

Grammatical Parallelism in Quiche Ritual Language

Author(s): William M. Norman

*Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (1980), pp. 387-399

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

---

*The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

## GRAMMATICAL PARALLELISM IN QUICHE RITUAL LANGUAGE

William M. Norman  
University of Pittsburgh

Verse differs from prose in that verse is normally built around regularly recurring formal units, while prose normally lacks this quality. On the phonological level, these regularly recurring units may be manifested as rhyme, alliteration, fixed patterns of tone or syllable quantity, etc. On the grammatical level, the recurrent structures characteristic of verse manifest themselves as parallels of form or meaning among different grammatical constructions. In China and Japan, grammatical parallelism has been extensively used as a major technique of versification, and the analysis and classification of types of grammatical parallelism has inspired a considerable body of native scholarship on the subject. Among western scholars, the study of grammatical parallelism was initiated by Bishop Robert Lowth, who in 1753 pointed out that parallelism on the grammatical level was the dominant stylistic feature of Hebrew poetry. Lowth defined parallelism as follows: "The correspondence of one verse or line with another, I call parallelism. When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it, or drawn under it, equivalent, or contrasted with it in sense, or similar to it in the form of grammatical construction, these I call parallel lines; and the words or phrases, answering one to another in the corresponding lines, parallel terms" (Gevirtz 1963:6). In this century, the union of poetics and linguistics forged by the Prague School has given rise to a number of studies of grammatical parallelism within different poetic traditions; notable among these are Roman Jakobson's programmatic studies of the grammar of poetry. As Jakobson observes (1966:399), the study of grammatical parallelism promises to shed light on significant issues in linguistic analysis: "Such traditional types of canonic parallelism offer us an insight into the various forms of relationship among the different aspects of language and answer the pertinent question: what kindred grammatical or phonological categories may function as equivalent within the given pattern? We can infer that such categories share a common denominator in the linguistic code of the respective speech community."

Among the Mayan communities of Mexico and Guatemala, verse forms based on pervasive grammatical parallelism are to be found in ceremonial speeches, oral history, songs, prayers, curing rituals, magical incantations, and dance dramas (for a survey of Tzotzil speech genres, see Gossen 1974; for a detailed treatment of parallel couplets in Ixil, see Townsend 1979). In the Quiché-speaking communities of Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán and Nahualá, Guatemala, a special form of speech, marked by extensive use of grammatically parallel couplets, is utilized in the rituals for petitioning a bride, initiating members of religious confraterni-

ties, and installing officials of the municipal government.<sup>1</sup> An excerpt from one such ritual, a marriage ceremony known as chupb'al q'aag' 'extinguishing the fire', is presented below:<sup>2</sup>

- 1      Jesus b'entiita alabaad santiis sakrameent,  
         Jesus blessed      exalted holy      sacrament  
         aanjl jandalawaard      aanjl chajineel,  
         angel guardian      angel guard  
                                     aanjl k'aak'alineel,  
                                     angel sentinel  
         nuDyoos chla7 chkaaj,  
         my-God      there in-heaven
- 5      waraal chwach uleew,  
         here on-earth  
         malaay intaat.  
         oh      my-father  
                     nunaan,  
                     my-mother
- Dyoos kuuk'a7n      sin aanimaa alaq,  
         God he-has-with-him emp. your-souls  
                     loq'chajin      sin aanimaa alaq,  
                     he-reverently-guards emp. your-souls
- 10      Aree k'u ri kamiik, mal k'u tyoox,  
         and-so the today so-thanks  
         karaj ne7 (x)sagirik,  
         perhaps it-got-light  
         karaj ne7 xpakataj jun saantalaj uwach uleew,  
                     it-dawned a holy world  
         xneek'aama chu7loq,  
         I-was-brought now-here  
         xneeyaaka chu7loq,  
         I-was-raised now-here
- 15      chwa ri nutz'aag,  
         before the my-wall  
         chwa ri nuk'axtuun,  
         before the my-fortress  
         chwii nub'iineem,  
         above my-walking  
         chwii nuchakaneem.  
         above my-crawling
- Aree k'wa7 xin-loq'-k'u-tewechi7j wiib',  
         And-so-now I-reverently-so-blessed myself  
                     xin-loq'-k'u-k'amowaj wiib'.  
                     I-reverently-so-thanked myself
- 20      Xink'am k'u loo wee kurusim b'eh,  
         I-brought so maybe this crossed road  
                     wee kurusim jook,  
         upam loo gaswaan,  
         its-interior maybe our-ravine  
         upam loo gatinamiit,  
         its-interior maybe our-town

