

# ***San Simón: God Passing Boundaries***

## **Ethnic Identities and Boundary Dynamics in “Contact Zone” of Post-colonial Guatemala**

Michiyo Sasao

### Introduction

There is a folk saint widely revered among the indigenous Mayan population (*Indígenas*) and the lower class *Ladino* population in the regions surrounding the southwestern highlands of today's Guatemala. This article is an attempt to interpret the worship and rituals centering around the sacred effigy of this folk saint, called *Maximón* a.k.a. *San Simón*, in connection with the dynamics of ethnic boundaries that still remain deep in post-colonial modern Guatemalan society.

The sections to follow describe an aspect of the “lived colonial experience” from which the *Maximón/San Simón* worship has developed in a “colonial situation/contact zone.”<sup>1</sup> In the course of the description, the author will re-examine the meanings that religious rituals can have in the religious creativity of peoples living in contact zones, and will re-consider the meanings of colonial-ness/modern-ness that continues to be reproduced in ongoing interactions in an age flooded with “post-colonial” or “post-modern” discourses.

The Modern Age was a time that saw a dramatic increase in human mobility on a global scale, and colonies were, first and foremost, interfaces where different peoples encountered and came in direct or indi-

rect contact with each other. In other words, colonies were contact zones.

This article refers to the modes of such contact generically as “colonial experience.” Of course, individual “colonial experiences” took diverse forms, and neither did the “superordinate” nor the “subordinate” constitute a monolithic existence in any colony. Macroscopic approaches to colonialism invariably tend to regard colonies as the means of political and economic domination and adhere to the dichotomy between the “superordinate” and the “subordinate.” Such dichotomist views may oversimplify the issue and obscure the complex and dynamic nature of the phenomenon.

This article attempts to apply the concept of “interactions among diverse actors” to the analysis of the colonial system in the microscopic context of individual interethnic contact situations.

### I *Indígenas* and *Ladinos*

Today’s Guatemala is one of the Latin American countries which have the highest proportions of “indigenous” population. It is obvious that Guatemalan society is characterized by the asymmetric division between two major ethnic groups. One is the indigenous “*Indígena*” (or “*Indio*”) population, which reportedly accounts for half to 60% of the entire national population, and the other is the mixed-blood “*Ladino*” population. It is also obvious that the generally agreed ethnic categories of *Indígenas* and *Ladinos* reflect the reality of Guatemalan society, and that the ethnic division involves intense conflicts or distinctive asymmetries. However, it is not all that clear what actually differentiates the two ethnic groups.

Etymologically, the word “*Ladino*” comes from Latino, *i.e.*, “Latin

people,” and it can be used as the opposite concept to “*Indio*,” namely, “West Indians” or “residents of *las Indias*.” The term “*Ladino*,” originally used to mean “white rulers,” departed from its original meaning and came to refer to those *Indigenas* who abandoned the indigenous languages and customs and assimilated themselves to Spanish cultural tradition during the colonial period. After four centuries of interracial mating, the word has now become almost synonymous to “Hispanic” (Central Americans of Spanish extraction) and equivalent to “*Mestizo*” in Mexico. Anyway, the word was originally used in association with the racial characteristics of white people, and it still remains so to some extent. However, “to what extent” remains unclear.

In reality, the *Ladino* population includes pure whites, half-white half-*Indios*, and pure *Indio*. Cultural anthropology pays more attention to differences in cultural lifestyles than such racial/biological traits and regards as *Ladinos* those people who have left egalitarian, homogeneous *Indio* communities to speak the Spanish language, wear Spanish or Western clothes, and adopt Westernized lifestyles. Meanwhile, the rapid increase in the proportion of Spanish-speaking *Indios* has already begun to introduce changes to their traditional lifestyles. Accordingly, such an approach only adds another ambiguous characterization of *Ladinos*. To eliminate the possibility of inaccurate characterization, “*Ladinos*” must be defined as “non-*Indios*.” In fact, this is the most frequently used definition of the word. However, this definition regards *Ladinos* as a residual category. The real *Ladino* society consists of clear-cut strata of social classes; the definition of *Ladino* as “non-*Indio*” just obscures the reality of such stratification. In a broad categorization, *Ladinos* can be classified into: (1) “State *Ladinos*” who own plantations or large enterprises and maintain and run the oligarchic state machinery in Guatemala; (2) “Urban *Ladinos*” who are provincial city dwellers working in bureaucra-

