to successive events in a ruler's life such as birth, accession, or death. Many dates are also recorded in the Ton-Alam system different from the Initial Series and distance number schemes common in the south. Kelley (1982: 1) has, however, pointed out that these "variant methods of recording dates do not involve important calendrical differences, but rather a slight shift in emphasis."

An important historical inscription from Uxmal occurs on a small, cylindrical monument known as Uxmal Altar 10 (Figs. 1, 2; Pollock 1980: 275), where emblem glyphs appear at B2, A4, and B5. In 1998 Heinrich Berlin demonstrated that Maya sites are named by specific emblem glyphs, which are composed of the following principal parts:

(1) A main sign that varies from site to site, with two constant groups of affixes attached.
(2) the so-called "ton-i-kat" superfix (phonetic glyph). (3) a prefix of the so-called "water group" as defined by Thompson (1909: 276; fig. 4). 1992: 119, T3:43 (Fig. 3).

On Uxmal Altar 10 the glyph at B2 has typical emblem affixes. The main sign is the face of a young man wearing a large circular earplug and a close-fitting cap, or perhaps a cloth strip wrapped around the head. This is probably the emblem glyph of Uxmal.

In the second emblem glyph at A4 the prefix is a variant of the water group with a god C head (Thompson 1902: 741). The main sign most closely resembles glyph T3:116a or T3:11b (T-numbers refer to the Thompson 1982 glyph catalog, called the "Muhle Variants" by Thompson 1982: 119). Kelley (1982: 119) also accepts this as an emblem glyph, but prefers to identify the main sign as an earplug glyph.

The third emblem glyph at B5 is damaged, but definitely has the T168 stego superfix. Kowalski (in press) has suggested that the main sign may be T3:11c, another of the Muhle Variants, like that at A4. Kelley (personal communication) questions this identification and believes that the sign may be the moon glyph.

At other sites where dynastic content has been identified in the inscriptions the names and associated titles of rulers often immediately precede an emblem glyph, so is the case on Uxmal Altar 10. Before the final emblem glyph is a female name or title. The main sign is a profile human head with a small, rounded forked ear and strand of hair curled about the ear which identifies female name glyphs at several sites (Proskouriakoff 1961). The prefix seems to be a variant of the T110 "Bone" glyph. Because of the prominence of the "bone" element, this woman has been designated as "Lady Bone" (Kowalski in press).

"Lord Chac" and his Family

Preceding the first emblem glyph at A2 is the name glyph which designates god B, the Yucatec Maya rain god Chac, in the
Glossary

Calender Round—A two-part date including a position in a 260-day ritual almanac (tzolkin) and a 360-day "calendar year" (haab). The almanac pairs thirteen numbers with twenty days-names. The "calendar year" consists of 18 twenty-day "months" and a five-day unlucky period. A Calendar Round date, such as 2 Ajaw (tzolkin position) 18 Mol (haab position) or 4 Eh 5 Cole, will recur only after 52,560 days (about 146,000 years) have elapsed.

Distance Numbers—A number written in the Aztec calendar, 1989-1904, that specifies how many kins, uinals, tun, etc., are to be added to or subtracted from an i.s. to reach a new date.

GMT—The Goodman-Marín-Torrence-Tiberal correlation of the Maya and Christian calendars, placing the Long Count 11.16.0.0.0 in the year 1353 B.C.

Initial Series (I.S.)—A Long Count calendar date at the start of a Maya inscription. It records multiples of 360-day periods and any extra days that have elapsed between the beginning of the current Maya era in 3114 B.C. The system uses place-value notation and features a column of five numerals coupled with five time periods: knowl (20 days), tun (282 days), k'atun (360 days), uinal (360 days), and ahau (360 days). Such dates are then transcribed into Arabic numerals as follows: 10.8.10.1.1 (in 2090) = 26,250 days, 20 days, 30 days, 60 days, and 60 days. The day name is also included to form the complete date.

Jaguar—A Mayan symbol associated with the god of war and warfare. The jaguar is often depicted in a seated position with a open mouth, representing the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Eye—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar eye is often depicted as a large, glowing, red eye that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Hair—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar hair is often depicted as a pair of long, flowing locks that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Head—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar head is often depicted as a large, fierce-looking head that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Mask—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar mask is often depicted as a large, oval-shaped mask that symbolizes the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Tail—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar tail is often depicted as a long, flowing tail that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Teeth—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar teeth are often depicted as sharp, pointed teeth that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Tongue—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar tongue is often depicted as a long, forked tongue that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Whiskers—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar whiskers are often depicted as long, flowing whiskers that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Eye—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar eye is often depicted as a large, glowing, red eye that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.
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Jaguar Tongue—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar tongue is often depicted as a long, forked tongue that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Whiskers—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar whiskers are often depicted as long, flowing whiskers that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Eye—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar eye is often depicted as a large, glowing, red eye that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Hair—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar hair is often depicted as a pair of long, flowing locks that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Head—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar head is often depicted as a large, fierce-looking head that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Mask—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar mask is often depicted as a large, oval-shaped mask that symbolizes the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Tail—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar tail is often depicted as a long, flowing tail that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Teeth—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar teeth are often depicted as sharp, pointed teeth that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Tongue—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar tongue is often depicted as a long, forked tongue that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Whiskers—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar whiskers are often depicted as long, flowing whiskers that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Eye—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar eye is often depicted as a large, glowing, red eye that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Hair—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar hair is often depicted as a pair of long, flowing locks that symbolize the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Head—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar head is often depicted as a large, fierce-looking head that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.

