Ancient Mesoamerica, 3 (1992), 269–279
Copyright © 1992 Cambridge University Press. Printed in the U.S.A.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CANEK MANUSCRIPT

William F. Hanks
Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

Abstract

The Canek manuscript is written in a distinctive linguistic style, probably a local variant of Spanish influenced by Yucatec Maya and archaic forms of Spanish. It also reflects a curiously ambivalent perspective on the Itza king Canek, at once aligning him with the pagan Indians and suggesting an affinity with Saint Francis. Like many other colonial texts, the four extant folia of this manuscript show a blending of verbal genres. This paper presents a discourse analysis of the manuscript, demonstrating that it is organized according to a systematic rhetorical structure based on syntactic foregrounding, poetic parallelism and thematic development. Placed in the context of other colonial documents, this one displays the cultural and linguistic ambivalence of its author.

Recent advances in Mesoamerican research have basically altered the study of language and society in the Maya region. Precolumbian representational forms once thought to be strictly ritual in reference are now understood to recount the historical exploits of named individual rulers, acting within regional political systems. Glyphic discourse projects a social world that we can learn about by reading the inscriptions. Much of the iconography serves the same referential function of projecting a world, such as the gathering and interaction of nobles portrayed on the walls of Bonampak. Alongside the realization that the glyphs record "historical" facts, epigraphers have demonstrated that they have a syntactic structure closely linked to that of spoken Maya languages, especially Cholan and Yucatecan. In particular, the once dubious notion that the glyphs correspond to speech sounds has been shown to be true beyond reasonable doubt, and phoneticism is now a staple of Maya epigraphy (Bricker 1989; Justeson 1989; Justeson and Campbell 1984; Mathews 1984). Phonetic correspondences are only the beginning of what is proving to be a powerful set of linguistic parallels between the formal structure of glyphs and the syntax and discourse organization of spoken Mayan languages (Bricker 1986; Hopkins 1987; Josserand 1987; cf. Hanks 1989b). These twin breakthroughs, referential function and language-based form, have helped lead to quantum changes in the way scholars think about precolumbian Maya society. For the study of colonial discourse, this research serves as a reminder that the Maya sector was no less complex and dynamic than the Spanish. In this paper, I present a preliminary analysis of the Canek Manuscript, a significant new addition to the colonial sources. Although produced in the late seventeenth century, and written in Spanish, this document is linked to Maya representational traditions through its description of the Itza ruler Canek and, most dramatically, through its reproduction in Folio 6 of the glyphic emblem that appeared on Canek's cape. The author also translated the glyphs into Spanish, showing that he, like modern epigraphers, considered them to be arbitrary signs whose meanings corresponded at least partially to spoken language.[1]

Significant changes are taking place in the study of postconquest Mesoamerica too, and the Canek Manuscript takes on its full significance in this context. Particularly in the areas of literary studies (Edmonson and Bricker 1985; Gossen 1974, 1985; Hanks 1988, 1989a; Tedlock 1983) and colonial history and native resistance (Bricker 1981; Carmack 1981; Carmack and Mondloch 1989; Farriss 1984, 1987; Gosner 1989a, 1989b; Hawkins 1984; Jones 1989; Miller and Farriss 1979; Quezada 1985; Sullivan 1989), an increasingly complex view of Maya peoples is emerging. Since the fall of Mayapan confederate rule in northern Yucatan in the mid 1400s, and probably long before, Yucatan was subdivided into some 16 political geographic regions. Called *cacicazgos* in the European scholarly literature, these regional units differed significantly in their internal structure and external relations (Farriss 1984; Roys 1957). There were well-known enmities among regions, such as that between Mani and Sotuta provinces, and differences of production, as in the salt beds of Chikinchel, Chakan, and coastal Ceh Pech provinces, and the honey and cacao production of Chetumal (Roys 1943, 1957:54). Some of these preexisting divisions lasted into the colonial period, and underlay the regional diversity, political division and stratification that were facts of life in colonial Yucatan. Reporting on a Franciscan mission to the heartland of Itza resistance in the seventeenth century, the Canek Manuscript

[1]The name "Canek" is composed of at least two morphemes in Maya, *can*, "serpent, sky" and *ek*, "star, black." I have adopted the convention of citing it as a single word for convenience, because it appears to function as a single name. It could equally well be cited as "Can Ek." In saying that the glyphs are "arbitrary," I invoke the linguistic concept of arbitrariness: the systematic character of human languages whose meaning is fixed by social convention, not by any natural connection between signifier and signified.

further documents regional conflict, the forms of Maya resistance, and the distinctively ambivalent actors who made colonial history.

Maya resistance to the Spanish in northern Yucatan was aimed at gaining access to power within the emerging social and cultural fields of the colony. As Bricker (1981), Farriss (1984), and Jones (1989) show persuasively, the Yucatecan Maya sought to secure for themselves a position in the colonial society. This appears to be true even when pursuing the strategies of flight (Farriss 1978; Jones 1989), millenarian appeals to a purely Indian future (see Bricker 1981; Sullivan 1989), and, indeed, consolidating regions of resistance from which Spaniards were physically excluded (Jones 1989; Sullivan 1989). The principals leading these movements were usually people who had had extensive contact with the Spanish, were bilingual and bicultural to a degree, and went on to create social contexts in which Spanish and Maya practices were fused rather than isolated (see Miller and Farriss [1979] for an early example of religious fusion, and Hanks [1989a] for textual examples). The goal evidently was not to banish the Europeans and their god from the local world, but to influence the timing and terms under which contact would take place. The Maya ruler Canek represents the extreme case of Itza resistance until the late seventeenth century, and yet his actions fit into this broader pattern. Hence the significance of the Canek Manuscript, with its detailed description of the person and behavior of Canek, and the strained relations among Tipuan, Chacan and Itza Mayas.

It is well known that the Franciscans had a profound impact on Maya moral, religious, and literary practices. By learning the native language early and well, the friars engaged with the Indian nobility as of the sixteenth century, trained their children in Christian doctrine, Latin, Spanish, and alphabetic writing. These strategies of conversion contributed to the emergence of culturally ambivalent actors, many of whom would occupy the influential posts in the local town councils and serve as advisers to the Spanish authorities as well (cf. Collins 1977; Farriss 1984; Hanks 1986; Ricard 1947). These same actors were in many cases practitioners of "pagan" rituals that combined Catholic and Maya elements, and were among the principal instigators of resistance to the Spanish. Religious practice and instruction were a crucible for cultural hybridization within the Maya sector from the earliest years of the colony, a fact well reflected in Maya-language documentation. By contrast, the influence of Maya language and culture upon the practices of the Spanish colonizers is less obvious and usually assumed to be less profound (but cf. Burkhart [1989] and Dibble [1974] on Nahuatl influence on Christian doctrine). This is a point on which the Canek Manuscript adds a critical new piece of evidence. For while the author of the manuscript clearly identified with the Franciscan mission and the Spanish world it represents, he nonetheless wrote in a local language possibly influenced by Maya, and adopts an extraordinarily positive perspective on Canek. Jones's (1992) inferences regarding the identity of the author are consistent with the language of the manuscript, as we will see. In this light, the text provides a rare view into the cultural ambivalence of an agent within the Spanish sector, whose identity and affective alignment were at least partly tied to the Maya. Hence, it provides a case inverse to the more commonly attested influence of Franciscan practice on Mayan expressive forms (Hanks 1986, 1988, 1989a).

