

THE MAYAN FRANCISCAN VOCABULARIES:  
A PRELIMINARY SURVEY

David Bolles

The publication by UNAM of the two most important Yucatec Mayan vocabularies, namely the *Bocabulario de Maya Than / Viena* (1993) and the *Calepino Maya de Motul* (1984),<sup>1</sup> has brought renewed attention to this important window into the past of the Yucatec Maya. Because both of these works are more than just mere compilation of words, but rather give numerous examples of usage in sentences to illustrate the meaning of words, we can deduce many things about life in Yucatan at the time these vocabularies were written.

More recently, these and other contemporary vocabularies, grammars, liturgical works, and Mayan texts have become available on the computer. We are thus able to more easily search for and find like or similar passages in these works, and make some comments about these works which formerly would have been difficult to substantiate.

The list of available Franciscan Maya-Spanish and Spanish-Maya vocabularies, given in what seems to be the chronological order of their respective composition, is as follows:<sup>2</sup>

- 1) *Bocabulario de Maya Than / Viena* (Spanish-Maya), c. 1570's; author unknown, original missing, extant copy dated c. 1730's.
- 2) *Calepino Maya de Motul* (Maya-Spanish), c. 1580-1614; Fr. Antonio de Ciudad Real.
- 3, 4, 5) *Solana / Diccionario de Motul II* (Spanish-Maya) / *San Francisco Dictionary* (Spanish-Maya); attributed to Fr. Alonso de Solana (died in 1600 or 1601); attributed date, 1580.
- 6) *San Francisco Dictionary* (Maya-Spanish) (date and author unknown).
- 7) *Diccionario de Ticul* (Spanish-Maya), 1690; author unknown.

Added to this list, but unfortunately missing, is the lexicographical opus by fray Gabriel de San Buenaventura. This work is said to have been comprised of both a Maya-Spanish and a Spanish-Maya dictionary, each of them very extensive and probably made up of items from the *Vienna* and the *Calepino* mentioned above, and perhaps from the *Solana*. When writing his *Arte* in the early 1740's, Beltrán had San Buenaventura's material at his disposal and made specific references to it.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A transcription of this work by Ramón Arzápalo Marín as editor was published in 1995. A more recent highly annotated transcription was published by René Acuña in 2001.

<sup>2</sup>It is important to point out that the very first vocabularies of any given Indian language were always Spanish-Indian. The reason is that all of the Colonial lexicographers used the Spanish-Latin dictionary by Antonio de Nebrija (1492) which conveniently provided an alphabetical listing of Spanish words.

<sup>3</sup>See for example Beltrán, 1746:13: 50. Y aunque el R. P. [Fr. Gabriel] fue Autor primero

## The *Bocabulario de Maya Than / Viena*<sup>4</sup>

The *Bocabulario de Maya Than / Viena* is available to us in its present state only in a mid-18th century copy, and a very poor copy at that. There are errors not only in the Mayan glosses, something which could be explained by the fact that various copyists were involved in making the copy of the *Vienna*, but there are errors also in the Spanish entries, which shows a general lack of knowledge or care in making the *Vienna* copy. Incidentally, it should be noted that there is a rather inaccurate copy of material on folios 72-73 of the *Vienna* to be found on folios 83-84 of the *Motul II* Spanish-Mayan, written by an intrusive hand.

While there is no direct evidence that the *Vienna* is the earliest of the Franciscan dictionaries, there are various indications that this is in fact the case. First and foremost, while the other dictionaries mention information supplied by a grammar, called “*el Arte*”, the *Vienna* makes no such mention of “*el Arte*”.<sup>5</sup> Aside from this, it has long been known that the *Vienna* and the *Calepino* share much of the same information. There has been much discussion as to which dictionary came first, and thus which supplied the other with material. However, while René Acuña and I were working on the liturgical work published in 1620 by Fr. Juan Coronel, which, as Coronel states in his introduction to this work, is based on work done by “los padres antiguos”, we have come across several examples of phrases given in Coronel which are used as illustrative examples of usage in the *Vienna*. In one case in particular, this example is blatantly altered in the *Calepino*, leading to the conclusion that the *Calepino* example is derived from the *Vienna*.<sup>6</sup>

---

del Arte, y aun de algunos vocablos que faltaban al Idioma; pero el primero que hallò las letras de la lengua Maya, è hizo el computo de los años, meses, y edades, y lo enseño todo à los Indios de esta Provincia, fue un Indio llamado **Kinchahau**, y por otro nombre **Tzamna**. Noticia que debemos à dicho R. F[r]. Gabriel, y trae en su *Calepino*, lit. K, Verb. **Kinchahau**, fol. 390, vult. mas no dice como adquirio este Indio tal Idioma: y de aqui se infiere que el Idioma de esta Provincia era otro, y muy distinto.

<sup>4</sup>It is Acuña’s opinion that this *Bocabulario* was originally written mainly in the Franciscan convent of Maní. Personal communication.

<sup>5</sup>Landa’s letter of 1578 quoted below states that there were no existing *Artes* at the time. This contradicts Lizana’s assertion that an “*Arte*” was put together by Luis de Villalpando (Lizana, 1995:71) and perfected by Landa (Lizana, 1995:170). It is presumable, then, that the *Arte* mentioned in the *Calepino Maya de Motul* (221v, 225v) was that written by Gaspar González de Nájera in the early 1580’s. See below.

<sup>6</sup>Coronel 1620a:190r: ca v lapah vba Iudio huntul ichil Christianosob, tu mucul muculil cuchi, vchebal yilic v nuucul v kuil thanob,

BMTV: Çeremonias, como de misa y coro: kuil than. ¶ Mesclóse un judío entre los christianos desimuladamente, para ber las ceremonias que tenían: v lapah uba judio huntul ychil christianob ti mucul muculil, vchebal yilic v nuucul v kuil thanob cuchi.

CMM: Lap.ah.ab: encaxar, meter o entremeter, poner y mezclar vna cosa entre otras, y esconderla assi.... ¶ v lapah v paalil ychil v paalil cristianoob: mezclo o metio su muchacho y entremetiole entre los de los cristianos.

When the question regarding as to who was the author of the *Vienna* arises, the available answers are very hazy. According to Lizana's account (1995:223), the Spanish Franciscan friars had written before the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century "muchos sermonarios y vocabularios"; but, when he gives specifics on this point he mentions only three authors: Luis de Villalpando, Alonso de Solana, and Antonio de Ciudad Real (*op. cit.*: 150, 228-229, 242-244). Whatever trust Lizana's assertions may claim to deserve, these are clouded by bishop Landa's report to the Inquisition in January 19, 1578:

En esta tierra no se a hasta aora traduzido en la lengua de los naturales cossa alguna de la Sagrada Scriptura, ni tienen en la lengua más de una Doctrina Christiana que yo hize ymprimir en essa ciudad [de México] estando en ella, y también algunos sermones de mano en la mesma lengua, no ympressos. Y de éstos, porque e yo hallado algunas cossas que me an descontentado en algunos, abía ya días que los andaba haziendo recoxer para examinarlos y ver si tienen qué les quitar. Y, en lo que toca en lo que se a de advertir a los ministros, guardaremos todos el orden que se nos diere, porque el que por acá aora ay es predicar cada uno conforme a las fuerzas que en la lengua y en la suficiencia tiene. Libros, y cosas prohibidas, con mucho cuydado se a<n> quitado a todos siempre.<sup>7</sup>

The alleged existence of a Mayan vocabulary by Luis de Villalpando is hardly admissible. He arrived to Campeche in 1546. In the Franciscan Chapter of September, 1549, he was elected Custodian and sent to serve the guardianship at Conkal. By 1552 he had passed away.<sup>8</sup> It seems hardly likely that he had time to write such an extensive work as the *Vienna* dictionary. Taking these factors into consideration concerning the candidates for the *Vienna's* authorship, we are seemingly restricted to the two other friars mentioned by Lizana as authors of vocabularies: Alonso de Solana and Antonio de Ciudad Real. However, both of them are also unlikely candidates. Ciudad Real authored the *Calepino Maya de Motul* and Solana is the claimed author of a Mayan dictionary whose manuscript is actually held by the Hispanic Society of America. Is there, then, some other person who we could possibly name in our search for the author? Seemingly so.

