CHICAGO JOURNALS

Review: [untitled]
Author(s): Penelope Brown
Reviewed work(s):
 Mayan Texts I by Louanna Furbee-Losee
 Mayan Texts II by Louanna Furbee-Losee
 Mayan Texts III by Louanna Furbee
Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Papers Presented at a Symposium on Uto-Aztecan Historical Linguistics (Jul., 1983), pp. 337-341
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1265167
Accessed: 03/08/2009 07:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of American Linguistics.*

JSTOR®
http://www.jstor.org

——. 1969. A formal account of Chalchiuitán Tzotzil kinship terminology. Ethnology 8:85–102.

KÖHLER, ULRICH. 1974. Zur Jagd auf die Schemel der Berggötter: Ein Gebetstext auf Tzotzil (Maya). Indiana 2:193–207.

——. 1975. Ein Zauberspruch auf Maya-Tzotzil zur Heilung von Schlangenbissen. Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 100:238–47.

LAUGHLIN, ROBERT M. 1975. The Great Tzotzil Dictionary of San Lorenzo Zincantán. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, no. 19. Washington, D.C.

WEATHERS, NADINE. 1947. Tsotsil phonemes with special reference to allophones of b. IJAL 13:108–11.

MAYAN TEXTS I. Edited by Louanna Furbee-Losee. IJAL-NATS 1, no. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976. Pp. 136. (Paper.)

MAYAN TEXTS II. Edited by Louanna Furbee-Losee. IJAL-NATS Monograph no. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press and University Microfilms International, 1979. Pp. 146. (Paper.)

MAYAN TEXTS III. Edited by Louanna Furbee. IJAL-NATS Monograph no. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press and University Microfilms International, 1980. Pp. 116. (Paper.)

Mayan Texts I started off the IJAL Native American Text Series in 1976; *Mayan Texts II* came out in 1979, and *III* appeared fast on its heels in 1980.[1] Before more appear it might be well to take a moment to think about the format in which such texts could most usefully be presented, and what kind of texts should be published for the kinds of linguistic work that could profitably be done with them today. In this review I look briefly at the texts which have appeared in these three volumes, and then suggest some ways in which the format could be improved and the content expanded in the light of recent linguistic interests.

All three volumes begin with a very brief "Introduction" by Louanna Furbee,[2] detailing the contents and spelling out the common alphabet and transcription conventions adopted (with occasional modifications) for the volumes. In the first, we find twenty-four texts in eight languages: Huastec, Kekchi, Quiche, Tzutujil, Pocomam, Mam, Jacaltec, and Acateco. Volume *II* presents a total of fourteen texts in Chol, Lacandon, Yucatec Maya, Tzeltal, and Tzotzil, while volume *III* gives us four Ixil-Maya texts, and five from Kanjobal, Chuj, and Tojolabal. The texts range from myths, fables, and folk stories to dreams, songs, and descriptive, autobiographical, and semihistorical texts. Almost all are elicited texts, rather than performances of naturally-occurring events. All provide a word or two of background about the language, its locale and speakers, and the source of the text; they then give a transcribed text with literal glosses plus a free translation. Some include grammatical notes and/or references to grammatical information. A few add ethnographic notes to aid in interpretation, and one includes extensive linguistic and social commentary on the text.

---

[1] Between *Mayan Texts I* and *II* the series numbering system was changed, so *Mayan Texts I* is volume 1, number 1 of the series (followed by two more issues of volume 1, and three issues of volume 2, all North American Indian texts). *Mayan Texts II*, however, is Monograph no. 3, following the two initial volumes of the monograph numbering system. This poses confusing, if not insurmountable, difficulties for libraries.

[2] Formerly Louanna Furbee-Losee.

Despite the claim (vol. *I*, p. 1) that these texts are presented in "comparable format," the amount of information included and the layout of the text itself vary greatly from one contribution to another, making comparison harder than necessary. Norman McQuown's Huastec autobiographic text starts off volume *I* with a bang: this text is a historical wonder, since it was recorded many years before the recent development of cassette technology has made tape-recorded texts commonplace. It was produced by an informant who spoke the San Luis Potosi variety of Huastec, and was recorded on an aluminum disc during the early 1930s by Manuel J. Andrade, who provided it with a rough phonetic transcription and Spanish translation. Text and translation were taken by McQuown and checked in the field in 1946 with an informant from the town it originated in. It was then further altered in 1948, when McQuown revised the translation "to assume the form of a (grammatically correct through highly unidiomatic) literal Spanish version," and the version presented here is the 1948 version with the addition of a free English translation. McQuown has been careful to indicate in the transcription expansions of words which are not audible in the text, so that the transcription he presents is as accurate a representation as might be hoped of the Huastec text as spoken in the 1930s. It is therefore a unique record. The text is preceded by grammatical notes with superscript labels, and cross-referencing superscripts in the transcribed text indicate these grammatical categories in the Huastec. A Spanish translation and an English translation then appear on succeeding lines. The result is an extraordinarily detailed representation of the text. Unfortunately, however, it is not for the casual reader, for the grammatical notes and footnotes are so indexical as to be all but unintelligible to the nonspecialist. However, McQuown does refer to his grammatical materials on Huastec available through the University of Chicago Library's Microfilm Collection, so that the truly dedicated can track down the system and use it in conjunction with the text.