The Canek Manuscript is written in distinctive language, probably a local variant of Spanish. It also reflects a curiously ambiguous perspective on the Itza king, at once aligning him with the reprehensible paganism of Indians, as well as suggesting an affinity with Saint Francis. With its peculiar style and ambivalence, the text does not neatly fit into any preestablished type of discourse. This unfamiliarity is another feature that it shares with colonial sources more generally. Despite their familiar labels, such as *carta*, "letter," *cronica*, "chronical," and *acuerdo*, "accord," colonial Maya documents are hybrids, as yet ill understood: the Spanish genres were adapted and altered in very significant ways in Maya-language texts, becoming in effect what Morson (1981) called "boundary genres." Among the properties typical of such genres is their systematic ambiguity. Not belonging unequivocally to any preestablished category, a boundary text can be read in more than one way, with significant shifts in the interpretations one ascribes to it. The Canek Manuscript appears to be such a text: it can be read as a narrative of missionization within a Franciscan perspective, and yet it contains clues suggesting that its author was a native Yucatecan with ties to the local, indigenous world. Jones (1992) inferred that the author of the text was a lay brother, probably a native of Yucatan, writing in order to report details of the trip to the Franciscan provincial in Merida. This reading, which places the Franciscan perspective in the foreground, is consistent with the language of the text, and will serve as the framework for the following discussion.

In this paper, I focus on the language of the Canek Manuscript, starting at the level of phrasal syntax, and proceeding to verse forms, thematic chunks, and other locally defined structures.[2] A thorough grounding of even this limited analysis would require a better knowledge of other contemporaneous discourse in Spanish, Maya, and perhaps other indigenous languages than I can draw on here. What I hope to provide is a sufficiently explicit description of parts of the text, so that it will be possible eventually to compare it closely with other documents from the period, and to make inferences about contextualization that are consistent with the linguistic evidence. Jones's (1992) inferences regarding the identity of the author suggest that the distinctive language of the manuscript may be due to interference from Maya or a local, perhaps archaic, variant of Spanish. This was my first hypothesis in working with the text, and I will try to falsify it in the analysis that follows. Ultimately I argue that the author was familiar with a range of speech styles, almost surely including Maya, but that his language in this text is the product of rhetorical choice, not mechanical interference.

The relation between the four folios is intriguing: they are clearly separate, but also clearly connected, and they seem similar in overall structure. Each folio is a thematic unit distinct from the others, and there is a clear sequence between them,

[2] A "locally defined" discourse structure is one which can be identified through analysis of segments of the text, as small as a single morpheme and as large as a chapterlike section. Global structures, by contrast, encompass the whole text and its relation to context. A full analysis would necessarily join the two levels, but is impossible in this case because only four folios exist from what was obviously a longer document. It is not known what the missing portions of the text looked like, nor can this be inferred from the extant parts, and therefore little or nothing can be said about its global structure.

which is accurately reflected in the numbering of the pages in the original, but not in the numbering of the lines that was subsequently added (see Jones 1992). There are no sentence overlaps between folios. It is not known under what conditions they were written. Given the relative independence of the folios, they could have been written on separate occasions, perhaps successive days. Although I see no unequivocal evidence of multiple authors, we cannot rule out the possibility that more than one person contributed to the narrative. The hand appears to be the same throughout, but this could be evidence that the manuscript is a copy of some other set of episodes reflecting the work of multiple authors.[3] It is unclear what overall discourse structure the larger work had, and there are noteworthy differences in the rhetorical styles in the different folia. This reinforces the caution expressed by Jones (1991:32) regarding the proper presentation of the text. Given its stylistic diversity, it would be inappropriate to present it as all conforming to a single scansion or system of line divisions.

Before proceeding to detailed consideration of the folia, let us briefly summarize their main features. There is a striking contrast between Folio 5 and Folio 6. The former portrays the night of terror in Chacan, when the three Franciscans and their ten Tipuan assistants huddled in a single house, fearing for their lives at the hands of the local Indians. The author stayed awake with the Tipuans, keeping guard for attack, while the two Franciscan friars slept. He expresses his sense of honor, resolute faith in Divine will, and steadfastness in the face of danger. At the end of the folio, morning breaks and Canek, King of the Itzas, arrives dramatically from the direction of the rising sun. His appearance changes the entire situation, since the Chacan Indians all go to the shore to receive him. In this folio, a number of linguistic devices are used systematically to foreground aspects of the description, giving it cohesion and the relief of a figure upon background.[4] One of these devices is the systematic use of grammatically anomalous noun phrases when making definite reference to the night of terror and its episodes.

Folio 6 starts immediately with a poetic description of Canek's person. The use of alliteration and rhyme is so marked that one is tempted to treat it as sound symbolism. It's all *oro* gold and *azul* blue, rounded vowels and liquids. The syntax of noun phrases, which was highly marked in the preceding folio, has been rectified to standard Spanish, and we find almost none of the distinctive referential forms of the preceding folio.[5] But the attention paid to Canek's costume and majesty invites the inference that the author revered him, or was otherwise adopting a "Maya" perspective. After 18 lines of rapt attention to Canek, the section culminates in a reproduction of the glyphic sign on his cape, which the author glossed as *Estrella Veignte Serpiente* (line 18). The remainder of the folio shows less poetic structuring, and is thematically backgrounded. It sketches Canek's relation with the Chacanes, his refusal to go amidst the Chacan priests, and his departure for Tayasal with the Franciscan party behind him. From the outset, Canek plays the role of a luminous savior to the Franciscans, and this position in the drama is reflected in the poetic language that portrays him.

Folio 7 recounts the massacre of a previous party of Franciscans at Tayasal, from where the authorial voice now speaks. Stylistically, it maintains the pattern of a rhetorically flush opening after which the remainder of the folio fills in the background. Early on, the date and time of day on which the dreadful event took place are brought forth in verse parallelism, to be followed immediately by mention of the massacred party and a Latin blessing for the dead. The reader is led by the stylistic salience of the date and prayer to identify the voice of the author with the victims. Indeed, it is precisely this identification that is in danger of coming true, since the author is in peril on Tayasal even as he speaks of his departed predecessors.

Folio 8 starts off by recounting the abominations of the Chacan priests. The prose is marked by a great deal of low-level parallelism that gives it a poetic quality but no single obvious scansion. It is more like a litany, in which the barbaric practices inspired in them by the Devil are rehearsed. This opening ends in another Latin blessing complete with graphic signs of the cross. In what follows, the Franciscans are justified in their desire to missionize the area, and the reader is left with the sense that progress is being made, however slowly, and successful Christianization will be achieved.

FOLIO 5: REFERENCE AND RHETORICAL STYLE

In the Folio 5, the first in the sequence of four extant folios, the author makes reference to aspects of the events at Chacan, using a total of 66 definite noun phrases (henceforth NP).[6] These are reproduced in the Appendix. This total includes three distinct syntactic structures, whose distributions indicate a consistent rhetorical pattern. The relevant nominal expressions break down

[3] This was suggested by Matthew Restall (personal communication 1992). C. Andrew Hofling argued that this inference was a red herring, in light of the powerful continuities in style and writing throughout the extant folios. While I agree that the idea of multiple authors is fishy, the matter is less clearcut than might appear. On the one hand, there *are* multiple voices in the discourse, in the form of Latin quotations, shifts in perspective, and the idiosyncratic style of the narrative. On the other hand, it is probable that the author, assuming it was an individual, discussed his impressions with his companions and may even have revised the text before committing its final version to the record. The key problem is how one conceives of the participant category "author." If we follow the lead of Goffman (1983) and modern pragmatics, then it would be viewed as a composite category joining together the "principal" or primary source of expression, the "author" who selected the words and composed the discourse, the scribe or "animator" who produced the textual object itself, and any witnesses who shared in the process of production. This and other factors belong to what Goffman called the "production format" of the text. I maintain that the ambiguities in the present manuscript are sufficient to warrant caution on the issue of authorship.