cies, or as legal, medical or educational professionals, or as provincial-level entrepreneurs; and (3) “Rural *Ladinos*” who generally live at the same level of poverty as *Indios* and are engaged primarily in agriculture or running small shops in rural areas surrounding provincial cities<sup>2</sup>. Some researchers make more detailed breakdowns of the Ladino population into: (1) cosmopolitan; (2) provincial upper class; (3) new middle class; (4) independent farmers; (5) migratory agricultural workers; (6) sedentary agricultural workers; and (7) urban workers<sup>3</sup>.

As will be seen later, the internal structural diversity of the Ladino population is characterized by a relatively high social permeability, especially, between the lower “agricultural/urban working class” Ladinos and *Indios*. Therefore, this socio-structural diversity is a very important subject of inquiry to understand the multiplicity and loose cohesiveness of the socio-ethnic boundaries between Ladinos and *Indios* in Guatemalan society.

Finally, another issue naturally arises in association with the definition of Ladinos as “*non-Indios*.” This definition of Ladinos presupposes the definition of *Indios*. However, it is unclear what makes “*Indios*” *Indios*.

Contrary to the indecisiveness of external observers on the definitions of the two ethnic groups, national census data provides a clear picture of how the Guatemalan people assess their own “ethnicities” (more than half of the entire population answered that they are *Indios*). As pointed out by Nora England, ethnic identity depends ultimately on “self-definition,” which may be “based on languages,” though<sup>4</sup>.

Nevertheless, the contrast between the solid perception that Ladinos and *Indios* are ethnic opposites of each other and the uncertainty included in the actual definitions of the two reflects the fact that the ethnicities at issue here are each defined by the other. Ladinos are defined

in relation to Indios, and *vice versa*. In this respect, the “Inverse Image” metaphor by Hawkins<sup>5</sup> is an adept description of the ethnic situation in Guatemala. Whatever the case may be, what can be ascertained by the tautology that a non-Indio is a *Ladino* and a non-*Ladino* is an Indio is the fact that there exists a “boundary” between the two.

## II Ethnic Boundaries

It was Fredrik Barth that first argued for paying attention to “boundaries” in ethnicity studies<sup>6</sup>. Barth pointed out that an approach to the study of ethnicity which focuses on “common attributes of groups” –such as race, language, history, religion, lifestyle, or value –assumes the “existences” of autonomous and homogeneous groups, who may sometimes exist isolated from others, and hence obscures not only the relationships between groups but also the circumstances in which it appears as if groups exist because of the boundaries between them. Boundaries are formed because groups exist, but it is also true that groups exist because boundaries exist.

None of the ethnic attributes mentioned above such as race, language, or lifestyle serves as a decisive factor in defining the respective ethnicities of Guatemalan Indio and Ladino groups. However, a look at phenomena occurring at intergroup boundaries reveals that boundaries do not exist because of the paucity or absence of transboundary interactions, but rather that boundaries are maintained by close transboundary interactions in economic, political, and social dimensions. In other words, quite interestingly, any Guatemalan Indio can become a Ladino. Migration from the community of birth to an urban area and switching of languages, manners, customs, lifestyles, etc. allow Indios to *Ladinoize* themselves. Thus, the ethnic boundary between Guatemalan Indios and

Ladinos, categorical and fixed as it may seem, is considerably permeable and flexible. The so-called “passing,” or crossing boundaries, is readily possible. In fact, “passing” is a real aspect of Guatemalan society, covertly or overtly.

Shifts of focus to such questions as what kind of situations make which segment of the Indio population “pass,” or what keeps the majority of Indios from “passing,” which is supposedly easy to do, would reveal the basic characteristics of the multilayered, loosely knit Guatemalan ethnic boundaries as well as the image of the most marginal people on loosely knit boundaries.