In spite of the silence on this subject by the sources such as Lizana and Cogolludo in regard to his work, there is ample documentary evidence

---

<sup>7</sup>Landa's Documento Numero Cuatro in *Relación de las cosas de Yucatán* (1966:168). An interesting question may be, was Landa's report dealing with the entire bulk of Mayan manuscripts which possibly existed at the time? For an approximate answer, it is advisable to read Viana's report on similar matters addressed to Maestro Bermejo in September 18, 1577 (AGNM, Inquisición, vol. 83, exp. 24, fols. 305-306).

<sup>8</sup>López de Cogolludo (1957:269, 343).

attesting to the fact that Fray Gaspar González de Nájera<sup>9</sup> wrote an *Arte* and a *Vocabulario de la lengua maya* before 1582. Furthermore, he got the Royal approval for publishing them in New Spain, as the following Royal order attests:

A la Audiencia de Nueva España, para que viesen un *Arte* y *Vocabulario* para aprender la lengua de los Indios de Yucatán, y una *Cartilla* para enseñar a leer a los niños Indios, compuestos por fray Gaspar González de Nájera, y, siendo útiles y sin error, le dieren licencia para imprimirlos y venderlos por un tiempo de diez años (AGI, Audiencia de México, leg. 2999).

Fray Gaspar González de Nájera had gone to Spain in 1580 in order to accomplish several civil and religious assignments.<sup>10</sup> One of them was to bring together and send back to Yucatán new Franciscan missionaries. When he was going to Spain in January 1580, Governor Guillén de las Casas commended him to the Royal court with these words:

E yo, advirtiendo a lo que se pretende, que es saber = las antigüedades y orígenes destas tierras, acordé con el Prouinçial que el padre ffray Gaspar de Nájera fuese el portador desta, que es la persona más curiosa y que más sabe destas cosas, que quantos hasta oy a abido en estas prouinçias, y así podrá dar muy bastante rrelación de todo (AGI, Audiencia de México, leg. 104).

Given the extensive material provided in the *Vienna*, and its detailed mention of various deities of the Maya, the writer must have been someone of Nájera's qualifications. Added to this it should be noted that a document dated March 1582 in the Archivo de Indias says:

Fray Gaspar González de Nájera, de la Orden de San Francisco, recopiló lo que otros habían hecho, y lo ordenó en *Arte* y *Vocabulario de la lengua [Maya]*, con *Doctrina Christiana* y *Cartilla*, y todo lo remitió a la Audiencia de México para que le diesen licencia de imprimirlo (*fide* Ana Luisa Izquierdo).<sup>11</sup>

We are thus unfortunately left only with circumstantial evidence about Fray Gaspar González de Nájera and his possible role in the writing of the

---

<sup>9</sup>This name is also given as Naxara, Nájara, Naxera and Nájera.

<sup>10</sup>Bio-bibliographical references to this friar are, among others: Valle, *Bibliografía maya* (1949:40); Streit, *Bibliotheca Missionorum* (1924, 2:318); Adams, "A Bio-bibliography of Franciscan Authors in Colonial Central America", in *The Americas*, VIII-4 and IX-1 (1952), etc. Nájera is also mentioned in the *Relaciones Histórico-Geográficas de la Gobernación de Yucatán* (1983, 1: XLI, 166, 402, 416, 430, 445), as well as in López de Cogolludo, Bk. III, chap. 4. More about fray Gaspar González de Nájera, below.

<sup>11</sup>The quest of these manuscripts in the Spanish archives as well as in those of México has been unsuccessful up to now. It is Acuña's opinion that a search in the Portuguese archives might be more productive. There is a major possibility that Nájera was Portuguese by birth (personal communication).

*Vienna*, but taking the above into account it he seems to be the most likely candidate.<sup>12</sup>

### The Role of Indigenous speakers in the development of the *Vienna*.

Early on in the conquest several people of noble Mayan lineage befriended the Franciscan friars and most probably were very important in the development of Mayan orthography. When the Spanish arrived and established themselves in Yucatan in the mid 1500's the religious orders immediately set about converting the Maya to Christianity. One of the methods by which they hoped to do this was getting their message translated into the Mayan language. Various members of the upper class of Maya, thus people who had been educated in the use of the Mayan hieroglyphic writing system before becoming christianized, became involved in this effort. Such names as Juan Cocom,<sup>13</sup> who was a close friend of Diego de Landa, and Gaspar Antonio Chi Xiu, who was a Landa protégé, and later the Spanish court official interpreter, both of whom were related to Mayan ruling families, come to mind. A major part of this effort to get proselytizing material translated into Mayan involved forming an orthography for the Mayan language from the Latin script.<sup>14</sup> This was done fairly quickly and in

---

<sup>12</sup>Nájera apparently also wrote a "Relación". There is an indication that part of de Landa's "Relación" is based on Nájera's work, as shown in the following comment from the Colección de Documentos Inéditos; Tomo Núm. 11, 1898, pp. 152-153: En lo demas tocante a los sitios y temperamentos y leguas destas provincias y otras cosas curiosas y particularidades della me remito a lo que lleva anotado Francisco dominguez cosmografo que por mando de su magestad y del visorrey dela nueva / españa vino a estas provincias el año pasado de setenta y seis, y a la relacion que uviese dado fray Gaspar de Najera fray de la orden de Sant Francisco que por ser lengua desta tierra y saber muchas cosas curiosas y antiguallas delos yndios se entiende avra dado larga relacion de todo, y a la recopilacion que el reverendisimo don Francisco de Landa obispo que fue destas provincias hizo desta tierra; ayudo a hacer esta Relacion Gaspar Antonio yndio natural destas provincias gramatico y ladino en lengua castellana .—Pero Garcia.— (Hay una rúbrica.)

<sup>13</sup>Landa, 1966:21: Que el sucesor de los *Cocomes*, llamado don Juan Cocom, después de bautizado, fue hombre de gran reputación y muy sabio en sus cosas y bien sagaz y entendido en las naturales, y fue muy familiar del autor de este libro, fray Diego de Landa,...

<sup>14</sup>A possible candidate for the invention of special characters for the Yucatecan Mayan language is fray Francisco de la Parra. For dates in Yucatan (1552) see Lizana (1995:176) and López de Cogolludo (1971, 1:387). Worth mentioning too is fray Juan de Herrera (Lizana, 1995:206).

Another possibility is that as Creoles began to enter in the Franciscan order they brought with them their extensive knowledge of the "mother" (quite literally) tongue. See for example Lizana, 1995:223: Otro religioso, llamado fray Juan Velásquez, huuo en esta santa Prouincia, el qual era nacido en esta tierra y, assí, fue grande lengua de los naturales y excelente ministro, porque tenía partes muy bastantes que en él concurrían para serlo. Quanto a lo primero, era grande sieruo de Dios, muy obseruante de su Regla; lo segundo, sabía bastantemente latinidad y era excelente lengua yucateca por ser criollo y hauer trabajado con los maestros de la lengua que de España vienen, que la han puesto en arte y perfección, y escrito muchos sermonarios y vocabularios, como después diremos.

a surprisingly uniform manner when one considers the rather variable and sloppy orthography of the Spaniards at the time. When one compares the uneven effort at writing Mayan words in Spanish literature of the period, for example that of Landa, with the Mayan literature written by the Maya themselves, it would seem that the Maya played a very important role in helping the Spanish friars develop a Latin script orthography for the Mayan language. Unfortunately we have not come across anything which gives us an indication of how extensive this involvement was. In any case, by 1557 when the Mani land treaty was written the use of the Latin script for the Mayan language seems to have been fairly well established.<sup>15</sup>

In the *Vienna* there is some indication that the process of developing the dictionary involved the help of indigenous speakers, but that these speakers were not always available for consultation. This is because at times there are examples of usage which appear to be of the most blatant type of Maya-Span,<sup>16</sup> and at other times there are examples of usage which are consistent with the earlier Mayan language to be found in such works as the older parts of the Books of Chilam Balam.

