



THE SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD
ICONOGRAPHY OF THE GODS OF EARLY CLASSIC MAYA ART
IN PETEN, GUATEMALA

by

Nicholas M. Hellmuth

THE SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD
ICONOGRAPHY OF THE GODS OF EARLY CLASSIC MAYA ART
IN PETEN, GUATEMALA

by

Nicholas M. Hellmuth

revised English original of Ph.D. dissertation

Karl-Franzens-Universitaet, Graz

Art History (submitted and accepted 1986)

VOLUME I

1987

FOUNDATION FOR LATIN AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH

THE SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD

Vol. 1, text

copyright 1987, F.L.A.A.R.

numbered edition limited to 50 copies.

this is book number 30

edition without numbers also limited to 50 copies

6355 Green Valley Circle No. 213

Culver City, CA 90230

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	4
Program	4
Paucity of Previous Studies Dedicated to the Early Classic	9
Cultural Geography of the Maya Area	10
Definition of Maya Time Periods	11
Maya (Peten Style) Artifact Sequence	16
PROPOSED REVISIONS FOR THE PETEN STYLE MAYA ARTIFACT SEQUENCE: THE HISTORICAL, ART STYLE, AND CERAMIC SEQUENCE FOR THE CENTRAL LOWLANDS	19
 PART I: DEITIES OR NOT: THE NOMENCLATURE DILEMMA IN MAYA RELIGION AND ICONOGRAPHY	 28
Chapter 1	
SHORT HISTORY OF MAYA ICONOGRAPHY	28
Eduard Seler	30
Herbert J. Spinden	37
Sylvanus J. Morley	39
J. Eric S. Thompson	44
Itzamna - Monotheism	49
George Kubler	52
Tatiana Proskouriakoff	57
Chapter 2	
THE TRADITIONAL CONCEPT THAT THE LACANDON AND MANCHE DID NOT HAVE IDOLS AND WORSHIPPED ONLY NATURAL FORCES	61
(Cholti) Lacandon and Manche Chol Claiming "No Idols"	67
Manche-related Religion from the Cholti Dictionary	71
"Idol," Maya Art History Confused by Semantics	75
THE PALENQUE TRIAD: DIVINITIES OR HISTORICAL MEN?	84
GI OF THE TRIAD	86
MASKS -- GOD IMPERSONATORS OR ACTUAL DIVINITIES	90
"Masks" as Abbreviations of the Full Figure	94
End of the Mask-Costume Objection	96
 PART II	
Chapter 3	
THE SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD AND ITS OCCUPANTS	99
GI, Concluded	99
The Composition of the Top Layer of the Underwaterworld	101
FISH IN SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD SCENES	104
Fin in front of Face	106
Complicated Tail Structure	106
Fish on the Black Basal Flange Bowl Lids	108

XOC MONSTER	111
Diagnostic Features of Late Classic Xoc Monster	114
Early Classic Xoc	115
Low Darkware Bowls with Xoc-like Monster Faces	117
Second Small Bowl with Piscine Monster	120
Return to Full Fledged Xoc Monsters, at Tikal	121
Full Figure Xoc Monsters and Relatives: Uaxactun Tripod	122
Comparing the Uaxactun Xoc with a Tikal Fish Monster	123
The Hooked Tail	125
Hooked Tail, Piscine Monsters as Forehead Ornament	127
MIDDLE MONSTER, UAXACTUN TRIPOD: BEARDED DRAGON RELATIVES	130
Bowl of the Fish-Snakes	132
The Reptile on the Gann Bowl	133
Dragon on the Pearlman Conch	134
Dragon on the Uaxactun Tripod	137
LILY PAD HEADDRESS MONSTER	138
Diagnostic Traits of the Monster Itself	142
Lily Pad Headdress Monster on the Uaxactun Tripod	144
Lily Pad Headdress Monster on the Kerr Rollout Bowl	144
SHELL WING DRAGON	147
Shell Winged Deity Faces	148
TUBULAR HEADDRESS MONSTER	151
The Headdress as Mimic of Sea Anemone	153
The Headdress as Tubular Root of Water Lily Plant	155
The Tubular Headdress Monster	157
Deification	158
Chapter 4	
HUMANOIDS IN THE UNDERWATERWORLD	160
The Lost Incised Vase	160
Humanoids on the Blom Plate	164
Humanoids on the Tikal Burial 160 Painting	167
The Headbanded Characters on the Tikal Bowl	169
Tikal Personages A, G, and L	171
Chapter 5	
SERPENT FACE WING AND THE PRINCIPAL BIRD DEITY-SNAKE BIRD	176
Serpent Face-Wing on the Tikal Painting	176
Serpent Face-Wing on Bird-Swallowing-Fish Lids	176
PRINCIPAL BIRD DEITY	181
The Early Classic Principal Bird Deity	182
Characteristics of Tzakol Principal Bird Deity	184
The Principal Bird Deity in Front View	188
Association of the Bird Deity with the Twisted Snake	193
Disembodied Serpent Face-Wing on the Tikal Fragment	197
Principal Bird Deity Transformations	198

Chapter 6	
THE SUN GOD AND JAGUAR GOD OF THE UNDERWORLD	207
"THE SUN GOD"	207
Thompson on the Sun God	210
Ah Kin on the Rio Azul Murals	211
Additional Kin on the Surface of the Underwaterworld	214
Portrait with Kin on Orange Cache Containers	216
Problems in Sun God Theology and Iconography	217
JAGUAR GOD OF THE UNDERWORLD (J.G.U.)	219
Museo Popol Vuh Jaguar God of the Underworld	223
Chapter 7	
MODELS BASED ON THE TRADITIONAL CORPUS	
THE CODEX GODS AND THE CLASSIC PERIOD SPIRITS	226
God L	226
Classic through Codex Continuity	228
God D: Early Classic to the Post Classic Codices	232
God D as an Underworld Denizen	233
The Classic Maya Pantheon	237
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	241
GLOSSARY	252
BIBLIOGRAPHY	267

Volume II

INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAWINGS	1
Drawing and Photograph Credits	2
List of Figures	9
ILLUSTRATIONS	44
APPENDIX A, SYNONYMS	239
INDEX	242

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research behind this study was accomplished while I held a nine month Fellowship from the Organization of American States (OAS) and a three semester appointment as Visiting Fellow, Department of History of Art, Yale University (1980-81). I appreciate the recommendations for these fellowships from Professors Gordon Willey (Harvard University), George Kubler (Yale University), and Michael Coe (Yale University). In Guatemala I appreciate the assistance of architect Federico Fahsen, Dr. Guillermo Mata A. of the Museo Popol Vuh Board of Directors, and Lic. Jose Luis Castillo at Planificacion Economica.

While at Yale I learned much from discussions with Drs. Mary Miller, Michael Coe, George Kubler, Floyd Lounsbury and with Anthropology Department graduate students Steven Houston and Karl Taube. The work space generously made available by Kubler and by Miller in the Department of History of Art at Yale and their continued help even after the Fellowship period reached its end, are particularly appreciated. The faculty, Department of History of Art staff, and students at Yale have all been very patient with the bulk of my archive especially considering that I myself am not enrolled there. This book demonstrates the benefits of having an academic nest.

In IDAEH I appreciate the early help of Licda. Dora de Gonzalez, who gave me suggestions in the early 1970's of where I could find Tiquisate incensarios to photograph. This was the beginning of now seventeen years of photography. On matters archaeological, credit should be given to Dr. Francis Polo S., for his directorship of IDAEH during which time guards were sent to many of the sites

that needed protection, such as Nakum and many others. The Director General of IDAEH while the first draft of this dissertation was being written, Lic. Rene Gordillo, visibly expressed his dedication to preserve the pre-Columbian patrimony of Guatemala by increasing the budget to fund more guards to protect more sites.

I thank Dr. David Freidel, Southern Methodist University, Dr. William Fash, Northern Illinois University, and Dr. Claude Baudez, Musee de l' Homme, David Stuart, Dr. George and Gene Stuart, National Geographic Society, Dr. Thomas Lee, Jr., New World Archaeological Foundation, Dr. Ray Matheny, and Dr. Susanna Ekholm, also of the NWAf, and Dr. Linda Schele, University of Texas at Austin for hospitality and friendly interchange of data.

Salvage work is increasingly a sad but necessary labor in archaeology. Special appreciation is due to OAS for their understanding of the lasting potential value of an international photographic archive of Maya art. The goal of the fellowship, though, was more than merely an academic catalog, it was and still is to make this iconography of ancient Maya deities available to students, museum personnel, to all Guatemalans, and indeed to all Maya aficionados of whatever country as a contribution of advancement of knowledge of the pre-Columbian heritage of Mesoamerica. I thank the Consejo Nacional de Planificación Economica, Ministerio de Finanzas Publicas, and Arquitecto Lionel Mendez, formerly of the Consejo. Within OAS itself, Sra. de Mendes gave me encouragement during the application process and I wish to thank L. Ronald Scheman and Jorge Zamorano, who helped me work my way through application paperwork.

At Karl-Franzens Universitaet, Graz, Univ.-Prof.Dr. Heinrich Gerhard Franz helped in the process of selecting a limited and thereby manageable topic for my

dissertation out of the larger Maya world which beckoned. In his courses on Roman and Egyptian art I found many examples for how the gods of different civilizations were borrowed and evolved following trade contact or conquest. Cultural parallels could be found in Maya adoption of Olmec and Teotihuacan deities. ao.Univ.-Prof.Dr. Guenter Brucher patiently furthered my education in Baroque, Byzantine, and Romanesque art and architecture. I thank Dr. Ariberto Guidani and Architect David Guidani for their hospitality over the past five years and the many trips they took me on to Etruscan, Roman, Renaissance, and Baroque museums, buildings, and paintings. The interest in Aztec religion, mythology and philosophy of Univ.-Prof. Ernst Topitsch encouraged me to delve into the art of that civilization more than I had previously. Univ.Doc.Dr. Manfred Hainzmann provided academic hospitality while in Graz. John Cederberg, Dr. Johann Lubienski, and Frau Dr. Silvia Lubienski helped in countless matters relating to academic paperwork.

In Graz I wish to express my appreciation to Karl Herbert Mayer for helping me get settled and find a place to move my library in Graz, and to Dr. Hasso Hohmann and Dr. Annegrette Vogrin for providing a place to stay my first year and later a place for my library when it overfilled my apartment.

Univ.-Prof.Dr.Thomas Barthel, Universitaet Tuebingen and Dr. Dieter Duetting, Max-Planck-Institut fuer Entwicklungsbiologie, Tuebingen both kindly provided copies of their articles which facilitated my background research.

General assistance during years of photography has been provided by Spencer Throckmorton, Ronald W. Dammann and family, Al Stendahl, Edward H. Merrin, Linda Schildkraut, and gallery staff, Klaus Perls and gallery staff, Mildred Kaplan

of Arte Primitivo, and Justin and Barbara Kerr. In San Francisco I thank Elayne Marquis and many individuals who facilitated photography. For help while photographing in Europe I thank Lin Crocker and Emile Deletaille.

The curators of museums in Canada, the USA, Europe, England, and especially at the Denver Art Museum and the Museo Popol Vuh in Guatemala City receive my gratitude for their long term cooperation with my project to salvage through photography the full range of Maya ceramic art. Overall, my appreciation for the "museum most helpful in my research" and the museum on which I have most often inflicted my camera equipment and requests to open the glass cases, deservedly goes to the Museo Popol Vuh, Universidad Francisco Marroquin. Since the foundation of the museum in 1978 all former and present curators, directors, and board members have been helpful. Dr. Luis Lujan Munoz, Mario Tejeda, F. Gomez, Arq. Carlos Fernando Fuentes, the present curator, arqueologo Lic. Rolando Rubio and the museum administrator Lucy Alvarado have been extremely generous of their time. Members of the Junta Directiva at the time of my OAS Fellowship were, in addition to Fahsen and Mata: Don Jens Bornholt, Dr. Manuel Ayau, Senora Aida Ch. de Ritz, Lic. Edward Carrette, Sr. Nicolas Buonafina, Senora Olga de Ayau, Senora Olga Ayau de Sanchez, Senora Eugenia Ayau de Minoldo, Srita. Elizabeth Hoenckel, Senora Isabel de Canella, and Senora Ela vda. de Castillo. The museum administrative secretary, museum guards and assistants and docents have assisted me during many photographic visits. Compared to needless petty hassels that can be raised to frustrate research by outsiders, it is indeed a pleasure to work with the personnel at the Museo Popol Vuh. They are truly fulfilling the purpose of a museum: to make their material available to the public for enjoyment and to students for the advancement of knowledge. A museum should be, and the Popol

Vuh certainly is, more than a warehouse of dusty pots.

Looking back now, I realize that if my interests of 1970-75 in provenanced pottery had been facilitated, I would have ended up in an academic career focusing on grave lots and stratigraphy--important perhaps, but not the only feature of an ancient civilization. Instead I have stumbled upon and by necessity worked out the study techniques that now allow appreciable information to be gleaned from pottery irrespective of absence of grave lot and loss of site provenance. With unprovenanced art being the material that was widely available to study yet otherwise abandoned, I worked out the clues necessary to render this orphaned art useful to iconography. The advances are the most telling in deity identification, mythology, and work on the Primary Standard Sequence, the latter independently by David Stuart, Stephen Houston, and Nikolai Grube.

Sr. Hector Santamarina and his family, Mr. and Mrs. Karl-Heinz Nottebohm, Sr. Edgar Castillo, and Sr. Juan Maegli and sons, with their registered collections, have all consistently cooperated with visiting students and scholars. I have also enjoyed viewing the collection of General Carlos Arana O., former constitutional president of Guatemala.

Access to archaeological data is increasingly restricted for political, personal, competitive, exploitative, vindictive, or theoretical grounds. I regret that the world is as we find it, but I attempt to work around problems by setting a simple goal: to salvage a pictorial archive of all Maya art extant wherever it may be so that this illustrated reference to one of the world's great civilizations is available without discrimination to all interested people of all nations with which to study the achievements of the Maya culture of Guatemala and adjacent lands.

The situation is confused by the fact that the study of unprovenanced pottery, instead of conforming to the heralded total lack of scientific value of such artifacts, in fact is producing as much and occasionally embarrassingly even more information than grave looted pottery (PSSequence, deities, and as itemized elsewhere). Thus the ultimate mistake is to abandon the artifacts that are already in storage. More effort should be expended in making sure that the sites are guarded than the easier exercise of witch hunts. Sites should be protected before they are looted, not only after they are sacked. The fact that entrenched theories are overturned by the study of looted artifacts introduces a further complication, since attacks against the study of unprovenanced pottery are often a thinly veiled attempt to protect personal theories and academic reputations grounded on these now unacceptable models. Hypocrisy enters the scene when field archaeologists themselves in fact make use of looted pots in their own publications. The list of such writings is considerable.

Looting is unethical, causes the destruction of scientific data, and corrupts all it touches from the looter through the smuggler. There is no justification for these activities other than greed. The slick repainting of looted pots is a further travesty.

During the beginning years of my research in Guatemala my research was aided by Vivian Morales de Broman and Rafael Morales, former director of the museum at Tikal and then the museum in Guatemala City, and for many years in charge of the IDAEH section dedicated to the rescue and preservation of archaeological resources. Also to the Asociacion Tikal members, and especially to Dona Laura de Garcia Prendes and Sra. de Hempstead, I express my appreciation for assisting me during my early years of residence in Guatemala. Joya Hairs in

Guatemala City and Edwin Shook in Antigua have helped introduce me to private collectors and to places where I could find Lake Amatitlan and Tiquisate ceramics to photograph. Hairs has also aided in solving photographic problems. I wish to thank Lic. Emilio Barrios Flores and Lic. Horacio Maldonado for guiding me through the 1970's in Guatemala, and to Karl Herrmannsdorfer for hospitality at the Hotel Cortijo Reforma.

In Peten I thank Rafael Sagastume and family for hospitality at their hotel in Santa Elena/Flores, The Maya International; Antonio Ortiz, wife, and sons Aureo Rene and Rufino for their hospitality in their hotel at Tikal, Posada de la Selva--The Jungle Lodge. Those who live and work at Tikal have considerable insight and information to offer the archaeologist, such as, Jose Maria Marcus, Clarence Massiah, Edmundo Solis, Patty de Solis, Miguel Sam, Pilar Martinez, Ricardo Ortiz, Spencer Ortiz, Francisco Florian Escobar, Rene Pinelo, Vladimir Herrera, Carlos Galindo, Raul Gavarrete, Luis Gonzales, Lorenzo de Leon, and the other guides of Tikal. By workers at both Tikal and Yaxha, Nolberto Tesecun, Felipe Lanza, Alejandro Montejo, Santiago Cifuentes, and many other helpful Peteneros I have been taught much.

During the now almost two decades of photography that stand behind this present monograph, my research was aided by the dedicated labors of editor and publisher Frank Comparato and then long term volunteers, Carol Hester, Mary Wise, Genevive Michel, as well as seasonal volunteers, Brother Robert Wood, SM, Robert Neeley, David Koons, Ann Dowd, and other students. The several scientific illustrators aided in many ways in the daily chores of running a research organization, especially Barbara Van Heusen, Laura Gornto, and Persis Clarkson. Appreciation is also rendered to the volunteers from several countries who

contributed to the goals of public education of the Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research in the nightly lectures on Maya civilization given between 1975 and 1980 to over 27,000 tourists visiting Guatemala.

Financial Assistance

Since fellowships provided help only during nine months out of a seventeen year project, my work has been facilitated by donations from the general public, individuals who share the feeling that research should not be restricted, hampered, or manipulated but instead should enjoy the productive atmosphere of academic freedom, and freedom of the press in including whatever archaeological pieces one needs to illustrate a given topic. The years of photography expenses--principally transportation of myself, cameras, and lighting--together with film processing and enlargements of study prints, have cost more than a quarter of a million dollars. A good way to calculate costs is from the photography charges of an outside photographer for pictures of three pots. The bill was over \$ 500--and the photographer did not have to move more than a few meters. Worse, the vases and plate were so poorly photographed I had to send half the pictures back. The F.L.A.A.R. Photo Archive project totals between 20,000 and 55,000 km. a year of travel, and I have photographed an estimated 5,000 whole ceramic vessels. Based on the one sample charge, the photographic corpus behind this work is over six hundred thousand dollars worth, the photographs in the dissertation itself, over \$32,000... plus transportation of a photographic studio criss-crossing continents over seventeen years.

A second major expense in preparing and successfully finishing this dissertation was building up a reference library. To have had to trek back and forth to some

institutional library, fill out cards, return books on due dates, and to find most of the rare books not available in any event, would have delayed the already overdue finishing of this present work. Easily two years labor was shortened by having the books right alongside my desk--2,000 volumes worth, since references had to cover tropical flora and fauna as well as history, religion, art, anthropology, architecture, and archaeology. My profound thanks go out to the many considerate individuals whose checks in the mail have made the Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research library now the largest in Austria on Maya subjects, shared and valued by the other Maya scholars in Graz, and indeed from elsewhere in Europe.

One of the biggest helps in my years on the road has been that where possible, most collectors and many curators have provided me with rooms in their homes, plus sustenance, during the often long periods of photography. If I had had to pay for hotels, restaurant meals, and rental cars in every city where I have photographed over the past decade then my project would be even deeper in debt than even Kingsborough managed to get in his publications of Mesoamerican material.

My yearly advances in Maya studies have been possible since the very beginning by annual contributions by Harlan and Ann Scott. The initial years' research was aided by gifts from Richard Williams, Helen Baer, Roy Jordan, Keith and Muriel Irish, Robert and Virginia Orr, Richard Weller, and by my beloved grandmother, Harriet Fowler Hellmuth. Research during Yaxha Project years was aided by a helpful gift from the Fowler family, Los Angeles. During the mid-1970's, contributions by Larry Ottis, M.D., William Judy, M.D., Virginia and Arthur Riggs, Francis Robicsek, M.D., Edwin Pearlman, M.D., Todd and Becky Aikins, Leon

Morgen, Gerald Benjamin, Christopher and Annett McConnell and Elfriede Schuh, M.D., the latter four of Canada, are much appreciated. Donations within 1982-83 from Robert Schyberg, Simon Hodgson, Jack Sulak, Ngaire Yesland, Shirley Quement, have kept me going. The donations by William Daugherty, M.D. are particularly appreciated. Donations by William Parady, Richard and Lina Wagner, John Hathaway, and Linda Meyer have aided the general research programs of F.L.A.A.R. Donations by Robert and Diane Schyberg and by Jeanne Randall have been especially timely and helpful in making this Ph.D. dissertation a finished reality.

Annual gifts are the mainstay of the success of my research which has led to the discovery of so many ancient Maya deities. During the past years annual donations by: John Conway, M.D., Eldon and Elenora Leiter, Keith Irish, M.D. and Muriel Irish, Em Reynolds, Robert Condon, and Augusta Heinrich have helped considerably. Continued research has also been sustained by donations over several years from: Cleve Bachman, Cirilo Villaverde, Manuel de Leon and Malline La Fontaine, Jack Sulak, James R. James, Jr., Harold Haley, M.D., Tom Klug, M.D., Lupita Lucio, Thelma Sanders, Barnet Fain, Joye Gasser, Lucy Lee Lancaster, Alec and Gail Merriam, Carl Brandenburg, and Barbara and John Monlux. I appreciate the contribution of Ronald and Lynn Gilbert which helped obtain for the Foundation an office computer, and then the donation by Spencer Throckmorton which assisted me in getting additional computer storage and software capacity. This present opus was written on a Kaypro 10MB Winchester Hard Disk system using Perfect Writer software. Donations from Ann and Harlan Scott and from John Conway, M.D. also aided in the computerization of my catalog project. Gordon Smith's donation to help publish the F.L.A.A.R. monograph on Maya cylindrical tripods also

facilitated this dissertation, since data were derived from these vessels. These people have all been considerate in their understanding of the expenses involved in advancing knowledge of the ancient Maya civilization. Government and foundation grants are ephemeral and require wasted months of application paperwork which could be better devoted to research, especially when colleagues who disapprove of (or feel their theories threatened by) the study and publication of unprovenanced artifacts work overtime to torpedo all grant applications which might support archival photography. Universities just do not have funds for publication, especially not in Europe. Private support has been the most expedient, and has produced the results herein now published. As the overall costs of research in the 1980's has been well over several hundred thousand dollars, each gift of \$100, \$500, \$1000 helps, since each check adds up.

Special appreciation is due to my long suffering parents, George and Mimi Hellmuth, who have helped keep me from Kingsborough's fate both through donations and by co-signing several bank loans which kept this photography project going when all other monies had run out. During the first decade of this project I never let the absence of money halt continued photography, a situation that makes this one of the only on-going archaeological projects keep going by bank loans.

Special appreciation is also due to two individuals, in Florida and in California, whose contributions each of over \$15,000 during the years of my dissertation research made it possible to keep general iconography research and publication going.

I thank in advance each individual whose checks in the mail for one of the 50 reserved copies of this opus made this limited edition possible. This income is

being used to pay back loans taken out for this research and for equipping F.L.A.A.R. for the approaching decade of high technology research, especially computer aided design of Maya architecture, laser disk storage of the archive of 23,000 photographs, desktop publishing system to facilitate dissemination of information on archaeological discoveries, modernizing the Frank Comparato's F.L.A.A.R. office with a computer, obtaining a 4-wheel drive vehicle, and specialized camera equipment for the expanding F.L.A.A.R. photographic archive of tropical flora and fauna related to the daily life and mythology of the Maya.

The line drawings for this study are the work of Susanna Reisinger, Barbara van Heusen, and the others mentioned in the illustrations section. The reader should recognize that certain of these drawings are only the initial pencil sketches and that in this incomplete state they are not really intended for publication. All such drawings will be edited, redrawn, and inked for any final, formal publication.

I welcome (at the California editorial office of F.L.A.A.R.) letters from readers with constructive criticism, from readers and colleagues with references to publications that I may have overlooked, to mistakes and omissions, and especially with references to material in obscure catalogs, unknown private collections, or in other photographic archives that should have been included here as comparative illustrative material. I always plan on future, revised editions and further research, and gladly receive xeroxes, polaroids, 35mm color slides, or study prints of Maya, Teotihuacan, and Olmec art.

Academic and Editorial Appreciation

Early stages in the development of this dissertation were read and red-lined by Mary Miller and George Kubler. Subsequently revised editions were re-read again

by Kubler, and reviewed by Lee Parsons, Michael Coe, and Floyd Lounsbury. I thank them for their time and perseverance. The general iconography of my dissertation was also reviewed during a lengthy session with Christopher Jones (University Museum, University of Pennsylvania), with Linda Schele and all three Stuarts, Gene, George, and David. Their constructive comments on the iconography has helped me. Frank Comparato, Margaret Young, and Susanna Reisinger have each helped edit earlier versions which allowed my work to reach its present stage. Karl Herbert Mayer has helped with the bibliography. I thank Michael Coe for being an outside reader of this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

From 1973 to 1983, Michael Coe and Francis Robicsek published more than 900 Maya works of art which were not then widely known. During this same decade I continued a long-range project to find and photograph all Maya ceramic art extant in the private collections and museums of the world. Ten years research produced 23,000 photographs, so for a dissertation length study I narrowed coverage down to the Early Classic in general and to mythical waterscapes in particular. This program combines murals, stelae, and seashell art with that of ceramics. The focus highlights the individuality of the Early Classic style and content while at the same time showing its place in the flow of evolution from Preclassic through Early Classic into Late Classic then into Post Classic.

GI (see Glossary) is a netherworld denizen who serves as a focus for the first section, a review of theories on the nature of Maya religion. Seler, Spinden, Morley, Proskouriakoff, Kubler, and Franz have observed the Maya emphasis on natural forms as models for the visual images in their art. Seler introduced into the Maya literature a Spanish observation that the native Maya stated they had "no images of their gods" and "worshipped only natural forces." Yucatec, Cholti-Lacandon, and Manche Chol testimony to Spanish inquistors were accepted by Proskouriakoff and Kubler to develop models of differences between Classic art (no deities per se and non-idolatrous until the arrival of Kukulcan) and Post Classic art (with deities in the codices). My research in the Archivo General de Centro America (Guatemala City) and in the Archivo General de Indias (Seville) on the

Lacandon Maya combined with a search through the extant ethnohistorical chronicles and Maya-Spanish dictionaries provides abundant data on the actual Spanish-Maya observations and the full dimensions of conquest period lowland Maya religion. Monumental and funerary art provides even more data for the earlier Maya. Coe's deity iconography of 1973-1982 illustrates Classic Maya myths which satisfy basic requirements for divine beings in a pantheon. With this combined ethnohistorical and artistic theological background, research has proceeded deeper into the mysteries of Maya cosmology.

The Rio Azul murals, a Tikal Burial 160 bowl, a Uaxactun tripod, the Austin Tetrapod, a previously unpublished stuccoed-and painted bowl (Merrin Bowl), and an incised bowl are the Tzakol renderings of the Underwaterworld cosmos which are the heart of the discussion. GI of the Triad, the Headband Partners, Sea Anemone Headdress Monster, Lily Pad Headdress Monster, Shell Wing Dragon, and Principal Bird Deity are the leading protagonists in Tzakol Maya religious drama.

The Maya cosmos is inhabited by saurian, feline, avian, monsters, humanoid personalities, and grotesque mythical composite beings engaged in codified interaction episodes within a standardized mythology. Reptilian and avian metamorphosis of certain anthropomorphic divinities hints at Maya concepts of the transformations they would undergo after death in the journey into the Underworld. Funerary art is the door to the Maya cosmos. Rim sherds and grave lot data provide the framework -- but do not provide the key to this door.

After cosmology and iconography comes a discussion of the Spinden-Morley belief that because not all the gods of the Post Classic Maya codices were present in the Classic period, then thus the religious system was different in each epoch.

Background research for this dissertation resulted in catalogs of all supernatural Maya characters now known from private collections and museums. As samples, God D, God L, and the Lily Pad Headdress Monster demonstrate the continuity of form (but difference in context) from the Early Classic through to the Post Classic. Utilization of this material reveals a host of Classic period netherworld beings even greater in number than the deities of the Post Classic codices.

Modern studies of Costa Rican, Panamanian, and especially of Moche and Etruscan pottery have long ago demonstrated that finds even without provenance offer helpful data on deity iconography and art styles. Maya studies have now reached the point where enough figural art is available for comparable advances in knowledge from multi-disciplinary analyses of funerary artifacts.

INTRODUCTION

The ancient Maya civilization is defined in architecture, art, language, geography, and history (Benson 1977; M.Coe 1984; Kubler 1969; 1984a; Morley 1947; Spinden 1913; Thompson 1950; Weaver 1981; and in articles of Volumes 2 and 3 of the Handbook of Middle American Indians). These enigmatic people speak various languages and dialects of Mayan (Vol.II, Map 4) (Johnson 1940; Feldman nd; 1985; McQuown 1956; Campbell 1978; Justeson and Campbell 1985) and occupy southern Mexico, adjacent Guatemala, Belize, and portions of nearby Honduras and El Salvador. Their cultural geography and developmental sequence are presented here in maps (Map 2 and 3), charts (Chart 1), and in a later section of this introduction. Characteristic Maya artifacts include giant stucco face masks on architecture, carved stone stelae, lintels, altars,¹ painted murals, decorated pottery, bark paper codices, and objects buried with the dead.

Program

My long range goals in Maya art history are to find, photograph, catalog, describe and differentiate the beasts, creatures, composites, confluations, humanoids, culture heroes, revered ancestors and supernaturals of the ancient Maya. This program in iconography works to establish which costumes, accessories, props, associations and interactive episodes distinguish the personalities depicted in carvings and paintings. Whereas this type of information is already known for

1. Clancy (1980) and Kubler (1975:162) prefer the word pedestal for the altar-like stone disks.

Christian iconography -- and thus known for most European art history -- the characters of Maya mythology are only incompletely recognized. Often -- as with Itzamna, Chac, and the Sun God -- the traditional attributes need revision in light of recent discoveries. Several previously unrecognized major Maya deities have been found only in the last decade. An initial goal is to understand the cosmological situation, status and rank of Maya personalities by finding which of them are joined together into clusters, families or related actors within a myth episode or cosmological layer. Prepared with an understanding of these aspects of Maya art, it becomes possible to comment on the nature of these figural entities, and whether they may be divine, mythical, revered ancestor, mask, figural allograph or personification of natural forces.

The following study of Early Classic waterworld iconography is presaged by addressing the question of whether the characters depicted in Classic period scenes can properly be considered "deities." This program provides discussion of both a general theoretical model of worship of non-representational natural forces as opposed to deity idolatry combined with a specific practical study (the individual mythical creatures). The selected focus is the Early Classic (ca. A.D. 250-550), in part since less work has been done on this period and especially because the Early Classic is a direct link from the Izapa-Abaj Takalik-Kaminaljuyu Preclassic past and then a direct bridge to Late Classic Maya artistic expression that follows.

A preliminary review of Early Classic art revealed that the scene most commonly pictured was a geometricized depiction of the interface between a watery Underworld and the world above (Fig.94). This stylized illustration of a cosmological setting offers a natural limit for a research project. To keep this paper within page limits traditional for a doctoral dissertation, the subject matter

stays with those creatures or humanoids that are associated with the aforementioned dominant cosmogram of the Early Classic period, the "Surface of the Underwaterworld."² Study material is primarily full figure characters and standardized facial grotesques. Miscellaneous decorations are discussed only in the rare instances when related to figural personalities.

The layer decorated with this exotic water imagery is clearly supernatural, and is home to several personalities who are considered potential inhabitants of the Maya netherworld. The imagery projected by the Maya artists is demonstrably the uppermost layer of their cosmological water model and specifically the surface. On these grounds the level has been named the "Surface of the Underwaterworld".³ This level is the interface between important cosmological situations.

Hellmuth 1982-84 itemizes all of the cylindrical tripods, basal-flange bowls, murals, stelae, and architectural stuccos that portray this vision of the cosmological habitat and describes two related images, the Curl Formed Monster and the Recurved Snout Monster. Figs.44-49 bring to this dissertation illustrations of the

2. My discovery and definition of the Surface of the Underwaterworld based on unprovenanced darkware cylindrical tripods and basal flange bowl lids has been presented as a lecture at Princeton University, Yale University-Department of Anthropology, Denver Art Museum, and University of Texas, Art Department and is available as an unpublished manuscript, Hellmuth 1982-84. Rand's study of water in Mesoamerican art dealt primarily with Late Classic scenes and was specifically dedicated to the identification of falling water (1955). Coggins recognized the Tikal examples (1975) but did not avail herself of unprovenanced examples. Schele recognized the general pattern but her 1979c work was dedicated to water lilies in general rather than to the water band in particular.

3. This designation for English is shorter than "Top Layer of the Underwaterworld." For the German term, the translator (Susanna Reisinger), Hasso Hohmann, and Karl Herbert Mayer preferred to emphasize that it was a layer with vertical dimension rather than a thin line. In English, though, I include the horizontal spread of the surface as a meaningful dimension.

pertinent features of this visual presentation of the Maya netherworld.

The ancient Maya themselves did not include any hieroglyphic inscriptions in any of the depictions of this cosmogram on pottery found so far. Only on Rio Azul Tomb 1 murals is a glyphic text near a monumental rendering of a Tzakol Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.163). Consequently, epigraphy is not a theme immediately pertinent to this present research. Floyd Lounsbury, Peter Mathews, George Kubler, Linda Schele, Mary Miller, Michael Coe, Tatiana Proskouriakoff, and Stephen Houston have all recently demonstrated that epigraphy is a crucial aspect of Maya iconography. The examples they have been discussing, though, are traditionally stone sculptures (with the exception of Kubler on Tikal artifacts and Coe for funerary pottery) and in any event, predominantly Late Classic, when hieroglyphs were more frequent on pottery than in the Early Classic. The Primary Standard Sequence did begin in (or before) the Early Classic, but is not present on key scenes of the Surface of the Underwaterworld.⁴ Dynastic texts are indeed on Tzakol pottery -- as well as Tzakol stelae and lintels -- but again, not with the Underwaterworld. Thus the seeming absence of epigraphy from this present paper follows the Maya situation. Nonetheless, epigraphy is approached through the utilization of Maya-Spanish dictionaries of the 16th-17th centuries. Maya linguistics cannot be neglected in any modern study of Maya iconography even when hieroglyphs themselves are absent. Maya art itself is created in part from the same design representations that also appear in textual hieroglyphs, the humanoids of the Tikal Burial 160 bowl are identical to heads in dynastic texts on

4. The earliest yet known text which exhibits certain features of the later PSS has gone so far unrecognized on the early stone pectoral from southeastern Mexico, published before the PSS had been recognized (Coe 1966:Fig.11). It starts off with the same main sign, then Step. A God N-like glyph comes later.

contemporary pottery. GI can be both an interactive figure and an hieroglyph. The dual opposition of Kin versus Akbal (sun/day versus night/darkness) appears in the text of Tikal Stela 31 as well as on the wings of the Principal Bird Deity.

Because this study is on figural art, Preclassic (Mamon, Chicanel) pottery is not included. No figural art on Preclassic pottery has yet been found in stratigraphically recorded, institutionally sponsored excavations in the central lowlands. Scattered pieces in private collections (Merrin nd (my Fig.115); Coe 1973:Grolier Nos.1 and 2 (my Fig.116); and one Preclassic incense burner in the Hellmuth Photo Archive) demonstrate that figural art of the B.C. centuries exists, but it is primarily on non-pottery artifacts (carved stone bowls, carved shell or bone), on early stelae, altars, or murals, or when on pottery, on shapes other than bowls or vases.

For the subsequent Holmul 1 period, a photograph of an important mammiform vessel shows that elements of the Surface of the Underwaterworld were in use as early as then (Fig.53,a) -- not surprising since this symbolism is a heritage of either earlier Izapa stela base waterscapes and/or Abaj Takalik Stela 4 imagery (Fig.54). The subject matter of this dissertation, therefore, has its roots in Preclassic stone sculpture and appears in rare instances on Holmul 1 pottery but does not become a dominant image until the Tzakol period. The Surface of the Underwaterworld is primarily a theme of Classic period artists from Kaminaljuyu northward through Peten and into Belize.

Actually, a study of the Surface of the Underwaterworld brings into focus a

5. Thompson prematurely stated the Maya did not have a pantheon (1970:198). The semantic and religious problem of a Maya pantheon is covered in the last chapter.

substantial cross-section of the Maya "pantheon"⁵ because even "celestial" personalities, such as the Sun God (Ah Kin), might appear in or on top of this watery cosmogram. One manifestation of the Principal Bird Deity also turns out to be directly related to the underworld swamp. GI is immersed in the Surface of the Underwaterworld in Early Classic Peten cosmology as are the two headbanded characters first identified by Michael Coe for the Late Classic. Thus a focus on the Surface of the Underwaterworld simultaneously facilitates a reasonable limitation while at the same time offers a thorough study of the Preclassic and even often Olmec ancestry and then Late through Post Classic heritage of pivotal Early Classic art. Furthermore, the pages that follow review certain mythical monsters that are increasingly in discussion by Mesoamericanists today. GI, again for example, is crucial to Proskouriakoff's and Kubler's writings on the historical nature of personalities in Maya art. GI is especially pertinent to the question of masks and god impersonators on Yaxchilan Stela 11. GI is the focus of contemporary epigraphic research of Lounsbury and Schele as well as architectural mask studies of David Freidel.

Paucity of Previous Studies Dedicated to the Early Classic

Archaeologists and art historians have specialized in Preclassic material, or in lowland pottery, but no one has dedicated themselves full time to the Early Classic, in part because no field archaeologist has yet faced a site with solely Early Classic remains. For art historians not enough Tzakol material was available before 1977 to support a specific Early Classic research project. Consequently, no monograph exists on the Early Classic as a unit. The only complete catalog of any specific early ceramic period is by Pring for Holmul 1 pottery (Pring 1977, see

Glossary). Furthermore, even the recent studies of Maya funerary art which featured previously unknown material from private collections tend to picture fancy Late Classic polychromes rather than Early Classic pieces. Whereas between 1973 and 1983, considerable advances and surprises came in the field of Late Classic Maya iconography, no comparable publications are available of Early Classic art. Thus, before this dissertation could begin, I prepared a catalog of all known Tzakol funerary ceramics in unpublished private collections and museums.⁶

Cultural Geography of the Maya Area

The ancient Maya occupied Guatemala from the highlands north into Belize and the Mexican states of Campeche, Quintana Roo, Yucatan, most of Chiapas, much of Tabasco (Map.1). The Maya also populated a third of Honduras and influenced an area of El Salvador, (Maps 2 and 3). Early Classic Maya trade goods went as far south as Costa Rica and as far north as Teotihuacan. Four centuries later the Cacaxtla murals near Tlaxcala (near Puebla) show how strong Late Classic Maya cultural influence was far away from its original heartland.

Maya regional cultural subdivisions of lowlands and highlands loosely follow topography. The highlands include the mountainous area from Chiapas through Guatemala into Honduras. The lowlands encompass: Yucatan, Campeche, Quintana Roo, Tabasco, lower elevation Chiapas (Mexico), Belize, and all the Peten department, Guatemala. The Lowlands are traditionally divided into the Northern Lowlands (Yucatan and adjacent Campeche) and the Southern Lowlands (Peten and

6. Hellmuth 1985a; 1985b; Photo Archive. This background research was done with the aid of a simultaneous Yale University-Organization of American States fellowship in 1980-81.

adjacent lands on both sides, namely Belize on the east and Chiapas on the west). Often the term "Central Lowlands" is used, which means Peten, or Peten through into Palenque, that is, the heart of the "Old Empire" of Carnegie Institution terms. Material for this dissertation comes primarily from central Peten (lowlands), adjacent Kaminaljuyu (highlands), with Preclassic forerunners from Izapa and Abaj Takalik (coastal piedmont).

The geographical-cultural boundaries of Map 2 are based on pottery and related features. In the fifth century there was no Peten-Campeche border. One northern cultural border was in the Calakmul-Kohunlich area, in terms of architecture, with islands of the stela-altar cult extending up into Oxkintok and Coba. Boundaries of Peten architectural style coincide more with the area of Peten ceramic influence than to the much wider zone of the stela cult. Calakmul ceramics and Kohunlich-Placeres architectural decoration are both directly allied with Peten, though naturally with regional peculiarities reflecting their more northerly situation. El Mirador and its satellite sites may have represented an extensive cultural island of Chicanel conservatism. El Mirador certainly did not feature corbel vaulted buildings with the fervor of either Calakmul to the north or central Peten sites to the south. The unexpected wealth of a previously little known site such as Rio Azul demonstrates that traditional maps of the Maya lands need to be updated.

Definition of Maya Time Periods

In Mesoamerican studies the changes in pottery shape, ware, and decoration are used as the yardstick of history. In the Maya area, the native calendrical hieroglyphs on stone stelae provide dates which can be deciphered, then correlated

with the European calendar and associated with ceramics. In its simplest terms, Maya history is divided into CLASSIC period (formerly called the "Old Empire") and then the POST CLASSIC period (formerly called the "New Empire"). In the Maya setting "Classic" means the time period of hieroglyphic writing, stela and altar cult, corbel vaulted masonry architecture, and naturalistic figural representations in predominantly polychrome pottery. Ceramic specialists, though, differ among themselves over the dates and methods of subdividing Maya origins and cultural historical change. Pottery specialists working in the Northern Lowlands (Yucatan-northern Campeche) use one schema (Andrews 1965; Ball 1977); archaeologists working in Peten use another (R. Smith 1955a; W. Coe 1965; Willey, Culbert and Adams 1967); and some, such as Parsons, develop unique sequential divisions to suit particular local situations, such as Bilbao. For the purposes of iconography it is more productive to use a straightforward, flexible, sequence that recognizes our ignorance of precise moments of history a thousand years ago.

George Vaillant was the first Maya pottery specialist and he worked out a provisional developmental sequence based on Merwin's excavations at Holmul (Vaillant 1927; Merwin and Vaillant 1932). Previously, Herbert Spinden had worked out a cultural developmental sequence based on stylistic change in Maya art, principally in the sculpture of Copan (Spinden 1913). During the 1920's through 40's, Sylvanus Morley popularized the NEW EMPIRE - OLD EMPIRE terms which were followed faithfully by most writers of his day. This schema placed the major cultural break at the collapse, circa A.D. 900. Morley's utilization of stelae as historical mileposts at least alerted him to the "stela hiatus," a period between A.D. 534 to 593 when almost no stone stelae were carved in the Peten Maya heartland.

Since Morley's lifelong interests were stone monuments and their hieroglyphic calendrical inscriptions, he worked out his chronology for his Maya on the basis of stelae. The start of his Old Empire was the natives' first dedicatory date in hieroglyphs, correlated to approximately A.D. 320 in our calendar.⁷ Morley was aware of the newly devised ceramic sequence terms, Tzakol and Tepeu, but he preferred stela to pottery, so he stayed with his stela chronology. On the basis of changes in style he subdivided his Old Empire into three divisions (Morley 1947:61, for example). Morley's subdivision terms are no longer employed and were not even widely used by his own colleagues. Morley did not use the terms "Early Classic" and "Late Classic" in his initial writings. Only the stela hiatus which he astutely identified is a permanent residue of his sequences in Mayanist writings today.

By the 1940's the pottery of Uaxactun had been studied by the Ricketsons, then by Robert Smith. Smith introduced the technical terms, TZAKOL (for the Early Classic) and TEPEU (for the Late Classic) (R.Smith 1955a) to subdivide the overall Classic period.⁸ These are still the standard reference terms for the Maya pottery historical periods today -- though traditionally the pottery specialist of each site gives a completely distinctive series of names since the history of each site is naturally to some degree different than that of neighbors. In generalized, non-herd oriented studies such local site pottery names are known to the writer,

7. Leiden Plaque and Uaxactun Stela 9. When Stela 29 was discovered at Tikal in the 1960's with an earlier Maya date, the beginning of the Classic period was moved to A.D. 292. Today, for sake of convenience, the date has been rounded off to A.D. 250.

8. Essentially no Post Classic habitation at Uaxactun, so no terms were elaborated for the time after the Maya collapse of circa A.D. 869-900.

at hand in reference books, but not cited except by dedicated specialists. For iconography of central Peten, no pottery jargon other than TZAKOL and TEPEU is necessary. Specialists who need more complicated terms may consult standard ceramic charts (Willey, Culbert and Adams 1967) (Table 1).

As Morley did, Proskouriakoff also used stelae as her time-sequence markers, but she was one of the first authors to use, outside of a pottery study, the major time subdivision terms of "Early Classic" and "Late Classic" (Proskouriakoff 1950:102, 112). Of course she also recognized the Preclassic and the Post Classic, as these terms are part of the whole sequence. Although she defined stylistic changes based on stelae, she also paid close attention to advances in pottery chronology at Uaxactun. She discussed further the stela hiatus from 9.5.0.0.0 to 9.8.0.0.0 in the Long Count. This hiatus falls conveniently in the uncertain period at the "end" of the Early Classic which has made a convenient "beginning" of the Late Classic. She follows R. Smith in using the Long Count date 9.8.0.0.0 (the end of the hiatus) as the dividing point between Tzakol and Tepeu pottery (RS 1955a, I:111). Coggins has urged having the Early Classic end before the hiatus begins (1979).

Since the 1950's the developmental history of the Maya has been divided into the PRECLASSIC or Formative period (first millennium B.C. before the great achievements in sculpture and architecture up to the erection of the first carved, Long Count dated stelae in Peten, circa A.D. 292);⁹ the EARLY CLASSIC time period (Tzakol 1, 2, 3)(250-550 A.D.: the spread of stelae, altars, hieroglyphic

9. The Preclassic dates of monumental architecture at El Mirador and Cerros were not known when these periods were defined.

writing, polychrome ceramics with figural representations, and monumental architecture featuring the corbel vault); the LATE CLASSIC time period (Tepeu 1, 2, 3)(A.D. 550-900: the height of Maya cultural development which was terminated by the collapse and abandonment of the cities); then the POST CLASSIC, (A.D. 900 to the 16th century arrival of the Spanish conquerors).

The Tikal sequence for the Early Classic, termed Manik I, II, IIIa, IIIb is in some technical points different from Tzakol 1, 2, 3 which it attempts to replace (Coggins 1975,II:Table I). But the traditional Tikal sequence does not (yet) take into account the IDAEH discoveries in Tikal of Miguel Orrego and Carlos Rudy Larios. Coggins' 1970's writings predate Juan Pedro Laporte's six years of ceramic finds from excavations 1979 to the present. Additional unutilized Tikal finds include artifacts rescued from grave robbers' backdirt piles within the national park; pottery confiscated by the Tikal park police which languishes in the back storage room of the Tikal museum; whole pots found in private collections and museums and showed by Ron Bishop to be definitely made from Tikal clay through neutron activation analysis; and pieces (wherever made) that refer to Tikal through the use of the Tikal emblem glyph in their Primary Standard Sequence or secondary texts.¹⁰ Without these data the traditional sequence is incomplete both for Tikal in particular and for the Peten in general. In the interim until finds of the last ten years are incorporated by students of pottery in their traditional chronologies, this paper will use the Uaxactun sequence modified by familiarity with both the published and unpublished Tikal material combined with personal communications about the latest discoveries (TABLE 1).

10. Hellmuth Photo Archive; approximately 15 vessels, of which about 5 have been published elsewhere during the past decade.

CHART 1: MAYA (PETEN STYLE) ARTIFACT SEQUENCE

Christian Calendar	Maya (GMT) Long Count			
A.D. 1000		Caban		no name
		-----		-----
928	10.5.0.0.0	Eznab		Tepeu 3
900		-----		
830	10.0.0.0.0	Imix		-----
800				Tepeu 2
731	9.15.0.0.0	-----		-----
700				
633	9.10.0.0.0	Ik	Blom Plate	Tepeu 1
600		-----	Gann Bowl	-----
	9.8.0.0.0	-----		
	stela hiatus			
534	9.5.0.0.0	Manik IIIb		
500		-----	Tikal, Bu. 160	Tzakol 3
485	9.2.10.0.0		Uaxactun, A-31, A-22	
			Rio Azul, burials	
			Tikal, Bu. 48	
435	9.0.0.0.0	Manik IIIa	Rio Azul, Tomb 1	
400		-----	Tikal, Bu. 10	
			Tikal, Bu. 22	Tzakol 2
300		Manik II	Leiden Celt	Tzakol 1
		-----		-----
		Manik I		Matzanel-Holmul 1
		-----		-----
200		Cauac-Cimi		

39	8.0.0.0.0	Cauac	Hauberg Stela	Chicanel
A.D. 1			Kaminaljuyu	
		-----	Abaj Takalik (proto-Maya phase)	
100 B.C.		Chuen	Chiapa de Corzo	
200 B.C.		-----	Izapa	-----
300 B.C.			Pot Bellied People	
400 B.C.		Tzec	missing links	Mamon
500 B.C.		-----	Abaj Takalik (late Olmec phase)	
600 B.C.		Eb	Olmec incised jades, widespread	
earlier finds mostly in Belize			Olmec sculpture, Mexico-Guatemala	

- AD
1000 no polychrome painted pottery
no stuccoed-and-painted pottery
- no more polychrome plates
- 900 Carved fine orange bowls
Pabellon molded-carved bowls
Pabellon molded-carved pedestal base vases
Polychrome vases are rare, and have distinctive profile
- 800 Abundant polychrome vases of diverse sizes and shapes
Stuccoed-and-painted vases (rare)
Abundant polychrome vases of diverse sizes and shapes
- 700 Polychrome plates are common.
Bowls of all proportions continue popular, mostly polychrome.
Multiple Resist Vases No more "cookie jar" effigies
Red Band Tepeu I No more cylindrical tripods.
- 600 No more hourglass base censurs.
Hiatus in Teo motifs. No more tetrapods
Basal flange bowls do not have lids any more, become flatter, and evolve into Tepeu I plates.
- 500 Evolved form of PSSequence on bowls of diagonal swirl colors
Diagonal Swirl cylindrical tripods and leg-less bowls
Polychrome (non-stuccoed) cylindrical tripods
Polychrome basal flange bowls & tetrapods, with lids
- 400 Stuccoed-and-painted cylindrical tripods
Black (carved & modeled) cylindrical tripods
Black basal flange bowls & tetrapods
- 300 Early forms of cylindrical tripods, but no fancy decoration.
Early forms of basal flange bowls.
Stela tradition well set at Tikal by 292.
pottery not well known
- 200 Polychrome figural art on mammiform tetrapods
Dimple footed tetrapods
Flat footed tetrapods (dead end development)
Mammiform tetrapods
- 100 Spouted vessels
- no polychrome figural art yet found
- A.D. 1 hardly any carved figures yet on funerary art.
figural art is mainly modeled in three dimensions.
- 100 B.C. Giant stucco mask tradition at Cerros (Belize), El Mirador (Peten) are expressions of sophisticated monumental art already developed in the central lowlands.
- Preclassic Two pot-bellied sculptures at Tikal demonstrate connection with Kaminaljuyu.

PROPOSED REVISIONS FOR THE PETEN STYLE MAYA ARTIFACT SEQUENCE:
THE HISTORICAL, ART STYLE, AND CERAMIC SEQUENCE
FOR THE CENTRAL LOWLANDS

To put one thousand years of history into a single chart is to presume that we actually know what happened. This knowledge is incomplete and these notes cite principal gaps.

This chart brings into Maya history an enigmatic "Pot Bellied Phase" to cover the scores of pot bellied sculptures found not only in El Salvador, Cotzumalhuapa, Monte Alto, and Kaminaljuyu, but also at Tikal (two) and at Copan (two).¹¹ Those at Tikal and Copan are clearly Post Olmec, as most likely are all the others. If Tikal was not settled before 600 B.C., the pot bellied sculptures there cannot be earlier. As there is only one line per date in the chart space, certain captions are either one line above or below their traditional ascribed date, but since no archaeological date in the Preclassic is really accurate more than one century in either direction, positional precision is false.

I accept John Graham's warning that the term "Izapan" should not be widely applied to all proto-Maya art (as had inadvertently been the tradition during the 1960's through 1970's) but that Izapan should refer carefully to the art specifically related to that of Izapa. Nonetheless, actual Izapan art did influence early Maya art, as demonstrated by the base of Yaxha Stela 6 (Fig.165,c) (Hellmuth 1978:86) and by the crocodile tree monster on the Deletaille Cylindrical Tripod (Fig.165,a

11. After I completed my dissertation I learned of the book by Arthur Demerest on pot bellied sculptures. The two from Tikal are not illustrated there.

and b) (Hellmuth 1978:140; 1980).

The Surface of the Underwaterworld cosmology of Peten is derived from both Abaj Takalik and Izapa. Kaminaljuyu was the most likely intermediate transmitter from the piedmont into Peten. If the provenance of the Hauberg Stela could be ascertained from stone analysis, and if a date could be convincingly established from style and content (Schele suggests A.D. 199 as one possibility), one of several missing parts of the piedmont-highlands Peten-Belize-lowlands sequence could be filled in.

Mamon and Chicanel artifacts have little figural art. The plain pots of this period are mainly in the bodegas of IDAEH and INAH.

Figural art appears fully developed on Holmul I pottery, principally as polychrome painting, mostly on mammiform or spouted vessels. Mammiform related feet continue into Tzakol I times. The Copan burial now exhibited in the new village museum shows mammiform vessels in the same tomb as Tzakol basal flange bowls. Ceramic sequences need to take into account conservatism, archaism, and heirlooms. Material in private collections can contribute to filling in uncertainties in the traditional sequence, though my O.A.S.-Yale fellowship cataloging did not have enough time to do material earlier than Tzakol 2.

Fancy, involved figural art flourishes in Tzakol 2 and 3, diminishing considerably in the proposed Tzakol 4 phase, the same time as the stela hiatus. The great incised works of art (Deletaille Cylindrical Tripod and Pearlman Collection God N vase) are not likely to have been produced by Tzakol I ateliers, but are Tzakol 2 or 3 in date. The Pearlman Conch (Fig.73,a; 75,a) could be Tzakol 1, though a date of Tzakol 2-3 would agree more with the use of conch

shells in Kaminaljuyu related Peten burials. The entire series of orange cache vessels, both profile incised and frontal applique are Tzakol 2 or 3 in date (Figs.8,a; 9,a-d, f; 10; 12; 17,a-c; 31-34). Stratigraphic finds at Tikal and Uaxactun fix this date in history. Despite the similarity in earring assemblage to Preclassic stucco masks, the ceramic counterparts to these architectural masks are neither Preclassic nor even early Tzakol. Such early incense burners do exist (Hellmuth Photo Archive) but are of a totally different style than the more common Tzakol 2/3 specimens. Likewise, a Preclassic date for either the Kohunlich architectural masks or the Placeres facade with mask in the Museo Nacional de Antropologia-Mexico City can now be revised. These two masks are closer in style and content to Tzakol 2-3 Peten cache vessels than to Preclassic Belize stucco masks. Dating must follow actual style and content not merely be led by a theoretical model.

The beautiful funerary art considered probably to be from Rio Azul are all of Tzakol 2 and 3 date, although I suspect that rich finds of Tzakol 1 and Holmul I material will reward further scientific investigation. Neutron activation analysis of mammiform and dimple-footed tetrapods in private collections will establish how much of this material has a north-eastern Peten origin. Any site near Belize or on river or other trade routes from Belize are likely loci for Tzakol 1- Holmul I material.

When a stylistic seriation of all extant basal flange bowls is undertaken, certain of the problems of the Early Classic sequence can be resolved. Until such a program is initiated, I propose dating Tikal Burial 22 as Tzakol 2 (early Manik III) rather than following Coggins' date of late Manik II (Tzakol 1) (Coggins 1975,II:Table 3).

Rio Azul Tomb 1 may be contemporary with Tikal Burial 48. It depends upon how long the Rio Azul ruler lived. Tzakol 3 is overcrowded, either because this was the richest century in the Early Classic, or because we cannot yet differentiate between Tzakol 2, 3, and 4 material.

Lids with erect ring-shaped handles, such as illustrated by Smith for Uaxactun (RS:fig.1,a) and as found by Diane and Arlen Chase at Santa Rita (D.Chase 1981:front cover) are Tzakol in date when they cover a cylindrical tripod, a tetrapod, or a related vessel. Unrecognized in the traditional charts is that lids in general and with ring handles in particular in fact continued into Tepeu 1 times (RS:Fig.7,h), especially in the area where the highlands meet the central lowlands, as well as occasionally within the Peten style area itself. Polychrome vases or bowls with ring-handled lids should have their published dates revised from Tzakol 3 to Tepeu 1. All polychrome vases or bowls are Late Classic unless painted in a color related to Diagonal Swirl (Hellmuth 1985a) or otherwise related to cylindrical tripods or basal flange types.

Overall, Tzakol 2 and 3 together form practically a continuous block and for the moment are more easily referenced as a single unit of time (the time of figural scenes on cylindrical tripods and basal flange bowls or tetrapods) until basal flange bowls and cylindrical tripods can be better differentiated between Tzakol 2 and Tzakol 3. Tzakol 1 is vastly different from 2-3. Tzakol 4 (see below) is as much a slowing down in all forms as a recognition of new forms. Tzakol 4 could equally well be called Tepeu 0 (pre-Tepeu 1). Presence and absence of Teotihuacan motifs is not the sole pertinent diagnostic for these phases.

I propose a Tzakol 4 phase to account for polychrome (non-stuccoed)

cylindrical tripods and low bowls painted in colors related to the diagonal-swirl series (Hellmuth 1985) and for certain few polychrome basal flange bowls that appear rather advanced in shape and decoration for earlier Tzakol phases. A particular form of the Primary Standard Sequence can also be provisionally dated as Tzakol 4: it is still on cylindrical tripods but is definitely a "Tepeu 1" kind of inscription. The tripods are painted -- yet no longer on stucco. Coggins admits that the transition from Tzakol 3 to Tepeu 1 is poorly represented in the traditional corpus. Perhaps it has not been represented at all. Grave robbers, though, have found the missing elite burials of this period, and these data should begin to be used to make the pottery charts conform more to ancient Maya reality.

Tepeu 1 may look differently to the field archaeologist working with rim sherds from domestic middens as opposed to an art historian looking at elite pottery from funerary contexts. Also, the Uaxactun sequence was based on changes in masonry and vaults styles in palace A-V as much as on changes in pottery. Today a different data base is available, and a noticeable event within Tepeu 1 is not adequately reflected in the traditional ceramic sequence of any lowland Maya site. That is the predominance of the vase shape and more interestingly, "secondary" glyphic texts on vases. Vases are a different form of bowls; round bottomed vases with figural decoration begin to evolve during Tzakol 4. Beginning with the Red Band series of bowls and round bottomed vases and characterized by the multiple resist vases the "Tepeu 2" vase comes into being.

In my first notes, 1976, I dated multiple resist (then nicknamed "Pastel Tricolor") as Tepeu 2 because they were the same shape as the great Late Classic polychromes which are all definitely Tepeu 2. Then Kubler's 1977 book on the

Uaxactun Initial Series vase pointed out that this multiple resist type of painting was of uncertain date at Uaxactun. Coggins illustrates sherds from Tikal (Coggins 1975,II:Fig.78) and dates them to Tepeu 1 (in the traditional sequence; transitional Ik-Imix in her personal sequence). While not a single whole vessel was found in the 1960's, grave robbers have found more than 25 in the 1970's. On the basis of the PSS glyphs, the vessels (including the Uaxactun specimen) may be dated to Tepeu 1 in the traditional sequence.

The data base which permits dating a Primary Standard Sequence by style and content was not known in the 1970's, and has not yet been published. The data base (F.L.A.A.R. Photo Archive) consists of 1:1 photographs of PSSequences on more than 200 whole vessels, most unpublished in the 1970's. The multiple resist polychromes have a 7th century type of PSS which cannot be dated with now available evidence as within Tepeu 2 and is certainly not 9th century (late Tepeu 2). The size and shape of these vases, and especially the use of vertical secondary texts next to the figures, are traits atypical for Tepeu 1. For funerary polychrome vases, "Tepeu 2" may begin with these multiple-resist vases. If a corresponding change can be detected in plate form and subject matter, then the advent of Tepeu 2 should possibly be earlier than in the published charts. Coggins' "Transitional Period" (1975,II:Table 1) should be strengthened -- and documented with additional observations. As with the Tzakol 3-Tepeu 1 intermediate period, the subsequent transition periods are the least understood in part because ancient forms are still in use and because burials of the transition period had not yet been found in the 1960's. Also, the flow of cultural history does not stop, change form, then neatly continue evolving with the regularity of a Maya ceramic chart. Charts with diagonal evolution are more realistic than with horizontal break points.

This dissertation is in art history -- not in rim sherd sequences -- and photographs of all the material in IDAEH bodegas will be necessary before the traditional ceramic sequence is acceptably modified. Advent, popularization, Mayanization, hiatus, and reintroduction of Teotihuacan motifs should be discussed directly with fresh data not with recourse to models.

Within the Late Classic, the Blom Plate (Fig.102) may be dated anywhere from A.D. 630 to 750, since it is archaistic, and thereby hard to date from style or content. A precise date must eventually come from the plate's form and the hieroglyphs. The hieroglyphs are a sophisticated, Peten influenced elaboration of the Altun Ha type Primary Standard Sequence, and are probably a generation later than those of Belize. The plate was found in a rich burial completely bulldozed to make room for the Chetumal airport, access roads, and adjacent highway. Chetumal is not far from Altun Ha, slightly south in Belize.

From the 1960's through today, the chronological framework of Preclassic (or Formative), Early Classic (Tzakol 1, 2, 3), Late Classic (Tepeu 1, 2, 3), and Post Classic has continued in force. But in 1969 Lee Parsons proposed a "Middle Classic" as an intermediate period to include both Tzakol 3 and Tepeu 1. Esther Pasztory sponsored an informative symposium on the subject, and reviewed the utility of a Middle Classic (Pasztory 1978). The acceptance of a Middle Classic was popular among Mayanists for a short time but recently use of the term has been only sporadic. One problem with employing this term for Peten is that the Middle Classic model was worked out originally for the Cotzumalhuapa area piedmont and Chichen Itza -- southern and northern extremes. Events relevant for Parsons' Middle Classic in these regions did not necessarily take place in the same manner in the central Lowlands. A further complication arose after Parsons created his

Middle Classic to handle the arrival of Teotihuacan influence (Parsons 1969,II:138) when Coggins created part of her Middle Classic to handle the lack of Teotihuacan influence. For the Maya in general and the Peten-Maya in particular, perhaps an insertion of a Middle Classic division (in the form suggested so far) is less pertinent.

A clearer treatment of "Early Classic" and "Late Classic" is used by William Coe for the Tikal Project (W.Coe 1965 for example). No Middle Classic confuses his straightforward presentation. He reminds colleagues that architecture or other cultural products will not necessarily change at the same rate as ceramics. He divides his chapters by the Early Classic-Late Classic terms. Since the official Pennsylvania report on the ceramics of Tikal authored by T. Patrick Culbert has never appeared (by the time of this writing, 1982-86), no further Tikal Project communique reveals how they will revise the traditional Tikal-Uaxactun sequence in the light of newly discovered material.

A different problem with the traditional sequence is whether the "Early Classic" ends at, during, after, or even because of the political-economic-military-religious turmoil that led to the stela hiatus. The continuity of subject matter (myths, supernaturals, hieroglyphic texts) between Tzakol and Tepeu periods is an art history problem parallel to the archaeologist's problem of ceramic evolution and monument production. Such uncertain aspects of traditional archaeological dating and sequence can now be overcome in part through analysis of artifacts found in this decade.

