

A PETICIÓN OF 1619 IN K'EKCHI' (MAYA)

Ray Freeze

In the *Archivo General de la Nación* of Mexico is found a document with the address: Inquisición, Tomo 361, 1627, foja 521v. and r. This document is a one page letter¹ internally bearing the date March 7, 1619 and the provenience: Cahabon in what is now the country of Guatemala.

At the end of the letter is notice that it has been translated into Spanish on the opposite side. The hand of the translation seems to the present writer to be much later than that of the original, but the translation is signed by individuals named in the original, so we must conclude that the hands are contemporaries.

The letter was originally directed by municipal officials of Cahabon to their Provincial Priest petitioning the replacement of their local priest by another who had been previously assigned to Cahabon. The writers of this *petición* (hereafter: petition) were careful to explain how their present priest was offending them and were equally careful to name several other priests they had known and greatly admired. Many of the names of these priests are familiar to those acquainted with the early history of the region.

A look at Remesal (1932) and Ximenez (1930) reveals much information about the individuals mentioned in the petition, although the episode occasioning the petition is not mentioned. Those mentioned in the petition as being good priests are seen to have been important in the mission among the Chols of the Manché, an area to the north of the K'ekchi'. According to Ximenez, P. Fr. Juan Ezguerra and Salvador de

¹ This letter was recognized by Lawrence H. Feldman in the Archivo and he was kind enough to furnish me with a copy for purposes of preparing it for publication.

San Cipriano were sent from Cahabon in the priorate of Coban to work with the Manché Chol, a mission of particular priority at the time. This change of station of Ezguerra and Cipriano occurred in 1603, and probably created a need in Cahabon — a need which the offending priest Gregorio de Castro must have been sent to help alleviate.

Remesal and Ximenez do not seem to agree on whether Ezguerra or Cipriano died in the convent in Coban and thus which died on the Golfo Dulce, but according to Ximenez, the year of Ezguerra's death was 1604. Given this, he was not available as a replacement for de Castro.

Also frequently mentioned in Ximenez is the Prior to whom the letter was addressed, P. Fr. Agustin Montes, elected Provincial Priest in 1615. He held this office until 17 January 1619 when he was elected Provincial Prior, the office he held at the time of the letter. He is said to have died in 1630.

Ximenez tells us that P. Fr. Alejo Montes was sent, in 1604, from Coban to Cahabon to join Cipriano on to the Manché. Perhaps Montes was to replace Ezguerra who died that year, according to Ximenez. This Alejo Montes and the *Alexo* (1. 13) of the petition must surely be one and the same.

The signer of the petition was Juan de Castro. Remesal (1932) mentions two individuals by this name — one being the nephew of the other— who were among a group of Dominicans who left Acapulco for the *Filipinas* in 1587. A person of this name is mentioned in chapter x of Ximenez as the author of certain *Actas*, in connection with the date, 1572. Later, in 1577, a P. Fr. Andres is said to have been in the company of P. Fr. Juan de Castro from whom he managed to learn much, including the Tzotzil language. Little in either Remesal or in Ximenez is much help in identifying which Juan de Castro actually penned the petition.

Finally, P. Fr. Gabriel de Salazar appears first mentioned in Ximenez associated with the same P. Fr. Andres (ca. 1612) and not again until the 1630's where we find Salazar

having learned Chol so well that he served as the teacher of Francisco Moran.² Chapter LXIX of Ximenez is a *Memorial* by Salazar about the *reducción* of the Chol people, in which he mentions Juan Ezguerra and Alejo Montes as being among his predecessors in that mission. Gabriel de Salazar also appears in Tovilla (1960) where he is identified as the vicar of San Agustín [Lanquín] in 1631. Ximenez, in giving notice of his death, calls him the "first Apostle of the Manché".

Neither the offensive Gregorio de Castro nor Pedro Nuñez, who are also named in the petition appear in Remesal, Ximenez, or in Tovilla. The episode of the petition may be partial explanation for Gregorio's anonymity, but that of Nuñez presently remains unexplained.