The answer to the first question is that Indios can “pass” the highly ambiguous boundaries with lower class Ladinos, *i.e.*, agricultural and urban Ladino workers below independent farmers, whereas it is impossible for Indios to “pass” the boundaries with new middle class Ladinos.

As to the second question, the observation by Henning Siverts in his research on an Indio community in southwestern Mexico provides a suggestive answer. Siverts reported that Indios opt to keep their ethnic identity because they can at least retain the right of cultivation of communal lands as long as they are Indios. To put it differently, Indios prefer to play it safe, even if that option keeps them at the bottom of the social hierarchy and reduces their economic opportunities. This suggests how risky, costly, ill-defined, and dangerous for Indios the boundary that separates them from the adjacent and reachable domain of the lower class Ladinos can be<sup>7</sup>.

In Guatemala, there are several routes for “passing” or ethnic identity change. These routes include marriage of young Indios outside their communities, migration to plantations, participation in missionary activities, commercial activities, or military service. However, the major-

ity of the “passing” experiences of Indios occurred in the process of incorporation of the country into the modern capitalist economy after independence from Spain. From the end of the 19th century, a series of government-led political and economic restructurings promoted large-scale land ownership and forced-labor practices to facilitate the adaptation of the country to coffee-monocultural capitalism. Then, US capitalist monopolies came to virtually control Guatemalan society, politically and economically, through large-scale banana plantations and through the Pan-American Highway completed in the mid-1950s. All such processes deprived many Indígenas of access to communal lands and drove them out of their traditional communities, reducing them to landless, migratory agricultural workers. The group of lower class Ladinos or the so-called “new Ladinos” consisting of such displaced people no longer belong to Indígena groups, but remain nothing but Indios from the viewpoint of urban Ladinos and are at least sometimes regarded as Indios. They are denizens, so to speak, that walk on the thin boundary between Indios and Ladinos. Thus, quite a few of them have double identities, moving to and fro between Indio-ness and Ladino-ness.

Although much still remains to be researched and analyzed to answer the question of what makes Indios change their ethnic identity to Ladino, it is obvious that the question is inseparably linked with the issue of the definitions of self and others. What needs to be emphasized here is that the act of passing the boundary between lower class Ladinos and Indios at least in Guatemalan society is passers’ manipulative behavior. Put simply, Indios have options to become Ladinos or Ladino-like or to temporarily act Ladino, at least subjectively.

In this respect, the ethnic boundary, that is, ethnic dichotomy in Guatemala, cannot be defined directly by usual “objective” ethnic indicators such as language, race, religion, history, etc. Rather, such indica-

tors provide no more than a stock of “tools” for dichotomization. What matters is which “tool” the actor chooses as the distinctive ethnic signal visible to those both inside and outside the boundary. Junji Koizumi studied the boundaries of the *Mam* community and gave language, saint worship, costume, and ritual as examples of the distinctive ethnic signals. Koizumi writes about the importance of costume as follows:

When inseparably associated with the ethnic identity of community members and worn ‘all the time’ by both male and female members, nothing serves better than costumes to signal their ethnicity. Nothing would express as constantly, clearly, dichotomously without any agency as costumes that one is within the boundary. The signal is constantly sent to both *Indios* and *Ladinos* around the wearer. What is important about costumes is not the tradition associated with them but their distinctiveness.<sup>8</sup>