[4] I use the term "foregrounding" in the standard sense first defined by Praguean linguists (see Havránek 1964): any departure from an automatic linguistic pattern, so as to bring attention to itself, whether intentional or not, is a case of foregrounding. For further discussion of foregrounding and figure-ground structures in discourse, with examples in Yucatec Maya, see Hanks (1990:36–41, 149–150, 568).

[5] My reference to "standard Spanish" is an abbreviation, because there was no standard in the New World Spanish at this time, as an anonymous reviewer for *Ancient Mesoamerica* pointed out. The proper generalization is that the distinctive noun-phrase syntax in Folio 5 gives way in Folio 6 to a pattern similar to what subsequently became the standard. The distinction will become clear in the next section, where I spell out the forms in question.

[6] The abbreviation NP is standard for "noun phrase." The total of 66 excludes pronouns unaccompanied by lexical description. The rationale for this exclusion is that unaccompanied pronouns lack the internal phrase structure necessary to display the pattern under study, and, hence, neither support nor contradict the proposed analysis.

into: 54 with a definite article (*el*, *los*, *la*, *las*); 16 with a possessive pronoun (*nuestro*, *su*) and 6 with a demonstrative article (*este*, *aquella*). The total exceeds 66 because the different markers of definiteness are combined. The vast majority of these NPs conform to the grammatical patterns of what was to become standard Spanish, but there are 13 that are anomalous, and these appear to be the locus of a stylistic choice by the author. NPs with peculiar syntax include: 5 instances of [article demonstrative N X], as in *los estos indios chacanes*, "the those Chacan Indians"; and 8 instances of [article possessive pronoun X N] as in *la nuestra volunta*, "the our willingness" (X stands for the optional presence of further lexical material). This syntactic pattern, particularly the combination of article with possessive pronoun, is atypical of Spanish of this period, at least insofar as it is represented by written sources, but may fit with some variants of spoken Spanish at the time, and accords well with Maya usage. Hence, *la nuestra volunta* would be *le k volunta* ([article possessive pronoun N]), *el su hermano* would be *le u sukú'un*, "the his brother" ([article possessive pronoun N]), and so forth. The combination of article with demonstrative is also typical of Maya, although the order of elements is not always identical to that in Spanish, *le chacanilob helo*, "the people of Chacan there, those people of Chacan" ([article N demonstrative]). On a first reading, these peculiarities seem to indicate that the author's command of Spanish is flawed and may be subject to interference from Maya. This would be consistent with the inference that the author was a relatively uneducated lay brother whose first language may have been Maya, or some variant of Spanish heavily influenced by Maya. On closer examination, however, it seems that a conscious choice has been made to foreground the terror of the night with distinctive language forms: the marked forms arise almost exclusively in NPs referring to the Chacan Indians and the night of terror there.

The first point in favor of this view is that, of the total collection of NPs, only a small subset are formally anomalous. Fifty-three NPs are grammatically standard, proving both that the author knew the "usual" forms, and that these define the statistical baseline against which exceptions are noteworthy. Example 1 displays all of the NPs with the structure [article demonstrative N X]$_{NP}$, where X indicates optional presence of further lexical material.[7]

1. Folio 5:131 los estos indios
   Folio 5:132 la esta noche
   Folio 5:132 aqi en el este pueblo dde Chacan
   Folio 5:140 de la manos de los estos idios Chacanes
   Folio 5:157 toda la aquella noche

Notice that all of these phrases denote aspects of the night setting in which the author described the terror that he shared with his companions. In the remainder of the document (including Folios 6–8), there are just six more instances of this syntactic form, and every one of them refers to Indians, usually in the context of the terror they provoke. Indeed, the syntactic form becomes an index of the gulf between Indians and the Spanish; that is, the use of the structure [article demonstrative N] appears to be an emblem of the social distance and estrangement between the Franciscan mission and the unconverted. The forms are reproduced in example 2.

[7]Line numbers are retained from Jones (1992).

2. Folio 6:44 la aqueya musica
   Folio 7:53 en aquello ese dia
   Folio 7:57 en la esta cibda de el tayasal
   Folio 8:114 por medio de el este indio Ironimo Zinack
   Folio 8:124 la cateqizazio de los estos indios maias
   Folio 8:125 que solo estos los itzaes

The music referred to in the first phrase is Canek's; the day referred to in the next is the one on which 90 Tipuans and 1 Franciscan were massacred by the Itzas at Tayasal. Line 57 denotes Tayasal in this specific context—other tokens of the name do not have the same syntactic peculiarity. Zinack was one of Canek's interpreters as he postpones considering whether to convert to Christianity. Lines 124 and 125 from Folio 8 fall in the context of how much work remains to be done to convert the Itza.

The point of these observations is that the incidence of these syntactic forms is not random in relation to the thematic development of the narrative. The author used the forms systematically to foreground and to refer back to parts of his story. That this form signals the deep ambivalence and fear of the author in the face of the Indians of the southern frontier may not be arbitrary. The demonstratives distance the Indians, treating them as part of the sinister setting in which the Franciscans found themselves.

The second noteworthy feature of NP syntax is the combination of the definite articles with possessive pronouns. Example 3 displays all of the NPs with the syntactic shape [article possessive pronoun X N Y], where X and Y stand for optional lexical material[8]:

3. Folio 5:130 la nuestra volunta
   Folio 5:131 la su merce
   Folio 5:135 el noestro † beato padre el santo serafico san francisco †
   Folio 5:137 el nuestro clamor
   Folio 5:139 la nosstra llegada
   Folio 5:141 a la su cibdad de el Tayasal de la laguna
   Folio 5:143 a la su volunta
   Folio 5:148 de las nostras personas

The first point to notice about these NPs is that in seven of the eight cases, the possessive pronoun refers to a Franciscan. In five cases, it is a first-person plural possessor, which includes the author along with the other two Franciscans. Also noteworthy is the thematic similarity of the possessed nouns, all denoting aspects of what we might call the moral persons and vocations of the friars. For instance, no body parts, material objects, or instruments appear in this shape. The city of Tayasal is the one exception to this and stands out as such. Recall, however, that it is in the context of Canek's life-saving invitation to Tayasal that this occurs, and thus the city serves as a kind of sanctuary for them at this point (contrast the treatment it receives in subsequent folios). Based on these occurrences, we would hypothesize that the author had selected this syntactic form to foreground the close relation between the Franciscans and their mission of conversion.