There are some non-K'ekchi' influences evident in the petition and they are probably all from or through Spanish, including the Aztequism, *calpul*. The rest are from Spanish, and include proper names, the date, names for municipal offices, religious terms and the words *petición* and *pleito*. Perhaps it is also Spanish influence which allows the first mention of the town name to appear without its locative preposition *chi* (1. 2) while the second mention includes it: ...*chi cahbom* (1. 28). The modern form of the place name requires this preposition: /čik'axbob/.

The orthography usually fails to mark the distinctions, so important in many Mayan languages, between velar and uvular stops, and between glottalized and plain occlusives.³ There is some indication that the scribe did employ spellings of particular words incorporating some differential marking of these distinctions. It has been shown (Freeze, 1975) that a writing system for K'ekchi' in which all of these distinctions could be conventionally marked did exist later, and the spellings discussed here may attest a developmental stage leading to that system. For instance, in the petition there are

² Doubtlessly he was the same Francisco Moran who authored the invaluable 1695 *Arte* and vocabulary of the Chol language.

³ The consonant phonemes of K'ekchi' are /p, b', t, t', c, c', č, č', k, k', q, q', ʔ, s, š, x, h, m, n, l, r, y, w/. There are ten distinct vowels in K'ekchi': long and short varieties of /a, e, i, o, u/.

four morphemes spelled with the tresillo (appearing as *E* in the paleography and its cited forms): *loElah* 'revered'; *toEob* 'unfortunate'; *Euz* meaning 'scold' in modern K'ekchi' and probably meaning 'punish' in 1619; and *siE* 'look for'. In the first three, the tresillo stands for a glottalized uvular stop: /q'/. In the last, it mistakenly is employed to represent a glottalized velar stop: /k'/. This latter consonant is regularly represented (at least when occurring before the vowels *i*, *e*) as the form of the doubled *c* when before *i* and *e*, i.e. *cqu*.

Doubling was systematically used by early Spanish scribes to distinguish glottalized consonants from their plain counterparts. Two morphemes containing /k'/ are regularly written to indicate this glottalization: *cque* 'give' (11. 25, 27) and *ucqn* 'with' (various in 11. 3, 22, 30); cf. /k'e/ and /uk'in/ respectively. The combination *cq* occurs mistakenly in *cavancquil* 'our ways' (lit. 'our being') in 1. 5. The word *vanc* occurs commonly, but the addition of the *il* suffix created the necessity of using *q* and so it was simply added to the more familiar unsuffixed form of the word before adding the suffix. Before other vowels, /k'/ is expected to be represented as *cc*, but opportunities to use this digraph were ignored in words like *chicacalenc* (1. 1), cf. /čik'ak'alenc/.

Though there is appreciable inconsistency of spelling at the period of the petition, it seems likely that the use of the tresillo, like the use of the *cq* digraph, does not deserve the characterization given it by W. E. Gates (1932) as "...wholly irregular...". The graphs employed in the petition for the guttural stops are systematic, though they do not mark some distinctions. The phonemes /k/ and /q/ are not distinguished and both are written as *c*, *qu* according to Spanish orthographic practice. /k'/ is regularly represented as *cqu* before *i* and *e*; and /q'/ is most consistently written *E*.

An example of the confusion of the plain velar and uvular stops in the petition is the constant representation of the first person plural possessive prefix as *c/qu*, and thus identical to the representation of the velar stop: eg. *cahau*, cf. /q-axaw/) 'our-lord'; *quech*, cf. /q-eč/ 'to-us'. Comparison of the

original with the modernized version of the K'ekchi' text which is in a more adequate orthography, will reveal the amount of imprecision in the orthography of the original.

Besides historical relevance, this document contains various data which, when compared with the modern K'ekchi', show linguistic change to have occurred in the grammar and phonology in the intervening three hundred fifty years. Again, comparison of the original with Transcription C will reveal the character and extent of the changes.