### III *Maximón/God of Indígena vs. San Simón/God of Ladinos*

The most distinctive characteristic of the socioeconomic structure of Guatemala is that the agricultural population accounts for as disproportionately high as 58.1% of the total population while accounting for only 25% of the GDP. This is considered attributable to uneven land distribution, coupled with numerous small-scale farmers and landless agricultural workers. Such small scale farmers are primarily *Indígenas* living in the southwestern highlands of the country and the lower class migratory *Ladino* workers living around the highlands. The highland region has as much as 60% of the entire national population, whereas the vast fertile lowlands on the Pacific coast are studded with middle- and large-

scale plantations owned by a small number of white planters or by U.S. capitalists. The most impoverished region in Guatemala with a high rate of unemployment and underemployment it may be, the southwestern highland region has a concentration of Indígena villages with a diverse and rich Mayan tradition. The region has seen the organized development of congregations called *Cofradías*, which are one of the institutions introduced from Spain during the Spanish colonial period. Today, the *Cofradías* fervently worship and enshrine the religious figures of the folk saint called *Maximón* or *San Simón*. Constant streams of Indígena and Ladino worshippers pay their homage to their deity to pray for healing, business prosperity, bountiful harvest, or reciprocal love. Religious practitioners keep incense and candles alight, and carry offerings of liquor and tobacco to the lips of the dolls.

The deity is called by different names such as *Ximon*, *Judas*, *Maximón*, or *San Simón*, depending on *Cofradías* (and individual worshippers). He is the most enigmatic and controversial deity (or folk saint) among the Mesoamerican deities. His appearance is quite a departure from those of Catholic Santos. Sometimes he is represented as a doll in the shape of a Spanish white man dressed in a dark suit or military uniform. Some other variations may include a human head-sized “package” or “bundle” of woven textile topped with a hat and sunglasses. Some effigies may consist of a wooden carved mask and a body dressed in a male costume of the indigenous people with a great number of scarves hanging down from the neck. The different names and physical forms of the deity reflect the diversity of the ethnic identities of the respective *Cofradías* (or individual worshippers) and that of their perception of the characteristics of the deity.

The broadest generalization available here is that the icons revered by Spanish-speaking Ladinos have the name of ‘*San Simón*’ and

wear a dark suit, a military uniform, a gala attire reminiscent of a Mexican mariachi band uniform, a white shirt paired with a tie, or some other costume associated with different occupations of Ladinos, whereas many of the icons worshipped by Indígenas, whose mother tongue is one of the 23 Mayan indigenous dialects in Guatemala, are known as '*Maximón*' and dressed in ethnic costumes of Indígena peasants. If costumes are, as explained above, inseparably associated with the ethnic identities of members of Guatemalan society, and therefore if costumes serve as the constant signals of group membership sent to both Indígenas and Ladinos, the physical features and costumes of *Maximón* and *San Simón* icons would be important differentiating factors. In other words, *Maximón* dressed in indigenous costume is the deity of Indígenas, and *San Simón* dressed in Ladino costume is the deity of Ladinos.

According to the generally accepted theory, *Maximón* was originally the name of the holy icon venerated exclusively by the *Tzuthil*-Mayan people of Santiago Atitlán (hereafter Santiago village) in the southwestern highlands since the colonial period or before. Later, the name spread to other Indígena villages in the latter half of the 20th century. The process of the dissemination of the name *Maximón* coincided with the time when Indígena communities that had remained more or less egalitarian, homogeneous, static, and autonomous since the colonial period were exposed to tremendous influences of the external world, such as the penetration of US monopolist capital and the extension of highway networks, and to the social turmoil caused by the sophistication of the political and economic systems. Such a wholesale social change rapidly increased the number of migratory agricultural and urban workers, *i.e.*, lower class Ladinos, hence causing the *Ladinoization* and popularization of *Maximón* as *San Simón* among Ladinos. According to Sanchez Ochoa, *Maximón/San Simón* worship spread from

Santiago village simultaneously with the extension of intercity highways<sup>9</sup>.

Then, exactly what kind of a deity is *Maximón/San Simón*? The complex nature of this deity may be attributable to the multiplicity of meanings and origins of the name *Maximón per se*.

A theory has it that the name *Maximón* is a blend of the name of the ancient Mayan God *Mam* and that of the Biblical *Simon*. Meanwhile, some researchers consider that the name means “Mr. Knotted” in the Greater *Quichean* language family including *Tzuthil* and *Cakchikel*. According to the latter theory, the name derives from the words “*ma*” (an honorific title for “señor” or “don” in Spanish (or Mr. in English)) and “*xim*” (“bind/tie” or “bundle/package”).