### The *Calepino Maya de Motul*

Recent research, especially by René Acuña, has left little doubt that the *Calepino* by Fr. Antonio de Ciudad Real, mentioned in Lizana,<sup>17</sup> is the same as the work most commonly known as the *Motul* Maya-Spanish dictionary, now at Brown University Library. As mentioned above, it has long been clear that the *Vienna* and *Calepino* shared many entries, but it has also become clear, as mentioned above, that the *Calepino* is in fact based in part on the *Vienna*. However, the *Vienna* was not the only source of material for the *Calepino*, and much additional information came from other sources, such as native informants. Also, as mentioned above about the *Vienna*, there are areas in which the examples of usage are Maya-Span, and others in which apparently a native informant was consulted to give a correct example.

---

<sup>15</sup>Landa makes the following comment about the changeover from the use of hieroglyphs to Latin script by the Maya in his note about hieroglyphs in his *Relación*: De las letras que faltan carece esta lengua y tiene otras añadidas de la nuestra para otras cosas que ha menester y ya no usan para nada de estos sus caracteres, especialmente la gente moza que ha aprendido los nuestros.

<sup>16</sup>The term Maya-Span was developed by René Acuña and me to indicate that the language in which a particular passage is written was written by a Spanish speaker who was not well versed in the Mayan language.

<sup>17</sup>Lizana, 1995:242: Y no sólo se contentó con hazer vocabularios, sino que hizo *Calepino* tan grande, que son sus bolúmenes de a dozientos pliegos cada uno, los dos de su letra sacados en limpio, y los borradores llenauan dos costales. Ocupó 40 años en esta obra, mas es tan buena, y de tanto peso y utilidad, que no tiene otro defeto que ser para esta tierra solamente;...

In terms of actual size, the *Calepino* is almost double that of the *Vienna*. Part of this can be attributed to the fact that there are proportionately more examples of usage in the *Calepino* than there are in the *Vienna*. However, there are also many more terms given in the *Calepino*. Thus it goes without saying that the *Calepino* is the primer dictionary of the various Franciscan Mayan dictionaries.

As stated in the commentary about the *Vienna* given above, there are references to a grammar of the Mayan language in the *Calepino* which is known as “*el Arte*”. There are in fact six such references.<sup>18</sup> A comparison of the information contained in these six references with the earliest known grammar, *Arte en Lengua de Maya* by Juan Coronel (1620) confirms that these topics are touched on in “*el Arte*”, but a more definitive comment is not really possible.

### The *Solana*, *Motul II*, and *San Francisco* Spanish-Maya Dictionaries

Of the various Maya-Spanish and Spanish-Maya dictionaries of the Mayan language of Yucatan which are generally available for study, only two are for the most part identical, indicating that they are both copies of an earlier and presently unavailable work. These two dictionaries are the *Motul II*, now at Brown University Library, and the *Solana Dictionary (Vocabulario muy Copioso en Lengua Española e Maya de Yucatán)*, now in the library of the Hispanic Society of America.

Neither of these dictionaries is complete. The *Motul II* is missing the following folios: 85-104, 161, 171-174, 209-216, and 233. The *Solana* on the other hand gives the appearance of being complete, but the last entries starting with the word “vulgar” consist of the Spanish headings only without the Mayan equivalents. Upon comparing the entries from the two dictionaries, it becomes apparent that in fact the problem begins with the word “visar cosa, cuxan.” (*Solana*) / “viva cosa: cuxan.” (*Motul II*). From that point on the copyist or restorer of the *Solana* had difficulties in reading the manuscript which he was working on, and later perhaps had run out of

---

<sup>18</sup>The six mentions of “*el Arte*” are as follows:

I: postpuesta al cabo de la oracion es relatiua de muchos significados segun lo que ha precidido y significa “el”, “la”, “los”, “las”, “eße”, “eßo”, “eßos”. Otras vezes significa dellos; otras vezes significa “alla”, “de alli”, “alli”, “por alli”, de lo qual se trata en el arte. Otras vezes significa “hasta que”. ¶ Ma a ualic ti xicen toi: no se lo digas hasta que me vaya.

II: postpuesta a diciones significa “que”. ¶ Ma a ualicen, mail halaan teex: no digais que no se os ha dicho. ¶ Item: tiene romance de infinitiuo. ¶ ocaan ti yol Diosil Jesu Christo: yo creo ser dios Jesucristo, o que es Dios. ¶ Item: assi postpuesta a participio de preterito, y a otras diciones denota en donde, a donde, en que, &, como se podra ver en el arte.

II: esta particula tiene otros muchos significados como se puede ver en el arte.

Lacil .l. licil: particula de presente de indicatiuo con los significados que se contienen en el arte.

Licil .l. lacil: particula de presente de indicatiuo, con los significados que se contienen en el arte.

Ti: quando esta particula significa a, en, con, ettz., esta breuemente puesto en el arte.

manuscript altogether and was trying to fill in the remainder of the alphabet. Alternatively, perhaps the last page of the *Solana* was missing and a restorer tired to give the impression that the dictionary is complete by adding a false page. (See Appendix C for the comparative listing of this problem.)

In the *Motul II* only there is a specific reference to “*el Arte*”:

Nunca en ningun tienpo: ma bikin; ma bahun. ¶ vease en el arte  
fo. 100 et 140 et 136 en el ringlon 26.

Since this reference is to be found only in the *Motul II* it is possible that it is intrusive material introduced by the copyist and not something which was originally part of the dictionary’s text.<sup>19</sup>

#### Maya-Spanish entries in the *Solana / Motul II Dictionary*

One interesting feature of the *Solana / Motul II Spanish-Maya Dictionary* is that there are some entries which are Maya-Spanish. The first example is found on the very first page of the *Motul II*:

Aa .l. ee: assi que esso pasa. es como admiracion.

This entry is to be found only in *Motul II*. On page 94 of the *Solana*, unfortunately in the area where pages from the *Motul II* are missing, there is the obverse of this entry:

ee; aa: asi que eso pasa.

Apparently, whoever put together the original Spanish-Maya dictionary, for some reason left these entries in their original Mayan alphabetical area, but also placed them under the correct Spanish alphabetical area on page *Motul II* 29r / *Solana* 30:

assi que eso pasa: bai xabe .l. aa .l. ee.

For comparison see *Vienna* 21v: *Así que, ¿eso pasa? Es del que se admira:*  
bay xa be; aa.

There is a group of five entries which are given as Maya-Spanish in the *Motul II* after the entry “Ocho en numero: vaxac” on page 164r.<sup>20</sup> The

---

<sup>19</sup>A search for this grammar has not yet been successful. If the grammar of Coronel is being referred to there is on pages 64-65 a discussion of **bikin**, on pages 77-78 a discussion of **bahun** and **ma bahun** and on page 88 a discussion of **bikin** and **bahun**. If it is that of Beltrán (1746), see pages 126 (**bahun**), 128 (**bikin**) and 141 (**ma bahun**, **ma bikin**). In Buenaventura there is a discussion of **ma bahun** on page 32r.

<sup>20</sup>Entries from DMM 164r:

Oçio: mak olal; nay olal. ¶ Vide: pereça.

Ocho en numero: vaxac.

Ocol ti ol: creer.

Ocol: entrar. ¶ hokol: salir. ¶ hokol: manifestarse. Vide: llegar a su notiçia. ¶ hokol xiu: salir las yeruas.

Okol: sobre.

Ocol: hurtar.

Okol.t.: llorar.

Ocuparse: çuvanhal.

Ocupada cosa: çuuan; ma hunppel v beel.



*Solana* scribe changed these entries about to put the Spanish gloss first but otherwise left these entries in their original position. Needless to say leaving the entries “Creer:...; Entrar:...; Sobre:...; Hurtar:...; and Llorar:...” between “Ocho en numero...” and “Ocuparse...” makes them completely out of place. These entries as a group are not matched by the Maya-Spanish section of the *San Francisco* nor by any other known Maya-Spanish dictionary. Since these entries are not matched in other dictionaries then we must come to the conclusion that, 1) the *Solana / Motul II* dictionary is the obverse of a previously existing Maya-Spanish dictionary and that, 2) this Maya-Spanish dictionary is now lost.

The use of *vide* entries which reference Mayan glosses

One of the more perplexing things to be found in the *Solana / Motul II Dictionary* is that there are a number of entries in which a *vide* will refer to a Mayan entry. These *vide* entries take various forms as the following examples show:

Amañçabarse, y amañçabamiento: veyancil; tzayomancil; tzubancil. ¶ Vide: numçah ol.