This may appear farfetched or arbitrary, but the regularity is

[8]There is one further example (Folio 5:152: *de la mesma vida mia*) that combines the two categories, but it does so in a way conforming to standard Spanish.

impressive. In the remainder of the document there are only five more tokens of this NP syntax. These are shown in example 4:

4. Folio 6:31 la nosstra llegada
   Folio 6:32 la su presenza (Canek)
   Folio 6:37 la su cabeza (Canek)
   Folio 7:84 los nuestros menesteres
   Folio 8:110 la nostra religion

The pattern is consistent with the tokens in Folio 5: Three of the five instances have a first-person plural possessor whose reference includes the author with the other Franciscans, and the two exceptions refer to Canek. These two occur just after the poetic description of Canek's person, in the salutary context of his first encounter with the friars. Moreover, there is a further motivation for the phrase in Folio 6:32: It is syntactically parallel with the one in Folio 6:31, which occurs in identical position in its verse line (i.e., final position):

5. Canek quisso saber de la nostra llegada
   i nos luando a qe venezemos a la su presenza

Taken together, these facts make a strong case that the atypical syntax of the NPs under discussion is not due to errors of any kind, but rather to a specific discourse strategy. The author's belonging to the Franciscan mission and the intimate relation between the persons and their vocation is systematically emphasized in the combination of the definite article with possessive pronouns. By contrast, the estrangement, distance, and deep ambivalence of the mission in the face of the Indians of the southern frontier is underscored by the use of article plus demonstrative in NPs denoting scenes of terror and the people associated with them. A case could be made for the similarity of these syntactic forms to patterns found in Maya at this period, and it is also possible that they represent an older variant of Spanish. In my opinion, however, these links do not explain the presence of the forms. The regularity with which they are deployed as foregrounding devices in this text is a stronger motivation and indicates a rhetorical strategy.

FOLIO 6: CANEK'S POETIC

One of the remarkable passages of this document is the description of Canek's person, which occupies the first 18 lines of Folio 6. The marked NP syntax of the previous folio is completely absent from this section, despite the multitude of definite NPs in which it could have been used. In example 6 all nouns and NPs are underscored. It is only in line 31, well after the splendor of Canek, that the marked NP syntax reoccurs, briefly. This is the point at which the author refers back to their first night in the area, which had been originally described with peculiar NP syntax.

With respect to the description of Canek, several factors are noteworthy. The first is that his arrival on the scene in Folio 5 was actually in response to a plea from the Franciscans to God and Saint Francis (lines 135–141). That is, the timing of his appearance is such as to make it a case of divine mercy shown the friars. This is perhaps what motivates the similarity between the Christian halo and Canek's golden aura, crown, and crest described in the first line in example 6:

6. Folio 6: Description of Canek

Line		Remarks
1	teniase el Rei Canek mui bien adornado	
	de su cabeza oronoza	
	grande corona de oro puro	
2	con copete de oro.	
3	i traiba las orexas tapadas	
	con discos de oro	
4	i los disscos tienen colgaduras	
	que se muben	
5	i se caen por cima de los ombros	
	como colgaxos	
6	i asi mismo en los brazos	A Interlocking couplets
	tiene aros de oro puro	B
7	i en los menores de las manos	A′
	tiene tambien aros de oro.	B′##
8	y se vesste con un tunico	A Cycle of 4 elements
	de color blanco poro	B
	que essta todo adornado con bordados	C (also could be A′)
	de color azul.	D (also could be B′)##
9	e en la capa qe lo cubre	A′ Second instance of cycle
	qe es blanca mui limpia	B′
11	tiene flecos	C′
	de color azul	D′##
	i la orya de la capa	A″ Third instance of cycle
	essta toda bordada	C″
	de color azul	D″##
12	i cine la cintura	
	con una ancha faxa	
	a giza de atadura	
13	pero qe essta es negra	
	i qiere dezir qe Canek	
	se es tambien sacerdote	
	de los itzaes.	
14	i las sandalias son	A Serial couplets
	unas mui finas sandalias	A′
	como echas de ilo azul	B
	con muchas sonajas de oro	B′##
16	i la capa tiene un grande signo	
	de su nombre	
	que es de la escritura maia	
	i qiere dezir la estreya veinte serpiente	
18	i es asi **THREE HIEROGLYPHS IN BOX**	

These are the first 18 lines of Folio 6. They contrast in significant ways with the preceding folio. The sustained descriptive focus on Canek and his clothing differs sharply from the focus on situation and event in Folio 5. The sumptuousness of Canek's appearance stands out like a light upon the dark horizon of the night before, amplifying the dramatic entry of the Itza king, portrayed at the end of Folio 5. The language shows little of the grammatical peculiarity that was evident in Folio 5, and the NPs in particular show no trace of the features we tracked there (see underscored items in the text, where we might have expected special forms). At the same time, there is an almost opulent use of vowel alliteration and grammatical parallelism (of various sorts). I have attempted to reflect what I take to be significant parallels by indenting and labeling lines in the transcript in example 6. Lines that recapitulate significant fea-

tures of an earlier one in the same series are marked with the same capital letter plus a prime. Series are set apart by the ## sign at the end. Between series, no special relation is implied between lines that share the same letter, except in lines 8–12, where a cyclic recurrence of a series of forms builds up what I have called a series of cycles. The parsing of lines is guided by the recurrence of parallel grammatical features or, in the default case, by the working definition that one line equals one major grammatical constituent (such as an NP, verb phrase, or adverbial phrase).[9]

It is worth emphasizing that the grammatical form of noun phrases in this portion shows no trace of exogenous syntax, even where we would strongly expect interference if it were to occur. Given Maya usage, the NPs that refer to parts of Canek's body would be phrased as possessive relations (i.e., "the earrings fell down over his shoulders," not "the shoulders"; cf. lines 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12). Also, there are a number of part/whole relations between the cape and its parts that would be expressed usually with a possessive structure in Maya, not with a definite article (lines 9, 11, 14, 16).

The thematic progression of this passage is equally remarkable and suggests a systematic and esthetically attuned gaze on Canek's person. Starting from the luminous head of Canek, the author proceeds up to the crown and crest, before moving downwards to the ears, the shoulders, arms, hands, torso, waist, feet, and ending in the hieroglyphic sign of the person, the emblem of the whole just described from top to bottom. This hieroglyph serves the same function in this folio as the signs of the cross do in Folios 5 and 7: it is the index of the Maya system of knowledge, as is the cross for the Catholic system.

Although there are repeating features throughout this passage, the parallelism coalesces into verse in only a few places. This shifting between verse and prose is typical of Yucatec Maya literature, but may have also been a Spanish form at this time.[10] The first five lines scan into four phrases apiece, not so much by verse criteria as by gross semantic parallels and alliteration of variable density. Whereas lines 1–2 start at the head and work upward, lines 3–5 start at the ears and work downward. Each new phrase in the respective lines makes another step upward or downward. Lines 6–7 are structured into what we can call interlocking couplets, that is, AB A′B′ line sequence, in which each of the first two lines is parallel with the one after the next. This pattern is also typical of colonial Maya documents (Hanks 1987). Observe that these lines are the only portion that describes the arms and hands, and the only instance of interlocking couplets in the first 18 lines of the folio. Interestingly, hands and arms are both included in the reference of the Maya term *k'ab*, "arm, hand," hinting at a possible Maya substrate for the verse equivalence.

In line 8 a new theme is taken up and with it a new poetic form: The tunic is portrayed in three cycles of four lines apiece, in the pattern {A B C D## A′ B′ C′ D′## A″ C″ D″##}. The A lines all begin with Spanish *y* (i, e), and each one introduces a major part of the clothing, tunic, cape, and border. The B lines are devoted to the whiteness of the tunic and cape. The C lines denote a design on the main objects in the A lines, namely two embroidered edges, and the flecks in the cape. The D lines denote the blue. Thus, there is a very tight fit between the semantic dimension of thematic focus and the formal dimension of poetic structure. This is further reinforced by the sound symbolic association between goldness, rounded vowels (o, u), and the rounded objects made of gold (crown, crest [?], ears, disks, rings).[11] One imagines Canek's head rounded by its very goldenness, and his body plump beneath the precious metal bands.