The meaning of “Mr. Knotted” is clearly a reference to the manner of construction of the *Maximón* effigy enshrined at *Cofradia Santa Cruz* in Santiago village. A typical *Maximón* effigy of Santiago village has a scarecrow-like body, which is said to be a “bundle” of straws with wooden sticks at the core, and a wooden carved masked head capped with two Stetson hats stacked one on top of the other. The neck connecting the two portions is wrapped around with a numerous number of scarves of different colors.

The reason for the somewhat vague description of the structure of the body portion is because no one except religious practitioners is allowed to see the original manner of construction of the body portion. Formerly, it was only on festive occasions such as the Holy Week and other special holidays that the head and the body portions were put back together. For the rest of the year, the body portion used to be hidden from public eyes and stored as a “bundle” wrapped in a “*petate*” mat in the sanctuary (attic), off-limits to anyone except male religious practitioners of the *Cofradia*, and only the head portion was exhibited on the

sacred chair in the assembly hall of the *Cofradia* for worshippers. Today, while the full-length figures of *Maximón* are placed visible to worshippers all the time, the esoteric ritual of “dismemberment” and “resurrection” of *Maximón* is held during the Holy Week of Easter, which is the occasion for dramatizing the death and resurrection of Christ.

The name meaning “Mr. Knotted” and the symbolism of the “bundle” in this “dismemberment” and “resurrection” ritual are the adaptive reproduction of the myth “*Popol Vuh*” handed down to the *Quiche-Mayan* people. Therefore, these are very important to understand the traits and archetypal form of *Maximón*.

Once upon a time, many moons ago, *Balam Quiche*, “the Grandfather and Father of People,” left the symbol of his being, the *Pizom-Gagal*, to his children surrounding his death bed, telling them “[T]his remembrance, which I leave you, shall be your power.” Its form was invisible because it was wrapped up and could not be unwrapped. So great was the glory of the bundle to his children that they never dared unwrap it and kept it wrapped and close to them. According to a footnote to the Spanish translation by Adrian Recinos, the bundle was the “symbol of power and majesty, the mysterious package which the servants of the temple guarded as a symbol of authority and sovereignty.”<sup>10</sup>

According to another legend, when the *Quiche* tribe was about to leave the East, the Great Father gave them a stone as a gift. This stone is said to have been a kind of obsidian traditionally worshipped by the *Cakchiquel* tribe as the symbol of sanctity. It is also said that Mexican *Indígena* tribes worshipped “bundles” made of mantles that belonged to deceased deities (ancestors) as the sacred symbols of God. Such a “bundle” is said to have contained several sticks, jadestones, a snake carcass, and jaguar fur. Even today, such obsidian stones, sticks, or clothes together with “bundles” are dedicated beside effigies of *Maximón/San Si-*

*món* as the symbols of sanctity and ethnic identity of Mayan Indígenas.

The *Maximón* ritual abounds in more aspects that vividly portray the world of the Quiche-Mayan mythology. For example, *Maximón* masks and bodies are carved out of wood called *Tz'ajtel*; *Maximón* figures are displayed publicly for only five days of the Holy Week (corresponding with the “Missing Five Days” of the Mayan Calendar); and *Maximón* figures are hung down on a pillar of a green leafy branch on Holy Wednesday (connotation of the Second Coming of the Creator told in the Creation Myth).