Amansado anssi: kuban yol. ¶ Vide: ixma kub ol: la que no tiene amor al marido.<sup>21</sup>

Cosas asidas vnas de otras: vide: trauar et hoken hok.

Again, as in the case of the Mayan-Spanish entries, the conclusion must be that the writer had a Mayan-Spanish vocabulary at his disposition, and again, because the entry **ixma kub ol** is not to be found as it is given, this Mayan-Spanish vocabulary is apparently now lost.

Intrusive material in the *Motul II* from the *Vienna*

The place where the *Motul II* is missing the largest number of pages is from folio 85 to folio 104. Actually folios 83-84 were also at one point missing. The hand on these two folios is different from the one which wrote the rest of *Motul II*, and was a later attempt to fill in the missing material. This added material is actually a rather inaccurate copy of pages 72v-73v of the *Vienna Dictionary*. Interestingly enough, someone marked this material in the *Vienna* manuscript, placing the pound sign # in the left-hand margin in front of the entries Deestocar..., Desberarse... and the final entry Desbiarse... This symbol is not to be found in the rest of the *Vienna* and so seems to be clearly associated with the process of copying this material into the *Motul II*.

---

<sup>21</sup>If one compares the gloss “ixma kub ol” with the same CMM entry on page 229r it will be seen that while the sense is the same the entry in itself is not. Compare also with the DMSF: Kubul ol; zuchal; tzayamhal ol: amanzarse. ¶ ixma kub ol; la mujer que no tiene amor a su marido. Here the gloss is much closer in form.

### The *San Francisco Spanish-Maya Dictionary*

There is yet a third dictionary which upon closer inspection shows that it is also derived from the same original dictionary which is the basis for the *Solana* and the *Motul II*. It is the Spanish-Maya portion of the *Diccionario de San Francisco*.

In 1855 Juan Pío Pérez had in his possession a Maya-Spanish / Spanish-Maya dictionary from the library of Dr. Juan María Herrero y Ascaro. Pérez mentions in the preface to his copy of the *San Francisco Dictionary* that he had seen this dictionary on a couple of occasions, once in 1836 and then again in 1848.<sup>22</sup> This dictionary is now known as the *Diccionario de San Francisco*, so named because it was taken from the library of the Convent of San Francisco of Mérida when that convent was disbanded in the 1820's. The dictionary itself is now lost, but a copy was made by Pérez in the late 1850's or perhaps early 1860's. This copy is presently in the Middle-American Collection at Tulane University.

Unfortunately, Pérez had the habit of reordering the dictionaries he worked on according to "modern" spelling and alphabetical practices,<sup>23</sup> so at first glance it seems that the Spanish-Maya portion of this dictionary (sometimes referred to as the *San Francisco II*), while bearing great similarity to the *Solana / Motul II Dictionary*, is a different dictionary. However, upon closer examination, comparing these dictionaries entry by entry, it is clear that in fact the Spanish-Maya portion of the *San Francisco Dictionary* is the same as these other two dictionaries.

As far as can be ascertained, the *San Francisco Dictionary* itself has disappeared. Given Carl Hermann Berendt's comments about the Pérez transcript, which are written in the foreword to his copy of the Pérez transcript,<sup>24</sup> it is a shame that the dictionary from which Pérez worked is no longer available, because it would be valuable to see the original and how Pérez changed the dictionary in his transcript.

### The *Ticul Spanish-Maya Dictionary*

In 1836 Pérez copied a vocabulary which was found amongst the baptismal records in the church at Ticul. He rearranged it in 1847, and this rearranged copy was published posthumously in 1898. The *Ticul Dictionary* was dated January 26, 1690. While the author's name is not given, it should be noted

---

<sup>22</sup>*Diccionario de San Francisco* (DMSF), Prólogo por J. Pío Pérez (Graz, 1976:vii).

<sup>23</sup>The most noticeable of these practices was to eliminate the use of "ç" and substituting either "c" or "z" as is common usage today, and then running these words off to the appropriate alphabetical area. However, unfortunately sometimes in the shuffling about some entries got lost. Another Mayanist of the time, Carl Hermann Berendt, made a note about this problem in his copy of the Pérez transcript.

<sup>24</sup>DMSF (1976: XI-XIII).

that Fr. Gabriel de San Buenaventura was active at this time, and Beltrán mentions him as being a writer of both a Maya-Spanish and a Spanish-Maya dictionary, as well as the writer of the grammar<sup>25</sup> from which Beltrán was working while making his own grammar.

At first glance the *Ticul Dictionary* seems to be quite different from the dictionaries mentioned above. However, by the time one gets to the words beginning the letters “Al” it becomes noticeable that the *Motul II / Solana / San Francisco II* dictionaries are running almost the identical entries as the *Ticul*. (See Appendix D.) It becomes evident that in the Pérez transcript of the *Ticul* Pérez has rearranged the alphabetical sequence of the *Ticul* according to the “modern” method, as he states in the introductory pages to the *Ticul*. Furthermore, it would appear that either the ms. from which Pérez was working was badly damaged, or the ms. from which the writer of the *Ticul* was copying was badly damaged, including lost pages or parts of pages, and that someone supplied what he presumed was the missing material. That would explain why parts of the *Ticul* are very different from the *Motul II / Solana / San Francisco II* and why other parts are almost identical.

It is evident that in order to ensure that a transcript of the *Solana Dictionary* is as complete as possible, all four source works must be consulted, with the *Solana* and *Motul II* dictionaries supplying the basis from which the transcript is made, and the *San Francisco II* and *Ticul* supplying corrections and additional information.

#### The Friars *Alonso de Solana* and *Gaspar González de Nájera*

Alonso de Solana and Gaspar González de Nájera were contemporaries of Diego de Landa. Some notes on the life of Solana were written up by Fray Bernardo de Lizana in his book *Devocionario de Nuestra Señora de Izamal y Conquista espiritual de Yucatán*, published in 1633, and some notes about the positions held by Nájera are to be found in Cogolludo’s book *Historia de la Provincia de Yucathán*, published in 1688. It is apparent from these two works that Solana arrived in Yucatan in about 1560 and died in 1600 or 1601. While it is not known when Nájera arrived in Yucatan, it is clear that he was active in the 1580’s. It is also known that he made a trip from Yucatan to Spain carrying with him a letter dated January 6, 1580, in which he is mentioned as being the person who was most knowledgeable about matters concerning the Maya. He is last mentioned in Cogolludo as being elected as a “definidor” for the year of 1603.

The frontispiece of the *Solana* dictionary gives the name of the author as

---

<sup>25</sup>It should be mentioned that the San Buenaventura grammar is basically a rewrite of the Coronel grammar published in 1620. Thus, while Beltrán says that San Buenaventura wrote both a Spanish-Mayan and a Mayan-Spanish dictionary, it would not be surprising to find that what San Buenaventura really did was to rewrite older dictionaries at his disposal.

being Fr. Alonso de la Solana, and the date of composition as being 1580. Lizana confirms that Solana was responsible for a “Bocabulario”,<sup>26</sup> and so despite doubts raised by some researchers, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Solana “Bocabulario” mentioned by Lizana and the Hispanic Society’s *Solana* dictionary are one and the same.

Attention is brought to Fray Gaspar González de Nájera because of the following entry on page 58v of the *Motul II*:

Corromper virgen: çatçah çuhuyil; yet vayte; yax than, yax et vayte. Estos dos vltimos son dos conosidos, según diçe el Padre Nájera.

It is interesting to compare this statement with an entry in the *Vienna* where only the last two terms are given:

Corromper donçella, bocablo onesto: yax than [.l.] yax et vay [.t.]

It is not clear what role Nájera had in the formation of the *Bocabulario* of Solana. However, the above serves to reinforce the idea that the *Vienna* is the vocabulary of Nájera.

#### The Controversy over the *Solana Dictionary*

Gates, and apparently at his instigation Thompson, have cast some unwarranted aspersions on the Hispanic Society’s copy of the *Solana*. It was Thompson’s claim that the *Solana* was in the Brigham Young University Library (Thompson 1960, 337), which may well have come from Gates’ opinion in later life that he had the *Solana* (Thompson 1973, 65), but Thompson later noted that the *Solana* was not to be found at the BYU Library nor in the Princeton Gates-Garrett Collection, and further that he had seen the Hispanic Society’s *Solana* (Thompson 1962, 14). It may well be that Gates got a glimpse of the then Huntington owned *Solana Dictionary*, or of at least some parts of it, and became aware that he had already reproduced nearly the same thing in a photographic copy earlier in the century (about 1915) in the form of the *Motul II Dictionary*.