Although the subsequent lines continue the themes of costume and color, the effects of poetic structuring are much less noticeable, in my opinion, until we come down to line 14. At this point, the sandals are introduced in the two couplets labeled "serial couplets" in example 6. Whereas interlocking couplets always involve alternating parallel lines, serial couplets always involve contiguous parallel lines. The two are variations on the couplet structure well known to Mayanists. It is interesting to note that the two variants occur in this passage only in reference to the arms and legs of Canek, as though these two sectors of the body were complementary, and especially well suited for expression in couplets.

At the end of the passage the author reasserts that the gloss of *canek* is "the twenty serpent star," but this assertion sheds little light on the question of his knowledge of Maya language. The Maya expression *can ek* can be read as "four star," "sky star," "serpent star," but not as "the star twenty serpent." Either the author of this portion is simply wrong about the meaning of such basic words, which would put in question his knowledge of the language, or he is relying on knowledge not encoded in their literal meanings.[12] It is important to recall that even if the gloss of the name and the drawing of the glyphs were both inaccurate, however, their indexical values are still in force. The author has achieved the rhetorical purpose of producing an emblem for the Maya chief.

FOLIO 7: RECALLING THE MASSACRE AT TAYASAL

As with the previous folios, the stylistic effects in this one take shape at the beginning, within the first 15 or so lines. The key theme is the memory of the massacre of the previous Franciscan party at Tayasal, and it is crystallized in use of periphrasis in the Spanish and Latin epithets, and graphic signs of the cross. I will concentrate on the portion of the text reproduced in example 7, since this is where stylistic regimentation of the language is the strongest.

[9] For further discussion and illustration of scansions of Maya language documents, see Hanks (1989a).

[10] I have analyzed some Maya verse forms in detail in Hanks (1986, 1987, 1988,1989a). Although the parallels with the present document are in some cases striking, I hesitate to label them Maya because of the presence of widely used verse forms in Spanish of the early colonial period as well.

[11] As with most other poetic effects, the associations noted here are based sheerly on the text in question: the fact that the terms used to describe goldness in the text include rounded vowels, and the golden objects are themselves round. Although there is no evidence that the author, or anyone else, conventionally associated the color with certain vowel qualities, the two coincide in this text.

[12] In reviewing this paper for *Ancient Mesoamerica*, C. Andrew Hofling suggested an alternative interpretation that is well worth considering: The hieroglyphic forms may correspond to *ek' k'al kan*, which could be read as *ek'al kan*, "stars (of the) serpent," which would be an appropriate gloss of *kan ek'*, the ruler's name.

7. Folio 7: The massacre at Tayasal

Line		Remarks
49	pues qe muy bien conozian la suerte	A
50	qe habiales tocado a aqellos malaventurados	A′##
	de manos suyos	
51	la mañana de el dia	A
52	de X Santa Issabel	A′
	8 de el mes	A″
	de xulio de el año	A‴
53	qe fue el de 1623	A‴##
	a en aquello ese dia	A
54	i a la ora de la celebrazion	A′(B)
	de la santa misa	B′##
	dieron muerte a todos los qe la oian	
55	qe eran en numero de 90 indios tipues	
56	ademas de su paternidad fray Diego de Delgado	
	aqi se fueron en la esta cibda de el tayazal	
57	X Reqien estam in pax X	A
58	X Requien eternan Domine isr	A′(B)
	Domine nos a Dei X	B′##
59	X Lux perpetuan X	A
	Lux a Dei X	A′##
60	por la grazia de X Dios	A
	nostro Señor a nos	A′

The layout of this example follows the same conventions as in example 6, with indention showing parallelism, and the capital letters at the far right showing the line relations in verse terms. Lines 49–50 form a weak verse pair based on the recurrence of the complementizer *qe*. Lines 51–53 show a combination of verse parallelism, based mainly on the recurrent preposition *de*, along with periphrasis. The latter can be seen in the fact that the date could have been very simply stated as "*8 de xulio 1623*," without expanding each calendrical unit into its own phrase. By expanding, however, the author has taken the opportunity to create a verse series, stretching out the date and engraving it in the consciousness of the reader. A similar pattern of periphrasis in date forms is evident in some colonial Maya language documents, such as the Yaxkukul land surveys (Hanks 1992). In the next line we see once again a combination of demonstratives atypical of standard Spanish. As we would expect based on Folio 5, this combination comes in the context of reference to a scene of terror. In the present case it accomplishes two effects: It distances the author from the revulsive massacre he is about to describe, and it continues the dramatic lengthening of phrases that we saw in lines 51–53 just before it. Line 54 is notated "A′(B)" to indicate that it plays a role in two independent verse series: it shares with the immediately preceding line a thematic focus on temporal units (day, hour), and with the immediately following one the structure "de la _____." The same kind of interlocking structure occurs in line 58, where the repeated term *Reqien* links the A–A′ pair, and the repeated term *Domine* links the B–B′ pair. Thus a single line functions in two distinct series. Lines 59 and 60 break down into simple serial couplets based on *Lux* and *Dios-a nos*, respectively.

The periphrasis and seeming prolixity of parts of example 7, therefore, fit into a shifting blend of verse and prose. It is worth noting that the verse forms, while they are occasionally based on phonetic and syntactic similarities, are nonetheless continuously tied into the meaning of the text. Each one of the verse series coincides with a thematic unit: the bad luck of the previous trip (49–50), the date of the atrocity in calendrical terms (51–53), then in ritual terms (54), and finally the Latin blessing for the departed souls (57–60). This blessing, regardless of the grammatical errors it contains, is, along with the cross, an emblem of the Catholic sacraments, as were the hieroglyphs of Canek (regardless of the errors that they may contain). In each case, the presence of the emblem indexes the presence of the cultural sector from which it derives. In the present passage, the signs of the cross take on a further indexical value as well, due to their number and placement. The first one occurs at the first mention of the date of the atrocity, the feast of Saint Isabel on July 8. Later, when the author blesses the dead, he marks eight crosses, reinforcing their placement on the earlier mentioned date. The combination of Latin and the cross further foregrounds the fact that it took place during the celebration of mass. As we would expect, the final cross occurs at the mention of the sacrament of baptism, at the end of the folio. Consequently, the cross functions as an index of the date of the massacre, the blessing of the dead and the sacrament of baptism.

The remainder of the folio fills out the description of Canek, his family and physical stature, and the food he fed the missionizing party. It ends with an assertion that, indeed, his arrival at Chacan had saved their lives. In my judgment, the presence of verse parallelism is minimal in these lines, and the information that they add to the narrative is more a matter of elaborating what the reader already knows, instead of adding new dramatic elements. For instance, it is interesting to learn that Canek is tall and fair-complexioned in lines 69–73, but this has none of the rhetorical force of his almost divine appearance in Folio 6.