The phonological differences are relatively small. A number of morphemes show a final /k/ which their modern reflexes lack: eg. *vac* 'instance'; *hoc* 'thus'. The preconsonantal, third person transitive subject prefix is represented a *y* or *i*,⁴ and is reflected as /iʃ/ in the modern language.

The most common article is of the form: *i*, although when clear definiteness must be solely expressed by the article, *le* tends to be used. These functions correspond to the single modern form: /li/.

The perfect verbal prefix is clearly *o*, corresponding to the modern /š/ or /ki/. Neither of these modern forms appear in the petition. Finally, the optative incomplete verbal prefix is *chi* in subordinate and in independent clauses, a function largely taken over by modern /ta/ in subordinate clauses. Such a change is facilitated by a semantic change by which early K'ekchi' /ta/ 'progressive; incomplete; present' loses the present and progressive meaning it clearly had in 1619 (eg. 1. 28).

The effects of time on the set of tense/aspect prefixes apparent in this short text are rather great: the 'habitual' prefix is maintained, the 'future' meaning of *chi* 'optative' is completely taken over by /ta/, and the 'past, perfective' *o* prefix is all but obsolete in modern K'ekchi' —having been replaced by /ki/ and perhaps /š/. Table 1 allows comparison

⁴ This morpheme is represented identically in Freeze, 1975.

of the two stages at a glance. When there is a syntactic requirement for a prefix, "subordinate clause" follows its gloss in the Table. Care should be taken to remember that the brevity of the text can be expected to exaggerate the amount of change this prefixal system has undergone. It is, however, quite clear that an appreciable amount of change has occurred in the last 350 years.

gloss	1619	Modern⁵
optative	<i>chi</i>	či
incompletive (subord. cl.)	<i>chi</i>	ta
progressive/durative	<i>ta</i>	(periphrastic)
habitual	<i>na(c)</i>	na(k)
narrative/distant past	<i>o</i>	ki
completive	—(?)	š
prohibitive	?	mi

Table 1

K'ekchi' Aspect Prefixes: Modern and Colonial⁶

At least one aspect prefix in 1619 was more loosely bound to its verb complex, giving it the character of a modal proclitic.⁷ For example, the conjunction *ut* is seen as able to intervene between the aspect prefix and the inflected verbal complex (eg. 1.20: ...*ta ut rabi*...; durative and him-he-listen: 'and he is listening to him')

There were some problems in the preparation of the English translations and the modern K'ekchi' version appearing in the appendices.

⁵ Modern K'ekchi' here refers to the language of San Juan Chamelco, a relatively less conservative dialect of K'ekchi', and the dialect with which the present writer is most familiar.

⁶ Table 1 contains results reported in Freeze, 1977, and information available in Morales, 1741. A discussion of the periphrastic progressive is available in Freeze, 1976.

⁷ The modals /ta/ and /na/ which bear great phonological similarity to these prefixes are believed by this writer to be the actual source of these prefixes. Such documentary data as that of 1. 20 is part of the basis for such a hypothesis, but more rigorous data of various kinds is required before this hypothesis can be considered well established.

Various words in the K'ekchi' original were unknown to this writer. They will be listed here along with the line in which they are found and possible meanings are provided where possible: *chicux*(t?) *zulbil*, 24; *ohit* 'he released him', 25; *vahi* 'here (take it)', 25; *o*(?)*atilac*, 19.

Some of the problems were particular to the preparation of the modern version. The word *haua* meaning 'respected sir; lord; father' is no longer current in the meaning of 'father', and the new word, /*yuwa*?/ may not be appropriately extended in meaning as *haua* is numerous times in the letter. The modern form of 'respected sir' is obligatorily possessed (/*qa-wa*?/ 'our-sir': perhaps a reduction of /*qa-hawa*?/) and thus cannot occur as *haua* does in the greeting of the petition, for example. The regularized form *xawa* has been used in order not to overemphasize differences of syntax necessary because of this single lexical problem. Both articles *i* and *le* were represented as modern *li*.