Part of the controversy might well stem from the fact that there has been an obvious effort on the part of some unknowledgeable restorer to restore damaged paper and the writing lost on the area which had been destroyed in the Hispanic Society’s copy of the *Solana Dictionary*. For example, starting with the word Aborreçedor on page 2 of the *Solana*, the left-hand margin for this entry and the next four entries was damaged. The person who repaired the manuscript tried to supply the Spanish glosses, but did so incorrectly. Later on in the *Solana* on page 228, as mentioned above, starting with “viva cosa: cuxan” (*Motul II*) / “visar cosa, cuxan.” (*Solana*), the restorer of the

---

<sup>26</sup>Escruió bocabulario excelente en esta lengua maya, muchos sermones y sermonarios con grande propiedad, como si fuera indio mesmo. (Lizana, 1995:229)

*Solana* could not read the left-hand portion of the entries which he was restoring, and in an effort to fill in the Spanish words used an unrelated and incorrect series of words. (See Appendix C.)

While it is obvious that someone has tampered with the *Solana* in an effort to restore it, altering some of its parts, these alterations do not invalidate the work as a whole.

### **Status Report**

As mentioned in the opening paragraph of this paper, all of the dictionaries talked about in this article have been punched into computer files. The three principal Franciscan grammars, those of Coronel (1620), San Buenaventura (1684) and Beltrán (1746) and the liturgical work published by Coronel (1620) have also been entered. For comparative reasons the liturgical work of Beltrán (1740, 1757) has also been entered.

Also as mentioned above, some comparative work has been done already with the punched-in material. Appendix B gives some of examples of this work. Comparison between the Coronel liturgical and the Franciscan dictionaries is presently an on-going project, and hopefully many more examples of this kind will come to light.

In order to provide a guide into the labyrinthine origins of the Mayan Franciscan dictionaries, Appendix A displays a raw sketch of their possible authors, dates, places of composition and sources. It is easy to handle, but much caution is advisable before putting to work the data of this table. In no way it should be considered a conclusive study. There are many details, many missing pieces still of the jigsaw puzzle that are yet to be put together.

## Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank René Acuña for all of his assistance and support for working on the subject of Franciscan Mayan dictionaries, grammars and literature. Although for years we have had numerous conversations and correspondence on the subject, our collaboration began in earnest in 1991. In the summer of that year I was invited to go to México D.F. to work with René on preparing the *Bocabulario de Maya Than de Viena* for publication by UNAM. Because of the number of problems which are to be encountered in the original manuscript it seemed only logical to look at all other available Franciscan vocabularies and grammars to see if there was some way to resolve the problems we encountered. However, because of the difficulties which we had in using these sources and the fact that the questions we were asking were often not easily found it became obvious that the best solution was to computerize all of this material so that any word or collection of words in these sources could be easily located. Thus began the rather long and at times very difficult job of typing these sources into the computer. A follow-up visit and work session was arranged by René in the fall of 1994 at which time we were able to review the work we had done on the various vocabularies and grammars in the mean time and also to work on making a definitive edition of the *Calepino Maya de Motul*. The gratifying result of this work is the publication by René Acuña through Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas a collection of works which include the *Artes* of Coronel and San Buenaventura, the *Arte* of Beltrán, and independently of UNAM, the *Calepino Maya de Motul*.

René has been very instrumental in preparing the present article for publication. His contribution to it has been very substantial, especially in questions concerning the Franciscan friars mentioned here and in dating the various Franciscan vocabularies which are talked about in this article.

## Abbreviations used

BMTV = *Bocabulario de Maya Than / Viena*

CMM = *Calepino Maya de Motul*

DESF = *Diccionario de San Francisco II* (Spanish-Mayan)

DMM = *Diccionario Maya de Motul* (Motul II, Spanish-Mayan)

DMSF = *Diccionario de San Francisco* (Mayan-Spanish)

APPENDIX A

**How the Mayan vocabularies grew: A tentative sketch**

TITLE	AUTHOR	DATE	PLACE	SOURCES	O/C	LANG.	REPOSITORY
<i>Bocabulario de Maya Than</i>	Gaspar González de Nájera	1580	Maní	Mayan notes by predecessors	C	Sp/M	Vienna.
<i>Bocabulario muy copioso</i>	Alonso de Solana	1600	Unknown	Mayan notes by predecessors Najera's dict.	C	Sp/M	Hispanic Society.
<i>Motul II</i>	Alonso de Solana	1600	Unknown		C	Sp/M	Brown U. Library.
<i>Calepino Maya de Motul</i>	Antonio de Ciudad Real	1614	Motul	Mayan notes by predecessors, Solana's and Nájera's dict.	O	M/Sp	Brown U. Library.
<i>Calepino Maya</i>	Gabriel de San Buenaventura	1680	Unknown	Najera's, Solana's and Ciudad Real	na	both	Missing
<i>Diccionario de San Francisco</i>	Gabriel de San Buenaventura	1680	Unknown	Late copy by J. Pío Pérez	C	both	Tulane U. Library.
<i>Diccionario de Ticul</i>	Gabriel de San Buenaventura	1680	Unknown	Late copy by J. Pío Pérez	C	Sp/M	Published, 1898.

C = copy  
O = original  
M/Sp = Maya-Spanish  
Sp/M = Spanish-Maya

APPENDIX B  
Coronel's Discursos

Coronel 4r: Ca utzac ca tohol patcantic teex: ca ix utzac ca cici cambeçicex ti vabici a benebalex te tu kul na Dios, te ti caane.

BMTV: Declarar derechamente: tohol pat can.t. ¶ Para que os declaremos derechamente como aueis de yr al çielo: ca vtzac ca tohol pat cantic teex, ca vtzac ca cici cambeçicex ti va bici a benebalex ti caan.<sup>27</sup>

Coronel 16v: Ca uhocçah<sup>28</sup> cayumil hundzit tuchelatil tichanchanbelil: tixmamacimilil timaix yubah Adan: cayutzcinah caix vpatah vcucutil huntul çhuplal tichalatloe.<sup>29</sup>

BMTV: Sacar de una cosa otra, tirando, como espada: hil.t. .l. pay.t. ¶ Sacó Dios una costilla a Adán, y hiço de ella una muger: u hiltah Dios hun dzit tu c[h]elatil Adan, caix u patah u cucutil huntul çhuplal ti c[h]elat loe.<sup>30</sup>

(CMM: expunged because of Inquisition?)

Coronel 20v: Ma uil yanhom çapahal teex, maix vchuchom v kuxuchal a uokolex, maix bal bin numçicex ti ya matac a caanomex,

BMTV: Dolor tener con escosimiento: kuxul okol. ¶ No tendréis dolor ni pena de cosa alguna en el çielo: ma vchom v kuxuchal a vokolex maix bin a numçicex ti ya ti caan.

Coronel 44r: hex ca yumil ti Iesu Christoe ma yoltah u kamab v thanob, heuac bai thonlic, baix chinlic çuc tix dzedz taname, ti yanil tu tan ah xotkin to Pilatoe

BMTV: Cordero: yalam tanam, ix mehen tanam .l. ix dzedz tanam. ¶ Estaua humillado delante de Jesuchristo como manso cordero: bay chinlic yix dzedz tanam Christo ti yan tu tan ah xot kin cuchi.

---

<sup>27</sup>For some unexplained reason the Spanish gloss failed to translate the phrase **ca ix utzac ca cici cambeçicex** (Coronel) / **ca utzac ca cici cambeçicex** (BMTV). See CMM: Cici: en composicion; bien, con tieno y consideradamente o despaçio. ¶ cici mente: hazlo bien y con tieno. / Cambeçah: enseñar y la enseñaça. Translation: “and so that we can teach you well”...