Moreover, *Maximón* is venerated as the “Lord of Looking Good” in Santiago village. This name not only has something to do with the fancy garb of the *Maximón* effigy but also suggests the sexuality of this deity. As to the creation of *Maximón*, Robert Carlsen explains as follows:

Sexuality is certainly part of *Maximón*'s creation, which according to the myth occurred in the primordial time again. The rain deities, called *nawals*, created him to watch over their unfaithful wives. Contrary to plan, *Maximón* displayed unbridled hypersexuality, forcing the *nawals* to break his neck to curb his behavior and power. *Maximón* nonetheless retained a capacity to transform into unworldly, beautiful women and men. Yet, should one succumb to *Maximón*'s sexual temptations, the price is insanity or death.<sup>11</sup>

Carlsen continues:

The ambivalent gender of *Maximón* reflects one of the god's more esoteric dimensions. Maya cosmology has long emphasized

binary opposition, including the world's never-ending transformation of male into female aspects, of dry into wet, and of life into death. As 'Lord of the Center,' Maximón occupies the space between opposites and is the power that attracts one to the other. This emphasizes *Maximón's* 'Judas' aspect, which devotees understand to be required for the resurrection of Jesus and therefore to the world's transformation of death into life –or dry season into rainy season. Sexuality also drives the lust for liquor, tobacco, and fancy clothes of this god of good times.<sup>12</sup>

Needless to say, the "Holy Week" ritual is originally the most important and dramatic Christian rite that reproduces the passion, crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ. Most of the attention of the people present at the ritual in Santiago village naturally goes to the performance and rendition of the dismemberment and resurrection of *Maximón*. The ritual unabashedly takes advantage of the time and occasion of the Holy Week to feature *Maximón* as something of a trickster that mimics and caricaturizes the death and resurrection of Christ, thus giving an impression as if *Maximón* is the star.

*Maximón* also appears in the Holy Week rituals of other regions with an important role. In the course of some such rituals, *Maximón* is seen to undergo transformation into Judas and get hung and sometimes set aflame, in front of the church building on Good Friday. This identification of *Maximón* and Judas is quite suggestive for the argument of this article. In Mesoamerica, Judas Iscariot is widely worshipped as a dual personification of two contradictory, ambivalent meanings. June Nash points out that Judas is identified with and accepted as Satan in Amatenago:

The Indians, with all the subtlety and intensity of the domi-

nated, have transmogrified the despised villain of the anti-Semitic Christian passion into an icon of their own oppressor, the Christian *ladino*.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, Judas is identified with *Ladinos*/non-Indians in Amatenago.<sup>14</sup> Be that *Maximón* or Judas, he is the personification of the anti-Catholic dimension. Through the sublimation of the enemy of orthodox Catholicism to their deity, the Mayan people have segregated themselves from the dominant ethnic group and maintained their ethnic identity.

During the colonial period, the dominant white colonizers imposed Spanish Catholicism on the Mayan Indígenas. In response, the indigenous people used some symbolic elements of the rulers' religion to cover up their own traditional faith. While doing so, their *Cofradías* creatively organized rituals to caricature the system of domination and prevent explosion of the pent-up public rage against oppression and exploitation. Thus, *Maximón* is the symbol of the religious autonomy and ethnic identity maintained and reproduced by the Mayan Indígenas. Undoubtedly, *Maximón* is the form of ambivalent acceptance of the Orthodox Catholicism by the Mayan indigenous people. To borrow the description by Carlsen: "[I]t is ironic that, insofar as indigenous cultures have survived in post-Conquest Mesoamerica, Judas (*Maximón*) has provided an element of salvation by constituting a buffer with the dominant non-indigenous sector."<sup>15</sup>

Quite suggestive is the fact that, since the 1950s on, the cult of *Maximón* has spread from Santiago village through other Indígena villages deep into the stratum of lower class Ladinos. In other words, *San Simón* is a deity that "occupies the space between opposites," that is, a lower class Ladino version of *Maximón*, who freely comes and goes

across boundaries. *San Simón* is a deity *Ladinoized* by lower class *Ladinos*, who are the most marginal people on the loosely knit ethnic boundaries of today's Guatemalan society.