Discoveries from 1970-1980 likewise provide information which facilitates revising traditional concepts in Maya ethnohistory and iconography. The following

introductory section reviews Maya iconography from its beginnings in the 1890's. This history shows the use of Mexican (Aztec) models for the development of the principal models of Maya iconography and cosmology from the 1890's through the 1960's -- with the notable exception of writings of Kubler and Proskouriakoff. This review also demonstrates the seldom cited fact that ethnohistory forms the basic underpinning of current academic beliefs on the nature -- or absence -- of Maya gods and idols. An understanding of the role of ethnohistory in shaping 19th century and subsequent Carnegie Institution era iconography helps understand an academic dilemma of the 1960's as to whether the Maya worshipped spirits of nature or had deities in corporal form -- or both.

Part I
"DEITIES" OR NOT:
THE NOMENCLATURE DILEMMA IN MAYA RELIGION AND ICONOGRAPHY

Chapter I
A SHORT HISTORY OF MAYA DEITY ICONOGRAPHY

Kubler's suggestions to investigate the Maya situation carefully before automatically calling Maya figures "gods" has prompted me to study the background of current nomenclature before working with the individual figural characters of the Early Classic. Traditional nomenclature comes from basic literature in Maya iconography, ethnography, field archaeology -- and especially ethnohistory. The academic origins and traditional rationale for Maya theology and deity nomenclature turn out to provide the clues to explain why and from where the various current models of Maya religion developed. The following authors are relevant to the background of iconography: the early explorers: Stephens, Maler, Maudslay; the first Mayanists: Fewkes, Schellhas, Seler, Brinton, Thomas, Dieseldorff, Goodwin, Bowditch; the Carnegie Institution of Washington era Mayanists: Morley, Thompson, Beyer, Kidder, Proskouriakoff, Tozzer, Berlin; the modern writers: Kelley, Schele, Quirarte, Parsons, Barthel, Duetting, Anton, M. Coe, Willey, Kubler, and Coggins plus Latin American colleagues, Bernal, de la Fuente, Foncerrada de Molina, Ruz, Gendrop, Leon Portilla, Navarrete, and Schavelzon. I also consulted ethnohistory and

current ethnography. This dissertation selects from the above list those particular writers who have formed the traditional academic conception of the nature of Maya figural art.

The early explorers Stephens, Maudslay and Maler did not investigate at length the nature of the images they were finding. Their primary concern was discovery rather than interpretation; their lasting contributions were their large format photographs and excellent drawings. These traditional data set the stage for subsequent Maya research.

Initial exploration of Maya ruins in remote rain forest regions began in 1840 and continued past 1899. By 1899 the stelae and lintels portion of the traditional corpus was available, and all three Post Classic codices had been published. Brinton, Bowditch, Dieseldorff, Fewkes, Schellhas, Seler, and Thomas (among others) utilized the monuments and codices to work out the ancient Maya calendrical system and to catalog the images. Epigraphy and iconography were not really separable and studies of the monuments tended to be primarily on matters of calendrics. Contemporary 19th century writers provided reviews of then current research (Maudslay 1889-1902, I:iv; Foerstemann 1904). Brinton (1895) and Bowditch (1910) summarize in their monographs all advances in calendrical epigraphy of their day. Modern reviews of this sequence of discoveries are available from Kelley (1962), Willey and Sabloff (1974), Thompson (1950:28-34), and others.

Fewkes, Schellhas, and Seler initiated studies in iconography and began to give names to "gods," but no published study investigated the basic nature of Classic Maya deities. Writers simply quoted earlier Mayanists who in turn quoted earlier authors. Basically, since the 1890's writers have called the Maya characters gods

because they were presented already deified by Fewkes, Seler and Schellhas (Fewkes 1894; 1895; Schellhas, German original several years before 1904 English translation; Seler, articles before his 5 volumes, 1902-23).

By 1886 Schellhas had categorized the humanoid figures of the three Post Classic Maya codices as gods.

...the three manuscripts all contain a series of pictorial representations of human figures, which, beyond question, should be regarded as figures of gods (1897 update, 1904 translation, p.7).

Schellhas elaborated a system of alphabetical names, God A, God B, etc. While Schellhas was not the first (Brinton wrote on the Troano segment of the Paris Codex in 1882 and Fewkes wrote on God D as early as 1895), it is Schellhas whose 1904 article is still the bible of the Maya "deities" today, even considering revisions by Seler and Zimmermann.

Eduard Seler

Seler, as early as 1886, in his "Maya-Handschriften und Maya-Goetter," had accepted Schellhas's first article and was on his way to disseminating Maya divinity in his prodigious lifelong literary output. Seler deified the Bat God by 1898 (1904 translation) and fairly well deified the rest of the Maya zoo and most humanoids by 1909-1910. An example of his deification process for animals: "This deity is the bat god" (Seler 1904a:233). The title of the article is, appropriately, "The Bat God of the Maya Race." When faced with Maya images, he used names taken from colonial Spanish sources: "Both hold an idol of a god characterized by an upturned nose, who must be identified as the god Ah honon tz'acab of the Yucatecs, god of water and fertility who is one in nature with Chac the rain god" (Seler

1915/1976:5).

Here is the start of the Chac cult which is part of most Maya writings today where the popular Chac designation is still used virtually any time a "long nosed god" is found.¹²

Seler calls the personalities of the codices gods by 1886. For the Maya day signs he speaks of them as gods using Aztec patrons as a basis (Seler 1888). The literature of 1886-1899 gives the impression that once anyone provided a suggestion that something was a "god," that character was deified from then on. While Seler did investigate the nature of Nahuatl mythical characters when he came to the Maya situation he transferred his Mexican model to the Maya situation, based on his strong belief of cultural equivalency across Mesoamerica. It is rare in Seler's writings where, with Maya material, he presents rationale for deification other than with a reference to Mexican sources.

An example of traditional transformation of Aztec concepts into Maya models is seen at Palenque:

Considering the deep significance attributed to the numbers thirteen and nine by the people of the old Mexican-Central American culture according to this view, it is a natural conclusion to assume that the described thirteen medallions of the east building's east hall are related to those gods of the thirteen heavens. And we would have

12. Chac continues to be used incorrectly in the Tikal Museum for the characters that are more correctly called God K. Another recent use of Chac is for Dzibilchaltun, such as in Coggins 1983:26: "The eight masks of Str.1-sub are the earliest known examples of the Chac (Long Nose rain deity) mask that later became one of the most important characteristics of Pure Florescent architecture." Actually this creature does not even have a long nose, he has a long snout. The breathing apparatus of most comparable Maya monsters is a small snail-like shape on top of the snout, next to the face structure. Besides, the Dzibilchaltun creature is a Lily Pad Headdress Monster -- not a Chac at all (Fig.81).

an even stronger justification for this assumption if it should turn out that there were other reliefs that seemed to depict the nine underworlds and their lords (Seler 1915/1976:35; 197).

Most of the faces were eroded, so Seler was able to continue filling in the Aztec prediction for Palenque. Seler is the source of Mexican-Mayanism in writings on Mesoamerica. Thompson is a direct follower of Seler: "Perhaps his (Seler's) greatest single contribution was his demonstration of the essential cultural unity of the advanced cultures of Middle America" (Thompson 1950:31).

Why did Seler utilize Aztec patterns to interpret the Maya situation? He used the Mexicans because in his time it was believed that an overall cultural similarity united the Mesoamerican peoples. This belief is still a basic tenet of practicing Mesoamericanists today. The degree to which cultural unity was accepted is expressed by Seler himself:

The whole region of ancient Mexican-Central American civilization is, however, a conspicuous example of what Adolph Bastian calls a "geographical province". For, independent of a linguistic difference, we find the special elements of Mexican civilization developed in an exactly similar way among all the peoples of this territory. This is true of the general conduct of life, the technical and military customs, the organization of state and of society, but more especially of religion and learning. The unity of this entire region of ancient civilization is most clearly expressed by the calendar, which these people considered the basis and the alpha and omega of all high and occult knowledge (Seler 1904b:266).

Studies of calendrics resulted in the first god identifications. Calendrical studies began with central Mexican material because the conquering Spanish had left more detailed -- and fully illustrated -- chronicles of these non-Maya civilizations. In the 1890's, writers had more central Mexican data than Maya data. Only in the past ten years have enough Maya pictorial scenes become available to allow a study of Maya topics using specifically Maya illustrations.

Later Seler gives another reason for his belief in a similarity of Mesoamerican culture: "It could hardly be otherwise in view of the active intercourse which existed between these two great civilized races."¹³ The writings of Schellhas and Seler have been transmitted into today's literature through Spinden, Morley, and Thompson. Much of Thompson's epigraphy and iconography of 1950 is rewritten from 19th century Mayanists, especially from Seler.¹⁴ Thompson's absorption of Seler comes through clearly, such as when Sir Eric writes:

The traveler of two thousand years ago would not have noticed much difference in the way of life of Indian communities in the whole length of a walking tour from what is now Mexico City to what is now Guatemala City (Thompson 1954:43).

This comment is in Thompson's work on "The Maya." In a different manner, M. Coe and Nicholson (1976) have worked on Mesoamerican iconology. Their accomplishments in Mexican-Maya studies come from a point by point comparison of limited aspects rather than the total application of an overwhelming pan-Mexican culture area. These modern contributions are distinguishable from earlier problems.

The fact that the Mexican material may not be understood itself or may be a mixture of Borgia Group codices with Sahagun is never brought up or may not even be recognized by the author. Aztec-Maya parallels are not automatically incorrect but in the past they have not actually been true parallels -- they are often conveniently similar or selectively cited so as to appear comparable. Using Post

13. Seler 1904c:391. The two great races would be "The Aztecs" and "The Maya."

14. Mary Miller reminded me that it was Thompson who translated Seler's five volumes of German writings into an unpublished Carnegie Institution of Washington English language edition. Thompson did the translation in 1939. His compendium on Maya hieroglyphic writing appeared in 1950.

Classic, Central Mexican material places one in multiple jeopardy: first, potential weakness and misunderstanding in the Mexican material itself; second) potential misuse of cross-cultural analogy (depending on visual similarities which are only coincidental -- as in the excesses committed in attempting to prove Japan-Jomon (Ecuador) contacts or Chinese Bronze Age-Mesoamerican similarities); third, Post Classic versus Classic, and Highland Mexican versus Lowland Maya cultural differences remain, not to mention the thousand year time gap which adds to the Post Classic-Classic gulf. Kubler has warned of problems inherent in using far-away situations for creating models of Maya civilization, yet he has never said that Maya forms should not be compared with Aztec forms. Disjunction means only that identical forms may not ALWAYS equal identical meaning (Kubler 1967:12; 1969:48). The point is not that using Aztec data is inherently wrong, but that Aztec explanations for traditional Maya models need to be re-studied before they continue as the basic concepts for academic understanding of Maya civilization.¹⁵

Hindsight is easy with Seler and Thompson, but with today's availability of plentiful Maya material, students should return to other central Mexican-Maya parallels that are entrenched in the literature and see if they hold up in light of new information. All too often fresh data show the weaknesses of having started with a central Mexican premise. With so much Maya material available today, do scholars still need an Aztec or Teotihuacan crutch to hold up the Maya universe? Can the Maya now be studied directly? Do we want to learn what the

15. Coggins has introduced Teotihuacan models to replace Aztec models. Thus she interprets the middle history of Tikal with respect to appearance, disappearance, and patterns of Teotihuacan motifs. Her latest work takes a Teotihuacan-Tikal-centric model even further, to fashion a model for the stucco decoration and architectural assemblage of Str.1-sub at Dzibilchaltun (Coggins 1983).

pan-Mesoamerican forms evolved into in the Post Classic, or know what they were like on their own in the Classic, in their Guatemalan milieu?

Codices from the Borgia Group (Borgia, Cospi, Vaticanus B, etc.) contain pictorial representations which are a mine of information for understanding the nature of ancient Mesoamerican religion, deities, and cult activities and paraphernalia. The absence of references to these codices in this study is not because the Aztec codices are irrelevant but because my goal is to work out the nature of Maya cosmology in its 5th century lowland Peten situation, where Preclassic Kaminaljuyu and even the distant Olmecs are more in the geographical and temporal picture than 15th century Mexico. A study of Aztec-Maya sharing of a common Mesoamerican religion and world view is all the more interesting today because at last there is more on the Maya side to provide as comparisons for the abundant Mexican pictorial manuscripts. Musical groups and instruments are quite similar between Post Classic Mexican codices and Classic Maya polychrome vases. Pertinent to continuity from the Early Classic are the same unusual "can opener" or "crab claw" tails on reptilian fish monsters (Fejervary-Mayer) and the ubiquitous "Crocodile Trees" in the Post Classic Borgia and Laud. The skeletal frame in Borgia 30 and in Codex Laud is the same as on Early Classic Maya turtle effigy containers and on snake bodies pictured at Palenque. Vaticanus B (33) pictures gods carving masks, a favorite subject of painters of Late Classic Maya plates. Coe has already pointed out the patron of such artists among the Classic Maya. It is to these actual Maya that this study is dedicated.

Olmec-Aztec-Maya relationships are a crucial part of Mesoamerican studies and should not be discouraged, but the Maya project in these pages simply has a different interest -- to see what Early Classic Guatemala looked like on its own.

For example, the Surface of the Underwaterworld is strikingly devoid of Teotihuacan influence.¹⁶

Aside from zealous cross-cultural use of Aztec data, though, Seler produced reliable analyses of Maya material in its own right, both epigraphic and iconographic. Kubler has noted many useful contributions of Seler (Kubler 1969). Seler's 1902 review of numerical Maya calendrical hieroglyphs is often more lucid than later compilations. Seler is an underused source in Mesoamerican studies. Kelley puts the matter succinctly: "The tremendous range of Seler's contributions to the study of the Maya hieroglyphs has been most inadequately recognized in the English and American literature of Maya studies" (Kelley 1962a:7).

Contemporary with Seler was Fewkes (early investigator of God D), Schellhas (whom was cited earlier as having written the standard reference on Maya deities), Thomas, Foerstemann, Brinton, and Bowditch. Often when these late 19th century writers cite a deity, they cite Seler.

Appearing the same year as a work by Seler on animals in Maya art was Tozzer and Allen's independent book on Animal Figures in the Maya Codices. The Harvard University team wavered on whether ALL creatures were gods, but certainly accepted animals in general as potential gods in general:

16. Even though Teotihuacan cosmology features water serpents, water bands, a generally water-related cosmology, a raptorial bird monster, even God N in his seashell, and even though the Surface of the Underwaterworld imagery peaked during the century of Teotihuacan influence on the Maya, attempts to use a Teotihuacan model to interpret the Maya cosmogram forget the fact that the Maya cosmogram was already well entrenched at Preclassic Izapa, Abaj Takalik, and Tikal well before the advent of Teotihuacan influence. More importantly, of the principal inhabitants of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (GI, Anemone Headdress Monster, Shell Wing Dragon, etc.), none occur in the indigenous art of Teotihuacan.

Where figures are shown with human body and animal head standing alone in the place usually occupied by one of the various deities in the tonalamatl, there can be little doubt that they have a mythological meaning and are to be taken, either as gods themselves, or as representing certain of the gods... other animals when they occur alone... might also be considered as mythological animals.... The idea of worshipping animals as gods in themselves is strengthened by noting the ease with which the Maya people worshipped the horse which was left behind by Cortez (Tozzer and Allen 1910:286).

That is Maya theology in one handy paragraph. They simply accept that figures in the codices are deities. Spinden followed and deified most animals.¹⁷ Thompson solved the religious and semantic problem by calling any supernatural representation a god, especially any personified hieroglyphic face relating to calendrical periods. He deified the days themselves. Anders, in his Das Pantheon der Maya follows the status quo of his time (1963) and accepts all previous deifications.

Today the tradition is to term almost all major animals (jaguar etc.) and all non-historical humanoids as "gods." Together with the Schellhas alphabetical series of Gods A-P, the Maya pantheon became rather crowded, especially when each author invented his and her own name for each characterization, or out of unfamiliarity with the proper name, called everything with a long "nose" either "Chac" or "Itzamna." Kubler's reminder that deity nomenclature and models are seriously deficient necessitates this review of the background of these traditional dictums.

Herbert J. Spinden

Spinden is widely recognized as the first modern iconographer. His Ph.D. dissertation of 1909 on evolution of style in Maya art (especially in the Copan

17. In his 1909 Harvard University Ph.D. dissertation. Published in 1913.

stelae) covered iconography and is still a basic text. Spinden's deity names and theology were part of the heritage absorbed by writers of the following Carnegie Institution era (1920-1955), especially Proskouriakoff (who never objected to gods in her early writings). Although the idea is probably deeper in earlier Maya writings, it is in Spinden where the novel idea of "forces of nature" became noticeable -- a definite source to influence Morley and Proskouriakoff:

Planets and stars, as well as the sun and moon, were represented by divinities. The forces of nature, such as the rain, the wind, and fertility in its various forms, were conceived as individual or as variant gods (Spinden 1913:11)

Spinden also championed another view repeated later by Proskouriakoff -- god "impersonators" (p. 22).

Spinden reviewed the Schellhas alphabetical gods for the Classic period and thought he could find Gods A, B, D, E, G, I, K, and N present, some more than others.¹⁸ Spinden could not find Gods F and G in the Classic period. He was unable to spot God L or M, though L was of course present all along at Palenque and has been rescued from obscurity by Coe in his study of polychrome pottery. Overall though, today in 1986, Spinden's ageless 1909/1913 dissertation, A Study of Maya Art is still one of the well used books in a modern iconographic library. Spinden made many a discovery long ago which in the 1960's-1980's has been rediscovered: "An idea of the symbolical complications which probably prevailed throughout Maya religion may be gained from the Popol Vuh, the cosmogonic myth of the Quiche" (Spinden 1957:11; 55; Fig.57). His book is a true classic.

18. Actually God D was not properly identified until 1978 (Hellmuth) and God E was not described until 1983 (Karl Taube).

Sylvanus G. Morley

The prodigious output of Morley -- and subsequently of his contemporary Thompson -- overtook all earlier writers and still sets the tone for Maya studies today. In his long career Morley wrote 81 articles, five monographs, and a five volume Inscriptions of Peten. When as prestigious a recent book as Anders' Das Pantheon der Maya uses Morley as a general review of Maya religion (Anders 1963:32), the still pervasive influence of Morley's ideas is evident as opposed to a ground level re-working of Maya civilization from the original archaeological data. Magazine and newspaper articles on the Maya still today present "the Maya" as created by Morley and Thompson. It was Morley who first took both Thompson and Proskouriakoff on his Carnegie Institution of Washington staff (Lister and Lister 1970; Thompson 1963:5). Understandably Morley's ideas were readily absorbed by his co-workers. To understand Thompson's and Proskouriakoff's writings, it helps to see the milieu in which they began their Maya studies.

Morley was actively writing from 1910 until his death in 1948, with posthumous books appearing shortly thereafter, then two biographies (Brunhouse 1971; Lister and Lister 1970). From all of Morley's writings three are pertinent to iconography: Maya Hieroglyphs (1915), Guide Book to Ruins of Quirigua (1935), and The Ancient Maya (1946). Of these three, the 1946 book is largely a popular compilation of his earlier writings, so the following discussion will review primarily the 1915 and 1935 output.¹⁹

19. I use the 1947 2nd edition, but "1947" should be understood to represent Morley's 1946 THE ANCIENT MAYA concepts. Most subsequent writers use the Brainerd revised edition of the 1950's rather than either Morley's original 1935 ideas or his pre-Brainerd 1946-47 concepts. Today a new updated edition, revised by Sharer, is available.

Overall, Morley's 1915 "Introduction" is a testing ground for his general appraisal of Maya civilization that would be expanded in 1935 and then grow to a best seller in 1946. Essentially his "Maya" were word for word from Bishop Landa's 16th century relation, the tradition of the time in American writings. The 1915 section on Maya religion does not yet use Schellhas's alphabetical nomenclature, cites no authority, but is otherwise the forerunner of all Morley's pronouncement: "The religion of the ancient Maya was polytheistic, its pantheon containing about a dozen major deities and a host of lesser ones" (1915:16). This first Morley production differs somewhat from later output in that "natural forces" are not mentioned at all. Perhaps a clue as to Morley's source is his use of the name Ahpuch for God A. Berlin says this erroneous reading was proposed by Brinton.²⁰

Morley's deification of the calendrical periods, and especially Thompson's deification of essentially all head variants of calendrical or mathematical hieroglyphs does not appear in 1915. In 1915 there is no mention of the word God in the section on head variants or full figures (pp. 68-73). Even more uncharacteristic of Morley is that the head variants for the numerals are not considered deities by him in 1915 (pp. 96-100). In keeping with his "godless phase," Morley does not endow the day or month hieroglyphs with divine personality either.

But by Morley's 1935 book, the numerals become the "Thirteen Gods of the Upper World" (1935:184) -- not only deified but capitalized. The months never

20. Berlin 1977:149. Modern linguists and epigraphers from Berlin onward no longer accept the Ahpuch term. Schellhas also mentioned the misnomer Ahpuch (1904:13), not cited by Berlin. Schellhas says the name comes from Hernandez. The Popol Vuh should be checked.

caught his (or Thompson's) theological attention.²¹ Morley left months alone with only: "each had its own particular deity" (p.161). By 1946, in essence, any head-variant hieroglyph, and even more so the full figure form, were now tagged as being "of deities" (Morley 1946:276) Did the Maya themselves change? It is not the Maya that change, it is the writer. The writer himself creates "the Maya." The change between Morley's 1915 and 1935/1946 models is quite noticeable. In 1935 when he leaves the inscriptions per se and enters the "Story Told by the Maya Inscriptions" he is on his favorite subject:

Each of the nineteen divisions of the 365-day calendar year had its own particular deity. For example, the month Yaxkin had for its celestial patron the Sun God; the month Chen, the Moon God; the month Yax, the planet Venus, etc. The name hieroglyph of the deity in whose month the corresponding date fell is recorded in the first hieroglyph of each text in the vast majority of Old Empire inscriptions. Another group of very important deities was the Bolon-ti-ku or Nine Gods of the Underworld (Morley 1936:161-162).

Morley expresses no particular limit to the possible number of Maya deities. He asks himself what undeciphered hieroglyphs are likely to be found to discuss:

Certain it is that we will eventually find hieroglyphs for a group of special moon gods--the patrons of the six different months of the eclipse period.... Some of the unknown signs undoubtedly represent deities...and less and less of history in the Old World sense of personal or nationalistic records.

...one may perhaps hazard the guess that the remaining undeciphered glyphs deal with further ceremonial matters, perhaps such as offerings appropriate to specific religious festivals, the designation of lucky and unlucky days, the malevolent and benevolent deities of the ritualistic year, the name glyphs of the patron deities of the six different months of the lunar half-year.... Some of the glyphs as yet unknown undoubtedly represent deities; others perhaps the special kinds of offering with which they were to be severally 'propitiated' and still others, the special rites with which they were to be worshipped--that is to say, more and more of ritual, of liturgy, of astrology and religion, and less and less of history in the Old World sense of personal and national records (Morley 1940:147-149).

21. Possibly because the month patrons were already identified by Beyer (M. Miller, personal communication).

Morley (and later Thompson) popularized the idea that the Maya inscriptions:

tell no story of kingly conquests, recount no deeds of imperial achievement;..indeed they are so utterly impersonal, so completely non-individualistic that it is even probable that the names of specific men and women were never recorded upon Maya monuments (Morley 1935:161)

This is the tenor from Goodman's 19th century heritage (Goodman 1897:120).

Morley accepted Aztecisms when they were presented by others, but for once his Maya nationalism worked in his favor, as he believed his clever Maya to be ultimate inventors of all superior features. Hence there was not much need for anything Aztec in the Morleyian model. For Morley the Aztecs were only late barbarians. Thompson, on the contrary, believed that discovering the inner thought of the Maya was impossible (Thompson 1968:8-9) and so saw the abundant Aztecs data base as the only hope of recreating the earlier Mesoamerican patterns.

Religion and deities do not get discussed by Morley in this popular The Ancient Maya until the chapter of this title (1946:208ff). Then directly in the first paragraph comes a statement crucial in the development of the Spinden-Morley-Proskouriakoff model of Maya religion:

At first the Maya religion was probably a simple nature worship, personification of the natural forces which influenced and in large measure shaped their lives: the sun, the moon, the rain, the lightning, winds, mountains, plains, forests, rivers, and rapids (ibid., p.208)

Morley did not use footnotes, so the reader has no way of knowing the 16th century Spanish source via Seler for this. When Proskouriakoff first discussed with me in 1966 her concept of the Mayas lack of idols in the Classic period, she repeated Morley's model effectively word for word. Morley also emphasized the Spanish record of the Maya claim that they had no idols before the arrival of the

Mexicans but without citing Landa.

Maya religion had become a highly developed cult based upon a complete fusion of a more primitive personification of nature with a more sophisticated philosophy, built around a deification of the heavenly bodies, a worship of time in its various manifestations never equalled anywhere in the world before or, for that matter, since. (Morley 1947:210).

On page 222 (1946) Morley treats the reader to the pantheon, starting with Itzamna, God D in the codices (God D in the Classic period had not yet been found). In fact the Classic period is dismissed quickly with the then correct reasoning: "Unfortunately, Old Empire representations of few if any of the Maya deities have survived" (Morley 1947:222). This idea has stayed in the literature to influence models developed by later writers. For example, Kubler accepted a paucity of Classic "gods" (Kubler 1969:47).

After his Pantheon, Morley tackles the "Patron God Series." His manner of sectioning the book suggests that these gods are not part of his Pantheon, an unexplained arrangement also perceptible in Thompson's subsequent ordering of the Maya gods. Actually, neither writer ever really worked out a systematic organization of deities since they bring in gods from every imaginable source. The "gods" have still not been organized today, though Kubler (1969) and Coe (1973-1982) made a helpful start.

Thompson, in his introduction to the 1975 reprint of Morley's 1915 work, says: "Morley was not an intellectual.... He was able to imbue his reader or his hearer with his enthusiasm and he did not hide his conviction that the Maya were a race of supermen... The book was sort of a Hallelujah chorus." (Thompson 1975:xii). But Morley's epigraphic monographs are still consulted today, as this academic subject stayed with its hieroglyphic calendrical calculations and was not as

susceptible to Greco-Roman models as were his writings on the general nature of Maya civilization. The fact that his first book written in 1915 not long after only undergraduate studies, would be reprinted six decades later, and with an introduction by the leading writer of the field, demonstrates that Morley has indeed made a lasting impression, for the good, with his hieroglyphic inscriptions. His monumental Inscriptions at Copan is still a basic reference in epigraphy.

J. Eric. S. Thompson

Thompson is widely considered the leading Mayanist. His long career spanned the Carnegie Institution era into modern times. Queen Elizabeth knighted him in 1975.²² His scores of scholarly as well as popular articles make him the most prolific writer on Maya subjects -- even more so than his contemporary Morley. At least five of Thompson's major monographs are still in print today. It would be unlikely to find a monograph or a major article on any aspect of Maya archaeology, ethnography, or iconography since 1950 which did not quote Thompson, and in this legacy again he far exceeds Morley. Thompson (as was Morley) was a dedicated and kind individual who obviously enjoyed his work.²³

A 1934 article, "Sky Bearers, Colors and Directions in Maya and Mexican Religion" provides a first introduction of the Aztec source for Maya concepts that was his trademark in Maya iconography for four decades. His treatise on Mexican deity iconography also introduces his life-long habit of selectively choosing, adding,

22. He died several months later.

23. I had the chance to meet Thompson on two occasions in Guatemala, and I contributed an article to his memory in the Hammond organized tribute to Sir Eric (Hellmuth 1977).

and omitting attributes from one god after another to bolster his theories. Even Thompson himself admits that "Having wandered along the paths of Mexican theology with more deviation than is permitted to the stars we are pursuing, let us return once more to the Maya of Yucatan, or rather to a feature of that hybrid culture evolved from the contact of the Yucatecan Maya with Mexico" (Thompson 1934:234). Here perhaps is a hint of justification for inserting Mexican concepts into an article purportedly on the Maya: that the Yucatecan Maya is a hybrid-Mexican culture due to the Toltecs. But, the Yucatec are Post Classic. Is the source of Thompson's subsequent Mexican model really Toltec? That would be rather difficult since the Mexican codices are not 10th-12th century Toltec but 16th century post-Toltec. Also, normally his Mexican models are used to describe Peten Maya, 800 years and 200 km. separated from the Yucatan and the Post Classic.

In this seldom cited article is Thompson's first substantial description of what evolved several decades later into his monotheistic Itzamna hypothesis. But Thompson's 1934 sky monster is not yet a single time labeled as Itzamna (Thompson 1934:237). Thompson is more intent on "bonds known to link Mexican and Maya religion, ritual and mythology" (p. 239). He also adds, "In conclusion, one might call attention to the remarkable parallel between ancient Greek and Mexican ideas on the sky bearers" (p. 238). Here Thompson echos Morley's Greco-Roman model. The year 1934 is still close to the time when Thompson joined Morley's team. In Thompson's first public treatise on Maya religion (Gann and Thompson 1937:118ff). Morley's spirit remains dominant. Thompson did not work out independent models until 1939 -- and then he stayed on the Mexicanized Maya track until his death in 1975. "The Mexicans" continued as an undefined mother culture bequeathing to the

Maya their pantheon and thirteen layered heavens.

"The Moon Goddess in Middle America: With Notes on Related Deities" is regrettably not often cited by current scholars,²⁴ yet it contains a complete preview of his later popular theory of Itzamna monotheism which was not widely taken up by the public and scholars until its reappearance in monograph form in 1970. The 1939 article also contains other hints relative to the ideas that were circulating among Carnegie Institution workers at that time. His first sentence perpetuates the Spinden-Morley "personification of nature" concept, a model based ultimately on Seler's readings of Spanish chroniclers, Ximenez and Remesal.

The religious concepts of the peoples of Middle America can be classified in two major groups: one is based on a lay growth from a primitive personification of nature; the other, more abstract, is seemingly the outcome of the ideas of a professional or semi-professional priesthood, fused with incidents of a more primitive mythology... personifications of blended forces of nature, be they rain, lightning, mountains, or plains. Seemingly this was the religion which early sources inform us preceded the introduction of idolatry (Thompson 1939:127).

This classification is actually a mixture taken partly from early Spanish colonial misinterpretation of the Manche Chol and is lacking documentation from or relationship with the actual ancient Maya.

There is a subtle distinction in how the various writers perceive these personifications. Proskouriakoff firmly locks the personification of nature with the Spanish belief in the Indians' claim that idolatry did not enter until a certain Post Classic period. Thompson, in 1939, cites the Relaciones de Yucatan, II:78-79 and Codex Ramirez, chapter 1; in 1970 he cites Remesal on the Manche. This entire

24. Kubler cites the 1939 article. Of course Thompson's 1970 monograph on Itzamna was not available yet to Kubler in 1969.

problem of relying on Spanish beliefs is discussed in the following section of this dissertation. Morley on the other hand has worship of the personification of nature at some dim, prior stage of underdevelopment, several thousand year earlier, and has it replaced for his version of the Classic Maya by a Pantheon with a capital P. Morley made it quite clear that he believed the Maya were the Greeks of the New World. Thompson himself, with his European classical education, used the Romans for his principal comparative culture. Indeed, on the same page that he creates the Maya religion based on personification of nature he compares Imperial Rome with the Aztecs. The rest of this lengthy article he devotes to a comparison between "Maya Tradition" and "Aztec Tradition."

The "Maya Tradition" of the 1930's-1960's is composed of Landa, Redfield (contemporary Maya ethnography), plus all extant highland Maya ethnographies, and especially Thompson's own field work in Kekchi-Mopan villages of southern Belize (Thompson 1930). In 1939 there were few data from the Peten Maya heartlands. The question reduces to whether there is a "Maya Tradition" or one created from scattered references across the entire Maya map and up and down the long column of Maya history. Textbooks and many monographs give the impression that a monolithic "Maya Civilization" really existed. In actuality "the Maya" are largely a construct of writers. "The Maya" are at best a necessary evil. "The Early Classic Maya," "The Late Classic Maya," and definitely a "Central Lowland Maya" need to be better distinguished as also between the highlands to the south and the Northern Lowlands above. Specialists in Maya pottery have attempted this, but their technical temporal and regional boundaries have tended to be overwhelmed by other writers when it comes time to put the concepts into books that are widely read and cited.

Another question is to what degree the "Mexican Tradition" is an academic construct. Is not the model builder simply scanning the entire face of central Mexico until he finds a single element that fits his concepts -- then inserting this Mexican feature into his Maya model? Why does this technique differ from that of trans-oceanic diffusionists who pick and choose items in China or in Japan that look similar to features in the art and ceramics of Mexico or Ecuador and then conclude that there is a trans-oceanic relationship? The traditional "Maya" is an idealized construct, a hybrid culture, not just Mexican-Maya, but all Mexican areas and all Maya periods. Where is an opportunity to see an actual Maya culture? Where is a religious system worked out from contemporaneous and geographically contiguous material?

A sample of Thompson's own model building speaks for itself: "The sun, morning star, and moon are associated with the deer." Then, four paragraphs later in the same section: "In Maya mythology there is no direct association of the moon goddess with the deer" (p. 150). On the next page under "Mexican Tradition:" "Although the associations between the deer and the sun, moon, and morning star are somewhat tenuous, they serve to strengthen the mythological ties between Central Mexico and the Maya area" (p. 151). This is only a small sample of the text that forms his principal writings -- the writings which are the foundation for other authors of his generation and today. A review of textbooks of the 1960-s through 1980's demonstrates how the Thompsonian Maya are the traditional model which still dominates the field of anthropology and art history. It is reaction against these unlikely models which led Proskouriakoff to propose dismissing the entire structure of Maya deities for the Classic period. Prior to discussing her widely disseminated ideas, it is helpful to cite the specific study that triggered her

counter model, Thompson's Itzamna theories. For an introduction to Thompson's own imagination on Maya divinity, a review of his concept of Itzamna is instructive.

Itzamna - Monotheism

The favorite theory of Thompson, presented even more forcefully than his ideas on the vacant ceremonial center nature of Maya settlement pattern, and even more pervasive than the popular concept that the Maya dedicated the erection of their stelae to commemorate the passage of time, and equal to his insistence that the Classic Maya diet was more than 85% maize, is his novel idea that the Late Classic Maya were developing monotheism. Thompson popularized his Itzamna hypothesis in a widely read and still reprinted Maya History and Religion (1970). In a seldom cited publication, based on a lecture in 1970 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, he reiterated Itzamnaism after a long digression into Aztec veneration for their rulers.

A survey of Maya deities would be incomplete without a review of Thompson's theory, in part because of the vigor with which he launched it, and in larger part due to the uncritical acceptance of it by Mayanists with the notable exception of Proskouriakoff and M. Coe.²⁵ A review of Thompson's earlier works in order to figure out when, on what grounds, and from what other influences he developed Itzamnistic monotheism, brought to light the lengthy 1939 article in a widely

25. A survey of textbooks, popular articles, and monographs from 1960-1984 that touch on Maya religion or deities quickly reveals the degree to which Thompsonian Itzamnaism, and Seler-Morley-Thompson calendrical gods are considered as basic tenets of Classic Maya religion. Coe, 1973, makes the most decisive independent breakthrough; Miller and Schele have independently indicated they are working out their own concepts of Maya epigraphy, iconography, and cosmology directly from primary material without recourse to Thompson-Morley models.

available but evidently overlooked Carnegie Institution publication where the entire Itzamna thesis was already essentially fully developed in that early year.

Fortunately it was not widely copied by other writers yet, and Thompson himself made little mention of Itzamna between 1939 and 1970. In his 1970/73 lecture article (p. 58) he refers the reader to his 1970 data. He does not cite his own 1939 genesis of Itzamna.

After creating a composite Itzamna-Sky Monster, Thompson subsumes an earth monster aspect to his growing creation. He reasons that "...it certainly is not inconsistent with belief concerning the sun, it would naturally lead to the celestial monsters having sub-terrestrial aspects" (Thompson 1939:156). Led by his new creation he enters Mexican cosmology and explains that "It is, therefore, clear that in Mexican mythology existed a belief in celestial serpents and monsters which are associated with world directions and sent or denied water to mankind" (p. 159). Adding directional creatures, he moves across the map back to the Maya area, in Copan, 8th century, and says that indeed the Maya had not merely one sky monster, but four of them. The next paragraph skips to the Post Classic Belize at Santa Rita, and, bringing in Yucatan of the 1920's, concludes that "celestial monsters were associated in the minds of the Maya with world directions."

Next comes a "Summary of Itzamna Theory" (p. 160) which presents his summary: "The evidence, although inconclusive, points to Itzamna and the sky monsters being one and the same." But this is not the end of the spread of Itzamna (now spelled as one word). At this point God K is added to the conglomerate "since celestial snakes occasionally have heads shaped like that of God K, and the intricate heads of the sky monster somewhat resemble that of this god" (p. 160).

His next section, "Kinich-Ahau Itzamna," absorbs totally unrelated characters into his single creation in fulfillment of his monotheistic ideas.

Among the heads inserted in the jaws of Maya sky monsters that of the sun god, the Yucatecan Kinich-Ahau, is the most frequent and the most easily recognizable, particularly in the jaws of the miniature celestial monsters, the so-called ceremonial bars, carried by personages on stelae, at Copan and elsewhere. If, then, our identification of Itzamna as the celestial monster be correct, Kinich Ahau Itzamna would naturally be one aspect of Itzamna, and would be portrayed in sculpture by the well-known head of the sun god in the jaws of the celestial monster.

Itzimt'ul Chac would be another aspect of the sky monster, and Itzamna Kauil yet a third. Itzamna's alternative name of Yaxcocahmut might even have reference to the celestial birds so intimately associated with the sky monster in art, since "mut" means 'bird' in some Maya languages, and we know also of an Ekcoahmut, which in conjunction with Yaxcocahmut suggests a world-color association - the black Coc bird, the green Coc bird. (1939:161).

When one studies the source of the ideas through his articles, one can see that it is Thompson himself who builds the Maya cosmos. The type of documentation he offers is typified by: "Itzamna's position as inventor of hieroglyphic writing is partially confirmed by the fact that Kinich-Ahau Itzamna was invoked by the priests when they opened their books for divination in the month Zip" (p. 152). But Kinich-Ahau (the Sun God) is unlikely the same as Itzamna, and merely opening books is hardly a grounds for creating a patron of hieroglyphic writing. It was not until 1977 that the patron of writing was worked out, by Michael Coe, on the basis of ceramics in private collections -- and the patron was a monkey-man, not Itzamna. Thompson was possibly a better missionary of Itzamna than the Maya priests themselves.

Despite his difficulties with theology and iconography, Thompson made

contributions in epigraphy until the problem of phoneticism.²⁶ Thompson fared better in dirt archaeology. He was a tireless laborer in the Maya field and is widely envied for his popular writing style. After his death more than a dozen monographs were dedicated to his favorable memory. His books today still serve as the primary source for tens of thousands of students and lay people. It is precisely because Thompson equals "The" Maya that the validity of his constructs need to be scrutinized. A study such as Becker's critique of the vacant ceremonial center model is long overdue for Thompson's theology and iconography (Becker 1979). With all due respect, some of the deification of gods and of writers need to be reconsidered. Since Thompson himself took every opportunity to make good use of polychrome vases in private collections,²⁷ he himself would have recognized the dramatic changes that need to be effected in Maya studies today to absorb all the recent discoveries in museums.

George Kubler

George Kubler has worked on many other art styles in addition to those of Mesoamerica. Within pre-Columbian studies, he is best known for his application of Panofsky's principal of "disjunction" (Kubler 1967:12). Kubler suggests that the use of Aztec data to describe the Classic Maya situation may not always be a valid comparison because the meaning behind the image may change over periods as long as 1000 years. The potential of disjunction exists as well between the Classic and the Post Classic Maya themselves. But the whole problem of disjunction is easier

26. Thompson 1971:vii; Mary Miller, though, cautions against taking even Thompson's epigraphy always at face value; personal communication, May 1984.

27. Thompson published the Rockefeller-Primitive Art Museum vase three years before the Grolier Club exhibit.

to avoid today than for Seler or Thompson because now we have as many Classic Maya pictorials (on pots) as early writers had Aztec ones (in codices). Today it is possible to formulate models directly from related, contemporary data.

In a 1969 monograph on the Maya, Kubler presents the combined results of iconographic studies from Seler through Spinden updated with commentary on artwork from Machaquila and Tikal.²⁸ Studies in Classic Maya Iconography is the first major, book-length survey of Classic period iconography for half a century and the only modern iconography before ceramics previously lost in private collections were made public.²⁹ In 1969, Kubler reviews the field and finds that since Spinden's 1913 monograph, no complete book covers Maya iconography.

Kubler faces the problem of religion on the first page. He makes several points, first:

Morley (1946,222f) noted that "Old Empire representations of few if any of the Maya deities have survived," and (257) that "the Old Empire Maya were not, generally speaking, worshippers of images in a literal sense," observing (208) "probably a simple nature worship" of personifications of natural forces (Kubler 1969:1).

This point is crucial to understanding the Seler (Ximenez-Remesal)-Carnegie Institution of Washington tradition as passed on to the current generation. My chapter, "Codex (Post Classic period)-Ceramic (Classic Period) Parallels," will discuss this situation in more detail.

28. This publication resulted from William Coe's invitation for Kubler to be the editor of the then planned Iconography of Tikal volume. Editorship of the second stage of this has passed to Arthur Miller.

29. Kubler has always maintained and practiced the art historian's academic freedom to research in private collections. His catalog of the Arensberg Collection, for instance, is a useful primary source for the study of Veracruz hachas and yokes.

On a second point relative to the dilemma of "deities" Kubler states:

Recent studies now suggest that much Maya sculpture pertains to the portraiture of commemoration of historic persons... and that the Schellhas system is relevant only for the Maya codices, which are generally admitted as being of post-Classic date and under Mexican influence (G. Zimmermann, 1956). It is therefore urgent now to review the entire Classic Maya configuration as one including many historical representations, as well as having many fewer figures of gods than Spinden supposed... Only the following deities of the revised Schellhas system have recognizable counterparts in Classic sculpture: A, G, K, N, X. In no case can we be sure that the meaning is the same in both manuscript and monumental versions (ibid. p.2).

This dissertation faces his issue by using new pictorial ceramics not previously published. Kubler also independently began a revision using material in private collections in his latest publication (1984a).

Central to Kubler's writings is his clearly outlined acceptance of specific positions. The section on God D and the codices will compare and contrast Kubler's points with pertinent data. Beforehand -- now, in historical perspective -- it is necessary to present his own words, again in the Spinden tradition that the Schellhas characters of the codices are lacking in the Classic period and therefore the Classic Maya had a different system of supernatural personalities.

In the three post-classic codices about 30 types of 'deities' are distinctly identifiable and separable (Zimmermann, 1956, pl.7) and have been accepted by students for several generations (Schellhas, 1904). In classic inscriptions and sculpture, no definite body of figures of deities can be labeled and recognized. True, there are various series such as the nine forms of glyph G (Thompson, 1960, 209, fig. 34) and their head variants as well as eighteen figures whose heads or glyphs appear as month patrons in the superfix of the introducing glyph (Thompson, 1960, figs. 22, 23). But a large company of astrological regents like those of the manuscripts is hard to find in the inscriptions.... In general the multiplicity of the deities in the manuscripts is lacking in classic Maya iconography. There is no body of images or activities accompanied by suitable divine regents, and in place of the gods, we probably see only images of spirits, whose attributes and characteristics vary according to place and period (Kubler 1969:31-32).

A further point of Kubler parallels a position emphasized by Proskouriakoff respective to masks and impersonators. I cite Kubler's own words in this section, then review Proskouriakoff, and next review the greater mask-impersonator problem using Spanish observations, Mayan linguistic terms, and then actual Classic period masks. These topics are in specific chapters that follow this current section on the principal writings of the dilemma of deity identification and definition. First we can learn from Kubler's concepts:

"In brief, Maya figural art contains large numbers of graphemes, just as Maya writing is everywhere invaded by images. Proskouriakoff (1968, 251) states the possibility that "all normal forms could be pictorialized by way of phonetic or ideographic metaphor". Her observation here is extended to pictorial compositions containing allographic images which are equivalent to glyphs. Both commemorative and ritual images thus contain graphemes that have been converted into pictorial forms, usually by the device of humanization. The graphemic origins of these figures remain clearly evident in the heads, masks and body forms of human impersonators of nature spirits and animal forces. Such impersonators have been called "gods" ever since Schellhas (1904) studied their occurrences in manuscripts. But until their meaning is more surely known, a term like "figural allograph" will avoid premature decisions about religious significance (Kubler 1969:7).

His own study is cautious but decisions on religious significance are already present in the Morley-Proskouriakoff model that is embedded in the literature. For this reason the review of Morley, Kubler, and shortly, Proskouriakoff, is necessary in direct citations first, before pertinent data from Maya art, archaeology, and ethnohistory are introduced two chapters from now.

Summarizing Kubler's contributions, he reintroduced iconography into Maya studies in 1969 and produced a penetrating inquisition of the nature of Maya images: gods or men. When Kubler found that current terms were imprecise, he proposed better ones. Kubler's constant reminders to be more precise prompted my returning to ethnohistory to reach the essential, original points behind

Proskouriakoff's ideas that the Classic Maya had no idols and possibly not even deities. If the review of god studies is judged too critical, it is only a reflection of his call for sustained questioning of what we are studying. No matter to what degree one accepts or rejects his position, or disjunction, one cannot escape their implications by avoiding the question. Even when data are still lacking today to reach final conclusions, Kubler's questions need to be raised in order to keep the search open minded.

After Anders' 1963 treatise on Maya gods, Kubler's 1969 monograph is the last great treatise on the traditional corpus before the inundation of study pieces through the opening up of private collections. It will be educational to see how the new material can be handled by the exacting method of Kubler. He already reintroduced from Maudslay and Seler the triadic sign, which in subsequent Palenque Mesa Redonda proceedings gained further prominence as the Quadripartite Badge. This sign is now widely recognized as a key item in the Palenque Maya's recreation of earlier Peten accessories. Kubler also brought out the host of characters with shell diadems in their headdress, which today are recognized as badges Chac Xib Chac, Schele's recent designation for a zoomorphic (usually full-bodied) variant of GI of the Triad.³⁰ Kubler's 1969 monograph will continue to stand as a landmark that needs continual reference in all our further Maya studies.

Tatiana Proskouriakoff

30. Both Schele and also Coe in their varied discussions of the Rain Beast did not cite Kubler's discussion and illustration of the identical images under the name shell diadem headdress

Tatiana Proskouriakoff

Proskouriakoff is universally regarded highly for her lifelong achievements in Maya research. Her studies include Maya architecture (1946), sculptural style (1950), women in Maya art (1964a), and epigraphic breakthroughs of 1960-64 in the first demonstration that the ancient Maya stelae recorded dynastic history³¹ and not only calendrical incantations. This section will review only Proskouriakoff's comments on deities. Most of these thoughts on theology are in letters or verbal communications, and although never published, widely influential.

Proskouriakoff's 1950 monograph on the styles of carved stone monuments stands out as a cautious contribution in a sea of contemporary excess. In the same decade that Morley was creating his Greco-Maya model and while Thompson was resurrecting Seler's Aztec-Maya, Proskouriakoff stays with her subject matter. She uses no Aztec models. She does mention gods but only when appropriate. It is not until her 1974 monograph on the jade from the cenote of Chichen Itza that her godless phase is noticeable. This change is comparable -- in reverse -- to Morley's switch from a 1915 godless phase into a 1936-1946 phase where all figural characters became gods. But have the Maya changed or has the writer's personal conception changed? Her 1974 statements need citation because they are a rare instance in which she has put her views on this particular subject into print.

These human faces with grotesque or exaggerated features are usually considered to be portraits of deities. However, their symbolic function is not well understood and we know too little about ancient Maya religion to identify them. (1974:152).

31. Heinrich Berlin identified "city" emblem glyphs in 1958; Kelley worked out some dynastic rulers of Quirigua in 1962.

Nonetheless she discusses Maya deities in an open and direct fashion.

On number 1, however, the square eyes are associated with a mouth that shows only two teeth, a characteristic of God D of the codices.... Number 3.... The protuberance over the nose suggests that this might be the god for number 7, associated with the sun and the jaguar.... Number 2 is ... a portrait of the Maya sun god..with its large crossed eyes and its filed teeth (Proskouriakoff 1974:153).

This is straightforward deity iconography and parallels Spinden or even Thompson. Not even Goodman deified the face variants of the numerals. Proskouriakoff and Thompson certainly crossed paths often enough in their long, contemporary careers. Later though, she cautions that "other human heads with distorted features are not so clearly indicative of the gods. Some may be merely caricatures of the human face, but I believe that all are probably derived from masks used in ceremonial dances" (ibid., p. 153). Spinden's influence shines through; he brought the concept of masks into Maya theology and iconography. Masks will continue to be her central theme in her Tulane University article of 1978.

It is helpful to itemize her objections to deities and then analyze them one by one. Proskouriakoff's objections to gods (1974 and especially 1978) have the following components: first, a recognition that Thompson's ideas on gods were unlikely; second, a dissatisfaction with pronouncements on Olmec "gods" and on Aztec religion in general; third, a full belief in the Spanish statement: "The Maya had no idols before the arrival of Quetzalcoatl"; fourth, a conviction that not only do stela texts pertain to historical dynasties but also that inscriptions in general treat historical rather than supernatural matters (eg., for her the Palenque Triad are not gods but the historical founders of matrilineal lineages). The foundation of her theories is a Spanish observation that the Cholti Lacandon claimed they had no images (and worshipped only the Sun), and a Manche Chol claim that they likewise

had "no gods" and worshipped only "natural forces."

In agreement with her conclusions, Mayanists increasingly recognize today that Thompson's iconography was not as acceptable as Thompson's epigraphy. I accept all of Proskouriakoff's objections to Thompsonian religion. However, since Thompsonian religion had little relationship with the actual Maya, accepting Thompson's failure does not prove a lack of Maya gods. We can dismiss Itzamna-monotheism, Bacabs as bees and opossums, and God L wearing a flying fish (Thompson 1934; 1939; 1970/73 for Itzamna; Thompson 1934, 1970b for Bacabs; 1972a:45 for God L headdress misidentification) without dismissing Maya deities *per se*.

Proskouriakoff did not accept Olmec images as being identifiable from Aztec models. She consequently disavowed Olmec deities, and then by analogy dismisses Maya deities since they were also created from Aztec models. Proskouriakoff's unacceptance of Olmec studies may reflect a Morley period tradition that Maya sculpture originated at Uaxactun and radiated from there. Although by the 1980's, she realized this 1940's-1960's idea was no longer tenable, its heritage shows in her comments on Izapa and the earlier Olmec.

The continued discovery of Olmec, post-Olmec and proto-Maya art³² indicates now that Olmec art indeed represents a mother civilization in Mesoamerica. It is equally obvious that the early Maya are not simply the late Olmec, any more than the Olmec are the early Aztec, nor has Coe ever tried to project this extreme of a scheme. Joralemon's and Coe's publications on the

32. Navarrete 1974; as but one example: serpent ceremonial bar prototypes on Olmec celts. Olmec-related pottery has now been unearthed at Copan.

Olmec are essential for our understanding of Mesoamerica but we can sympathize with Proskouriakoff and Kubler's suggestion that caution is needed before attaching 16th century Aztec deity names to 6th century B.C. Olmec celts. Simultaneously recognizing the Olmec precedence and at the same time the Maya individuality should in no way affect whether the Maya had gods or not. Olmec problems should be studied separately and not used to confuse the overall issue of whether the ancient Maya had deities or not.³³

Her 1978 objections are to specific academic models -- she does not address Maya deity representations of the non-stelae corpus themselves. Memory of her personal communications on the nature of Maya religion coupled with scrutiny of the background of her 1978 article shows that the basis of her model -- that so-called gods are primarily only masked impersonators of deities -- is derived from a limited range of stone sculptures and three sets of colonial Spanish comments. Portraits on pottery are not considered because Proskouriakoff's objections to Maya deities of the Classic period come from her idea that the conquered Maya specified to the Spanish that they had no idolatrous representations or other deities before the introduction of idols by Kukulcan.

33. Actually, many Maya myths may well be ultimately derived from Olmec or pan-Mesoamerican Preclassic beliefs, but until more post-Olmec and pre-Maya missing links are unearthed this question should not be mixed in with a study of the Maya in their own environment.

Chapter 2

THE TRADITIONAL CONCEPT THAT THE LACANDON AND MANCHE DID NOT HAVE IDOLS AND WORSHIPPED ONLY NATURAL FORCES

This chapter reviews the persuasive use of Spanish colonial analogy to suggest that the lowland Maya had no idols. In conversations,³⁴ Proskouriakoff coupled three batches of Spanish observations to build her model of a Classic Maya worshipping no idols -- and practically having no gods: originally, the Yucatan observations that the Maya had no idols; joined with second, a suggestion by a captured Cholti Lacandon that he worshipped only the sun, and made no god images; coupled with, third, the oft-quoted statement that the Manche Chols had no idols. The Yucatec Maya-Spanish situation will be discussed initially, then the Manche.³⁵ After ethnohistory this paper discusses other objections to the concept of deities -- masks as opposed to god impersonators or gods, a concern shared this time with Kubler and Franz. First to Yucatan, where Spanish chroniclers were thorough in their reportage.

It is said that the first population of Chichen Yza (sic) were not idolaters until KuKalcan (sic), a Mexican captain, entered into these parts. He taught idolatry, and necessity, as they say, taught them to worship idols (Relaciones de Yucatan, 1:121 in Tozzer 1941:23, footnote 124).

The natives of these provinces were great idolaters. Especially

34. Discussions in her basement office at Harvard during 1965-67 and occasionally 1968-69.

35. The early Cholti Lacandon statement is only a single line, hardly a valid theological summary of an entire culture. The later Cholti Lacandon, of 1690-1696, had altars, stelae-like stones, incensarios, oracles, and quite a few deities (Hellmuth 1970A; 1970B; 1971; 1972), so the frequently quoted observations are incomplete.

the lords and principales worshipped idols of stone, wood, and clay and they offered incense of the country, precious stones, and feathers, hearts and blood of men and animals and they asked them (the gods) for health and good rains and they say that the first settlers of Chichinisa were not idolaters until the Mexican Captain, Kul Kau came into these parts. It was he who taught idolatry or necessity, as they say, taught them to idolatrize (Op cit).

Tozzer cites Seler (Seler 1898-1902,1:675 in Tozzer 1941:23 from an "ancient manuscript of Motul" (the Motul Dictionary?):

Originally a god had been worshipped here who was the creator of all things, and who had his dwelling in heaven, but that a great prince named Kukulcan with a multitude of people, had come from a foreign country, that he and his people were idolaters, and from that time the inhabitants of this land also began to practice idolatry, to perform bloody sacrificial rites, to burn copal, and the like (Tozzer op. cit.).

The concept of no human sacrifice and no idols stayed on in the literature because of the frequency of its citation by Tozzer in his edition of Landa's Relacion, the bible of Maya studies. Ironically these very Spanish observations provide an excellent definition of divine worship for the native religion: bloodletting and copal burning in particular.

The ancients of this province say that anciently, about 800 years ago, there was in this land no idolatry and after the Mexicans entered it and took possession of it, a captain who was called in the Mexican language Quetzalquat... and this captain introduced into this land idolatry and the use of idols for gods which he had made of wood, of clay, and of stone. And he made them worship these idols and they offered many things of the hunt, of merchandise and above all the blood of their nostrils and ears and the hearts of those whom they sacrificed in his service. And they incensed them with smoke of copal which is the incense of this country. This custom remained till the conquistadores conquered them and the friars have been getting them to stop it little by little (Relacion of Quinacama, Relaciones de Yucatan, 1:255 in Tozzer 1941:22, footnote 124).

This is typical of the Spanish statements used to bolster the traditional idea of no gods before the Itza. But how does this claim compare to what we know of the Classic period?

The Yaxchilan lintels and recent finds of paintings on Late Classic polychrome pottery (Schele and Miller 1986 and additional unpublished vases in Hellmuth Photo Archive) show that the ancient Maya systematically utilized spines, wooden sticks or stone knives to pierce their penis, tongue, and ears to offer blood. Joralemon has emphasized the stingray spine, a "Perforator God" (1974), and identified a triple bow-tie motif that is often associated with scenes of blood drawing and bloody sacrifice. Schele has investigated other aspects of ritual perforation and Stuart has studied the iconography of blood, especially on Yaxchilan sculpture.³⁶ Early and Late Classic Maya burials even include stingray spine perforators next to the penis of deceased rulers.³⁷ The traditional belief that personal bloodletting was brought into the Maya area by Quetzalcoatl in the Post Classic is disproven both in iconography and in archaeological finds. This part of the 16th-century Maya claim is transparently propaganda.

Burning copal is as old as Mesoamerica, so the 16th century fable that the pre-Itza Maya did not burn incense can also be dismissed. Burnt copal is found on the floors of Classic Maya temples, and Tzakol cache vessels at Uaxactun held balls of unburnt copal (RS:Fig.84,j).

Hunting iconography has not been studied recently but in fact Tepeu I Maya vases and plates picture post-hunt ceremonies with scenes showing what may be

36. Schele 1985 and in unpublished papers and personal communications; Stuart 1982 Princeton University Art Museum symposium, unpublished as of 1986 but available elsewhere (1984).

37. In Tikal Burial 196, the Tomb of the Jade Jaguar, I found actual stingray spines next to the deceased's penis (Hellmuth 1967).

offerings.³⁸ Thus, iconographical data document that the standard Maya Spanish claim of offerings of the hunt being introduced by Quetzalcoatl is not true for the pre-Spanish period of the central lowlands. Whether the Maya were attempting to shift the blame for their idolatry to the Itza, or whether the pre-Itza Yucatec situation was totally different from that of the Peten (highly unlikely) makes only academic difference. The important point is that the entire line of traditional "evidence" of an idol-less model in the period before the Post Classic is no longer sustainable in light of newly discovered data.

Associated with the idea of "no idols before" is the popular belief in "no human sacrifice before." It is a standardized 16th century Yucatec Maya claim to the Spanish Inquisitors that human sacrifice was introduced by the barbarous Toltecs or Aztecs and that the Maya did not practice this abomination. Despite the Bonampak murals which show sacrifice and painful torture (M. Miller 1981), other sacrifice (Quirarte 1979a; R+H 1984; Schele 1984), despite bound captives on the round stone sculptures of Tikal and on the balls of Yaxchilan terrace panels (I. Graham 1982,III:160, 162; M. Miller, personal communication), and in direct contradiction to the clearly depicted heart removal on base panels of two Piedras Negras stelae, the entrenched belief remains that the ancient Maya had only minimal human sacrifice. Maya human sacrifice is so controversial that at the beginning I will state that no scenes of human sacrifice have yet been found in any Early Classic ceramic art.³⁹ No vase -- of any period -- shows, or even suggests,

38. The Hellmuth Photo Archive includes at least two Tzakol painted (non-stuccoed) cylindrical tripods, two painted basal flange bowls, three Tepeu bowls (Hellmuth 1987b), and four Tepeu plates that picture ritualized hunting. Three of the paintings show post-hunt offerings (Hellmuth 1985e). Both Mary Pohl (1981) and Hattula Moholy-Nagy (1981) have independently written on aspects of ritual deer hunting.

cannibalism for the ancient Maya.⁴⁰ Likewise no one has found a single indication that the limited human sacrifice which was practiced had any relation to feeding a Mexican solar deity. In short, Maya human sacrifice appears not related to that of the later Aztecs. This paragraph supports Kubler's warning not to attach Aztec levels of human sacrifice to the Maya period.

In personal communications Kubler correctly points out that such Maya scenes could depict judicial punishment -- state execution for crimes. When the victim is captured from another social group, though, sacrifice seems more likely than judicial punishment. Hieroglyphic decipherment initiated by Proskouriakoff correctly documents capture as the source for victims on certain Yaxchilan sculptures. Mary Miller demonstrates capture in battle as the source for victims of execution at Bonampak. On the basis of analogy with these non-judicial scenes, I find a sacrificial role more probable in the Mesoamerican situation of portraiture than judicial, especially in light of sacrifice in the Popol Vuh -- judicial only within a mythical context. Judicial execution cannot be entirely ruled out for pottery scenes until the hieroglyphs can be deciphered, but none of the initial readings by Schele or Quirarte for glyphs on Dance after Decapitation Sacrifice vases yet suggest a judicial situation.

Polychrome Late Classic vases found by grave diggers in central Peten show two series of graphic human sacrifice (no cannibalism). The first series is a

39. The Teotihuacanos may have introduced an early form of Xipe imagery into Peten during Tzakol times. In addition to the well known Tikal example (M. Coe 1984:Fig.44) I have found two Maya faces with the vertical face markings (Hellmuth in press A).

40. I found possible human bones in a midden between Temple I and Str.5D-38 during Tikal Project excavations of 1965. But that midden most likely dates to the terminal Classic period of anarchy and collapse of classical traditions.

simple, basic sacrifice, with minimal pageantry and no cult costumes (Hellmuth 1987b:Fig.101). The second series is the Dance after Decapitation Sacrifice, of which the archive has five specimens showing the actual execution (Fig.28 is one example and Hellmuth 1976:Rollout Fig.10), and more than 30 polychrome paintings of the dance that took place afterwards (op. cit., Rollout Figs.8-14; 16-17; Quirarte 1979a). The traditional critique holds that this is all merely "ritual portraits of only mythical events." Is it likely that the Maya were unique among Mesoamerican groups and had no human sacrifice? The conservative belief is negated by the actual severed heads found at Classic Maya sites such as Tikal where smashed neck bones demonstrate the heads were really chopped off.

The concept of a peaceful, non-sacrificing Maya is the last remnant of a traditional model that is still deeply entrenched. Becker (1979) thoroughly dissected and thereby disproved the "vacant ceremonial center" hypothesis so beloved by writers of the 1940's-1960's; Puleston, Turner, and Harrison have disproved the milpa agriculture/maize dependence ideas of popularized Maya models; and this dissertation suggests the same needs to be done for traditional models of iconography and theology, from the Itzamna heresy to calendrical "gods" through the model of peaceful, sexless -- and now godless -- natives. Respect for early pioneering labors should not stand in the way of utilizing new data to bring published statements in line with ancient Maya reality. Thus, the Peten Maya burnt copal incense, made blood sacrifices, offered game from the hunt, and did not wait for Quetzalcoatl to introduce these basic Mesoamerican habits. Besides, feathered serpents had been in Mesoamerican culture since Olmec times. As the 16th century Maya lied about not having bloodletting, human sacrifice, offering of game, and copal incensing, is it so unlikely that they also lied about the worst

pagan offense of all -- worship of idols? We can hardly blame the Maya under the screws of the inquisitors -- but today there is no longer a need to hide Maya idolatry.