<sup>28</sup>The Coronel text is in error: this should read **hokçah**. See CMM: Hokçah; hokeçah: } sacar afuera, manifestar, publicar, y deulgar. Compare with BMTV: Desbuchar y echar del buche: hokçah .l. likul ichil hobonil. / Sacar algo fuera: hokçah.

<sup>29</sup>Note the use of both **chelat** and **chalat** for the word for “rib”. The BMTV spells this word **chelat** in the example but reads **chalati** in the following: C[os]tilla de hombre: u c[h]alati[l] uinic. There are two other examples in the BMTV in which **chalatil** / **chalat** are given: Quebrar las costillas a otro... / Rayos [o costillas] de la noria... The DMM/Solana gives Costilla de espinazo: chelat., whereas the CMM reads as follows: Chalat: costilla del hombre y de qualquier animal.

<sup>30</sup>Note that the Coronel sentence is more complete. Furthermore, the BMTV example uses the verb **hiltah** instead of **hokçah** and **Dios** as opposed to **ca yumil**. The Coronel translates as, “Then our lord took out one rib very slowly so that Adan neither died nor felt it; then he made and formed the body of a woman from this rib.”



Coronel 165v: Be, mehenexe, toon mehe[n] ca noh Ahau ti Dios tumen ix v keban ca yax yumob ca pulci vay tu kom yaalil ich lae.<sup>31</sup>

Coronel, Doc 2: coon yal Euae tech lic ca put yktic tamuk cacán, tamuk ix cokol vay tu koom yaalil ich lae.<sup>32</sup>

BMTV: Valle entre dos montes: kom .l. hem. ¶ Aquí en este valle de lágrimas: vay tu kom yaalil ich lae.

CMM: Kom: hoyá, valle, o barranco.... ¶ vay tu kom yaalil ich lae: en este valle de lágrimas.

Coronel 165v: chupanonix tuyabal numya, yetel otzilil, ychticilyaix vmalkintoon tuyam canupob.

CMM: Ich ticil ya: con trabajo y miseria. ¶ ich ticil ya v mal kin toon: con trabajo y miseria passamos la vida.

Coronel 190r (1576 ms.: pp. 322-323):<sup>33</sup> ca v lapah vba Iudio huntul ichil Christianosob, tu mucul muculil cuchí, vchebal yilic v nuucul v kuil thanob,

BMTV: Ceremonias, como de misa y coro: kuil than. ¶ Mesclóse un judío entre los christianos desimuladamente, para ber las ceremonias que tenían: v lapah vba judio huntul ychil christianob ti mucul muculil, vchebal yilic v nuucul v kuil thanob cuchí.<sup>34</sup>

CMM: Lap.ah.ab: encaxar, meter o entremeter, poner y mezclar vna cosa entre otras, y esconderla assi.... ¶ v lapah v paalil ychil v paalil cristianoob: mezclo o metio su muchacho y entremetiole entre los de los cristianos.

Coronel 233r-233v: ¶ Lic va a yacunic Dios paynum yokol tulacal. Amas a Dios sobre todas las cosas.

Coronel, Doc 5: V hunppel bin a yacun Dios paynum yokol tu çinil.<sup>35</sup>

Coronel, Doc 5: He lahunpedz yalmah thanil Dios lae, caa tzuc yanil v yacunabal Dios paynum yokol tulacal .y. a lak bay a yacunic abae.<sup>36</sup>

BMTV: Amar: yacunah. ¶ Amad a Dios sobre todas las cosas: yacunex Dios paynum yokol tulacal. / Más o sobre, adueruio de comparación: paynum okol .l. pot manan okol. ¶ Amo a Dios sobre todas las cosas: in yama Dios paynum yokol tulacal.

CMM: Paynum: sobre o mas; es comparatiuo. ¶ in yama dios paynum yokol tulacal: amo a Dios sobre o mas que a todas las cosas.

---

<sup>31</sup>“Thus, you children, we the children of our great lord God because of the sin of our first parents are thrown here into the valley of tears.”

<sup>32</sup>“We the children of Eve sigh to you while we moan and while we cry here in the valley of tears.”

<sup>33</sup> The last part of the 1576 Manuscript, beginning on page 201, is parallel to the Discursos Predicables from page 158v through page 214v.

<sup>34</sup>Note the difference in the placement of the word **cuchi**.

<sup>35</sup>Note what appears to be the incorrect usage of the word **tuçinil** = “everywhere” whereas all other examples of this phrase give **tulacal** = “everything”. Translation of the sentence as is: “The first is that you will love God more than everywhere.” See the correct usage of the phrase **tu çinil** in the line **Ocaan ti uol Dios citbil, uchuc tumen tu çinile**, given below in the Doctrina.

<sup>36</sup>“Here are the ten commandments of God, two of which are God is to be loved over everything and your fellow man (is to be loved) as you love yourself.”

## Coronel's Doctrina

Coronel, Doc 1: tocoon ti cah ualob,  
BMTV: Libranos de nuestros enemigos: tocon ti cah valob.

Coronel, Doc 1: ma ix a uilic ca lubul tac tumtabale<sup>37</sup>  
BMTV: No permitáis que caigamos en tentación: ma a vilic ca lubul tac tumtabale.  
CMM: Ma: no. es particula prohibitiua antepuesta en presente de indicatiuo.... ¶ Item: es deprecatiua. Ma a uilic ca lubul tac tumtabale: no permitas caygamos en tentacion.

Coronel, Doc 2: Ocaan ti uol Dios citbil, uchuc tumen tu çinile,  
BMTV: Creo en Dios Padre: ocan ti vol Dios Citbil. / Poderoso en todo: vchuc tumen tu çinil.  
CMM: Tu zinil: todo; contidad concreta. ¶ in cucutil tu çinil: todo mi cuerpo. ¶ vchuc tumen tu zinil Dios: es dios todopoderoso....  
SFM: Uchuc tumen ti zinil: poderoso en todo.

Coronel, Doc 2: tali tu chi Poncio Pilato numci ti ya  
BMTV: Por mandado: likul ti chij, tali ti chij .l. tal ti chij. ¶ Por mandado de Poncio Pilato: likul tu chij Poncio Pilato.  
CMM: Likul ti chij: por mandado. ¶ likul tu chi Pontio Pilato numci ti ya: por mandado de Ponçio Pilato padecio.  
CMM: Tali ti chij: por mandado de alguno. ¶ Tali tu chij Ponçio Pilato: por mandado de Poncio Pilato; salio de su boca.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Note the use of conjunction **ix** in **ma ix** which is absent from the examples given in the dictionaries. On pages 155r-188r of the *Discursos Predicables* in the Exposicion del Pater Noster, page 182v, this particular line is given as: **Chan a uilab ca lubul ti dzaal pach**. The use of the phrase **dzal pach** seems to be inappropriate for “temptation” in as much as it is composed of **dzal** = pressure, for example when applied by the hand or a press, and **pach** = the back of an object. See CMM: Dzal pach: hazer fuerça o violencia; constreñir o apremiar y la tal fuerça o violencia. Sometime between the time the Exposicion was written and the *Pater Noster* was revised (which of course had to be before the BMTV was written) an attempt was made to correct this problem and the word **tumtabal** was substituted for **dzal pach**. However, **tumtabal** does not really mean “temptation” either. See CMM: Tum.t.: considerar, prouar, experimentar, arbitrar, deliberar, ordenar, traçar, y dar orden y traçar en algun negoçio, y pensarlo bien: y la tal consideracion, deliberaçion y orden. / Tumut. tumtah, tumte: lo mismo. / Tumtabal: es al passiuo. (The Michelin edition of the DMSF does equate both **dzal pach** and **tumut** with “tentación”, but this may well be after-the-fact translation. See DMSF: Dzal pach; tumut; tumtah; tumtah ol; ppiz muk: tentar, probar, esperimetar, tentación. ¶ balx u chun a dzalic ti pach ti keban: ¿porqué lo provocas o tentas a pecar?)

<sup>38</sup>Note the difference between the BMTV and the first example from the CMM which use **likul tu chi** and the Coronel and the second example from the CMM which use **tali tu chi**.

Coronel, Doc 2: tij tun likul ca bin tac v xotob v kin cuxanob yetel cimenob.