FOLIO 8: THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE UNCONVERTED

Folio 8 continues the trend of elaborating a description already started, adding little new information of dramatic consequence, but reinforcing and filling out things already mentioned. Canek had indeed learned of the abominable intentions of the Chacan priests, and thwarted them. These facts, already given in the preceding text, are amplified over the first twelve lines, reproduced in example 8:

8. Folio 8: The abominations of the Chacan priests

Line		Remarks
87	Esstorbo el Rei Canak	A
	a los sacerdotes	B
	de los Chacanes	B′
88	de qe nos maten adelante	A′
	de sus idolos	B″
89	qe se esstan en los adoratorios	A″
	de las abominaciones	B‴
90	qe aqi los ai en grande abondanza	A‴
	i qe los tienen mui en resso	A⁗
91	qe por nada quien abrazar	A
	la nosstra santa religion	B
92	i qe no dexan las malas costumbres	A
	de baixeris	B
	i barbaros sacrifizios humanos	A
94	i de indefenzos animales	B
	qe en todavia aqi se acostunbra	A
95	sin qe se pecata	B
	qe los tan grande son segir	A
	& pior orudda	B
96	la qe solo su padre el Diablo	A
	aiga podido imsspirarles	B

(*Example 8 continued*)

8. Folio 8 *continued*

Line		Remarks
	X Ab setunzio perpetuan abomnae	A
98	Dei gratia X nos	B
	por la grazia de Dios X	B′
99	dimos el Santo Sacramento	A′

There are various possible relations of verse parallelism in this passage, and the one shown in example 8 is provisional. Indention is mainly heuristic. As a general rule, the lines flush left contain the main verbs and give mostly central information, while most indented lines contain objects, circumstantial phrases, or subordinate verbs. The A and B symbols reflect this difference. In the lines leading up to the Latin, there are two tendencies (both with exceptions): (i) verbs in A lines are introduced by the complementizer *(i) que* and nouns in B lines are introduced by the preposition *de*. The overall effect of these patterns is to give the language a diffuse poetic quality without imparting a very clear scansion.

Throughout the passage there is a fairly steady thematic development, starting with Canek's intervention and leading through the abominations of the Chacanes, culminating in Latin and the sacrament. In my opinion, the strongest parallelism runs from lines 87–89. Here the horror of the Chacanes is reinforced with alliteration and grammatical parallels that place the native priests, the Chacanes, the idols, and the abominations in equivalent positions. The implication is that they make a single set. Lines 90–97 then fill out the picture of unrelenting evil. In this case, the A lines seem to make the most coherent series, emphasizing the continuing of offensive religious practices fathered by the Devil. Finally, lines 98–99 reaffirm the triumph of good over evil, giving the last word to God and his sacrament. The scansion treats these lines as a chiasmus, or a pair of couplets, one contained within the other [A[BB′]A′].

The remainder of the folio constitutes a justification for further Franciscan missionization of Tayasal. The author described the desire of the people to convert to Christianity, their domination by the terror of the priests, Canek's reticence to convert at this time, and the certainty that, were he to do so, then the entire island would follow in his footsteps. Following his dramatic rescue of the Franciscans in Folio 5, the implication of Folio 8 is that this frontier area really is in need for conversion, and Canek is the person to convince. One is left with a fear of the Chacanes and a sense of understated disappointment when Canek puts off discussing conversion, at the end of the folio. But there is also a sense of inevitability that the Itza, the last holdouts, will convert eventually, and that the Franciscans will persist until they do so.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Parts of these folios are so finely tuned in rhetorical terms that it seems safe to infer a persuasive intent on the part of the author: that is, he appears to have sought systematically to affect the eventual reader(s) of his narrative—to move them with the terror of those Indians beyond the frontier; the faith and pious valor of the missionizing party, of which he was a member; the risk to life and limb run by the Tipuans who accompanied them; and the mystical intercession of Saint Francis. Assuming he was himself a Yucatecan lay brother, the author would have had an a priori interest in presenting the missionizing effort in its best light. This is so whether the addressee was the Franciscan provincial, as Jones (1992) suggested, other members of the order, or even secular authorities who could have influenced the campaign to conquor and convert the Itza stronghold of Tayasal. We have in Folio 5 a moving portrait of steadfast faith in the face of terror. An appeal to Saint Francis is answered in the form of a radiant Indian king who appears from the east. In Canek's first appearance we have dramatic proof that there is indeed a line of connection between the saint and the native chief. This is then projected into splendor in Folio 6, where Canek's luminosity approaches a hierophany. (One area of further research on this document would be reports of hierophanies and appearances of saints at the time.) From here they move away from the menace of the Chacanes, returning to the island on which their predecessors had been massacred during the sacrament of the mass, deeper into the valley of death, but accompanied by the unwitting emissary of Saint Francis. Once again the reader is moved by the faith of the mission. The last folio reinforces this image and the certain death they would have faced at the hands of the Chacanes. Canek is left in the highly ambivalent position of being the savior and yet refusing to convert at this time. This could well be part of a larger effort by the author to legitimize the trip as necessary (because the Itzas really are pagans), as yet unfinished (because the conversion has not occurred), but nonetheless destined to succeed (because they will return and Canek will address the issue). Such a logic would make sense at several levels: the author was legitimizing his own valor, perhaps directed to a superior in Merida, as well as the worth of the mission, directed either to readers outside the order or to others in Merida. This array of possible goals is what I mean to highlight in suggesting that the narrative may have been produced with a persuasive aim.

Supposing that the overall aim of the author was to support the Franciscan effort, there are still aspects of cultural ambivalence in the document, and these tie it back into broader issues in colonial Maya and Spanish discourse. There is a sympathetic orientation to Canek, and a clear belief in the capacity of the Indians for religious participation. Yet there is a deep revulsion towards the unconverted, including the chief. Canek is both a symbol of native royalty and an instrument of Saint Francis, the paramount of idolatry and a resource for conversion at the same time. The author appears to have purposely chosen nontypical phrasings in a variety of contexts, and was probably not a native speaker of Spanish, although he had a subtle command of the grammar and makes many fewer "mistakes" than one might think at first. The sheer regularity of his departures from more canonical patterns suggests that he was sufficiently familiar with the language to know what he was writing. The discourse is consistent with Jones's (1992) inference that he was probably a native Yucatecan who was also lay Franciscan, which would account for the intermediary position he took between the converted Indians and the Spanish. His estrangement from the Chacan and Itza Indians would follow from his own likely roots in the extreme north of the penninsula, and from his deep identification with the Franciscan mission. Still, his medial social position, on the boundary between Franciscan and native traditions, was projected into the language of his narrative. This projection from ambiguous social identities into ambivalent discourse expressions recurs again and again in postconquest Maya sources. It is one of the hallmarks of the colonial world.

It is worth emphasizing that, although one can perceive oddities in the language of the Canek Manuscript upon first reading, it is only when one analyzes it closely that the patterns emerge. The projection from social context into discourse form is never mechanical, but is mediated by the linguistic systems involved. This is why it is crucial for historians to pay scrupulous attention to the language in which documents are written: much of the dynamic interplay in which identities are constructed and realities defined takes place in the details of expressive form. It is also why we must be cautious in inferring the identity of the author of the Canek Manuscript from the text itself. In the absence of a well-defined Spanish standard language at this time, it is uncertain which norms the author of this text was following. It is therefore equally uncertain at which points he departed from the norms in order to achieve his expressive aims. Skepticism notwithstanding, certain generalizations about the extant folios and their author are justified.