- 25    xaa chwii loo    jun raqan alih,  
       just above maybe a    her-leg girl  
       xaa chwii loo    jun raqan alah,  
       just above maybe a    his-leg boy  
       xaa chwii loo    jun ooch',  
       just above maybe a    growing-ear-of-corn  
                               jun pakaay.  
                               a    pacaya

Ceremonial speeches such as this one are delivered by specialists known as k'amal b'eh 'guides' (literally 'bringer of the road'), ajb'eh, or ajtz'onolob, men who have held offices in the traditional cargo system and who have learned the ceremonial orations by apprenticing themselves for several years to a senior k'amal b'eh. The language of ceremonial rhetoric differs from everyday Quiché in a variety of ways. Ceremonial speech has a 'hypothetical' quality to it which results from using particles like loo 'maybe, probably' and karaj ne7 'perhaps' to qualify nearly every assertion. Ritual language preserves several archaic features of Quiché which have otherwise been lost: the use of the particle mi to mark recent past (attested in Quiché documents from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) and the incorporation of the adverb log 'reverently' into the verb word (cf. xin-log'-k'u-tewechi7j, line 19 above). But the most striking feature of Quiché ceremonial speech is its couplet structure: lines come in pairs, one word of the second line contrasting with the corresponding word of the first line. Above all else, this pervasive grammatical parallelism sets ritual language apart from ordinary discourse.

The object of this paper is to describe the grammar of parallelism in Quiché ritual language. This problem will be approached by considering two questions: 1) What are the well-formedness conditions for parallel constructions in Quiché? What types of terms may participate in parallel constructions, and in what configurations may these terms occur? 2) What must a k'amal b'eh add to his knowledge of ordinary Quiché in order to produce ritual speech?

In order to answer the first question, it will be helpful to consider some of the parameters along which parallelistic systems of versification may vary from one culture to another. Chinese Regulated Verse offers a particularly instructive example of parallelism in versification since its rules are quite strict and have been highly codified (cf. Chen 1979, Kao and Mei 1971, Liu 1962, T'sou 1968). In Regulated Verse, poems could consist of lines of either five or seven syllables, and corresponding syllable in adjacent lines had to contrast in tone. In a poem of eight lines, the four interior lines had to form two antithetical couplets (Liu 1962:147-148). Both lines of such a couplet had to have the same syntactic structure, with words of the same lexical class occupying corresponding positions in the paired



metal'. The following couplets from poems by Nezahualcoyotl (León-Portilla 1972:66-71) illustrate the manner in which such lexical pairs were employed:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 4) Tel ca <u>chalchiuitl</u> no xamani<br>no <u>teocuitlatl</u> in tlapani | 'If it is jade it shatters,<br>if it is gold it crumbles'         |
| 5) Ayac <u>chalchiuitl</u> ,<br>ayac <u>teocuitlatl</u> mocuepaz           | 'No one into jade, no one<br>into gold will transform<br>himself' |
| 6) ma nel <u>chalchiuitl</u> ,<br>ma nel <u>teocuitlatl</u>                | 'Even if you were jade,<br>even if you were gold'                 |

In Aztec poetry, it appears that paired lexical items normally bear the same grammatical relation within their respective clauses, although the paired clauses do not have to be syntactically identical in other respects (cf. example 5 above). In one respect, Aztec and Hebrew poetics represent the antithesis of Regulated Verse: the Chinese poetic tradition dictates strict syntactic parallelism between lines of a couplet, leaving the choice of lexical items relatively free, while Hebrew and Aztec versification prescribe the pairing of lexical items without imposing such strict requirements on syntactic parallelism. Thus parallelistic systems of versification may vary as to whether the basis of parallelism is primarily syntactic (Regulated Verse) or lexical (Aztec and Hebrew).