BMTV: Jusgar, oficio de juez: xot kin, xot tab .I. xot tabil. ¶ Bendra nuestro Redemptor a juzgar los biuos y los muertos: bin tac c'ah lohil v xotob v kin cuxanob yetel cimenob.<sup>39</sup>

Coronel, Doc 2: çipen ti Dios yetel ti yalmah t[h]anil,

BMTV: Pequé contra Dios y sus mandamientos: çipen ti Dios yetel ti yalma[h] thanil.<sup>40</sup>

CMM: Nup: cosa contraria, que esta de frente o otro que esta de frente y opuesto de qualquier cosa que se le pone en contra, o el contrapeso que pone a alguna cosa.... ¶ çipen tu nup yalmah thanil dios: peque contra los mandamientos de dios.

Coronel, Doc 2: Tezcuntech ix ahaue

BMTV: Sálbete Dios, reina y madre: tezcuntech Dios, ix ahaue.<sup>41</sup>

CMM: Tezcun.t.: saludar; es vocablo antiguo con que saluda. Van a los grandes señores. ¶ Tezcuntech ix ahaue:

---

<sup>39</sup>Note the introduction of **cah lohil** = “our redeemer” in the BMTV example.

<sup>40</sup>Note that in the Doctrina the **h** is missing in **thanil** whereas in the BMTV it is missing in **yalmah**.

<sup>41</sup>Again, as happened above with the phrase **tali tu chi**, note that the BMTV differs from Coronel and the CMM. It is not clear why the word **Dios** was introduced into the BMTV.

## APPENDIX C

### Comparison of the *Solana* and *Motul II* Dictionaries

To give the reader an indication of how the *Solana* and *Motul II* Dictionaries are related to each other, the following parallel passages are presented. These passages are chosen not only to show where the two dictionaries agree, but also to show where they differ. The first passage is from the beginning page. The second passage is from near the end of the two dictionaries to show the problems which the copyist or restorer of the *Solana* manuscript encountered as he approached the end of the manuscript.

Motul II, page 1r

Solana, page 1r

*vocabulario en la lengua de Maya*

*bocabulario en lengua Maya*

a ante b

a proposicion, ti. Vt.

A. Preposicion, ti.

A, preposicion por cerca:

yican: nadzan

aa. L. Ee. Assi que eso pasa.

Es como admiracion

aha: no lo dezia yo. L.

No ----ia yo de loger

abadesa: ix kin. v chun vthan

Abadesa de kin v chun vthan

abahar: auex. Ti

abahar ou--xte,

abalancarse: pic chinba:

abalancarse, pic chinba,

pulba: cithpom

pulba, cith pan

abarcar entre los brazos:

abracar entre los brazos.

Mek: holmek.T.

Mek. Holmekte.

Abarcar entre las manos y

abarcar entre las manos y

la tal abarcada. Lot

la tal abarcada. Lot.

Abarca, y qual quier calcado

abarca y qual quier calzado

de cuero: keulel xanab

de cuero. Keulel xanab

abarcar barro en la pared

abarrar barro en la pared

arrojandolo: pakchin.T.

Arrojandolo. Pak chinte

pak pul.T.

Pak pu---

abarrer o arrebajar: volmoll:

abarrer o arebajar. Vol mol

haymol

hay mol

abatida cosa: cabal cunan.

Abatida cosa. Cabal cunan

abatimiento: cabal cunanil

abatimiento. Cabal cunanil

The *Motul II* is more complete than the *Solana* at the very beginning and there are indications that the *Solana* copyist was having difficulties with his text, but on the whole there are not many significant differences. Aside from this, typically the *Motul II* has some extra entries, especially of the *vide* or *idem* type, but on the whole there is basically little difference between the two manuscripts.

Now for a look at the entries near the end of the two manuscripts showing the beginning of confusion as mentioned above.

Motul II, page 234r  
 visitar: -- thibah  
 visitar y consolar: ppum  
 Visitar los pueblos: thibah  
 cah: xoytah cah: zutcah  
 visita sujeta al conuento: cuchcabal  
 visitar los lazos: mab.T.  
 Vision, o fantasma: manab.  
 visiones ver: manabchi.T.  
 visiones ver como entre  
 sueños: nay.T.  
 vista de cualquier cosa: Pacat  
 Viva cosa: cuxan.  
 Viuda: ah cin icham: ixmaicham  
 viudo: ahcim atan: Ixma atan  
 viudez deella: ixmaichamil  
 vivir, o morar en casa o pueblo,  
 vide: morar.  
 Vivir, vide: vida:  
 vizco de los ojos: zat vuich  
 vizcocho, o pan tostado:  
 Oppbiluah  
 vizcochar: oppcinah uah.  
 vmana cosa, vmanidad: vinicil /234v  
 vmanas obras: vini---  
 vmeda cosa o mojada: dzom  
 Dzuucnac: dzaacnac  
 vmedecerse anssi: dzoomil, dzuucnacil  
 vmedad anssi: dzoomil, dzuucnachil.  
 vmeda tierra empapada en agua:  
 Yukucnac luum  
 vmedecerse como la hostia en  
 la boca: pukul.  
 vmilde: ah thontal: ah chintal:  
 ah thoncinahba  
 Vmimente: tu dzaabal thontal  
 vmilarse: thontal: chinntal:  
 thoncinahba  
 vmillar a otro: thoncunba: chincunab.  
 vmillarse, vide: derribarse postrando:  
 hincar las rodillas.  
 etc.

Solana, page 228  
 vissitar, thibah  
 vissitar y consolar. Ppum.  
 vissitar los pueblos. Thibah  
 cah. Xoytah cah, zut cah  
 visita sujeta al conuto, cuch cabal  
 Vissitar los lazos. Mabte.  
 Vision o fantasm--, manab  
 Visaga: be--- manab chite  
 visiomes be-- como entre  
 Sueños. Nayte  
 vision de --al quiera cosa. pacat.  
 Visar cosa, cuxan.  
 visora, ah cimycham, ixmaicham  
 visado, ah cim atan. ixma atan  
 vista-- deella. Ixmaichamil  
 vista delos ojos zat vuich  
 vista de ojos roan tostado.  
 oppbilvah  
 Vistuar: oopp cinah vah  
 vituallas y humanidad, vinicil  
 vituperta vinicil be  
 vizconde o mojada. Dzom.  
 dzuucnac. Dzaacnac  
 vocativo dzomil dzuucnacil  
 voluntad dzoomil Dzuucnachil,  
 voluntario ---pada enagua.  
 yukucnac luum  
 volar dar el voto ---ia en  
 La boca, pukul  
 voto desto manera ah chintal  
 ahthon cinah b. /229  
 vulgar  
 vulgarmente  
 vuestra cosa  
 X ante v  
 xabon  
 xabonera yerva  
 Xaquima

With the page 229 of *Solana* the copyist or restorer gives up trying to figure out what he is working on, and gives only a list of Spanish words from “vulgar” on to the end of the manuscript.

It is interesting to note that starting with “viva cosa: cuxan” (*Motul II*) / “visar cosa, cuxan.” (*Solana*) the copyist or perhaps the restorer of the *Solana* couldn’t read the left-hand portion of the entries which he was working on, and in an effort to fill in the list used a series of words, perhaps from another dictionary, to fill in the voids. Obviously this person didn’t know Mayan, or he would have, one should think, known that for “ah cim icham” and “ah cim atan” “viuda” and “viudo” would have been the proper words.

It seems evident that neither of these two dictionaries is a copy of the other, but that each is a copy of some older source or even perhaps of older copies of some even earlier source. It would seem that the *Solana* could not be a copy of the *Motul II* dating from a time when the *Motul II* was complete (if indeed there ever was such a time) because otherwise the *Solana* copyist wouldn’t have had the problems which he did with the last pages since the *Motul II* is clear enough to copy from. On the other hand, the *Motul II* couldn’t have been copied from the *Solana* or the final pages would have been defective also.

## APPENDIX D

### **Comparison of the Ticul to the Motul II / Solana / San Francisco II**

Given below is the beginning of a composite edited version of the *Motul II / Solana / San Francisco II* dictionaries and the *Ticul* dictionary, where it would be difficult to ascertain that these two dictionaries are derived from a single source. Next is given the part where both dictionaries begin with the “Al” words, in which it is clear that the root dictionary was the same. Throughout the *Ticul* there are moments in which the two dictionaries show a common origin, followed by moments where it is clear that the scribe of the *Ticul* derived his material from some other source, perhaps for example from his own experience and knowledge of the Mayan Language. This different material is at times not captured in the other dictionaries, such as the *Vienna* or the *Calepino Maya de Motul*, and thus from time to time adds some words and expressions to our vocabulary base.