(Cholti) Lacandon and Manche Chol Claiming "No Idols"

Connected with the popular belief that the Maya did not have idols until these were introduced by the Itza, is the oft-quoted 16th-17th century Spanish statements that the (Cholti speaking) Lacandon Maya and the neighboring Manche (Chol speaking) Maya had no idols. Seler introduced this Spanish idea ninety years ago by selective quotation of Spanish chronicles (Seler 1895/1908,III:584) and the concept became ingrained in traditional models. This idea that the Lake Miramar Lacandon worshipped only the sun and fashioned no idols has consistently been coupled with a like statement on the Manche Chol. Spinden incorporated these ideas in his model from where it was absorbed by Morley and Thompson (1938), and the Lacandon-Manche claim is specifically the main bit of evidence that Proskouriakoff cites in each discussion of her rationale for dismissing gods from the Classic Maya culture. Proskouriakoff indicated she had not read the original Spanish and specifically asked me in 1967 for the chapter and verse of the original Spanish statement. This request suggests that Morley, Thompson, or Spinden could have been the source for her idea, as Seler's original is seldom cited.

There are two Spanish sources: one observation for the early Cholti speaking Lacandon of Lake Miramar, Chiapas; a second for the Chol speaking Manche of Guatemala. The latter Spanish observation is published both by Remesal and by Ximenez, whose texts are often virtually identical.

The brief 16th century description of the island Lacandon sun worship caught the fancy of early writers, yet they neglected to follow up with the more thorough eyewitness Spanish observations on the descendants of these same island Lacandon -- the Cholti-Lacandon of Sac Balam (Nuestra Senora de los Dolores de Lacandon) (Estrada Monroy 1970a; 1970b; Hellmuth 1970a; 1970b; 1971; 1972; 1977).

Overlooked were such rich descriptions of Maya religion as:

We have also made inquiries, as your Lordship ordered... regarding their religion, worship, and observances... As pagans, they adore the devils in their idols, which are many.... (1984 Comparato revised edition of Tozzer 1913, page 12).

So much for the Cholti Lacandon worshipping just the sun and not having idols. A comparable situation exists for the second part of the traditional evidence for no deities -- the Manche, eastern Chol relatives of the Cholti.

Before the incomplete basis for the erroneous model continues unchecked as a foundation for Mayanists' concepts, it will be educational to return to the original Spanish (Remesal or Ximenez), and especially to the situation of those times. Fray Francisco Ximenez, in his authoritative history of Guatemala and Chiapas written just a few years after the events he describes, working from the archives, quotes a local priest who visited the Manche Chol in the 1600's.

En este pueblo (Choc-ahau, 3 leguas del Manche) junto a la Iglesia (Catolica) hallaron los Padres (Fray Juan, Fray Salvador de San Cipriano) en una como plaza hecho un sacrificadorio de piedras y barro labrado toscamente, de hechura redonda y de una brazada de diametro. Aqui hacian sus sacrificios que eran quemar unas candelas de cera negra y teas; y algunas veces sacrificaban gallinas y otros pajaros; y asimismo se solian sacar sangre de la lengua, orejas, sienes, molledos de los brazos y otras partes. No se les hallaron idolos de piedra ni otra material solida aunque se hizo diligencia por haberlos. Y por esto preguntaron los Padres: que pues no tenian idolos? A quien ofrecian aquellos sacrificios? Respondieron: que a los montes y sierras muy fragosas y altas y a los pasos peligrosos y encrucijadas de los caminos, y a los grandes remances de los rios, porque entendian que por esto vivian y se multiplicaban y que de alli les venia todo su

sustento y las cosas necesarias para la vida humana (Ximenez 1929-31,II:19).

Are we to presume that Maya theology is accurately summarized by this simple native's answer to the enraged Spanish friars? Here, in the 17th century, after a century of Spanish atrocities and disruption of native life, in a poor settlement of a few decaying hovels are we to take this religion and transport it back one thousand years to the Classic Maya -- back from a town of barely a hundred starving natives, with no art capability, no monumental sculpture, not even sophisticated enough for a full time priest and compare it with Maya civilization in full form?

Imagine the large populations of the Classic Maya city-states, their international trade, their artistic tradition unbroken since Kaminaljuyu and even back to Abaj Takalik, with a proud heritage including Izapa, and heritage of the earlier Olmec, with resultant sophistication of mythical characters and their portraits, cults, and priests. Kubler's warning of disjunction should be applied even more between the Manche and Tikal religion since the cultural levels are not even compatible. Between Olmec and Maya, or between Maya and Aztec, at least we have sophisticated civilizations in comparison. The Manche Chol were only a few hundred subsistence level farmers -- hardly a civilization, and only barely the remnants of one.⁴¹ Besides, the Maya of Tikal, Uaxactun, Yaxha, Nakum, and El Mirador did not have towering mountains nearby to worship anyway, nor dangerous mountain passes, or even rapids, since the nearest such topography was in the Piedras Negras region far to the north and west. The Manche statements are all

41. I base my comments on my 3 years research in ethnohistory including work in both the Archivo General de Indias (Seville) and in the Archivo General de Centro America (Guatemala City).

the more inapplicable on the basis of geography alone.

But more to the point, the same consideration exists here as in Yucatan, namely was the poor Chol dumb enough to provide the Spanish friars with the information with which to be tortured and hung as an infidel? What he said was in fact more or less correct; they did revere and even consider mountains as gods (this is clearly expressed in the Quiche Popol Vuh, and still in modern Zinacantan beliefs), but the Chol simply stopped with that. His religious beliefs were far more complicated, though still hardly a reflection of the level of the Classic Maya. In essence, he kept his idols hidden and his mouth shut. No evidence -- either archaeological or ethnohistorical -- ever actually documents the absence of idols among the Maya. They hid them and what the Maya considered as idols were not always recognized by the Spanish anyway, who wanted to see three-dimensional, figural representations of humanoids or animals in statue form.

Nonetheless, the habit of accepting, quoting, and perpetuating models kept the Manche heresy as the underpinning of models on Maya religion:

Thompson (1938a, 593-4) suggests the probable character of the Maya religion before the advent of the Mexican influences. He writes, "The explicit statement that the Manche Chols did not have idols is of particular interest, as according to early sources, the Mayas of Yucatan similarly lacked idols until they were introduced by Mexicans.... Instead these Chols sacrificed to woods, very high and rough mountains, dangerous passes, cross roads, and great whirlpools in rivers, believing that from these came everything needed in life." (Tozzer 1941:p.23, footnote 124).

Here the Itza Kukulcan fiction is joined to the Manche fable. This single, simple Manche paragraph has proved so catchy that it has resurfaced to confuse the actual nature of Maya civilization from iconography through theology. Further in Ximenez's history comes what academic writers on the no-idols theory missed:

... los indios infieles y recién bautizados (de Chocajan (sic) y Manche) resistían mucho el entregar los ídolos de las ceremonias de su idolatría.... El P. Maestro no dejaba diligencia que no hiciese por inquirir los secretos de los indios Choles y por saber de sus idolatrías.... Tubo noticia.. de una legua del parage donde se hallaba tenían los indios guardados muchos ídolos.... Y hallaron gran suma de ídolos de barro (Ximenez 1929-31,II:376-377).

So much for the Manche Chol Maya not having idols. What does this do to all the models? As long as early theorists made such an issue of the Chol lack of idols, it is necessary to continue with the Manche, as they are an interesting case. The Manche even provide an eyewitness comment on penis perforation (Ximenez, II:p.383) which was a definite part of the standard pan-Maya religious practice. My point is that the Manche did have, in abbreviated form, the basic observances of Maya idolatry.

Manche-Related Religion from the Cholti Dictionary

The Chol provide an additional source of potential data, the "Cholti" dictionary.⁴² Although dated in the 1690's from the Cholti town of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de Lacandon (Sacbalam, Chiapas), this is probably an abbreviated copy from a longer (now lost) dictionary of the Manche Chol area, specifically San Lucas. In fact the extant text states it is a copy. In any event, this dictionary certainly shows a native, central lowland Maya cultural milieu, and not as Toltec influenced as either the Quiche Popol Vuh or the Yucatec Maya of Landa's Yucatan. The following vocabulary entries are pertinent:

Bolomao, nagual de Choles
Chac Chac Chacib, podaderas antiguas
Chail (?) diablo, demonio
Chu, idolo
Cizin, diablo, demonio

42. Cholti is a western language of Cholan, as Chorti is a southeastern language.

Coman, idolo
Mam, idolo
Pom, incenso
Ah Tzail, Ah Chail, demonio diablo autonomastico
Tzibai
Shiba, diablo

Mayanists will recognize familiar words, even though in Chol or Cholti. **Bolomao**, possibly **Balam**⁴³ "jaguar" or probably a contraction of Balam Ahau, "jaguar lord," certainly a proper tonal (spirit companion); **Cizin** (**Kisan** - "devil"), **Mam**, and **Shiba** (**SHIBALBA** or **Xibalba** of the Popol Vuh highland Quiche dialect) are all recognizable. **Chu** is deity in general, comparable to Yucatec **Ku**. Here are the beginnings of the standard, pan-lowland Maya deities. Idols were part of the worship elsewhere, and I see no convincing evidence that the Manche Chol were a unique exception. Ethnohistorians have simply not yet found a 16th-17th century chronicle on the rest of their religion equivalent to texts of Landa, Margil de Jesus, or Valenzuela.⁴⁴ Other dictionaries certainly show linguistic evidence for idols in other Maya regions.

For the Chol-Cholti, **Chail**, **Ah Tzail**, and **Ah Chail** must have been important enough for the Spanish friars to note it three times in different spellings. Moran's Pokoman Mayan dictionary lists **Ihcam Cauil** as carrier of the idol and as priest of their gods (Miles 1957:750. She does not cite the Cholti occurrence). **Cauil** is possibly the god carried by the **Ih cam**. In Yucatec Maya **K'uil** has a general meaning of divinity (Barrera Vasquez 1980:419). **K'ul** means adoration, reverence. **K'ul Yokil** has a particular meaning of person who frequents the church (p. 422). No sense of ranking is indicated; **Kisin** (the "devil") is considered acceptably defined

43. Suggested by Frank Comparato.

44. Tovilla's report shows what might still be buried in the archives (Scholes and Adams 1960).

by K'u and derivatives, and thus is an acceptable divinity. The Maya do not always distinguish theologically between Christian saints and the Christian "god." Cyril Mango considers that the Virgin Mary was effectively part of the Christian pantheon, especially in Byzantine art (1980:155). Under such a flexible acceptability of "pantheon" is the word pantheon out of place for the Maya situation?

The Mam of Moran's Cholti is a pan-Maya god of the mountains (Miles 1957:749). Does this mean the Cholti list of deities supports the claim "we only worship mountains and rapids in the rivers"?

Since Mam is generally accepted as a widely revered ethnohistoric period Maya deity of mountains, his presence in the Cholti dictionary could be taken as proof that the Chol worshipped mountains. In this scheme it is presumed that mountains do not have idolatrous images. But in my research in original eyewitness records of the 17th century Cholti Lacandon in the Archivo General de Indias, Seville, I found the following report:

...en otra casa a lo ultimo del pueblo, un viejo principal con sus dos hijos hizieron dos idolos de barro, grandes, y se juntaron a lla (sic) muchos a comer y beber; y dar de comer y beber a los idolos.... Luego vino el viejo cargado con el un idolo, y el hijo mayor con otro idolo a nuestra presencia. Y les dijimos, que que (sic) figuras y demonios eran los que adoravab? Y respondio el viejo, que eran sus dioses &a que se llamavan Mam. Y ellos respondieron, que querian ir a arrojarlos, y que querian a nuestro Mam por su Dios. Mando el Capitan ensender fuego en la plaza delante la cruz.... (A.G.I. Guatemala 153, No. 3, folio 12,v; F.L.A.A.R. Ethnohistory Files.)

So, even "mountain spirits" were represented by idols.

A final observation is Scholes' and Adams' translation of Tovilla's report on the Manche Chol. While this was not published in time for Thompson in 1938, it was potentially available to writers from 1960 onward. Tovilla's reliable contemporary

report reads:

These Indians of Manche have, as we have been relating, many idols, and three which are their principal gods, which are named MAM, CANAM, CHUEMEXCHEL. And when they sacrifice to them and celebrate their fiestas...they set up an altar on which is the idol.... And placed on the two sides of the altar are two earthen pots with some pots full of sweet smelling aromatics. The priest collects in the other earthen vessel the blood which everyone sacrifices from the ears and the arms, and thighs, and offers it to the idol, and asks it for those things which they need. Then they all leave together and in another separate room they all get drunk with a very strong drink named chicha. Those who serve this drink are all the maidens very adorned with plumes, strings of beads, and garlands, and they are wont to be 2 or 3 days making these drunken carrying ons.... (Scholes and Adams 1960; cited in Hellmuth 1971).

In summary for the reliability of models based on the traditional quotations of "worship only of natural forces," unfortunately each supporting reference is incorrect, incomplete or inapplicable for the Classic Maya of Peten in any event. The perpetuation of the "nature worshippers" model is what caused later Mayanists to develop ideas which diverged from the actual Maya situation -- they accepted the standard models and thus the traditional conclusions. They combined this belief with the then current concept that most of the Schellhas alphabetical (Post Classic, codex period) gods were not present in the Classic period and concluded with a strict model not only of no idols -- but even a concept of no deities other than mountains, rivers, and the sun.

On the first page of his 1969 iconography monograph, in the introduction to his suggestion that the Classic Maya had fewer gods than Spinden suggested, Kubler cites Morley⁴⁵ who had repeatedly stated, "The Old Empire Maya were not, generally speaking, worshippers of images in a literal sense...(they had) probably a

45. Proskouriakoff relayed her Manche theory only in unpublished personal communications.

simple nature worship' of personifications of natural forces" (Kubler 1969:1). Kubler, in art history, had trusted the standard sources in archaeology. Likewise, his quotation of earlier writings that Post Classic codex gods of Schellhas not being present in the Classic period because Spinden and Anders did not find them resulted in Classic period deities going unrecognized. Kubler was right with respect to the sample and traditions of the 1960's. His most recent publication (1984a) in its section on the Maya, adds new material (his Fig. 231-232)⁴⁶ to the traditional corpus and in the text revises his description of Maya religion.

"Idol," Maya Art History Confused by Semantics

A central feature of the traditional model is the idea that if the lowland Maya lacked idols then they lacked a system of representing their gods in figural forms -- since the gods were misunderstood to be limited to spirits of the mountains, rapids, etc. The model assumed that natural forces did not need figural representation. But what is an idol for the Maya? Tozzer's labors in editing a translation of Bishop Landa's 16th century manuscript put him in close contact with the problems of semantics in Maya theology.

Landa uses the Spanish word, "demonio", about thirty times. It is clear that he attaches to the term several different meanings: evil spirit, idol (or statue, image, "stones," etc.), a god, the Christian devil, and once the victim of human sacrifice. In some cases there is no possibility of determining just what Landa had in mind when he used this word. In the passage reading, "the demon ordered them to offer him squirrels," demon might, from Landa's point of view, well be translated "devil" and an alternate would be "god." Again in "an oratory to the demon" one might use for this either "idol," as has been done here, or "god." (Tozzer 1941:43, footnote 213).

46. Though this vase should be listed as dating to "after 700" since it is Tepeu 2, rather than "before 700" as in the published caption, possibly a typographical error.

Tozzer had lived among the Lacandon at the turn of the century, around 1902, when idols were still worshipped (before portable radios, trucks, and Protestant missionaries arrived in force). Tozzer also did extensive background research in the primary and secondary Spanish chronicles of Landa's time. Even allowing for Spanish religious bias, vested interests in projecting a certain picture, semantic and translation problems, and basic Western misunderstanding of the native culture they faced, we can still get a rough sense of idols. Tozzer continues:

Landa's nomenclature in the use of the terms "idol" (idolo), "image" (imagen), "statue (estatua), "brazier" (brasero), and in a few cases "demon" (demonio), ...is often inconsistent. It seems clear that the word "idol" is used interchangeably with all of these words.... There is also the question of the brazier. Later Landa tells us that "each idol should have its little brazier" and mentions "the brazier of the demon (idol)." Here it is clear that the brazier and the idol are distinct. And yet we read in a *Relacion* (RY,2:27) that copal was burned in the clay idols: "They worshipped some idols made of clay like small jars and pots of sweet basil (with) deformed (desemejar) faces made on the outside of them. They burned in these a resin called copal of a strong odor" (Tozzer 1941:110, footnote 502).

There were idols of the tilled fields, idols of the sea, and many other kinds for each thing, some idols different from the others in their faces (*Relaciones de Yucatan*, 2:28).

They had a very great number of idols (Landa, Tozzer 1941:108).

They had such a great quantity of idolas that those of their gods were not enough for there was not an animal or insect of which they did not make a statue, and they made all these in the image of their gods and goddesses. They had some idols of stone, but very few, and others of wood, and carved but of small size but not as many as those of clay.... They knew well that the idols were the works of their hands, dead and without a divine nature; but they held them in reverence on account of what they represented (Landa, Tozzer 1941:110).

Landa solves the question of whether an idol was considered a god or merely a representative: "One of the things, which these miserable people regarded as most difficult and arduous, was to make idols of wood, which they called making gods" (Landa, Tozzer 1941:159).

"This was his first repast, this balche, with which we, the ruling men revere him here. Very rightly they worshipped as true gods these precious stones..." (Roys 1933:98).

Next comes an even more difficult theological concern, the relationship among incense burners, idols and the gods that are being offered incense.

Lacandon braziers have faces on the front, they are the direct descendants of cache vessel incensarios of the Early Classic and the face-decorated incensarios of the Late Classic lowlands. These braziers are used to burn incense to the gods. It is theologically and linguistically acceptable in this situation to consider the god-brazier as an idol. This does not fit our Western conception that an idol should be an independent statue. But the search should be for the Maya definitions within their own theology. Documentation that braziers were acceptable as, or in place of, idols comes separately from colonial times as well as from Tozzer's ethnography among the surviving Lacandones at the turn of the century. It is a Maya practice to smear the faces of the idols with sacrificial blood or with food offerings: "...those officials seized him and took out his heart with great quickness, and carried it to the new idol and offered it to him between two platters" (Landa in Tozzer 1941:143). "Hearts of sacrificed victims were placed in the mouths of twenty clay idols and on the snouts of other idols." In another reference the blood of victims was used to anoint the snouts of the idols (Tozzer 1941:110, footnote 502). Today's Lacandon Maya smear their offerings on the snouts of their incense burners because they have braziers that feature the face directly on the pot. I propose that such incensarios can be considered idols. They are a self-contained and practical idol-incensario. Tozzer gives full details in his ethnography (Tozzer 1907:84ff.) and in his footnotes cites this aspect among earlier Maya:

Adoraban unos idolos hechos de barro a manera de jarrillos y de

macetas de albahaca, hechos en ellos de la parte de afuera rostros desemejados, quemaban dentro de estos una resina llamada copan, de gran oler. Esto les ofrecian a estos idolos, y ellos cortaban en muchas partes de sus miembros y ofrecian aquella sangre.... Para estos sacrificios y sus areytos usaban beber y emborracharse con un vino que ellos hacian de una corteza de un arbol que llaman baleze (balche) y miel y agua (Relacion de Valladolid, 1578, quoted by Tozzer 1907:85).

Tenian sus idolos en la casa de arriba hechos de barro, de la forma de macetas de albahaca, muy bocadeadas, con sus pies y en ellos hechos rostros mal ajustados y disformes de malas cataduras, echaban dentro de este idolo una resina que llaman copal a manera de incienso, y esta reverential ofrendaban y quemaban que daba de si muy gran oler, y con esto hacen continuo sus ritos, ceremonias y adoraciones (ibid.).

Usaban de adorar unos jarrillos hechos en ellos ROSTROS desemejados, teniendolos por sus idolos quemaban dentro y ofresian una resina llamada copan que como trementina elada, de gran oler, y se cortavan en muchas partes para ofrecer la sangre a aquel idolo (ibid.) (author's emphasis).

That a face can equal an idol is reflected in the Yucatec Maya language and is discussed in the following chapter on masks. Essentially an idol does not have to be an entire figure, it can be merely a face.

But more than that, the Maya hold divine essence to be present in uncarved stones. Little stones are used inside the braziers by the Lacandon (Tozzer 1907:87-89). Tozzer's observation is strengthened even more by a pertinent situation among the Guatemalan natives of Zenzontepeque (not far from Guatemala City):

Tambien en este ano se descubrio en el pueblo de Zenzontepeque una grande idolatria. Porque al tiempo de la sementera de las milpas, el dia de San Marcos, se juntaba todo el pueblo habiendo recogido antes cantidad de cera y hule y hacian un gran convite. El Sacerdote se entraba en un aposento en que tenian unos chalchihuites (que son unas piedras pequenas de diversos colores y tamanos, unas redondas, otras largas, otras anchas). A estas tenian por sus dioses y las invocaban segun las oraciones y necesidades" (Ximenez, II:381)

Those last two sentences reach deep into lost Maya theology. Ethnohistory is turning out to be non-supportive for traditional models, because the Manche also

had stones associated with incense burners. "...el Cacique...trajo dos incensarios de barro y unas piedras (Ximenez 1929-31,II:23). In the next sentence the Spanish priest displays his lack of comprehension of what was going on: "...porque como se ha dicho, estos indios no tenian idolos de ninguna materia. Estas piedras e incensarios hicieron luego los Padres pedazos...", yet shortly thereafter the Chol "concertaron un sacrificio y borrachera muy grande...." The enraged Padres went over to the native temple hut and found it "lleno de vasijas todo apropiado para la borrachera." Sixteenth century Spanish is so imprecise that it is unclear whether these vases were for orgiastic drinking or were more incense burners. Drinking is suggested by the fact that for incense burning in this particular ceremony the Padres cite "dos piedras en que los indios ofrecian sacrificios de humo al demonio." Consumption of native beer is certainly a documented feature of deity worship among both the Yucatec speaking Lacandon of today and the Cholti speaking Lacandon of the 16th-17th century. The Chol stones were vestigial altars. More traditional stone altars, with elaborate pottery incense burners nearby, were used by their Cholti relatives at Sacbalam (Hellmuth 1971). Incense burners are not only paraphernalia of worship and associated with idols but the incensario itself may be an idol. This would mean that the "missing idols" have existed all the time, since all Maya fashion incense burners with figural representations on the front.

The Manche heresy resulted in a century of mistaken models, so the errors and omissions need to be brought forth in no uncertain terms. Ethnohistory provides data that the Manche and Lacandon each had both deities and idols. Deities may be defined as culturally recognized, standardized, supernatural personalities who are accorded worship. For the Maya, worship includes drinking to

the point of intoxication, bloodletting, sacrifice of animals, occasional human sacrifice, costumed dancing, and incense burning. Gods may be represented as idols. The idols may be in human or animal form -- or not. Both the Spanish chroniclers and ethnographers document that incense burning and bloodletting are two key features of Maya worship. Connections exist between the ethnohistoric situation (where deities, idols, and incensing are clearly present) and the Classic period. The thread from this present ethnohistory section into the Early Classic is incensarios. Incense burners are certainly mentioned throughout the ethnohistoric and ethnographic sources. Incensarios appear on Preclassic Izapa stelae, in the Bonampak murals, and are a common ceramic form at Tikal (Ferree 1972), Uaxactun, and elsewhere.

On Tzakol pots (of a type that held copal at Uaxactun) the dominant personality is GI of the Triad (Figs.8,a; 9,a-d, f; 10; 12; 14,b-c; 17,a, c). He is an occupant of the top layer of the Underwaterworld in both the Early Classic (Fig.20,a-d) and the Late Classic (Fig.19,a-b) -- and -- GI is crucial in both Proskouriakoff's and Kubler's statements that the Triad are historical and not divine. The new understanding of the actual situation in ethnohistory can now be related directly with Maya art of the Classic period. Bloodletting and incense burning allow the recognition of divinity in the Classic situation.

The connection of personal bloodletting and idols is persistent in the quotations already rendered from the Relaciones de Yucatan and from Landa. This is such an important connection that this line of thought needs to be continued for a moment, because in a Tzakol period, Peten region, orange container with GI on the front a stingray spine was still stuck with rotted exudate on the inside bottom. I found this stingray spine while photographing the vessel in a museum.

In all other cases the contents of the cache vessels have been dumped out before study is possible.

Ethnohistory provides eyewitness records of the relationship between bloodletting and deities. "Others drew blood from themselves, cutting their ears, and anointing with it a stone which they had there of a god Kanal Acantun" (Landa in Tozzer 1941:141). "There were many people who drew their blood, cutting their ears, and anointed with the blood the stone of the god called Chac Acantun, which they had there" (ibid., p. 144). My proposal is that the chimney-less cache containers of central Peten may be related both to copal incense and also to the Early Classic bloodletting ceremonies. The front tooth of the principal adornment duplicates a shark's tooth (Fig.23) and mimics a shortened stingray spine. The standard GI headdress on these cache vessels is a Quadripartite Badge with a "stingray spine" in the center. (It is actually a fat, enlarged shark's tooth, or more properly considered, a generalized perforator conflating features of both a stingray spine with a shark's tooth (Figs.8-10; 14)).

The second most common Tzakol cache vessel personage has a triple bow tie nosepiece (Figs.31-34), the standard accessory for blood sacrifice, both personal and for executions (Fig.26-29) (Hellmuth 1982b). The aforementioned evidence of an actual stingray spine inside one of these same series of vessels associates these vessels directly with bloodletting. Smith found unburnt copal in these vessels at Uaxactun and Joralemon reports evidence of burning in such vessels that he has worked with in private collections (1982, personal communication). Adams records evidence of burning in comparable vessels at Altar de Sacrificios (Adams 1971:caption for Fig.95,a).

To summarize the connection between incensarios, bloodletting, and worship: Early Classic, Peten Maya, orange, lidded, frontal applique, and profile gouged vessels are used with copal and with stingray spines and may have the portrait of a personage on the front related to bloodletting, GI with a perforator tongue-fang, or a straightforward bloodletting reference, Triple-Bow-Tie Nose Plaque Character. Ethnohistory documents that copal and perforating are associated with idols and their divinity. Copal incense burning and self-perforation are the two principal rites of expression towards the deities.⁴⁷ By direct association then, the faces on these orangeware containers have something to do with deities. I propose they are in fact representations of the deities themselves. These face-decorated containers may be the antecedents of later god-pots of the historical Lacandon.

The relationship between divinity, incensarios, and offerings (as an expression of worship) is seen in Mayan dictionaries.⁴⁸ The entry under incense burner is:

INCENSARIO **CH'UYUB CHUK**, p. 147
P'UL, p. 701
P'ULTAH, p. 702
YUM K'AK', p. 983
YUM POM, p. 983

A related entry, **Ch'uyula'**, means agua con que hacian la bebida a los idolos, bebida de los dioses que ofrecian los antiguos (p. 147), "Drink OF THE GODS." If this drink is offered to incensarios, that links the incensarios to the gods.

YUM K'AK': **k'ak** means fire. **Yum** means father, lord, owner. **YUMILAN** means saint or patron on Christian sense. **YUM POM**, **POM** is the generic word for

 47. Drinking is the other feature of pan-Maya religious ceremonies.

48. Page citations are to the Cordemex dictionary of Yucatec Maya. Spanish words are underlined, Mayan words are in boldface. Mayan words commonly used in modern discussions, though, are not always needed to be distinguished in boldface.

copal incense, from the bark of the copal tree, still used today throughout Mesoamerica in native ceremonies (p. 982-983). **Yum** is part of the names of five or so current Yucatec-Lacandon god names. **Yum** means patron, backer (sponsor) in colonial times.

IDOLO **K'ul Yokil**, p. 422
 Lox K'ato'b, p. 463
 Ma'ok Olal, p. 500
 Pay, p. 640
 Tok Pom, p. 805

K'ul Yokil: **K'u** is a generic word for god as well as for temple, adulatory, and nest of bird and rabbits, especially in the sense of nest where they give birth. (p. 416). **K'uul** is a more general meaning of divinity. (p. 419). **K'ul** means adoration, reverence. **K'ul Yokil** has a particular meaning of person who frequents the church (p. 422).

Pay: has to do with witchcraft, especially casting spells and related to **Kisin** (p. 640). Also means guide, including animal that can guide (p. 637), possibly a reflection of a nagual. **Payabtah**, to invoke the protection of some invisible being, calling them for help and favor (p. 637).

Tok Pom: ofrecer copal o incienso pegandole al idolo, (p. 805). Also translated simply as idolatry. **Tok** means flint, and blood, and bleeding. Here certainly is a relationship with perforation in honor of the gods.

A shark's tooth is an effective as well as economical perforator. The perforator relationships of GI also leads into two key additional aspects of the dilemma of deity recognition -- first, Proskouriakoff and Kubler have proposed that the Palenque Triad are humans, i.e., not gods (Kubler 1969:18-19; Proskouriakoff 1978). Schele, Lounsbury, Kelley, Coe, and to some degree even Berlin, accept the

Triad as divinities (Schele 1979a; Lounsbury in press; Kelley 1965; M.Coe 1973; 1978; Berlin 1963, but more in 1977). Second, Proskouriakoff and Kubler have warned that figures which have been called gods may in fact only be masked (human) impersonators. The perforator relationship of GI provides examples with which to discuss both these two points, taken one by one. GI stays as the thread of continuity to lead out of art historical-ethnohistory into the chapters on Early Classic iconography and cosmology.

THE PALENQUE TRIAD: DIVINITIES OR HISTORICAL MEN?

KUBLER AND PROSKOURIAKOFF

Adding to Kubler's proposal (1969:18-19) that the Palenque Triad are historical humans (i.e., not gods), Proskouriakoff introduces the novel idea that the Triad "correlates with three matrilineal clans of Maya society" (Proskouriakoff 1978:116). She continues, "Maya texts are best studied in the context of mundane events and conditions as revealed by archaeology. Maya theology in itself gives us few grounds for reconstruction."

In communion with the rising tide of the 1960's in Mayanist studies towards a historical reading of inscriptions Kubler disagrees with both Berlin's and Kelley's arguments that the Palenque Triad inscriptions treat the birth of gods. Kubler states the inscriptions treat instead the reigns of men (Kubler 1969:18-19). Proskouriakoff dismisses the Triad's divine status further in a 1978 article with her model of historical lineage ancestors.

In 1969 the full figure forms of GI and GIII were not yet recognized, though

Kubler came close to GI with his shell diadem headdress. Coe called the creature the Rain Beast, correctly separating it from GI. Schele has read its name glyph as Chac Xib Chac on a Codex Style plate (Fig.19,a). This character shares seashell earrings and fish-like nature with GI. The reader of Proskouriakoff's 1978 article cannot ascertain whether she is familiar with Coe's identification of the full figure form of GI (1973:Grolier No.45) or with Schele's complete 1976/79 review of variations of GI and especially of the J.G.U. (Jaguar God of the Underworld), Schele's choice for the full figure form of GIII⁴⁹. Nothing by Schele at all is referenced by Proskouriakoff. Not a single scene from a private collection or museum is cited -- not a single book by Robicsek and none of the Coe books that include finds of grave diggers. Though Thompson did not recognize GI, he did at least utilize pertinent material in private collections.

As her article was written before Lounsbury', she cannot cite his detailed review of the Triad. Lounsbury does not accept the Triad as entirely historical. He certainly recognizes that there is potential room for differing interpretations but he allows the possibility that they were gods (Lounsbury 1980-85:2). Furthermore he suspects that the Triad were "pan-Mayan deities" (p. 4) and that their "birth dates" were Palenque manipulations to reinforce a belief in divine origin of their own ruling dynasties. (ibid.). I certainly agree with him.

In light of these lacunae, is it likely that GI, GII, and GIII are non-divine?

The Triad was first recognized just at the period when Proskouriakoff freed

49. Although not published until 1979, Schele's article was read at a well attended international congress in 1976. Pre-publication drafts of all Schele's articles are widely distributed in xeroxed form.

Mayan studies from the stelae time-worship theory of Goodman-Morley-Thompson who had stressed that the hieroglyphs dealt with calendrics and that no historical persons were named in the texts. During this 1960's period of rapid epigraphic breakthroughs, Berlin, Kelley, Kubler, and Berthold Riese worked out historical readings for hieroglyphic texts. The historical readings were well received and spawned a further number of historical readings of monumental texts that has continued unabated still today. Working out historical dynasties site-by-site became an essential aspect of both archaeology and art history. Since the Triad was initially identified and published as a hieroglyphic inscription, Mayanists of the 1960's understandably strived to show a historical interpretation for these Palenque texts also. The Triad's divine nature got dismissed in a rush of historical enthusiasm. After a century of too much religion, the writings of the 1960's suffered from too much history.

Now the Triad may be reanalyzed by including modern advancements on personified, figural portraits of these characters, and by not moving everything into a historical framework. The over-use of the former time-worship model can be a warning for the potential overuse of a solely historical model. Lounsbury maintains a flexible modern attitude on dynastic texts, recognizing and discussing the historical aspects yet continuing to work on astrological interpretations as well.

GI OF THE TRIAD

Now that Mayanists have Early Classic prototypes of GI from Peten ceramics in private collections, plus a host of Late Classic portrayals it is possible to get closer to the personality of GI. The earliest representation of a probable GI (mask only) is on the Hauberg Stela. Izapa Stela I offers a GI (or Chac Xib Chac variant)

as an even earlier rendition. 1977 was the first exposition of GI's Tzakol form (Hellmuth 1977c). The first publication of one with a GI label was by Nicholson.⁵⁰ Today iconographers recognize also that Land No. 128 is just a frontal version of GI, not a Sun God. "Sun God" was the old attribution for any Maya face with large eyes and protruding central tooth. Today iconography specialists have Tzakol GI images available if they wish (Fig.4-10; 11-17) and Schele cited them in her 1982 Princeton Symposium paper. Where is any reference to a matrilineal lineage in these Early Classic incense pots?

Four of these cache vessels show GI residing in the principal Tzakol representation of a cosmological location (Fig.20,a-d). This undulating layer decorated with encircled curls (and sometimes elsewhere with double yokes) is the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Figs.38-49). Also, a Codex Style plate shows a full figure Chac Xib Chac in the Late Classic version of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.19). This GI-related character with a seashell earring is engenderer of a sacred Loincloth Apron Face tree from which sprout additional god-like visages. This Codex Style plate does not appear to be a portrayal of a recent historical personage or of a matrilineal lineage. We can argue Maya divinity endlessly, but these GI associations are in situations which are outside of human reality on earth. All GI's associations are with supernatural people and mythical places. Spanish observers and ethnographers have provided useful criteria for recognizing divinities in the Maya context. From these reports I accept gods when artists render recognized, uniform (standardized), supernatural, pan-Maya characters (of whatever form) to whom worship may be accorded. Incense burning,

50. 1978:148; derived in part from the 1977 symposium and/or from personal communications, cited by Nicholson, p. 4.

bloodletting, dancing, certain costumes, and offerings connote worship for the Maya.

GI satisfies these criteria and he is associated with God-like scenes and activities. Worship per se should not be expected to be overtly rendered in each portrayal. It is the job of the iconographer to detect which Maya abbreviations connote a religious image or cosmological location. For example, in the Late Classic, certain horizontal bands, divider panels, and hanging symbols are several Maya manners of indicating a supernatural situation (Figs.185-188). Divinity is especially likely for GI because GI is featured on incense burner/perforator containers. The Maya today do not always make strict division between Catholic "santos," and the presumably monotheistic Christian "god" or between any of these and their traditional ancient Maya deities. Is the Virgin Mary a historical person, a god, a supernatural? Would a Byzantine lay person, a Latin priest, and a Maya peasant give the same answer? Perhaps divinity can also be in the eye -- and mind -- of the beholder. Thus a 20th century, atheistic background may bring in ethnocentric problems just as would a Catholic background for creating unlikely models dismissing divinity in the Classic period Maya.

There is no contradiction that GI at Palenque is a historical personage (at an early time period), a progenitor of a lineage (even a matrilineage), and also a god. It is perfectly acceptable within Maya theology to deify a revered ancestor. Perhaps it may be ethnocentric to draw such a strict line between "men" and "gods." My model is a continuum. "Man" at one end (dynastic rulers that is), gods at the other, with spirits, culture heros, various classes of supernaturals,

51. The actual model must have been more complicated, hierarchical, and needs places for supernatural monsters, spirits, and bizarre flora and fauna.

metamorphic transformations, and conflations in between.⁵¹ Thus I accept Heinrich Berlin's description of the Triad for Palenque (subject to Schele and Lounsbury's amendments in epigraphy and iconography). Despite their disagreement on the patrons for GIII, they both treat the Triad in a comprehensive manner of flexible divine and historical natures.

GI is not only both in the top layer of the Underwaterworld and associated with bloodletting and with pots that may hold copal incense, but also is at the heart of the occasional controversy over whether masks are incorrectly called gods. This chapter leads fully into Early Classic iconography.

MASKS -

GOD IMPERSONATORS OR ACTUAL DIVINITIES?

Heinrich Franz's monograph on Tiermaske und Mensch- Tier-Verwandlung in pre-Columbian art carefully places the question both of possible disjunction between early and late forms, and the fact of our ignorance of many aspects of ancient religion (Franz 1974:90). Kubler devotes parts of his 1969 iconography monograph to these problems. He speaks of "human impersonators of nature spirits and animal forces. Such impersonators have been called "gods" ever since Schellhas (1904) studied their occurrences in manuscripts (the codices). But until their meaning is surely known, a term like "figural allograph" will avoid premature decisions about religious significance" (Kubler 1969:7). Proskouriakoff writes that "the ascription of divinity to the masks is entirely our own" (Proskouriakoff 1978:113). This may be an interpretation of the historian of religion Arild Hvidtfeldt who concludes that "The anthropomorphous features of many gods seem mainly to originate from masked dancers. Thus, 'gods' of human form and e.g. with an animal head very often on close inspection prove quite clearly to be masked human beings."⁵²

The Chilam Balam of Tizimin states it was traditional among the Itza to parade specifically "with the faces of the gods" (Edmonson 1982:line 1495). Masks are also mentioned in passing on p. 90. The Itza consider masks an aspect of the

52. Hvidtfeldt 1958:53. This book was suggested by Kubler as reading material for this chapter of the dissertation. On pages 97-98 Hvidtfeldt goes on to conclude that "god" may be an appropriate designation for masked Aztec figures. This section is not cited in writings on Maya masked dancers as not being gods.

gods (p. 100, 104). Again, ethnohistory provides documentation which enables revision of traditional standpoints in art history.

Recent recognition in this paper that for the Maya a face equals an idol may also be cited with respect to masks as the Maya language itself does not agree with the model of a godless mask either: the Diccionario Cordemex has two pertinent entries, ich, (page 262), wich, (page 922), rostro, face.

Ich: face, U Wich K'u, idolo, estatua que se adora is an idol, statue that they adore (p. 922). Direct translation is "face of the god." Thus an idol does not have to be an entire figure, it can be merely a face. The best archaeological example of a face mask as idol is the 5th century GI greenstone mask formerly of the

53. One respected scholar suggested privately in 1984 that the mask is a clever forgery and suggested I withdraw the illustration based on the exhibit from my dissertation. I had studied this mask in person the day before it was placed on exhibit in New York in 1984 and from a point of view both of style and content. The mask is Early Classic in every aspect, has none of the hallmarks of forgers, has been scrutinized by specialists, and has an hieroglyphic inscription (on the unpublished back) of which absolutely no prior model existed for any forger to copy. The form and content of the Quadripartite Badge is specifically early in the Tzakol period, a particularly pertinent clue for the authenticity of the composition. A comparably early form of the Quadripartite Badge is on the Deletaille Tripod (Hellmuth 1978:140). This tripod has likewise been scrutinized and given a thermoluminescence test -- and is considered as unquestionably authentic -- by those scholars who are familiar with the full Maya corpus, more than solely the traditional pots. The relationship of the Wray Mask and the Belgian tripod is more than just the badge; a set of earrings reputed to come from the same location as the tripod has the Mo Mouth glyph, and another name or title which occurs on the Belgian tripod (the Mo Mouth occurs on the earring and the mask -- not on the tripod). Although I believe the tripod and earring came from central Peten (unless Rio Azul was being looted in the mid-1970's), the joint tripod-earring text reflect on the authenticity of the mask. The earring text had not been published (as of 1985) and the glyphs were not understood until 1985 -- so no forger had them available or could have worked them out, before that time. My inclusion of the Wray Mask in the 1984 first draft of my illustrations was entirely on the basis of its GI image; the glyphs were not worked out until a year later. These advances of the last two years now authenticate the text on the back of the Wray Mask. To hold up any serious claim that the mask is a forgery, one would have to: a) find machine tool marks (metallic drill residue); b) show that the stone did not come

Wray Collection (Fig.6a).⁵³

The traditional model of Maya religion stresses that most Maya portraits of gods are merely dance masks -- just costumes. This objection is combined with the Manche model to strengthen the conclusion that therefore the Maya had no gods, or at least none which could be conceptualized in portraits or idols. But, as with the ethnohistoric citations, the mask beliefs are limited to the traditional corpus. The model does not cite any Early Classic situations. New discoveries in the Late Classic do not substantiate the mask theory either.

Late Classic Pink Hieroglyph Style vases from the Ik-emblem glyph site show bizarre monster masks on fat faced lords (Hellmuth 1976:Rollout Figs.1 and 2; Coe 1978:Princeton No.20).⁵⁴ The general feeling is that the people are historical rulers, their fellow elite, and often their wives. The masks are headdresses, plain and simple. Whether they are totemic, whether the animals are naguals, are

from the central lowlands or a Rio Azul trade area (the stone is demonstrably not the type used by either the Ticul or the Taxco mask fake factories); and, c) demonstrate that forgers could create a grammatically and dynastically correct Tzakol period hieroglyphic text before these glyphs were even recognized by epigraphers. The best evidence for the actual authenticity of the mask is the hieroglyphic text on the back. If this contains glyphs which give the names of any actual Tzakol Maya rulers or unpublished emblem glyphs, then the text cannot have been created in modern times, since only the 5th century Maya knew the names of the Rio Azul rulers. Not a single Rio Azul text was published -- and available to forgers -- before 1984. The mask has been in a private collection prior to this date. The presence of the Mo Mouth glyph authenticates the mask since this glyph was not recognized as being an insignia for Rio Azul until just recently. Forgers cannot, yet, generate Early Classic texts without copying known ones.

54. "Pink Hieroglyph" is a name I gave in 1976 to a series of vases on which the glyphs are pink. Most of these vases picture a fat ruler and feature an Ik emblem glyph. Although Motul de San Jose has been proposed as the site in question, the actual site is not known. Peter Mathews and Ian Graham have been working on the location of this site based on stelae inscriptions. Barbara and Justin Kerr have gathered a useful archive of important Pink Hieroglyph vases which portray the "fat cacique." The F.L.A.A.R. Photo Archive has most of these plus at least three others (Hellmuth 1987b:Fig.101).

ethnographic questions that needs separate discussion. I do not want to digress into an anthropological analysis of totemism as Spinden started to. Whether a Maya nagual is a god or a spirit is another whole host of theological dilemmas. These particular masks are not necessarily gods, though that should no more be ruled out as accepted. No one knows what the masks represent because they have not yet been adequately studied. Their meaning should be worked out, not predicted by a model. In any event, the fat faced lords wearing the masks appear to be named, historical rulers in the Kubler model, not gods; nor has Coe called them divine (Coe 1978:Princeton No.20). Their masks are animals, birds or monsters -- no need to call any of them "gods" in this context. The secular monster masks of the Pink Hieroglyph vase series, though, offer no reason to dismiss deities.

Yaxchilan Stela 11 (Fig.7), where a male personage clearly has a mask in front of his own face (Maler 1903:LXXIV,1; Spinden 1913:Fig.9) is the mainstay of the traditional model that "grotesque figures on monuments are generally simply masked humans -- not gods." Today, though, specialists can at least, at last, recognize the mask as being of GI or Chac Xib Chac with shell diadem headdress (typical of Chac Xib Chac) rather than the Quadripartite Badge headdress which appears increasingly to be a diagnostic feature of GI. This recognition simplifies the situation considerably.⁵⁵ The wearer is presumably Bird Jaguar, ruler of Yaxchilan. Whether the lord bothers to don the entire costume of GI is not necessarily relevant either. The face acceptably embodies the entire essence of the whole character. Thus, the mask is the abbreviation of GI. His mask brings to

55. We should again postpone the problem of whether it is totemic, matriarchal or what not. A favorite ploy to dismiss something is to introduce a red herring or straw man.

the Yaxchilan portrait a divine adjectival flavor. He is visibly calling upon the mythical power of GI and displaying to his subjects that he, Bird Jaguar, is allied with, protected by, or will help the populace with the benefits of, GI. A human wears a god mask. Kubler and Proskouriakoff are correct in not deifying such a person (whether he was deified upon death is another question). The mask though, remains an abbreviation of a deity.

The model of no-gods depends on the issue of impersonators, working towards the idea that the other deity scenes are impersonators also. If they are all masked impersonators then the Maya have no actual god images -- and thus potentially no gods. Even if the Maya utilize only the mask representation of the god essence, does that rule out the essence itself? Not all Maya supernatural creations have "bodies" anyway. The Cauac Monster, for example, is normally a face only, yet it is a fully functioning member of the grotesque monster series within Maya mythology. GI exists as a definite personality in the Maya beliefs, whether as a mask (Fig.4), as a bust (Fig.20,d), as a full figure, or as an hieroglyph (Fig.17,f).

"Masks" as Abbreviations of the Full Figure

Epigraphers have known since the 19th century that a Maya numeral can be written as a face or a full bodied figure. The face hieroglyph is an abbreviation of the full figure hieroglyph based on considerations of space, style, or expression. Why then is a face outside a hieroglyphic textual context only a mere dance mask? The faces on pottery or stone are identical to the faces in hieroglyphic inscriptions (Fig.6; 17). Our knowledge of Maya representational grammar demonstrates that faces in art are also abbreviations of full figure personages.

Two sets of examples show the abbreviation clearly: GI and the Principal Bird Deity. This section will stay with GI; the bird is discussed in a special section later.⁵⁶ More than 30 Early Classic frontal and profile orange copal pots picture the Tzakol variant of GI.⁵⁷ No body is presented. Thus one might conclude the visage is a "mask." But the face often has a Xoc Monster jaw across the top of its forehead, and nubbins around the GI face suggest additional "teeth." It is possible that these early GIs are set within the jaws of a Xoc Monster. Certainly on ceremonial bars of the same time period God K sits within an obvious monster mouth. Aside from its toothy frame, the GI is only a face. But one rare orange vessel shows the GI with shoulders and the beginnings of arms (Fig.20,d). The Surface of the Underwaterworld frames the bust. In this stance the GI is standing in the underworld looking up or out. It is his face that is the important part. Considerations of artistic composition result in his face being the part that the artists of the other 30 vessels stress. After all, the pots do not have enough space to show the entire figure.

The Wray Collection GI mask may have been worn only in the tomb as a funerary mask but this impressive greenstone sculpture is certainly a shorthand form of the whole GI. The first two glyphs on the back text give the hieroglyphic form for GI -- identical to the portrait on the mask (Fig.6). Greenstone does not come in large enough pieces to render a full figure GI life-size, and if the Wray GI was in fact worn as a mask, weight was a consideration also. So even when we have a certifiable mask, or a face, either still holds the full essence of the god.

56. I use these particular examples because both are associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld.

57. Variant because only one specimen features the seashell earring.

GI masks were essential to dynastic imagery from the Preclassic (Hauberg Stela, Fig.3) through the Early Classic (Tikal Stela 2, Fig.14) into the Late Classic (Copan Stela I, Fig.8,b) and even into the Terminal Classic (Seibal Stela 2, Fig.8,c). The Seibal stela has not previously been cited in lists of GI or his impersonator. The traditional position is that the stelae of Seibal are "non-Classic."

Other face-sized images -- that were not intended to be worn as masks (even in death) -- were carved in three-dimensional, almost statue-like form -- but were still faces only, with no body. The body was not necessary for recognition of the divinity. Thus the ancient Maya produced a life size proto-GI face in jade (Fig.1 and 2). For GI's companion, Triple Bow Tie Nose Plaque Character,⁵⁸ the Maya also routinely portrayed the visage by itself -- yet could equally well show an individual in full bodied form -- either two-dimensional (Figs.32; 33, top), modeled relief (Fig.34, top) or three-dimensional (Fig.35) (Rhodes 1984:32 (mistakenly dated as Late Classic and misidentified as the Sun God); Crocker-Deletaille 1985:No.359).

End of the Mask-Costume Objection

Kubler and Proskouriakoff's recognition that many "gods" were actually humans wearing costumes has been crucial to this discussion. Their observation can now be expanded to bring out that the costume has a theological referent. There is a supernatural personality behind the idea of certain costumes. Any contemporaneous Maya viewer would have recognized the mythical personality even though it may

58. Photographs in the Hellmuth Photo Archive of more than 50 unpublished Tzakol Peten cache vessels show that four facial types were standard: GI, the Jaguar God of the Underworld, idealized youthful nobles, and a character with triple-bow-tie (bloodletting symbol) nose plaque that hung down over the mouth.

have been his uncle sweating away under the scratchy costume. Arguing about impersonators detracts from the more crucial feature -- the essence of the mask or costume itself. "Mask" and "impersonator" are important features of Maya religion -- but not in the sense of excluding divinity and idols.

Mayanists wholeheartedly embrace Proskouriakoff's dynastic articles of the 1960's. It is in the '70's and '80's that the rapid and specialized advances in iconography created a gulf between model and data, the same way the historical decipherments, phoneticism, and acceptance of the non-Peten Preclassic passed Thompson by in the previous decade.⁵⁹ Any review of books and articles published from 1973 through 1985 would reveal that a major gulf has developed in Maya writings between those who restrict themselves to the standard Copan-Tikal-Yaxchilan-Palenque sculptures and Carnegie-Uaxactun-Tikal sherds opposed to those who have sought out pictorial scenes not in the traditional corpus. In Moche ceramics, Elizabeth Benson and Christopher Donnan have showed the advances possible by breaking out of the limited sherd corpus (Benson 1972; Donnan 1976; 1978). They achieved particularly interesting results in the study of Moche deities. Maya studies have the opportunity to catch up with South American studies -- but sherds alone will never lead into a knowledge of cosmology and iconography of one of the advanced civilizations of the ancient world.

GI has served as a thread of continuity through the theoretical introduction of this dissertation. The Principal Bird Deity would be an equally apt example, as he occurs both as a "mask" (Fig.111; 115) and as a full figured personage (Fig.131).

59. His last book, Hieroglyphs without Tears was a swan song for the Carnegie era rather than a graceful acceptance of the current reality of Knorosov, phoneticism, and non-Uaxactun origin for Maya civilization.

This majestic bird monster is equally well treated as having been considered divine by the ancient Maya. Both these creatures share other common features -- they are directly associated with the dominant cosmogram of the Classic Maya -- the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Now that both ethnohistory and Early Classic cache vessels document deities and idolatrous representations for the ancient Maya, the theoretical section of this dissertation can give way to a detailed analysis of those supernatural personalities who are most closely related to the Surface of the Underwaterworld in general. Space considerations do not permit a review of all Maya gods and supernaturals so the focus will remain with water-related netherworld characters.

PART II

Chapter 3

THE SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD AND ITS OCCUPANTS

GI Concluded

The first datable appearance of a proto-type of GI is on Izapa Stela 1, a Preclassic sculpture. Earlier ones are expected. Schele has suggested that an upper terrace stucco mask on Cerros Str.5C-2nd is GI (Freidel and Schele 1982), but that is a supposition based on a theoretical model taken from epigraphy and dependent on the validity -- or not -- of whether structuralism occurs in Maya iconography the same way as in Maya epigraphy (where the principle is well demonstrated by Schele). Parsons suggests (personal communication 1985) that a face on Preclassic Stela 10 (50 B.C.-A.D.50) should be considered as a potential GI prototype (Miles 1965:Fig.3,a). Coe (personal communication 1986) suggests that even earlier GI prototypes may be found in Olmec art on artifacts being studied by David Joralemon. The Izapa character's identification as GI-Chac Xib Chac is based on its similarity with the fishing gods of the Late Classic Tikal incised bones from the burial of Temple I. Coe called these characters the "Rain Beast" and suggested they be kept separate from GI. The humanoid standing in water on the Codex Style plate (Fig.9) is the most recent discovery of this class of GI-Rain Beast personalities. GI must be counted among the pantheon of Preclassic Abaj Takalik and Kaminaljuyu, but the figures there have their faces so loaded with scrolls that it is hard to pick out the single, simple distinguishing characteristic of GI -- the fish fin on the cheek.

In his full, Late Classic form, GI has a bivalve shell earring, a Quadripartite Badge headdress, a mouth curl or cheek fin, and large, round god eyes. Chac Xib Chac has a zoomorphic face and shell diadem headdress. Early Classic renditions tend not to have the seashell earring or the shell diadem headdress. Instead renditions of Tzakol 2 and 3 have a shark's tooth in their mouth and an avian form of the Quadripartite Badge as headdress. As no Preclassic Quadripartite Badge headdress is yet known, it is unclear what a Preclassic GI will look like (when the identification is not aided by context, such as on Izapa Stela 1. Also, no shark's tooth or seashell earring has yet been noted in a Abaj Takalik or Kaminaljuyu mask mouth.⁶⁰ That leaves the next securely identifiable Pre- or Protoclassic GI to be the Hauberg Stela, some time between 100 and 200 A.D (Fig.3). Once the GI cult was introduced into the lowlands, dynastic rulers portrayed themselves in the guise of GI on Tikal Stela 2 (early 9th baktun, 5th century A.D.), on Copan Stela 1 (9.12.3.14.0) (Fig.8,b) and even in the terminal Classic, on Seibal Stela 2 (circa 10.2.0.0.0, circa A.D. 870) (Figs.7 and 8).

Although Izapa Stela 1 and the Codex Style plate place Chac Xib Chac directly in netherworld waters (Figs.18-19), since GI is by its very fin and shark tooth essence a fish god, he does not need to be pictured directly in water on each occurrence. During the Early Classic he sometimes wears the seashell earring or cheek decoration (Fig.17,b,c,f) which becomes his trademark throughout the Late Classic. On several Early Classic cache containers GI is specifically presented as bust deep in the undulating waves of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.20).

60. Only four or five Abaj Takalik sculptures have been published and fewer than half the Kaminaljuyu stelae are readily available for study at the time of this writing, 1985. When all of Parsons' photographs of Kaminaljuyu sculpture are published it will be easier to work out the Preclassic Maya pantheon.

The Composition of the Top Layer of the Underwaterworld

GI is one of a diverse host of supernatural creatures that inhabit the netherworld waters. His divine nature imparts a supernatural aura to the overall setting and scene. The following sections describe the cosmogram itself in more detail and then itemize the principal inhabitants one by one. This "Surface of the Underwaterworld" is a cosmogram depicting the upper layers of an unusual environment. Tables of Hellmuth 1982/84 itemize all the cylindrical tripods, basal flange bowls, murals, and architectural stuccos that portray this picture of the cosmological habitat.⁶¹ Figs.36; 39-49 and 20 of this dissertation show the pertinent features of this visual presentation of the Maya netherworld.

In Early Classic funerary art this one assemblage of decorations consistently stands out as occurring frequently and having the most associated figural personalities. This assemblage consists of an undulating band decorated with encircled curls and double yokes. The presence of fish, water plants, herons or cormorants, turtles and frogs suggest that the serpentine layer is water. Water lilies indicate that the water is clear and slow flowing, since water lilies do not grow in muddy, fast flowing streams such as the Rio Usumacinta or in the deeper parts of lakes. Anemone-like plants and exotic fish add a sea water aspect. The occasional conch shell of God N is a marine shell and demonstrates elsewhere the Maya dedication to marine models for a component of their mythical imagery.⁶² The coastal Maya were capable fishermen and shell divers and therefore would be

61. This separate paper has already summarized two years research that discovered this on previously unpublished cylindrical tripods and basal flange bowls, identified and tabulated this cosmic diagram.

62. GI's earring is a bivalve, not a conch.

quite familiar with the Caribbean reefs. Long distance trade routes brought barnacles, coral, seashells, shark's teeth, and other marine items into Peten centers. The rulers wore marine shells as jewelry during life and in their tombs after death. Coral and barnacles were buried in religious offerings on the sacred central axes of temples. This utilization of marine products is strongest in Peten during the Early Classic time period.

Schele has suggested dynastic blood is a possible component of the Late Classic layers of the Underwaterworld on Palenque's Temple XIV's bas relief panel.⁶³ Semen, another salty liquid, may be present also as the stuff of dynastic continuity (Schele, various unpublished lectures). We can tentatively conclude the Maya envisioned a multi-referent liquid, possibly of four colors and correspondingly different essence. Fresh water and sea water are essential to natural life. Blood and semen are elemental components of human life. Blood (during bloodletting, (Stuart 1982)) and semen both issue from the penis. The Underworld waters are painted blood red in the Late Classic (Coe 1975:Dumbarton Oaks No.11). Maya waterscapes need not conform to any naturalistic order.

They say that there was one sea that was white, and there was one sea that was sticky like tar. And they say there was one sea that was pure blood, perfectly red.... They say that they were stuck together, the sky and the sea. And there lived the gods.... And they say that in the sea there were many animals, filling it. (Fought 1972:354)

Most Tzakol Surface of the Underwaterworld scenes show only the various layers with no inhabitants (Figs.46,b-e). Only a few scenes have creatures present; all of these are sources for this dissertation. Of these scenes, the Gann, Kaminaljuyu,

63. A river of blood is mentioned in the Popol Vuh, and the Chorti speak of a sea of blood (Fought 1972:354).

Blom, Tikal, and Uaxactun renderings are long part of the traditional corpus.⁶⁴ The Altun Ha fragments both have stratigraphic provenance but are not well known. The Kerr Rollout, Lost Incised Vase, and the remaining Tzakol examples have never been formally published. The Merrin Bowl (Figs.78, top; 94, bottom) and the Lost Paris Plate have appeared only in an auction or sales catalogs (Merrin 1985:No.20; Loudmer, Poulain, and Cornette de Saint-Cyr 1974:No.23) (Fig.51). These scenes lead into a discussion of the figural creatures -- fish, Xoc Monsters, snakes, Lily Pad Headdress Monsters, Tubular Headdress Monsters, Shell-Wing Dragons, the serpent face-wing, and humanoids. Special attention will be given to the serpent face-wing, as it is related to the Principal Bird Deity and God D.

A fundamental principle of Early Classic Maya art must be described before individual Maya creatures are discussed. This is the practice of assembling composite creatures from discrete, standardized elements. The same basic parts can be used to form birds, fish, snakes, and so on. The parts most interchangeable are facial: teeth, snouts, beaks, and eyes. Often the same decorative element can simultaneously serve as two different body parts, as when a thick curl serves as a fang for the Curl Formed Monster and doubles as a latch beak for an abbreviated Principal Bird Deity. All of the parts and their potential double imagery must be understood before the complete creation will be recognized. One source of these multiple-service designs is the Maya tradition of utilizing hieroglyphic features as parts of costume. For example, the costume and accessories on the front of Tikal

64. Citations are in the Table, Hellmuth 1982-84. Although the Blom Plate is looted and although Gann had a private collection, these artifacts have become acceptable by archaeologists to mention due to the passage of time and are for decades part of the traditional, allowable corpus. According to reports the Blom Plate was uncovered in the late 1940's by a bulldozer operator flattening mounds outside Chetumal. This site -- not on any map and evidently by now totally removed -- is today the Chetumal airport area.

Stela 31 contain almost as many hieroglyphs as does the long formal text on the back.

Only about a dozen distinct parts for Tzakol monsters exist, but the combinational possibilities of these parts seem endless. No key exists to reveal where one mythical species ends and where another begins. We do not even know whether there is a conceptual distinction to match the visual distinctions we catalog, since mythical biological metamorphosis would produce a host of intermediate forms.

FISH IN SURFACE OF THE UNDERWATERWORLD SCENES

Fish have been known in Maya art since the 19th century when Catherwood's and then the Maudslay-Annie Hunter drawings of Copan and Palenque were published. Fish were first seriously studied by Seler and by Tozzer and Allen (Seler 1909/1923,IV:706-709; Tozzer and Allen 1910:307-308). Neither book describes the fish of the codices as deities; Seler does not deify the fish of Palenque either.⁶⁵ The term Fish God has nonetheless crept into the lexicon. No justification for it has been advanced and its deification should be quietly rescinded. If there are any divine fish in the Maya bestiary it would be GI and/or the Xoc Monster.

The Maya added fish to scenes of the Surface of the Underwaterworld to emphasize the watery nature of this environment (Figs.36-37; 55-60). No Maya fish

65. Recently Susanna Ekholm has been studying fish on the polychrome Late Classic plates of Lagartero, Chiapas. These fish are highly stylized in a manner unique to the Lagartero region.

looks like an Audubon nature drawing, but some are clearly closer to natural models and others are composite monsters. "Naturalistic" fish are found on the Tikal Burial 160 painting, on the lid of the Ocosingo vessel, and to a lesser degree on the Kerr Rollout (Fig.80,b) and two of the creatures on the Tikal Burial 10 tripod (Fig.62). More than 40% of the Peten's land area is covered by water during the rainy season. A string of lakes from Lake Peten through to Lake Yaxha, a system of rivers and lagoons in the Rio Usumacinta and Rio San Pedro systems, and the Rio Azul going into Belize all provide plenty of areas for fresh water fish. A fresh water environment on the Tikal and the Kerr Rollout painting is provided by the water lilies that grow from the monster's headdress. These water plants are probably Nymphaea ampla. Snails and other creatures live around the underside of the water pads. In certain streams, such as the Rio Pucte, Peten, these water lilies start their blooms underwater. Thus natural referents exist for fish nibbling on water lily pads and flowers.

The non-naturalistic features of the fish are a scallop-bordered "cartouche" on the back (Fig.59; 60), often with a glyphic infix, a stylization of the top fin, an addition of a fin on the front of the face and the complex tail structure which may include a joint before the tail fins (Fig.55). Fish and water birds are both created from a combination of hieroglyphs and standardized monster parts. Isolation and definition of the different parts would make possible more exact interpretations.

The fish's long top fin appears perfectly normal at first glance, but the Maya artist has cleverly created a pun on a water lily flower cross-section. This dorsal fin/flower is also appended to snake monsters (Fig.59,e), especially to the full bodied form of the Lily Pad Headdress Monster (Fig.78,b). These statements hold

true for the Late Classic as well. There is an unbroken continuity and evolution of fish forms and context from Tzakol 3 through to Tepeu 2. Our knowledge of Holmul 1/Tzakol 1-2 fish, and Tepeu 3 fish is too limited at the present time to determine their place in evolution of fish in Maya art. Fish, especially a "ring tailed" variety, are well known for Preclassic stelae at Kaminaljuyu and Izapa (Miles 1965:Fig.5; Norman 1978:62).

Fin in front of Face

Maya fish often have a large fin growing out of the face (Fig.55,e). Sometimes on piscine monsters this fin issues from a cavity in the snout. On normal Maya fish the fin just is in front of the forehead or nose. It is hard to tell whether this fin is actually on the other (hidden) side of the fish and is moved out in front to remind the viewer that the fish has bilaterally symmetrical fins. The artist does this for the tail by rotating the tail so that we look down on it, seeing both sides at once. An alternative possibility is that the Maya are just adding extra fins to stress that aspect of the fish. The scenes on two Tepeu 1 bowls typify this practice (Hellmuth 1983:Fig.1 and Photo Archive 486667-11). One artist added fins to a jaguar and to a canoe paddle; another painter places fins on the serpentine neck of a water bird. Thus the addition of fins to a fish's head should not be a surprise. The addition of fish fins to bodies dates back to the Preclassic on the GI/Chac Xib Chac proto-type of Izapa Stela 1.