In addition to the syntactic/lexical dimension, there is a second parameter along which parallelistic systems may vary: the allowable configuration of sets of parallel terms relative to one another. In Regulated Verse, as a consequence of the prohibition against repeating a word of the first line in the second line of a couplet, other parallel terms always intervene between the first and second terms of any juxtaposed pair. If we let A stand for the first member of a pair of parallel terms and A' stand for the second member, then the canonical configuration of parallel terms in Regulated Verse would be (schematically) A B C D // A' B' C' D'. In Aztec poetry, A and A' may be separated by an element B of another pair, as in 4 above, where xamani, paired with tlapani, intervenes between chalchiuitl and teocuitlatl. Aztec permits the configuration A B // A' B', as well as A B // A B' as in 6. Permissible configurations in Hebrew are too numerous to list.

The purpose of this digression has been to enable us to place Quiché parallelism in the proper typological perspective. Aware of some of the ways parallelistic systems may differ, we will wish to ascertain the relative importance of syntactic versus lexical parallels in Quiché ritual language and to determine the permissible configurations of parallel terms. Even a cursory examination of Quiché ceremonial speech is sufficient to reveal three of its most salient characteristics. First, the same pairs of lexical items are repeated a number of times throughout the same text, e. g. b'eh, jook 'path, road', k'am yak 'bring, raise', tz'aag k'axtuun 'wall, fortress', b'iineem chakaneem 'walking,

crawling'. In most cases, the relative order of the paired terms is invariant. For instance, in lines 23-24 above, swaan 'ravine' is paired with tinamit 'town'. When these terms are paired, the order is always swaan tinamit, never \*tinamit swaan. Nor does one find \*k'axtuun tz'aaq for tz'aaq k'axtuun, or \*chakaneem b'iineem for b'iineem chakaneem. Furthermore, the majority of lexical pairs have a metaphorical or idiomatic meaning, some of which are illustrated in Table I.

Table I. Metaphorical interpretations of lexical pairs<sup>3</sup>

<u>Paired terms</u>	<u>Literal</u>	<u>Metaphorical</u>
juyub' taq'aa	mountain, plain	country
aqan q'ab'	foot, hand	person
b'iineem chakaneem	walking, crawling	daily activities
tz'aaq k'axtuun	wall, fortress	home
b'eh jook	road, path	destiny
eeqa7n pataal	load, burden	family of groom
ooch' pakaay	corn ear, pacaya	single boy and girl
loq'oneel mayijaneel	esteemer, worshipper	in-laws
k'am yak	bring, raise	hire a <u>k'amal</u> <u>b'eh</u>

There are some words which only occur as part of a lexical pair; thus k'axtuun only occurs in the pair tz'aaq k'axtuun, pataal occurs only in combination with eeqa7n, and mayijaneel must be paired with either loq'oneel or ch'uteneel 'consoler'. These characteristics make it clear that Quiché versification resembles Aztec and Hebrew in the use of conventionally paired terms.

Paired lexical items are subject to the further restriction that both members of the pair must belong to the same lexical category: nouns must be paired with nouns, adjectives with adjectives, and so forth. In the case of verbs, transitive verbs must be paired with transitive verbs, intransitives with other intransitives. Not all word types are to be found in lexical pairs. Word types which may participate in lexical pairs are nouns, adjectives, verbs (transitive and intransitive), adverbs, numbers, relational nouns, and positionals.<sup>4</sup> Word types which cannot participate in lexical pairs include prepositions, directionals, sentence connectives, pronouns, deictics, epistemic particles, and other minor word classes. The division between those lexical categories which can participate in stock pairs and those which cannot corresponds to a distinction between content words and function words: only content words of the same class can be terms of a lexical pair.