As Catherine Albanese argues, “[R]eligions arose in the context of dealing with boundaries. .... it was that any exchanges conducted across these boundaries were stressful occasions and that people strengthened themselves for these exchanges through the use of ritual.”<sup>16</sup> There is no doubt that, for the people living in the stressful situations on the ethnic fringes of the modern Guatemalan society, today's *Maximón/San Simón* ritual is “a rite that would ease the passage across the ethnic boundaries in today's Guatemalan society.” It is in this context that *San Simón* appears as the “God Passing Boundaries,”<sup>17</sup> who obscures all the conceptual categories, such as ‘ethnicity’, ‘culture’, ‘religion’, or ‘God,’ constructed in modern European civilization and Christian culture.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The term “contact zone” originally comes from Mary Louis Pratt's book, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London and New York:Routledge, 1992,) in which she describes the “contact zone” as a place of tense interface of cultures. “The ‘contact zone’ is the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict...often within radically asymmetrical relations of power. By using the term contact, I aim to foreground the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters so easily ignored or suppressed by diffusionist accounts of conquest and domination.”(p.7.) David Carrasco, furthermore, extends Pratt's theoretical as-

sertion to argue the richness of the “contact zone” as analogy for the interpretive situation scholars of the history of religions in the Americas are surely in: referred to by Charles H. Long as the “New Arche” of Enlightenment/Colonialism. Long insists that the locus of our problem is the slash between the categories of primitive/civilized, proposing that this slash, this historical, hermeneutical space between the polarities of categories such as the primitive/civilized constitutes a “New Arche” for the study of religion in the Americas.

Carraso, David. “Jaguar Christians in the Contact Zone: Concealed Narratives in the Histories of Religions in the Americas” *Sekai no Minshu-Shukyo* [*Popular Religions in the World*] ed. Michio Araki: Minerva publishing Co. Ltd, 2002. pp.17–38.

Charles H. Long, *Significations: Signs, Symbols, and Images in the Interpretation of Religion*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

<sup>2</sup> Junji Koizumi, “Kyoukai wo Bunseki suru: Guatemala no Baai. [Analyzing boundaries: Guatemalan Cases]” *Minzoku no Deau Katachi* [*Forms of Contact between Ethnic Groups*]. Ed. Etsuko Kuroda. Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 1994. pp. 64–65.

<sup>3</sup> Mieko Sakurai, “Maya no Kami to Radino no Kami. [Mayan God and Ladino’s God]” *Henbo suru Shakai* [*Societies in Change*]. Eds. Hajime Moribe, Toshio Mizutani, and Masaru Oiwa, Kyoto: Minerva Publishing Co.Ltd., 1997. pp.127–129.

<sup>4</sup> Nora England, “Lengua y definición étnica entre los mayas de Guatemala,” *Mesoamérica*. Vol. 22, 1991.

<sup>5</sup> John Hawkins, *Inverse Images: The Meaning of Culture, Ethnicity, and Family in Post-Colonial Guatemala*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.

<sup>6</sup> Fredrik Barth, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1969.

<sup>7</sup> Henning Shiverts, "Ethnic Stability and Boundary Dynamics in Southern Mexico." Ed. Barth, F., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, op. cit. 1969. pp.101–116.

<sup>8</sup> Junji Koizumi, op. cit., pp.68–69

<sup>9</sup> Sanchiz P. Ochoa, "Sincretismos de ida y vuelta: el culto de San Simón en Guatemala. [Two–Way Syncretism: The Cult of San Simón in Guatemala]" *Mesoamerica*, No. 26, 1993. pp.253–266.

<sup>10</sup> *Popol Vuh*, original trans. and notes by Adrian Recinos. Trans into Japanese by Eikichi Hayashiya, Chuko–bunko, 1977. pp.172 – 173, pp.233–234.

<sup>11</sup> Robert S. Carlsen, "Maximón," *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures. Vol. 2.* Ed. In Chief, David Carrasco. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. P.180.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.180–181.

<sup>13</sup> June Nash, "Judas Transformed." *Natural History* 103(3), 1994. pp.47–52.

<sup>14</sup> June Nash, "The Passion Play in Maya Indian Communities." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 10(3), 1968. pp.318–327.

<sup>15</sup> Robert S. Carlsen, "Judas" *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures. Vol. 2.* Ed. In Chief, David Carrasco. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. P.78.

<sup>16</sup> Catherine L. Albanese, *America: Religions and Religion.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992. pp.4–5.