Complicated Tail Structure

Most Tzakol fish and some Tepeu fish have a complicated, non-naturalistic tail structure (Fig.55). The structure starts with an intermediate joint, which Coggins

correctly notes. This joint can either be an Ahau (Fig.55,e) or a spiral (presumed to be the cross section of a seashell, though other possibilities should be studied). Comparable joints appear on monsters in other water scenes, on throne monsters at Piedras Negras and at Palenque. Such joints are not present on real fish and must serve some heraldic, adjectival, punning, or hieroglyphic function. The joint may be an elaboration of the Preclassic ring-tailed fish.

The second unnatural aspect of the end is that a "tail" continues past a bifurcated or double fin. True fish have a split "tail" which is really all fin structure. Fish do not have a separate "tail." All Maya would know what a fish looked like, and unless the artist is attempting to add a reptilian component we do not know yet why certain Maya fish have this extra tail. Another tail shape class is discussed in the later section on composite fish monsters -- the Xocs.

The elaboration of the tail and fin may be the artist's attempt to render some of the more exotic marine fish of the reefs off Belize, Quintana Roo, and Campeche. Some of the fish in Maya art have unusual appendages that are more likely for reef fish than for fresh water species, though the ordinary freshwater catfish is clearly pictured on Late Classic vases (Hellmuth photo in Stuart and Stuart 1977:111). The fact that Peten does not border on any ocean did not separate the central Maya from marine imagery. The totally landlocked Teotihuacanos had even more expressive renderings of waterscapes and water-related creatures that also featured seashells (Seler 1915,V:Tafel VIII; Gamio 1922,III:Lam.74; Kubler 1967:Fig. 16; Sejourne 1966a:Figs.27; 38; 85; 1966b:Figs.17; 32; 54; 80; 133; 137; 142; 143; 154; 155; 178; Miller 1973:Figs. 33; 51; 81; 270; 273; 277; von Winning 1981:p.315-Fig.9-10;p.316-Fig.10,c-f). Sejourne 1966a:Lam 58 and 64 illustrates examples and even actual shells imported from the ocean.

Fish on the Black Basal Flange Bowl Lids

The elaboration of fish in Early Classic, Peten Maya art indicates that fish were key characters in netherworld myths. Two Tzakol vessels present fish (as lid handles) where the fish snout has a latch shaped beak (Fig.25,c; 59,a; 144,c). A latch shaped beak is a diagnostic trait of the Early Classic Principal Bird Deity (discussed at length in a later section). One latch-beaked fish wears the same double yoke necklace pendant as an actual Principal Bird Deity from the same grave lot.⁶⁶ Why do a fish and the Principal Bird Deity share the same face? What is the meaning of this face? Certainly the lid handle is a conflation of a fish body and a non-fish face. It even wears earrings and has a beard. The artist may be rendering transformation in the sense of metamorphosis. The Principal Bird Deity sometimes has a beard and routinely wears earrings.

An even more enigmatic fish conflation is on the "hummingbird" lid from the same basal-flange bowl grave lot (Figs.61 and 60). The center of the lid shows the wavy outline traditionally presumed to be that of a water lily. Stylized flowers issue at four points (cosmological quadrants?). At four inter-points the beaks of birds feed on the center (the base of the lid). None of the two bird-types is the usual heron-cormorant composite. Two have serpent face-wings (Fig.122-123). Their long beaks have no curve, fin, or nose bump. Either a hummingbird or a long

66. The three basal-flange bowls of Figs.93; 123; and 128 all share comparable ware and related iconography, and were reputedly found together (Crocker-Deletaille 1985:No.340). The circumstances described for these pots suggest indeed they are part of the same grave lot. However this association is not necessary for iconographic analysis. The fish-lidded cylindrical tripod has a different provenance.

beaked water bird is a possible identification. A deliberate composite is another possibility.

The other two feeding "birds" have normal Maya bird beaks, complete with the nostril curl in front of the eye (Fig.60). Such a curl is typical of Early Classic birds, as on the Belgian Tripod (Hellmuth in press D). Naturalistic (but non-avian) features on these birds include dorsal and ventral fins, a fin at the inner end of the beak, cross-hachure indicating scales, and a decidedly fishy tail. Their dorsal fin is the same type as on the lid handle fish monster of their grave lot mate.

Fish-bird confluations are uncommon in Maya art. Flying fish come to mind, as this marine creature is common in the sea off the coast of Quintana Roo, but these lid bird-fish exhibit no specifically marine features. Explanations for some of the confluations and substitutions in Maya fish creations may be discovered through a study of Mayan terms for body parts.⁶⁷

<u>ALA</u> , "wing"	Bab 22	<u>ALETA</u> , "fin"	BAB 22
	Le' 442		XIK' 943
	Xik' 943		

Bab: is a paddle, "arm" of crab, crab claw, large toad or frog, bunch of fruit (p. 21-22).

Le' is a rope for fishing or hunting. **Le'** is leaf of tree or plant. I found no indication of "wing"; perhaps the index is in error.

Xik': ala de cualquier ave, y el brazo del hombre. Ala con que vuela el ave y nada el peje (p. 943). Has general meaning of flight.

67. Numbers are page citations to Barrera Vasquez 1980, Diccionario Maya Cordemex. Underlined words are Spanish.

Xil: el cerro o espinazo de las iguanas o pejes. Espinazo de pez y de reptil.

The ridge or row of spines of iguanas or fish. Spiny crest of fish and reptiles.

COLA, "tail Ne 564 (cola de) pajaros y peces
Pak'ab 624: cola, pez.

In two instances wing and fin can be described by the same word in Yucatec Maya. Fish tail and bird tail are both translatable by the Yucatec Maya as "ne." Other lexical terms will help understand another Maya fish composite, the Xoc Monster.

XOC MONSTER

In current iconography the Mayan word **xoc** is used for a variety of fish and piscine creatures. This use evolved from Thompson's 1944 proposal that "xoc" was the way to read the fish glyph in calendrical texts since "xoc" also means to count in Mayan. The first use of the term Xoc for a monster dates from 1974 by Jeffrey Miller. This creature was never fully described or illustrated and remained poorly known. New data allows the identification of an early Xoc Monster at Uaxactun, the separation of piscine creatures at Tikal into mere fish and the real Xoc Monster, and the introduction of several representations of Xoc and Xoc-related Monsters on unpublished Tzakol ceramics from private collections. A thorough review of the Xoc Monster, starting at the beginning, will facilitate understanding the situation in nomenclature and iconography.

Seler uses for fish the Mayan terms "car" and "cay" (Seler 1909,IV:701). Tozzer and Allen use the latter word also but spell it "kai" Tozzer and Allen 1910:307. It was not until 1944 that a thorough study of the fish as hieroglyph was completed. In this study, Thompson produces widely accepted evidence that the fish is a rebus form for the concept of counting (Thompson 1944:15). From this time onward, "xoc" has been used as the translation for fish of virtually any size or shape, especially mythical fish, that is, decorated or elaborated fish that are more complicated than natural species. Is it likely that each and every representation is meant to be read exactly the same way?

In the Primera Mesa Redonda of Palenque, J. Miller identified the Cleveland Stela (Fig.71,b) (Site Q/El Peru) woman's waist decoration as "a flattened fish head

grasping a Spondylus shell.... The flattened fish (T204), sometimes read xoc (cf. Thompson 1944), grasping a shell occurs at the waist of female figures at Naranjo (St. 24, 29, 31), Copan (St. H), Altar de Sacrificios (St. 7), and Calakmul (St. 54)" (J. Miller 1974:154). Miller's total sample is seven. Today the study corpus is treble that number.

The next publication about this waist adornment as xoc came in Schele's paper at the Third Mesa Redonda of Palenque (Schele 1979:46). Her article provides the first major recognition of the xoc when in profile view. Then in 1980 illustrator Barbara van Heusen recognized that the Palenque waist xocs were the same as a rare profile Holmul Dancer waist medallion (Fig.70,c). That led to the identification of the xoc on most Holmul Dancers, including in the stage when he wears no backrack costume, where this personage is the Principal Young Lord.⁶⁸

In epigraphy and iconography up until now, there has been no dissection of the xoc and no rigorous differentiation between regular fish and the more ornate xoc as monster visage. Variable regional and temporal renditions and the availability of dozens of fish to serve as natural referents resulted in nomenclature and classification problems with piscine beasts in Maya art.

As a first step in bringing order to piscine iconographic nomenclature, the term Xoc Monster should be standardized for all the Late Classic belt medallions. The Primary Standard Sequence (PSS) fish hieroglyph should never be called a Monster unless monster features are present. The normal fish glyph's face is

68. The Holmul Dancer and Principal Young Lord are described in a separate paper (Hellmuth 1982a and 1982c). Following this lecture the Holmul medallion was first published as xoc by Robicsek and Hales (1982b:p.34).

usually naturalistic and thus quite distinct from that of the waist medallion monsters. The PSSequene fish can indeed be a monster (Tikal black cache vessel) but should then be correctly labeled. The word "cai" should be re-employed for fish when they are not in a situation where a reading of "count" is appropriate. But Thompson's xoc name has caught on and we do not know how the PSSequene glyph should be read, so it will probably continue to be glossed as xoc. Separating out the waist medallion monsters will help some, but of course the semantic meaning is not known for this costume situation.

In the process of separating and differentiating miscellaneous fish from fish monsters, Mayanists should establish type specimens the same way biological science does. This practice would help to systematize and standardize Maya iconography terms. Since Maya representations vary, it may help to have a type specimen for each period, each style, each geographical region -- but all dependent on a single, original type specimen, which for the Xoc Monster might as well be the Cleveland Stela, since it was on the basis of this stela that the xoc as a monster was identified.⁶⁹

The best preserved Late Classic, Peten xoc waist medallions in frontal view are:

Cleveland Stela (from El Peru (Site Q) (Fig.71,b)

Site Q stela in private European collection (Ian Graham archive)

Cancuen, Stela 1 (Maler 1908:Pl.13,1)

Naranjo, Stela 24 (Graham and von Euw 1975,2:63)

The most complete profile views for Late Classic Peten are:

69. J. Miller did not use the term "monster" nor did he differentiate xoc as hieroglyph or as free swimming fish from xoc waist medallions.

Palenque, Temple of the Foliated Cross, sanctuary tablet
(Schele 1979:Fig.1) (Fig.70,a)

Holmul Dancer vase (Banque 1976:no. 138; better visible
in close-up Photo Archive views.) (Fig.70,c)

The best preserved profile view for the Early Classic is

Caracol Stela 1 (D.D. is 9.8.0.0.0 but the style and content of
the costume is "Early Classic").

It is necessary to utilize Late Classic type specimens because the creature was originally identified in this context. Next it must be proven that the Early Classic faces are indeed the same monster. First, a definition of the Late Classic Xoc Monster from the above examples⁷⁰ will establish the points relative to which the Early Classic monsters must refer.

Diagnostic Features of Late Classic Xoc Monster

SUPRAORBITAL PLATE (eyebrow) is crested, curled, and finned. A comparable shape is used as a tail on two Early Classic turtle effigy basal-flange bowls.⁷¹

NOSE BULB protrudes; it is shown as separated from the nose on photographs of the Cleveland Stela and on Cancuen stela. On the Naranjo stela the bulb is continuous with the "nose."

EYE CURL may descend from the top (one of the Cleveland Stela eyes) or from the bottom (Naranjo Stela 21). The Cleveland Stela has one of each type of curl. For the Early Classic the curl from the top is the norm but exceptions are found.

NOSE FINS in front view come from either side of the nose. This is typical of Maya fish in general rather than the monster in particular.

The shell in the mouth is a feature of the waist medallion assemblage but not of

70. The corpus includes other, less well preserved Xoc Monsters on stelae (including courtesy of Ian Graham's archive) and from all portraits of the Holmul Dancers and PYL on ceramics.

71. Duke University Art Museum and European private collection.

the Xoc Monster per se. This shell adds, though, a definite salt water atmosphere, and a linguistic pun. When the monster is not part of a waist assemblage the seashell is absent. Xoc is the word for large fish in general and shark in particular.⁷² Maya fishermen and shell divers faced sharks on both coasts. Shark's teeth are even included on the Xoc Monster of Cancuen, Stela 1 back (Fig.71,c) (Maler 1908:Pl.13,1; unpublished Ian Graham drawing of base salvaged from looters).

Early Classic Xoc

The Tzakol form of the Xoc Monster has not previously been categorically identified on sculpture. The few Tzakol stelae that show the trellis pattern tubular jade beaded skirts have been overlooked in connection with the Cleveland Stela or the Palenque examples. El Zapote Stela 5 (Fig.71,a), unpublished (fragmentary) El Peru stelae from the archive of Ian Graham, and the Tzakol-Tepeu transitional stelae from Caracol (Fig.72) are infrequently cited Tzakol related specimens.⁷³ No Holmul Dancer and only one Principal Young Lord are known for the Early Classic and the latter is in simplified costume without the waist xoc (Hellmuth 1985a:104). Cataloging orange cache vessel/incensarios has turned up a number of Tzakol Xoc Monsters (Fig.63-65). The Early Classic Kohunlich terrace facade stucco mask decoration also includes a xoc-related face. How do these proposed Early Classic Xoc Monsters fit the pattern established by the type specimen -- the Late Classic

72. A recent article proposes that the English word shark is derived from a European pronunciation of the Mayan xoc (T.Jones 1985a; 1985b).

73. Tikal Stela 1 shows lord wearing trellis pattern, tubular outfits but with no specialized waist medallion visible.

Cleveland Stela?

The Photo Archive makes available seven examples of frontal applique Xoc Monsters and five examples of profile carved (Fig.63-65). The availability of both front views and side views of the same creature makes possible a full understanding of what the Maya artist intended to represent. Since the Late Classic front views are created by joining two profile views together with a frontal nose bulb, the profile views of the Early Classic are immediately comparable with the Late Classic even though the latter are in "front face." In the Early Classic the imagery is more fluid in the sense of flowing into other images. The same eye may simultaneously serve for two monsters; monster faces may be stacked one on top of another without any immediately noticeable boundary. Dozens of body parts may be compressed together and unrecognizable until the Maya conventions of rendering body parts become familiar. A second problem in recognition is that the Xoc Monster is to some degree a family of variant creatures and not always a single standardized creature.

One potential early type specimen is on an orange vessel in a Tuebingen private collection (Hellmuth 1978:141) (Fig.63,b). On the lid is the Squiggle Eye Monster with a Quadripartite Badge headdress in bird form. The bottom of the two part container shows a standardized GI in typical Tzakol form -- no seashell earring. His headdress is a piscine monster with the Lily Pad Headdress on top. The piscine beast has upturned bulb snout, eye curl from the top, frontal fin on snout, and prominent, enlarged shark's tooth. The first two features alone make him an acceptable Xoc Monster. The expected crested supraorbital plate is missing because with the Lily Pad Headdress there is no space left to include the eyebrow.

The finned eyebrow is conspicuous on another profile incised cache container (Fig.63,a). The eyecurl comes from the top of the eye. The shark's tooth is stylized and would not be recognizable without the knowledge of the more naturalistic examples on other vessels. From the back of the Xoc Monster emerges another creature of unknown genus.

Frontal examples mainly allow seeing the bulbous "nose" (Fig.64-65). The crested, curled supraorbital plate is acceptably comparable with that on Late Classic stelae renditions. The frontal examples all have a shark's tooth as a central perforator fang and a mouth curl at either side. The GI face emerges from the open jaws of this Xoc Monster. Is perhaps the GI head conceptualized as being carried in the Xoc Monster's jaws the way other personages are carried in a reptile's jaws (for example on so many serpent ceremonial bars)?

A familiarity with the profile orange cache vessels facilitates interpretation of an early PSSsequence on a blackware cache vessel from Tikal (W.Coe 1965:30; Kubler 1969:Fig.53). This is a rare PSS that shows a glyphic "fish" in monster form -- with crested supraorbital plate (regular fish are provided no such plates), shark's fang, prominent snout, and frontal fin. Missing from the monster assemblage is a bulbous nose, though the front fin puns the expected nose. In other instances the standardized Xoc Monster is sometimes simplified, modified, or conflated.

Low Darkware Bowls with Four Xoc-Like Monster Faces

The bowl of Fig.77,a-d is broken, partly eroded, and has no spectacular figural scenes. Yet it is the average pieces such as this that contribute data which help make the fancier pieces understandable. Rarity and aesthetics are only two

components of art historical value. More than one hundred other little bowls such as this (Hellmuth 1982/84) are scattered in the private collections of the world, especially in the smaller and unstudied ones. A dozen such simple bowls with iconographically important medallions are in the government warehouses in Guatemala (Tikal and Guatemala City). Unfortunately neither Holmul, Uaxactun, nor Tikal produced any other than curl decorated creatures on such bowls. Expanding the Maya corpus to include simple examples as on this "Bowl of Four Xoc-like Monsters" offers additional samples from the ancient Maya cast of mythical characters.

When a mythical entity is repeated on an Early Classic Peten vessel, it is likely to be shown four times, often each with slight differences. Examples are: the four stuccoed avian personified Shell Wing Dragons (Fig.85), four flowers on the lid of a blackware basal flange bowl (Figs.61 and 123), and the present bowl with four piscine visages. The Maya have a tradition of four versions of certain gods, one for each of the world directions. We do not know whether this potential for quadriplicity applies to all creatures or just for world directional patrons or attendants. It is not yet known whether all four versions will appear more or less the same, or whether they may be strikingly different.

The faces on this bowl are basically piscine, to judge from the fins on all four. All four have crested, "turtle-tail" supraorbital plates. One of these dips down appreciably into the eye. The four have different markings, some vaguely hieroglyphic. One has black spots while a second has parallel fin ticking. The third has a scallop-outlined affix while the last has a concentric affix. Two faces have identical eyes (but different teeth). All four have a double yoke under the eye. Three have identical fat mouth curls; one is longer and curls in the other

direction, resembling a barbel. All four have fins issuing from their mouth end. All four have lower jaws, something uncommon on Xoc Monsters serving as belt medallions or as stelae adornments. Three have snout fins; the fourth has no space for this. One has definitely no nose upturn; another probably has none. A third has a slightly upturned nose; only one has a strongly upturned snout. It is on the basis of the fat upturned snout that the whole group may be variations on Xoc Monsters.

Two of the faces have leaf-shaped front perforators as their front fang. That shape mimics the fat, short perforator spine found upright in Quadripartite Badges. Joralemon's concept of stingray spine perforators in his Palenque Mesa Redonda paper of 1974 has endured even when in most cases this specific zoological identification is unsure. The usual form on the badge is an exaggerated shark's tooth or a conflation of stingray and shark. Real stingray spines are long and thin. The basal curl is the property of a shark's tooth (Fig.23,a-d) and the nose of a leaf-nosed bat. All three (stingray spine, bat's leaf nose, and shark's tooth) have diagonal ticking along both sides. A bat's nose is obviously soft tissue and not useable as a bloodletting perforator, though the bat's nose is far closer to the exact shape and proportions of the central decoration of most Quadripartite Badges than any stingray spine.⁷⁴ A similar shape serves as the tail feather of the bird-men variety Shell Wing Dragons on a stuccoed and painted Tzakol cylindrical tripod (Fig.85,a).

On none of the four fish, though, is there any avian trait. Avian puns and

74. Perhaps the model comes from the connection between a vampire bat and bloodletting? (Hellmuth 1982a).

beaks appear on the Lily Pad Headdress monster in certain instances but not on the Xoc Monster and only on two fish found so far.

Two of the other bowl monsters have wider front teeth with curved ticking across the bottom rather than along the sides. These strange teeth do not appear often enough anywhere else to offer a pool of comparative examples with which to hope for a natural referent. These teeth have a double cusp (?). In sum, present identification reaches only a general conclusion that the four faces are piscine in general and Xoc-like in particular.

Second Small Bowl with Piscine Monster

A review of variant Xoc Monsters should include another small, simple bowl. This particular example shows an as yet unidentifiable creature that is a cross between a Xoc Monster and an Early Classic GI (of the cache vessel series) (Fig.77,e-f). It has the frontal shark's tooth of GI as well as his cheek fin.⁷⁵

The Xoc Monster feature is that the eyecurl issues from the top of the eye area. The mouth and dentition assemblage is also allowable equally for a Xoc Monster as for a GI.

75. These wide, ticked forms are not barbels. A barbel is a thin, non-finned "whisker" such as on a catfish. It is round in cross section, and often hard to distinguish from a mouth curl, except that in my nomenclature a mouth curl should issue out from inside the mouth, at the corner of the mouth. A barbel starts on the cheek, in the same position as a cheek fin, but with no tick lines and with a thinner form. Intermediate confluents confuse the nomenclature (Copan Stela I for example, Fig.8,b). "Barbel" has been used in an imprecise manner, incorrect both from an iconographic as well as from a biological point of view. The fact that the first uses of "barbel" were for fin-ticked forms is insufficient justification to continue its use. The word barbel should only be used when a thin piscine "whisker" is present.

What is atypical for either mythical entity is that they have a multiple-yoke supraorbital plate on top of another equally unusual eyebrow. The turtle-tail supraorbital plate of the Xoc Monster is not present. The Xoc's upturned snout is also replaced by a different form. This unidentified composite piscine monster shares features with cache vessel GI's yet is different. This bowl is a reminder of what is in the remainder of the as yet unstudied private collections of the world.

Return to Full Fledged Xoc Monsters, at Tikal

On the oft-published Tikal Burial 10 "Old God" effigy a Xoc Monster serves as waist medallion (Fig.66; 68), but not in the same setting as on tubular beaded female skirts. This Tikal monster appears to have gone unrecognized as a Xoc. Coggins calls this Tikal effigy itself a "Sun in the Underworld" (Coggins 1975,I:150). The proper term would be Jaguar God of the Underworld if a feline, but that designation is utterly unlikely for this figure.⁷⁶ Coggins describes the Tikal effigy's loincloth decoration as "a grotesque head which might be described as bird-like if the back of the apron were to be understood as tail feathers" (op. cit. p. 151) The rear loincloth adornment is indeed a standardized assemblage, found as a bird tail on a blackware lid (Fig.129-130) and evolved from the Protoclassic, such as on the Diker Bowl (Fig.116). But the apron front decoration has turtle tail crested supraorbital plate, eyes that seem to curl from the top, and upraised snout with fin on it. The upraised snout is the same blunt pointed shape as on all the orange cache vessels in private collections. While the saw toothed triangle (tongue?) that sticks out the bottom is not yet decipherable, the face itself is in the same family

76. For J.G.U. iconography see Schele's International Congress of Americanist article, 1979, and the chapter on the J.G.U. later in this dissertation.

as the Xoc Monsters on contemporary cache vessels.

Full Figure Xoc Monsters and Associates: Uaxactun Tripod

This lengthy preview of the Xoc Monster is to prepare for recognizing the most important Surface of the Underwaterworld monster scene which has come from properly provenanced, grave-lotted excavations, the Uaxactun (cylindrical) Tripod, a polychrome, Tzakol sharp-Z-angle bowl from Burial A20 (Fig.62; 76; 81). With data available in the 1930's, Smith thought the main, undulating water band was a serpent. He then spotted the central (actual) serpent. Smith did not discuss the additional serpentine monster on the right and the final fish monster on the left. Coggins' discussion of the same creatures in fish-body form at Tikal does not cross-reference the Uaxactun tripod (Coggins 1975,I:164). She mentions the Uaxactun tripod elsewhere in her dissertation referring to what Smith interpreted as the horizontal, undulating serpent, what today is considered a water layer with only pun and conflation of serpent features.

The reason that writers have missed some of the monsters on the Uaxactun tripod is partly because of what Schele calls lack of visual acuity (Schele 1979:407). The second reason is the 1930's-1950's tradition of using diagonal lines as color indicators in drawings of Maya pottery. These artificial color symbols obscure the details, in this case two additional monsters. The Maya did not paint their color with diagonal lines and thus a scientific illustration should not use this means of color rendering.

If the monster heads are isolated, and the heads are oriented horizontally, it is possible to see all three monsters (Fig.49). They are: Xoc Monster on the left,

water snake in the middle, and a Lily Pad Headdress Monster (with beak) on the right. The Uaxactun tripod offers the opportunity to see what the creatures look like in full figure form. And all three are immersed directly in the top layer of the Underwaterworld.

The left creature's head is above the undulating water band. Most of his body is hidden by the water band. His head must be turned around in order to recognize it properly. This head has an appropriate supraorbital plate with a curl at each side (the long upper part is covered by the water band), an eye curl from the top, a snout that turns upward and is pointed, a fin on his snout, and single shark tooth as central perforator. The remainder of the teeth are generalized. A mouth curl is present. Although distorted by its situation and painted rather than carved, it is physiologically and iconographically identical to profile faces on contemporary orange cache vessels.

What does its body look like? No cache vessel shows its body since on the cache vessel the Xoc Monster is abbreviated to fit as part of the costume. The Uaxactun specimen has ventral scales to indicate the underbelly. Their orientation means that the creature's head is turned completely around. On the other side of the body, which would be the top, is the expected dorsal fin, executed in a flower-like fashion so typical of Early Classic Peten fish. It is composed of three widely spaced fin spines and a thin band which doubles as the fin membrane (of a fish) and the pistils (of a flower) (Fig.59).

Comparing the Uaxactun Xoc Monster with a Tikal Fish Monster

As on the Uaxactun tripod, the Tikal Burial 10 tripod has three creatures, but

they have oval, stylized fish bodies instead of reptile bodies (Fig.62,d). Both a fish and a reptile have ventral scales. Coggins correctly recognizes the tail as a "three-lobed device with an interior hook that usually represents the cross-section of a univalve shell" (Coggins I:165). Whether or not a shell is the actual natural referent, this is the generally accepted iconographic interpretation at present.⁷⁷ The middle Uaxactun monster has the same tail joint. These piscine monsters are glyphic from head to tail. The tail joint area of the Uaxactun Xoc Monster is covered by the undulating water band.

Of the three Tikal fish creatures, the middle one has an upturned nose and a shark fang front perforator that identify it as a Xoc Monster. It has the expected crested supraorbital plate and the eye curling down from the top. Its fin structure is simple, consisting of small fins rather than wide, spiked, flower-fins.

Of these Tikal monsters, Coggins says: "One of the three differs from the other two in having a hook eye, which connotes a deity image" (Coggins I:165). Is an eye alone enough to deify the monster? Was the creature worshipped? Rather than call it a god -- monster with a capital M is sufficient. The two other Tikal "fish" are hardly naturalistic but certainly not out of the ordinary for a Peten Maya funerary painting. Clearly it is necessary to work out the nomenclature for different levels of mythical monsters, supernatural, and divine beings, such as spirits, patrons, revered ancestors and culture heros.

77. The best reference book for what cut cross-sections of various Mesoamerican shells look like is an informative INAH publication by Suarez Diez.

The "Hooked" Tail

This Tikal Xoc Monster has a tail of the same class as that worn by the Uaxactun tripod monsters to the left and to the right. This tail is unlike that of any Caribbean Sea, Pacific Ocean or fresh water fish. Searches of tropical fish manuals for a tail anything like these Maya fish have not turned up a natural referent (Ellis 1976; Greenberg and Greenberg 1976; McCormick, Allen and Young 1963; Randall 1968; Took 1978).

Crabs provide a possible clue. Crab claws are the same shape and proportion as the form used by the Maya at the end of certain fish (Figs.30; 32; 74 and 36 and on a Principal Bird Deity, Fig.74,g; 126). By the time any actual Caribbean crab claw got into central Peten it was probably separated from the crab's body, so it is not entirely surprising that a crab claw could be conflated onto a non-crab body to create a mythical composite. "Hummingbird fish" (Fig.60) and the above discussed pre-tail joints are not natural fish body features either. Perhaps the artistic tail joint is a reference to the armored joint on a crab's claw? The joints on Palenque and Copan monsters are equally intriguing.

This is only a suggestion, not an identification. The fact that crabs do not appear in the art of Early Classic Peten weakens this suggestion. Crabs occur only in one scene of the Bonampak murals, in the Late Classic. Only at Cotzumalhuapa (Parsons 1969,2:Fig.58,b.) -- a non-Maya area -- are crabs well known in a local art style, other than as decorations in generalized water scenes, such as the Chichen Itza murals (Tozzer 1957,XII:Fig. 62). An unsymmetrical shark's tail fin is more likely than a crab claw as a model, but the nickname "crab claw tail" helps distinguish this tail form from others.

Linguistics may help by demonstrating a relationship between crab claws and paddles (eg. fins). In Maya thought a bird tail was designated by the same word as a fish tail, and a fish tail is paddle- or fin-like, eg, **bab** in Yucatec Maya.

Bab: is a paddle, "arm" of crab, crab claw, large toad or frog, bunch of fruit (see also), (p. 21-22).

Cola, "tail" ne p.564 (cola de) pajaros y peces
pak'ab p.624: cola, pez

Native fishermen should be queried by ethnographers and linguists on all body parts used by the Maya in their myths.

Fish on Izapa stelae have a strange "tail" but there the form seems to be merely a real tail (on top) added to a long anal fin. This may have evolved into the Classic period tail without any intention of representing a crab claw. Certain sharks have a rear body structure with trailing fins that might be misunderstood by a land-locked artist as a bilaterally asymmetrical tail. Since most Tzakol monsters evolve from a Preclassic prototype, the Izapa and shark origin are more probable than a crab origin. Only intermediate Holmul I examples, or more naturalistic renderings from any period, will reveal the natural referent for the tail -- if it exists outside of mythology.

Caracol Stela 3, dedicated around 9.11.0.0.0 (Coffman, Reents, Stone nd) (no date but several years before the Pennsylvania report of Beetz and Satterthwaite 1981)) but clearly Early Classic in style and content, shows the "crab claw" tail on the ruler's anklets and bracelet (Fig.72; 74,c-d). A Xoc Monster serves as the waist medallion of the same ruler, but the modern line drawing does not render the features correctly.

The Hooked Tail Again: Piscine Monsters as Forehead Ornament

A later section of this dissertation shows that Coe's Headband "Gods" can be present in the Surface of the Underwaterworld. In the Late Classic the headbanded partners are associated with water lilies in scenes where the Principal Young Lord rises from a splitting turtle carapace (Figs.100 and 101,b). Also, the Headband Partners are on the Blom Plate (Fig.102), where a Tubular Headdress Monster and the Surface of the Underwaterworld are the dominant features. These associations indicate that one (of several) cosmological locations for the Headband Partners (Numeral Nine and Spotted Partner) is in the netherworld waters. These associations with the watery cosmogram bring into this chapter, briefly, a headdress feature of the Early Classic renditions of the Spotted Partner, one of the headbanded "twins." This headdress adornment has the same "crab claw" tail as monsters on the Uaxactun polychrome tripod, a scene which serves throughout this whole chapter as a guide to which creatures are related to or present in the Surface of the Underwaterworld. The Early Classic form of the Spotted Attendant has as his forehead adornment a little "snail" (Fig.73; 100). This creature is known by specialists (Schele for example, personal communication) and has been commented upon when in publications (Coe 1982:Pearlman No.63, p.122) but it has never been singled out for analysis. Never have all major examples been gathered together; and it has never been added to the list of distinguishing characteristics of the spotted Headband "God."

Linda Schele considers this snail slug an early variant of the Jester God, merely a reflection of the title Ahau. Her interpretation is based on a structuralistic argument that the slug is in free association with Jester God therefore has the same meaning. Under structuralism, if A can be on a forehead

and if B sometimes replaces it and even looks like A or is a forerunner of A, then A equals B and they are thereafter treated as equal. The situation of occurrence is acceptable since it is a readily observable fact that A and B are in free association. But that only guarantees that the two can replace each other, perhaps pun each other, but that does not mean that they "are" each other.

A Jester God is a long-snouted face with sprouting cap. The forehead slug is a piscine composite with shark's tooth and crab-claw tail, the same tail as several fish monsters. The tail may curve, the curving tail may be upward in the arrangement, but it does not sprout (except in intermediate composites, the curse of Maya iconography nomenclature and classification, such as at Palenque (Fig.74,h). Normally though, the forehead slug and a Jester God are visually and corporally distinct. Even intermediate examples such as on Caracol stelae are just that, intermediate. The two characters, Jester God and forehead snail, are merely exchangeable; they may both signify lordly (Ahau-ness). But one is a humanoid, the other is an animal (fish-creature).⁷⁸

In the evolution of this forehead decoration, the snail's tail arches so far over it tops the head and turns into the cap. Nonetheless, the snail was separate for centuries and has cosmological associations (piscine) that the Jester God simply does not exhibit. This digression on the forehead slug is for two sets of reasons: first, this creature has been poorly reported, never fully studied, and lumped with Jester Gods without due process; second, the creature shares the weird "bottle opener" pseudo crab claw tail that is on mythical fish and on piscine-reptile

78. For the JGU Schele has suggested that humanoid, animal, skeletal and juvenile can all be variants of the same entity (1976/79).

monsters both at Tikal and at Uaxactun. Forehead slugs have not been accorded full recognition in part because no catalog has ever been made of them. A catalog would help advance their recognition. To begin, the most important overlooked example is the Holmul shell disks, where a total of four crab claw tailed slugs are present, two on each headdress (Fig.74,e-f) (Merwin and Vaillan 1932:Fig.29). Other examples are: Tikal, Stela 31 (Fig.74,b this paper); Yaxchilan, Lintel 48 (Graham 1979,3:105; Fig.74,a this paper); Pearlman Conch (Coe 1982:No.63), slug but with no crab claw tail (Fig.73,a).

In contexts other than on forehead bands, Caracol Stelae 3 front (Fig.72,a), 5 front and 6 front, all show the same piscine tail on archaic clothing.

For "fish" and reptile monsters with this non-symmetrical tail, see previous sections and pertinent illustrations. Here this section closes so that the text can go on to the other full figure creatures on the Uaxactun tripod with upturned snouts that share features with the Xoc Monster but are more reptilian and less piscine.

**MIDDLE MONSTER ON THE UAXACTUN TRIPOD:
THE BEARDED DRAGON'S EARLY RELATIVES**

A popular monster family throughout the entire Maya sequence of Preclassic through Post Classic are composite reptiles that are part snake, part crocodile, part fish, and often with feathers (though they are not all the same as Quetzalcoatl). Because there are so many confusing temporal, regional, and combinational variations, no one has ever done a monograph or dissertation on the entire family. Granata (1980) did a Ph.D. dissertation on snakes in Maya art, but limited it to the beasts in the three Post Classic codices plus the traditional Classic period snakes of Tikal, Uaxactun, Yaxchilan, and Copan. Every iconographer from Spinden on has had to tackle these reptile monsters, and everyone has come up with a different classification and a new name -- generally totally confusing because no one author has ever taken the time to master the entire corpus of these creatures. Since my personal interests are in monsters in general, and as I want to survey a variety of families (fish, water lily, humanoids, etc.), I will not here attempt to solve the problems, but will at least bring out the flaws in current writings. This section is tedious, but the reptiles are a real challenge and they have to be taken care of, as best we can at this early stage. Three previously unpublished Tzakol reptile portraits bring out familial variations among the generalized "Bearded Dragon" classification. Gradually the text will consider the member of this family on the Uaxactun polychrome tripod.

In a private collection there is a remarkable lid for a cylindrical tripod (Fig.76,a-b). The lid's flower shape reminded me immediately of the four wide

petaled underworld cave symbol (Figs.42-43; 175-177). The clay out of which this lid is fashioned is of a strange, too light weight, but the four carved decorations are correct in the most intimate detail that no forger has -- yet -- learned or reproduced. On the basis of the style and content I accept this unusual object as authentic until a clay test can prove it is a forgery.

The creature has a long lower jaw, opened at 90 degree angle and then turned and flattened. The overall effect of the jaw and its dentition is comparable to that of the middle Uaxactun tripod monster -- a snake. Secondly, the dentition of the carved lid is closer to composite crocodile-snake monsters than to any fish monster, and again, is comparable to the Uaxactun painted reptile. What is more, the accomplished Maya artist of the carved flower lid has added a complex pun marked by three widely spaced floppy triangles. This overall assemblage can simultaneously be interpreted as three additional fangs deeply set in a wide gum; the petal puns of a fish flower-fin; the three spines of a fin-flower. The "gum" assemblage puns a fish fin, and the eye curling down from the top is a Xoc Monster indicator, though also possible as an alternative eye for other monsters.

A bowl in the Denver Art Museum demonstrates that Curl Formed Monsters inhabit the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.48,a), thus the curl decorated monster is acceptably an underworld denizen. The Uaxactun tripod showed the reptile fanged serpent as directly in the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Thus both the lid creatures are inhabitants of the watery sector of the netherworld. From the Frog Lid (Fig.42) comes proof that the Surface of the Underwaterworld can be contained within the wide petal cave entrance symbol. That symbol in its floral pun form frames the lid. Everything fits together in a unified system all related to the netherworld. Fish of course are appropriate inhabitants of water. Snakes

swim readily, especially in an area where the "land" mass is actually more than 40% seasonal swamp. Besides, the crocodile/caiman dentition adds a further swamp/riverine indicator.

Central America has two species of native crocodile: Crocodilus moreletti and a tropical American sea crocodile, Crocodilus acutus that lives in salt water (Alvarez de Toro 1972 and 1974; Cendrero 1972; Schmidt 1924; 1952). The "American alligator" of southern USA fame, especially in Mississippi and Florida is Alligator mississippiensis and not resident in the Maya area. The Spectacled Caiman is the only tropical representative of the alligator family, and to confuse the issue for lay people who associate crocodiles with the African Nile and Tarzan movies and call everything in America an alligator (a constant problem with writings on Mesoamerica), the Maya area caiman's scientific name is Caiman crocodilus although it is a member of the scientific sub-family, Alligatoridae.

Bowl of the Fish-Snakes

A small blackware bulbous bowl from an unknown Peten site shows what a more elaborate member of this snake monster family looks like (Fig.59,last; 77,e-f). The two renditions are essentially identical except that one is longer than the other. That they are snakes is self evident from their body form with xXx cross-hachure to indicate dark scale markings and the ventral scale band. That they are conflated with a fish is specified by the sets of wide fins on both top and bottom. Floral pun are not activated in these particular fins other than the mimicry of the utilization of specifically three knife-like extensions, a pun on the generalized Maya water flower tradition of showing only three petals (in order to allow a view of the inside structure of the flower).

The artist himself seems to have been confused as to what kind of tail to show. Since the creatures are obviously snakes, he wants to show the tail dwindling naturally; but since the creature is more than a mere snake he splits the tail, though not evenly as a fish tail. Somehow it ends up unevenly as a crab claw tail. The crab claw shape though is totally lost by the exterior shape and the final wiggle to get at the snake tail diminution.

The dentition starts with a giant shark's tooth as perforator adapted into a stylized profile form. The next tooth is a traditional Maya step shape with bifurcate. No crocodile teeth are present, so the dentition is distinct from most bearded dragons. There is no lower jaw, so no beard. The snout turns up but not particularly in a Xoc Monster fashion. The nose has a single tubular bead with round adorno at the end. A fin of some sort protrudes from behind the face. Whether this is the snout fin of a Xoc Monster is not clear. The supraorbital plate is more or less of the turtle-tail family. The eye curl comes from the bottom. We end up with neither fish nor fowl, as the proverb goes. The principal contribution of this incised monster is to document the piscine nature of certain of these Early Classic composites. It is unclear whether this monster is not the same as the reptiles that carry humanoid busts in their jaws, though it is a relative perhaps. At our present stage of ignorance splitting categories is safer than lumping everything under a popular name.

The Reptile on the Gann Bowl

A possible additional representative of this Surface of the Underwaterworld snake creature family is on the Gann Bowl, the snake that transports the human

face (Fig.50). Such snake transporters are the main theme of the Deletaille Tripod, but set within a different cosmogram, as the Surface of the Underwaterworld is not present there. The date of the Gann Bowl is problematic, since it has Late Classic features (stacks along the top of the water band) yet has Early Classic feather arrangement and a definitely Early Classic subject matter. Mold-made pottery is almost unknown for Peten during the Early Classic, as is pottery carved in this almost mold-made manner. Mold made pottery per se is typical of Escuintla, but there is nothing of Tiquisate or Teotihuacan style or content on the Gann Bowl or any of the scenes discussed here.

Dragon on the Pearlman Conch

In his catalog of the important Pearlman Collection, Coe names an Early Classic serpent the Bearded Dragon (1982:Pearlman No.63, p.122). Since bearded dragons are so common in Maya art (most of the serpent ceremonial bars) they come in many different varieties, with bulbous noses, with sprocketed noses (Crocodile Tree) (Fig.165) (Hellmuth 1980/82), and so on. Schele calls one family vision serpents. I use the name "Bearded Dragon" with trepidation that Coe's own warning:

All of the mistakes which may be made by iconographers have been committed in dealing with the Bearded Dragon. It has been confused with the Imix Crocodile and other ophidian forms; too many other creatures have been subsumed in it; and an identification with a god known to have been worshipped by the lowland Maya, Itzamna, has been prematurely made (Thompson 1970:209-24). It seems far safer, given our very shaky understanding of Classic Maya iconography, to make sure that we have a discreet iconographic form (i.e., to be 'splitters' rather than 'lumpers') and to give this form a descriptive but noncommittal name (Coe 1975:20)

will need to be turned against this family of monsters as well. All the Late Classic snake monsters with deer ears and bound hanks of hair are a particular

challenge for nomenclature. The deer ear is not common on Early Classic monsters, yet they all would get named Bearded Dragon. I use the term provisionally, and do not mean to suggest connection with Late Classic snake monsters until this is demonstrated on a case by case basis.

Whatever its name, the serpentine dragon on the Pearlman Conch trumpet (Fig.75,a) shares the following features with the Uaxactun reptile:

a. they are both bearded, with a continuous beard not marked by the three sets of double beads (as on the Deletaille Tripod). Beard marking, though, is a stylistic and adjectival adornment, not a trait that distinguishes one member of the family from another. The crucial trait is a beard per se, not how it is decorated.

b. both have prominent shark's tooth as front perforator.

c. both have upturned nose, that on the Pearlman Conch more distinguished and getting close to a Xoc Monster nose upturn.

d. both have widely spaced major fangs separated by continuous smaller, non pointed teeth in between. Comparable dentition is on the Deletaille Tripod sprocketed-nosed monsters.

Comparable serpents as double-headed ceremonial bars are on Tikal Stelae 1, 2, 26, and 31 (single headed bar of disembodied bust overhead). The importance of this comparison is not merely to show the serpents are the same or similar monster, but also to point out the association of the Spotted Partner on the Pearlman Conch (Fig.73). The Spotted Partner is one of the two Headband "Gods" as identified by Coe in 1973 and subsequently revised in light of additional data (Coe 1982:122) to differentiate between Numeral Nine (one of the twins) and Spotted Partner (the other one). A full introduction to the Headband Partners (Spotted and Nine) comes later, under discussions of humans in the Surface of the Underwaterworld on the Lost Incised Vessel.

The bearded snake on Tikal Stela 31 over God K-Cleft Sky's head (Fig.75,c) shares even more characteristics with faces on the Flower Lid (Fig.76,a-b). The diagnostic trait that is strongly developed here is the 90 degree angle upturned snout, similar to a Xoc Monster, although this snake is a different creature (pure snake body, fangs and "molars" in addition to shark perforator). I would like to distinguish him from the sprocketed nosed reptile monsters with snake bodies (Deletaille Tripod and Tikal Stela 31, headdress of floating bust, Rio Azul murals, etc., Figs.165-166). It is a challenge to figure out which features are adjectival and which features are diagnostic of change of mythical species. Another dozen Tzakol serpents are needed to get better statistical patterns.

Although xerox copies of the Caracol stelae drawings have been widely traded among iconography specialists since 1980, and although the stelae are now all published,⁷⁹ the Caracol stelae have not yet been integrated into the "traditional corpus." These stelae are a mine of iconography though they are not as well preserved as the Tikal stelae and the line drawings are not quite as good as those of William Coe. Caracol stelae 1, 3 (Fig.72), and 6 (Fig.68) have as many Xoc Monster related and Bearded Dragons with piscine attributes as do their slightly earlier Tikal counterparts. Caracol Stela 6, back, has a stubby double headed ceremonial bar where the "serpent" nature is submerged by a fish monster attributes. On each shoulder is an additional monster of the Bearded Dragon family. The reptiles more often have a lower jaw than the Xoc Monsters.

79. Paper of Coffman, Reents and Stone in Schele seminar which contains the dynastic history and readings of most of the hieroglyphs of Caracol, then that of Beetz (and Satterthwaite) 1981.

Dragon on the Uaxactun Tripod

All this preliminary investigation of reptile monsters has been to prepare for the middle monster on the Uaxactun tripod (Fig.76). His jaw is wide open, unnaturally so (due to space and design considerations). A comparable jaw opening is on the carved flower lid carving (Fig.76,a-b). The Uaxactun monster has a front shark's tooth, then "crocodile" fangs alternating with generalized reptile "molars." There is no venom fang. The lower jaw has a clipped "beard." The supraorbital is the crested variety. The snout is not with bulb (thus distinct from many reptile monsters on stelae ceremonial bars). The creature's body is of a typical Maya snake. The tail has a joint (certainly not present on any reptile), then a three part tail, a sort of floppy rendition of the "crab claw" with an additional curl. These are more like trailing fins or tails than a stiff crab claw, so that should be considered only a memory device, a nonsense name. Overall these snake monsters are more straightforward than Xoc Monsters. The final creature on the Uaxactun tripod is the strange reptile on the right. It is unfortunate that the Uaxactun artist was not as skillful as his contemporaries. He abbreviates things and has a rather clunky manner. Nonetheless he has given the only view of these three leading monsters together, and all very clearly swimming in the primordial waters.

LILY PAD HEADDRESS MONSTER

The third and final monster on the Uaxactun tripod (Fig.81,left) occurs frequently in both Early Classic and Late Classic art (Figs.78-82), yet this creature has never been specifically identified or even cataloged in relationship to other comparable faces in Maya art and hieroglyphs. A face of the same creature had actually been in the literature since Seler's 1899 updating of Goodman's 1897 discovery of the personified forms for Mayan numerals and calendrical periods. Among the face glyphs for Tun and also for the numeral 13 (Goodman 1899/1902,I:771, Fig.221; 1900/1902,I:823, Fig.163-169) was a generalized long-snouted monster face but with a special headdress consisting of a flower whose stalk is knotted around a water lily pad. The naturalistic aspects of the water lily are more clearly visible in other examples (Figs.78,a-c). Yet after the 19th century discovery it would be many decades before examples such as the full bodied numeral 13 from the west side of Quirigua Stela D would be recognized again.

While both Brinton (1895) and Bowditch (1910) wrote books on hieroglyphic writing, it was not until 1950 that a complete review of Maya epigraphy appeared, by J. Eric S. Thompson. Of the personified Tun he writes:

There is another personified form of the tun, the head of a long-nosed being, of either ophidian or saurian origin, which lacks a lower jaw, indicating a connection with the earth. Often this creature wears the tun headdress, although in early texts the headdress is of the voluted form much favored in the first half of Cycle 9 (Fig.27; 28; 30-33; 35). In two full-figure representations of the tun, this head, with tun headdress, is attached to the body of a snake, and the same is true of the example on the Leiden plaque. This snake is also the

deity of number 13, god of the day Muluc, 'water,' and as such is intimately associated with water. The absence of the lower jaw and the presence of the tun headdress, which is often decked with vegetation, also worn by the Mam, god of the interior of the earth, greatly increase the possibility that this is the snake or crocodile monster which supports the earth. In any case, as god of the number 13, this creature represents rain.... In three full-figure representations of the tun at Quirigua a creature which one can tentatively identify as a crab is substituted.... (Thompson 1950:145).

Thompson was fairly close to recognizing the nature of the Tun and numeral 13 and he certainly was correct to speak of the two together. It is acceptable in the Maya system to have a single personality as patron of both numerals and calendrical entities. The Muluc personification is, however, completely different (incidentally it is a xoc fish -- not a Xoc Monster). The Muluc should be removed from commentary of the Tun-thirteen personification, as it is unrelated.

After 1950 two more decades passed before any aspect of the assemblage was reconsidered, though of course as a water flower the headdress was tabulated by Rands in his study of water plant iconography (Rands 1953). In 1979 Schele illustrated what is now termed the Lily Pad Headdress in her paper on Palenque dynastic iconography and epigraphy. Her discussion dealt with the Shell Wing Dragon, which frequently perches on top of the Lily Pad Headdress. Schele did not distinguish the specific Lily Pad Headdress assemblage from other lily pad arrangements frequently found in Maya headdresses. She dealt primarily with three examples from Machaquila, Peten.⁸⁰

In the previous year, 1978, the first Early Classic example of the overall headdress and also the earliest then known example of the Shell Wing Dragon had

80. Schele 1979:Fig. 17b-d. She is aware of the other examples and has covered them in an unpublished paper.

been published (Hellmuth 1978:141) (Fig.80,c). But this was incidental to using the piece to illustrate an early Quadripartite Badge headdress. On this cache vessel was an even better rendition of both the Lily Pad Headdress and also the Shell Wing Dragon. The Early Classic portrayal of the fully developed Lily Pad Headdress Monster is preserved on a stuccoed-and-painted bowl.⁸¹ The Shell Wing Dragon will come in the next section; at present the description stays with the lily pad.

Because water flowers are so common in Maya art in general and on headdresses in particular, the term "Water Lily Headdress" would not be meaningful. A descriptive title should emphasize the pad. "Lily Pad Headdress" was chosen for this reason. The full assemblage includes several parts, though it can be abbreviated down to a simple bumpy outlined pad. Usually, a mere flower or a mere pad is not enough, not even together. It is the flower tied in a thick knot across the pad and a fish nibbling at the flower that forms the constellation. The Shell Wing Dragon is a further diagnostic trait, but is often the first part to be left off when the headdress is abbreviated.

For this headdress there is no question that the Early and Late Classic specimens are directly related. The Tepeu examples have evolved directly from the Tzakol prototypes. Thus only one type specimen is really needed, but to be on the safe side the Merrin Bowl example may serve for the Early Classic ideal and the Blue Vase for the Late Classic form. The Tuebingen cache vessel and the

81. When Justin and Barbara Kerr kindly let me peruse their informative photograph archive I found the key piece, the Merrin Bowl (Figs.78,a; 91, bottom; 94,d). Subsequent cataloging of all known instances on pottery in private collections, museums, and also examples on stelae and in inscriptions, especially of Dos Pilas, helped reveal the full extent and temporal/regional features of the assemblage.

Merrin Bowl together provide a fully representative sample. The following features are diagnostic:

1. The main feature is a rounded shape with a bumpy outline. A review of all Maya water scenes shows that water lily pads can be stylized in this way (Figs. 78-80; 82,c-d; 89; 90,c-d; 97; 98,d; 100,a; 136,d; 168; 185; 189). A more naturalistic form is the lily pad growing from the other monster's head on the same Merrin Bowl. Thus, two different outlines can decorate the lily pad in Maya art: widely spaced knobs or continuous scallops. The difference in meaning, if any, is not yet known. The surface of a lily pad is normally indicated by widely spaced diagonal criss-cross lines. The same pattern may be used for turtle carapace pattern or bat wings. On the Merrin Bowl the headdress pad has no naturalistic features. Hidden under the pad is the glyphic forehead display unit. The glyph there is not possible to identify as it is covered over.

2. A water flower stem is tied across the pad with a thick knot.

3. The flower itself is a cross section view of the water lily. Academic debate continues over the proper identification of water flowers. Rands' opinion that Nymphaea ampla is the natural referent is generally accepted (Rands 1953). John Bowles has proposed Dorstenia contrajerva as the model. But Dorstenia is not a water plant, could not have fish nibbling at it, and has no "flower" (Bowles 1974). I have studied both water lilies and Dorstenia plants in Peten and Chiapas.⁹ Only the Nymphaea flower may, sometimes, start blooming underwater and then rise to the surface. Such underwater blooming is peculiar to certain ecological settings, such as the Arroyo Pucte.

4. Nibbling on the flower (not eating the actual flower as feeding on other

creatures that are attracted to the flower) is a stylized fish. This fish is not a monster. The fish has the dorsal flower-fin and a split fin-tail with central extension. Any kind of fish can be pictured nibbling, and often the fish is eliminated for the sake of abbreviation. The fish is merely an additional indicator of watery environment.

5. Perched above or behind the lily pad may be a Shell Wing Dragon (Fig.82,a-b; 83). On the German cache vessel its wings are clearly seashells (Fig.17,a). On the Merrin Bowl they have bat-wing edges (but under no condition are they actually bat wings) (Fig.80,b). The creature itself looks like a sprout, though other examples show the actual dragon is a slug, a fish, a bird, a snake, or a composite of these. Frequently the Shell Wing Dragon is absent.

Diagnostic Traits of the Monster Itself

The pad headdress may top humans, gods, Uinal Monsters, and long-snouted monsters. A certain type of long-snouted monster, though, appears to be the actual body of the headdress creature. This creature has the following attributes (numeration is continued from the headdress).

6. Snout may have latch-shaped beak, mimicking that of the Principal Bird Deity, though the overall creature is clearly a water snake (when seen in full figure form).

7. Lower jaw may be absent (this is common for a diverse number of mythical characters.)

8. Mouth area may be filled with large crossed bands. Crossed bands may

occur elsewhere on the headdress.

9. Headdress may have one or more diagonal frames sticking out. The Shell Wing Dragon may perch on one. The diagonal frames may have sky band symbols inside, and may sprout at the end (especially at Seibal, Late Classic stelae).

10. Body may be the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Merrin Bowl for Tzakol period (Fig.78,a); Fig.78,b-c for Tepeu period) or a regular snake body. The Surface of the Underwaterworld will have its appropriate symbols on top, mostly stylized shell sections.

11. Fish may be near, or nibbling on, the body. These fish remind the viewer that the snake is in a waterscape.

The Lily Pad Headdress -- with or without its monster body -- can be easily recognized by examining the illustrations. On all of the few full figure representations the body of the pad headdress creature is of a snake, as at Uaxactun. On the Merrin Bowl the snake is feathered, on the Belgian Blued Vase the feathers issue from an evolved and elaborated flower-fin. This is a special elaboration of the piscine fin-flower that serves for snakes. On the early personified Tun of the Leiden Plaque (Fig.80,g) the creature has a definite fish fin and a vaguely fish-like tail. The "snout" is vaguely beak-like -- see lid handle of Fig.25,c. On the Merrin Bowl the snout is of indeterminate genus; on the Uaxactun Tripod the snout is decidedly bird-like. Since the Pictun, Baktun, and Katun periods of the Mayan calendar are all depicted as birds, a bird image is not out of keeping for the Tun. The next lower calendrical segment, the Uinal or 20 day period, is a frog/toad. Kin is a carnivore when not the Sun God face (note the animal head with Kin forehead on the Rio Azul wooden bowl fragment) (Fig.170,a).

So the year and longer periods are personified as birds, lesser divisions are other creatures.

Lily Pad Headdress Monster on the Uaxactun Tripod

The Uaxactun Tripod shows a snake body, fish fins on both top and bottom, water flower tied across an indeterminate headdress, and latch shaped bird beak. If the Maya artist had continued and added a nibbling fish and water lily crinkle cross-hatching to the headdress, the creature would have been recognizable. The challenge of iconography is to recognize the beasts when they are abbreviated -- and on this tripod, even to see that there is a monster blended into the scene at all. Since it is wrapped around the main water band of the Surface of the Underwaterworld, he is certainly an inhabitant of this cosmological niche. His intimate relation to the Surface of the Underwaterworld is further emphasized on the Merrin Bowl.

Lily Pad Headdress Monster on the Merrin Bowl

On the Merrin Bowl, beneath the overlay of the feathers, the body of the creature is composed of two parallel undulations: a thin snake's body surmounted by a thick water band decorated with ...ooo.... The thin snake's body is independent, demonstrated by its continuity after the water band stops. The fish at the tail nibbles on the snake rather than on the water band. All these creatures are understood by the Maya painter and his contemporary audience to be set within the underworld water. If the fish are not a sufficient indicator of this, then the nearby water lily sprouting monster head should be, as that head is always immersed in water.

The additional thick band that parallels the thin serpent is recognizable as the main band of the Surface of the Underwaterworld by the ...ooo... pattern of "water dots" (Hellmuth 1982/84). Within the wide curve of the undulation is an encircled curl. Comparable curls in similar monster undulations occur in the Proto-Classic (Abaj Takalik Stela 4, Fig.54) through time to the Late Classic "blood-letting vision serpent" of Yaxchilan Lintel 15. At the 1983 Palenque Mesa Redonda, Schele traced this bloodletting serpent all the way back to the Proto-Classic Hauberg Stela (Fig.75,b) this paper).⁸² Bloodletting imagery is not featured on the Lily Pad Headdress Monster or related to the Merrin Bowl.

Research on darkware bowls coeval with the painted Kerr bowl establishes that undulating water bands with curls in the undulations are the early Maya rendition of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Hellmuth 1982/84). The curls within bumpy-outlined cartouches that decorate the body of the Kerr Lily Pad Headdress Monster are probable early antecedents for the decorations associated with Late Classic renditions of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Hellmuth Photo Archive). The creature's body is a composite, since the thin snake body and the thick water band are not merged, they are merely adjoined. The overall beast could be viewed as a personification of the Surface of the Underwaterworld. There could hardly be a more effective manner for the Maya artist to indicate to the viewer the close association between the Lily Pad Headdress and the Surface of the Underwaterworld than to merge them into a composite unit.

82. I do not know whether Schele cites the Abaj Takalik stela as an example even earlier than the Hauberg Stela. John Graham's final report on Abaj Takalik has not yet appeared.

The name Shell Wing Dragon has come up in several instances in connection with the Lily Pad Headdress. Since this dragon appears directly associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld on the Merrin Bowl, and as additional examples are available to study today which were not previously known, the following section will review this multi-faceted creature.

SHELL WING DRAGON

Schele gave the name "Shell Wing Dragon" to a headdress accessory based on examples at Palenque and Machaquila (Fig.83). Her initial references included the dragon in its form as a hieroglyph on the Dos Pilas Hieroglyphic stairs (Schele 1979:Fig.17 and p.65) She suggests its presence marks the wearers as "supernaturals" because at Palenque the wearers are deceased. Elsewhere the dragon is worn by evidently living dynastic rulers.

This creature is not yet known for the traditional corpus of Tikal or Uaxactun and has not been otherwise discussed in any of the Maya iconographic treatises of the 1960's through today. The examples on Seibal Stelae 8 and 11 (Maler 1908a:Pl.7 and 9; Hellmuth 1978b:76) seem to have been overlooked. Three specimens on pottery had been published before Schele's article, though without recognition at that time. The first possible specimen is on the badly eroded Lily Pad Headdress worn by a seated noble on Grolier No. 43. This portion is incorrectly rendered in the modern line drawing. A second specimen is illustrated by Robicsek (Robicsek 1975:Fig.287). The third specimen is the first known Tzakol example (Fig.17,a). Two three-dimensional renderings on lid handles for tetrapods are particularly interesting (Fig.87-88). The Shell Wing Dragon first appears in Tzakol 2 (estimating that black tetrapods are of that early date), continues in Tzakol 3 (on stuccoed and painted examples, Fig.85,a), and bridges the hiatus to continue on Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2 pottery. A single possible variant appears in the Post Classic Dresden Codex (Fig.194,a).

The Shell Wing Dragon is found principally in association with the Lily Pad Headdress Monster (Figs.80; 82,a-b). On the Tuebingen cache vessel, the Shell Wing Dragon is associated with GI, certainly a denizen of the netherworld waters (Fig.17,a). The Early Classic "Bowl of the Nine God Glyphs" includes a Shell Wing Dragon atop a Lily Pad Headdress (Fig.80,a). The portrait panel in front is a GI; the portrait panel behind is Ah Kin, who adorns a crossed-bands eye monster with sprocketed nose in Rio Azul Tomb 1 murals, where giant Surface of the Underwaterworld undulations are on both sidewalls. In the Late Classic, the dragon may perch on the diagonal band that is part of the Lily Pad Headdress assemblage.

The dragon may be a bird, a snake, a generalized reptile, slug-like -- or a composite of these entities. Schele's term dragon is definitely appropriate for such a monstrous mixture. The creature often has fangs, and an ear-like tuft (something most real snakes lack). It usually has the feet of a bird and certainly has wings. These wings are in fact normally bivalve shells, probably specifically a spondylus (Fig.84) (Coe personal communication, 1985). When the feet are carefully rendered they are of a raptorial bird -- not webbed.

SHELL WINGED DEITY FACES

A sub-series of the dragon features a deity head as the "body" out of which sprouts a serpent-like or avian neck with its own head (either of a water bird or of a snake) (Figs.85 and 86). On this creature the bird legs are appended to the neck or jaw of the deity head. The shell serves two simultaneous functions, as earring accessory and as vestigial "wings" -- though the wing function is only known by analogy to the more fully avian renditions.

A perplexing feature of this shell-winged deity head is that the main head can be any one of a variety of otherwise different gods. The stuccoed Tzakol example shows a probable God N (Fig.85,a).⁸³ The three-dimensional heads are not readily identifiable. The Late Classic heads vary from a Kinich Ahau to a GI-like head with crested supraorbital plate. An interesting -- and unpublished -- specimen is on exhibit in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in attractively incised shell, probably Late Classic (Fig.86,b). This potential for interchangeability is dramatized by the four different sets of "wings" found on the stuccoed Tzakol specimen. These wing devices are the same as four of the designs floating on the Tikal Burial 48 murals and the comparable text on a late Tzakol 3/early Tepeu 1 cache lid/plate.⁸⁴ Does the set of four "wing" variants indicate four different colored cardinal directional gods (M. Miller, personal communication, April 1984)?

It seems that the Shell Wing Dragon is both an entity in itself and also a mythical heraldic device whose presence as headdress alters or otherwise describes some particular aspect of the god-head that it adorns. A transformational phase into a reptilian- bird form is also likely. A later section suggests that the Principal Bird Deity is a vehicle for metamorphosis for God D, perhaps the Shell Wing Dragon enables God N, GI, and Ah Kin to metamorphose into a bird form. The reasons behind this are lost in time. Whatever the eventual answers, the previously unknown Shell Wing Dragons in museums and private collections have certainly allowed entree into aspects of Maya iconography and cosmology that were

83. Though such an aged face could also be of God L, or less likely, of God D. God N fits best with the shell accessories.

84. Hellmuth 1986b. Such a piece is best dated as Tzakol 4, transitional between early and late form, color, and subject matter.

not noticed when studies were restricted to the traditional corpus.

Three Tzakol vessels with the Surface of the Underwaterworld led into Early Classic cosmology: the Uaxactun Tripod, the Kerr Rollout (the Merrin Bowl), and the Tikal Burial 160 stuccoed wooden bowl. The Uaxactun tripod has introduced the Xoc Monster, reptile dragons, and the Lily Pad Headdress. The lily pad has brought in the Shell Wing Dragon. Now the Merrin Bowl and the Tikal bowl show the rest of the strange characters which are directly associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld.