As is the case in Chinese, Hebrew, and Aztec versification, parallel terms in Quiché must belong to the same semantic category, that is, they must share a number of semantic components. In Regulated Verse, antithesis is the preferred mode of semantic relationship in parallel terms, while the stock pairs of Hebrew appear to consist largely of (near) synonyms. Quiché lexical pairs exhibit a wide range of semantic relationships, of which

we will present only a sample (cf. Townsend 1979 for a more exhaustive treatment of semantic relations in Ixil couplets). In many instances, the parallel terms of a lexical pair comprise polar opposites, e. g. q'iiij aq'ab' 'day, night', jujub' tag'aaaj 'mountain, plain', agan g'ab' 'foot, hand'. In other cases, members of a pair differ with respect to a single semantic component without being antonyms, e. g. nuumik chagijchi7 'hunger, thirst', choh poloh 'lake, ocean'. Synonyms or near synonyms are also frequent: b'eh jook 'road, path', chajineel k'aak'alineel 'guard, sentinel'. Other terms are semantically related by virtue of contiguity: q'aag' xk'uub' 'fire, trivet (cooking stones on which pots are placed)', swaan tinamit 'ravine, town' (tinamit earlier referred to fortified towns surrounded by ravines). In the case of numbers, if the first term is X, the second term is X+1, e. g. jumejaaaj kaamejaaaj 'one act of kneeling, two acts of kneeling', a pattern also found in Hebrew poetry (Gevirtz 1963:18ff.). Finally, there is a kind of pseudo-parallelism employed when listing entities which belong to semantic classes with a large number of members, such as trees, plants, animals, or tools. Here the pair is formed by repeating the name of the entity, preposing the adjective q'ana 'golden' to the first occurrence and preposing saga 'silver' to the second, e. g. q'ana siijah, saga siijah, q'aniipuum, sagiipuum 'golden cowbird, silver cowbird, golden Inca dove, silver Inca dove'.

A second salient characteristic of Quiché ceremonial speech is that paired lexical items must appear in the same syntactic environment. Both members of the pair must bear the same syntactic relation in their respective clauses, and there must be word-for-word identity between the other lexical items occupying corresponding syntactic positions in the two clauses. For instance, in the couplet karaj ne7 xqayaa nee ri b'iis, karaj ne7 xqayaa nee ri oq'eej 'perhaps we caused sadness, perhaps we caused crying', the paired terms b'iis and oq'eej are both direct objects, and the other syntactic slots common to the two clauses are filled by identical lexical items. The same pattern may be noted in the sample text above at lines 13-18 and 21-26. Not all the lexical material which appears in association with one term must be repeated with the other term, a fact which may be confirmed by a comparison of lines 25-26 with 27-28. Couplets whose lines differ in their lexical composition at more than one point are ill-formed.

In the discussion above it was observed that parallelistic systems of versification may differ in respect to the allowable configurations of parallel terms. In Quiché there is only one possible pattern for the occurrence of several sets of paired terms: A // A', B // B', C // C', as for example in lines 13-18 (xneek'aama . . . // xneeyaaka . . . , . . . nutz'aag // . . . nuk'axtuun, . . . nub'ilineem // . . . nuchakaneem). To put it somewhat differently, between the first and second members of a pair A A', there may not appear a term belonging to another lexical pair. Thus configurations such as \* A B // A' B' or \* A B B' // A' are not permissible in Quiché.