The two verbs in the past tense without overt tense marking (11. 6, 7) have been modernized as the /š/ 'completive' prefix. The modern narrative past /*ki*/ everywhere represents *o*. Making finer distinctions would require access to semantic subtleties not allowed us in so short a text.

English translations of the K'ekchi' original and of its contemporary Spanish translation were prepared independently to facilitate comparison of the actual content of each. Material present in the Spanish translation but not in the original is underlined. This added material is largely further explanation of the translated meaning of the original. Underlining is also used to indicate letters in abbreviations which were raised in the petition. The following equivalents were employed in the translation of Transcriptions A and B: *padre fray* > *Father*; *fray Nuñez* > *Friar Nuñez*; *padre* > *priest* and *padre Nuestro* > *our father*.

In the copy available to me, the Spanish translation seems to have been bound in such a way that some words next to the right margin have been cut off. From context and from

comparison with the original, suggested words or parts of words have been provided in parentheses where possible. In the texts a question mark indicates uncertainty and an ellipsis indicates unrecoverable material. Two sequences of letters within the Spanish version were unidentifiable: *ore* (1. 21) which may be scribal error for *oye*: and *qui(?)el* (1. 28) which remains a mystery.

Bibliography

Freeze, Ray, A.

1975. "A fragment of an Early K'ekchi' Vocabulary," *Studies in Mayan Linguistics* 1 (Monographs In Anthropology 2, University of Missouri at Columbia, Anthropology Museum.)

1976. "Possession in K'ekchi' (Maya)", *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 42.2:113-125.

1977. "Whence the Future in K'ekchi' (Maya)". In the Third LACUS Forum 1976. Hornbeam Press, Columbia, South Carolina.

Gates, William E.

1932. "A Lanquin Kekchi Calendar", *The Maya Society Quarterly*, Vol. I, pp. 29-32

Morales, Juan de

1741. *Arte en lengua Kekchi*. In the Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University. (photo of ms. copy by C. Hermann Berendt, Coban, 1875).

Remesal, Fray Antonio de

1932. *Historia General de las Indias occidentales, y particular de la gobernación de Chiapa y Guatemala* (T. II, Segunda Edición, Guatemala).

Tovilla, Capitán don Martín Alfonso

1960. *Relación Histórica descriptiva de las provincias de la Verapaz y de la del Manché*. Editorial Universitaria, Guatemala. [a history dated 1635].

Ximenez, Fray Francisco

1930. *Historia de la Provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala*. T. II. Tipografía Nacional-Guatemala. [a history of the early 18th century].

*Original K'ekchi'. Transcription A.***At caloE lah aua padre fr. provincial**

1. Dios canimahual chi cacalenc auech at caloElahaua padre fray provinci 2. al: haoalal acahol ah sancta Ma nativitas cahabom: xpoual xiluano 3. alldes y Juan perez alldes rucqneb y Regidor rucqneb ut y huntac chi 4. nam. tacotzibac xac chavuch. chirix yculunic y Pe fray gregorio 5. de castro: toh mahi nanau le cavancquil. toh mahi nanau y catinal.

6. haban y atin tayyej rech y yxc ce y confession har vac abanu 7. y mac rucqn y pe fray po nuñez fray gabriel. vey at y pilee y pe chuuch. 8. yyxc ce y confesion: hachic retal napatz y pe quech chanc anchal y. 9. ixc nacabj. Relic taxiuc anchal y yxc: nacta rabi tayyej anchal 10. chiribil yyxc vinc: y ban le maco cayejnac le tenamit chirabinquil

11. napatzec ta ymac y pe ybā hun chic pe maco nacanau yrabinquil le a 12. tinan. vanc le cah tih fray gabriel loElah pe yalal tihoc yalal ser 13. mon nayej quech: / ovanc pe fray po nunez: / ovāc pe fr alexo/ pe fr 14. saluator: y fray Juan ezguerra. yal Relic vz. otih ui vzil sermon o 15. yej quech. yalal confession, ocabanu chirucheb anchal y pe mah inca.