TUBULAR HEADDRESS MONSTER

One monster head of the Classic Maya period is consistently found in a majority of the inhabited Surface of the Underwaterworld renditions. This head is typified by a headdress of wavering forms that look sometimes like feathers (Fig.91) and sometimes like sea anemone, columnar coral, tubular sea sponge or tubular roots (Fig.89; 90). The Maya fishermen and shell divers of Caribbean reefs would have been intimately familiar with the first three. They most likely would have classified the sea anemone as a "plant" rather than the invertebrate "animal" it is in the Linnean system. Before deciding on the identification of the headdress, it helps to review the history of discovery of this standardized monster. Frequently depicted he is one of the easiest ones to recognize, yet has not figured very much in current iconography.

The first major example was discovered by Thomas Gann during his pot hunting "excavations" in Mound 16 (Fig.95) "about 2 miles due north of the last described mound, close to the north bank of the Rio Hondo, within the territory of Quintana Roo" (Gann 1918:105).⁸⁵ Gann suggested the creature was God K, but in 1918 writing in the backwaters of Belize one cannot blame Gann for this mistake, since even in the 1980's the Tikal museum exhibit tag still confuses God K of Burial 195 with Chac. The next discovery of a comparable creature was by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, at Kaminaljuyu, within what is now modern

85. Gann, a medical doctor stationed in Belize, did not particularly worry about obtaining excavation permits. He wandered digging at will even over the borders into Mexico and Guatemala.

Guatemala City. Kidder tackled the iconography of that vase (Fig.91,a). He immediately recognized that the Kaminaljuyu head was the same as the one on the Rio Hondo bowl of Gann (KJS 1946:Fig.98,d and p. 226). Unfortunately Kidder developed a term, "Profile Serpent Head X," or for short, Serpent X (ibid. p. 223). Under this name he subsumed his Figs.97-98, what today we would catalog separately as: serpent face-wing, head of Principal Bird Deity, Curl Formed Monster, Sea Anemone Headdress Monster, as well as other creatures not even named yet. For the headdress of the monster Kidder used Kublerian restraint: "from which rise six round-ended projections and from whose upper corners spring long stems terminating in leaves" (ibid., p. 226). Kidder was at least forthright about his lack of adequate comparative material: "Here again we regret our ignorance of Maya religious symbolism." That such ignorance is still demonstrated today in iconography is a result of what Schele calls lack of visual acuity plus a lack of sufficient zeal in seeking and presenting fresh comparative evidence.

Three decades passed before another monster of this species was discovered (W.Coe 1965:30). Another full decade passed before anyone attempted to study the scene. Then, with three fully detailed examples of the monster head, Coggins says of the headdress: "...there are five feathers, or looped cloths. The stems of plants sprout from each side of these top elements, terminating in waterlily blossoms" (Coggins 1975,I:226). Coggins was well aware of the other specimens in the traditional corpus: Gann's Rio Hondo bowl, the Kaminaljuyu bowl, and the Late Classic Blom Plate (ibid., p.229-231). At this point Coggins is the first to rescue from the 19th century corpus a specimen which Kidder and Gann both overlooked -- namely the Palenque Palace, House D stucco decorated piers (Fig.98,d). Today we can add the Altun Ha example, published by Pendergast (1979:pl.17; Hellmuth

1982-84; Coggins 1983:Fig.41; MAYA 1985:No.120)). four years after Coggins's thesis, the outstanding rendition on the Merrin Bowl, the rendition on the Lost Incised Vessel (Fig.94,c), a remarkable sculptural rendering as lid handle (Fig.91,b; 92), and renditions elsewhere (Figs.93; 96-97). Most importantly of all is a Late Classic incised portrait of this creature (Fig.89; 90,a-b) (Schele 1979c:Fig.26b).

The Headdress as Mimic of Sea Anemone

In discussing a remarkable incised Late Classic vase (Fig.89; 90,a-b), Mary O'Boyle and Lang Reid commented that they had seen sea anemones comparable to the tubular form of the headdress when they were diving in the Caribbean Sea off the Quintana Roo coast. On the basis of this vase and their observation, the name Sea Anemone Monster seemed appropriate. At least this name is easy to remember. As long as it is considered a nonsense name it will not interfere with further search for the headdress's natural referent. Coe has felt that most representations of the headdress show feathers (Coe, personal communication, 1981), the conclusion also of Coggins. Neither, though, knew then of the incised rendering which is the most columnar sponge or anemone-like (Fig.90). Also, still more examples in private collections show such headdresses where the "plumes" are intended to be tubular, with definite three dimensionality and specifically a rounded top with a hole in it (Fig.94,c) (the mouth of the sponge, coral column or sea anemone or the growing section of a tubular root). At most a feather is punned but is demonstrably not the principal reading. Some artists show a feathery variant, more artists selected the tubular variant -- a feather is a flat object, hardly cylindrical.

In view of the consensus initially favoring the feather suggestion, I consulted

with divers of Caiman Expeditions who yearly dive the Caribbean. I showed them pictures of all available monster headdresses of this class, told them that archaeologists called the headdress "feathers." They considered this idea puzzling since they agreed the headdress looked very much like sea anemones, Caribbean sponge columns, and local columnar kinds of coral formations. All of these would have been visible to Maya fishermen and shell divers. Whether this appearance is coincidental (if the primary natural model is a tubular root) has to be decided.

The Peten artist would not have first hand familiarity with the living marine model from the far away Caribbean Sea. And since he added fresh water water lilies anyway, it is not surprising that he made the tubes look leaf-like. Since many long leaves occur in feather shapes, and since palm frond and corn fronds appear the same shape as feathers (Clarence Massiah, personal communication, 1975), the Peten artist would have punned these. Mimicry is a standard feature of Tzakol art. But what remains sea-anemone like is the close grouping and the undulating parallelism that results from the action of waves. Sea anemones grow in shallow water and show such movement.⁸⁶ The identification of this monster's headdress is multi-referential, with a marine "plant" as a potential model. The incised Tepeu vase (Fig.89) certainly does not show feathers. It is on the basis of this as type specimen that the nickname Sea Anemone Monster is appropriate.

86. As part of my dissertation research I took diving lessons in Quintana Roo, Mexico so I could see firsthand what the Maya divers had found. From the surface you can see sea anemone clusters clearly waving. For the coral and columnar sponge you have to go just a few meters deep, an easy free dive with no air tanks needed.

The Headdress as Tubular Root of Water Lily Plant

A sub-series of water lily monster has tubular "roots" on their heads (Figs.97-98). The stalks of plants -- probably water plants -- clearly grow directly from these roots. Roots introduce an interesting linguistic pun, since **xoc** is also the Yucatec Maya word that means tubular root. The tubular "root" aspect is pertinent because the headdress of the "anemone" is in large part a massive root structure for the sprouting water lily plant. This root structure is attached to the head of the monster. In other instances all this grows from a skeletal monster head, sometimes humanoid skull. The concept of regeneration in the netherworld pond from a skull, combined with the plant's narcotic potential has never been fully investigated. While it is not the tradition in European art history to utilize native word lists, for Mesoamerican art history it has been a tradition since Seler in the 19th century. Water lily plants are featured on the long Tikal fragment, on the Merrin Bowl, and on several of the Late Classic scenes with the Anemone Headdress Monster.

From Nomenclatura Etnobotanica Maya (Barrera M. et al. 1976). Schele has already obtained a list of the Yucatec Mayan terms for water lily (Schele 1979c:12): **nukuch naab, nicté'ha, xikin chaak, lol ha, sak naab**. I have found additional terms in Martinez's monumental book on Mexican plant terms (Martinez 1979:1133): hoja de sol (Escarcega region), lab, lol-ha, Sak-chab, and Sol de agua. The Barrera list (also from his general Yucatec dictionary) provides important linguistic clues. Even more tantalizing though is the Martinez term for water lily: hoja de sol and Sol de agua. Sol is the common word for "sun" in Spanish, so we get "leaf of the sun" and "sun of the water," both plausible since these plants grow in full sun. But, in Yucatec Maya **sol** means "skin, peel (of a fruit), scales of a snake or fish, or lizard, iguana, bark of a tree, and even shell of a turtle" (Barrera

Vasquez 1980:736). Now it happens that in Maya art that water lily pads are decorated with the same surface texture symbol -- cross hachure -- as turtle carapaces, bat wings, and certain Etz'nab day signs. In Maya art criss-crossed lines can stand for: the color black, snake scales, fish scales. These concepts are clearly united in the Maya culture. The Yucatec word **Box** stands also for tree bark, shell, skin, the color black and is the name for an ocean fish, bagre (ibid., p.65). Stalks associated with water lily plants rising from Kan cartouche heads often have cross hachure decoration (Photo Archive). It appears that such cross-hachure, and the textured skin/scales/black can be glossed in Maya as either **sol** or **box**. Epigraphers can work out the details. I also suggest that Martinez has gathered a mixed Spanish- Mayan term for water lily, and that **sol** is Mayan rather than Spanish. His terms would thus translate: hoja de sol = leaf of scale texture, certainly appropriate for the lily pad. And sol de agua = scaly skin of the water, certainly appropriate for ponds or lake shores which are totally carpeted with the patterned lily pads (Lundell 1937) (Fig.98 this dissertation). Indeed the mass of pads looks like a skin or film on top of the water.

Sak chab leads to the dictionary entry for **chab** (Barrera Vasquez 1980:120). **Chab** includes the meaning criar algo de nada, que es propio de Dios. Ah chab, creador. Since the water lilies traditionally sprout from a fleshless skull, that is certainly creating something from nothing. Further linguistic, ethno-botanical, epigraphic, and iconographic research on water lilies and associated monsters lead directly to some of the mental concepts behind the bizarre cosmology of the ancient Maya. As Miller and Schele have both independently warned Mayanists, without being "literate" in the Mayan language one cannot hope to advance.

Potential readings for the various standardized parts of the water lily

monsters are so complicated that I will stick with the term Tubular Headdress Monster as a nickname that at least is easy to remember. The term "Water Lily Monster" does not allow differentiating this creature from the Tun patron (Lily Pad Headdress Monster) -- a totally separate individual within the same mythical waterscape. This is one case where splitting is necessary over lumping.

The Tubular Headdress Monster

No example of the Tubular Headdress Monster's body has yet been found. It might have reptilian and/or piscine attributes. Schele has proposed that long-snouted heads are merely a device to personify the headdress. I certainly agree with her that a headdress is what differentiates some creatures, but the faces may also have individual identities if we find the Maya key to their classification. Accepting Schele's model does not change the present situation anyway, as it is precisely the headdress which is under discussion. Whether it expresses the essence of the monster or whether it is only adjectival is not yet known. One thing is certain, whatever his name, the anemone-like tubular headdress is firmly associated with the netherworld waters. On the Blom Plate (Fig.96), the Gann Bowl (Fig.95), the Kaminaljuyu tripod, the Lost Incised Vase, and the Tikal stuccoed bowl this head is directly in the water layer (Fig.94). On the Merrin Bowl the Tubular Headdress Monster is sandwiched between personifications of the mythical waters (Fig.94). His watery essence is further emphasized on the Tepeu I bevel-based PSS Bowl by nibbling fish (Fig.90,c-d) and on all bowls by water flowers. Water lilies do not grow in salt water nor in fast flowing muddy streams such as the Rio de la Pasion or the Rio Usuntacinta. There the completely different spider lily flourishes. If some underwater growth in association with

water lilies equaled the wavy "feather-anemone-tube-root" headdress, then the natural models would be all from fresh water environment. Mixing fresh and salt water imagery is traditional for the Maya though, since the Xoc Monster is ultimately a marine creature, as is the conch shell and the spondylus that adorn the Maya Underworld or costume its inhabitants. GI is certainly a water related creature. His earring is a bivalve shell, probably a marine species.

Deification

The tubular headdress creature is not a patron of any calendrical segment nor of any numeral. Thus it has escaped being deified by Thompson. Seler was not particularly familiar with this creature, since its occurrences at Palenque are camouflaged and the examples on pottery were unearthed after his main investigations. The Gann Bowl was not dug up until after Spinden's 1909 Ph.D. dissertation so again, the monster never entered the basic iconographic references. Until 1975 only four examples were in the traditional corpus (Gann, Kaminaljuyu, Blom Plate, and Tikal, plus the weak Palenque specimen). Today four additional examples are in the Photo Archive, a 100% increase over the previous six decades. No compelling reason for deifying this creature stands out. It is a composite monster, an elaboration of the basic long-snouted base unit adorned with the supraorbital plate glyph and its headdress, plus water lilies. This monster lives in the same environment as the Lily Pad Headdress Monster. The Uaxactun bowl does not have an Anemone Headdress Monster because no one artist ever has the space to present the entire Underwaterworld population in a single scene. The Tikal Burial 160 rollout is the closest to a full dramatis personae. The Uaxactun environmental niche is the same as on all other vessels that illustrate the ...ooo...

water band signifying the presence of the Surface of the Underwaterworld. I rank the Tubular Headdress monster in the same status as its associates: a mythical monster, actually as much a state of being (state of transformation from death to sprouting life). A model of transformation should be compared and contrasted with Schele's model of personification. Transformation includes personification but goes beyond. The where will need to be worked out.

It is presumptuous or at least premature to try to get into the heads of 5th century Maya to decide whether they viewed a particular image as beneficial or harmful. That is a separate study in religion and philosophy. Classification and comparisons, however, are necessary as a first step. Through these processes this paper now reviews the human-like personalities associated with the Tubular Headdress Monster within or near the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Humanoids occur on the Lost Incised Vase, on the Blom Plate, on the Gann Bowl, and on the Tikal bowl.

Chapter 4

HUMANOIDS IN THE UNDERWATERWORLD

More than ten cylindrical tripods and basal-flange bowls picture only the uninhabited layers of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Hellmuth 1982-84). The Kaminaljuyu tripod, Kerr Rollout, Uaxactun tripod and other vessels add only monsters. The Tikal Burial 160 stucco painted bowl is the first securely Early Classic dated portrayal that includes human figures (Fig.99,c-d). The "Lost Incised Vase" is one of the few other early scenes to feature humans directly within the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.99,b).

The Lost Incised Vase⁸⁷

Incising is a technique used in the Preclassic and then continued from Tzakol 1 times into Tepeu 2, and especially popular during Tepeu 1. Tzakol vases tend more to be gouged or carved rather than incised, though the distinction is often more semantic than technical. The subject matter of this lost vessel is acceptable for either Tzakol 3 or Tepeu 1 dating. Certainly Tzakol 1 and 2 renditions will be found, if this is not itself of that early a date. The shape of the vase is unique, so this cannot yet date the piece. The style is enigmatic, equally acceptable for Tzakol 3 as for Tepeu 1. The handling of feather masses is the easiest indicator of style-date, but on this vase too few feather ends are present. Double nose beads of tear shape are normally giveaways of a Tzakol costume, but no nose jewelry is

87. I photographed this incised vase eight years ago and do not know where it is today -- hence the name.

worn. In any event, this lost vessel is Early Classic in spirit and close enough in time to be considered.⁸⁸ The loss of grave lot provenance has cost this scientific information. The iconography can be salvaged, however, and when more is known about the Tzakol and Tepeu style and technique it will eventually be possible to give this vessel a narrowly defined date. Only once Maya pottery specialists have a chance to see it, can they contribute suggestions as to a date classification.

On the vessel, two Tubular Headdress Monsters are visible. One faces left and has a clearly detailed Kin glyph in its supraorbital plate display unit. The other faces right and has the curls (only) of the more usual Uinal-like design as does the monster of other paintings (Fig.97). Two include a *le*-like infix (Fig.90, bottom; 92). The glyph on the Merrin Bowl monsters may originally have been a conflation of the *le* with a Uinal-like arrangement. Comparable monsters elsewhere have Kan (Fig.90, top).

The headdress worn by the incised monsters has only three erect tubes. To show that these tubes have a round cross-section (and are not flat and thin like a feather or leaf), the artist bends them over to reveal their top surface. The top oval of each tube is decorated with wide crinkle lines, the same as on waterlily pads, turtle carapaces, and the day sign, Etz'nab. The artist thus indicates that lily pads will sprout from these tubular "roots." All meanings relate to water, though a feather design is potentially punnable by the circlets of decreasing size, a mimicry

88. If this vase is a 6th century A.D. artifact, it is a perfect candidate for a "Tzakol 4 phase".

89. "Dress Shirt" is a nickname given by Robert Smith to designs popular on Tepeu 2 pottery at Uaxactun, based on the similarity of these vertical row of circles to buttons of a dress shirt worn with dinner jacket or tuxedo (1955,1).

of the "dress shirt" decoration typical of Maya feather renditions.⁸⁹

The creature's nose in this one vase is a composite of several Maya monster classes, including the bumpy bordered decoration at the end, sometimes an indicator of a crocodile tree monster (Fig.165-166). The decorations above the nose defy analysis at the moment. The creature has a lower jaw with beard decorated by three rows of circlets. Triple rows of circlets are diagnostic of a Tzakol style beard. Whether this is a contemporary fashion on this vase or an anachronism depends on the solution of the vessel's enigmatic date. Hanging from the extended upper jaw is a mass of plumes. These details are as eccentric as is the vessel's shape, though in no way do I consider the vase a forgery.⁹⁰

This vessel has an elaborate rendition of the Surface of the Underwaterworld including stacks in addition to double yokes. No encircled curls are included. The main band is composed of diagonal units, a heritage from the Preclassic at Abaj Takalik (Stela 4) and Izapa, found on a Tikal Burial 48 Tzakol 3 cylindrical tripod, and later often a feature on Tepeu bowls (Fig.100,b; 101,a). Along the top of the vase is an additional segmented band of undetermined meaning, as it is not known from any other vessel. The stacks and double yokes are enough to indicate that the scene is set somewhere in the Layers of the Underwaterworld. The presence of the Anemone Headdress Monsters relates this scene to all the others with the same monster. In simplest terms this vessel is a variation on the theme of the Tikal Burial 160 fragment (Fig.99), but is not a copy.

Of iconographic as well as religious interest is the presence of two human-like

90. This vase has three small, round feet, but is not in the cylindrical tripod class.

figures standing alongside (or intended to be immersed waist deep) in the netherworld layer. Both individuals have the same large, thick cloth knot trailing behind their headdress. Each person has patches on their body (of differing designs). The shell affix in particular is traditionally termed a god marking.⁹¹ Of these two humanoids, one stands between the two monsters as they face each other. This man has patches with "waterlily pad" scalloped outlines and a bound bank of hair. Elsewhere these are indicators of the Headband Partner who resembles personified Numeral Nine. In other renditions the patches have feline pelage marks inside and represent feline skin.⁹² The pointed extremities on the patch outlines are the parts where the animal hide was pegged down to dry when being salted and cured. The same "upholstery" marks are visible on feline skins that cover thrones. Certain hieroglyphs at Palenque with feline pelt segments also have similar tabs, even with peg holes. On this incised vase, though, the upholstery tabs are merged into a continuous lily pad edge pattern. This is not infrequent on other renditions which surely show the Headband Partners. Coe dubbed comparable characters elsewhere Headband Gods, though he had few Early Classic examples to work with. The divine nature of these beings is probable but it is equally appropriate to discuss them as culture heros. They are certainly standardized fixtures in ancient Maya mythology.

In Maya mythical scenes, each individual fulfilled a certain role pertinent to the selected subject matter of the composition. Characters are not mixed on pots/haphazardly or for decorative reasons. Since definite Headband "Gods" are in

91. No thorough study has ever documented their actual divinity.

92. Lounsbury interprets the markings as of a snake (personal communication, January 1984.) I find most of the markings feline-like, but some could be reptilian.

the Underwaterworld with the Principal Young Lord (Figs.100 and 101) it is possible that the two youthful men on the Lost Incised Vase are early renderings of comparable partners; the P.Y.L. is not required to identify the Hero Twins. On two other vessels with diagonal cosmograms, the Hero Twins in traditional outfits are clearly recognizable. Coggins has already noticed that diagonally decorated bottom layers are place indicators in early times and at Teotihuacan (Coggins 1975,I:197ff). The Headband Partners appear with one another consistently enough so that when one is present with another idealized attendant nearby, the additional youth can by statistical analogy be suggested most likely to be the other partner; here, the character who would normally have large, isolated black body spots.⁹³ The series of illustrations of Figs.100-101 demonstrates that when one finds Personified Numeral Nine, then his partner is usually also present. Associations and setting can help as much in identifying mythical personalities as can costume, body features, accessories, and headdress. In the present case the second character's headdress is covered by the incision of the rim band. Thus it is not known whether he had a headband or bound hank of hair, both expected. All that is visible is the identical fat cloth tie trailing behind. Documentation for the presence of both attendants even when their bodies are not differentiated comes from the Blom Plate (Fig.102).

Humanoids on the Blom Plate

This large polychrome plate was painted during Tepeu 1 times in a Late Classic manner but shows a scene based directly on popular Tzakol 3 imagery. A Tubular Headdress Monster is present, just as on the Lost Incised Vase (Fig.99,c).

93. The two men function almost always as attendants and partners, especially in the company of God D or the Principal Young Lord.

The blowgun hunters on the Blom Plate each wear the same costume and both have identical large, isolated black spots. At first glance they would be interpreted as two renditions of a similar type. But by analogy with other scenes it is known that normally only one large spotted character at a time is present. Such a large spotted character has a partner, characterized by feline pelage with tabs. That is precisely what the seats under the Blom hunters shows, and it is the decorations of these seats that reveal the identities. The Ik glyph throne marks the real Spotted Attendant and the seat with feline pelage is for personified Numeral Nine. The Blom Headband Partners⁹⁴ are in close association with a Surface of the Underwaterworld motif with snake heads attached to either end.

On the Blom Plate a regal bird monster perches on top of an Anemone Headdress Monster. The twins aim their blowguns at the bird. A majestic Principal Bird Deity is also shot by a three-dimensional blowgun hunter on the lid handles of the Rio Azul double chambered cylindrical tripod (Hellmuth 1985a:100).⁹⁵

In all lectures and discussions of the relation between the Popol Vuh and Classic Maya art, the episode of the blowgun hunters has always been labeled as

94. The partners do not always actually have a headband. The name was coined from examples that happened to have the headband. Codex Style examples and others hardly ever have the headband. Its presence or absence does not affect the basic identity as long as other features are present or absent.

95. The F.L.A.A.R. Photo Archive also has a photograph of the interior of a polychrome basal flange bowl where a Principal Bird Deity (Fig.132,b) is in the tree. A monkey is there also. In front is a man (but with no blowgun aimed at the bird) as well as a scorpion. The presence of a scorpion on a Codex Style vase showing a blowgun being aimed at a perching Principal Bird Deity (R+H 1982:Vessel 109, p.83) suggests that the scorpion on the basal flange painting is a visual clue that in fact a blowgun episode is intended; the artist is showing a pre-shooting moment.

96. All page references are to the Edmonson translation in English, MARI.

Vuqub Kaqix (7 Parrot) being the one who was shot (p.36)⁹⁶ Since the Principal Bird Deity on the Blom Plate and on the Rio Azul double-chambered cylindrical tripod (where also a bird is being shot by a blowgun hunter) is a raptorial species and not a parrot, I have wondered how can the 7 Parrot or 7 Macaw name be appropriate. The answer to this enigma comes from further into the Popol Vuh, in an entirely different episode. The less known Popol Vuh blowgun instance -- and with a bird other than Vuqub Kaqix -- has not been cited in reference to the Blom Plate or similar scenes. I describe this overlooked Popol Vuh episode in the chapter on Principal Bird Deities.

On the Rio Azul double tripod sidewall is a Curl Formed Monster. This monster is a denizen of the Surface of the Underwaterworld and indeed is formed out of re-combined segments of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Hellmuth 1982/84). A possible atelier mate of the Rio Azul double tripod, the Boston (single chambered) Tripod (Thomson 1971:No.66) has an abbreviation of the Surface of the Underwaterworld around its top (double yoke alternating with encircled curl). The Denver Bowl (Fig.48) demonstrates that the Curl Formed Monster's habitat is immersed in the Surface of the Underwaterworld. The blowgun hunter is related to the Surface of the Underwaterworld by analogy with other scenes. Likewise, the Principal Bird Deity itself can appear directly in the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Hellmuth 1985a:front cover and frontispiece).

The Blom Plate reiterates that one proper environment for the Headband Partners is in association with the Surface of the Underwaterworld and Anemone Headdress Monsters. This association can be used as analogy to document again that the two personages on the Lost Incised Vase are possibly an early form of the Headband Partners.

The Lost Vessel is a key transition piece, as it shows the probable Headband Partners fully within the Surface of the Underwaterworld and in direct association with two Anemone Headdress monsters, who are prime indicators of the presence of the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Next, the Tikal Burial 160 vessel presents the Surface of the Underwaterworld scene with more humanoids than any other yet found.

Humanoids on the Tikal Burial 160 Painting

University of Pennsylvania excavators found a stuccoed-and-painted bowl fragment in Burial 160 which shows several Sea Anemone Headdress Monsters, a long Surface of the Underwaterworld band, and a host of mythical inhabitants (Figs.105,a). Although excavated in the 1960's, the scene was not fully analyzed until Coggins' 1975 Ph.D. dissertation. She says of the humanoid characters on this painting:

The first remaining figure on the left has sun-deity eyes, a moustache and forehead plaque with a u-element on it. He raises his left hand, as if to catch the drops coming from the sky....

In Post Classic times the Maya conceived of the earth, and their world, as being divided into four horizontal quarters and directions. This was also believed to be true of the sky and the Underworld. Subsidiary forms of deities, or their spirits, reigned over each quarter, thus there would be rain spirits associated with each cardinal direction....

The next two figures, which have red skin and wear jade bracelets, as do all but one of the figures on the frieze, are alike in their identifying features. Both wear tied armbands, have curling fillets at the corners of their mouths and nose beads and earplugs with a star-shaped design, and trefoil element below. They both also have glyphs on top of their heads. These consist of Cauac (?), an affix, and what may be a Ben Ich above. One figure looks upward and brandishes a fish that may be the mythological Xoc, which is commonly associated with funerary inscriptions. The facing figure gestures with one hand and points toward the sky with the other....

The next figure (G) is like the first, with the addition of a beaded emblematic element at the top of the forehead plaque. The figure holds a snake looped in his hand.... Inside the loop of the serpent's body there is an Akbal glyph.... The snake's tail curls to the mouth of figure G while its head is held in the hand of the next figure. This is the only figure in the frieze which represents a human, instead of a supernatural being.... Behind the human figure there is another night sun deity with a headband, a hook-eye, and a 9 Ben Ich "Cauac" atop his head.... The last remaining figure is another head band deity, without glyphic emblem. Below his limp upraised left hand there is a beaded headdress finial, like that worn by the snake-holding deity and belonging to the next figure which is lost. below it there is a "serpent wing." This is a bird wing with the upper jaw.... (Coggins 1975,1:224-228)

Knowledge of full figure, anthropomorphic deities or spirits of the Early Classic was limited in 1975. Also, several popular misconceptions were present, namely that any fish is a "mythical Xoc", too free use of Thompson's "night sun" terms, and a continuation of the Seler-Spinden-Thompson idea that rectangular eyeballs were "crossed eyes" (crossed vision, not cross-shaped) and hence characteristic of the Sun God. Today the rectangular eye is recognized as merely one of two major "god" eyes (Quirarte 1978; Termer 1959). Although this nomenclature is present in the literature, neither eye shape nor spots on the body has yet been systematically proven to bestow divinity. Ironically, Coggins does not say that the face with "sun god eyes" is the sun god, rather for her this is a rain deity. No demonstration, though, has been advanced that the stacks are rain.

The following re-investigation of these Tikal characters takes into account that full figure renditions of these gods are still practically unknown for the Early Classic. For Tzakol comparisons only face forms of deities as hieroglyphs (bodiless) are available. Virtually all identification for this vase's humanoids must be by analogy with Late Classic scenes. The present knowledge is so fragile that the discovery of a single additional Tzakol period multi-person scene could change all

this.

Coggins adequately describes the fully human figure (H) because without a headdress, with the pectoral effaced and no belt medallion visible, it is impossible to identify him specifically at present. He could be a dead noble introduced into the scene. A human in the company of headband characters could also be the Principal Young Lord, but without his diagnostic headdress or double dome forehead this personage can not certainly be placed in this Tikal scene. He is present only once on Tzakol pottery found so far (Hellmuth 1985a).

The Headbanded Characters on the Tikal Bowl

Coe had published his discovery of the Headband Gods, and had specifically indicated that a pair, or twins, existed, two years before Coggins' dissertation (M.Coe 1973:Grolier No.37). Headbanded characters are sufficiently rare that the presence of that band alone is usually sufficient to pin down the identity of a character. There is still another overlooked Early Classic example for comparison, at Kaminaljuyu, part of the traditional corpus since 1946 (KJS:Fig.205,c) (Fig.103). This lone Esperanza⁹⁷ headbanded representative has not been cited in other discussions of the Headband Gods. Tzakol iconography has never been as fully studied as has that of the Tepeu period with its richly decorated polychromes. The Kaminaljuyu attendant even has the large spots that potentially distinguish him as the Spotted Partner (Numeral Nine with feline pelage patches would be his partner). Headband use in the Early Classic has not yet been cataloged, such as on the Tikal black cache vessel (W.Coe 1965:30; Kubler 1969:Fig.53). It is not yet

97. Highland ceramic phase approximately equivalent to Tzakol 3 of Peten.

known whether a headband alone cannot always certify a Headband "God" unless the correct clues are present: body patches, large spots, a God D nearby, or a Principal Young Lord nearby.

The Tikal Burial 160 headbanded faces lack bodies, so we have no way of seeing whether they had small dots enclosed in jaguar hide with stretch tab pattern or in scalloped pattern (either one acceptable for Numeral Nine), or whether they had large, isolated black spots on their limbs (indicative of the Spotted Attendant). The final possibility would be a repetition of one basic body type with only props to distinguish which partner was intended, as with the blowgun twins on the Blom Plate. So far, no other representation, Early or Late Classic, highland or lowland, has the Cauac glyph on top. It is theoretically possible that this glyph alters the personality of the headbanded youth, since the mouth curl or barbel (depending on whether it comes from inside or alongside the mouth; tiny reproduction scale of the published drawing does not allow the distinction to be made) is not typical of the Headband Gods as we know them from Late Classic ceramics.

Similarly unexpected for a headband character is the pattern of regularly spaced small black dots closely surrounding the mouth. More typical would be a triangle of circlets on the cheek (also used on unrelated cache vessel characters), fewer and larger black dots (indicator of the Spotted Partner), or pelage pattern of black dots but bounded with stretch tab outline around the mouth. Finally, the Headband Partners tend to have idealized young lord faces rather than the "god" faces of the Tikal scene. With all this tradition against the faces being of normal headband gods, I would classify these characters as provisionally unidentified until additional figural scenes from the Early Classic become available. Proper Early Classic Headband partners are visible on Yaxchilan Lintel 48 (Fig.99,a-b).

Tikal Personages A, G, and L

Personages A and G have the same almost Roman-nosed, crossed-eye face. Coggins is correct that tradition ascribes these faces to gods. Whether this divinity could be maintained under closer scrutiny is untested. The characters certainly appear supernatural since the entire environmental setting is unreal and almost certainly an area entered during life after death and in the meantime inhabited by monsters and spirits. Personage L, an incomplete individual, has the same headdress as does G. Personage A lacks this yax suprafix but the absence is most likely due to lack of space -- G and L must bend over to show theirs. Coggins correctly pointed out that this shape occurs as a glyph in the Tikal Burial 48 tomb murals. The same form is a favored headdress in Tzakol times (Figs.105; 107; 108), on a Burial 48 monster (W.Coe 1965:28), and especially of the Principal Bird Deity, for example the winged bird dancers of Kaminaljuyu (Fig.124) and God D (Fig.125). On the Deletaille Tripod the headdress decoration mimics a bird's beak. Epigraphers consistently read it as Yax (Lounsbury personal communication 1985; Schele, personal communication, 1984), as well as "first," "prime," "blue," or "green."

A and G cannot be identified by context because no comparable scene has a human except the Lost Incised Vase or the Gann Bowl of 100 or 200 years later. A comparative study of associations will not help either because only a single Tzakol scene has a Figure G-like personage -- a shell disk (Fig.106). Akbal jugs are known from Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2 Dance after Decapitation scenes and an important Tepeu 1 bowl shows snakes coming out of a jar held by the Headband Partners (Fig.101), but on the Tikal painting it is not the headband personage

holding the snake-Akbal jug (Hellmuth 1983:Fig.1). This impasse is what drives me to seek, photograph and study unknown Maya pottery in private collections because the answers are waiting on another artifact somewhere.

The serpent face-wing near Figure L suggests the presence of a missing personality further over, an enigma to be discussed in the following chapter. The forehead area (it is not actually a headdress, it is a replacement of the forehead) of L consists of three layers: on the bottom is a comb-U-comb set of affixes, next is a stylized oOo vertebra set, on top is a finial with a bead. Just over this wing is the rest of the headdress as worn by G, so G may have the potential to enter a winged state. G and L have the same headdress. G and A have the same face and comparable forehead affixes (the same affixes as L, but we do not see his face). The possibility thus exists that A, G, and L were the same face type, and that originally there were four. The scene on the preserved fragment is clearly incomplete.

Tikal A and G's face is a stock, blank, generalized "deity" face. By adding forehead units or facial adornments the personality is changed. The same situation holds for the series of elderly deities, God D, God L, and God N (though A and G are clearly not of this family, but of the Sun God family). There are situations when God L and God N are completely identical in body and face and differentiable only by headdress, attendants, or props (Hellmuth in press B). Here at Tikal the same difficulty appears for figures A and G, except that all the hints are lacking that would allow differentiating them. Most likely A and G are identical, just as E, I and K are triplets. With only one full-bodied rendition of figures A and G existing elsewhere in either the traditional corpus or in private collections, no one has yet noticed this personality or given him a name. In the interim the

face can be studied from hieroglyphic portraits, one of which has been readily available since 1955 but not cited.

The Tikal face A may be the same as glyph J1 on a blackware pedestal base bowl from Uaxactun (RS:Fig.8,g and h; Yomiuri 1977:No.69). The same face appears on a comparable blackware bowl in the Pearlman Collection, glyph F1 (Coe 1982:Pearlman No.32). Coe's comment, "since comparable texts are not present at Uaxactun" (p. 68) can be amended in the case of this glyph. Pearlman glyph F1 is also the same as on two more or less contemporary slate mirror backings traded in pre-Columbian times from Peten to Costa Rica (Stone 1964:Fig.2; Stone 1977:Fig.84). Also, Uaxactun glyph G1 shares features with Pearlman glyph H1 (latter has cross-hachured face).

Lin Crocker's detailed line drawings have salvaged Tzakol period inscriptions that discuss the same historical individuals and mythical patrons as does Pearlman No.32, so it is possible to expand Coe's analysis. When three texts (Pearlman, tripod, Crocker lid, Fig.105) are placed together their similarity is self-evident. The lid text is essentially a precis of the sidewall text and both together are an elaboration of the long Pearlman text. Rather than digress into Tzakol dynastic inscriptions, here the subject is the glyph's iconography and its relation to Tikal and Uaxactun artwork. The Crocker tripod drawing shows a Tikal related "god face" at B3 and D1; the lid has this glyph just before the bird. The bird's beak is the same as the headdress Yax finial. Is this finial a dried bird's beak or a wooden or cloth model? Several Peten birds have bumps one third of the way down their beak, yet this form has traditionally been read as yax.⁹⁸ By the Late

98. Lounsbury, personal communication; Schele, personal communication.

Classic at Palenque it had been conflated with a cross section of a conch shell for both the bird and for God D. Birds are common in Early Classic symbolism. Birds were buried in the tombs of the lords of Kaminaljuyu and of Tikal during this time period. On the Crocker lid drawing the comb-U-comb affix is in front of the face rather than on top (perfectly acceptable change in glyphic writing). The U appears to be replaced by a simple shape. An irregular barbel is visible. These glyphic heads are certainly similar to the heads of A and G on the Tikal painting.

Another hieroglyphic text, published since 1976 (Banque 1976:No.194) shares the "deity face" study glyph with the Pearlman bowl, the Uaxactun tripod, and the Crocker drawings (Fig.105). A face similar to the "Tikal god face" is a glyph on the side panel. The lid handle of this tripod shows the same stocky god face but with a completely different headdress (the Lily Pad Headdress in simplified form). The mouth of the face on the lid handle is treated with the mouth curl or barbel (it is hard to tell which is mouth and which is sunken cheek). On the lid inscription the headdress on the glyph lacks the postfix and a Kin sun/day sign occurs on the side. How the Kin changes the meaning is not yet known.⁹⁹ Both texts deal with the same subject, because they share many glyphs. Schele has pointed out a comparable situation in Palenque inscriptions -- repetitious rephrasing of essentially the same statement several times in an inscription.

The difficulty of giving an acceptable name to Personage A of the Tikal rollout is that the distinguishing features of a rectangular god eye and three part forehead replacement are all just stock body parts. Essentially the identical

99. These may all be personified Kins, some with, some omitting, the actual Kin infix on the cheek.

headdress is worn by a totally different individual (a monster) on a Uaxactun plaque (Fig.105,b). Underneath all his costume, "Curl Snout," overhead on Tikal Stela 31, has the central U-element (Fig.105,f). Even a Principal Bird Deity has the same forehead replacement (Fig.107,b). In the hieroglyphic texts, some of the faces have a Kin infix on their cheek (and thus are presumably related to a Kin personality) whereas otherwise identical faces do not. Outside the Rio Azul Tomb 1 murals (Fig.163) the Surface of the Underwaterworld is not otherwise, yet, a known locus for the Sun God, despite the Austin Tetrapod (Fig.36-37). In a personal communication Coe suggests the Austin boatman might be the paddler whose glyph is Kin (thereby the one who is usually aged and with perforator through his nose; his companion in that more usual guise is the J.G.U.-related Akbal paddler (Figs.177; 188,b)).

One final example of this generic god face glyph is on a little bowl photographed more than a decade ago (D.O.269-Neg.10). The inscription is comparable to that of the Uaxactun, Pearlman, and all the Crocker drawings. While an acceptable name is not yet available for this glyph, iconography has at least shown the personage on the Tikal bowl to be similar to a face glyph found on contemporary inscriptions both on ceramics and stelae. Additional examples on Peten stelae of the same period show that whether a title or a personal name (or simultaneously both), this entity was widely known and pictured during the Early Classic. The Tikal painting is at present the only rendering of the face together with a body and located within an interactive setting. For the serpent face-wing near the enigmatic Tikal Bu. 160 stucco painted personages much more comparative data are available.

Chapter 5

SERPENT FACE-WING AND THE PRINCIPAL BIRD DEITY

Serpent Face-Wing on the Tikal Painting

The Tikal Burial 160 painted bowl fragment shows an isolated serpent face-wing in the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Figs.109,a). This same wing is simultaneously a profile serpent face. The feathers double as teeth. The wing bone structure doubles as the snout and structure of the serpent monster face. These wings are detachable and can be worn as costume. The serpent face-wing has been the subject of major articles by Quirarte, Bardawil, and most recently by Parsons (Quirarte 1973; Bardawil 1976; Parsons 1983). Coggins is well aware of the serpent face-wing at Tikal (Coggins 1975,I:228). Evidence from previously unpublished pottery in private collections suggests that several related creatures may wear the wing. This paper will first describe the serpent face-wing by itself, since it is essential to recognize this accessory before we can recognize the Principal Bird Deity.

Serpent Face-Wing on Bird-Swallowing-Fish Lids

A major context for serpent face-wings is on pottery vessel lids that are modeled to represent a water bird swallowing a fish (Figs.11; 118-120). The wings may be incised (gouged, grooved, scraped) or rendered in raised relief (Fig.34). An example in raised relief is in the Brooklyn Art Museum (MAYA 1985:No.26). These vessels tend to have four peccary heads as supports. Examining the bird wings, the

first step is to determine whether the serpent face is to be read rightside up (relative to its position as the bird's wing) or upside down, whereby the drawing must be inverted to help recognize the reptile face features worked into the wing structure. Some serpent face-wings are more naturalistic than other, more stylized versions. Some include all possible monster parts and adornments, while others are abbreviated to the bare essentials.

The San Francisco (de Young Museum) serpent face-wing is bi-directional, that is, two creatures can be visualized, each one facing in a different direction (Fig.119,b). As a wing it faces right, towards the back of the lid handle bird. This direction is recognizable on the basis of the prominent shark tooth. Such a tooth is often in the front center of the mouth. This particular monster has a tau-shaped tooth, a rounded tooth, saw teeth, and a curl at the "back." The projecting feather mass doubles as additional fangs. The creature's eye is a curl; the supraorbital plate a trough. The creature has two snouts formed by long feathers or wing structure. The upper one has a curl nose (missing the expected nose tubes or beads).

At the rear of the face the back of the mouth turns into a vestigial lower jaw. It has ticks to indicate gum scale. The overall latch form can also double as the beak of a visage facing left. A spare curl serves as the beak's nostril. Even though the overall entity is a serpent face-wing, it has a subtle partial pun as the Principal Bird Deity himself -- a creature who will be discussed in the next section. Curls and step teeth can also decorate the Surface of the Underwaterworld so an interconnection exists. A simplified but essentially comparable double-facing serpent face-wing with a latch beak at the back is painted on a New Orleans Art Museum lid (Fig.119,a).

A similar monster is on a peccary supported tetrapod (Fig.88). In this case, the face does not appear within a wing and is not associated with a modeled bird. This monster's latch beak faces in the same direction as the monster's snout and doubles as a front fang. Such curled front fangs that double as a latch beak pun are on Curl Formed Monsters.

The Maya emphasize that the serpent face-wings may be associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld on one bird-swallowing-fish bowl (Fig.39,a). Virtually all water birds that serve as lid handles on Tzakol basal flange and tetrapod bowls have serpent face-wings (parrots and other tree species may also wear this wing). But on the blackware basal flange vessel under discussion the actual Surface of the Underwaterworld is personified on the sidewall (Fig.11,b). On one other vessel a continuous yoke borders the circumference of the lid indicating that the inner contents are within the Underwaterworld. All these lid birds swallow fish. Fish naturally occur in water. Further documentation that the bird's mythical habitat is the Surface of the Underwaterworld is found on a rare white toned polychrome sidewall (Fig.47).

The birds themselves are certainly not the Principal Bird Deity (that deity is raptorial and has a latch shaped beak). These lid birds are cormorants, duck-like mixtures, or other composites. The beak is usually too short and wide for that of a heron. In only three known cases is a lid handle a Principal Bird Deity: the double tripod in the Metropolitan Museum, Rockefeller Collection (Fig.133,b), the Rio Azul double tripod, and a basal flange bowl lid in the Bowers Museum (Fig.142) -- and he never holds a fish in his mouth.

A second visual demonstration that the bird-swallowing-fish motif during the

Early Classic is conceptualized as taking place within, or even under, the mythical watery area is found on a large orange profile-carved cache vessel/incensario (Fig.20,b). The bird-swallowing-fish on this vessel is the organic extension of the Quadripartite Badge headdress.¹⁰⁰ Rows of water dots in front of the headdress indicate that everything is taking place in water. All this is depicted on top of a possible GI head. Chapter 3 has already established that GI's habitat includes the Surface of the Underwaterworld. The standard Early Classic headdress for GI and GI-impersonators is a bird-swallowing-fish Quadripartite Badge. Even Tikal Stela 2's dynastic portrait has the ruler in this guise.¹⁰¹ These water environments for the serpent face-wing elsewhere explain the wing's presence in the Tikal bowl water band.

Of the Tikal bowl wing Coggins writes: "serpent wing." This is a bird wing with the upper jaw of the Celestial Serpent upon it" (Coggins 1975,I:228). She cites the Kaminaljuyu report, where in that early era (1946) the serpent face-wing was lumped into the concoction, Serpent X. But is the Tikal serpent really "Celestial?" In light of these watery relationships for the serpent face-wing, an alternative opinion might be proposed. **Kan** means snake in Mayan, and **ka'an** means sky, thus setting up a pun as well as ambiguity.¹⁰² The Maya show serpents with fish fins, shark and crocodile dentition, etc., hardly celestial imagery. While Maya serpents do in fact float in the sky (Coe 1982:Pearlman No.58, character 3; R+H 1982:p.34,

100. In this assemblage the bird is not necessarily a personification of the badge. The bird is simply conflated onto the badge.

101. Hellmuth 1982a. Tikal Stela 1 did also, but the headdress is partially broken off.

102. Schele 1980, personal communication in reference to the Belgian Tripod serpents.

Vessel 55), they are more often fish than fowl, and even when composite reptiles are avian, they are often nestled in the Underworld swamp as is the Curl Formed Monster which has a snout that mimics that of the Principal Bird Deity. More likely the serpent is neither absolutely celestial nor solely underworld.

The Tikal painted serpent face-wing has led to a review of the wing on water birds. Due to the ubiquity of this special wing from Preclassic through Post Classic on a special mythical personality, this next section studies the traditional association of the wing -- on the Principal Bird Deity. After this discussion the isolated wing on the Tikal bowl can be more easily identified.

PRINCIPAL BIRD DEITY

The Principal Bird Deity is a large, mythical, raptorial bird. "Principal Bird Deity" (Bardawil), "Serpent Bird" (Maudslay), and "Serpent Wing Deity" (Parsons) are the same creature in different terms (Bardawil 1976; Maudslay 1889-1902, V:8 and 9; Parsons 1983). Some writers use the popularized name, "Moan" or "Muan Bird." Since the Moan is traditionally considered a mythical, owl-related creature, this word should only be used when an owl is clearly rendered. An owl-like example is the bird on a lintel of Tikal Temple IV. Even in such instances, "Moan Bird" still should be avoided, since this title is as misconstrued in popular writings as Itzamna and Chac. Bardawil's term brings out the supreme importance of this creature. Not only was it the prime avian creature in Maya mythology, it was one of the five principal creatures in Maya mythology and art, in all media, especially sculptures and pottery.

Since Bardawil has adequately reviewed the creature in the traditional corpus, and as Quirarte, Parsons, and Norman have shown examples of this creature in the Pre- and Proto-Classic sculpture,¹⁰³ this section features the Principal Bird Deity in the Early Classic and as it is related to the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Norman 1976). Late Classic specimens are pertinent here for two reasons: first,

103. Several Kaminaljuyu sculptures (including but not only, Zoomorphic Altar 12 and Monument 42) that have been given the traditional attribution as "feline" or zoomorphic may in fact be variants of a fat-snouted bird monster. The "ropes" held in their mouth (Monument 42, and for Palo Gordo, Piedra Santa (Parsons 1981:figs. 17 and 18) may mimic the twisted snake.

several Tepeu I renderings of the Principal Bird Deity are clearly in an Early Classic style and content, and second, in the Late Classic interesting theological and zoological additions and subtractions take place to the Principal Bird Deity assemblage. Whether these different bird monsters are four world directional variants of a quadruplicate deity (like our Trinity but in four parts as typical for Mesoamerica), or merely a sharing of the wing in an adjectival sense is not yet known. Bardawil suggests an Underworld/death variant (the Moan/owl) and a serpent faced variant (Bardawil 1976:204-206) But he wrote his article before the portraits on pottery were available to study. Other research has been on the creature in his pre-Maya form (at Izapa, at Kaminaljuyu, or even earlier, among the Olmec). Not only is the bird a major and popular creature, he is perhaps as old as Mesoamerica.

This bird monster is absent in the Post Classic Dresden codex, but present in the Paris codex, page 4 (Fig.192,a-b). The Principal Bird Deity is above all a patron of the netherworld and of the ruling dynasty. Since the preserved codices are in part astronomical, they do not have as much of the dynastic portraiture or specific funerary imagery that would be likely to include the Principal Bird Deity.

The Early Classic Principal Bird Deity

Bardawil had no Tzakol period depictions of the Principal Bird Deity to work a decade ago. He had only the Preclassic-Protoclassic Izapa birdmen, the Kaminaljuyu painted birdmen of the Esperanza period¹⁰⁴ and the Late Classic

104. The highland temporal equivalent to the lowland Tzakol.

105. Ian Graham suggests (personal communication) that the single "l" spelling is more accurate than Gann's "Yalloch."

Copan, Quirigua, and Palenque specimens. He did not include the examples on Holmul-Yaloch¹⁰⁵ dancer vases.¹⁰⁶ Photography in private collections in this intervening decade has made it possible to salvage a record of two Early Classic Tiquisate area Escuintla (Pacific plain) Principal Bird Deities as well as at least five Peten examples. In Escuintla these birds are Mayoid in rendition, not Teotihuacanoid (Fig.118). A Veracruz region, Rio Blanco style, mold impressed bowl in a private collection has a bird with serpent face-wing (Hellmuth Photo Archive). This same bowl shares features with mold made Tiquisate tripods. Ian Graham and Merle Greene Robertson have salvaged a record of the seldom cited Tres Islas stela that pictures an early Principal Bird Deity in its Izapa derived position in the heavens dominating the scene from above (Ian Graham archive, Peabody Museum, Harvard University; Greene, Rands and J.Graham 1972:p.208,Pl.97). The outstretched wings emphasize the expression of raptorial strength. This impressive image is found on several vessels; Early Classic Peten potters excelled in rendering the Principal Bird Deity in blackware.

One basal flange bowl lid pictures a Principal Bird Deity neatly arranged across the lid (Fig.128).¹⁰⁷ His serpent face-wings are rendered in modeled detail. One wing has an Akbal-like infix signifying night or darkness; his other wing has a kin glyph, sun and light (Figs.128). The bird holds a twisted snake in its mouth

106. Bardawil was a medical student at the time he wrote this seminar paper; he did not continue this Maya avocation.

107. In the center is a spindly limbed personage. Aged, emaciated God N is the only known individual in Maya mythology to have such thin arms and legs. The Placeres stucco relief (Fig.182,a) and a Tepeu 1 bowl (R+H 1982:Fig.32) both reveal the spindly guise of God N. Interestingly, in both of these God N scenes a "pyramid" step design is present nearby.

(Fig.133,a). The snake is a double-headed creature, with a recurved snout -- a potential Zip Monster.¹⁰⁸ This Recurved Snout Monster has a shark's fang, an Ahau-step tooth (out front), and Ahau-step earring pendant, and in general shares accessories with inhabitants of and adornments on the Surface of the Underwaterworld.

Characteristics of the Tzakol Principal Bird Deity

1,a. BEAK is slightly recurved, hooked in what I nickname a latch or bottle opener shape. The beak is generally of the same thickness right up to the blunt end, rather than tapering to a point as in a rare instance (Coe 1978:Princeton No.18). The beak may be angular rather than naturalistic. A lower "jaw" is present and usually is not at all beak-like, but instead jaw-like. As typical with Maya art, every conceivable variation and exception to the rule exists.

1,b. BEAK IN FRONT VIEW. Schele has warned that in order to understand Maya creatures writers must teach themselves to recognize the creations in both front view and profile view (Schele 1976/79). The Tzakol rendering of the Principal Bird Deity snout in front view is best illustrated by first examining three-dimensional specimens from the front (Fig.140; 142,b; 143). These are readily identifiable as Principal Bird Deities. Then estimate how such a snout would likely be rendered in profile view, remembering it is not pointed as a real bird's beak. This is a composite monster, not an actual bird. In summery for 1,a and 1,b, The beak may be BLUNT AND SQUARED in side view, FAT OR WIDE in front view.

108. A dozen black, gouged Peten cylindrical tripods show the abbreviated head of the same Recurved Snout Monster, a relative of the Curl Formed Monster (Hellmuth 1982/84).

2. NOSTRIL and NOSEBEADS. In those cases where a nostril opening is present it rises from the beak near its juncture with the face or mid-way along the beak. Such a nostril is usually a standardized, species-interchangeable curl (that is, a stock Tzakol nose used on all kinds of different creatures). The nose may have nose tubes, best known for reptile monsters. Nose tubes are generally adorned at the end by a bead. Nose tubes come in a set of two, though in a profile view only one may be rendered by the artist.

3. DENTITION varies from none, to a curl-ball-curl assemblage or variant. No one kind of dentition seems standardized for the Principal Bird Deity. Most of the teeth sported by these monsters are also found on other contemporaneous beasts, especially on the Curl Formed Monster. Of course sharing between the bird and the Curl Formed Monster may be expected since the latter reptile monster often has a large curl in its mouth that doubles as, or puns, the latch beak of a Principal Bird Deity.

4. MOUTH CURL. When worn by a bird, I do not interpret this as a fish barbel. It would be necessary to review all Preclassic monsters to see what the model may have been then, since the bird and reptile composites of Tzakol Peten are derived from Kaminaljuyu prototypes which in turn are derived from the piedmont which in turn have a long history. The Tzakol Maya artist may well have had little idea of the evolutionary history behind the features he was rendering. He followed a model handed down from the earlier generation, altered only enough to suit changing cultural situations.

5. HEADDRESS "FINIAL." The Kaminaljuyu vessel, the Kerr bird, the Palenque bone, the Duke cache bowl, the repainted basal flange bowl, and examples in

private collections all have a jewel sticking up from their heads (Figs.107-109; 124). It is marked with a "nen" infix, occurs on the Tikal Burial 48 murals, and is traditionally read as yax (blue-green or precious). Tzakol period finials look like bird beaks. In the Late Classic they become more curved and have more than one bump. In this shape they mimic the cross-section of a conch shell. The finial obviously had special meaning to the Early Classic Maya. The finial is so often atop the Tzakol-Esperanza Principal Bird Deities that it is almost their trademark after their beak, but other personages could wear the finial also, notably God D (Figs.107,d; 108).

6. HEADDRESS AFFIX SET. The Kerr Collection orange bowl presents a Tzakol Principal Bird deity with an elongated bone-Ahau and circle with spiral radial lines in its headdress. The Kerr carved bowl also has a "crab claw" decoration on top of the earring, something unique to this interesting presentation (Fig.74). The Uaxactun clay plaque (Fig.105,b) has a headdress affix set which includes a ticked side affix, a larger central affix, then usually a repeated ticked side affix or a curl. The bird's affix set can be compared with those on the Tikal humanoids of the Burial 160 fragmentary painting. This affix assemblage is not by any means limited to the Principal Bird Deity but may be worn by Sun God-like faces.

7. "HORNS" are thick feather-like forms projecting from the top corners of the head (above the earring). Such horns are most noticeable on the black grave lot lid (Fig.127; 128; 143) and continue being used on occasion into the Late Classic, as on the Tikal, Temple IV, Lintel 3. Owls and other birds have head tufts which could have served as a natural model. It is the "horns" that suggest the lid handle face of Fig.143,c is related to the Principal Bird Deity. This is an unlikely

parrot or macaw, and thus an unconvincing 7 Parrot of Popol Vuh fame.

8. RECTANGULAR GOD EYE is one of the two most common god eyes. The Sun God uses the identical eye. So far students have not worked out the actual meaning of the eye form and markings, nor the rules determining when one eye is used and when the other is not. Quirarte has made an interesting suggestion that may work in those situations he discussed, but his model has yet to be applied in situations which have come to light in the last decade (Quirarte 1978).¹⁰⁹ Some bird monsters have a curl eye, a human-like eye, or other eye types.

9. BEARD is a common but not universal feature of the Tzakol Principal Bird Deity. The beard usually has three sets of beads (Fig.131,a). Such beards are typical of the Early Classic in general and are not diagnostic of any one god or monster.

10. DOUBLE YOKE NECKLACE/PENDANT hung from large round or oval beads may be worn. A second, trough-shaped necklace with diagonal "nen" marking may also be present, or the two pendants may be conflated. Not enough full figure renderings of the rest of the contemporaneous pantheon are available to know whether other personalities also share one or both of these necklace pendant shapes.¹¹⁰ On the grave lot of three blackware basal flange bowls, the complete Principal Bird Deity and the conflated fish-monster creature both wear essentially

109. I have found about five additional (unpublished) examples that conform to his model, but an equal or greater number that do not.

110. On the Tikal Burial 48 tripod with birds singing on either side of a cave entrance cartouche, the curl formed creature inside wears a double yoke necklace.

111. The beads on the bird's necklace are decorative and do not distract from the direct relationship between the fish and the full bird.

identical double yoke necklaces.¹¹¹

11. It may have Kin INFIX IN ONE WING and Akbal infix in the other (Figs.114).

12. The bird may carry a SNAKE IN ITS BEAK; often the snake has two identical heads.

With fewer than a dozen specimens of the Tzakol-Esperanza Principal Bird Deity to work with, no list of features will be complete or take into consideration all potential exceptions. Bird iconography has, though, advanced considerably since the 1970's, as then scholars had only the Kaminaljuyu and the Zaculeu portrayals for an Early Classic corpus.

The bird is created out of stock parts, interchangeable with the contemporaneous "pantheon." Proskouriakoff has suggested that such combinations of stock features cannot be gods (Proskouriakoff 1978). But combination of stock features is the Tzakol Maya/manner of portraiture, whether god or man.

The Principal Bird Deity in Front View

Most extant Preclassic and Early Classic renditions of the Principal Bird Deity picture it in side view. The profile beak facilitates recognition. Four three-dimensional portraits (Fig.140; 141; 142) the unillustrated double tripod lid, a polychrome ceramic rendition of the Principal Bird Deity,¹¹² two rare raised reliefs (Fig.128), and a seldom discussed container of the May Collection in the St. Louis

112. Private collection, Europe, an effigy bowl which has not yet been photographed.

Art Museum (Parsons 1980:No.292), allow learning about the monster's front view form. An early carved shell section (Fig.145) is a possible related face. On the seashell it was not possible to show the snout sticking out in the form of a beak. The same problem occurs on the Altun Ha jade head.

These frontal representations make it clear that the Principal Bird Deity's appearance is different in front view than in the usual side view. In side view the avian nature of the beak is clearly visible (even on the Tikal Structure 5D-33-3rd stucco masks). In front view the beak is flattened into a wide snout because a longer beak sticking out would break off. Recognition that this wide snout is actually a beak suggests that the traditional identifications of a Tikal North Acropolis stucco mask and the Altun Ha jade "Sun God" head can be modified.

Tourists visiting Tikal have been told that the stucco mask on the buried terrace of Str.5D-33 is Chac -- the long nosed rain god.¹¹³ A comparison of the North Acropolis snout -- in both its front view and side view -- with other snouts, may necessitate revising the popular misnomer (Fig.147).

Elsewhere at Tikal, the frontal feline-like face on Tikal Altar 19 (Fig.147,b) shares with Principal Bird Deities on pottery the headdress, wide snout and the nearby associations of a two-headed recurved snout snake. Such a snake is clearly the prey of the Principal Bird Deity. Neither Joyce Bailey, Flora Clancy, nor Christopher Jones used pottery consistently as comparative material in their writings on the monuments of Tikal; they limited their discussion to traditional stone monuments but Jones helps with a date for the Altar 19 imagery, 8.18.0.0.0

113. The same visitors are again misled with the equally erroneous Chac label for the turquoise God K idols in the Tikal museum.

to 9.0.0.0.0, which corresponds to Tzakol 2. Independently Robert Smith dated black basal flange bowls to this same time period.

The fuller corpus of comparative material also aids in clarifying the identification of two other fat snouted creatures: one on a Uaxactun plaque, the other a jade head from Altun Ha (Fig.146). Both have the eye and beaded beard of the Principal Bird Deity. Neither feature is diagnostic solely of a bird monster, however. The acrobatic monster on the Belgian Tripod also has a thick snout and rectangular eye (and is in a descending posture) but without wings or Yax is not yet acceptable as the Principal Bird Deity (Fig.148,b). Additional comparative examples are needed before the Altun Ha and Uaxactun faces can be positively identified, but in the meantime the Kinich Ahau designation for the former should be quietly rescinded. Pendergast was correct when he wondered why there was no Kin sign on the Altun Ha face.

The Altun Ha jade head is Early Classic in date (Mary Miller, personal communication, 1982). The distinctly Tzakol features are the double yoke under each eye, the previously mentioned rectangular eye, especially the triple beaded beard (each of the three sets is of two beads), and the curl-ball-curl dentition. Also specifically Early Classic on the Altun Ha face is the geometric Ahau-like decoration on the forehead and the beaded sprouts or "hair?" over the otherwise smooth head.¹¹⁴ A sprouting Ahau headdress is found on a jade plaque in an unpublished private collection and occasionally on other Early Classic artifacts. Since I have not photographed private collections in Belize nor worked with Belize

114. A late Tzakol 3 Principal Bird Deity from Peten in the Duke University Art Museum has an Ahau -- as tail joint, from which issue feathers (Fig.131,b).

material elsewhere, I do not know whether these features are typical of this eastern area. One feature though is well understood; the rectangular eye is what caused the Sun God misnomer because Thompson fixed this eye type as an indicator of Ah Kin. One feature alone is usually insufficient to identify a complex mythical personage. It is the overall assemblage and associations that permit educated guesses.

Three or four different Tzakol monsters can have rectangular eyes or curl-ball-curl dentition. The approximately contemporary Uaxactun plaque shares enough features with the Altun Ha jade head to allow comparison, as the face on the plaque also has curl-ball-curl dentition, a rectangular eye, and a mouth curl. Its snout comes down below the upper lip -- perhaps to faintly mimic a latch-shaped beak. The crucial feature of similarity is the bump in the center of the lower lip. This bump is prominently rendered on the Altun Ha face and suggested on the Uaxactun face. Is this an abbreviation of the upcurved lower beak?¹¹⁵ On definite Principal Bird Deities the lower jaw is relatively human with the avian beak aspect being emphasized mostly in the snout/upper lip. To visualize the Uaxactun face fully, the obtrusive pendant that hangs down in front and obscures the actual profile needs to be subtracted from the view (Fig.146). The Uaxactun face has one beaded "sprout" comparable to the set on the Altun Ha. The Uaxactun face has the comb-U-comb affix set sometimes found on the headdress of a bird monster, as on the Becan tripod and on a definite Principal Bird Deity of the Kerr Collection orange bowl (Fig.107,b; 126). It seems that both the Uaxactun plaque and the Altun Ha jadeite share some features with each other and with the

115. Parsons suggests a dragon rather than necessarily an avian creature. Personal communication, 1985.

Principal Bird Deity.

The shell, the Uaxactun plaque, and the Altun Ha jade face show that in front view the snout goes all the way across the mouth. This is the Maya convention for indicating the Principal Bird Deity's latch shaped beak during the Early Classic. The monster's beak is much wider, unlike any real bird beak. The snout alone on the Altun Ha head is enough to suggest an attribution other than solar.¹¹⁶

These analyses reveal a convention of Maya art, that a side photograph of a three-dimensional carving will never be the same as a profile Maya view. In a Maya side view, the features are deliberately re-arranged by the artist to bring in aspects of the front of the face which would aid in its recognition. Thus the side view drawing or photograph of the Belize jadeite head gives only a close resemblance to the Uaxactun face. The Altun Ha face looks less like a Sun God in this new perspective. A previously unpublished carved shell (Fig.145; 146) shows how these fat snouted faces are totally distinct from a real Sun God (who has a Roman, humanoid nose).