A rather remarkable fact about Quiché ritual speech is that grammatical parallelism does not stop at the level of the word but applies to the internal morphological structure of paired terms as well as to the syntactic constructions in which they occur. That is, if A and A' are paired terms, then if there is a morphologically complex pair A+X A'+Y which contains A and A', X and Y must be identical.<sup>5</sup> As an example we may take the pair k'am yak 'bring, raise' which occurs at lines 13-14 in the morphologically complex form xneek'aama . . . // xneeyaaka . . . The morphological structure of xneek'aama is x-n-ee-k'ahm-a completive aspect-1 sg./absolutive-GO-BRING/passive-imperative (the passive of monosyllabic transitive verbs is formed by infixing a morphophonemic H which is realized on the surface as vowel length, ee is the incorporating form of the verb b'ee 'to go'). x-n-ee-yaHk-a has the identical internal structure. Since in this case the identity of structure applies only to inflectional affixes, it may not seem really all that remarkable: as we have already stated, parallel terms occur in the same syntactic position, and if inflectional morphology is generated by rules which mark a word for features which occur in its syntactic environment, then one could perhaps predict this fact from what is already known. But identity of internal structure applies to derivational morphology as well as to inflectional morphology. For example, the nouns b'eh jook 'road, path' (cf. lines 21-22) form the bases of the derived nouns b'e7-aal jook-aal and of the intransitive verbs b'e7-an jook-an; the pair of nouns chii7 wach 'side, front' form the derived verbs chi7-n wach-in and the derived nouns chi7-b'al wach-ib'al. In the foregoing examples the corresponding derivational affixes happen to have the same phonemic shape, but this need not always be the case. The nouns chaak pataan 'work, service' form the derived transitive stems chak-u patan-i; the nouns kik' kuma7j 'blood, coagulated blood' form the abstract nouns kik'-eel kuma7j-iil. -u and -i are lexically conditioned allomorphs of the same morpheme, as are -eel and -iil. In the case of paired terms where one term has undergone reduplication, the other term must have undergone the same type of reduplication: rem-el tik'-il 'spread out, standing up' (-V<sub>1</sub>l reduplication), luk-lut pach-pat 'bow, stoop' (-C<sub>1</sub>at, with subsequent vowel assimilation), jet-et may-ay 'approach, go haltingly' (-V<sub>1</sub>C<sub>1</sub>l).

At this point we can summarize the well-formedness conditions on parallel constructions in Quiché: 1) Parallel terms must be content words, and they must belong to the same lexical class. 2) Parallel terms must share a number of semantic components. 3) Both terms of a pair must appear in the same syntactic frame. 4) No member of one pair can intervene between the first and second members of another pair. 5) Paired terms which are derived from more basic paired terms must have identical derivational affixes.

The final issue to be addressed here is the following: what must a k'amal b'eh learn (in addition to his knowledge of normal

Quiché) to be able to produce ceremonial rhetoric which conforms to the well-formedness conditions above? Clearly the k'amal b'eh must memorize the stock lexical pairs and their metaphorical interpretations, or at least the contexts in which they are appropriate. But how does the k'amal b'eh ensure that paired terms always appear in the same syntactic environment, without being separated by any term of another pair? An answer to this question is suggested by an examination of stylistic options in ritual speech.

A k'amal b'eh may present couplets in either an expanded or a condensed form, with several intermediate stages between the most expanded and the most condensed style. The examples below illustrate various degrees of condensation.

- (7) kayojlin k'u loo pa ri awas chee7  
kayojlin k'u loo pa ri awas k'a7aam  
'It echoes in the forbidden tree, it echoes in the forbidden  
vine'
- (8) je7l b'aa loo kayojlin ruuch'aab'al  
                                utzijob'al     pa ri awas chee7  
   pa ri awas k'a7aam  
'Its voice, its speech echoes wonderfully in the forbidden  
tree, in the forbidden vine'
- (9) xuq kawajlin loo pa ri awas chee7  
                                awas k'a7aam  
'It also echoes in the forbidden tree, forbidden vine'

In the most expanded style, represented in 7, everything to the left of awas chee7 as far as the beginning of the sentence is repeated on the left of awas k'a7aam. In the most condensed style, shown in 9, the second term of the pair immediately follows the first, with no intervening elements. (awas 'forbidden' is an obligatory part of the stock pair; chee7 k'a7aam by itself does not occur as a lexical pair.) In 8, awas chee7 occurs in a prepositional phrase preceded by the preposition pa and the definite article ri. Only the lexical items belonging to the prepositional phrase are repeated on the left of awas k'a7aam.