16. y pleyto otzama chiruch y tihom./ haut mahoc taybanu y pe fr grego 17. rio naquil nacabj yal hatziE le vinc. ah pleyto. le ah pilec le Euz 18. bil chi mac chi pile. haut ta pacoc y atin le vāc ymac. vanc y xicquil. ra 19. oreca ocuçec oatilac yban y pe hūhaber cahaber. oxhaber cahaber yEuzbal 20. yban y pe hoc ut pacol atin vance ui taut rabi le pe taypaab le pe fray gre

Translation of the Original K'ekchi'

Oh our revered father, Provincial Priest

1. May our great Lord God take care of you, you, our revered father, provincial Father. 2. These your children of Santa Maria Natividad Cahabon: Cristobal Silvano 3. Mayor and Juan Perez mayor and Aldermen as well as a councillor 4. we are writing to you in reference to the coming here of Father Gregorio 5. de Castro: He does not yet know our customs; he does not yet know our language.

6. Besides, these are the words he has been saying to the women in the confession: "How many times have you 7. sinned with Father Pedro Nuñez, Friar Gabriel. Has the priest "defiled" (pilee you?)" is said to 8. the women in their confession. "This is really what the priest asks us 9. women" they tell me. All the women are very afraid when they hear it. The men and women are all discussing it 10. among themselves: because the people are not accustomed to hearing

11. mention any sin of a priest made by another priest. We don't know how to interpret these 12. questions, The teacher/preacher Friar Gabriel used to be here. He was a revered priest who true prayers and true sermons 13. he provided us with. Father Pedro Nuñez was here, Father Alejo was here, Father Salvator was here and Friar Juan Esguerra 14. truly good prayers they would pray, good sermons they would 15. preach to us. Proper confessions we would say before all the priests. No

16. quarrels would be raised(=asked for) in the preachings, but this does Father Gre 17. gory [according to what] I see and hear. He only seeks the quarrelsome people, the fornicators, those who have been punished 18. for carnal sin, and those with sin, those possessed of evil are bearing false witness. painful 19. They felt being punished (?...) by the priest —a year, two years, three years, four years they were punished 20. by the priest. Because of that they are telling lies. The priest is listening to them. Father Gregory is believing them

21. gorio yban le maco nanau. maco ilbil yban. maco nanau y ruch le pa 22. col atin le pē fr. gregorio hoc ut mavuzcul maconacah chi vāc cucqn 23. cah nacah chacque quech cahaua cah tih pē fray gabriel de salaçar vžil ca 24. haua vžil cah tih uzil yyalal nacoytiḥ uj vžil chicut zulbil y catin cape 25. ticion chi ruch le pē fr Agustín montes ohit chi cuch ocquequech y vahi pē fr

26. gabriel y fray Saluator erah tih tain cque erech naquetzama chanc fr. agustín 27. at cahaua pē fr provincial chacque quech fr gabriel toEob y cuch 28. cah hū calb y catin auech tacatziba vin sancta mā natiuitas chi cahbom 29. en 7 de março 1619 años hao acahol xpoual xilvano alldes y Juan 30. perez alldes vucqneb y Regidores vucqn hū tac chinam.

31. haín tatzibac y ratin ahualebc hunta chinam

Juan de castro

ah tih

32. [in the hand of the translation:] a la buelta desta esta fielmente traducida esta carta.

Contemporary Spanish Translation. Transcription B.