On first examination, the early lines in each folio appear to carry much more rhetorical and thematic weight than the remaining ones. Accordingly, I have concentrated on these, and proposed selected verse readings of them. In a fuller analysis it would be necessary to examine all of the discourse with equal care. Still, there is evidence that the beginning part of each folio was a sort of focal area in which the most foregrounded information was presented. Despite the different rhetorical styles of the folios, this recurrent feature helps to unify them as being all comparable in structure. It also lends further support to the deduction that a single author composed the document. The sequential relations among folios are specified in the page numbers but can also be seen in their obvious temporal and spatial sequence, from the arrival at Chacan to the mass in Tayasal. There appears to be a very limited amount of anaphoric coreference between folios, mostly involving continued commentary on Canek, the Tipuan, Chacan and Itza Indians, the Chacan priests and those of Tayasal (Folio 7–8).[13] But much of what is described is never mentioned again outside the folio in which it appears. Despite the drama of their first presentation, we never hear again about the Franciscan appeal to Saint Francis during the night of terror in Chacan (Folio 5), nor of Canek's clothing or even his aura (Folio 6). It would be fruitful in further study of this manuscript to plot closely the incidence of coreference both within individual folios and across folios. This would give a more precise measure of the semantic relations between folios, and of the elaboration of themes within and across them.

The brief illustrations shown here demonstrate that, within the overall text, there are thematic foci that tend to be well delimited by the stylistic shifts, particularly NP syntax, periphrasis, and a variety of verse types. This is another feature that contributes to the overall coherence of the four folios as part of a single work. Even as verse forms and descriptive foci shift about, the author consistently used verse forms to index themes.

The evidence for a Maya substrate in the language remains uncertain, but it is clear that the rhetorical abilities of the author were well developed in ways consistent with what we know of colonial Maya. These include shifting between verse and prose, couplet parallelism, cyclic parallelism, and repeated use of line-initial particles such as *que* and *y*. It is possible that the author's use of the signs of the cross also conforms to usage patterns in Maya-language documents, although this is speculative and would require an equally close study of the Spanish use of crosses. In some of these cases, there are possible Spanish sources of a pattern, and one would have to rule these out in order to identify the Maya elements. What we would end up with in this approach is a part of the linguistic profile of the author, and a classification of discourse features by their source language.

In these remarks I have taken a different approach to contextualization, by focusing on the internal dynamic of the text and the ways in which it appears to reflect identifiable communicative goals. This choice was motivated in part by the lack of information regarding the author's identity and background and by the real ambiguity of many of the discourse features, in terms of which language they might reflect. Still other limits are placed on discourse analysis by the fact that the four folios that we have are a fragment of something whose proportions are unknown. In the face of these constraints, the language of the text itself becomes the object and the patterns within it become the grounds for further inferences.

The language of the manuscript is very systematic, even when it appears irregular. This was dramatically illustrated in the syntactic oddity of noun phrases referring to Franciscans and Indians. The combinations of articles with possessive pronouns and deictics looked like intrusion from another language in Folio 5, then it appeared in the context of widespread periphrasis in Folio 6. Subsequently, it reemerged in references to massacre by the Indians and faith by the friars in Folios 7 and 8. By the end of the fragment one realizes that the article-possessive constructions are an index of the Franciscans, which includes the author and likely the addressee as well. The article-demonstrative constructions are an index of the unconverted Indians, including the Chacan and Itza groups. Normal article-noun NPs are used for the intermediate category, the converted Indians. Recall that the Chacan Indians (Folio 5:131, 140, etc.) and the Itza Indians (Folio 8:114–115, 124–125) are both refered to with the odd forms on some occasions, but the Tipuans never are. They always receive canonical Spanish referential forms (Folio 5:151, Folio 6:40–41, Folio 7:47–48, 55, 83). At the end, when the other converted Indians are named, they are introduced with the standard article-noun form, not with a doubled form (Folio 8:127–128). Thus, there is a strong indexical relation between these syntactic forms and the social groups of the Franciscans, the converts, and the unconverted. For the author, this appears to be a progression from a primary identification group outwards to distant and dangerous frontier Indians. Canek on Tayasal belongs to the unconverted, but in Chacan his appearance is too closely linked to the appeal to Saint Francis to share the distance of this group. What we see in general is that the forms of reference covary with the social identity of the referents. In the case of Canek, his ambivalent identity shows up in the variety of ways in which he is described.

Such covariation might reflect the virtuoso verbal abilities of the author, who was able to improvise the language of this manuscript using canonical Spanish and a smattering of Maya (maybe), Latin, and signs of the cross. But this can only be part

[13] Coreference is a relation among two or more referring expressions that designate the same object. "Anaphoric coreference" designates the relation of coreference between a given expression and some other expression that precedes it in the discourse. Thus, in sentence "I gave the book to John so he could read it" the words "he" and "it" are coreferential with "the book" and "John," respectively. For further discussion, see Hanks (1990:Chapter 2).

of the story. It is equally likely that in writing this manuscript the author followed more widespread linguistic practices. Some of the idiosyncrasies of the document are probably indices of a social or regional dialect of Spanish, although this is unconfirmed at present. The real challenge of the manuscript in linguistic terms is to determine to what extent it is an improvised, unique creation, and to what extent it represents a common language. Such a challenge can be met only on the basis of studies of regional and social variation in the colonial languages.

RESUMEN

El lenguaje del Manuscrito Canek tiene un estilo distinctivo, probablemente un variante local del español colonial influenciado por el maya yucateco y por formas arcaicas del español. Refleja también una perspectiva ambivalente hacia el rey itza, Canek, tratandole a la vez como un indio pagano y sugeriendo una afinidad con San Francisco. Al estilo de muchos otros textos coloniales, este manuscrito contiene una mescla de géneros verbales, incluso naración, oración católica e expresión afectiva. Aquí se presenta una análisis del discurso, mostrando que se compone el texto segun una estructura retórica sistemática. Esta se base en formas sintacticas especiales, en paralelismos poéticos de varios tipos, e en la elaboración tematica. Considerado en el contexto de otros documentos coloniales, este refleja la ambivalencia cultural y lingüística de su autor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research on which this paper is based was supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, entitled History and Discourse, the Colonial Roots of Maya Shamanism (#RO22303). I gratefully acknowledge this support. An earlier draft of the paper was read and commented on by Grant Jones and Matthew Restall. Both made helpful suggestions. C. Andrew Hofling gave extensive, constructive comments on the penultimate draft, for which I am most grateful. An anonymous reviewer for *Ancient Mesoamerica* made several further points of value. I appreciate these responses and have attempted to incorporate them, insofar as possible. For the rest, only the author of the Canek Manuscript knows who he was, and he's not telling.

REFERENCES

Bricker, Victoria R.
1981 *The Indian Christ, the Indian King, the Historical Substrate of Maya Myth and Ritual.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
1986 *A Grammar of Mayan Hieroglyphs.* Middle American Research Institute, Publication 56. Tulane University, New Orleans.
1989 The Last Gasp of Maya Hieroglyphic Writing in the Books of Chilam Balam of Chumayel and Chan Kan. In *Word and Image in Mayan Culture, Explorations in Language, History and Representation*, edited by William F. Hanks and Don S. Rice, pp. 39–50. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Burkhart, Louise M.
1989 *The Slippery Earth, Nahua-Christian Moral Dialogue in Sixteenth-Century Mexico.* University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Carmack, Robert
1981 *The Quiché Mayas of Utatlan.* University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Carmack, Robert M., and James L. Mondloch
1989 *El Título de Yax y Otros Documentos Quichés de Totonicapán, Guatemala.* Edicion facsimilar, transcripción, traducción y notas de Robert M. Carmack, and James L. Mondloch. Universidad Nacional Autonoma de México, Mexico.