A study of the Principal Bird Deity's face provides a second demonstration that the Maya faces are a representation of the front of the head and heads are abbreviated (actually concentrated) representations of the whole entity. The bird monster certainly appears often enough as a full figure to allow recognition when rendered in face form. In fact the black grave lot specimen (Fig.127; 128) shows

116. To confound the Sun God issue a fat snouted animal on the Rio Azul wooden bowl has a Kin infix (Fig.170,a), suggesting the possibility of an animal form of Ah Kin. Schele has already documented that animal forms can co-exist with human (and skeletal and infantile) forms for the Jaguar God of the Underworld (Schele 1979a).

the Principal Bird deity simultaneously as an isolated face and as a full figure. Due to the shape of lid and for compositional emphasis the artist has made the face into one sculpture, the wings another, and the tail a fourth part. No body is ever shown, since there is no need for it. Covering over the wings and tail -- leaving only the face -- presents the/same/image as on a black tripod lid (Fig.133; 140) -- showing only a head. Its eye, headdress, and beard are the same as worn by other Principal Bird Deities. Since the snout has no latch or hook, without wings it is not fully a bird, but it certainly is a facial abbreviation of an important monster immersed in the Surface of the Underwaterworld. On one lid the artist shows the head, wings and tail, so the Snake Bird is present. On another lid the artist shows only the head. The absence of the body is unlikely to mean that the creature is no longer there.

Association of the Bird Deity with the Twisted Snake

One of the responsibilities of the Principal Bird Deity is to hold a thin snake in its jaws (Fig.135-137). The long, cord-like snake (cord and snake are the same word in Mayan) twists just below the mouth. The use of this motif in Late Classic art is directly inherited from Early Classic Peten traditions. On a Tzakol period carved slate mirror back in a private collection is a further example of such a twisted cord-snake held in the jaws of the Principal Bird Deity (Fig.134). A further rendition of the Twisted Snake is on the Principal Bird Deity lid of the blackware grave lot (Fig.127). In this scene the snake is adorned with a recurved snout. An identical monster is on one of the three Ludwig Collection black cache vessels (Bolz 1976:Abb.L and LI) and on Tikal Altar 19 (Fig.147). The iconography of snakes has ramifications in all aspects of Maya cosmology, from metamorphosis to a

physical structure as on the Belgian Tripod.¹¹⁷

The front of Caracol Stela 5 shows that in Belize the tradition of the Principal Bird Deity with twisted snake continued into the Late Classic (Fig.137,a).¹¹⁸ This 9.9.0.0.0 monument (Coffman, Reents, and Stone nd; Beetz and Satterthwaite 1981:27-28) -- like Palenque examples and the Tikal Burial 72 -- was created just a few generations into the late era, when Tzakol traditions were revered and strongly upheld at Caracol and specifically resurrected at Palenque. The bird twisted-cord snake image continues further into the Late Classic on Piedras Negras accession stelae, 11 (eroded), 14, and 25 (Maler 1901:Pl. XX,1; XX,2; XXII) and elsewhere. In these situations the bird perches on a sky band -- far from the Underwaterworld. Since the art of Palenque begins its highest development around A.D. 600, this is only 3-4 generations after Tzakol 3 ended, when Tzakol traditions and Tzakol works of art were still widely known. The Maya did not stop using, appreciating, or creating Tzakol style art precisely in 550 A.D. (or whatever particular transition date is selected by the particular ceramic specialist). The Early Classic style did not end at the same moment all over the Maya realm any more than did Gothic architecture in Europe. A Tikal Burial 72 bowl with the Principal Bird Deity in an Early Classic content (costume) though with slightly Late Classic feathers on a definitely Tepeu 1 bowl shows again how the Principal Bird Deity in particular went through the stela hiatus with

117. Spinden found snakes an important part of Maya art. Currently snake symbolism has become so popularized -- as in the tourist books of Diaz Bolio for Yucatan -- that serpents have not recently been adequately discussed in an academic framework.

118. If the bird were perched atop a cactus plant, then the origin of the Nahuatl and Mexican national symbol would go back to the Maya and Izapa before them.

imperceptible change and even still kept the twisted snake in its mouth (Fig.136,a-b).

The bird deity's catch -- the snake monster -- is a denizen of the netherworld waters and possibly sky also. "Swamp Bird" rather than any celestial title would be an equally appropriate name for the Principal Bird Deity. The association between the bird and the water may be that the sky bird hunts the swamp snake. Future discoveries will provide more information on the actors of this myth episode. Enough data are present -- two sets of independent evidence that both serpent face-wing bird types can operate in or near the netherworld: the fishing water bird and the raptorial Principal Bird Deity.

Unanswered questions remain. Is the Akbal snake on the Tikal rollout a naturalistic rendering of the Principal Bird Deity's eventual prey? Does a Headband partner shoot at the bird monster in order to protect the snake? Akbal snakes are possibly related to Akbal jugs and one wing of the bird has an Akbal-like glyph. On a Tepeu 1 bowl headbanded partners (Fig.101) are certainly associated with Akbal jug snakes. The Akbal relationship to the jug appears in other Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2 scenes (Margaret Young, Yale University seminar paper). Actually, the snake-in-the-mouth of the raptorial bird may relate to a section in the Popol Vuh.

In all lectures and discussions of the relation between the Popol Vuh and Classic Maya art, the episode of the blowgun hunters has always labeled Vuqub Kaqix as being the one who was shot (p.36)¹¹⁹ Since the Principal Bird Deity on

119. Page references are to the Edmonson translation in English.

the Blom Plate and on the Rio Azul double-chambered cylindrical tripod (where also a bird is being shot by a blowgun hunter, Hellmuth 1985a:100) is a raptorial species and not a parrot, the 7 Parrot or 7 Macaw name does not seem appropriate. The answer to this enigma comes from much further into the Popol Vuh, in an entirely different episode.

The key to the identification of the bird which is shot by the young hunter comes from pages 104-107. The second clue comes from a carved shell which shows a bird "holding" a snake; a toad is nearby (Fig.135b) (Mayer 1985). The third clue is that both the birds on the black double cylindrical tripods have snakes coming from their mouths. The Popol Vuh specifically mentions a snake being vomited by the hawk -- and the Blom Plate shows a bird indeed vomiting, though it is inexplicably a secondary, skeletalized water bird doing the actual act. Nonetheless the bird is vomiting, and the hawks in several scenes have snakes clearly in their mouth. The "Mayer Shell" definitely associates the toad directly with this moment. Could it be that the blowgun incidents in Classic Maya art are against Hawk, not 7 Parrot. Is the bird presenting the snake messenger in his mouth? Perhaps royal art was an inappropriate place for the portrayal of actual vomiting; all the Maya viewers would know what the snake was doing in the mouth area. Considering that over 1000 years separate the Early Classic renditions and the Ximenez's transcription of the Popol Vuh there is no reason to anticipate direct equivalency anyway. But the point has been made with the Mayer Shell. Another episode in the Popol Vuh has a parallel in Classic Maya funerary art. Possibly this episode has already been considered in the animation of the Popol Vuh by Patricia Amlin, but the bird was named 7 Parrot in personal communications with all Mayanists who discuss the blowgun scene.

Since the snake appears in the mouth of raptorial birds in the accession motif on Maya stelae it would be of importance to figure out its meaning. Prior to noticing the Popol Vuh relationship, I had worked more on the Zip Monster-Sky Band relationships of the snake, a direction which should not be given up. Coe has pointed out that the Popol Vuh is only a small surviving part of the rich Classic Maya myths. The potential for advancing further into Maya cosmology are limited only by the quantity and quality of study pieces that are available for photography.

Now that serpent face-wings and Principal Bird Deity iconography and associations have been itemized, it is easier to discuss the bodiless serpent face-wing on the fragmentary Surface of the Underwaterworld Tikal bowl rollout.

Disembodied Serpent Face-Wing on the Tikal Fragmentary Bowl

The discussion of supernatural birds arose from the presence of a disembodied serpent face-wing on the Tikal Burial 160 rollout. During the Early Classic by this wing may be worn by:

1. Bird-swallowing-fish.
2. Principal Bird Deity.
3. Virtually any bird in a myth episode.
4. Human transformations of the Principal Bird Deity.
5. God D.
6. Generic character with Comb-U-comb affix headdress.

Possibility 1 may be eliminated because the bird-swallowing-fish with serpent face-wing is normally restricted to lids of basal flange bowls. Quadripartite Badge Birds (swallowing fish) may be underwater, but these birds do not have serpent face-wings. Birds-swallowing-fish do not wear headdresses, especially not the assemblage over the serpent face-wing as on the Tikal painting. It is the Principal

Bird Deity, God D, or humanoid transformations with the bird monster, who wear such headdresses.

A Principal Bird Deity can perch on something rising out of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (on the Blom Plate, Fig.102). The image of Fig.143, bottom (Hellmuth 1985a:front cover) suggests that he can physically be within, alongside, or under the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Possibility 3, another mythical bird, cannot be ruled out, but is unlikely since humanoids are the dominant participants in the particular myth episode of the Tikal bowl. This leaves a God D (possibility 5) or another wing-costumed humanoid -- Comb-U-Comb (6) -- as the most likely the missing wearer of the wing prop. Humans and gods receive wings through biological metamorphosis (possibility 4). The wings may be physically part of the composite creation or worn as a costume accessory. Metamorphosis into avian forms may be the reason behind the serpent face-wing attachment for the missing character on the Tikal bowl. Thus a divine bird or a winged anthropomorphic composite are the best candidates for the missing body on the Tikal Burial 160 bowl. Something like the characters on a Kaminaljuyu painting are plausible (Fig.124).

Principal Bird Deity Transformations

A small, carved brown bowl establishes that mythical characters can conflate with or metamorphose into the Principal Bird Deity by donning his wings and jewelry (Fig.149). On the bowl's three panels is a visual record also of the potential of the serpent face-wing to be attached to more than one mythical character. In one panel a "normal" Principal Bird Deity has a long-snouted visage in place of the usual latch beak. It has no God K display unit or torch through the forehead (in

fact no Palenque type God K-Serpent Bird has yet been found for the Early Classic).

The other two panels show humanoids with the IL tattoo on their cheek. Their personalities have not yet been identified though the winged humanoid on the impressive Proto-Classic Diker Bowl may be related (Fig.116). Whoever these characters are, they have just received the power and means of flight, as does a larva when it metamorphoses into a winged insect. The Maya, though, may have associated wings with far more powerful forces than mere biological metamorphosis. A full grown harpy eagle is an appropriately fierce model for a giant, mythical, raptorial bird. The owl need not be the sole model. The Popol Vuh records how important a variety of bird characters were to the Quiche.

This carved bowl shows that the wings may be worn as costume props for impersonators or as growth structure for mythical characters. Kubler has worked with problems of such addition and subtraction of features at Teotihuacan and recognizes this trait in Maya art. This feature is deeply ingrained in Maya convention and its use in the Maya area of course is independent of its use at Teotihuacan, where in any event the grammar of art is different.

A forerunner to the Peten bowl mythology is found at Izapa, where a "Principal Bird Deity" is a giant costume worn by a human character. The Preclassic Olmec Oxtotitlan Cave murals provide an even earlier prototype (Fig.111). Such an individual is typically termed a "god impersonator" implying that he is completely human and only dons the costume of a god for a particular moment. Certainly instances of this could be found throughout the art of many times and places within Mesoamerica. I would like to add another dimension (for

the Classic Maya), of a god impersonator being sometimes one god impersonating -- or transforming momentarily or metamorphically -- into another god or into a higher or lower state of being. Among the Maya the concept of deity metamorphosis is particularly pertinent with the Jaguar God of the Underworld (a definite inhabitant of the Surface of the Underwaterworld) and of God D (a netherworld overlord of the Headband Partners).

After the brown Tzakol bowl a second set of transformation portraits is a series of Tepeu I bowls that picture winged, jaguar-pawed, sometimes partially skeletalized creations, especially on Red Band Tepeu I vases, such as on Grolier 35 (Fig.151,b), but also on four others not known at that time (Fig.151,a). Coe had good reason to be perplexed by these "grotesque gods" (Coe 1973:Grolier No.35). The whole time there was actually another identical creature, on another Red Band Tepeu I vase even.¹²⁰ On the Mellon Vase the winged monster is enthroned, establishing a high rank for him. On the Grolier 35 vase he carries what Coe correctly identifies as the Jaguar God of the Underworld in a cartouche -- the cartouche is the shape of the cave entrance to the Underworld.

Is it possible that the winged jaguar-like monsters are going to transport the J.G.U. through the Underworld? Vases are only now available which show major personalities of the netherworld that were not in Thompson's schema. They are introduced by Coe but in 1973 there was no way to work them into a model of the pantheon that he had carefully begun to develop, with headband gods, God L, the Jaguar God of the Underworld, Cauac Monster, and the rest. The winged

120. In the Museum of Primitive Art, now transferred to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York and in print at least since 1969 (J.Jones 1969.)

characters were seen, noted, yet not understood since no other examples were widely enough known to show a pattern. Extensive photography in museums and private collections has expanded the comparative corpus -- such as four similar partially skeletalized feline monsters with serpent face-wings on a Tepeu I bowl in the Duke University Art Museum (Hellmuth Photo Archive). On a Late Classic polychrome vase of dynamic complexity are two feline beasts (not skeletalized as on Red Rim style vases) perched high in a tree (Fig.150,a-b) majestically overlooking groups of interacting gods and mythical creatures. New discoveries allow a vision into a world so bizarre that our rules of reality do not provide a ready model. Restrictions of human nature and animal potential are breached in the Maya cosmos. Maya studies have reached where no potsherd will suffice for an answer. Not even grave lot and provenance have provided the kind of data to facilitate breakthroughs.

The traditional corpus actually had an example of feline-avian metamorphosis all along -- Piedras Negras Stela 5, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Here a "Principal Bird Deity" with a clearly distinguishable Jaguar God of the Underworld face and earring occurs nearby a normal Jaguar God of the Underworld (Fig.152). Their faces are identical. Comparable feline spotted-Principal Bird Deities appear on a Codex style vase and on a related plate (Fig.153).¹²¹

The third set of scenes which document potential avian metamorphosis deal with God D. In 1978 I was able to find God D in the Classic period on polychrome

121. Some "Principal Bird Deities" have God K faces. Yet no one ever proposed that these were actually God K. With their wings they were always presumed to be simply a Serpent Bird who happened to share a God K face. Is it not possible that it is a God K who happens to have wings?

funerary vases and bowls, thus breaking the impasse whereby God D of codex appearance was cited as an example of a codex period god not existent in the Classic period. God D can wear a serpent face-wing on his back. In some renditions the wing seems only a prop rather than a functional wing (Fig.125) but two unpublished vases picture God D in the company of actual birds or a bird god (Fig.154). On this Late Classic vase the god-like bird wears a God D headdress and has an aged, human, God D-like face. I tentatively interpret this scene as indicating the death of God D and his apotheosis as a supernatural bird. He receives homage in both his "human" and his avian forms. The relationship of God D with a Principal Bird Deity goes back to the Early Classic, since the same cylindrical tripod which shows a handsome bird god (Fig.131, top) has a God D with feather prop on the other side.

Another vase pictures an emaciated God D resting on a supernaturally floating serpent (Fig.150,a). A naturalistic bird is on either side of him. Underneath are detailed portraits of God D's attendants, most likely the Headband Partners (Personified Numeral Nine on the left, Spotted Attendant on the right). In this remarkable Peten vase painting the elderly God D's face has already begun the transformation into a bird -- notice the beak -- and he wears wings (in this case with no serpent faces; the reptilian imagery is underneath him). Clearly the Principal Bird Deity is a more complicated personality than has been suspected before.

The traditional corpus is weak in transformation scenes, though a Tepeu I dated stuccoed plate from Tikal Burial 195 (Fig.108) shows an aspect of God D-serpent wing composites. This Late Classic personage (wearing a completely Early Classic headdress of finial (partially eroded) over a oOo stylized vertebrae

cross-set) has one serpent face-wing attached to his back and another in front of him acting almost as a support to the bowl with the triple celted head. Another Tepeu I bowl¹²² shows several God D's; detached serpent face wings are elsewhere in this complex scene. A Tepeu I bowl shows two portraits of God D unequivocally with wings -- a complete set of serpent face-wings, one attached to each arm (Fig.154).

Metamorphosis in the Maya sense implies that one creature can acquire traits of another through physical transformation or costume addition. The end product usually retains some physical features and/or costume elements of the original species. In fact the entire body of the original species may be retained, adding during metamorphosis only specific physical changes, either as accessories such as wings, or organic such as ventral scales, or black spots. Metamorphosis may be distinguished from conflation. A conflation is a form of artistic license, an expedient, to show two different glyphs or personifications within a limited space. In a conflation the two different original personalities can still be distinguished through the overlay. The conflated result may not reflect any physical change in either of the original parts.

After metamorphosis -- for the suggested model -- the end product is a single, new species, more than the sum of the two (or more) constituent parts. Since the nature and potential of the basic personalities of the Maya cosmos are not yet fully understood, the metamorphic end products are correspondingly enigmatic. And, true to the Maya habit, exceptions will be present to any rule.

122. Private collection, Canada.

For human dancers, rulers, and other historical individuals on monuments, murals, and ceramics, costume may be used to suggest metamorphosis. Costumed or masked humans (god impersonators) are as useful to study as are actual gods, since Maya cult drama is an expression of Maya religious beliefs.

Maya artists tended to portray the metamorphosing personalities only in certain stages of the process. It is not yet clear how long transformation took, an instant, or a gradual process such as aging, or a periodic process such as a snake shedding its skin or an individual giving birth. The Maya must have seen butterfly and moth larvae getting wings and flying away, but Olmec and Izapa art suggests that the ideas were already codified in supernatural references before the Maya borrowed them. One of these supernatural aspects must be associated with the serpent face-wing on the Tikal Burial 160 bowl.

On this Tikal scene, the potential wearer of the wing is either missing (off the extant fragment), or is figure L. Since personage L on the Tikal bowl is leaning over backwards (as is G, whose headdress is also turned 90 degrees to make it horizontal, because if he stood straight up there would not be space in the restricted composition to show the headdress), if a set of two wings were on his back, one might be placed a little to the left as we see here. Also, even though all other characters are behind the water band, to show something on their back it would have to be placed in front of the water band.

The Tikal Burial 160 humanoids A, G, and L wear the same headdress affixes as a possible Principal Bird Deity face on the Uaxactun plaque, on the avian monster on the Becan tripod and as the Principal Bird Deity on the Kerr Collection carved bowl. The affix headdress raises the question of whether they can

transform into the Principal Bird Deity, or at least into a winged phase. Somebody was wearing a serpent face-wing on the Tikal rollout, and it was not necessarily an actual Principal Bird Deity. Are perhaps A and G pre-wing transformations? Under this hypothetical model, personality A-G has the potential to undergo metamorphosis and turn into a serpent face-winged creature. I do not say this is what happened, I only propose this as a possibility in Maya mythology based on the scenes illustrated in this section.

If the serpent face-wing were not present, it would appear that personage L was a third representation of A-G in the same manner that the headband characters are shown several times. The serpent-sack Akbal may have been the center of the long scene, which means that there was space probably for a fourth Anemone Headdress Monster and a fourth A-G-L character. The wing though complicates the situation unless the myth episode presents a stock facial character in several guises -- including winged, headbanded, etc. In actuality, the enigma of the disembodied serpent face-wing on the Tikal painted fragment can be solved only by finding a contemporary rendering that shows the wings attached to or associated with a figural character of the A-G-L family face type. The shell disk reveals what that character looked like in full body form (Fig.110). A Yax finial should be added to his head and/or to the Principal Bird Deity on his back. A God D or a Principal Bird Deity remain possibilities, although a winged version of the A-G-L family face type is more likely, (that is, the character on the shell disk) since God D is not yet elsewhere known to be physically immersed in the water layers.

This section completes the survey of the Tikal painted fragment and leads into the final chapter, the Surface of the Underwaterworld in the Rio Azul painted

tomb. Flanking the Long Count date and dynastic statement hieroglyphs are remarkable paintings of Early Classic Maya monsters. The Ah Kin face introduces a current controversy over the proper patron of GIII of the triad, Kin or the Jaguar God of the Underworld. Both the Kinich Ahau and the Jaguar God of the Underworld are denizens of the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Also, the Jaguar God of the Underworld metamorphose into a winged state, may have his portrait framed by the quartrefoil Cave Entrance to the Underworld, is one of the paddlers of the Principal Young Lord across the netherworld waters, and is overall a popular character in the cast of Maya mythical personalities.

Chapter 6

THE SUN GOD AND JAGUAR GOD OF THE UNDERWORLD

The first three quarters of the dissertation worked from the Uaxactun Tripod, the Kerr rollout of the stuccoed Merrin Bowl, and the long Tikal Burial 160 painted fragment. This closing section on the Surface of the Underwaterworld inhabitants discusses the most unexpected rendition of the Surface of the Underwaterworld -- the Rio Azul painted tomb. Here the undulating water bands are painted on the two long sides of an underground burial chamber (Figs.46 and 163). On the adjoining wall are remarkable paintings of Early Classic Maya monsters. On top of one pile is Ah Kin. The Kin leads into a current controversy over the proper patron of GIII of the triad, Kin or the Jaguar God of the Underworld.¹²³ This theme in Maya art history is pertinent to this dissertation since both the J.G.U. and Ah Kin are associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld.

"THE SUN GOD"

God G of the codices is a personage whose cheek or head is decorated with a Kin sign. This G designation is part of the Schellhas alphabetical series and has no relationship to the Triad's G-series (GI, GII, GIII), except that by coincidence Berlin coded as GIII what turned out later to be related to Schellhas's God G. To ease the confusion, this paper avoids using the God G designation and calls him the Kin God, the Sun God, or Kinich Ahau, or Ah Kin. Kin means sun and day in Mayan. The letter "G" is reserved for the Triad.

123. Abbreviated as J.G.U., or simply JGU.

At the same time that Schellhas and Fewkes were creating the initial nomenclature for Maya gods Seler made good use of material in private collections to illustrate the 19th century, academic concept of the Maya sun god.¹²⁴ Seler used the large eye and filed front tooth of the Classic period representations to characterize the Sun God -- a definition that was followed faithfully by Spinden, Morley, Thompson and Proskouriakoff and is still firmly fixed in iconography today.¹²⁵ In Seler's day (1880-1920) it was already recognized that Goodman's personification of the numeral four was the Sun God.¹²⁶

A generation later Spinden classified gods on the basis of their facial characteristics and adornments, following Fewkes. Spinden created a "Roman Nosed God" which unfortunately mixed together what are separated today as the Jaguar God of the Underworld, God D, the Sun God, the Loincloth Apron Face, and other humanoids. Spinden was not in his time able to separate God D from the Sun God. He did a good job nonetheless, since it took until 1978 before God D could be recognized in the Classic period.

In the past 20 years scholars easily separated out the Jaguar God of the Underworld from Spinden's concoction, but the Loincloth Apron Face, in its skyband

124. Seler, Vol. III, pp. 612-613. Seler published every private collection he could find in Mexico and Guatemala.

125. Unfortunately, while all Sun Gods may have a filed (Tau-shaped or pointed (shark's) tooth), not all gods with prominent front teeth are the Sun God. Prominent front teeth are characteristic of a class of deities in general. The large eye is no longer an acceptable -- sole -- criteria for the Sun God either. Large eyes are the prerogative of a variable host of Maya deities.

126. Some gods serve as face variant hieroglyph for a variety of numerals, days, months, or other calendrical aspects.

and tree trunk form, got stuck with a Sun God tag until 1981. By this date cataloging of funerary pottery had advanced to the point where I could identify the Loincloth Apron Face (abbreviated, L.A.F.) as a completely separate character. The Loincloth Apron Face appears on the Palenque sarcophagus, on the sanctuary panel of the Temple of the Foliated Cross, and elsewhere (Hellmuth 1986a). The Loincloth Apron Face is related to the Surface of the Underwaterworld in the Late Classic, where it appears on the tree trunk which sprouts from GI's head on the Codex Style plate of Fig.19,a. On an unpublished Late Classic Peten vase, the L.A.F. appears as a decoration in the main side panel and also as a suprafix to the GI glyph in the PSS. The introducing glyph of the PSS, when in personified form, is a GI (in normal form it has a turtle affix). A further watery association for the L.A.F. is on a small Codex Style bowl scene with water birds and water lilies (Hellmuth Photo Archive). The L.A.F. is not yet well known in the Early Classic, so it is not included in the god discussions of these chapters. The L.A.F. -- in non-water situations -- appears in sky bands, especially at Palenque, where it has traditionally been identified as a Sun God. This present discussion will not deal further with the God D or the Loincloth Apron Face, whose appearance on the back of toad/frogs and on execution axes on Codex Style pottery had also been misidentified as God C. The tag, "Sun God," should be carefully restricted to humanoid faces with an associated Kin infix. To return to Spinden's time:

Still another manifestation of the Roman-nosed God is probably seen in the face form of the kin glyph,... the period glyph representing one day. If this god is, as we surmise, a god of both night and day but with the idea of the sun god uppermost, his face would serve nicely as a sign for the period, one day.... Sometimes the kin sign appears on the face, usually the nose is of the Roman type, a peculiar terraced tooth that is commonly described as filed projects from the front of the upper jaw, and a flowing beard is often present. The eye likewise shows similarities to the eye of the (Roman nosed god, D) we have been studying (Spinden 1913:72).

Thompson on the Sun God

Thompson entered Kin iconography because of the calendrical implications of Kin as day and patron of a number. He paraphrased Seler and Spinden in his description of the sun deity.

The head of the aged sun god represents the number 4. He has a large, almost square eye with the pupil set in the top inner corner, so that he squints.... The god of number 4 sometimes wears the kin (sun) glyph on the side of his face, and often has the upper incisors filed to a T-shape, as was the custom of the sun god.... There is, accordingly, irrefutable evidence that the sun is the god of number 4 (Thompson 1950:133).

The characteristic features of the sun god are: a squarish eye with squarish pupil in the top inner corner and with a loop, often with two or three circlets attached, which encloses the eye on the sides and bottom; a prominent Roman nose; the central incisors of the upper jaw filed to the shape of a squat tau; often a fang projecting from the corner of the mouth; and a hollow on the top of the head.

Today iconographers distinguish between the Sun God's eye frame and the same but with cruller added that signifies the Jaguar God of the Underworld. In 1950 the characteristics of the day sun and the night sun were not yet fully differentiated.

Thompson continues:

Gods could change their localities and resultant associations. The sun god was, naturally, a sky god, but at sunset he passed to the underworld to become one of the lords of nights, and emerged at dawn with the insignia of death. To depict him during his journey through he underworld it was necessary to add attributes, such as those of the jaguar or black, the color of the underworld, or maize foliage, which also connoted the surface of the world and the underworld."¹²⁷

127. Thompson 1950:11. Thompson's maize foliage theory fortunately never caught on.

Here is the beginning of what two decades later Coe separated out and tagged as the "Jaguar God of the Underworld." Otherwise the Seler-Spinden "Sun God" creation has stayed persistently intact because Kinich Ahau was not recognized in the new corpus of funerary ceramics (Coe 1973:14). Ah Kin is indeed rarely seen outside of stelae.¹²⁸ The most dramatic representation of a clearly defined Kinich Ahau in the new corpus is on the murals of Rio Azul, Tomb 1.

Ah Kin on the Rio Azul Murals

The monumental presence of the undulating bands on the Rio Azul tomb sidewalls suggests that the room space between the walls may be considered a portion of the netherworld. Furthermore this chamber is physically underground, is the burial place of a revered ruler, and was a veritable warehouse of mosaic masks and deity portraits.¹²⁹ When the entire tomb chamber is a section of the netherworld, then the monsters therein are residents or patrons of this netherworld. In an unpublished 1980 Princeton symposium lecture Coe has already spoken of the underworld aspects of the Classic Maya grave chamber. The undulating bands on the sidewall suggest that the tomb chamber is more specifically in, or alongside, the Surface of the Underwaterworld section of that netherworld.

A "Sun God" face is conspicuous in the Rio Azul tomb murals. Another kin

128. As suggested earlier, the jadeite "Kinich Ahau" of Altun Ha, Belize is definitely not the traditional Sun God but is more likely a fat beaked character, possibly the Principal Bird Deity or another Tzakol monster.

129. Ian Graham has provided a suggested list of contents of the tomb based on fragments salvaged by him and the subsequent Adams project.

decorated face is on a wooden bowl from the same tomb (Fig.163; 160-162). While no Ah Kin is on the Tikal Bu. 160 bowl, the god faces on that bowl are of the same standardized deity family as is Kinich Ahau -- only a cheek or forehead glyph infix is lacking to make them actual Kin characters. On the Austin Tetrapod a paddler with Kin cap is directly on top of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.37) suggesting that "sky personalities" will, on occasion, come down onto the interface with the netherworld. Apparently the Maya visualized the afternoon sun setting into some watery world which was mysterious to their pre-Galilean cosmology. The next day they witnessed the wonder of the morning sunrise.

The Kin God on the Rio Azul murals is a characteristic presentation, even with a Kin affix on both his head and his cheek, plus all the normal characteristics elsewhere: filed tooth (here as a shark's tooth, not a tau), large rectangular eye, and mouth curl.¹³⁰

This Kin face sits atop a commonly seen Maya reptilian monster which is known in several variations: 1st) a creature with crossed-bands-eye, a saurian monster which serves as the head of a Crocodile Tree (Figs.165); 2nd) with star glyph in the eye, which makes him the the Venus Monster -- the front head of a long, complicated, often "two faced" beast.¹³¹

130. It is hard to tell whether the mouth curl here is a barbel and/or mouth curl; in fact there are two curls, but the inner one may be part of a thin curl-ball-curl assemblage here rendered as a curl-shark tooth-curl, with the other side of course not visible in a profile presentation.

131. Schele has reported the fact that the monster's rear "face" is only a plaque or mask set on the tail. That means the creature has only one "front" -- the Venus or crossed-bands eye. A fuller representation of the Venus Monster is seen in Fig.192,c. Normally the "back" face of such a supernatural monster has a Quadripartite Badge headdress, but in the Rio Azul murals the opposing panel has a giant Cauac Monster on top of an unidentified bird monster.

Coe coined the "Cauac Monster" nomenclature (1973:98; 107). Neither Seler, Spinden, Morley, Thompson, or Proskouriakoff had identified the Cauac Monster as a specific, independent creature even though it appeared often on zoomorphs and as base panels of stelae. It was not until polychrome vases with Cauac Monster scenes in private collections were studied that the pattern became obvious. Dickey Taylor and Carylyn Tate took advantage of the new unprovenanced corpus to continue development of Cauac Monster iconography. Tikal Altar 4 (Fig.172) and the Rio Azul murals demonstrate that one cosmological locus of the Cauac Monster is in association with either the four petalled cave entrance -- the beginning of the Surface of the Underwaterworld -- or, as in the tomb murals, between the undulating bands. An unpublished drawing provided by Ian Graham of an otherwise unknown stela fragment shows Cauac Monsters directly associated with Late Classic layers of the underwaterworld.

A second early association of a Kin portrayal and a Cauac Monster comes from the carved wooden bowl of the same Rio Azul tomb (Fig.170,a). A third Kin-Cauac Monster pairing is on the base panel of Caracol (Belize), Stela 6, back, (Fig.171,a) dated at 9.8.10.0.0, in the transition period between Early and Late Classic when Tzakol forms were used archaistically. The face on the left of the Caracol Cauac panel, has a probable Kin affix on his cheek.¹³² A fourth Cauac-Kin relationship in an early context is on Caracol Stela 4, front, where the base panel Cauac Monster has a codex style Kin within a cave frame on its headband (Fig.171,c). The Cauac Monster may be a patron, protector, or

132. The Caracol stelae drawings are not sufficiently accurate for detailed iconography.

personification of the entrance to the underworld.

The Kin glyph on the Rio Azul head is a headdress glyph cluster with flanking affixes rather than a decoration on his actual forehead. This headdress Kin is an interesting mixture of Codex Kin (double line quadrant markers, "=", read by epigraphers as "nicte," flower) and classic Kin (wedge shaped quadrant markers ")"). A comparable situation is on the eye glyphs of the Kohunlich stucco mask character and in a Quadripartite Badge of a Chama bowl (Coe 1978:Princeton No.13). The Deletaille Tripod has the **nicte** form of the Kin as giant floating symbols (Hellmuth 1978:140; 1986c; in press D). On the basis of the Rio Azul painting, the Chama Bowl badge, and the Kohunlich stucco mask, I argue that the =form of the quadrant marker is an acceptable substitute for the) form.¹³³ The substitution is particularly appropriate, since Schele reads the "Codex Kin" as **nicte**, a sacred flower for the Maya. The original model for the) kin is also a (four petaled) flower.¹³⁴

Another Kin Character on the Surface of the Underwaterworld

The Austin Tetrapod clearly pictures the Surface of the Underwaterworld, complete with stylized fish (Fig.36-37). Paddling across the surface of this mythical

133. Schele disagrees; personal communication, 1981. She suggests that the Post Classic codex scribe did not always know what he was painting and often used the wrong symbols. But, I do not subscribe to any model that substitutibility makes the two interchangeable forms have the same meaning, so I do not claim that = Kin is the same as the ^ Kin. I only point out that they are demonstrated as interchangeable in certain situations by the Classic Maya themselves. Lounsbury agrees with the allowable substitutibility of T-544 by T-646 based on the precedent of the flower patron of the 20th Aztec day, personal communication, 1985.

134. Thompson's derivation of this from a five petaled plumeria is typical of his manipulation of forms to fit a preconceived idea (1950:142).

stream is a shallow canoe. The youthful paddler has a Kin glyph on top of his head. The Rio Azul murals and Post Classic codices show that the head is an acceptable location for this glyph on a Sun God. But this paddler is youthful, totally human, definitely male, and has none of the eye, tooth, or mouth features expected for Kinich Ahau. He lacks the lancet through his nose and an aged face to be the expected form of Kin paddler. He has a fish tied on his back, nothing yet associated with a Sun deity elsewhere.¹³⁵

Since Schele has demonstrated that mythical personalities may occur in several, diverse forms, such as skeletal, infant, normal, or zoomorphic, perhaps the paddler is an idealized young human form of the Kin character. Or else the lid shows an unidentified planetary paddler who happens to have the Kin on his head. If this paddler is the Sun God it offers implications for the sun's journey through the Underworld, because the surface would logically be the first stage -- and last stage, presumably at sunset, but this needs to be found in figural art.¹³⁶ He is still in his Kin form, not yet a J.G.U. form. At what point in the myth does Kinich Ahau transform into the J.G.U.? The J.G.U. is often a paddler (Fig.177; 188), but of aged appearance, definitely feline, and not as man-like as the Austin Paddler. Are the two really transformations of the Sun or separate characters only accidentally related to the sun by popularized academic nicknames?

135. Unless a full figure glyph can be found somewhere with a Kin carrying a piscine creature. Lounsbury says a single Maya Yucatec dictionary entry (Andrew Heath de Zapata, *Vocabulario de Mayathan*) equates the word kin also with planet, personal communication, January 1985; Coe suggests the paddling partner of the J.G.U.-Akbal paddler.

136. Parsons reminds me to consider cycles of rebirth after death, personal communication, 1985.

At present I classify the Kin character and the J.G.U. as two separate personalities on the basis of Lounsbury's reminder that Kin is patron of numeral 4 and variable element for the month Yaxkin, whereas the J.G.U. is patron of numeral 7 and related to the Initial Series variable element Pax as well as paired with Pax in deity scenes. As faces they can conflate into one another -- Tikal Stela 31 documents this -- but I am not yet sure that conflation must mean transformation (whereby one personality changes sufficiently that he becomes the other). These problems do not occur on the Rio Azul murals. The Sun God is in traditional form, albeit in an unexpected almost "underwater" association.

Portrait with Kin on Orange Cache Containers¹³⁷

Two Early Classic orange cache containers present a deity with a Kin glyph on the cheek. The most noticeable instance is on a unique rectangular cache container (Fig.161).¹³⁸ The rectangular cache box has God L and God K on the front,¹³⁹ the Principal Bird Deity facing a rare full figure rendition of the Triangular Mouth Plaque character (Hellmuth 1982a), and on the end under discussion, GI of the Triad on the left, and Kinich Ahau, the Sun God, on the right. For a non-textual situation, this is the only instance on Tzakol pottery

137. Kins in Quadripartite badges do not mean the wearer is a Kinich Ahau. The Quadripartite Kin is part of a different assemblage. Its true meaning in this setting is unknown.

138. Probably from Central Peten, as this vessel became known at least 3 years before the Rio Azul area was looted. Indeed Robicsek published two figures from the rectangular box in 1978, which means it was available for study since at least around 1976.

139. Robicsek 1978:pp. 118-119; figs. 132-133; pls. 101-102. Neither God L nor God K have other direct relationship with the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Each side of the box may picture a different netherworld domain

besides the Bowl of the Nine God Glyphs (Figs.17,f; 160,f; 166,c) where GI and the Sun God are together. If Ah Kin is GIII -- as Lounsbury proposes -- then the cache box has the whole triad, GI, GII (God K), and GIII (Ah Kin).

Problems in Sun God Theology and Iconography

Since "kin" means "day" as well as "sun," how do we know he is god of the solar disk and not the concept of a day's time? This is a prickly theological question that has not previously been asked.

In Western cosmology, the sun's domain is the sky. But since the sun sets into the ocean, or into the earth and rises from it the next day, for those that live out of doors and see this natural phenomenon every day, the sun was not perhaps so fixed in the heavens. GI does not present these problems of cosmological association, since he has fish fins on his mouth, Xoc Monster in his headdress, and shark's tooth as his central perforator. Two Tzakol cache vessels even present GI immersed in the Surface of the Underwaterworld. An important Late Classic plate shows the same for Chac Xib Chac. So GI is definitely a fishy, watery character, and perfectly at home with the Surface of the Underwaterworld. His is the portrait I would have expected in the tomb murals, not the Kin.

But on the rectangular box, GI and Kinich Ahau are together, specifically in the same panel. Since GI is self-evidently associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld, then under a pattern of associations, the Kin has a definite, albeit unexplained, relationship with the Surface of the Underwaterworld. I do not extend this to suggesting that Ah Kin is an "underworld deity" any more than the Principal Bird Deity is an underworld deity on the other end of the box. What is

happening is that data from private collections at last allow breaking through the model pan-Mesoamerican cosmos as developed in the 19th century and seeing actual presentations of the specifically early Maya cosmos. The environment and associated characters are different than predicted.

In summary on Ah Kin, the two leading epigraphers still debate the precise relationship between the Kin-decorated Sun God, the Jaguar God of the Underworld, and GIII of the Triad. Lounsbury has done the most thorough modern analysis of the GIII aspect of Kin. Linda Schele did a thorough review of GIII as being the Jaguar God of the Underworld. Their original articles are essential reading and should be consulted. Despite the potential importance of day solar imagery no thorough study on the Maya sun god, Kinich Ahau, exists since both specialists tackled only the GIII relationship. As both creatures are present in close association with the Surface of the Underwaterworld it is necessary to mention the problems if not at this moment to solve them. Asking the right questions is as important in this stage of our knowledge of Maya mythology as providing the answers. Kubler is correct in that too many "answers" have been provided in the past, and not enough questions.

JAGUAR GOD OF THE UNDERWORLD (J.G.U.)

The J.G.U. is most widely known on shields (Fig.151,b) and, now it has been found on orange cache containers (Figs.158-159) or as a hieroglyph (Fig.160,b). His diagnostic characteristics vary, and as usual with Maya personalities, not every example exhibits all the traits (Hellmuth in press C). Schele demonstrates there may be zoomorphic, anthropomorphic, young, aged, fleshed, and fleshless variations of certain Maya mythical characters (1976/79).

One of several popularized names for the standard feline form is the Night Sun. Thompson is the principal instigator of that as well as background for the current term, Jaguar God of the Underworld, though he himself never used this particular name; he usually just called it a "Jaguar God" (Thompson 1950:Fig.12,12-15).

...a loop passes under the eyes, and is loosely tied like a cruller, to use Spinden's expressive description, over the bridge of the nose. Characteristic, too, is the earplug which is oval and has a flamelike pendant with one tongue longer than the other. The eyes are square; the nose is Roman. The central incisors of the upper jaw are filed T-shape. There are two or three little circles below the loop under the eye.

The deity represented is the jaguar god as recognized first by Seler. This is shown by the jaguar paws of the only full-figure representation of the god of number 7, and by numerous representations of the god in sculpture and ceramics, which show the details noted above in combination with the peculiar ear of the jaguar, or the beard or spotted skin of that animal....

As already pointed out, the jaguar is the god of the underworld, and appears to be merged with the night sun. As a god of the earth he carries the symbols of his origin, for frequently he wears the lily of shells, and not infrequently he has the symbol for night as an ornament of his ear or before his face. He is the Maya equivalent of Tepeyollotl (Thompson 1950:134)

Thompson's "Maya History and Religion" gives a 1970 repeat on the jaguar:

A jaguar god, his features often displayed by an impersonator, is very prominent in the art of the Classic period, and he appears frequently on the fronts of incense burners from Chiapas and the highlands of Guatemala. His most readily recognizable attributes, even when he serves as the disguise of an impersonator, are a large conventionalized jaguar ear complete with circular jaguar-hide markings; a loop passing beneath both eyes and twisted into a design resembling our number eight above the bridge of the nose; round eyes (denoting a god's animal derivation); "whiskers" in the form of a curving line from level with the nose to the chin, almost certainly representing the jaguar's whiskers; prominent filed central incisors in the upper jaw, symbolic of the sun god, or a fang, such as distinguishes representations of the jaguar, at each corner of the mouth;... and, at times, the water lily, a well-recognized attribute of the jaguar (Thompson 1970:292)

This is what is today enshrined in every article and book written on the Maya -- Jaguar as Night Sun. Thompson's cosmology has been fully accepted in this case but his night sun did not become a prominent fixture in the pantheon until 1973 when his portrait on polychrome ceramics in private collections allowed Coe to resurrect his image, and to enshrine his current capitalized name in the literature, Jaguar God of the Underworld. The reference is to Grolier 49, Vase of the Seven Gods, with God L overseeing two rows of deities.

"Figure 2 is the Jaguar God of the Underworld, an aged god with a Roman nose, large eye, and filed upper incisors, traits he shares with... others.... Around his mouth are jaguar spots, and a jaguar's ear is fixed over his own. Behind his headdress...hair flows down in a long, bound hank....

Many representations of the Jaguar God of the Underworld show him with a twisted element over the nose, but this is lacking here and is not universal. Rather, his distinctive feature is the hank of hair, as seen on the shield in the Temple of the Sun at Palenque, and on the front of the waistband of the deity shown on Stela I at Copan. The Jaguar God of the Underworld appears as the paddler on one of the incised bones from Tikal (Triak 1963, fig.4), and in the act of spearing a reptilian fish on a remarkable polychrome vase at Dumbarton Oaks. In infantile form, he is the central personage in the sacrificial scene of No. 45. An association with the day Akbal ("darkness" or "Night") and war seems well founded since the Akbal glyph substitutes for the god's face on war shields shown on Classic Maya monuments. He also

appears as patron of the month Uo... and of the numeral 7.

Other representations on the monuments include Stelae 1 and 4 at Yaxchilan (where the god's head peers down on the scene below from a sky band or from a star), and from Piedras Negras Stela 5, in which he emerges from the eye of the Cauac monster and is associated with other Underworld figures such as the Death God, Monkey, and a quetzal-like bird with the head of the Jaguar God of the Underworld" (Coe 1973:Grolier 107-8).

Coe brings overdue attention to Piedras Negras Stela 5, one of the few stelae that includes a multitude of characters from ceramics.¹⁴⁰ Although the Tikal canoe paddler had been known for a decade, in The Maya Scribe, Coe also provided the first correct iconographic identification.¹⁴¹ In his catalog of the Dumbarton Oaks collection of Maya funerary ceramics, Coe says of the J.G.U.:

Figure 2 is the Jaguar God of the Underworld, one of the principal infernal deities, apparently second-in-command to God L. This (J.G.J.) is the divinity whose fearsome visage usually appears on Classic incense burners, and would seem to be the Night Sun during its passage through darkness and the Underworld. Present here are the "god-eye," Roman nose, filed frontal incisors or "egg-tooth," jaguar ear above his own, and bound hank of hair which identify the deity. God-markings appear on his body... (Coe 1975:20)

Coe has accepted Thompson's definition and correctly added the bound hank of hair. The teeth can be filed T-shape, or pointed, in which case they are derived from shark's teeth.¹⁴² A bound hank of hair can also be worn by the Headband

140. Today the Stela 5 bird is considered in the Principal Bird Deity family and not associated with the quetzal.

141. In 1978 a second J.G.U. canoe paddler was published (Hellmuth 1978:Frontispiece). In 1982 the central passenger in both these canoe scenes was identified as the Principal Young Lord (Hellmuth 1982c). Based in part on Mathews, Stuart (1982) and Schele have done the most work on the second canoe paddler, the one with the perforator bone or stingray spine through his nose (Schele 1976/79).

142. Parsons suggests that because the Tau is frequently included in Izapan basal bands it may have stood for "precious liquid" (personal communication 1985). This possibility would be an appropriate alternative for the shark tooth, but should be tested before further use.

Partners, by the Bearded Dragon, and sometimes by GI and other characters, as Coe is well aware of. So it is by no means restricted to the J.G.U. and is not used by itself to propose a J.G.U. identification for a particular portrait unless context, associations, props, and other costume features likewise indicate a Jaguar God of the Underworld. I want clearly to distinguish between J.G.U. diagnostics (in which Thompson did okay and are not the problem) and J.G.U. associations.¹⁴³ The problem is in the meaning, the activity, the lordship of this personality.

The question of where the J.G.U. roams and what he does can be answered in just the manner Coe uses, finding him on previously unknown ceramics or overlooked stelae. When in these known media he is actually portrayed or described as the Sun, as the Night Sun, and as a jaguar, then his name and fame can be demonstrated. A Late Classic Xoc Monster created out of a carved and incised seashell is an example of the fresh situational illustrations needed to clarify J.G.U. iconography (Fig.157). Whereas ceramics have occupied most of this dissertation, funerary seashells from tombs are as exotically decorated as ceramics. This Late Classic shell is from Mexico, and shows a Xoc Monster with upturned snout serving as a carrier or cartouche frame for a Jaguar God of the Underworld. He is identifiable as such by his cruller, feline ear, feline paw, and bound hank of hair. Here at last may be the illusive portrait of how the J.G.U. is carried through the Underworld waters. After all, why does he automatically have to go through the "earth." He could equally well enter a cave spring, descending

143. A J.G.U. association that I found in private collections is with the Pax god; while the association of J.G.U. with the Initial Series variable element for the month Pax has been known to epigraphers, the association (as distinct from conflation) between the two as distinguishable entities has not previously been commented upon by iconographers.

into the underworld part of the way through water. Indeed on some shields (Fig.151,b) the J.G.U. face is specifically framed by the four lobed "cave-spring entrance," a frame used elsewhere for frogs (Fig.176) and for God N (Fig.178) who are demonstrably netherworld and watery creatures. A pertinent example of J.G.U.'s direct relation to netherworld waters is on a Tzakol lid.

The Museo Popol Vuh Jaguar God of the Underworld Lid

This little sculpture is the lid handle of a cylindrical tripod. Other than the Chacmool-posed Jaguar or Puma Babies of Tikal stelae, this is one of the few other Tzakol period full figure representations of the Jaguar God of the Underworld. Full figure humanoids of any description are rare in the Early Classic. The importance of the Museo Popol Vuh felineized humanoid is its situation directly surrounded by a clear rendition of the Surface of the Underwaterworld (Fig.155; 156,a). Three other contemporary lids that feature the Surface of the Underwaterworld show: a naturalistic turtle (Fig.156,b-c), a possible Principal Bird Deity variant, and -- in a different arrangement -- the frog/toad (Fig.41). The turtle and frog are certainly creatures of the Maya mythical waterscape. This lid series tells us that the J.G.U. is also a denizen whose niche is in, or nearby, the Surface of the Underwaterworld. Since the Middle American feline is a known fisher and inhabitant of watery areas¹⁴⁴ a water feline should not be unexpected. The "Water Lily Jaguar" (another denizen of the Maya netherworld) has long been known. Confirmation of a watery relationship for the J.G.U. is on on Tikal Stela 31 where the J.G.U.'s cruller has the ...ooo... markings of a water band.

144. Alvarez del Toro 1977:112; and personal observation of three felines on the beach of the Rio Usumacinta near Yaxchilan.

The current situation is thus that both an independent Kin character and an independent (non-conflated) J.G.U. can both be near the Surface of the Underwaterworld. The real uncertainty is when a demonstrable Kin God wears obvious J.G.U. feline ear and cruller. Who is the composite, a jaguarized Kin, or a Kin-ized jaguar -- or are both the J.G.U. and the Kin God really the same entity, one being the humanoid daytime form (Kin God) the other the nighttime zoomorphic form (J.G.U.)? Other than on Tikal Stela 31 is there any indication of transformation from the day sun into a night jaguar, a transformation seemingly required under the Thompsonian schema? Schele and Lounsbury's divergence can be solved by searching for additional examples so that the nature and role of both Kinich Ahau and the J.G.U. are better known as individual personalities before trying to ascertain which is, or is not, the patron of GIII. I have brought forth the Museo Popol Vuh lid to demonstrate a self-evident association of the J.G.U. with the Surface of the Underwaterworld. The Rio Azul underwaterworld scene is puzzling. What is the Sun God doing down in a tomb, on top of a crossed-bands-eye monster and alongside the Surface of the Underwaterworld? Would not a J.G.U. or GI be expected in this position? The failure of this prediction demonstrates that more contextual scenes are needed for comparison.

No Jaguar God of the Underworld has yet been identified for the codices. Ah Kin, though, continues from the Early Classic through into the Post Classic codices, where Schellhas named him God G. Spinden believed this continuity was not universal for all the gods, and Kubler specifically brings up this observation and asks whether the absence of Schellhas gods in Classic art resulted from a fundamental difference between the Classic and the Post Classic era. This final question occupies the next chapter and will complete both the theoretical aspects

(nature spirits or idolatrous gods -- or both) and the practical aspects (specific iconography of a watery cosmogram) of this dissertation.

Chapter 7

MODELS BASED ON THE TRADITIONAL CORPUS: THE CODEX GODS AND THE CLASSIC PERIOD SPIRITS

God L

In Maya studies, iconography is an offshoot of epigraphy, which has been dedicated to stone monuments and the codices since 19th century beginnings and still is today. The dependence on the traditional corpus and especially the monumental sculpture and codex portion of that corpus has been a contributing factor to the conclusion that the Classic Maya had no pantheon or idols. Stelae, however, do not present all the gods that the Maya actually revered; most gods appear only on pottery. For example, god lists from 1910 to 1972 omit God L or relegate him to an insignificant position in the hierarchy. In 1973 Coe found God L often and in exalted positions on funerary pottery and thereby was able to recognize him as one of the principal Underworld lords.

Subsequent independent research confirms the preeminent position of God L. By 1977 I had identified a God L on a Jonuta panel in the Houston Art Museum.¹⁴⁵ Following up information from Miller that INAH excavations at Bonampak ca. 1980-81 had uncovered a carved panel with a full fledged God L, I suggested to her that the lord on Bonampak Stela 1 may have a God L headdress

145. Lecture at the 3rd Palenque Mesa Redonda, 1978, not submitted for publication. The first published identification of the God L hat was made independently by Mayer (1980:Cat.15,p. and Pl.38). Hales has evidence from art dealers that the panel may be from Palenque (personal communication, 1985).

the same way Yaxchilan's ruler donned a *GI-Chac Xib Chac* mask on Stela 11 -- as an expression of supernatural patronage of the dynasty. The strange floppy hats of secondary figures on Yaxchilan stela, such as number 19, may also be a reflection of a God L hat; Stela 20 has both the God L hat (minus the bird, also found this way on pottery, see Fig.190,a) plus the God L jaguar hide cape (Maler 1903:Pl.LXXVIII), suggesting some form of God L patronage for an aspect of Bonampak or wider Selva Lacandona area socio-political group. These occurrences in the heart of the traditional corpus went unnoticed until awareness of God L was prompted by new finds, in this case the God L vases published by Coe, plus an additional eleven unpublished Late Classic God L vases in private collections (Hellmuth Photo Archive).

The bottom third of Dresden 43 pictures a scene with features straight from Late Classic ceramics (Fig.190,b). The bird resting in a row of feathers is a Classic assemblage forming God L's headdress. The tied bale is God L's bundle, a standardized feature of God L scenes on both Peten and Yucatec ceramics (Photo Archive). Are the Classic ceramics fake? This would entail forgers recognizing that the bale belonged to God L, something not even Thompson recognized (he thought God L's headdress was decorated with a flying fish (Thompson 1972:45). Nowhere in Coe's or Robicsek's books are there models for associating God L and the bale, or even with a disembodied headdress. Those data are in the Photo Archive and have never been previously published.¹⁴⁶ We do not yet have any conception of what is in the bale or why God L carries it (that is not God L paddling the Dresden canoe, he is off stage at this point). Nonetheless, the Dresden Codex provides examples

146. Unpublished Maya vases show that God L's headdress is removed by Giant Bunny, the rabbit companion of the Moon Goddess.

of direct continuity from the Classic period in general, and from Peten ceramics in particular.

Classic through Codex Continuity

It has been traditional to compare the Schellhas series of alphabetical Dresden-Madrid-Paris Codex gods with the Classic period, find most of them missing, and then conclude that thus classical religion lacked gods. Such god lists for the Classic period lack the full *dramatis personae*, since the "missing" members were not found until the 1970's Kubler's list cites Spinden, Morley, and Anton, specifically for sculpture (Kubler 1969:2) where in that decade only A, G, K, N, and X (of post-Schellhas nomenclature revisions) were well known. We cannot fault a monograph that was written eight years before previously unpublished vase photographs became available and Kubler's most recent publication, 1984a, catches up with material in private collections.

Research from 1973-1986 reveals two points relative to the similarities and differences between the Classic (stelae and pottery) and Post Classic (surviving bark paper codices). First, certain monsters and supernatural characters do indeed occur in both periods and media; and second, the classical period actually turns out to have more mythical personages than for the Post Classic codices. Gods which had not yet been found in the codices until intensive iconography and hieroglyph studies of 1984-1986 include the two Headband gods, GI of the Triad, GIII, (GII appears in the codices in the form of God K), J.G.U. (as different than a mere jaguar), Principal Bird Deity (absent from the Dresden and present only rarely in the Paris (Fig.192)), Pax Patron and relatives, Cauac (actually present in the codices but so

rare as to have been generally unnoticed (Fig.197)¹⁴⁷), Tubular Headdress Monster, Xoc Monster¹⁴⁸, Holmul Dancer (in the codices only in the God E form¹⁴⁹), Nose-Perforator canoe paddler, several personifications of numerals, several of the personages found in Dance after Decapitation ceremony on pottery, several of the personages in enema rituals on pottery,¹⁵⁰ some personifications of calendrical elements, and others still being found each year as more private collections become available to study.

Christopher Donnan reports that after photographing Moche art in the private collections and museums of the world he quickly reached the point where his archive had representations of every myth that the Moche ever rendered on pottery. Thereafter he seldom searched for new pots. Maya mythology has more personalities and although pots do repeat well known scenes, iconographers have not yet found all the stock myth episodes that the Classic lowland Maya actually produced. There still remain over a thousand unstudied Maya vessels with figural art or hieroglyphic texts in the unstudied private collections and museum basements of the world. Gods, standardized characters, and specific monsters which do not yet even names exist on these vases, plates, and bowls.

147. No Cauac Monsters were cross-referenced from the codices in either of the three principal publications on the monster, Coe 1973; Taylor 1979; or Tate 1980.

148. Fish are illustrated in the codices but principally to emphasize a watery environment. Such natural fish are not the Xoc Monster.

149. Karl Taube has proposed that the Holmul Dancer, the Principal Young Lord, and God E are all the same; my classification joins the Holmul Dancer with the P.Y.L. but keeps them in different myth episodes from God E.

150. Such as the grotesque character with net weave costume (not God N in this case) and other mythical characters who are so recently recognized that they do not yet even have code names.

It is no longer acceptable to dismiss a Classic pantheon because they do not measure up to the codices. The surviving codices are not a statistically valid sample of all the gods or religion of the Post Classic anyway. The codices were merely a convenient data base. Schellhas's god list and the Villacorta's codex monograph made the codices a readily accessible source for Maya religion. But if grave robbers or archaeologists suddenly dug up even a hundred Post Classic codices today, it would be painfully clear how little of the full pantheon is in the surviving codex fragments. Coe and Robicsek have demonstrated that Tepeu vases are classic period equivalents of pages of a codex. Today art historians have more ceramic "pages" than bark paper ones. With the larger corpus of myth episodes comes a larger number of mythical characters.

A further reason for the statistically incomplete nature of the codex corpus is that the subject matter of the codices is not comparable to the subject matter of the traditional corpus -- stone sculpture and Holmul-Uaxactun-Tikal pottery. The codices should be expected to have characters not present in the Classic period because the codices are astrological tables -- not dynastic history or funerary mythology. The Classic period has not yet provided any purely astronomical tables, rather primarily dynastic portraits (sculptures), funerary pottery, and commemorative pottery (historical and cult presentations). Discovery of a Post Classic bark paper codex dedicated to dances, would undoubtedly reveal half of the missing members of the Tepeu I supernatural cast. A Classic period rendering of Venus astronomical tables would produce the missing Dresden, Madrid, and Paris codical characters. The difference in media and subject matter between the Classic and the Post Classic has never been brought up when the difference in cast has been denegated. The difference is primarily between Classic stelae and Post

Classic codices rather than a fundamental difference in religion.¹⁵¹

Despite the difference in cast and subject matter, there are similarities that have likewise not been known when the presumed codex-classic dissimilarity in number of shared gods was brought up. An initial demonstration of continuity between Tzakol, through Tepeu, and into the codices is with the Lily Pad Headdress. This headdress stands out in the Post Classic Dresden Codex, still topping a long snouted water snake in Dresden 13a (Fig.193,d). Dresden 36b shows an even more "classical" rendition of the Lily Pad Headdress Monster, complete with serpent body.

The Lily Pad Headdress continues from Tzakol 3 into Tepeu 1, Tepeu 2, and is present in Tepeu 3.¹⁵² These representations demonstrate continuity of form from the 5th through 10th centuries. The Dresden Codex is widely accepted as a later (ca. 14th-15th century) copy of a 12th century work. There is hardly enough time for disjunction between the 10th and 12th centuries, especially when the models for parts of the Dresden are pure 8th century -- and specifically Peten (as described in the next paragraph).

Dresden 53 top, the skeletalized character seated on a throne of bones, presents a second "Classic" subject. An 8th century masterpiece in the Museo Popol Vuh has the same imagery (Fig.195) (Hellmuth 1978:213). The latter's hieroglyphic inscription includes a reference to Ruler A of Tikal.¹⁵³ The reason the

151. Life and culture in the two periods must have been quite different but the basics of Maya art continued in many facets.

152. Terminal Classic, on a Pabellon-related, carved, molded pedestal base vessel, Hellmuth Photo Archive.

153. I first saw this vase in 1973; it had already been in Jorge Castillo's collection

Castillo scene looks like the Dresden scene is because they should look the same. They both do indeed picture the same entity. If anything, it is the Dresden that is copied, copied from the Peten tradition. Black-white-black or bone thrones are popular from the 7th century onward. Such paneled furniture appears at Xupa (Mayer 1981), in Peten-Belize (R+H 1982b:November No.11), at Palenque, and continued through Terminal Classic Tepeu 3 times on carved, mold impressed vases (Hellmuth 1978b:174; 175. They are hard to recognize when not painted black-white-black). Supposedly foreign, "non-Classic" art of modeled carved pottery in fact includes transmission of highly traditional central Peten images. Photographs of 32 unpublished Pabellon related mold impressed vases and bowls and four contemporary carved fine orange vessels in the Hellmuth Photo Archive include even Lily Pad Headdress Monsters and full Holmul Dancer scenes of Tepeu 3 date.

Dresden 69a shows a crocodile tree. Crocodile trees are well known for Preclassic Izapa. I have found Early Classic examples on the Deletaille Tripod and in the Late Classic (Hellmuth 1980; one in R+H 1982a:p.83, Vessel 108). Since crocodile trees appear even in Post Classic central Mexico, they may have been a pan-Mesoamerican trait, though, as Kubler warns, their meaning and associations may have been different in each place or period.

God D: Early Classic through the Post Classic Codices

Spinden had amalgamated God D in with the Sun God and all Roman nosed gods. Since God D does not often occur in the Classic period stelae he was not

a number of years. Any text about Ruler A would have been rather a difficult achievement for a modern forger since Jones' publication naming these rulers did not appear in print until 1977 (some one thousand two hundred years after the vase was painted).

noticed by Thompson or Morley. Thus it is understandable when Kubler and Coe both found God D lacking in the Classic cast of characters. Coggins likewise missed the God D on a Tikal Burial 116 vase. In 1978, pottery in private collections provided the clues to recognize the actual Classic period God D.¹⁵⁴ God D is present in the Early Classic Peten-Campeche corpus, riding a peccary (Fig.107,d). A probable God D -- with his headband attendants -- may be intended by the Kaminaljuyu artist of two cylindrical tripods (Figs. 103; 109,b-c). Although his Tzakol attributes are more abbreviated than his Late Classic characteristics, once more Tzakol examples are found it should be possible to recognize God D in the Preclassic too, though he is not usually on stone monuments. For the better documented Late Classic, the ceramic illustrations speak for themselves. God D is not only present in the Classic period, he is more frequently depicted than God C, E, F, G, or M. Also, D seems to pass a number of qualifications for deification.

God D as an Underwaterworld Denizen

Whereas no Maya rendering shows God D physically associated with the Surface of the Underwaterworld, his Late Classic throne room is identified with abbreviated symbols as being in a netherworld location (Fig.188). Also, his associates are known inhabitants of the Surface of the Underwaterworld, the Principal Bird Deity, God N and the Headband Partners. God N appears together with God D in more than five Late Classic polychrome scenes. God N lives in a conch shell or turtle shell, both inhabitants of the Maya netherworld waters. God

154. I worked out God D iconography from the Photo Archive in 1978-79 and presented the data in Coe's Department of Anthropology seminar as part of my Yale-O.A.S. fellowship in 1981. Coe and Robicsek subsequently revised their nomenclature for this aged deity.

N is himself physically in the Surface of the Underwaterworld on the Gann Bowl (Fig.95) and within the Cave Entrance to the Underworld on the Tikal Altar 4 scene, complete with framing Cauac Monsters (Fig.183,a). A God-N-like personage inhabits seashells also in approximately contemporary Teotihuacan murals (Sejourne 1966b:Fig.143).

The crucial indicators of cosmological location for God D are in the end panels (Fig.184 and 188) and sometimes in the hanging symbols within the scene (Fig.184,a; 186). End panels are a Late Classic innovation to show the viewer which part of the cosmogram is inhabited in the adjacent scene. Divider panel and associated hanging or floating devices (especially on vases of the Red Band Tepeu I style) may also designate state or stage of transformation/regeneration. A variety of designs were selected to be displayed in the divider panels. One or more designs, either a half quatrefoil (Figs.186) or stacks (Figs.185, last), are pertinent to the discussion at hand. Also, God D may sit on top of stacks (Fig.188,a). Coggins demonstrated that stacks were indicators of the underworld waters ten years ago. Robicsek produced additional evidence from Codex Style vases and Schele found comparable symbols on the underworld water surface on the Palenque Temple XIV sanctuary panel.

The Museo Popol Vuh black background canoe scene situates a half-quatrefoil directly under the sacred canoe (Fig.188,b). Figs.187; 189 illustrate other examples of either stacks, a wide curl, or half-quatrefoil as being directly under or on top of the Surface of the Underwaterworld. The presence of identical symbols in the end panels of the God D scenes suggests to me that the Maya artists are signaling that the interaction is located in, under, on top of, or near -- or otherwise related to -- the Late Classic version of the Surface of the Underwaterworld.