Since stock lexical pairs have an idiomatic semantic interpretation, it would be reasonable to suppose that, like idioms, they constitute complex lexemes: single dictionary entries which consist of more than one grammatical or phonological word. Let us suppose that a k'amal b'eh learns to treat awas chee7 awas k'a7aam as a single lexical item which contains two words. Since awas chee7 and awas k'a7aam are part of the same lexical item, they are inserted into sentences as a unit. Now suppose that the k'amal b'eh learns a repetition strategy such as 10:

- (10) Leftward repetition: Repeat on the left of A' those elements to the left of A. In copying leftward, you may stop at any constituent boundary, or you must stop if you reach the beginning of the sentence or a member of another lexical pair.

A sentence such as 7 would be produced by applying this repetition strategy to a structure such as 11:

- (11) [<sub>S</sub> [<sub>VC</sub> kayojlin k'u loo ]<sub>VC</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> pa [<sub>NP</sub> ri  
 N  
 N<sub>1</sub> N<sub>2</sub>  
 awas chee7 awas k'a7aam ]<sub>NP</sub> ]<sub>PP</sub> ]<sub>S</sub>

In 11, VC designates the verb complex, a surface constituent which consists of the verb word plus other words which either depend on the verb or which customarily occur in conjunction with verbs--this will be treated in more detail below. Sentence 7 could be produced by applying the most expanded option of the repetition strategy. The other options permitted by the leftward repetition strategy would lead to 12, 13, and 14.

- (12) kayojlin k'u loo pa ri awas chee7  
   awas k'a7aam  
 (13) kayojlin k'u loo pa ri awas chee7  
   ri awas k'a7aam  
 (14) kayojlin k'u loo pa ri awas chee7  
   pa ri awas k'a7aam

If the k'amal b'eh used such a repetition strategy, his speech would automatically conform to several of the well-formedness conditions observed above. The fact that a lexical pair is treated as a single complex lexeme would automatically have the consequence that both members of the pair would appear in the same syntactic environment. The repetition rule would automatically result in verbatim identity between the two lines of a couplet at every point but one. It would also automatically result in couplets where no member of one pair intervened between the first and second members of another pair. Furthermore, the repetition strategy would account for another fact about Quiché ritual speech: in couplets which have paired nouns, the lexical material which appears to the left of A' must be a subset of the material which appears to the left of A.

The repetition strategy in 10 will not account for the fact that in the case of paired verbs, words on the right of A may be repeated on the right of A', as in lines 13-14 above, which for ease of reference we repeat below:

- (15) xneek'aama chu7loq,  
       xneeyaaka chu7loq

In 15, chu7loq is a contraction of chi 'now' and ulog 'this way'. chi is a particle which occurs postposed to predicates; ulog is a so-called directional adverb which occurs as a modifier of verbs. Both of these words belong to the verb complex, which can also include auxiliary verbs, reflexive pronouns, second-person formal pronouns, deictic particles, and clitics of various sorts. It

appears that it is not possible to repeat just one element of the verb complex without repeating all the elements. Therefore a separate repetition rule is needed to account for the behavior of verbs:

- (16) Verb complex repetition: If A and A' are verbs, then repeat to the right of A all elements of the verb complex which occur to the right of A'.

This rule would account, for example, for the occurrence of the reflexive pronoun wiib' 'myself' to the right of both verbs in lines 19-20. These two rules appear to be sufficient to account for most of the well-formedness conditions of ritual speech.