It should be noted that the *Ticul* has only about half the amount of material given in the *Motul II / Solana / San Francisco II*, which in turn has about half of the material given in the *Vienna*. However, each vocabulary does have material not included in either of the others, so each is a special source of information particular to itself.

A, preposiçion: ti. ¶ Vt: a, preposiçion por çerca: tacan; nedzan.  
Aa .l. ee: assi que esso pasa. es como admiracion.  
Aha: no lo dezia yo .l. no os auia yo de coger.  
Abadesa: ix kin; v çhun v than.  
Abahar: ouox.t. ¶ ouoxte u kab ca kinlac: abajate las manos, &.  
Abalançarse: pic çhin ba; pul ba; çithpom.  
Abarcar entre los braços: mek; hol mek.t.  
Abarcar entre las manos y la tal abarcada: lot.  
Abarca, y qualquier calçado de cuero: keulel xanab,  
Abarrajar barro en la pared arrojandolo: pak çhin.t.; pak pul.t.  
Abarrer o arrebañar: volmol: haymol.

**Ticul**

**A**

Page 129

**Ab.**

*Abajar algo.* Cabalcunah.  
*Abajar la cabeza.* Thoncunah pol, cabal cu nah pol.  
*Abajo.* Ticab, cabal.  
*Abalanzarse.* Pulba, picchimba; ut u pulah uba, u picchintah. p.  
*Abarca ó zapato.* Xanab-keuel.  
*Abarcada, una asi.* Hun-lot, calot, oxlot. *Abarcada.* Hunmek.  
*Abarcar entre las manos.* Lot.  
*Abarrajarse algo.* Cabaljal.  
*Abeja.* Yikil cab.  
*Abertura.* Uakal, hetel.  
*Abismo ú hondura.* U dzonotil, u tamlil.



**DMM/Solana/DESF**

Ala de aue: xik.

Alabar y alabança: tich animal; nachcunah pectzil; nohcinah; titzcunah. ¶ lo contrario de esto vease desacreditar.

Alabar alguna persona diciendo bien de ella: vtzcinah pectzil.

Alabarse: vide: jatarse.

Alabastro: çac yeel bach; çac yeel bech.

Alacran: çinaan.

Alagar: vide infra: al hagar.

Al amor del agua: tu pul haa; tu hah haa; tu kak haa.

A la otra parte: citan tu pach.

A la postre: tu pach.

Alarde: v kukum tok; v kukum katun.

Alargarse algo: chauachal.

Alargar anssi: chauaccunah.

**Ticul**

**Al.**

*Ala de ave. Xik.*

*Alabanza. Tichomumal.*

*Alabar. Nachcunah pectzil.*

*Alabastro. Zacyelbach.*

*Alada; cosa que tiene alas. Xiknal.*

*Aladar de cabellos. Tup tzotz.*

*Alarde. U kukum tok, u kukum katun.*

*Alarido y dar alaridos. Uatah auat.*

*Alargar algo. Chauac-cunah; ut, chauaccume estribo, alargar el estribo.*

*Alargar la mano. Tich á kab ca dzicti.*

*Alargarse algo. Chauac-hal.*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Manuscript Sources

1576 Manuscript  
See Whalen.

Motul II, a Spanish-Mayan Dictionary  
N.D. Photocopy from a Gates reproduction at Tozzer Library,  
Cambridge, Mass. Original at Brown University Library,  
Providence, RI.

Solana Dictionary  
N.D. Hispanic Society manuscript number b2005, microfilm provided  
by the Hispanic Society of America, New York, N.Y.

### Printed Sources

Beltrán de Santa Rosa, Pedro  
1740 *Novena de Christo crucificado con otras Oraciones en Lengua  
Maya*. La Imprenta de D. Francisco Xavier Sanchez, Mexico.  
1746 *Arte de el Idioma Maya Reducido a Succintas Reglas, y  
Semilexición Yucateco*. Viuda de D. Joseph Bernardo de Hogal,  
México.  
1757 *Declaración de la Doctrina Christiana en el Idioma Yucateco*.  
La Imprenta del Colegio Real y Mas Antiguo de San Ildefonso,  
Mexico.

Bocabulario de Maya Than de Viena.  
1993 *Bocabulario de Maya Than*, Facsimile and edited version by  
René Acuña. Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas,  
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.

Calepino Maya de Motul: See Ciudad Real below.

Ciudad Real, Antonio de  
1984 *Calepino Maya de Motul*. Edición de Rene Acuña. Facsimile  
version by René Acuña. Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas,  
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México. 2 vols.  
1995 *Calepino de Motul*. Ramón Arzápalo Marín, editor. Published by  
Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, UNAM, México  
D.F., México. 3 vols.  
2001 *Calepino Maya de Motul*, Critical and annotated edition by René  
Acuña. Plaza y Valdés, México.

Cogolludo, Fr. Diego López de  
1971 *Yucatan o sea Historia de Esta Provincia*. Akademische Druck,  
Graz. (Reprint of the 1842/1845 edition.)

Coronel, Juan

- 1620a *Discursos predicables, con otras diuersas materias Espirituales*. La Emprenta de Diego Garrido, Mexico.
- 1620b *Doctrina Christiana, en lengua de Maya*. La Emprenta de Diego Garrido, Mexico.
- 1620c *Arte en lengua de Maya recopilado y enmendado*. La Imprenta de Diego Garrido, Mexico.
- 1998. *Arte en Lengua de Maya*. Critical edition by René Acuña. Fuentes para el Estudio de la Cultura Maya, 14. Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.

Landa, Fray Diego de

- 1966. *Relación de las Cosas de Yucatan*. 9th edition, Editorial Porrúa, Mexico.
- See also Tozzer, 1978, below.

Lizana, Fray Bernardo de

- 1633 *Devocionario de Nuestra Señora de Izamal y Conquista Espiritual de Yucatán*. Gerónimo Morillo. Valladolid.
- 1995. *Devocionario de Nuestra Señora de Izamal y Conquista Espiritual de Yucatán*. Gerónimo Morillo. Valladolid. Facsimile and critical edition by René Acuña. Fuentes para el Estudio de la Cultura Maya, 12. Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.

Maní Land Document of 1557: See Riese below.

Michelon, Oscar

- 1976. *Diccionario de San Francisco*. Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, Graz.

Motul I, a Mayan-Spanish Dictionary: See Ciudad Real above.

Pérez, Juan Pío

- 1898. *Coordinacion Alfabética de las Voces del Idioma Maya*. Imprenta de la Ermita, Mérida, Yucatan.

Riese, Frauke Johanna

- 1981. *Indianische Landrechte in Yukatan um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Hamburgischen Museum für Völkerkunde, Hamburg.

San Buenaventura, Fray Gabriel de

- 1996 *Arte de la Lengua Maya*. Buenaventura. Facsimile and edited version by René Acuña. Fuentes para el Estudio de la Cultura Maya, 13. Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.

San Francisco Dictionary, Parts I (Mayan-Spanish) & II (Spanish-Mayan).  
See Michelon above. Copy by Pérez at Tulane University.

Thompson, J.E.S.

1960. *Maya Hieroglyphic Writing*. Norman, Oklahoma.

1962. *El misterio del Diccionario Maya de Solana*, in *Estudios de Cultura Maya*, Vol II, Mexico, D.F.

1973. "After the smoke of battle: a colleague's assessment", in *William E. Gates*. Xerox publication by University Archives, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Ticul Dictionary: see Pérez 1898 above.

Tozzer, Alfred M.

1978. *Landa's Relación de las cosas de Yucatan*. Kraus Reprint Co., Millwood, N.Y.

Vienna Dictionary: See *Bocabulario de Maya Than* / Acuña 1993 above.

Whalen, Gretchen

2002. *An Annotated Translation of a Colonial Yucatec Manuscript On Religious and Cosmological Topics by a Native Author*. FAMSI.org. (This is a transcript and translation of a handwritten text referred to as the 1576 Manuscript and also the Morley Manuscript.)