D is a standard participant in Classic myths, even more so than God L, and only slightly less than God N. In 98 percent of the cases in Late Classic ceramics (sample of approximately 35 representations) where several different mythical characters are interacting, D is conspicuously in the superior position. When a throne is present it is he who is on the throne. In four instances God N is on the floor in front of an enthroned God D (including an unrecognized case from the traditional Tikal corpus); in two instances God N is being killed nearby the enthroned God N. In the sole painting where God L is together with God D, D is on the throne (L drags his bound bundle towards the throne, Fig.191,a). The only scene found so far with both God L and God D has God D enthroned (Fig.184,a. One probable and a second definite case shows a God D with serpent face-wings, the ultimate stage in transformation (Fig.150,a). Overall indications point to an extremely exalted position of D within the Late Classic Peten hierarchy. In at least two scenes, a Moon Goddess (clearly defined with conspicuous U-bracket from under her arm) sits directly behind D. Unless we are to state the Maya had no moon deity, this lady establishes a divine presence directly next to D.¹⁵⁵ The God D is not wearing a mask, is not a ruler wearing a costume, and gives no indication he is a mere "god impersonator."

When D's hieroglyph is on these Tepeu ceramics it is identical to that in the Dresden Codex. Personage D on Classic polychromes is self-evidently the same as

155. The moon is certainly a natural phenomenon and thus could be offered as proof for the model that the Maya worshipped only such attributes of nature. Polychrome ceramics now provide ample pictorial representations of this character -- for the Classic period -- especially in mythical episodes with God D and with God L. A moon goddess is prominent in most Maya myths as recorded by ethnographers from 1900 to today. It would be difficult to maintain the Maya had no moon goddess in figural portrayal.

"D" in the Dresden Codex. If deities are accepted for the codex period, then why are there "no deities in the Classic period?" From D's associations and status on Classic polychromes he appears acceptably mythical, supernatural, and hardly a dynastic ruler. From the Classic period representations alone D exhibits likely divine status. Semantic and theological arguments can go on endlessly, with no purpose. D for the Maya is as much a god as any number of Greek or Roman culture heroes were gods for those peoples. We can accept the Schellhas-Fewkes designation of God D. Whether D had the same associations and meaning to the 12th century Maya as he did in earlier Peten is a question for further research. He was evidently a god for both in whatever way they conceived of their gods in either period.

D is a standardized personage. Every Maya child would have known what he looked like. D was a specific individual, not a haphazard creation out of separate parts -- an objection of Proskouriakoff to Maya images in general (1978). God D is indeed formed out of stock parts: elderly face, large god eye, elderly body (shared to varying degrees with God L and God N), double dome head (shared with P.Y.L.-Holmul Dancer), and certain headdress accessories (sometimes shared with the Headband Partners) but such body parts are simply how the Maya formed their figural images, whether human or divine. This is a feature of Maya art as much as a feature of Maya theology.

D is one of several potential overseers of GI and of a Spotted Attendant (Headband God, Hunaphu) killing another deity. D interacts with the Headband Partners, who serve as his attendants. D subjugates and then has God N executed. D's throne partner is often the lovely young, big-bosomed Moon goddess. Whereas D himself is not pictured (yet) having sexual relations with her,

he is definitely a voyeur in that the buxom lady is being fondled in front of God D by monkey men on two paintings and fondled by a Pinocchio-like character on another painting (all Hellmuth Photo Archive). D often interacts with deer in funerary vase paintings, a trait continued in the Dresden. Maya artists record an orderly series of figural interactions for D. They were codified, organized, and obviously widely known. The same situation holds for God L, the Principal Young Lord, and for other dominant personalities of the Classic period.

Should D be called God D? I see no iconographical or theological reason why not. That does not mean I equate him with a Christian god; that does not mean I am so christianized that I fall into the claim that we westernize the Maya concepts. Westerners are not the only culture with "gods," though communist Russia may be the only culture without them. It should be no more acceptable to inflict an atheistic model on the Maya as it is to inflict a Western, Christian heritage. I will be the first one to admit the nature of these Maya entities needs to be worked out. However dismissing divinities per se is a negative approach, and does not contribute to the search for the actual Mesoamerican nature of these beings.

The Classic Maya Pantheon

At this point I would like to dispel popular and academic misconceptions on the Maya "pantheon." Thompson stated clearly that:

In considering the nature of Maya gods, we may first rid ourselves of certain misconceptions by noting that in our field the term pantheon should not be taken in its strictly Greek sense. The idea of a general assembly of gods finds no place in Maya theology, and the visions of the behavior of the very carnal gods of Greece and Rome that the word conjures up would have been rated by the Maya as conduct totally unbecoming divine beings.... the Hellenic idea that

the gods had constant love affairs with mortal flesh... would have been abhorrent to him (Thompson 1970:198).

Thompson's concept was based in part on 20th century Carnegie Institution ethnographic surveys of Maya attitudes in small villages in Yucatan, where Steggerda's data became part of the Maya mythos. But it is the 5th-8th century Maya whose gods are in question, and it is polychrome vases that show this lost world. God D and N assemble, and not only do gods have love affairs -- but also rape and sex between women and animals are specifically rendered in openness not expected for the Classic Maya.¹⁵⁶ The Maya characters very much gathered together -- the Maya themselves show this on Grolier bowl No.37 and Grolier vase No.49. November No.1 likewise suggests a gathering of god-like characters (R+H 1982b). The semantics of Maya religion may be argued endlessly; Hvidtfelt has shown how difficult it is even for an accomplished Nahuatl scholar to find a proper translation for the Aztec concept of god. Anders avoided the impasse in order to continue with research at hand, he simply titled his book Das Pantheon der Maya, period. Seler did not work specifically with a pantheon, but he certainly recognized a majority of the Maya characterizations as "Gottheiten."¹⁵⁷

The acceptable arguments are on the nature, extent, organization, ranking, and particulars of the pantheon, not whether they had one. No one expects the Maya pantheon was anything like the Greek or Roman pantheon. The Maya pantheon was a particularly Mesoamerican one, but certainly a grouping of supernaturals.

156. God D is a voyeur in two scenes where buxom females are sexually assaulted by men, monsters, or individuals dressed as monkeys; in other 7th century scenes rabbits appear to be sexual companions of the moon goddess (Hellmuth Photo Archive).

157. Coe points out that the use in German academic writings of the word god, is particularly demonstrative of the near universal acceptance of a god-like nature because of German reputation for care in word use (personal communication).

Historians of religion can work out the theological details of which were spirits, demons, devils, fetishes, culture heroes, saints, revered ancestors, or other categories of supernatural. Bruce has initiated this for the Lacandon pantheon. The word "god" alone does not take into account the potential variability in divine nature within a crowded pantheon for a complex culture with a 2,000 year history.

Maya gods assemble together in the sacred myths of the Maya people. The Popol Vuh myth speaks of meetings of the gods of hell. Normally, no one vase is large enough to present all the members of a single myth. Rarely does a single European painting present the entire Christian cast of characters either -- only on the larger Sistine Chapel frescoes or the accumulated centuries of mosaics of San Marco in Venice do all a religion's mythical personalities appear in a related setting. Coe proposed that individual vases showed segments of larger myths. Robicsek demonstrated this for several myths (R+H 1982a). In various working papers I have sorted out the dramatis personae of the Principal Young Lord-Holmul Dancer myth series, the Dance after Death series, the mythology of God D, the mythology of God L, and herewith present the personalities of the Surface of the Underwaterworld. One end product of such current research is the possibility to create a drawing to show the whole cast of Underwaterworld characters together. By no means does their presence in this cosmogram mean that they cannot appear elsewhere also. The Headband Partners are also attendants for God D in other cosmological niches and the J.G.U. roams through many other myth segments.

But the Surface of the Underwaterworld is only one segment of the Maya netherworld. And the Early Classic is only one fourth of Maya history. Not every Preclassic god was accepted into Peten cults and several Tzakol gods were not as well favored by the Late Classic Peten dynasties. The priests and rulers of no one

site pictured in their art more than a fraction of the whole pantheon. Not a single portrait of God D is yet known from Uaxactun, Yaxha, or Palenque -- and only two from Tikal. No Principal Young Lord scenes have yet been identified for Belize. Yet these are the two leading personalities of the pan-Maya pantheon of the Classic period.

The fuller demonstration of our current stage of specialized understanding of the various Maya supernatural personalities is best documented in illustrations and especially in pictorial groupings. These lists and visual presentations are the long range goal of my personal research interests. The documentation, however, for such additional lists far exceeds the space limitations of one dissertation, so these other god lists must await further opportunities for divulgation (Schele, D. Stuart, and G. Stuart in press). A drawing of the *dramatis personae* of the Surface of the Underwaterworld would be the best summary of this dissertation research, as a demonstration of what can be learned from unprovenanced art, and is a sample of the advances that will continue to be made in Maya art history in this decade. Such a drawing represents an entire project all in itself, so cannot yet be included here.

The "missing" Dresden gods are now found in the non-traditional corpus for the Peten in general and for Tikal in particular. Vases in private collections reveal that the lowland Maya did have Schellhas's principal divine personalities, did practice penis perforation and human sacrifice, did burn copal incense, certainly had incensarios, and even had portraits that could be considered idols. Certainly Maya iconography will never again remain based exclusively on the traditional corpus. Whether one accepts, or campaigns against, private collections does not alter the basic nature of Maya religion.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Early Classic period of Maya civilization (ca. A.D. 250-550) saw masonry architecture, hieroglyphic inscriptions, sculptured stone monuments, and an expressive pottery art style throughout Peten (Guatemala) and adjacent Chiapas, Tabasco, Campeche, Quintana Roo (Mexico), Belize, and the Copan area of Honduras. Craftsmen produced outstanding works of clay, jade, shell, wood, alabaster, bone, stone, and mosaic art to be buried with the elite in tombs; terraced mounds surmounted with sacred buildings were erected on top. The tombs themselves were sometimes painted with murals. The architecture was decorated with gigantic stucco face masks.

Starting with John Lloyd Stephens and Frederick Catherwood's explorations in the 1840's that informed the world of a lost civilization in the tropical rain forests of Mexico, Guatemala, and Honduras, explorers in the next 100 years found enough carved stone stelae so that by 1950 Tatiana Proskouriakoff had 400 examples to study for her monumental monograph, A Study of Classic Maya Sculpture (1950:3). Between the first university excavations at a Maya site, Copan, in 1891, to the present day an estimated 1,500 whole figurally decorated Maya ceramic vessels with stratigraphic grave lot data became available to study. The 400 stelae and 1,500 whole ceramic vessels -- together with standard Maya works of art such as the Bonampak murals, etc. -- are the "traditional corpus." Anders (1963) and Kubler (1969) provide discussions of this corpus. The cities of this traditional Maya realm are popularly Palenque, Copan, Yaxchilan, Piedras Negras, Tikal, Uaxactun, Holmul and increasingly sites in Belize, (see maps, Vol.II). Until 1973, scholars created their maps and models of "The Classic Maya" from this traditional corpus.

Beginning in the 1960's, Peabody Museum scholar Ian Graham has worked on finding, photographing, drawing, and publishing carved stelae that were either totally unknown to early scholars or which were incompletely recorded (which means not well enough illustrated for art historians to study). From the traditional corpus of 400 stelae available to Proskouriakoff, Graham and associates have doubled that number -- and also rescued -- through photographs and drawings -- stone sculptures which had been stolen from Guatemala and Mexico and are in private collections and museums, such as monuments from Site Q-El Peru (Mayer 1985). Independently, Karl Herbert Mayer, of Graz, has utilized photographs of unprovenanced stone sculptures in four books that contribute data despite lack of provenance of the pieces (Mayer 1978; 1980; 1981; 1984).

In 1973 Michael Coe showed that iconographic and stylistic information could also be gathered on pottery that was in private collections. But an academic disagreement had developed over the question of the basic nature of Maya figural presentations, were they gods, or men in strange costumes? Were they personages in their royal palaces or were they the dead resurrected in an afterlife? Were the vases revealing the real world or the Underworld?

During the 1960's Proskouriakoff had verbally promulgated her conception that the Classic period Maya had no idols -- and in effect no deities in the normal sense -- but rather they worshipped only natural phenomenon.¹⁵⁸ In 1978 she suggested in writing that, "Attempts by modern scholars to reconstruct pantheons for the Aztec and the Maya have not met with notable success."

158. Personal communications to me, 1964-66, and to other colleagues.

In 1969, and in a 1970 lecture published in 1973, Kubler suggested that the pantheons suggested for the Olmec, Maya, and Aztec might be in error. Kubler's 1969 Studies in Classic Maya Iconography agreed with aspects of Proskouriakoff's model as well as adding considerable additional data and his own models to the situation.

In a series of books about funerary Maya ceramics, Coe has strongly proposed and documented "on the testimony of the pottery, an incredibly varied and complex set of infernal gods" (Coe 1975:8). "The theme of death and the Underworld runs throughout the iconography of these objects. The Maya version of Hell was Xibalba, 'Place of Fright,' which was inhabited by a host of sinister deities, often macabre and even terrifying, and presided over by two or possibly three aged divinities who ruled their realm from elaborate palaces" (Coe 1982:10).

Thus current Mesoamerican art history presents a polarization of views on the nature of the creatures and characters shown, especially in Maya art.

Discoveries in the last 14 years of funerary ceramic art makes available today a corpus of material not known when these conflicting theories were developed. In addition to the estimated 1000 pots published and the additional 1,000 known by Coe, Robicsek or Quirarte there still exist more than 3,000 "unknown" vessels of cultural interest.

While it had been traditional to work with ceramics in private collections since the 19th century (Maler, Dieseldorff and Seler especially), and while Kidder, Smith, von Winning, Thompson, and even Proskouriakoff published private collections, this was done on a small scale and immediately blended in with institutional finds. The difference today is that a wider spectrum of researchers

have demonstrated that academic advances on the ancient Maya could be substantially improved by utilizing all available works of art, not merely restricting publications to the traditional corpus, namely sherds with provenance or vases sanctified by the passage of time (Gann Collection, Dieseldorff Collection, Blom Plate, etc.).

The availability of the several thousand vessels beyond the traditional corpus in fact allows changes in Kubler's position and additions to Coe's. In particular these scenes -- direct from the 4th-9th centuries -- relate to Proskouriakoff's hypothesis. Proskouriakoff's model uses 16th century, Yucatec or peripheral Spanish observations to attempt solving an essentially 5th-8th century, central Peten area, Classic Maya situation. This dissertation seeks to reach mutually acceptable accord of these theoretical conflicts through the presentation of fresh data -- ethnohistoric, linguistic, as well as pictorial. In particular, this dissertation shows that an understanding of the Maya situation is possible from fresh contemporaneous material, whether Early Classic or ethnohistorical. Further contributions can be added through studying Olmec precursors and Aztec sequel, but these are subjects for iconology more than for iconography, where Coe, Nicholson, and Joralemon have made contributions.

A more representative corpus facilitated Coe's rescuing from obscurity the Cauac Monster and showed the major importance of God L, the Bearded Dragon, Pax patron, and the Jaguar God of the Underworld. Based in part on concepts of Barthel, Coe worked out the Primary Standard Sequence. Coe made first identifications of the Headband "Gods," the first recognition of the full form of GI of the Triad, and the first post-Thompsonian model for a Maya Underworld. He proposed a funerary model and suggested the utility of the Popol Vuh as a

repository of ancient Maya myths and their divine actors.

To review the diverse host of mythical Maya monsters and possible gods, and at the same time to keep this paper within manageable limits, I selected the dominant netherworld cosmogram -- the Surface of the Underwaterworld -- and a focus on its Early Classic development. The Early Classic allows bringing in the Preclassic origins of Maya religious icons and then showing the transition between Early and Late Classic across an enigmatic hiatus period. The underworld waters theme combines cosmology concurrent with iconography. More importantly, all these subjects were constantly united by way of their direct relationship to the Surface of the Underwaterworld.

This ancient Maya cosmogram consists of an undulating band(s) with water dots. The top of the band is decorated with double yokes and encircled curls. Frogs, fish, turtles, water birds, iguanas and water lilies document that the principal component is water. Conch shells, sharks' teeth, a shark monster and sea anemone-like tube clusters suggest a marine component, understandable since both the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean border the Maya realms. Six portrayals of this mythical waterscape form the heart of my paper.

The documentation of the watery aspect begins with fish. The shark-like Xoc Monster is a particularly interesting composite. A polychrome tripod from Uaxactun is the introduction to these monsters, including an early variant of Coe's Bearded Dragon, who has piscine features in the Early Classic.

The next section treats the Lily Pad Headdress Monster, already published as the personified Tun glyph and the personified Numeral 13 -- but not previously recognized in full-bodied form on ceramics. Since the Merrin Bowl has an

outstanding rendition of this monster as a personification of the Surface of the Underwaterworld itself, special attention is devoted to this creature and to a headdress accessory of this monster, Schele's Shell Wing Dragon, previously unknown for the Early Classic. A discovery in a private collection reveals a previously unrecognized deity family as a transformation of this Shell Wing Dragon.

Six presentations of the Surface of the Underwaterworld feature a long-snouted monster head from which sprout water lilies (*Nymphaea ampla*) and tubular "roots." Ceramic art in private collections not known to other iconographers demonstrates that the headdress features are definitely tubular in shape with a round orifice at the top -- this proves they are not always feathers as had been suggested for the Kaminaljuyu and Tikal examples. Since exotic fish swim nearby, the tube clusters are an underwater feature. Scuba divers who are familiar with the Caribbean reefs suggested these underwater forms are sea anemones, coral tubes, or hard sponge tubes. Textbooks and illustrated monographs on Caribbean sea life document these possibilities. I took scuba lessons and investigated the underwater seascape personally off Quintana Roo in 1983 as research for this dissertation.

But since water lilies grow from or near the tubes, we must consider the likelihood that the Maya are mimicking artistically enlarged roots. A botanical survey combined with a linguistic review of Maya terms for water lily suggest several possible translations for aspects of this complicated monster-plant creation. Mesoamerican art history requires multi-disciplinary studies which include linguistics, hieroglyphs, tropical botany, zoology, anthropology, and archaeology.

The next chapter tackles all humanoids immersed in the Tikal Burial 160

painting, plus a previously unknown incised vase where the Maya place Numeral Nine of the Headband "god" twins. Following the trail of the Headband Gods we come to the Blom Plate. A three year search rediscovered the lost plate in an anonymous private collection, where it was possible to take the first extant color photographs. Although Late Classic in date, this plate's subject matter is pure Tzakol. This dissertation documents the site where this plate was found by a bulldozer operator in the 1940's.

The Tikal Burial 160 painting has a serpent face-wing that leads into the fascinating mythology of God D and the Principal Bird Deity. While this bird is well known for Preclassic Izapa and Late Classic Palenque, the present paper brings out unknown cases of his presence throughout the Early Classic. This creature turns out to be the pre-eminent mythical-sacred personality of the Classic Maya and therefore the dissertation devotes a concomitant amount of space to his elucidation. This research leads to the discovery from previously unknown pots that Maya gods can metamorphose from one personality into another, often winged state. God D especially undergoes this nagual-like transformation. The dissertation goes further and suggest that when a "human" wears a god mask (a problem noted by Proskouriakoff, Kubler, and Franz), that a humanoid figural allograph of one category may be transforming into, or conflating with an additional entity to form a higher state or multiple referent entity. The implications of transformational ability for the Maya "pantheon" are very exciting. Ample line drawings document this change in the iconographic model.

The section on humanoids of the Surface of the Underwaterworld closes with an introduction to the still unresolved problem of the standard Sun God, Kinich Ahau, and the suggested Night Sun, the Jaguar God of the Underworld, (J.G.U.). A

three-dimensional Tzakol ceramic statuette of the J.G.U. surrounded by a rendition of the Surface of the Underwaterworld establishes the J.G.U.'s relationship with the watery netherworld.

God G (Ah Kin, Sun God) is prominent in both the Early Classic and in the Post Classic codices. This god offers an introduction to the final component of the traditional belief that most of the Schellhas alphabetical gods were not present in the Classic period and that consequently the Classic Maya had a different religious system. It turns out that the "missing" gods were either on little known monuments or on funerary artifacts -- rather than in the traditional corpus of stelae and rim sherds. God D, God L, and the Lily Pad Headdress Monster are samples of a larger pattern of Classic-Post Classic religious continuity -- though naturally the socio-political situation was altered by the trauma of the 9th century collapse.

Proskouriakoff had expressed in conversations that: "the Classic Maya had no idols, not even deities in the normal sense; the Spanish quoted the Maya proclaiming they worshipped only natural phenomenon, such as wind and mountains." (paraphrase based on my remembrance of several 1964, 1966 personal discussions with Proskouriakoff while I was a student at Harvard). In print she has stated that human faces with grotesque features are not necessarily gods (1974:152). In the first full monograph dedicated to the iconography of the Maya since Spinden, Kubler in 1969 also warns of the problems of naming figures as gods without proper scrutiny. In a 1978 article Proskouriakoff goes further. She says the Catholic friars misinterpreted Maya native beliefs in a Graeco-Roman model. She finds Sir Eric Thompson was notably unsuccessful in working out Maya gods. She concludes that studies in Mesoamerican religion were wrongly focused on the

identifications of gods, that we are asking the wrong questions, that iconography and catalog of Maya gods left much to be desired, and that it was incorrect to interpret Olmec and Maya zoomorphs as gods. She continued with a rebuttal of current Olmec iconography and then finished by saying that "Maya texts are best studied in the context of mundane events and conditions as revealed by archaeology. Maya theology in itself gives us few grounds for reconstruction..." (1978:116).

Scholars today agree with Proskouriakoff in no longer accepting Thompson's Itzamna hypothesis, but it is premature to dismiss all deity research just because Thompson misinterpreted Maya religion and could not properly distinguish the gods. In addition, Proskouriakoff's ideas about Spanish ignorance of native religion does not acknowledge the in situ experience that many of these friars received. They may be bigoted from a 20th century viewpoint, but many were studious individuals, such as Fray Andres de Avendano, who taught himself to read the Mayan hieroglyphs. Based on my 1970's research in the Archivo General de Indias (Seville) and in the Archivo General de Centro America (Guatemala City), I beg to differ with Proskouriakoff's foray into the field of ethnohistory. Avendano's, Margil de Jesus's, and Landa's eyewitness observations of Maya gods certain warrant being studied. It was not the Spanish who twisted the truth, it was the clever Maya witnesses.

The 16th century Maya's claim to the Spanish inquisitors that "we had no human sacrifice before the Itza introduced it recently" is demonstrably a falsehood and inapplicable for the Classic period of Peten in any event. The Maya's claim that "we have no idols before introduced by the Itza recently" was a comparable native ploy to escape the deadly wrath of the Spanish zealots. Incense burners or

identifications of gods, that we are asking the wrong questions, that iconography and catalog of Maya gods left much to be desired, and that it was incorrect to interpret Olmec and Maya zoomorphs as gods. She continued with a rebuttal of current Olmec iconography and then finished by saying that "Maya texts are best studied in the context of mundane events and conditions as revealed by archaeology. Maya theology in itself gives us few grounds for reconstruction..." (1978:116).

Scholars today agree with Proskouriakoff in no longer accepting Thompson's Itzamna hypothesis, but it is premature to dismiss all deity research just because Thompson misinterpreted Maya religion and could not properly distinguish the gods. In addition, Proskouriakoff's ideas about Spanish ignorance of native religion does not acknowledge the in situ experience that many of these friars received. They may be bigoted from a 20th century viewpoint, but many were studious individuals, such as Fray Andres de Avendano, who taught himself to read the Mayan hieroglyphs. Based on my 1970's research in the Archivo General de Indias (Seville) and in the Archivo General de Centro America (Guatemala City), I beg to differ with Proskouriakoff's foray into the field of ethnohistory. Avendano's, Margil de Jesus's, and Landa's eyewitness observations of Maya gods certain warrant being studied. It was not the Spanish who twisted the truth, it was the clever Maya witnesses.

The 16th century Maya's claim to the Spanish inquisitors that "we had no human sacrifice before the Itza introduced it recently" is demonstrably a falsehood and inapplicable for the Classic period of Peten in any event. The Maya's claim that "we have no idols before introduced by the Itza recently" was a comparable native ploy to escape the deadly wrath of the Spanish zealots. Incense burners or

Classic Maya, and these personifications took on a divine, idolatrous nature. Maya religion per se is a separate dissertation in itself; this present paper is dedicated to iconography. The incursion into religion was to establish the basic tenets with which to recognize divine worship: copal incense, bloodletting, and idols -- among other aspects.

Any perusal of books and articles published from 1973 through 1985 would reveal that a major gulf has developed in Maya writings between those who restrict themselves to the standard Copan-Tikal-Yaxchilan-Palenque sculptures and Holmul-Uaxactun-Tikal sherds as opposed to those who have sought out pictorial scenes beyond the traditional corpus. In Moche ceramics, Elizabeth Benson and Christopher Donnan have showed the advances possible by breaking out of the limited sherd corpus (Benson 1972; Donnan 1976; 1978). They thereby achieved particularly interesting results in the study of Moche deities. Maya studies have the opportunity to catch up with South American studies -- but rim sherds alone will never lead into a knowledge of cosmology and iconography of one of the leading advanced civilizations of the ancient world.

The lack of previous studies of the Early Classic has made this present dissertation a stimulating intellectual exercise into the unknown. The availability of unpublished figural ceramics has provided an educational corpus forming a factual basis for offering a clearer picture of the actual nature of Maya religious cults. By using the Mayas own portraits of their mythical characters rather than establishing models and then fitting the material thereon, we can reach deep into the heart of Maya cosmology. The Maya show in their art a world more bizarre and challenging than imagined.

GLOSSARY

Most of the Maya monsters are described and illustrated in the text. The index (in Volume 2) provides the page numbers; numbers in **bold face** type are the most pertinent. Additional information on terms are available in the glossary of Muriel Porter Weaver's textbook (1981:525-535) or in Curt Muser's complete glossary for pre-Columbian art and archaeology (1978). For Maya architecture, H. Stanley Loten and David Pendergast have prepared a definitive illustrated glossary (1984).

ABAJ TAKALIK, an important Preclassic site in the piedmont area of Guatemala (maps, Volume II). The early stelae here are the direct ancestors of those at Tikal. Also at Abaj Takalik are monumental sculptures of Olmec style. The relationship between these Olmec sculptures and the subsequent early proto-Maya art has not yet been worked out. Chart 1, p.22, 36, 99, 100, 145, Fig.54.

AHAU, day name in the Maya calendar. An Ahau looks like a simplified, frontal face, sometimes like a stylized monkey face. Early Classic Ahaus have the forehead area narrower than the mouth half of the face. Early Ahaus can be joined into a bone shape or into a tooth shape. Ahaus often form an upside down pendant on earrings or pendants (Fig.163) especially on Early Classic pottery. Ahau means "lord" and is often used as a title.

BAJO, Spanish for seasonal swamp. This word is used in the Peten to mean the areas that are filled with water or at least mud during the rainy season. Then, during the dry season these same areas are completely dry. Scholars have debated as to whether some bajo areas were once shallow lakes during the Maya

era. All bajos are today filled with trees and from the air look like scrub forest, giving the mistaken impression to the tourist that the entire area is an homogeneous jungle. More than 30% of the Peten is bajo. Most Maya sites (such as Tikal, Yaxha, etc.) are ringed by bajos.

BASAL FLANGE BOWL is named after the protruding ridge or band of clay around the lower portion of certain Early Classic bowls dating to the Tzakol 1 and especially Tzakol 2 and 3 periods (Figs.11b, 47, 93, 120, 123). These bowls are the ancestors of Late Classic plates (which often still have a vestigial flange).

BRAZIER is that part of an incense burner which holds the hot coals necessary to get the copal incense to release the desired sweet smelling smoke.

CACHE, an Americanization of an originally French word, means in Maya studies a sacred offering which is buried never to be retrieved. Such offerings are generally put on the sacred, central axis of a temple or palace, but may also be in many other locations, such as under a stela. Peten stela caches usually have only eccentric obsidians and/or flints. Caches do not tend to have human skeletal material. When they do they are automatically termed burials.

CACHE VESSEL is simply the pot found in the cache hole. Often a cache offering is a single vessel with sacred objects inside. By coincidence, the term cache vessel has been used for the large Early Classic orange-red pots from Peten of enigmatic function which have no chimney, and hence cannot assuredly be termed an incense burner. These cache vessels are not restricted to interment in caches, but may also be in burials with deceased dignitaries. Looters rob science of this information. The grave robbers do not usually save the offerings inside these vessels. The only object I have ever found still inside a cache vessel by the

time I saw the vessel in the USA was a stingray spine inside one in a North Carolina museum. At Uaxactun, C.I.W. archaeologists found unburnt offerings of copal incense balls in an orange "cache vessels". In such case the contents of the vessel is the "cache offering" since this particular type of vessel itself may well be inside a tomb which is stocked with all kinds of other pots. "Cache vessel" is thus not a good term, since at least some of these pots were found in burials, but I do not like to call such non-chimney vessels "Incensarios" because they lack facility for incense burning, namely a chimney, although of course you could burn incense in them merely by taking off the lid. Joralemon favors an incense burning function for these vessels based on burn or smoke or incense residue that he has observed on vessels of the orangeware class (pp.22, 80, 81, Figs.8a, 9a-d, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 31-34, 63-65, 80, 132a, 158-159).

CAMPECHE, a State in the Estados Unidos de Mexico. Campeche is adjacent to southern Yucatan. Most of the Chenes and Rio Bec style Maya ruins are in this state. Campeche borders on its south with Peten and to the east with Quintana Roo. In the 4th-9th century the Maya political boundaries were not the same as today's Peten-Campeche border. Since few university or museum digs have been in this remote area, it is not yet known how far north "Peten style" ceramics extended. Current excavations at Calakmul by Folan et al. may shed light on this situation. When in this paper I attribute a vessel to "Peten" there is always a likelihood that it could come from far southern Campeche, as El Mirador is just about 8 km from the border and Rio Azul is not that far from the border either. Pottery which came out during the years 1960-70 (which is before I began to photograph ceramics) may likely be from southern Campeche if in Peten style, since grave robbing did not begin to be a serious problem in Peten until stelae

removal was prohibited in the 1970's.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTION OF WASHINGTON, a non-profit, private research institute which supported excavations in Maya archaeology between 1920 and 1950's. The institute's director in the 40's or '50's phased out Maya studies in the favor of hard sciences. For a while the Carnegie's historical research division was located in Cambridge near Harvard University, and the Peabody Museum inherited both all the Carnegie Maya files and also most of its staff (such as Proskouriakoff). One advantage of the Carnegie system was that researchers had full time employment with funds assured for both research and publication. They had no teaching duties to take time away from dirt archaeology. As a result of this ideal situation, the Carnegie had an excellent and unsurpassed record for discovery publication of their finds. No institute ever replaced the C.I.W., with its endowment maintaining a staff and research center.

CAUAC MONSTER is best defined by Coe's various publications and in an article by Tayler and a M.A. thesis by Tate. Adams made up out of thin air his personal name "Lightning Beast" for what everyone else knows as the Cauac Monster in the tomb murals of Rio Azul. Under the accepted academic rules of nomenclature Adams' designation should be discarded. Besides, many other Cauac Monsters do not have that eye form. And epigraphers have established that at least one reading for the Cauac glyph is **tun** or stone. That is why Cauac serves as a seat or the cave entrance to the Underworld. (pp.94, 213, 234, Fig.169-175, 197.)

CHAC is the popularized name commonly used by newspaper writers, tour guides, and many Mayanists to designate any Maya creature with a long nose.

Actually, virtually no Maya character has a long nose, it is the snout which is long. The nose is usually a small snail-shaped curl near the eyes. Whereas all Chacs may have long snouts, not all long-snouted gods are Chac. Only Chac Xib Chac, a variant or relative of GI, is properly designated by this word. Use of the word Chac in an article or publication is an indication that the author is repeating the Thompson-Morley model. (pp.33, 37, 151, 189.)

CHAC XIB CHAC, zoomorphic form of GI and with shell diadem headdress instead of Quadripartite Badge. See also **GI**. (pp.56, 87, 93, **99**, 217, 227, Fig.7, 21.)

CONFLATION, a term used by Schele and other epigraphers to describe a situation in which the Maya scribe has blended two hieroglyphs together to create a single hieroglyph. In this process a percentage of the features of each of the two glyphs are abbreviated. A composite monster may also be a conflation, although in composites the distinct features of two or more species may not be blended, they may rather just be tacked onto one another.

COSMOLOGY, world view (man's place in the mysterious universe). We have a Christian, biblical cosmology. A **COSMOGRAM** is a picture which graphically expressed one's cosmology. A cosmogram usually only shows a small portion of the cosmos though.

CURL FORMED MONSTER is a face created out of the curls which also decorate the Surface of the Underwaterworld. (pp.6, 103, 131, 166, 185, Fig.48a.)

DELETAILE TRIPOD, the largest darkware cylindrical tripod yet found at a Peten (or Campeche or Belize) site. The entire circumference is filled with mythical characters, reptile monsters, and fantastic iconography (Fig.165). This

tripod is in a private collection in Belgium. One view of this exceptional vessel is in Hellmuth 1978. This tripod has passed a thermoluminescence test, has passed all epigrapher's scrutiny (those epigraphers who are familiar with the non-traditional corpus), and has passed all iconographer's scrutiny (those iconographers who are familiar with more than merely the traditional Holmul-Uaxactun-Tikal corpus). The vessel is self-evidently authentic.

EARLY CLASSIC: ceramic specialists divide the Classic period into the Early Classic (approx. A.D. 250-600) and Late Classic (600-900), that is, up until the collapse). Parson's proposal for a Middle Classic period is a useful concept for the piedmont, and is a helpful consideration in Maya studies to remind us of Teotihuacan influence, but is not a necessary subdivision for Peten ceramics. This dissertation uses the normal system, Early Classic-Late Classic and does not interject a Middle Classic. This is only jargon anyway, as no data are available for the Tzakol-Tepeu transition generation since excavations at neither Tikal nor Uaxactun produced enough of the rare transitional styles. Huaqueros have found the missing links, but this material has not been assimilated by those who create ceramic charts.

ESCUINTLA, a Department of Guatemala, between Guatemala City and the Pacific Ocean. This piedmont area was never a stronghold of Mayan speakers yet during the Preclassic epoch sites such as El Baul were places where pre-Peten stelae with early hieroglyphic inscriptions were erected. Escuintla was on the route south from Mexico into lower Central America, so it was visited by Olmec merchants, then Teotihuacan merchants, then by Toltec influence, and finally by the Aztecs. **TIQUISATE** is a small town within the department. See map in Escuintla Hoards. Sites in the Tiquisate area were outposts of Teotihuacan influence

(Fig.118).

GI, a deity who lives in watery areas. He has a seashell earring, barbel or fin on his cheek, bony eyebrows, and often a fish-like mouth. He is frequently depicted on Early Classic Peten cache vessels and as a hieroglyph, in mythical genealogies in the inscriptions of Palenque. He tends to have a Quadripartite Badge Headdress (pp.56, 82-85, **86-88**, 94-96, **99-100**, 104, 120, 149, 179, 209, 217, 222, 228, 235, 236, Figs.1-10, **12**, **19-20**, 22, 25, 33, 34, 63-65, 161). When he has a zoomorphic face and a shell diadem headdress he is now designated as **CHAC XIB CHAC**.

GII, a hieroglyph which is part of the Palenque Triad. After Heinrich Berlin discovered the triad of glyphs, later investigators established that this particular glyph was a form of God K, the god of the manikin scepter. (pp.50, 85, 136, 198, 228.)

GIII, the third of the Triad characters. Lounsbury has established that GIII is the Sun God. Linda Schele suggests the Jaguar God of the Underworld. (pp.84-85, 218, 228.)

GOD C, appears usually as a face only, with vaguely monkey-like features. In the codices God C appears as a full figured individual. In Codex Style Pottery the weapons held by Chac Xib Chac are often confused with the Loincloth Apron Face.

GOD D, one of several elderly gods including God N and God L. God D is now recognized as Itzamna (pp.38, 43, 149, 197-198, 200, 202, 208, 233-236, Figs.21, 107-109, 150, 153, 154, 175, **184**, 1881, **198**.)

GOD N usually resides in a seashell, snail shell, turtleshell, or rarely a spider

web (pp.54, 149, 183, 233, Figs.21, 27, 45, 128, **179-180, 183**, 184b, 185, 189).

Thompson called God N "Bacab." In Maya myths God N is executed in front of the throne of God D.

GOD L is a high ranking elderly god who often is associated with females. Despite his high rank he is subservient to God D in the sole scene where the two are together. God L has his headdress taken off by the Giant Bunny companion of the Moon Goddess and is thereby humbled. (pp.59, 149, 216, 220, **226**, 236, 239, Fig.190-191.)

HOLMUL I, a ceramic phase in the Holmul ceramic sequence. Holmul, a Maya site in Peten, was excavated by Merwin, who died before he published his findings. Vaillant used Merwin's field notes for his Ph.D. dissertation and subsequent publication on the Holmul excavations. This was the first major publication on the pottery of the Peten. Holmul's tombs were rich in Proto-Classic and in Early Classic pottery. The first phase of ceramics at Holmul included pottery with breast shaped supports. The precise dating of such mammiform pots and their relationship to Tzakol I pottery is still argued by specialists. A dozen or more mammiform pots have been found in Belize; only one or two were found at Tikal and practically none at Uaxactun. Grave robbers have found about 20. The Holmul ceramic sequence has been replaced by that of Uaxactun, the standard by which most other site's ceramics are judged.

HOLMUL DANCER is my name based on a Late Classic vase and plate from the site of Holmul which are similar to over 20 others found by grave robbers. This dancer wears an elaborate backrack which consists of a sky band hut topped by a bird monster (pp.229, 236, 239, Fig.70). Under the hut is a Cauac Monster

from which hangs a Loincloth Apron Face. When the dancer has the backrack off, then he is designated as the Principal Young Lord. Taube proposes both are the Maize God (God E in the Schellhas alphabetical system).

IDAEH, Instituto de Antropología e Historia (de Guatemala), the government institute, under the Ministry of Education, that is entrusted with the protection of the cultural patrimony of the country, especially its archaeological patrimony. IDAEH also cares for most of the archaeological museums within the country.

INAH, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (de Mexico) is Mexico's governmental department in charge of historical and pre-Columbian heritage and museums. INAH also publishes the findings of its staff archaeologists in one of the best Latin American archaeological publication programs.

INCENSARIO, Spanish for incense burner. Brazero is essentially the same thing, though technically only the bottom part which holds the coals. For the burning of copal incense.

ITZAMNA, Thompson worked up his personal concept of a monotheistic Maya religion with an iguana house character as sole all-encompassing god. This is entirely a creation of Thompson himself, not of the Maya (pp.37, 43, 46, 59). The Maya god correctly named Itzamna is what Schellhas had earlier tagged as God D, based on phonetic reading of his hieroglyph by Floyd Lounsbury and others.

KAMINALJUYU, modern name for the ancient city which is now surrounded by modern Guatemala City. Kaminaljuyu received various Preclassic styles from the pot-bellied culture, from Izapa and Abaj Takalik and the enigmatic pot-bellied culture, and developed an eclectic style which was responsible in large part for the

development of the early Maya style. After the 3rd century, Kaminaljuyu received Teotihuacan influence as did the Tiquisate, Escuintla area, and transmitted these influences to Maya sites in the Peten. After the 6th century Kaminaljuyu was no longer a mediator or originator of Maya style. (pp.5, Chart 1, 19-20, 69, 99, 106, 152, 169, 171, 181, 182, 233, Figs.16, 67, 91a, 94a, 103, 121, 124, 125.)

KIN, means "sun" or "day", is a hieroglyph often found in costumes as well as in texts. **AH KIN** is one designation for the Sun God, God G of the Schellhas alphabetical series (pp.41, 58, 189, 192, **207, 224**, Fig.24, 160, **161-163**.)

LACANDON, as de Vos points out, this group of modern Maya uses the designation "Carib" for themselves. Historians, though, have dubbed them the Lacandon, after the totally different group that lived in the same remote Chiapas area in the 16th-17th century. Thus there are two groups of Lacandones, the original Choltil speaking descendants of the ancient Maya (exterminated by the Spanish conquest) and the Yucatec speaking peoples who moved into this area from down the Usumacinta and from people fleeing Spanish oppression in adjacent Campeche. Thus the current day "Lacandones" are neither Lacandones in fact nor certainly not descendants of the builders of Palenque, Bonampak, or Yaxchilan as fancifully claimed in guidebooks. The complete history of both groups are detailed by publications by Hellmuth and de Vos.

LATE CLASSIC: between about A.D.550 and 900, is when polychrome bowls and then polychrome vases come into vogue in Peten. Most of Michael Coe's books and virtually all of Robicsek's material has been on the spectacular Late Classic artistic achievements on ceramics.

LOINCLOTH APRON FACE is the head of a monstrous image seen primarily

on the loincloth apron of dynastic rulers, on the backrack of Holmul Dancers and certain Tikal lords (who are not Holmul Dancers), in sky bands, on the backs of certain frog-toads, faces which sprout from certain Cauac Monsters, and which are sometimes shown on sacrificial bludgeons carried by Chac Xib Chac on Codex Style pottery. The Loincloth Apron Face is usually labelled as the Sun God (a name which is unacceptable) or confused with God C (pp.87, 208).

MAMON, an early ceramic phase, of the Preclassic (thus well before Tzakol I). See ceramic chart.

MAMMIFORM, means a breast shaped support for pottery of the Holmul I and Tzakol I time periods. Such pots usually have four supports.

MANCHE was a town in Verapaz occupied by Chol or Cholti speaking Maya (pp.58, 61, 67, 68-73).

MESOAMERICA, is the area of high civilizations of Mexico and Central America. The equivalent area in South America is dubbed the "Andean area." Mesoamerica includes most of Mexico, all of Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. The precise borders at north and south (Costa Rica) are debated by specialists. Basically, Mesoamerica is that area inhabited by or directly influenced by the Olmecs, or the Maya, or the Toltecs, or the Aztecs. Naturally this area includes many other civilizations, such as West Coast area, Oaxaca, etc.

NAGUAL, a person who has the power to change into an animal, often confused with **TONAL**, the animal spirit companion that one receives based on one's birthday associations. Both are described by Foster (1944), Villa Rojas (1963), Stratmeyer and Stratmeyer (1977), and others.

OLMEC a precocious Preclassic people whose precise place of origin is not yet ascertained. Their major sites are best known in Tabasco (La Venta) and Veracruz (Tres Zapotes, etc.), but Olmec settlements are also along the lower Usumacinta River, throughout Chiapas, and INAH archaeologists have recently found a major Olmec site in Guerrero. The Olmecs originated many of the gods which the Maya later inherited (pp.9, 35, 59, 60, 69, 99, Fig.111).

PALENQUE TRIAD, see **TRIAD**

PETEN the Department which occupies the northern third of Guatemala.

PISCINE means fish-like.

POPOL VUH, the sacred history book of the highland Quiche Maya of Guatemala. Although Spinden suggested the Popol Vuh as a model for ancient Maya religion, the first one to propose an all-encompassing model was Michael Coe. There he found the Hero Twins, who are now certified as being on Classic Maya pottery by both epigraphy and iconography in addition to that of Coe (pp.38, 70, 165, 195-196, 239). Also a museum of the same name in Guatemala City.

PRE-COLUMBIAN means simply before Columbus. While the term means also anything before Pizarro in South America, the term Pre-Columbian is applied most frequently to Mesoamerica.

PRIMARY STANDARD SEQUENCE is a standardized sequence of hieroglyphs which appears mainly around the rims of Late Classic Maya funerary ceramics of the central lowlands (pp.7, 25, 112, 113, 117, 157, 209, Fig.22). The sequence was noticed by Thomas Barthel and worked out first in print by Michael Coe. Subsequently Stephen Houston, Nikolai Grube, and David Stuart have worked out

other aspects of this text. Increasingly, examples of Early Classic PSsequences are being found. I propose that a Preclassic inscription on a jade artifact at Dumbarton Oaks may be an even earlier prototype.

PRINCIPAL YOUNG LORD is the Holmul Dancer before he has donned his special fancy backrack. Taube suggests that both are the Maize God. It appears that most Maya rulers saw themselves in the guise of this character (Figs.73b, 100, 187). The Principal Young Lord is the occupant of the sacred canoe of the incised bones of Tikal Burial 116.

QUADRIPARTITE BADGE discussed by Kubler (1969) under Seler's name of triadic sign, and re-named Quadripartite Badge by Merle Greene Robertson. Most people now use her nomenclature. The badge consists of a large Kin hieroglyph, a seashell, a bloodletting perforator, and crossed-bands. Early Classic renditions vary somewhat from Late Classic ones, namely that the former blends features of a bird around the decoration. The Badge functions usually as a headdress (pp.93, 99, 100, 116, 119, 179, 212, 215, Fig.5-10, 34). Palenque artists borrowed this badge from Early Classic prototypes and then adapted it to their particular dynastic and cosmological necessities.

RECURVED SNOUT MONSTER is the name for a creature's face appearing especially on Tzakol cylindrical tripods and basal flange bowls. He may be a form of the Zip Monster. (pp.6, 184, Fig.134.)

SCHELLHAS, a German scholar writing between 1880-1904. He prepared the first complete nomenclature and classification system for Maya gods (based on the three codices). As he was not sure of their original Mayan name, he carefully gave them alphabetical designations. Although subsequent scholars have pointed out

a few minor mistakes in grouping various images together, in fact his naming system functions quite well still today. See God C, God D, etc. in this glossary.

SQUIGGLE EYE MONSTER, see Hellmuth 1982.

SUPRAORBITAL PLATE, the eyebrow of Maya monsters, especially Xoc Monsters and reptilian creatures.

TONAL, animal spirit companion whose species is predetermined based on one's birthday; usually confused with nagual.

TRIAD, the **PALENQUE TRIAD** was discovered in the inscriptions at Palenque by Heinrich Berlin, a Mexican-German epigrapher. At that time he was not sure whether they were gods or what, so he nicknamed them GI, GII, GIII. Subsequent scholars determined that GII was a variant of God K of the Schellhas system and that GIII was a sun related character. GI is simply GI; he had not earlier been known. David Kelley has also worked on the Triad. The triad existed outside of Palenque and reference to the Palenque Triad does not necessarily mean that one is referring to the site of Palenque. The Triad members can appear and act independently, especially GI. Linda Schele has written an excellent article on the gods behind the Triad glyphs.

TZAKOL, a ceramic period subdivided into Tzakol 1, 2 and 3. This is the span of the Early Classic time. The sequence goes: Preclassic, Early Classic (Tzakol), Late Classic (Tepeu 1, 2, 3), then Post Classic and was developed by Robert Smith for Uaxactun. This central Peten sequence is the yardstick for all subsequent sites' ceramics. But it is traditional for the ceramicist of each site to give completely separate names to the phases of his site's pottery, since obviously the history of

each site did not necessarily parallel that of Uaxactun in every detail. I find it easier just to use the Uaxactun sequence for material in private collections.

VENUS MONSTER, a composite beast which may have a Venus star glyph in its eye. Its body may be the sky band; its rear may have a Quadripartite Badge Headdress monster. Several examples are known from Palenque, Copan, and on the thrones of Piedras Negras stelae.

XOC is the Mayan word for fish. Thompson discovered that this glyph is used by the Maya for the concept of count(ing). The **XOC MONSTER** is a fish beast with upraised snout, shark's tooth, and scroll eye that curls down from the top. While all Xocs are fish, not all Xocs are Xoc Monsters (pp.95, 111-129, 131, 217, 222, 229, Figs.25, 63-72, 77). Jones has recently proposed that the early English word shark is a British seaman's rendering of the Maya word xoc.

ZIP MONSTER is a creature decorating the headdresses of young lords on Maya ceramics. Coe used this nomenclature in 1973 based on the similarity of this monster with that used as the Long Count Introducing Glyph's patron for the month Zip. No one has yet done a study of the Zip family, so we do not know whether the Zip Monster is actually the same as the patron of the month Zip. For examples on Early Classic pottery I prefer the term Recurved Snout Monster until the calendrical relationship can be better established. Such a study must include every known Early Classic hieroglyphic rendition of Zip.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following list includes not only titles specifically cited but also other books which picture Early Classic Maya art (especially ceramic art) which were read as background before narrowing the dissertation topic to a limited set of mythical personages in a single cosmological setting.

Because of the increasing number of conference papers or lectures which are delivered one year but not published until several years later, to cite solely the date of publication does not express the actual situation when there is confusion over who developed a decipherment, model, or identification first. Thus, in cases where the date of the conference is important to know then both the original date and the eventual date of publication are cited together. Although such double dates are not traditional, they make the references more meaningful and eliminate the need for another footnote. Therefore, in certain instances of historical importance, this bibliography has given a double date, for example, 1970-73, which means the ideas should be credited to the author from 1970, the date of the original paper whose publication did not occur until 1973. These dates are important in ethnohistory and in historical studies in iconography in tracing changes--or inflexibility--of models in light of new data or critique. For Seler the first of the double dates is that of the original article; the following date is that of publication in his first collected works.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CIW = Carnegie Institution of Washington
ed. = editor
F.L.A.A.R. = Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research
IDAEH = Instituto de Antropología e Historia (Guatemala)
INAH = Instituto Nacional de Antropología (Mexico)
KJS = Kidder, Jennings, and Shook, 1946 (Kaminaljuyu)
MARI = Middle American Research Institute
NWAf = New World Archaeological Foundation
Pub. = Publication
R+H 1982 = Robicsek and Hales 1982
RS = Robert E. Smith, 1955, Uaxactun, usually volume 2
UCLA = University of California, Los Angeles
UNAM = Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Univ. = University

ADAMS, R. E. W.

- 1971 The Ceramics of Altar de Sacrificios. Papers of the Peabody Museum, Vol.63, No.1, Cambridge.

ADAMS, R.E.W. and John GATLING

- 1965 Noreste del Peten: un nuevo sitio y un mapa arqueológico regional. Antropología e Historia de Guatemala, Vol. XVII, No.1, pp.47-61. (Announces discovery and location of Rio Azul.)

AGRINIER, Pierre

1960 The Carved Human Femurs from Tomb 1, Chiapa de Corzo, Chiapas, Mexico. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, Orinda, California.

1970 Mound 20, Mirador, Chiapas, Mexico. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, No.28, Brigham Young University, Provo.

1975 Mounds 9 and 10 at Mirador, Chiapas, Mexico. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, No.39, Brigham Young University, Provo.

ALVAREZ DEL TORO, Miguel

1952 Los animales silvestres de Chiapas. Gobierno del Estado de Chiapas. Tuxtla Gutierrez, Mexico.

1971 Las aves de Chiapas. Gobierno del Estado de Chiapas, Tuxtla Gutierrez, Mexico.

1972 Los reptiles de Chiapas. 2nd edition. Gobierno del Estado de Chiapas. Tuxtla Gutierrez, Mexico.

1974 Los Crocodylia de Mexico: Estudio Comparativo. Instituto Mexicano de Recursos Naturales Renovables, Mexico City.

1977 Los mamíferos de Chiapas, Universidad Autonoma de Chiapas, Tuxtla Gutierrez, Chiapas.

ANDERS, Ferdinand

1963 Das Pantheon der Maya. Akademische Druck u- Verlagsanstalt, Graz.

ANDREWS, E. Wyllys, IV

1965 Archaeology and Prehistory of the Northern Maya Lowlands: an Introduction. in Handbook of Middle American Indians, (G.R. Willey, ed.), Vol.2, No.12, pp.288-330. University of Texas Press, Austin.

1969 The Archaeological Use and Distribution of Mollusca in the Maya Lowlands. MARI, Pub.34, Tulane University, New Orleans.

ANDREWS, E. WYLLYS, IV and E.W. ANDREWS V

1980 Excavations at Dzibilchaltun, Yucatan, Mexico. MARI, Pub.48, Tulane University, New Orleans.

ANONYMOUS

1983 Journal of Field Archaeology, Vol.110, No.4, p.481.
(Anonymous article on the Rio Azul wooden bowl.)

ANTON, Ferdinand

1982 56. Auktion Praecolumbische Kunst. Galerie Wolfgang Ketterer, Munich.

AVENDANO Y LOYOLA, Fray Andres de

1696 Relacion de los dos entradas que hizo a la conversacion de los gentiles Ytzaex. English translation by G. Rivera in Peabody Museum Library, Harvard; original Mss. in Newberry Library, Chicago. (English translated edition in press, Frank Comparato, ed., Labyrinthos, Culver City).

BAILEY, Joyce Waddell

1972 A Preliminary Investigation of the Form and Interpretative Histories of Monumental Relief Sculpture from Tikal, Guatemala: Pre-, Early, and Middle Classic Periods. PhD dissertation, Yale University, Dept. of History of Art.

BALL, Joseph

1974 A Teotihuacan-style cache from the Maya lowlands. *Archaeology*, Vol. 27, No. 1, front cover and pp. 2-9. Archaeological Institute of America.

1977 The Archaeological Ceramics of Becan, Campeche, Mexico. MARI, Pub. 43, Tulane University, New Orleans.

BALSER, Carlos

1974 El jade de Costa Rica: Un Album Arqueologico. San Jose.

1980 Jade Precolombino de Costa Rica. Instituto Nacional de Seguros, San Jose, Costa Rica.

BANQUE (Societe Generale de Banque)

1976 Art de Mesoamerique. Societe Generale de Banque, Brussels. (Exhibit organized by Emile Deletaille, text by A. Dorsinfang-Smets)

BARDAWIL, Lawrence W.

1976 The Principal Bird Deity in Maya Art -- an Iconographic Study of Form and Meaning. Proceedings, Segunda Mesa Redonda de Palenque (1974) (Merle Greene Robertson, ed.), Vol. 3, pp. 195-210. Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach, CA.

BARRERA MARIN, Alfredo, Alfredo BARRERA VASQUEZ, and Rosa M. LOPEZ

1976 Nomenclatura etnobotanica Maya: Una interpretacion taxonomica. Coleccion Cientifica, No. 36, Etnologia, INAH, Mexico City.

BARRERA VASQUEZ, Alfredo

1980 Diccionario Maya Cordemex. Ediciones Cordemex, Merida.

BARTHEL, Thomas

1963 Die Stele 31 von Tikal. *Tribus*, Vol. 12, pp. 159-214,

Stuttgart.

1974 Zur Frage der "Senores de la Noche." *Indiana* 2, pp. 47-65.

1977 Untersuchungen zur grossen Goettin der Maya. *Zeitschrift fuer Ethnologie*, Bde.102, pp.44-102.

BAUDEZ, Claude-Francois and Pierre BECQUELIN

1984 *Les Mayas. Le Monde Precolombien*, Editions Gallimard, Paris.

BECKER, Marshall

1979 Priests, Peasants, and Ceremonial Centers: The Intellectual History of A Model. in *Maya Archaeology and Ethnohistory*, pp.3-20, (N.Hammond and G.Willey, eds.). University of Texas Press, Austin.

BECQUELIN, Pierre and Claude BAUDEZ

1979 Tonina, Une Cite Maya du Chiapas. *Mission Archeologique et Ethnologique Francaise au Mexique, Collection Etudes Mesoamericaines*, Vol.VI, No.1, Mexico City and Paris.

BEETZ, Carl P. and Linton SATTERTHWAITE

1981 *The Monuments and Inscriptions of Caracol, Belize*. University Museum, Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

BENSON, Elizabeth P.

1972 *The Mochica, a Culture of Peru*. Praeger, New York.

1977 *The Maya World*. Revised edition. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York.

BERJONNEAU, Gerald, DELETAILE, Emile and Jean-Louis SONNERY
(series producers)

1985 *Rediscovered Masterpieces of Mesoamerica*. Editions Arts 135, Boulogne, France. (The section on Maya art is listed in this bibliography under Crocker-Deletaille.)

BERLIN, Heinrich

1958 "El Glifo Emblema" en las inscripciones Mayas. *Journal de la Societe des Americanistes*, n.s. Vol.47, pp.111-119, Paris.

1963 *The Palenque Triad*. *Journal de la Societe des Americanistes*, n.s. Vol.52, pp.91-99, Paris.

1977 *Signos y significados en las inscripciones Mayas*. Instituto Nacional del Patrimonio Cultural de Guatemala, Guatemala City.

BERRIN, Kathleen

1982 *The Bay Area Collects: Art from Africa, Oceania, and the Americas*. The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, San

Francisco.

BERLO, Janet

1980 Teotihuacan Art Abroad: A Study of Metropolitan Style and Provincial Transformation in Incensario Workshops. PhD dissertation, Yale University, Department of History of Art.

BLOM, Frans

1950 A Polychrome Plate from Quintana Roo. CIW, Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, No.98, Washington, D.C.

BOLZ, Ingeborg

1976 Meisterwerke altindianischer Kunst. Sammlung Ludwig im Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum. Cologne.

BORHEGYI, Stephen de

1961 Shark Teeth, Stingray Spines, and Shark Fishing in Ancient Mexico and Central America. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol.17, pp.273-296.

BOWDITCH, C.P.

1910 The Numeration, Calendar Systems and Astronomical Knowledge of the Maya. privately printed, Cambridge.

BOWLES, John H.

1974 Notes on a Floral Form Represented in Maya Art and its Iconographic Implications. Proceedings, Primera Mesa Redonda de Palenque, (Merle Greene Robertson, ed.), Vol.1, pp.121-128. Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach, CA.

BRAINERD, George

1955 The Archaeological Ceramics of Yucatan. Anthropological Records, Vol.19, University of California Press, Berkeley.

BRINTON, Daniel G.

1895 A Primer of Mayan Hieroglyphs. University of Pennsylvania, Ser. in Philol. Lit. and Archaeology, Vol. 3, No.2. Philadelphia.

BRUCE, Roberto

1967 Jeraquia Maya entre los dioses Lacandones. Anales del INAH Tomo XVIII-1965, pp.93-108, Mexico City.

1968 Gramatica de Lacandon. Dept. de Investigaciones Antropologicas, INAH, Mexico City.

1976 Lacandon Texts and Drawings from Naha'. Coleccion Cientifica No.45, INAH, Mexico.

- 1978 The Popol Vuh and the book of Chan K'in. Estudios de Cultura Maya, Vol.X, 1976-77, pp.173-208. UNAM, Mexico.
- 1979 Lacandon Dream Civilization. Ediciones Euroamericanas, Mexico City.
- BRUCE, Roberto, Carlos ROBLES U., and E. RAMOS C.**
 1971 Los Lacandones. 2 - Cosmvision Maya. Depto. de Investigaciones Antropologicas, Pub.26, INAH, Mexico.
- BRUNHOUSE, Robert L.**
 1971 Sylvanus Morley and the World of the Ancient Mayas. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- 1973 In Search of the Maya: The First Archaeologists. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- 1975 Pursuit of the Ancient Maya: Some Archaeologists of Yesterday. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- 1976 Frans Blom, Maya Explorer. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- BUTLER, Mary**
 1935 Piedras Negras Pottery. Piedras Negras Preliminary Papers, No.4, University Museum, Philadelphia.
- 1937 Gods and Heroes on Maya Monuments. Publications of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society, Vol.1, pp.13-36.
- CAMPBELL, Lyle**
 1978 Quichean Prehistory: Linguistic Contributions. in Studies in Mayan Linguistics, No.2, pp.25-54 (N.England, ed.), University of Missouri Misc. Pubs. in Anthropology, No.6, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia.
- CASO, Alfonso and Ignacio BERNAL**
 1952 Urnas de Oaxaca. INAH, Mexico City.
- CENDRERO, Luis**
 1972 Zoologia Hispanoamericana: Vertebrados. Editorial Porrúa, Mexico City.
- CHASE, Arlen and Diane CHASE**
 1981 Archaeological Investigations at Nohmul and Santa Rita, Belize: 1979-1980. mexicon Vol.III, Nr.3, pp.42-44. Berlin.
- CHASE, Diane**
 1981 (front cover photograph of non-stuccoed, painted cylindrical tripod from Santa Rita, Belize). mexicon, Vol. III, No.5, pp.73-74, West Berlin.

CLANCY, Flora

1980 A Formal Analysis of the Relief Carved Monuments of Tikal Guatemala. PhD dissertation, Department of History of Art, Yale University.

COE, Michael

1956 The Funerary Temple among the Classic Maya. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, Vol.12, pp.387-396.

1973 *The Maya Scribe and His World*. Grolier Club, New York.

1975 *Classic Maya Pottery at Dumbarton Oaks*. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

1976 Early Steps in the Evolution of Maya Writing. in Origins of Religious Art & Iconography in Preclassic Mesoamerica, (H.B. Nicholson, ed.), pp.107-122. UCLA Latin American Center Publications, Los Angeles.

1977 Supernatural Patrons of Maya Scribes and Artists. in Social Process in Maya Prehistory, Studies in Honor of Sir Eric S. Thompson, (N. Hammond, ed.), pp.327-347. Academic Press, London and New York.

1978 *The Lords of the Underworld*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

1982 *Old Gods and Young Heroes, the Pearlman Collection of Maya Ceramics*. The Israel Museum, Jerusalem, distributed by University of Washington Press.

1984 *The Maya*. 3rd edition, revised. Praeger "Ancient Peoples and Places." New York.

COE, Michael and Elizabeth BENSON

1966 *Three Maya Relief Panels at Dumbarton Oaks*. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

COE, William

1959 *Piedras Negras Archaeology: Artifacts, Caches, and Burials*. The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

1965 *Tikal: Ten Years of Study of a Maya Ruin in the Lowlands of Guatemala*. Expedition, Vol.8, No.1, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

1967 *Tikal: A Handbook of the Ancient Maya Ruins*. University Museum, Philadelphia, and Asociacion Tikal, Guatemala.

COFFMAN, Bob, REENTS, Dorie and Andrea STONE

n.d. The Hieroglyphic Inscriptions and Iconography of Caracol, El Cayo, Belize. Unpublished Schele seminar paper, Dept. of Art, University of Texas at Austin.

COGGINS, Clemency

1975 Painting and Drawing Styles at Tikal: An Historical and Iconographic Reconstruction. 2 vols. PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Department of Fine Arts, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

1979 A New Order and the Role of the Calendar: Some Characteristics of the Middle Classic Period at Tikal. in Maya Archaeology and Ethnohistory, (N. Hammond and G. Willey, eds.), University of Texas Press, Austin.

1983 The Stucco Decoration and Architectural Assemblage of Structure a-Sub, Dzibilchaltun, Yucatan, Mexico. Pub.49, Middle American Research Institute, Tulane University, New Orleans.

COLIN, Patrick I.

1978 Caribbean Reef Invertebrates and Plants: A Field Guide to the Invertebrates and Plants Occurring on Coral Reefs of the Caribbean, the Bahamas and Florida.

COMPARATO, Frank (editor)

1983 History of the Conquest of the Province of the Itza, by Juan de Villagutierrez Soto-Mayor. Labyrinthos, Culver City, CA.

CHRISTIES

auction catalog ca. 1982 illustrating vases from Wray Collection. Christies, New York.

CROCKER-DELETAILE, Lin

1985 The Maya Civilization. Chapter V in, Rediscovered Masterpieces of Mesoamerica, Berjonneau, G., J-L. Sonnery, and E. Deletaille, producers. Editions Arts 135, Boulogne, France.