A second, much simpler format is represented by Ray Freeze's K'ekchi' texts (Chamelco dialect). Here the K'ekchi' lines are run on and numbered, underneath them the running English gloss appears, but morpheme-by-morpheme correspondences are not indicated (nor is intonation or prosodics). A free English translation then appears as a separate text at the end. No grammatical information is given (except in an occasional footnote), but the reader is briefly referred to the literature.

The rest of the texts in this volume follow roughly the same format of two-line transcription, English gloss under Mayan transcription. Unfortunately, although some of these give the English gloss aligned with the Mayan so that morpheme correspondences are shown, most of them do not. Some of the latter are redeemed by appendixes and/or footnotes with enough grammatical and lexical information that most of the correspondences can, with labor, be reconstructed.

Some use hyphens or dots to mark morpheme boundaries, which at least partially helps to match the English. Where Mayan text morphemes cannot be matched with the English glosses (e.g., in the K'ekchi' texts), the text is not of much use to a linguist, although of course it is still of potential interest to students of folklore. A third system of cross-referencing is used in the Jacaltec texts, where matching subscripts coreference the Jacaltec and English. Although this makes coreference explicit, the resulting mass of numbers (line numbers, subscripts, and, in C. Day's text, superscripts for footnotes) is extremely hard to read.

In volume *II* the two-line format with free translation following predominates, although the modern Yucatec text by McQuown (again, a 1930s text on an aluminum disc) returns to his superscript cross-referencing format, in even more complicated detail. Again, most of the two-line format texts fail to indicate morpheme-by-morpheme correspondence. (In addition, it should be noted, Robert Laughlin's dream texts have an unfortunate page mix-up: page 140 should be 138, page 138 should be 139, 139 should be 140.) In volume *III* we find a new format represented in Thomas Lengyel's Ixil-Maya text. Here a three-line format is adopted: the first line gives Ixil-Maya, with a hyphen indicating morpheme boundaries, the second line gives the corresponding English morpheme glosses, and the third line gives a free English translation. Grammatical information is given as needed in footnotes. Paralinguistic features are systematically marked, and thorough grammatical information is given at the end. The whole is followed by a commentary detailing sociolinguistic patterns that are revealed in the text—exploring variation, the meanings of certain paralinguistic features, discourse structure, and the ethnographic relevance of the story. A bibliography of language materials concludes the presentation. As such, the text is immensely rich not only for comparative linguistic studies but for those interested in broader sociolinguistic and pragmatic questions.

The rest of volume *III* returns to the predominant format of two-line transcription plus gloss, followed by free translation, with no marking of prosodics, little grammatical explication, and no way of recovering the morpheme-by-morpheme correspondences. It should be obvious that far from achieving a "comparable format," the contributions to these three volumes vary widely in how much information they present and how useful it is to a linguist. All are interesting from the point of view of content, and as Furbee suggests (vol. *III*, p. 1), they do "begin to make accessible the Mayan storytelling aesthetic." But they are by no means equally useful for linguistic work.

As Elinor Ochs has cogently argued,[3] a transcript is not a value-free objective "copy" of what someone has verbally said; any transcript reflects the theoretical interests and prejudices of the person who made it. To make a series such as this useful to the widest possible audience, it is desirable to include as much information as possible which will enable others with perhaps different theoretical orientations to make use of the transcript. At the very least, the transcript should indicate clearly what information has been added to or changed from what was actually said by the native speaker. For these reasons I favor a four-line morphophonemic transcription system, where the first line gives a systematic phonemic representation of what was actually said in the native language, the second line expands that to fill in elision, ellipsis, etc., and to indicate morpheme boundaries with hyphens, so as to make it accessible to grammatical analysis, the third line provides a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, with glosses aligned under their corresponding morphs, and the fourth line gives a free English translation.[4] If Spanish-speaking scholars are to be considered as part of the audience for this series (and surely they should be for Mayan languages), a Spanish gloss should also be given. The whole text then should have whatever grammatical notes are necessary for comprehension indicated either in a separate section or as footnotes. (I favor the separate section treatment as much less messy.) If some such format could be imposed by fiat on all the texts published in this series, the goals of comprehensibility and cross-language comparability would be greatly facilitated.

