos \*listga. 81. djek räp \*xuañ, "naxzini, rembal, cogak mexlre'." 82. djek räp vicos, "kwa'eni ctenluni; xyika'enakeni ruñzi \*import \*cgwendremic. 83. "yo," räpni, "pal naxlux zik." 84. "\*pues nax xyä'ät recguzane teyika' reni' mexlga vitla naxre yunlu \*mandad yaktci'i te \*woston rkine \*par sanä."

85. djek ruvem bicos \*mandad guktce'i te \*woston nina'x tci-vidjiop \*libr. 86. djek räp \*xuañ, "cigunä' \*xugitri' tenino'o tsividjiop \*rop, nik rladze." 87. "yo," räp bijoc, "\*per zagega gxiyäsłuni?" 88. "zakani, remboxl, tegakwie cika'o." 89. djek ruktce'i jvosto'eni, djekru pya'eni' \*konform. 90. sinätire cguzani' mexl \*par roli'sni'. 91. djek räp \*xuañ, "naxzini, kolyinli'i yeka tevaza'a-

---

raste." 73. Entonces dijo el muerto, "Pues ahora me saques dos barriles [de] dinero aquí en este lugar y lo coges; tuyo es. 74. Nada más pagas dos, tres misas que [aún] quedaban paraque me libra á Dios." 75. "Sí," dijo Juan, "adonde son esos; pon la seña adonde hay esos barriles?" 76. Entonces echó<sup>85</sup> el muerto la seña y se fué, se desapareció.

77. Cuando amaneció entonces le avisó á su padrino diciendo, "Así llegó un muerto; me vino á estorbar al noche; me vino á quitar el sueño. 78. Pues ahora me das dos mozos que vengan escarbar aquí paraque 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 paraque sepan los santos que paguen sus misas á él. 80. Cogió el cura la lista. 81. Entonces dijo Juan, "Ora sí, padrino, como se va á hacer [con] este dinero?" 82. Entonces dijo el cura, "Cógelo, 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 tú mandado hacer un bostón que necesito paraque ando con él."

85. Entonces hizo el cura lo mandar [y] se hizo un bastón que pesa doce libras. 86. Entonces dijo Juan, "Que quiero este juguete, uno que pesa doce arrobas, ése quiero!" 87. "Sí," dijo el cura, "pero que puedes levantarlo?" 88. "Sí," 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 sí, échenme á mi cabeza<sup>86</sup> paraque ya me voy

<sup>85</sup> Not quite clear.

<sup>86</sup> i.e., *echar la bendición*.



tceyene' \*venturar \*cverta." 92. "cotyälu, ciriya'zlu, ayu'x mexl \*par xyaknu \*mantener," räp ri' recguzaxn ni'i. 93. "zya'a, avenä-jigab kolzo'iktis \*lok nirniya." 94. "yo," räp reveñga, venle crim-balni yekni \*kon recguzani zätini'i. 95. bya'on reveñga \*kon \*trist yaze.

96. \*xuañ zeganilo nexs tcividja'ek ni' ste vexn. 97. djek räpni katcälu \*ayamigxu?" 98. "aza'etceyene \*korer \*cwerter; luxwa?" räpni. 99. "pues sigaksa naxre vax, nasini, xyaknu \*komponir tconu. 100. tulalu?" räp. 101. \*xuan \*os lox steni. 102. djek räpni, "naxre la'e \*trontcepin." 103. "wen," räpni'i, "pues yu-u tconu xyidonu kanixsga wgolui' \*dios nu'ire!" 104. tcividjagreni ste nigyi'i cigaksa räp reni'i, "kanictälux?" 105. "oza'atceyenesa \*korir \*cwerter." 106. djek räp reni'i, "tulalux?" 107. djek räpni, "naxre 'la'ä' \*xuañ \*valor." 108. \*pues nax si'ini koltcu' kidonu kaniskani' tconu."