CULBERT, P.

1985 MAYA -- Treasures of an Ancient Civilization. Archaeology, Vol.38, No.2, pp.60-63, Archaeological Institute of America, New York.

de BORHEGYI (see: BORHEGYI, Stephen de)

de SMET, Peter

1981 Enema Scenes on Ancient Maya Pottery. Pharmacy International, Oct.1981, pp.217-219. Elsevier/North-Holland Biomedical Press.

1985 Ritual Enemas and Snuffs in the Americas. CEDLA, Amsterdam.
(Appendix is cited under Hellmuth.)

de VOS, Jan

1980 La Paz de Dios y del Rey: La Conquista de la Selva Lacandona.
Fonapas Chiapas. (No copy found until after dissertation was
finished; added now since this is the best and most complete
history of the two Lacandon groups, Chol-speaking and the later
(modern) Yucatec-speaking.)

DICKEY, Thomas, MUSE, Vance, and Henry WIENCEK

1982 The God-Kings of Mexico. Stonehenge Press, Chicago.

DIESELDORFF, E. P.

1926 Kunst und Religion der Mayavoelker. 3 vols. Julius
1933 Springer, Berlin.

DONNAN, Christopher

1976 Moche Art and Iconography. UCLA Latin American Center Pub-
lications, Los Angeles.

1978 Moche Art of Peru: Pre-Columbian Symbolic Communication.
Museum of Cultural History, UCLA, Los Angeles.

DUETTING, Dieter

1980 Aspects of Classic Maya Religion and World View.
Veroeffentlichungen der Linden-Museums, Tribus, No.29,
pp.107-167.

1984 Venus, the Moon and the Gods of the Palenque Triad.
Zeitschrift fuer Ethnologie, Bande 109, pp.7-74.

DWYER, Jane and Edward DWYER

1975 Fire, Earth and Water: Sculpture from the Land Collection
of Mesoamerican Art. The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.

EASBY, Elizabeth

1966 Ancient Art of Latin America from the Collection of Jay C.
Leff. The Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn.

EASBY, Elizabeth and John F. SCOTT

1970 Before Cortes: Sculpture of Middle America. Metropolitan
Museum of Art, New York.

EDMONSON, Munro S.

1971 The Book of Counsel: The Popol Vuh of the Quiche Maya of
Guatemala. M.A.R.I. Pub.35, Tulane University, New
Orleans.

1982 The Ancient Future of the Itza: The Book of Chilam Balam
of Tizimin. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

of Tizimin. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

EKHOLM, Marguerite and Gordon EKHOLM

1974 The Scroll-Wing Motif in Ancient China and Mesoamerica.
41st International Congress of Americanists, Mexico City.
Unpublished ms.

EISLEB, Dieter

1969 Toepferkunst der Maya im Museum fuer Voelkerkunde Berlin.
Gebr. Mann Verlag, West Berlin.

ELLIS, Richard

1976 The Book of Sharks. Grosslet & Dunlap, New York.

EMBODEN, William A.

1979 Nymphaea ampla and other Narcotics in Maya Ritual and
Shamanism. mexicon, Vol.1, No.4, Sept.1979, pp.50-51.

EMMERICH, Andre

1963 Art Before Columbus. Simon & Schuster, New York.

EMMERICH, Andre, and others

1973 A Pre-Columbian Synthesis..? Mexican Atlantic Gulf Coast.
Lowe Art Museum, Univ. of Miami, Coral Gables.

ESTRADA MONROY, Agustin

1970a Zac Balam, legendaria y desconocida capital del Lacandon.
El Imparcial (Newspaper), in three parts beginning 29 Oct.,
Guatemala City.

1970b Odisea hacia Sacbalam. Desde el Archivo, Boletin
Eclesiastico de la Arquidiocesis. in 6 parts: Ano V, Num
13, pp. 95-98; Num. 14, pp. 124-127; Num. 15, pp. 72-74;
Ano VI, Num. 16, pp. 79-81; Ano VII, Num. 17, pp. 47-48;
Num. 18, pp. 83-84. Guatemala City. (Manuscript by Fray
Diego de Ribas (Rivas), Archivo Mercedario de Guatemala,
Guatemala City, Legajo 7, No. 204.)

1973 Popol Vuh. Editorial "Jose de Pinada Ibarra," Guatemala
City.

FELDMAN, Lawrence

1985 A Tumpline Economy: Production and Distribution Systems in
Sixteenth-Century Eastern Guatemala. Labyrinthos, Culver City,
CA.

n.d. The Linguistic Geography of Central-East Guatemala. Ms.
(in 1975).

1975 Riverine Maya, the Torquegua and the other Chols of the
Lower Motagua Valley. Museum Brief 15, Museum of
Anthropology, University of Missouri, Columbia.

FERREE, Lisa

1972 The Pottery Censors of Tikal, Guatemala. PhD dissertation, Dept of Anthropology, Southern Illinois University, University Microfilms, No. 7306203 01800, Ann Arbor.

FEWKES, J.W.

1894 A Study of Certain Figures in a Maya Codex. *American Anthropologist*, Vol.VII, pp.260-270.

1895 The God "D" in the Codex Cortesianus. *American Anthropologist*, Vol.VIII, pp.205-222.

FOERSTEMANN, E.

1904 Recent Maya Investigations. in Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History, pp.537-543. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 28 (Translated from *Globus* Vol.70, No.3, 1896, reprinted 1975, Blaine Ethridge, Detroit.)

FONCERRADA DE MOLINA, Marta

1977 Vasijas pintadas Mayas en contexto Arqueologico. UNAM, Mexico City.

FOSHAG, W.F.

1959 Mineralogical Attributions. in Robert Woods Bliss Collection, Pre-Columbian Art, by S.K. Lothrop. Phaidon, New York.

FOUGHT, John

1972 Chorti (Mayan) Texts (I). University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

FRANCO, Jose Luis

1968 Objetos de hueso de la epoca precolombina. Cuadernos del Museo Nacional de Antropologia, No.4. INAH, Mexico City.

FRANZ, Heinrich G.

1974 Tiermaske und Mensch-Tier-Verwandlung als Grundmotive der altamerikanischen Kunst. *Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Institutes der Universitaet Graz*, 9/10, 1974/1975, pp. 5-105. Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz.

FREIDEL, David and Linda SCHELE

1982 Symbol and Power: A History of the Lowland Maya Cosmogram. Paper read at the conference on The Origin of Classic Maya Iconography, Princeton University Art Museum, October 1982.

FRIESE, U. Erich

1972 Sea Anemones. T.F.H. Publications, Hong Kong.

FUENTE, Beatriz de la

- 1965 La escultura de Palenque. UNAM, Mexico City.
- GAMIO, Manuel**
 1922 La poblacion del Valle de Teotihuacan, 3 vols. Direccion de Antropologia, Secretaria de Agricultura y Fomento, Mexico. (Reprinted, Instituto Indigenista Interamericana.)
- GANN, Thomas**
 1918 The Maya Indians of Southern Yucatan and Northern British Honduras. Bulletin 64, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- GANN, Thomas and J. Eric S. THOMPSON**
 1931 The History of the Maya. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- GENDROP, Paul**
 1982a Representaciones arquitectonicas de Tikal y otros sitios Mayas. in Las Representaciones de Arquitectura en la Arqueologia de America, Vol.I, pp.127-137. UNAM, Mexico.
 1982b Los graffiti arquitectonicos de Tikal y otros sitios mayas. in Las Representaciones de Arquitectura en la Arqueologia de America, Vol.I, pp.139-147. UNAM, Mexico City.
 1983 Los estilos Rio Bec, Chenes y Puuc en la arquitectura Maya. UNAM, Mexico City.
- GIFFORD, James C.**
 1976 Prehistoric Pottery Analysis and the Ceramics of Barton Ramie in the Belize Valley. Memoirs of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Vol.18, Cambridge.
- GOODMAN, J. T.**
 1897 The Archaic Maya Inscriptions. in Appendix to Maudslay, Biologia Centrali-Americana, Archaeology, 1889-1902, Vol. VI. Godman and Salvin, eds, London.
- GORDON, G.B. and J. Alden MASON**
 1925- Examples of Maya Pottery in the Museum and Other Collect-
 1943 ions, 3 parts. University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- GRAHAM, Ian**
 1967 Archaeological Explorations in El Peten, Guatemala. MARI, Tulane University, Pub.33, New Orleans.
 1979 Yaxchilan, Part 2. Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions, Vol.3, Part 2. Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- GRAHAM Ian and Eric von EUW**
 1975 Naranjo, Part 1. Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions,

Vol. 2, Part 1. Peabody Museum, Harvard University,
Cambridge.

1977 Yaxchilan, Part 3. Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions,
Vol.3, Part 3. Peabody Museum, Harvard University,
Cambridge.

GRAHAM, John

in (Monuments of Seibal). Peabody Museum, Harvard University.
press

GRAHAM, John, R., Robert HEIZER and E.M. SHOOK

1978 Abaj Takalik, 1976: Exploratory Investigations. Contribu-
tions of the University of California Archaeological
Research Facility, No.3, pp.85-109, Berkeley.

GRANATA, Joseph

1980 The Significance of Zoological Identification of Serpent
Species in the Pictorial Manuscripts of Ancient Mexico.
PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

GREENBERG, Jerry and Idaz GREENBERG

1976 The Coral Reef: Seascapes of Belize. Seahawk Press, Miami.

GREENE, Merle, Robert RANDS, and John GRAHAM

1972 Maya Sculpture. Lederer, Street & Zeus, Berkeley. (for other
publications by her see under ROBERTSON, Merle Greene.)

GROVE, David

1970 The Olmec Paintings of Oxtotitlan Cave, Guerrero, Mexico.
Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

HELFRICH, Klaus

1973 Menschenopfer und Toetungsrituale im Kult der Maya.
Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gebr.
Mann Verlag, Berlin.

HELLMUTH, Nicholas

1967 Tikal Burial 196, Structure 5D-73 (Tomb of the Jade
Jaguar). Senior Honors Thesis, Dept of Anthropology,
Harvard University. (Original in Peabody Museum Library,
Harvard University).

1969 Mexican Symbols in the Classic Art of the Southern Maya
Lowlands. MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, Brown
University, Providence.

1970a Preliminary Bibliography of the Chol Lacandon, Yucatec
Lacandon, Chol, Itza, Mopan, and Quejache of the Southern
Maya Lowlands 1524-1969. Katunob, Occasional Publications
in Mesoamerican Anthropology, No. 4, Museum of
Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.

- 1970b Progress Report and Notes on Research on Ethnohistory of the 16th-19th century Southern Lowland Maya: Part I, the Cholti-Lacandon of Dolores (sac Balam), Chiapas, 1695-1712; Part II, the Yucateco Lacandon of San Jose de Gracia Real, Chiapas, 1786-180?. Mimeographed, Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research, Guatemala City.
- 1971 Some Notes on the Ytza, Quejache, Verapaz Chol, and Toquegua Maya: A Progress Report on Ethnohistory Research conducted in Sevilla, Spain, June-August 1971. Mimeographed, F.L.A.A.R., New Haven.
- 1972 Progreso y Notas sobre la investigacion etnohistorica de las tierras bajas mayas de los siglos XVI a XIX. *América Indígena*, Vol.XXXII, No.1, pp.179-244, Mexico City.
- 1975a Pre-Columbian Ballgame: Archaeology & Architecture. F.L.A.A.R. Progress Reports, Vol.1, No.1, Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research, Guatemala City.
- 1975b The Escuintla Hoards: Teotihuacan Art in Guatemala. F.L.A.A.R. Progress Reports, Vol.1, No.2, Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research, Guatemala City.
- 1976 Tzakol and Tepeu Maya Pottery Paintings: Rollout Drawings by Barbara Van Heusen, Persis Clarkson, and Lin Crocker. F.L.A.A.R., Guatemala City. (Printer's proof, edition limited to 60 sets).
- 1976b Diplomacy and Conquest in Pre-Columbian Mesoamerica. *Americas*, Vol.28, No.3, pp.5-12, Organization of American States.
- 1977a Human Sacrifice and the Dance after Decapitation as Depicted on Late Classic Maya Vase Paintings. paper read at the International Symposium on Maya Art, Architecture, Archaeology, and Hieroglyphic Writing, June 25-July 2, 1977, Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research, Guatemala City.
- 1977b Classic Maya Vase Paintings which now allow the Identification of Enema Iconography. paper read at the above listed conference. Guatemala City
- 1977c Iconography of Escuintla and Peten Tzakol 3 Ceramic Art. paper read at the above listed conference, Guatemala City.
- 1977d Cholti-Lacandon (Chiapas) and Peten-Ytza Agriculture, Settlement Pattern and Population. in Social Process in Maya Prehistory, (Norman Hammond, ed.), pp. 421-448.

Academic Press, New York and London.

- 1978a Teotihuacan Art in the Escuintla, Guatemala Region. in Middle Classic Mesoamerica: A.D. 400-700, (Esther Pasztory, ed.), pp.71-85, Columbia University Press, New York.
- 1978b Tikal-Copan Travel Guide. A General Introduction to Maya Art, Architecture, and Archaeology. F.L.A.A.R., St. Louis.
- 1980 Iconography of Early Classic Maya Myths Based on a Blackware Peten Cylinder Tripod. Preliminary Notes in Maya Iconography, No. 1. Foundation for Latin American Anthropological Research, Culver City. (Conference paper (long version) for symposium at Princeton University Art Museum. Describes the iconography of the Early Classic "Deletaille Tripod." 1980. cca. 100 pages.)
- 1982a The Primary Young Lord. Abstracts, 44th International Congress of Americanists, p.165. Manchester, England.
- 1982b Cosmology, Zoology, and Iconography of Early Peten Maya Cache Vessels and Incensarios. Preliminary Notes in Maya Iconography, No. 2. F.L.A.A.R., Culver City. (Handout for 2nd Princeton University Art Museum symposium, "The Beginnings of Maya Iconography." 1982. ca. 40 pages)
- 1982c (a paper on the iconography of the Principal Young Lord and Holmul Dancer). Preliminary Notes in Maya Iconography, No. 3. F.L.A.A.R., Culver City. (Paper following lecture at the 44th International Congress of Americanists, Manchester, England. 1982. ca. 30 pages.)
- 1982- The Iconography of the Early Classic Peten Maya
- 1984 Underwater Cosmos. Preliminary Notes in Maya Iconography, No. 4. F.L.A.A.R., Culver City. (Long version of lecture presented at the 2nd Princeton University Art Museum symposium, "The Beginnings of Maya Iconography." Whereas Notes #2 discusses incensarios Notes #4 discusses cylindrical tripods and basal flange bowls. 1982-1984. Ca. 150 pages.)
- 1983 Iconographic Amendments to Andrea Stone's "Recent Discoveries from Naj Tunich". mexicon, Vol. V, Nr. 3, pp. 45-46. West Berlin.
- 1985a Maya Cylinder Tripods and Related Early Classic Art: Iconography and Form. 2nd edition, Vol. II, Corpus of Maya Art in Site Reports and in Museums and Private Collections, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, USA, Canada, Europe, and Asia. F.L.A.A.R., Culver City, CA.

- 1985b Principal Diagnostic Accessories of Maya Enema Scenes.
Preliminary Notes in Maya Iconography, No. 5. F.L.A.A.R.,
Culver City, CA.
- 1985c Principal Diagnostic Accessories of Maya Enema Scenes.
Appendix B in Ritual Enemas and Snuffs in the
Americas by Peter deSmet. CEDLA, Amsterdam.
- 1986c Die Blumen des Todes--Die Knochen der Wiedergeburt: Die Ikonographie
der Maya-Philosophie der Regeneration dargelegt in den Wandmalereien
von Palenque, Rio Azul, und Tikal (Mexiko und Guatemala). Seminar
paper, Karl-Franzens-Universitaet, Graz.
- 1987a Human Sacrifice in Ballgame Scenes on Early Classic Cylindrical
Tripods from the Tiquisate Region, Guatemala. Vol.*, Corpus of Maya
Art, F.L.A.A.R., Culver City, CA.
- 1987b Ballgame Iconography and Playing Gear of Peten Guatemala: Late
Classic Maya Polychrome Vases and Stone Sculpture. Vol.*, Corpus
of Maya Art, F.L.A.A.R., Culver City, CA.
- in Basal Flange Bowls and Tetrapods: Early Classic Maya Iconography
press and Ceramic Form. Vol.III, Corpus of Maya Art. F.L.A.A.R.,
A Culver City, CA.
- in
press The Old Gods: God D, God N, and God L. Supernaturals, "Gods,"
B and Mythical Characters, Part I. Vol.*, Corpus of Maya Art.
F.L.A.A.R., Culver City, CA.
- in Jaguar God of the Underworld, Cauac Monster, Lily Pad Headdress
press Monster.... Supernaturals, "Gods," and Mythical Characters. Part II.
C Corpus of Maya Art, F.L.A.A.R., Culver City, CA.
- in (article on the Deletaille (Belgian) tripod). Princeton
press University Press, Princeton.
D

HOLLAND, William

- 1964 Contemporary Tzotzil Cosmological Concepts as a Basis
for Interpreting Maya Civilization. American Antiquity,
Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 301-306.

HUNN, Eugene

- 1977 Tzeltal Folk Zoology: the Classification of Discontinuities
in Nature. Academic Press, New York.

HVIDTFELDT, Arild

- 1958 Teotl and Ixiptlatli: Some Central Conceptions in Ancient
Mexican Religion. Munksgaard, Copenhagen.

ICHON, Alain

1977 Les Sculptures de La Lagunita, El Quiche, Guatemala.
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Institut
d'Ethnologie, Paris.

IRVING, Thomas B.

1985 The Maya's Own Words: An Anthology comprising Abridgements
of the Popol Vuh.... Labyrinthos, Culver City, CA.

JONES, Christopher

1977 Inauguration Dates of three Late Classic Rulers of Tikal,
Guatemala. *American Antiquity*, Vol.42, No.1, pp.28-60.

1983 Monument 26, Quirigua, Guatemala. in Quirigua
Reports:II, pp.118-128. The University Museum, Univ. of
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

JONES, Christopher and Linton SATTERTHWAITE

1982 The Monuments and Inscriptions of Tikal, Part A: The Carved
Monuments. Tikal Reports No.33, The University Museum,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

JONES, Julie

1969 The Americas. in Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas
from the Museum of Primitive Art, Metropolitan Museum of
Art, New York.

1976 An Early Classic Maya Vessel. Some Questions of Style.
Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Historia del Arte,
Granada 1973, Universidad de Granada, Depto. de Historia
del Arte, Vol.I, pp.145-154.

JONES, Tom

1985a From Maya "XOC" to English "Sharke:" a 16th Century Voyage.
Newsletter, Vol.13, No.6, p.4, Institute of Maya Studies,
Miami.

1985b The Xoc, the Sharke, and the Sea Dogs: an Historical
Encounter. in Fifth Palenque Round Table, 1983, Vol.VII,
(M.G.Robertson and V.M.Fields, eds), pp.211-222.
Pre-Columbian Art Research Institute, San Francisco.

JORALEMON, P. David

1971 A Study of Olmec Iconography. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

1974 Ritual Blood-Sacrifice among the Ancient Maya, Part I.
Primera Mesa Redonda de Palenque, Part II, (M.G.Robertson,
ed.), pp. 59-76. Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach.

1976 The Olmec Dragon: A Study of Pre-Columbian Iconography. in
Origins of Religious Art and Iconography,
(H.B.Nicholson, ed.). Latin American Studies Series, Vol.
31, UCLA, Los Angeles.

- 1980 Pre-Columbian Art from Mesoamerica and Ecuador:
Selections from Distinguished Private Collections. Lowe
Art Museum, University of Miami.
- JUSTESON, John and Lyle CAMPBELL** (editors)
1985 Phoneticism in Mayan Hieroglyphic Writing. Institute for
Mesoamerican Studies, State University of New York at
Albany.
- KAMPEN, Michael**
1972 The Sculptures of El Tajin, Veracruz, Mexico. University of
Florida Press, Gainesville.
- KERR, Justin and Barbara KERR**
n.d. Archive in New York of rollout and other photographs of
Maya art.
- KELLEY, David**
1962 The History of the Decipherment of Maya Script. Anthropologi-
cal Linguistics, Vol.4, No.8, pp.1-48, Bloomington.

1965 The Birth of the Gods at Palenque. Estudios de Cultura Maya,
Vol.5, pp.93-134.

1976 Deciphering the Maya Script. University of Texas Press,
Austin.

1980 Astronomical Identities of Mesoamerican Gods.
Contributions to Mesoamerican Anthropology, No.2, Institute
of Maya Studies, Miami.
- KIDDER, Alfred V.**
1942 Archaeological Specimens from Yucatan and Guatemala. Notes
on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.I, No.9,
pp.35-40. CIW, Washington, D.C.

1947 The Artifacts of Uaxactun, Guatemala. CIW, Washington, D.C.,
Pub.576, Washington, D.C.

1954 Miscellaneous Archaeological Specimens from Mesoamerica. Notes
on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.5, No.117
pp.5-26. CIW, Washington, D.C.
- KIDDER, Alfred, J. JENNINGS, and E. SHOOK** (abbreviated KJS)
1946 Excavations at Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala. CIW Pub.561,
Washington, D.C.
- KIDDER, Alfred V., and Edwin SHOOK**
1946 "Rim-Head" Vessels from Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala. Notes on
Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.3, No.69,
pp.54-61. CIW, Cambridge.

KIRCHHOFF, Paul

1943 "Mesoamerica." *Acta Americana*, Tomo I, pp.92-107. Mexico.

KNOROZOV, Yuri

1982 *Maya Hieroglyphic Codices*. Translated by Sophie D. Coe. Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, State University of New York at Albany.

KOWALSKI, Jeff

198? *Rulers, Deities and Death: Maya Ceramics from the Duke University Museum Collection and Other Examples of Pre-Columbian Art*. Swen Parsen Gallery, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb.

KUBLER, George

1961 *Rival Approaches to American Antiquity*. in Three Regions of Primitive Art, pp.61-75. The Museum of Primitive Art, New York.

1962a *The Art and Architecture of Ancient America*. Penguin, Baltimore.

1962b *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

1967 *The Iconography of the Art of Teotihuacan*. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

1969 *Studies in Classic Maya Iconography*. *Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol.18, New Haven.

1973 *Iconographic Aspects of Architectural Profiles at Teotihuacan and in Mesoamerica*. in The Iconography of Middle American Sculpture, pp.24-39. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

1974 *Climate and Iconography in Palenque Sculpture*. in Art and Environment in Native America, (M.E. King and I.R. Traylor, Jr., eds.), pp.103-114. The Museum, Texas Tech Univ.

1984a *The Art and Architecture of Ancient America*. 3rd edition, Penguin.

1984b *Ancient American Gods and their Living Impersonators*. *Apollo*, April 1984, pp.240-246, London.

1985 *Studies in Ancient American and European Art: The Collected Essays of George Kubler*. (T.Reese, ed.). Yale University Press, New Haven.

LABBE, Armand

1982 Religion, Art and Iconography: Man and Cosmos in Prehispanic Mesoamerica. Bowers Museum, Santa Ana, CA.

LANDA, Diego de

1941 Relacion de las Cosas de Yucatan. Translated and edited by A. M. Tozzer. Papers of the Peabody Museum, No.XVIII, Harvard University, Cambridge.

LEE, Thomas A., Jr.

1969 The Artifacts of Chiapa de Corzo, Chiapas, Mexico. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, No. 26, Brigham Young University, Provo.

LEON-PORTILLA, Miguel

1968 Tiempo y realidad en el pensamiento maya. Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas, UNAM, Mexico City.

LEOPOLD, A. Starker

1972 Wildlife of Mexico: The Game Birds and Mammals. University of California Press, Berkeley.

LINCOLN, J.S.

1942 The Maya Calendar of the Ixil of Guatemala. CIW, Contributions, No.38, Vol.VII, Pub.528, Washington, D.C.

1946 An Ethnological Study of the Ixil Indians of the Guatemala Highlands. Microfilm Collection Mss. on Middle American Cultural Anthropology, No.1, Chicago.

LISTER, Robert and Florence LISTER

1970 In Search of Maya Glyphs: From the Archaeological Journals of Sylvanus G. Morley. Museum of New Mexico Press.

L'ORANGE, H.P.

1947 Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture. Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, series B, No.XLIV, H.Aschehoug & Co. (Reprinted 1982, Caratzas Brothers, New Rochelle, NY.)

LONGYEAR, John

1952 Copan Ceramics: A Study of Southeastern Maya Pottery. CIW, Pub.597, Washington, D.C.

LOTEN, H.Stanley and David M. PENDERGAST

1984 A Lexicon for Maya Architecture. Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

LOUNSBURY, Floyd

1980- The Identities of the Mythological Figures in the 'Cross
1985 Group' Inscriptions of Palenque. in Fourth Palenque Round

Table, 1980, Vol. VI, (E.Benson, ed.), pp.45-58, Pre-Columbian Art Research Institute, San Francisco.

LOUDMER, Guy and Herve POULAIN

1975 Antiquites Mexicaines, 29 Novembre 1975. Paris.

LOUDMER, Guy, Herve POULAIN), and P.C. DE SAINT-CYR

1974 Collection de Madame X. Art Precolombien. Palais Galliera, Paris.

LOWE, Gareth and Pierre AGRINIER

1960 Mound A, Chiapa de Corzo, Chiapas, Mexico. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, No.8, Brigham Young University, Provo.

LOWE, Gareth, Thomas LEE, Jr. and Eduardo MARTINEZ E.

1982 Izapa: An Introduction to the Ruins and Monuments. Papers of the NWAf, No.31, Brigham Young University, Provo.

LUNDELL, Cyrus

1937 The Vegetation of Peten. CIW, Pub.478, Washington, D.C.

MALER, Teobert

1901- Researches in the Central Portion of the Usumatsintla Valley.

1903 Memoirs of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Vol.2, Cambridge.

1908a Explorations of the Upper Usumatsintla and Adjacent Region:

Altar de Sacrificios, Seibal, Itsimte-Sacluk, Cancuen.

Memoirs of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Vol.3, Cambridge.

MANGO, Cyril

1980 Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

MARTINEZ, Maximino

1979 Catalogo de nombres vulgares y cientificos de plantas Mexicanas. Fondo de Cultura Economica, Mexico City.

MASON, J. Alden

1960 Mound 12, Chiapa de Corzo, Chiapas, Mexico. Papers of the NWAf, No.9, Brigham Young University, Provo.

MATHENY, Ray

1980 El Mirador, Peten, Guatemala: An Interim Report. Papers of the NWAf, No.45, Brigham Young University, Provo.

MATHEWS, Peter

1980 Notes on the Dynastic Sequence of Bonampak, Part I. Vol. V, Third Palenque Round Table, 1978, Part 2, (Merle Greene Robertson, ed.), pp.60-73, University of Texas Press,

Austin.

MAUDSLAY, Alfred Pervical

- 1889- Archaeology. Text and 4 vols. plates. in *Biologia Centrali-Americana*, Archaeology. Godman and Salvin, eds, London. (Reprinted 1974, edited by F. Robicsek, M.D., since 1983, distributed by University of Oklahoma Press.)

MAYER, Karl Herbert

- 1978 *Maya Monuments: Sculptures of Unknown Provenance in Europe*. Acoma Books, Ramona, CA.
- 1980 *Maya Monuments: Sculptures of Unknown Provenance in the United States*. Acoma Books, Ramona, CA.
- 1981a *Classic Maya Relief Columns*. Acoma Books, Ramona, CA.
- 1981b *Eine Maya-Inschrift aus Xupa, Chiapas, Mexiko*. *Archiv fuer Voelkerkunde*, 35, pp.1-13, Museum fuer Voelkerkunde, Vienna.
- 1984 *Maya Monuments: Sculptures of Unknown Provenance in Middle America*. Verlag Karl-Friedrich von Flemming, Berlin.
- 1985a *Cleveland-Fort Worth: Zwei Maya-Stelen identifiziert*. *mexicon* Vol.VII, Nr.2, pp.18-20.
- 1985b *Registrierung von Maya Miszellen-Texten*. *Ethnologia Americana*, 21. Jahrgang, Dez. 1985, Nr.109, Heft 2, pp.1146-1148.

MERRIN (GALLERY)

- n.d. *Pre-Columbian Art of Mexico and Guatemala*. Edward H. Merrin Gallery, New York.
- 1985 *Precolumbian Masterpieces: Mexico, Peru, Central America, American Indian*. Edward H. Merrin Gallery Inc., New York.

MERWIN, R.E. and G. VAILLANT

- 1932 *The Ruins of Holmul, Guatemala*. Peabody Museum Memoirs, Vol.3, No.2, Harvard University, Cambridge.

MEXICON

- 1981 *Maya-Hohlenmalereien in Nord-Chiapas*. *mexicon* Vol.III, Nr.4, pp. 55-56. Berlin.

McCORMICK, Harold W., Tom ALLEN, and William YOUNG

- 1963 *Shadows in the Sea: The Sharks, Skates and Rays*. Sidgwick and Jackson, London.

McQUOWN, Norman A.

- 1956 *The Classification of the Mayan Languages*. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol.22, pp.191-195.

MILLER, Arthur

1973 The Mural Painting of Teotihuacan. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

MILLER, Jeffrey

1974 Notes on a Stela Pair, Probably from Calakmul, Campeche, Mexico. Proceedings, Primera Mesa Redonda de Palenque, Vol.1, pp.149-160, (Merle Greene Robertson, ed.), Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach, CA.

MILLER, Mary

1981 The Murals of Bonampak, Chiapas, Mexico. PhD dissertation, Dept. of History of Art, Yale University. (later published by Princeton University Press).

MILES, S.W.

1957 The 16th Century Pokom Maya. A Documentary Analysis of Social Structure and Archaeological Setting. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol.47, No.4, pp.735-781. Philadelphia.

1965 Sculpture of the Guatemala-Chiapas Highlands and Pacific Slopes and Associated Hieroglyphs. Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol.2, Pt.1, pp.237-275. University of Texas Press, Austin.

MOHOLY-NAGY, Hattula

1981 Ein alter Maya Mythos. *mexicon*, Vol.III, Nr.2, pp.26-29,

MORAN, Fray Pedro

1935 Arte y Diccionario en Lengua Cholti, a Manuscript Copied from the Libro Grande of Fr. Pedro Moran. The Maya Society, Pub.9, Baltimore. (Actually copied by an unknown fray from Moran).

MORLEY, Sylvanus

1915 An Introduction to the Study of the Maya Hieroglyphs. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 57, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

1935 Guide Book to the Ruins of Quirigua. CIW, Supplementary Publication 16, Washington, D.C.

1946 The Ancient Maya. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto.

1947 The Ancient Maya, 2nd edition. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto.

MUENSCHER, Walter C.

1944 Aquatic Plants of the United States, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

MUSER, Curt

1978 Facts and Artifacts of Ancient Middle America: A Glossary.
Dutton, New York.

NAVARRTE, Carlos

1974 The Olmec Rock Carvings at Pijijiapan, Chiapas, Mexico
and other Olmec Pieces from Chiapas and Guatemala. Paper 35,
NAAF, BYU, Provo, Utah.

NELSON, Joseph S.

1976 Fishes of the World. Wiley-Interscience, New York.

NEW YORK TIMES

1984a Untouched Mayan Tomb is Discovered. The New York Times,
Wed., May 23, 1984. (Front page story by Grace Glueck).

1984b Reporter's Notebook: A Mayan Pottery Hunt. The New York
Times, May, 1984. (Article by Grace Glueck).

1984c Professor's Path to Mayan Discovery. The New York Times,
Thursday, May 24, 1984. (Article by John N. Wilford).

1984d At Mayan Tomb Sites, Scientists vs. Looters. The New York
Times, Saturday, May 26, 1984. (Article by Mary A. Crossley).

NICHOLSON, H.B.

1976 Preclassic Mesoamerican Iconography from the Perspective
of the Postclassic: Problems in Interpretational Analysis.
in Origins of Religious Art & Iconography in Preclassic
Mesoamerica, (H.B. Nicholson, ed.), pp.157-175. UCLA
Latin American Center Publications, Los Angeles.

1978 Mesoamerica, in Pre-Columbian Art from the Land
Collection. California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco.

NORMAN, V. Garth

1973 Izapa Sculpture, Part I: Album. Papers of the New World
Archaeological Foundation, No.30, Pt.1. Provo.

1976 Izapa Sculpture, Part 2: Text. Papers of the N.W.A.F., No.
30, Pt.2, Provo.

OLIN, Joyce and Brian D. DILLON

1981 Ceramics. in A Student's Guide to Archaeological
Illustrating. (B.D. Dillon, ed.). Institute of Archaeology,
UCLA, Los Angeles.

ORREGO CORZO, Miguel and Rudy LARIOS VILLALTA

1983 Reporte de las investigaciones arqueologicas en el Grupo
5E-11, Tikal. IDAEH, Guatemala City.

PANOFSKY, Erwin

1955 *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y.

PARKE-BERNET

1969 *Pre-Columbian & American Indian Art*, Mar.29, Sale 2828. Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York.

1970 *Pre-Columbian Art*, Feb.28, Sale 2997. Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York.

PARSONS, Lee

1967 *An Early Maya Stela on the Pacific Coast of Guatemala*. *Estudios de Cultura Maya*, Vol.6, pp.171-198, U.N.A.M., Mexico City.

1969 *Bilbao, Guatemala: An Archaeological Study of Pacific Coast Cotzumalhuapa Region*, 2 vols. Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee.

1973 *Iconographic Notes on a New Izapan Stela from Abaj Takalik, Guatemala*. *Atti del XL Congresso Internazionale degli Americanisti*; Roma-Genova, 1972. Vol.1, pp.203-212. Casa Editrice Tilgher, Genova.

1974 *Pre-Columbian America: the Art and Archaeology of South, Central, and Middle America*. Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee.

1980 *Pre-Columbian Art: The Morton D. May and The Saint Louis Art Museum Collections*. Harper and Row, New York.

1982 *Proto-Maya Aspects of Miraflores-Arenal Monumental Stone Sculpture from Kaminaljuyu and the Southern Pacific Coast*. in, *The Beginnings of Maya Iconography*, Princeton University Art Museum symposium.

1983 *Altars 9 and 10, Kaminaljuyu, and the Evolution of the Serpent-Winged Deity*. in *Civilization in the Ancient Americas, Essays in Honor of Gordon R. Willey*, (Leventhal and Kolata, eds.). University of New Mexico Press.

in *The Origins of Maya Art: A Study of the Monumental Stone Sculpture of Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala, and the Southern Pacific Coast*. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

PENDERGAST, David

1969 *Altun Ha, British Honduras (Belize): The Sun God's Tomb*. Royal Ontario Museum, Art and Archaeology Occasional Paper 19. Toronto.

1979 *Excavations at Altun Ha, Belize, 1964-1970, Vol.I*. Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

1981 The 1980 Excavations at Lamanai, Belize. Mexican, Vol. II, Nr.6, pp. 96-99. Berlin.

POHL, Mary

1981 Ritual Continuity and Transformation in Mesoamerica: Reconstructing the Ancient Maya Cuch Ritual. *American Antiquity*, Vol.46, No.3, pp.513-529.

POHL, Mary and John POHL

1983 Ancient Maya Cave Rituals. *Archaeology*, Vol.36, No.3, pp.28-32, Archaeological Institute of America, New York.

POHORILENKO, Anatole

1977 On the Question of Olmec Deities. *Journal of New World Archaeology*, Vol.II, No.1, pp.1-16. Institute of Archaeology, UCLA, Los Angeles.

POLLOCK, H.E.D.

1980 The Puuc. *Memoirs of the Peabody Museum*, Vol.19, Harvard University, Cambridge.

POPOL VUH

1971 *The Book of Counsel: The Popol Vuh of the Quiche Maya of Guatemala*. (Munro Edmonson, editor and translator). M.A.R.I. Pub.35, Tulane University, New Orleans.

(For other editions of the Popol Vuh see also Agustin ESTRADA Monroy and Thomas B. IRVING).

PRING, Duncan C.

1977 Influence or Intrusion? The "Protoclassic" in the Maya Lowlands. in Social Process in Maya Prehistory: Studies in Honour of Sir Eric Thompson, (N. Hammond, ed.), pp.135-165. Academic Press, New York and London.

PROSKOURIAKOFF, Tatiana

1946 *An Album of Maya Architecture*, CIW, Pub.588, Washington, D.C.

1950 *A Study of Classic Maya Sculpture*, CIW, Pub.593, Washington, D.C.

1954 *Varieties of Classic Central Veracruz Sculpture*, CIW, Contributions, No. 58, Vol. XII, pp.63-94, Pub.606. Washington, D.C.

1960 Historical Implications of a Pattern of Dates at Piedras Negras, Guatemala. *American Antiquity*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 454-475.

1964 Portraits of Women in Maya Art. in Essays in Pre-Columbian

Art and Archaeology, pp.81-99. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

1968a Olmec and Maya Art: Problems of their Stylistic Relation. in Dumbarton Oaks Conference on the Olmec, (E.Benson, ed.), pp. 119-134. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

1968a The Jog and the Jaguar Signs in Maya Writing. American Antiquity, Vol.33, No.2, pp.247-251.

1968b Graphic Designs on Mesoamerican Pottery. CIW, Washington, D.C.

1971 Studies on Middle American Art. Anthropology and Art, pp. 129-139. American Museum of Natural History, New York.

1974 Jades from the Cenote of Sacrifice, Chichen Itza, Yucatan. Peabody Museum Memoirs, Vol.10, No.1, Harvard University, Cambridge.

1978 Olmec Gods and Maya God-Glyphs. in "Codex Wauchope": A Tribute Roll, (M.Giardino, B.Edmonson, and W.Creamer, eds.). Human Mosaic, Vol.12, Tulane University.

PULESTON, Dennis

1976 The People of the Cayman/Crocodile: Riparian Agriculture and the Origin of Aquatic Motifs in Ancient Maya Iconography. in Aspects of Ancient Maya Civilization, (F.-A. de Montequin, ed.), pp.1-26. Hamline University, St. Paul.

1977 The Art and Archaeology of Hydraulic Agriculture in the Maya Lowlands. in Social Processes in Maya Prehistory, Studies in Honour of Sir Eric Thompson, (N. Hammond, ed.), pp.449-469. Academic Press, London and New York.

QUIRARTE, Jacinto

1973a Izapan and Mayan Traits in Teotihuacan III Pottery. in Studies in Ancient Mesoamerica, (John Graham, ed.), pp. 11-29. Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility, No.18, Department of Anthropology, Berkeley.

1973b Izapan-Style Art: A Study of its Form and Meaning. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

1974 Terrestrial/Celestial Polymorphs as Narrative Frames in the Art of Izapa and Palenque. in Primera Mesa Redonda de Palenque, Part I, pp.129-135. The Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach.

1976a Izapan Style Antecedents for the Maya Serpent in Celestial Dragon and Serpent Bar Contexts. Actas del XXIII Congreso

Internacional de Historia del Arte: Espana entre el Mediterraneo y el Atlantico, Granada 1973, Vol.I, pp.227-237, Universidad de Granada, Dept. de Historia del Arte.

1976b The Relationship of Izapan-Style Art to Olmec and Maya Art: A Review. in Origins of Religious Art & Iconography in Preclassic Mesoamerica. (H. B. Nicholson, ed.), pp.73-86, UCLA Latin American Center Publications, Los Angeles.

1976c Izapan Style Antecedents for the Maya Serpent in Celestial Dragon and Serpent Bar Contexts. in Actas del XXII Congreso Internacional de Historia del Arte, Granada, 1973, Vol.I, pp. 227-238.

1977 Early Art Styles of Mesoamerica and Early Classic Maya Art. in The Origins of Maya Civilization, (R.E.W. Adams, ed.), pp. 249-283. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

1978 Actual and Implied Visual Space in Maya Vase Painting: A Study of Double Images and Two-Headed Compound Creatures. in Studies in Ancient Mesoamerica, III, pp.27-38. Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility, No.36, Dept. of Anthropology, Berkeley.

1979 The Representation of Underworld Processions in Maya Vase Painting: An Iconographic Study. in Maya Archaeology and Ethnohistory, (N. Hammond and G. Willey, eds), pp. 116-148, University of Texas Press, Austin.

1981 Trichephalic Units in Olmec, Izapan-Style, and Maya Art. in The Olmec and Their Neighbors, (E.Benson, ed.). Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

RANDALL, John E.

1968 Caribbean Reef Fishes. T.F.H. Publications, Hong Kong.

RANDS, Robert L.

1953 The Water Lily in Maya Art: A Complex of Alleged Asiatic Origin. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 151, Anthropological Papers No.34, pp.75-153, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

1955 Some Manifestations of Water in Mesoamerican Art. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 157, pp. 265-393. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

1974 The Ceramic Sequence at Palenque, Chiapas. in Mesoamerican Archaeology, New Approaches, (N. Hammond, ed.), pp. 51-76, University of Texas Press, Austin.

RECINOS, Adrian and D. Goetz (editors)

1953 Annals of the Cakchiquels. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

REENTS (see Coffman)

RELACIONES DE YUCATAN

1898- Relaciones de Yucatan. in Coleccion de documentos ineditos relativos al descubrimiento, conquista, y organizacion de las antiguas posesiones de Ultramar, 11 and 13. Madrid.

REMESAL, A. de

1932 Historia general de las Indias occidentales y particular de la gobernacion de Chiapa y Guatemala. 2 vols. Guatemala.

RHODES, Rilley

n.d. The World Beyond: Maya Tomb Ceramics. Epcot Center, Walt Disney World, Orlando. (Although no author is given, the actual author is Rhodes. The date is around 1982-84.)

RIBAS, Fray Diego de (see **RIVAS**)

RICKETSON, O.G., Jr. and E.B. RICKETSON

1937 Uaxactun, Guatemala: Group E -- 1926-1931. CIW, Washington, D.C.

RIESE, Berthold

1984 Sonnenherrscher und Erdungeheuer. FU-INFO 14/84, pp.4-5, Freie Universitaet Berlin.

RIVAS, Fray Diego de

1699? Refiere algunos casos, que en la reduccion de los indios del Lacandon... Archivo Mercederio de Guatemala, AMERGUA Legajo C-3, Guatemala City. (Date of letter is no earlier than 1699).

RIVERA Y RIVERA, Roberto

1980 Los instrumentos musicales de los Mayas. INAH, Mexico City.

ROBERTSON, Merle GREENE

1974 The Quadripartite Badge -- A Badge of Rulership. in Primera Mesa Redonda de Palenque, Part 1, pp.77-93. Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach.

1983 The Sculpture of Palenque, Vol. I. The Temple of the Inscriptions. Princeton University Press.

ROBICSEK, Francis

1972 Copan: Home of the Maya Gods. Museum of the American Indian-Heys Foundation, New York.

1975 A Study in Maya Art and History: The Mat Symbol. Museum of the American Indian-Heys Foundation, New York.

- 1978 *The Smoking Gods: Tobacco in Maya Art, History, and Religion*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- ROBICSEK, Francis and Donald HALES** (abbreviated as R+H 1982)
- 1982a *The Maya Book of the Dead: The Ceramic Codex*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- 1982b *Maya Ceramic Vases from the Late Classic Period: The November Collection of Maya Ceramics*. University Museum of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- 1984 *Maya Heart Sacrifice: Cultural Perspective and Surgical Technique*, in *Ritual Human Sacrifice in Mesoamerica*, pp. 49-90, editor E. Boone, Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.
- ROMANO P., Arturo, Carlos NAVARRETE, and Victor SEGOVIA P.**
- 1981 *Kohunlich, una Ciudad Maya del Clasico Temprano*. San Angel Ediciones, Mexico City.
- ROYS, R.L.**
- 1933 *The Book of Chilam Balam of Chumayel*. CIW, Pub.438, Washington, D.C.
- RUZ Lhuillier, Alberto**
- 1969 *La costa de Campeche en los Tiempos Prehispanicos*. No. XVIII, INAH, Mexico City.
- 1973 *El Templo de las Inscripciones Palenque*. INAH, Mexico City.
- SAHAGUN, Bernardo de**
- 1950- *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*. Translated from the Aztec into English, with notes and illustrations, by A.J.O. Anderson and C.E. Dibble. 12 Books, University of Utah and School of American Research, Santa Fe.
- SAMAYOA Chinchilla, Carlos**
- 1967 *L'Art des Mayas du Guatemala*. (traveling exhibit). France.
- SCHAVELZON, Daniel**
- 1980 *Temples, Caves or Monsters? Notes on Zoomorphic Facades in Pre-Hispanic Architecture*, *Third Palenque Round Table, 1978, Part 2*, pp.151-162, (M.G. Robertson, ed.), University of Texas Press, Austin.
- SCHELE, Linda**
- 1976 *Accession Iconography of Chan-Bahlum in the Group of the Cross at Palenque*. *Segunda Mesa Redonda de Palenque*, (Merle Greene Robertson, ed.), Part III, pp.9-34. Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach.

1976/ The Palenque Triad: A Visual and Glyphic Approach. Actes
1979 du XLII Congres International des Americanistes, Paris
1976, Vol.VII, pp.407-423, Fondation Singer-Polignac.

1979b Genealogical Documentation on the Tri-figure Panels. Tercera
Mesa Redonda de Palenque, 1978, Vol.IV, pp.41-70.
(M.Greene Robertson, ed.), Pre-Columbian Art Research Center,
Palenque.

1979c The Puleston Hypothesis: The Water-lily Complex in Classic
Maya Art and Writing. Unpublished Ms.

1984 Human Sacrifice among the Classic Maya. in Ritual Human
Sacrifice in Mesoamerica, pp.7-48, (E.Boone, ed.),
Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

1985 The Hauberg Stela: Bloodletting and the Mythos of Maya
Rulership. in Fifth Palenque Round Table, 1983, (M.G.
Robertson and V.Fields, eds), pp.135-149. Pre-Columbian Art
Research Institute, San Francisco.

SCHELE, Linda and Jeffrey MILLER

1983 The Mirror, The Rabbit and The Bundle: "Accession"
expressions from the Classic Maya Inscriptions. Dumbarton Oaks,
Washington, D.C.

SCHELLHAS, Paul

1904 Representations of Deities of the Maya Manuscripts. Peabody
Museum Papers, Vol.4, No.1, Harvard University, Cambridge.

SCHMIDT, Karl

1924 Notes on Central American Crocodiles. Field Museum of
Natural History, Zoological Series, Vol.12, pp.79-92.

1952 Crocodile Hunting in Central America. Chicago Natural
History Museum, Popular Series, Zoology, No.15.

SCHOLES, France and Ralph L. ROYS

1948 The Maya Chontal Indians of Acalan-Tixchel. CIW,
Washington, D.C. (Reprinted 1968, Univ. of Oklahoma Press).

SCHOLES, France and Eleanor B. ADAMS

1960 Relaciones historico-descriptivas de la Verapaz, el
Manche y Lacandon, en Guatemala. Editorial Universitaria,
Guatemala City.

SELER, Eduard

1902- Gesammelte Abhandlungen. 5 vols. Mann. Berlin (reprinted
1923 1960-61 by Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz.)

1904a The Bat God of the Maya Race. in Mexican and Central
American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History,

pp.231-241. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 28, Washington, D.C.

1904b Unity of Mexican and Central American Civilization. in Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History, pp.266-274. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 28, Washington, D.C.

1904c Venus Period in the Picture Writings of the Borgian Codex Group. in Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History, pp.353-391. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 28, Washington, D.C.

1915 Observations and Studies in the Ruins of Palenque. English translation by G. Morgner of Beobachtungen und Studien in den Ruinen von Palenque. Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach, CA.

SEJOURNE, Laurette

1966a Arqueologia de Teotihuacan: La Ceramica. Fondo de Cultura Economica, Mexico.

1966b Arquitectura y pintura en Teotihuacan. Siglo XXI Editores, Mexico.

1966c El lenguaje de las formas en Teotihuacan. Mexico (privately published).

SHARER, Robert, Sylvanus MORLEY, and George BRAINERD

1983 The Ancient Maya. 4th, revised edition, Stanford University Press, Stanford. (With coverage of Belize and the Preclassic, this book is very much by Sharer and I consider it as more than a re-edition of Morley's The Ancient Maya, therefore I include it under Sharer's name for those sections that should be credited to him.)

SHOOK, Edwin and A.V. KIDDER

1961 The Painted Tomb at Tikal. Expedition, Vol.4, No.1, pp.2-7, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

SHOOK, Edwin and R. HEIZER

1976 An Olmec Sculpture from the South (Pacific) Coast of Guatemala. Journal of New World Archaeology, Vol.1, No.3, pp. 1-8. Institute of Archaeology, UCLA, Los Angeles.

de SMET, Peter

1981 Enema Scenes on Ancient Maya Pottery. Pharmacy International, Oct.1981, pp.217-219. Elsevier/North-Holland Biomedical Press.

1985 Ritual Enemas and Snuffs in the Americas. CEDLA, Amsterdam. (Appendix is cited under Hellmuth.)

SMITH, Ledyard and A.V. KIDDER

- 1951 Excavations at Nebaj, Guatemala. CIW, Pub.594, Washington, D.C. (reprinted AMS Press).

SMITH, Robert E.

- 1944 Archaeological Specimens from Guatemala. Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.2, No.37, pp.35-47. CIW, Washington, D.C.
- 1955a Ceramic Sequence at Uaxactun, Guatemala. 2 vols. MARI, Pub.20, Tulane University, New Orleans. (Citations to this book of Smith are abbreviated as "RS".)
- 1955b Pottery Specimens from Guatemala: II. Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.5, No.124, pp.75-78, CIW, Washington, D.C.
- 1955c Pottery Vessels from Campeche. Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.5, No.125, pp.79-82. CIW, Washington, D.C.
- 1957a Tohil Plumbate and Classic Maya Polychrome Vessels in the Marquez Collection. Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.5, No.129, pp.117-130. CIW, Washington, D.C.
- 1957b The Marquez Collection of X Fine Orange and Fine Orange Polychrome Vessels. Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol.5, No.131, pp.135-181. CIW, Washington, D.C.

SMITH, Virginia

- 1984 Izapa Relief Carving. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

SODI, Demetrio

- 1980 Los Mayas El Tiempo Pasado. Bancomer-Beatrice Trueblood, Mexico City. (a coffee table book not to be confused with his small paperback of a similar title).

SOTHEBY PARKE BERNET (see also Parke Bernet)

- 1975 Important African, Oceanic, and Pre-Columbian Art Property of Jay C. Leff. Oct.10th and 11th, 1975, Sale 3792. Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York.
- 1979 Fine Pre-Columbian Art, Nov.10, 1979, Sale 4306. Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York.
- 1981 Pre-Columbian Art, Feb.25, 1981, Sale 4548Y. Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York.
- 1983 Important Pre-Columbian Art, May 12 and 13, 1983. Sotheby

Parke Bernet, New York.

SOTHEBY'S (see also Sotheby Parke Bernet and Parke Bernet)

1984 Important Pre-Columbian Art, Nov.27 and 28, 1984.
Sotheby's, New York.

1985a Pre-Columbian Art, May 31, 1985. Sotheby's,
New York.

1985b Pre-Columbian Art, November 26, 1985. Sotheby's, New York.

SPINDEN, Herbert

1913 A Study of Maya Art: Its Subject Matter and Historical
Development. Memoirs of the Peabody Museum, Vol.VI, Harvard
University, Cambridge.

STEGGERDA, Morris

1941 Maya Indians of Yucatan. Carnegie Institution of Washington,
Pub.531, Washington, D.C.

STEPHENS, John L.

1943 Incidents of Travel in Yucatan. 2 vols. Harper and Bros.,
New York (Reprinted, Dover Publications, 1963).

STONE, Andrea

1982 Recent Discoveries from Naj Tunich. *mexicon* IV, pp.93-99.

STONE, Andrea, see also: COFFMAN

STONE, Doris

1964 Rasgos de la cultura Maya en Costa Rica. *Estudios de
Cultura Maya*, Vol.IV, pp.51-62, UNAM, Mexico City.

1972 Pre-Columbian Man Finds Central America: The Archaeological
Bridge. Peabody Museum Press, Harvard University, Cambridge.

STONE, Doris and Carlos BALSER

1965 Incised Slate Disks from the Atlantic Watershed of Costa Rica.
American Antiquity, Vol.30, No.3, pp.310-329.

STRATMEYER, Dennis and Jean STRATMEYER

1977 The Jacalteco Nawal and the Soul Bearer in Concepcion
Huista. pp.126-158, in *Cognitive Studies of Southern
Mesoamerica*, (Helen Neuenswander and Dean Arnold, eds.).
Summer Institute of Linguistics, Museum of Anthropology,
Dallas.

STRAUS, Joyce

1977 A Mirror Tradition in Pre-Columbian Art. MA thesis, University
of Denver.

STUART, David

1982 Blood Symbolism in Maya Iconography. Paper presented at the "Conference on the Beginning of Maya Iconography," Princeton University, October 1982.

1984 Royal Auto-sacrifice among the Maya: A Study of Image and Meaning. Res, 7/8, pp.6-20, Peabody Museum, Harvard University.

STUART, George

1981 Maya Art Treasures Discovered in Cave. National Geographic, Vol.160, No.2, August 1981, pp.220-235 Washington, D.C.

STUART, George and Gene STUART

1978 The Mysterious Maya. National Geographic Society, Washington, D.C.

SUAREZ DIEZ, Lourdes

1977 Tipologia de los objetos prehispánicos de concha. INAH, Mexico City.

TATE, Carolyn

1980 The Cauac Monster. MA thesis, University of Texas, Austin.

TAUBE, Karl

1985 The Classic Maya Maize God: A Reappraisal. Fifth Palenque Mesa Redonda, 1983, Vol.VII, (M.G.Robertson and V.Fields, eds.), pp.171-182. Pre-Columbian Art Research Institute, San Francisco.

TAYLOR, Dicey

1979 The Cauac Monster. in Tercera Mesa Redonda de Palenque, Merle Greene Robertson, ed.), Vol.IV, pp.79-89. The Robert Louis Stevenson School, Pebble Beach, CA.

1982 Problems in the Study of Narrative Scenes on Classic Maya Vases. in Falsifications and Misreconstructions of Pre-Columbian Art, (E. Benson, organizer, E. Boone, ed.), pp. 107-124, Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

TERMER, Frans

1959 Observaciones etnológicas acerca de los ojos entre los antiguos mexicanos y los mayas. in Homenaje al Dr. Hermann Beyer, El Mexico Antiguo, Tomo IX, pp.245-273. Sociedad Alemana Mexicanista, Mexico City

THOMAS, C.

1897 Day Symbols of the Maya Year. in Bureau of American Ethnology, 16th Annual Report, pp.205-265, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

1904 Mayan Calendar Systems. in Bureau of American Ethnology, 22nd Annual Report, Part 1, pp.197-305, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

THOMPSON, J.Eric S.

- 1931 Archaeological Investigations in the Southern Cayo District, British Honduras. Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropology Series, Vol.17, No.3. (Reprinted by Kraus Reprint).
- 1934 Sky Bearers, Colors and Directions in Maya and Mexican Religion. Contributions, No.10, Pub.436, CIW, Washington, D.C.
- 1938 Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Reports on the Chol Mayas. American Anthropologist, (ns) Vol.40, pp.584-604.
- 1939 The Moon Goddess in Middle America: with Notes on Related Deities. C.I.W. Pub. 509, Contributions, Vol.V, No.29, pp.121-173. Washington, D. C.
- 1944 The Fish as a Maya Symbol for Counting and Further Discussion of Directional Glyphs. CIW, Division of Historical Research, Theoretical Approaches to Problems, No.2, Cambridge.
- 1950 Maya Hieroglyphic Writing. CIW, Pub.589, Washington, D.C. (2nd edition, 1960, University of Oklahoma Press).
- 1954 The Rise and Fall of Maya Civilization. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- 1962 A Catalog of Maya Hieroglyphs. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- 1968 Una manera de prologo. in Tiempo y realidad en el pensamiento Maya, by Miguel Leon-Portilla. UNAM, Mexico City.
- 19?? Review of Y.V. Knorozov - The Ancient Writing of the Peoples of Central America. Yan, No.2, pp.174-178, Mexico.
- 1970a Maya History and Religion. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- 1970b The Bacabs: Their Portraits and their Glyphs. in Monographs and Papers in Maya Archaeology, (W. Bullard, ed.), No. 3, pp.469-485. Papers of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Vol.61, Cambridge.
- 1972a A Commentary on the Dresden Codex: A Maya Hieroglyph Book. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol.93. Philadelphia.
- 1972b Maya Hieroglyphs Without Tears. British Museum, London.

- 1970/ Maya Rulers of the Classic Period and the Divine Right of
1973 Kings. in The Iconography of Middle American Sculpture,
pp.52-71. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
- 1977 A Proposal for Constituting a Maya Subgroup, Cultural and
Linguistic, in the Peten and Adjacent Regions. in
Anthropology and History in Yucatan pp.3-42,
(Grant Jones, ed.). University of Texas Press, Austin.
- THOMPSON, J.E.S., H.E.D. POLLOCK, and Jean CHARLOT**
1932 A Preliminary Study of the Ruins of Coba, Quintana Roo,
Mexico. CIW, Pub.424, Washington, D.C.
- THOMSON, Charlotte**
1971 Ancient Art of the Americas from New England Collections.
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
- THOMSON, Donald, L.T. FINDLEY, and A.N. KERSTICH**
1979 Reef Fishes of the Sea of Cortez: The Rocky Shore Fishes
of the Gulf of California. Wiley-Interscience, New York.
- TOOK, Ian F.**
1979 Fishes of the Caribbean Reefs. Macmillan Educational
Ltd., London.
- TOVILLA** (see Scholes and Adams)
- TOWNSEND, Richard**
1984 The Art of Tribes and Early Kingdoms: Selections from
Chicago Collections. The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.
- TOZZER, Alfred**
1907 A Comparative Study of the Mayas and the Lacandones.
Macmillan Co., New York. (Reprinted 1978, AMS Press).
- 1913 A Spanish Manuscript Letter on the Lacandones in the Archives
of the Indies at Seville. Translated and with Notes by
A.Tozzer. International Congress of Americanists, Proceed-
ings, XVIII Session, London, 1912, Pt.I, pp.497-509.
- 1941 Landa's Relacion de las Cosas de Yucatan: A Translation.
(A. Tozzer, ed. and translator), Papers of the Peabody
Museum Vol. XVIII. Cambridge.
- 1957 Chichen Itza and its Cenote of Sacrifice. Memoirs of the
Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Vols.11 and 12,
Cambridge.
- 1984 A Spanish Manuscript Letter on the Lacandones in the Archives
of the Indies at Seville. Translated and with Notes by
A.Tozzer, additional notes by Frank Comparato. Labyrinthos,
Culver City, CA.

TOZZER, Alfred and G. ALLEN

1910 Animal Figures in the Maya Codices. Peabody Museum Papers, Vol.4, No.3, Harvard University, Cambridge.

TRIK, Helen and Michael KAMPEN

1984 The Graffiti of Tikal. Tikal Report No.31. University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

VALENZUELA, Nicolas de

1695 Relacion... de la reduccion y conversion de indios infieles que habitan las montanas inmediatas a Verapaz, Huehuetenango, y Chiapas... en la entrada que hizo en la entrada desde Ocosingo, Chiapas. Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Escribano de Camara 339 B, Pieza 5. (Typed transcript in F.L.A.A.R. library).

1979 Nicolas de Valenzuela: Conquista del Lacandon y Conquista del Chol: Relacion sobre la Expedicion de 1695 contra los Lacandones e Itza segun el "Manuscrito de Berlin," 2 vols., Goetz Freiherr von Houwald, Ed. Colloquium Verlag, Berlin.

VAILLANT, George

1927 The Chronological Significance of Maya Ceramics. PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge.

VILLACORTA, C., J. Antonio and Carlos A. VILLACORTA C.

1930 Codices Maya. Dresdensis-Peresianus-Tro-Cortesianus. Guatemala City, reprinted 1977, Tipografia Nacional.

de VOS, Jan see under "d"

VOSTRADOVSKY, J.

1973 Freshwater Fishes: A Concise Guide in Colour. Hamlyn, London and New York.

WEAVER, Muriel Porter

1981 The Aztecs, Maya, and their Predecessors: Archaeology of Mesoamerica. 2nd edition. Academic Press, New York.

WEBER, Walter

1945 Wildlife of Tabasco and Veracruz. National Geographic Magazine, Vol.LXXXVII, No.2, pp.187-216.

WILLEY, Gordon R.

1974 The Classic Maya Hiatus: A Rehearsal for the Collapse? in Mesoamerican Archaeology: New Approaches, (N.Hammond, ed.), pp.417-430. University of Texas Press, Austin.

1983 Maya Archaeology at Harvard, 1982-83. Institute of Maya Studies Newsletter, Vol.12, No.11 (no pagination). Miami.

WILLEY, Gordon and James C. GIFFORD

1964 Pottery of the Holmul I Style from Barton Ramie, British Honduras. in Essays in Pre-Columbian Art and Archaeology, pp.152-170. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

WILLEY, Gordon, T.P. CULBERT, and R.E.W. ADAMS

1967 Maya Lowland Ceramics: A Report from the 1965 Guatemala City Conference. *American Antiquity*, Vol.32, No.3, pp.289-315.

WILLEY, Gordon and J. SABLOFF

1974 *A History of American Archaeology*. Thames & Hudson. London & New York.

XIMENEZ, Fray Francisco

1930 *Historia de la Provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala*. 3 vols. Sociedad de Geografia e Historia, Biblioteca "Goathemala," Guatemala City.

WINNING, Hasso von

1947 Certain Types of Stamped Decoration on Pottery from the Valley of Mexico. *Notes on Middle Archaeology and Ethnology*, Vol.3, No.86, pp.202-213, CIW, Washington, D.C.

1968 *Pre-Columbian Art of Mexico and Central America*. Abrams, New York.

1974 *Pre-Columbian Art of Mexico and Central America*. The Bowers Museum, Santa Ana, CA.

1981 *La iconografía de Teotihuacan: Los dioses y sus signos*. 2 vols. Unpublished ms. (in press, Mexico City).

WOODBURY, Richard and Aubrey TRIK

1953 *The Ruins of Zaculeu, Guatemala*. 2 vols. United Fruit Co.

WRAY COLLECTION

1984 *Masterpieces of Pre-Columbian Art from the Collection of Mr and Mrs Peter G. Wray*. Andre Emmerich Gallery -- Perls Galleries, New York.

XIMENEZ, F.

1929- *Historia de la provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y*

1931 *Guatemala en la Orden de Predicadores*. Biblioteca Goathemala, vols.1-3, Guatemala. (earlier edition was 1720).

YOMIURI SHIMBUNSHA (a Japanese newspaper)

1974 *Tesoros Mayas de Guatemala*. Yomiuri Shimbunsha, Tokyo, Japan.

1977 *Civilizacion Maya de Guatemala*. Yomiuri Shimbunsha, Tokyo, Japan.

ZAPPALORTI, Robert T.

1976 The Amateur Zoologist's Guide to Turtles and
Crocodilians. Stackpole Books, Harrisburg, Penn.

ZEILLER, Warren

1975 Tropical Marine Fishes. A.S. Barnes, Cranbury, N.J.

ZIMMERMANN, GUENTER

1956 Die Hieroglyphen der Maya-Handschriften. Cram, de Gruyter
& Co., Hamburg.