---

[3] "Transcription as Theory," in *Developmental Pragmatics*, ed. E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (New York, 1980).

A second fiat I would recommend is that every text should be preceded by the basic contextual information about the circumstances under which it was collected, whether an elicited or naturally-occurring event, who was present during the collection, how much it was edited, etc. Only if this is explicitly stated can we evaluate the sociolinguistic utility of the text. Additional information about patterns of variation, the nature of the event in which the text was (or would have been) embedded, etc., can be optional extras, depending on the particular interests of the collector.

One final plea: almost all the texts so far have been produced in artificially contrived events, most of them elicited from an informant in an interview-type situation. Some are reconstructions of formal native speech events, some were written by an informant, and one was elicited with Spanish questions to which native answers were given (the K'ekchi' Coban dialect text by Flora Ac Caal and Sandra Pinkerton). Only Thomas Smith-Stark's Pocoman texts (vol. *I*), and the Yucatec Maya text by Victoria Bricker (vol. *II*), were spontaneously recorded, and both of these were then edited to remove mistakes, false starts, and other people's comments. Such texts, while certainly of ethnographic interest in their own right, give us very little sense of how native speakers talk to one another in ordinary circumstances. I would like to see some texts of naturally-occurring interaction—people talking to one another normally in everyday situations—over meals, while working, at the market, in court, or at political meetings. Ideally, such texts would accompany any texts of a more formal or elicited nature, so that the linguistic differences could actually be pinpointed. In any case, with so many linguists now turning to natural ("performance") data, there is no excuse for totally ignoring performance data when one studies languages other than

---

[4] A transcription system along these lines has been developed by the Working Group in Language and Cultural Context at the Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, specifically to facilitate cross-linguistic comparability of natural language usage data. This has been computerized by John Haviland; the computer program is available through the Department of Anthropology, Australian National University, Canberra.

English. Indeed, there is a strong need to have access to such data in languages other than the Indo-European ones typically studied by linguists, so that theories of grammar, as well as of discourse structure and verbal style, can be tested with the data of actual language use.

In conclusion, I commend the publication of texts in Mayan languages and look forward to an expansion and a systematization of the presentation of these texts, so that their usefulness will be augmented to something approaching what it should be.

PENELOPE BROWN, *Australian National University*

LE VERBE HURON: ÉTUDE MORPHOLOGIQUE D'APRES UNE DESCRIPTION GRAMMATICALE DE LA SECONDE MOITIÉ DU XVIIIÈ SIÈCLE. Edited by Pierrette L. Lagarde. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1980. Pp. 221. $19.00 (paper).

Early in the seventeenth century, the Huron constituted a powerful confederation of nations in present-day Ontario. Linguistically they were Iroquoian, but politically they were in competition with the neighboring League of the Iroquois, composed of the Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, and Mohawk. In 1649, however, the Huron confederation was violently shattered by an attack from the League, and remnants of the defeated Huron scattered in all directions. Some were absorbed by the attackers. Others banded together with survivors from the defeated Tionontati and Neutral nations and migrated westward toward Detroit and into Oklahoma. Still others eventually made their way toward Quebec City, establishing a community at Lorette.

The Huron language is no longer spoken in any of these communities, but we do have rich records of it from the Recollet and Jesuit missionaries who lived among these people from 1615 on. The principal published linguistic material is contained in several volumes. Remarks on the language, scattered vocabulary, and a prayer can be found in the *Jesuit Relations* (Thwaites 1896–1901). The Recollet missionary Sagard published a remarkable French–Huron dictionary in 1632. During the early twentieth century, Marius Barbeau did extensive fieldwork with Wyandot, the language of the defeated Huron and their allies residing in Ontario and Oklahoma. Barbeau (1960) contains a collection of narratives from this time, with interlinear and free translations. Probably the largest collection of published Huron material is the massive *Huron Manuscripts from Reverend Pierre Potier's Collection* (Fraser 1920).

This last work consists primarily of facsimile reproductions of handwritten manuscripts compiled by the Jesuit missionary Potier during the mid-eighteenth century in Latin, with some French translation. Many of these papers are simply Potier's copies of earlier Jesuit works, although not all are so labeled. Included in the volume is a typeset appendix, in English, entitled "Grammar of the Huron Language, by a Missionary of the Village of Huron Indians at Lorette, near Quebec, found amongst the papers of the Mission, and translated from the