109. sätireni \*xuañ reni. 110. agukzit, zezareni. 111. tci vijunreni' ro' te bizye'. 112. sas räpreni, "riyolnu nis re'i potyu'u nis, ne'n bizyere'. 113. \*pues, "tyutcawi'i?" 114. djek räpreni. 115. \*pues tcavi'i \*trontcipin. 116. vaso'preni' tu' cgyi'i, \*trontcepin vaza'lreni'i nemizye' nu'nzi' zezani' nimbizye. 117. tcivaznini tubx djekru wgudop redek tu'u. 118. viriguju'na \*trontcepin \*par \*xwer djek räpni, "pues nax si'ini tä \*xuañ \*valor. 119. sigakso tini'nyu \*want nyutini' nimbizye djek räpreni', "pues nax tinuxyen \*uwant,

---

aventurar mi suerte." 92. "Cómo vas, qué necesitas, ya hay dinero para que nos mantengamos?" dijeron sus padres. 93. "Me voy, ya pensé, obedécenme lo que yo digo." 94. "Sí," dijeron ellos, [y] echó su padrino en su cabeza también con sus padres, [y] se fué. 95. Se quedaron ellos con triste ya se fué.

96. Juan iba andando en el camino cuando encontró al otro hombre. 97. Entonces dijo él, "Adonde vas, mi amigo?" 98. "Ya me voy correr mi suerte; y tú?" le dijo. 99. Pues también, "Yo bueno, ahora sí nos hacemos á acompañar, vamos." 100. "Cómo te llamas?" dijo. 101. "Juan Oso" al otro. 102. Entonces dijo él, "Yo me llamo Tronchepín." 103. "Bueno," dijo él, "pues ora vámonos á ver por que camino enseña Dios á nosotros!" 104. Cuando encontraron otro hombre lo mismo dijeron ellos, "Por donde vas?" 105. Ya me voy correr mi suerte." 106. Entonces ellos, "Cómo te llamas?" 107. Entonces dijo él, "Yo me llamo Juan Valor. 108. Pues ahora sí, vámonos á ver por donde es, nos fuimos."

109. Se fueron Juan, ellos. 110. Ya van lejos, van andando. 111. Y entonces llegaron en la boca [de] un pozo. 112. Luego dijeron ellos, "Tenemos sed, aquí puede [ser] agua, agua entre el pozo." 113. Pues, "Quien va á ver," 114. dijeron ellos. 115. Pues, que vaya á ver [era] Tronchepín. 116. La amarraron en la cintura Tronchepín, lo echaron entre el pozo un poquito no más, iba andando entre el pozo. 117. Luego meño el mecate y lo jalieron aquellos el mecate. 118. Lo salió luego Tronchepín para fuera y dijo, "Pues ahora así que vaya Juan Valor." 119. Lo mismo no hizo aguantar de entrar más entre el

tsonu ne'eñga." 120. \*pues naxru räp \*xuan \*os, "dze, zäbeduc vexro. 121. \*pues nax yaza'e tcegwie' gyidonu yuliya tu' te' gawkwie'." 122. "yo," räpreni'. 123. djek vazo'ivreni tu' \*xuan \*os djek byuxini' ne'eñx bizye \*kon \*jvosto'ini.

124. tcividjün ja'embizye ro'k kax tcon \*puert. 125. tcibasensni lo \*puert tciviri'i te guna'ix räp, "cirlaslu? 126. lu'izyätlu re'i nayesterogā asye'et tcäle." 127. djek räpni'i, "tyucnak tcä'elu?" 128. djek räpni', "\*pues tcäle nak \*serpient." 129. yambaxi," räp \*xuan, "\*pues naxre gutä mañga; xuligalu!" 130. räp guna'iga, "gulie?" räp \*xuan. 131. "a-i, palnaxlu sik \*komutco \*gust, xinälu naxre." 132. "wen," räp ni', "\*pues yeri'ilu ninri'." 133. djek sas kuso'p nidu'u, viri-eni \*xwer. 134. djekru räpeni, "xyeri'i styop väle niyu' niñga." 135. "yo," räp \*xuañ sas uvilakuni ro'iste \*puert sigaksa viri-i'; ste yuna'a ne'eñga varopreni', kari'ire \*par \*xwer. 136. djekru viri ste-ine sigaksa guktconza gana' virire \*par \*xwer. 137. djekru bya'on \*xuañ ne'eñga; zäti redik vasa'l reni' \*xuañ ne'eñvize'.