A ti nuestro amado Pē provincial

1. Dios gran señor te guarde nro muy amado Pē provincial nosotros tus hijos del (pueblo?) 2. de nra Sra de natiuidad de Cahabon xpobal silbano alcalde y Juan perez alcalde 3. con los Regidores y con todas las cabezas de calpul te escribvimos en orden a la x... 4. al del pueblo del pē fr gregorio de Castro que aun no sabe nuestro ser, i tanpoco (nuestra?) 5. lengua, este padre pues pregunta en la confesion a las indias cosas que nunca se an p(re) 6. guntado porque las dize luego que llegan quantas uезes as pecado con el Pē fray (pedro) 7. Nuñez, quantas con el Pē fray gabriel, y esto dicen todas las mujeres que les pre(gunta)

21. because he doesn't know (better). They haven't been seen by him. Father Gregorio doesn't [really] know these malicious
 22. gossips. So, (?...) we don't want him to remain with us.
 23. What we want is for you to give us our preacher Father Gabriel de Salazar, a good
 24. respected priest, a good preacher who good truth preached to us. goodness (?...) our words, our re
 25. quest. Before, Father Augustin Montes agreed (?) (ohit) and gave him to us, and "Here is Father
 26. Gabriel and Friar Salvator, your preachers who I am giving to you, who you asked for" said Friar Augustin.
 27. You, our father, Provincial Father, please give us Friar Gabriel, poor us. 28. Just [these] few words we write to you [from] Santa Maria Natividad Cahabon
 29. on the 7th of March, 1619. We your sons Cristobal Silvano mayor and Juan
 30. Perez with the Aldermen and a counsellor
 31. I am writing the words of the gentlemen and a counsellor
 Juan de castro
 preacher
 32. on the reverse side of this is faithfully translated this letter.

Translation of Contemporary Spanish

To you our beloved provincial priest

1. May god great lord keep you our very beloved provincial priest. We your children. 2. of our Lady of Cahabon Cristobal Silvano mayor and Juan Perez 3. with the aldermen and with all the heads of calpul, we write you (?...) 4. of the town of Father Gregory de Castro who doesn't know our customs, nor does he know (?...) 5. language. This priest, then asks the women in the confession things never asked
 6. because he asks them just when they arrive, how many times have you sinned with Father 7. Nuñez, how many with Father Gabriel, and all the women say this, that he asks them

8. lo primero en la confesion y pro esta causa tormentadas, y todo el pueblo ansi ombres y 9. mujeres estan escandalicados y lo andan communicando entre si, i dicen que (?...)
10. nunca emos vido tal cosa ni estamos acostumbrados a que cosa semejante s(e pre)

11. gunte si pecan o no pecan los padres. aqui tuuimos por nro Pē y maestro al Pē fr(ay) 12. gabriel buen Pē que nos enseñaba con verdad y nos predicaba muy bien ta(mbien?) 13. tubimos *por nro Pe al padre* fray Pedro nuñez al Padre fray Alexo, al P(e) 14. Juan ezguerra al Pē fr salvador que verdaderamē nos enseñaban bien, y nos co(nfes) 15. sabemos bien con ellos y no preguntaban *a sus ijos semejantes cosas ni cosas (de?)*

16. pleito no es este pues el ser del Pē fr gregorio que vemos y oimos porque solam(ente) 17. a los que andan con pleitos y a los açolados por fornicios, estos pues busca el Pē f(ray) 18. gregorio y en lo que dicen mienten y les leban tan testimonios porque les an a(?...) 19. y castigado por sus pecados y asi sienten gran dolor porque no los an castigado (una) 20. vez sino muchas un año, dos años, tres años quatro años, y por esto les leban tan

21. testimonios a estos pues obedece y (ore?) el Pē fray gregorio porque no conoze que 22. son los pleitistas y mentirosos en el pueblo, por esto no queremos queste con(osotros) 23. en nro pueblo y que sea nro Pē pues aze cosas semejantes y asi te rogam(os) 24. nos le quites y nos buelbas a nro amado Pē fray gabriel de salazar ques verdadera 25. mte nro Pē y que nos enseña verdaderamte. nosotros le pedimos al Pē (pro)