Collins, Anne
1977 The Maestros Cantores in Yucatan. In *Anthropology and History in Yacatan*, edited by Grant D. Jones, pp. 237–247. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Dibble, C.
1974 The Nahuatlization of Christianity. In *Sixteenth Century Mexico: The work of Sahagún*, edited by M. Edmonson. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Edmonson, Munro S., and Victoria R. Bricker
1985 Yucatecan Mayan Literature. In: *Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians*, vol. 3, edited by Munro S. Edmonson, pp. 44–63. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Farriss, Nancy
1978 Nucleation vs. Dispersal: the Dynamics of Population Movement in Colonial Yucatan. *Hispanic American Historical Review* 58:187–216.
1984 *Maya Society under Colonial Rule.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.
1987 Remembering the Future, Anticipating the Past: History, Time and Cosmology among the Maya of Yucatan. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29:566–593.

Garvin, Paul, editor and translator
1964 *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style.* Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC.

Goffman, Erving
1983. Footing. In *Forms of Talk*, pp. 124–159. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. (Originally published 1979)

Gosner, Kevin
1989a Caciques and Conversion: Juan Atonal and the Struggle for Legitimacy in Post-conquest Chiapas. Paper presented at the XV Congress of Latin American Studies Association, Miami.
1989b Conceptualizing Community and Hierarchy: Recent Views of Colonial Maya Political Organization in the Highlands. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Gossen, Gary H.
1974 *Chamulas in the World of the Sun: Time and Space in a Maya Oral Tradition.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
1985 Tzotzil Literature. In *Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians*, vol. 3, edited by Munro S. Edmonson, pp. 65–106. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Hanks, William F.
1986 Authenticity and Ambivalence in the Text: A Colonial Maya Case. *American Ethnologist* 13:721–744.
1987 Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice. *American Ethnologist* 14:668–692.
1988 Grammar Style and Meaning in a Maya Manuscript. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54:331–364.
1989a Elements of Maya style. In *Word and Image in Mayan Culture, Explorations in Language, History and Representation*, edited by William F. Hanks and Don S. Rice, pp. 92–111. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
1989b Word and Image in a Semiotic Perspective. In *Word and Image in Maya Culture, Explorations in Language, History and Representation*, edited by William F. Hanks and Don S. Rice, pp. 8–21. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
1990 *Referential Practice, Language and Lived Space among the Maya.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
1992 Intertextualité de l'espace. *L'HOMME* 32:55–76.

Havránek, B.
1964 The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language. In *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, edited and translated by Paul Garvin, pp. 3–17. Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC. (Originally published 1932).
Hawkins, John
1984 *Inverse Images: The Meaning of Culture, Ethnicity and Family in Postcolonial Guatemala.* University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
Hopkins, Nicholas A.
1987 The Lexicon of Maya Hieroglyphic Texts. Oral presentation at the 86th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (session 3–023).
Jones, Grant D., editor
1977 *Anthropology and History in Yucatan.* University of Texas Press, Austin.
Jones, Grant D.
1989 *Maya Resistance to Spanish Rule, Time and History on a Colonial Frontier.* University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
1991 *El Manuscrito Can Ek: descubrimiento de una visita secreta del siglo xvii a Tah Itzá (Tayazal), última capital de los maya Itzáes.* Introduction by George E. Stuart. Colección Divulgación. National Geographic Society and Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico.
1992 The Canek Manuscript in Ethnohistorical Perspective. *Ancient Mesoamerica.* 3:243-268.
Jones, Grant D., Don Rice, and Prudence Rice
1981 The Location of Tayasal: A Reconsideration in Light of Peten Ethnohistory and Archeology. *American Antiquity* 46:530–547.
Josserand, Kathryn J.
1987 The Discourse Structure of Maya Hieroglyphic Texts. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association.
Justeson, John S.
1989 The Representational Conventions of Mayan Hieroglyphic Writing. In *Word and Image in Mayan Culture, Explorations in Language, History and Representation*, edited by William F. Hanks and Don S. Rice, pp. 25–38. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
Justeson, John S., and Lyle Campbell, editors
1984 *Phoneticism in Mayan Hieroglyphic Writing.* Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, Publication 9. State University of New York at Albany.
Mathews, Peter
1984 Appendix A. A Maya Hieroglyphic Syllabary. In *Phoneticism in Mayan Hieroglyphic Writing*, edited by John S. Justeson and Lyle Cambell, pp. 311–314. Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, Publication 9. State University of New York at Albany.
Miller, Arthur G., and Nancy M. Farriss
1979 Religious Syncretism in Colonial Yucatan: The Archeological and Ethnohistorical Evidence from Tancah, Quintana Roo. In *Maya Archeology and Ethnohistory*, edited by Norman Hammond and Gordon Willey, pp. 223–241. University of Texas Press, Austin.
Morson, Gary S.
1981 *The Boundaries of Genre, Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer and the Traditions of Literary Utopia.* University of Texas Press, Austin.
Quezada, Sergio
1985 Encomienda, cabildo y gubernatura indígena en Yucatán, 1541–1583. *Historia Mexicana* 34:662–684.
Ricard, Robert
1947 *La conquista Espiritual de México.* Translated by Angel María Garibay. Editorial Jus, Mexico.
Roys, Ralph, L.
1943 *The Indian Background of Colonial Yucatan.* Publication 548. The Carnegie Institution, Washington, DC.
1957 *The Political Geography of the Yucatan Maya.* Publication 613. The Carnegie Institution, Washington, DC.
Sullivan, Paul
1989 *Unfinished Conversations. Mayas and Foreigners between Two Wars.* Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
Tedlock, Dennis
1983 *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation.* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

APPENDIX: LIST OF DEFINITE NPS IN FOLIO 5[1]

129 la liberta
130 la nuestra volunta las casas
131 la su merce **los estos indios**
132 **la esta noche aqi en el este pueblo de Chacan**
134 el esperar a qu la volunta de Dios
135 aqi adonde estamos el noestro X beato padre el santo serafico san francisco X
137 el nuestro clamor nuestras animas
138 en llegada la mañana el Señor Canek
139 la nosstra llegada
140 **de la manos de los estos indos Chacanes**
141 a la su cibdad de el Tayasal de la laguna
142 a su paternida fray Andres de Avendaño
143 a la su volunta
144 "hagase la santa volunta de Dios nostro señor X
147 la vanda de los indios chacanes
148 cuidado de las nostras personas
149 nos dessen la muerte a todos
150 temia yo por la vida de su paternida fray Andres i la de fray Antonio
151 i la vida de los diez sacrisstanes fieles Tipues
152 de la mesma vida mia la ultima vela de la noche la luz de Dios nos alumbro
154 se me zerene muy mucho sus paternidades
155 mi plaza de onor el sueño
156 los indios tiupes en el rincon de la cassa
157 estos no durmieron **toda la aquella noche**
158 su dialecto maia
159 con un temor su chilla la becindad de los indios chacanes
160 el dia
161 una mui grande grita por todas partes
162 fray Andres de Abendaño i fray Antonio
163 de las camasstros de varas
164 salimos los tres
165 a la puerta de la choza alzando la vista
166 por elado (el lado) el sol una mui grande malleta de canoas todas eyas adornadas
170 el Rei de los izaes que es el Señor Canek que quiere dezir la estreya veinte serpiente
172 todos los qu se estan en el pueblo de chacan
173 a la ribora de la laguna

[1]Only NPs marked with a definite article of possessive pronoun are shown. Bold type indicates those phrases with both article and demonstrative; underscoring marks those with article and possessive pronoun.