138. tcividjün \*serpient djekru \*kon tex \*voston vatyäxl \*xuañ mañga vagu't \*xuañ. 139. djek vidzuxn tex \*yigant djek sas watiyäxl \*xuañ ste \*vostonas yek \*yigant vagu't sani'i \*yigant. 140. sas vitcuini' nexn ste \*kwartya djivitsün \*mer vendjab. 141. djek räpini, "cigaxyu'inlu rolidjeri \*pues nax zika'alup." 142. djek räp

---

pozo y dijeron, "Pues ahora no aguantamos [que] vayamos adentro." 120. Pues ahora dijo á Juan Oso, "[Eso es] porque hay mucho aire."<sup>87</sup> 121. Pues ahora, "Ya me voy á ver si es cierto loque dicen Vds. paraque yo sepa." 122. "Sí," dijeron. 123. Entonces lo amarraron el mecate Juan Oso y él entró entre el pozo con su bastón.

124. Cuando llegó abajo el pozo hay están tres puertas. 125. Cuando tocó en la puerta entonces salió una mujer [y] le dijo, "Qué cosa quieres? 126. Tú vienes aquí, ahora verás ya viene mi esposo." 127. Entonces dijo él, "Quién es tu marido?" 128. Entonces ella dijo, "Pues mi marido es un serpiente." 129. "Bueno," dijo Juan, "Pues yo lo mato ese animal, que de verás!" 130. Dijo la mujer, "Es cierto," diciendo á Juan. 131. "Ai, si dices así, con mucho gusto [y] tú llevas á mí." 132. "Bueno," dijo él, "pues, te sales de aquí." 133. Entonces luego lo amarró con el mecate [y] se salió afuera. 134. Entonces dicen, "Que salgan otras dos hermanas, las que están hay adentro." 135. "Sí," dijo Juan y luego fué á tocar la otra puerta y así lo mismo; otras mujeres adentro [y] salieron dos, saliendo para afuera. 136. Entonces salió otra, lo mismo hicieron las tres mujeres saliéndoles para afuera. 137. Entonces se quedó Juan adentro [y] se fueron aquellos [y] dejaron Juan adentro entre el pozo.

138. Cuando llegó el serpiente, entonces con un bastón le pegó Juan en la cabeza [de] ese animal y lo mató Juan. 139. Entonces llegó un gigante y luego le pegó Juan otro bastonazo en la cabeza del gigante, lo mató también al gigante. 140. Luego fué á meter en el otro cuarto, llegó el mero diablo. 141. Entonces

---

<sup>87</sup> This and the preceding sentence are somewhat jumbled.

\*xuañ, "yide'tnubreb; yidonu yuliyalu, naxpakilu vinda'a'n. 143. \*pues djek vadedreni' \*prebx. 144. \*pues vexn \*xuañ \*yan vendjabx, djexru räpe ndjab," vax nasini agukwe-e yulikalu vixnda'axn. 145. mbax palnaxlup dixrulu gun \*menos naxre; \*pues nax xyaginu \*amixw." 146. "\*pues nax rladze xyini'ilu zatizä \*rekompanyero \*kon tcä'elu nibyedila lo gare'." 147. djek räp vendjab, "ayu'k zi't zäreni' \*nde nax." 148. djek räpini, "\*pues zyendjano \*yan xyiga'areni' neyizkax. 149. abiya'a," räpindjab, "kwaxvetsa xyo-o te'tconauznu reni'!" 150. "yo," räp \*xuañ, sas kwa \*xuañ de'ts vendjab. 151. tci vigareni' djek räp \*xuañ, "cikwent vasa'intu naxre \*logarya?" 152. djek räpreni', "vexn \*perdoñ nu're!" 153. djek räp \*xuañ, "jeti \*moti, avazalaze lup lox \*camigweri'. 154. \*pues nax kolcinä' veñga!"