26. vincial pasado fr Augustin Montes y nos le dio y dijo (?ay os doy?) al Pē fray Salv(ador) 27. y al Pē fray gabriel estos son vros Pē y Maestros Por eso nro amado padr... 28. nos le (?qu?el?) te pedimos pobres de nosotros, *ten misericordia de nosotros esto es (?...)* 29. tescribimos aqui en sancta Ma cahabon en 7 de marco de 1619 nosotros 30. los alcaldes xpobal silvano, y Juan perez, y los Rejidores y todas l(?...) 31. de calpul, y yo Juan de castro escribano 32. Tradujimos esta carta en spanol nos fr. salvador çipriano, fr. pe (dro nuñez) 33. y fr. gabriel de salazar...// y porque conste lo

8. the first thing in the confession, and because of this tortured, and all the town men as well as 9. women are horrified and they are talking about it among themselves, and they say that 10. we have never seen such a thing nor are we used to such a thing

11. being asked, whether priests sin or don't sin. We used to have here as our priest and teacher, Father 12. Gabriel, a good priest who taught us truly and preached to us very well. Also 13. we had as our priest Father Pedro Nuñez, Father Alejo, Father 14. Juan Ezguerra, Father Salvador who truly taught us and we (confes) 15. sed well with them and they didn't ask their children such things, nor things (about?)

16. quarreling. This isn't, then the way of Father Gregory, as we see and hear since only 17. those who quarrel, those destroyed (lost?) through fornication, it is these who Father Gregory seeks 18. and in what they say, they lie and they accuse them in court because they have been (?...) 19. and punished for their sins and so they feel great pain because they have not been punished one 20. time, but many. One year, two years, three years, four years, and this is why they accuse them.

21. It is these who Father Gregory obeys (obedece) and listens to because he does not realize that 22. they are the trouble makers and liars of the town and so it is that we don't want him to be with us 23. in our town and be our priest, since he does such things and so we beg that you 24. take him from us and that you return to us our beloved Father Gabriel de Salazar who is real- 25. ly our priest and who really teaches us. we asked the last provincial priest

26. Friar Augustin Montes and he agreed (nos le dió) and said I give you Father Salvador 27. and Father Gabriel. These are your priests and teachers. Thus, our beloved priest (?...) 28. (?) him from us we ask of you, poor us, have pity on us this is(?...) 29. we write you here in Santa Maria Cahabon on the 7th of 1619 we 30. the mayors Cristóbal Silvano and Juan Perez and the aldermen and all those

31. of the communit(y/ies) and I Juan de Castro scribe. 32. we translated this letter into Spanish we Friar Salvador Cipriano, Friar Pedro Nuñez 33. and Friar Gabriel de Salazar. and so it will be clear, we sign, of those named (?...)

firmamos de nros nom(brados) 34. fr salvador cypriano fray Pedro nunez, fr. gabriel de salasar

35. [perhaps in the hand of Salvador Cipriano] Pe nro, el escandalo es muy grande q resulta de tales confesion(es...?)

36. lo remedie por el señor co breuedad. qesta muy publico y temo (no...?) 37. nos entre por casa la st̃a inquisicion. q ya poco le falta nro (g...?) pe(?) 38. muchos años y lo trayga p̃sto. fr. salua

34. Friar Salvador Cipriano, Friar Pedro Nuñez, Friar Gabriel de Salazar.

35. Our Father the scandal is great, which comes of such confessions (?...) 36. it be fixed through the Lord (?) with dispatch, because it is quite public and I fear the Holy Inquisition 37. will come in on us, since it lacks little, our (?...) 38. many years and might bring it quickly. Friar Salvador.

*Modernized Version of the Ke'kchi' Text. Transcription C.***At qaloq'lax xawa Padre Fray Provincial**

1. Dios qanimaxwal čik'ak'aleng aweč at qaloq'lax xawa? Padre Fray Provinci 2. al. awalal ak'axol ax Santa Maria Natividad čik'axbob: Cristóbal Silvano 3. alcalde y Juan Perez alcalde ruk'ineb li Regidor ruk'ineb ut li xun taqči? 4. nam. takohč'ibak šaq čī a:wuč čī riš šk'ulunik li padre Fray Gregorio 5. de Castro tox maxi? naišnaw li qawankil. tox maxi? naišnaw li qatinal.