Viewing Quiché ritual language as the result of a special vocabulary plus two simple repetition rules leads to a consideration of two interesting questions. First, we have been treating ceremonial speech as a kind of linguistic game, like pig Latin or other codes. If ritual speech is indeed like a linguistic game, then it should be possible to produce ritual speech by adding a few rules to ordinary Quiché. Furthermore we would expect these rules to operate at a fairly superficial level. In the case of ritual language in Quiché, there so far does not appear to exist any evidence that the special rules of ritual language do not operate on a surface level of syntactic representation. Secondly, at the outset of our discussion of Quiché, we considered several aspects of typological variation in the use of grammatical parallelism in versification. If one considers only surface patterning, then Quiché versification seems to lie between Regulated Verse and the Aztec and Hebrew systems: like Regulated Verse, Quiché parallelism must conform to strict syntactic requirements, but like Aztec and Hebrew, it utilizes traditionally prescribed lexical pairs. If one considers the rules of production, however, then the similarity between Quiché and Chinese versification vanishes. Syntactic parallelism is a fundamental condition of Regulated Verse, while Quiché ritual language is basically a lexical pair system like Aztec or Hebrew, with a few additional rules.

The primary purpose of this paper has been to describe the use of grammatical parallelism in Quiché ritual. In the process we have raised some issues which go beyond more narrowly descriptive interests: the possibility of a typology of parallelistic versification and the principles upon which such a typology might be based.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>I would like to express my gratitude to the Quiché linguists at the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquín for collecting the ritual language texts and to the k'amal b'eh of Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. This research was supported by a

National Science Foundation grant to the State University of New York at Albany.

<sup>2</sup>This paper employs a Spanish-based practical orthography for Quiché. Symbols have their customary values except for the following: x = [ʃ], j = [x], ʔ = [ʔ] (glottal stop), VV = long vowel.

<sup>3</sup>The metaphorical interpretations were supplied by two k'amal b'eh. Their interpretations did not always agree, and they were not able to interpret all the lexical pairs. Adult speakers of Quiché know the approximate meaning of the most common pairs, but most of the pairs are too esoteric for non-specialists to gloss. Quiché speakers differ in this respect from speakers of Tzotzil, among whom knowledge of the metaphors appears to be more widespread (Robert M. Laughlin, personal communication).

<sup>4</sup>Relational nouns and positionals are both word classes peculiar to Mayan languages.

<sup>5</sup>There is one exception to this claim. An intransitive verb or a monosyllabic transitive verb takes an obligatory clause-final suffix when no word follows it in the same clause. Thus if A and A' are verbs of either of these types, and A is at the end of its clause, then A will have a clause-final suffix while A' will not. An example of this is (x)sagir-ik at line 11 (-ik is the intransitive clause-final suffix).

#### REFERENCES

- Chen, Matthew Y. 1979. Metrical structure: evidence from Chinese poetry. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:371-420.
- Gevirtz, Stanley. 1963. *Patterns in the early poetry of Israel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gossen, Gary H. 1974. *Chamulas in the world of the sun: time and space in a Maya oral tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1966. Grammatical parallelism and its Russian facet. *Language* 42:399-429.
- Kao, Yu-kung and Tsu-lin Mei. 1971. Syntax, diction, and imagery in T'ang poetry. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 31:49-136.
- León-Portilla, Miguel. 1972. *Nezahualcōyotl. Poesía y pensamiento*. Texcoco, Mexico: Gobierno del Estado de México.
- Liu, James J. Y. *The art of Chinese poetry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Townsend, Paul G. 1979. Couplets in Ixil Maya poetic genre.  
Paper presented at the International Congress of Americanists,  
Vancouver.
- T'sou, Benjamin K. 1968. Some aspects of linguistic parallelism  
and Chinese versification, in *Studies presented to Professor  
Roman Jakobson by his students*, ed. by Charles E. Gribble.  
Cambridge: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Yoder, Perry B. 1972. *Biblical Hebrew, in Versification. Major  
language types*, ed. by W. K. Wimsatt. New York: New York  
University Press.