155. djek sinäx \*xuañ xyon guna'aga. 156. djek räp \*xuañ lox reni', "kanakli-istu?" 157. djekru vixreni di'itc lo \*xuañ conak reni', \*cikwent yu' reni' \*logarya djek räpni, "\*pues nu're' naknu tcombäxl, cdadnu nak \*rex \*syudad nidri'i \*delantre. 158. \*pues nax xyonlu tcesa'onlu nu're lox cdadnu." 159. "\*xwen," räp \*xuañ, "koltcu' xyonu!" 160. tci vidziün reni' lox \*reix djek rdjeloxlox \*reix: "\*porke aguk ctcec säreni." 161. djek räp \*reix lox \*xuañ, "tyulup?" 162. räp \*reix, "tynaklu, covexnlu vilä'lu rejji'ina \*eñkantiga?" 163. djek räp "\*por \*valor \*virtuw niwani'itc \*dios

le dijo, "Que estás haciendo en mi casa, pues ahora te cojo?" 142. Entonces dijo Juan, "Vamos á probar, veremos si es cierto loque tú dices, si es verdad [que] eres valiente. 143. Pues entonces se dieron la prueba." 144. Pues hizo Juan al diablo y entonces dijo el diablo, "Bueno, ora sí, ya sé si es cierto loque dices; eres valiente." 145. "Bueno, es cierto loque dices, si ya no me haces menos á mí, pues ahora vamos á hacer á los amigos. 146. Pues ahora yo quiero [que] me digas hasta donde irán los compañeros con tu mujer, la que vine á sacar aquí." 147. Entonces dijo el diablo, "Ya lejos se fueron de ahora." 148. Entonces dijo, "Pues que ganaremos de los agarrar ahorita." 149. "Ya los alcanzamos," dijo el diablo, "yo los cargué, vamos paraque lo alcanzamos ellos!" 150. "Sí," dijo Juan y luego lo cargó Juan en la espalda del diablo. 151. Cuando los alcanzó entonces dijo Juan, "Porqué vosotros dejasteis á mí en ese lugar?" 152. Entonces dijeron ellos, "Hizo perdón á nosotros!" 153. Entonces dijo Juan, "No hay modo, ya los regalé vosotros á mi amigo. 154. Pues ahora váyanse con él!"

155. Entonces se lo llevó Juan las tres mujeres. 156. Entonces dijo Juan á ellas, "Adonde es la casa de Vd.?" 157. Y entonces platicaron palabras á Juan como fueron ellas, como están ellas en ese lugar y le dijeron, "Pues nosotros somos tres hermanas, nuestro padre es rey [de] la ciudad que está adelante. 158. Pues ora [que] andastes, vayas á dejar nosotras á nuestro padre." 159. "Bueno," dijo Juan, "vámonos y vayamos!" 160. Cuando llegaron ellos al rey entonces quedó admirado el rey porque hace tiempo se fueron. 161. Entonces dijo el rey á Juan, "Quién eres tú?" 162. Dijo el rey, "Qué cosa eres, como hicistes de ir á sacar mis niñas de ese encanto?" 163. Entonces dijo, "Por valor

naxre." 164. djek räp reix, "\*pues nax abyã'unlu \*lugar ri' \*koñ gutcna'ilup te ji'indja'apã."

165. djek bya'en \*xuañ \*konform recdi'ite \*reix. 166. vatcnã'a ni'i te jindja'ap \*reix ro'kti vade'it \*fin \*cwert \*xuañ. 167. bya'oni' \*lugarga djek vacalni' \*rasoñ lox recguzani' kati vadi-it \*fin \*cwert-ni'. 168. djek wix reveña vivi'ire viyumbe'ire cgulisni. 169. djek rowaduc rowadje'b la's reveña, sigaksa \*reix. 170. djek räp \*reix lox reveña, "sunak xi'tu, re'i xya'itu \*koñ ji'itu." 171. djek räp reveña "'wenduc \*wendje-ib, xyanu re'i \*per soxp lixsnu laxtcnu." 172. "jet nakdi," räp \*reix, re'i \*mazru yu'itis nigidjidja'ak laxstu, gyika'etu' kwä-ästu' čtentu'; dinatu' cteneni." 173. kwäp reveña bya'enre \*syudaxga, djek bya'en reveña \*asta nadjix.

---

y virtud que dió Dios á mí. 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 hay dió fin su suerte de Juan. 167. Quedó en ese lugar y mandó razón á sus padres hasta donde dió fin su suerte. 168. Entonces fueron ellos á ver, á conocer sus 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, cualquiera 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]