6. a? ban li atin taišyeh reč li išq sa? li confesion. har wa ša:ba:nu 7. li ma:k ruk'in li Padre Fray Pedro Nuñez, Fray Gabriel. wih šatišpile'eh li Padre. ču'uš. 8. li išq sa? li confesión. a? čik retal napač' li Padre qeč, čankeb ančal li 9. išq naqabi relik tašiwak ančal li išq naq tarabi taišyeh ančal 10. čī ribil li išq winq: šban li mako k'ayxenaq li tenamit čī rabinkil.

11. napač'ek' ta šma:k li Padre šban xun čik mako naqanaw šrabinkil li a 12. tin a'an wank li qax tix Fray Gabriel loq'lax Padre yalal tixok yalal ser 13. mon naišyeh qeč: / kiwank Padre Fray Pedro Nuñez: / kiwank Padre Fray Alejo / Padre Fray 14. Salvador y Fray Juan Ezguerra. yal relik us kītix wi? usil sermon ki 15. išyeh qeč yalal confesion, kišba:nu čī ručeb ančal li padre mah(?) ink'a'(?).

16. li pleito kišč'amah čī ruč li tixom.// a?ut maxo? taišba:nu li Padre Grego 17. rio naqil naqabi yal a? taišsik' li wi:nq ax pleito. li ax pile(ʔe)k li q'us(?) 18. bil čī ma:k čī pile (?) a?ut tapak'ok (=yo: čī pak'ok) li atin li wank šma:k. wank ššik'il ra 19. šre:k'ah šq'usek' oatilak (?) šban li padre xun haber, ka'haber, ošhaber, kahhaber šq'usbal. 20. šban li padre xo? ut pak'ol atin wankeb wi?. ut tarabi li padre taišpa:b li padre fray gre

21. gorlo šban li mako naišnaw ta. mako ilbil ta šban. mako naišnaw ta li ruč li ax pa 22. k'ol atin. li padre fray Gregorio xo? ut ma wuskul (?) mako naqax ta čiwang quk'in. 23. k'a? naqax ča:k'eh qeč qax tix padre Gabriel de Salazar usil qa 24. xaw usil qax tix usil šyalal nakoštix

wi' usil čik ut (?) sulbil (?) li qatin qa pe. 25. ticion či ruč li Padre Fray Agustin Montes kihit(?) či quč kišk'e qeč li wahi padre fray 26. Gabril y Fray Salvador e:rax tix tink'e e:reč nake'čama čan Fray Agustin 27. at qaxaw Padre Fray Provincial čak'e qeč Fray Gabriel. toq'ob quč 28. k'a'ax xun ka'ib li qatin aweč taqwač'iba wi' Santa Maria Natividad čik'axbob. 29. en 7 de marzo 1619 años awalal ak'axol Cristobal Silvano alcalde y Juan 30. Perez alcalde ruk'neb li regidores ruk'in xun taqči'nam 31. a'in tinč'iba li ratin axwaleb xun taqči'nam.

Juan de Castro

ax tix

32. A la vuelta de ésta está fielmente traducida esta carta.

Resumen

Se publica aquí, con amplio estudio introductorio, una *petición* suscrita por indígenas de lengua k'ekchí', habitantes de Cahabon en Guatemala. Dicha petición, dirigida al provincial de los dominicos, está fechada el 7 marzo de 1619 y se conserva en el ramo de Inquisición, volumen 361, del *Archivo General de la Nación*, en la Ciudad de México.

El interés de esta petición puede apreciarse desde varios puntos de vista. Por una parte está su interés histórico, ya que en ella aparecen personajes conocidos a través de las obras de cronistas como fray Antonio de Remesal y fray Francisco Jiménez. Por otra, está su importancia lingüística y, finalmente, su significación como una muestra de la relativamente poco abundante literatura indígena colonial en lengua k'ekchí'.