Jaguar Mask—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar mask is often depicted as a large, oval-shaped mask that symbolizes the power and strength of the god.

Jaguar Tail—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar tail is often depicted as a long, flowing tail that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.
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Jaguar Head—A Mayan symbol representing the god of war and warfare. The jaguar head is often depicted as a large, fierce-looking head that symbolizes the anger or fury of the god.
glyph that has two important components of the emblem glyph that appears on flint blades from the Uxmal Altar 10; the TI69 superfix and the "Moluc Variant" main sign, suggesting a graphic development of the "Lord Chac" glyph in the polychrome phase of the Uxmal Altar 10. In addition, there is a Uxmal Altar 10. In addition, there is a Uxmal Altar 10.

"Lord Chac" at Kabah

On the polychrome platform in the Uxmal Altar 10. In addition, there is a Uxmal Altar 10. In addition, there is a Uxmal Altar 10.

Before considering the evidence for a dynastic history at Chichen Itza, we should briefly examine the chronology. Kelvey (1982: 11–12, Table 1) has listed those dates from Chichen Itza that seem reasonably certain. One of these is a year-dated glyph on a tomb capping which must have been placed either at 10.3.8.14.6 K'an 2 Pop (A.D. 906, GMT) or at 11.2.8.13.6 K'an 2 Pop (A.D. 1066, GMT). The earlier date is preferred by Kelvey (1982: 11), while Beyer (1937: 140) and Morley (1920: 520) opt for the latter. Other secure dates include the 185. date of 10.3.9.13.8 Haa 19 Mol (A.D. 906, GMT) as well as three dates from Yuc. one from the Monjas. two from the Temple of the Four Lintels. and one from the High Priest's Grave. The non-185. dates are recorded using a Calendar Round date coupled with a Tri- Ahau statement (Thompson 1937). With the exception of the date of 10.6.10.11.12 Haa 19 Mol (A.D. 906, GMT) associated with the Toltec-Maya High Priest's Grave, all these dates fall within the Long Count period 10.3.8.14.6 K'an 2 Pop (A.D. 906, GMT) and the High Priest's Grave to the northern (A.D. 906, GMT). Four Lintels, L. 4), a period of some eight years. A probable date of 10.2.10.19.6 Haa 12 Mac (A.D. 966, GMT) at the Castillo Colodo adds four years to the begin- ing of the series. Other Chichen Itza dates, less securely placed in the Long Count, may span a period from 10.1.17.5.13 (A.D. 906, GMT) to 10.3.17.0.0 (A.D. 906, GMT, Caracol Stela). Because most of these dates correspond to inscriptions on lintels, they indicate that many of the major Chichen-Maya style buildings were constructed and dedicated within a period of some eighteen years from A.D. 906 to 954 GMT. The last phase of the Caracol and the High Priest's Grave seem somewhat later.

The High Priest's Grave date is particularly significant because it is associated with a pure Toltec-Maya structure. Kelvey (1982: 3) suggests that it must be approximately contemporary with the tomb and pyramid, which he views as a degenerate copy of the Castillo, so we may have to reconsider the traditional date of Chichen Itza's abandonment (A.D. 1066). In the first attempt to demon- strate the presence of historical material in the chronicle of Chichen Itza, Kelvey (1986: 99) suggested that a certain sequence of glyphs Watering through) to 10.3.17.0.0 (A.D. 906, GMT, Caracol Stela). Because most of these dates correspond to inscriptions on lintels, they indicate that many of the major Chichen-Maya style buildings were constructed and dedicated within a period of some eighteen years from A.D. 906 to 954 GMT. The last phase of the Caracol and the High Priest's Grave seem somewhat later. The High Priest's Grave date is particularly significant because it is associated with a pure Toltec-Maya structure. Kelvey (1982: 3) suggests that it must be approximately contemporary with the tomb and pyramid, which he views as a degenerate copy of the Castillo, so we may have to reconsider the traditional date of Chichen Itza's abandonment (A.D. 1066). In the first attempt to demonstrate the presence of historical material in the chronicle of Chichen Itza, Kelvey (1986: 99) suggested that a certain sequence of glyphs Watering through) to 10.3.17.0.0 (A.D. 906, GMT, Caracol Stela). Because most of these dates correspond to inscriptions on lintels, they indicate that many of the major Chichen-Maya style buildings were constructed and dedicated within a period of some eighteen years from A.D. 906 to 954 GMT. The last phase of the Caracol and the High Priest's Grave seem somewhat later.

In the first attempt to demonstrate the presence of historical material in the chronicle of Chichen Itza, Kelvey (1986: 99) suggested that a certain sequence of glyphs Watering through) to 10.3.17.0.0 (A.D. 906, GMT, Caracol Stela). Because most of these dates correspond to inscriptions on lintels, they indicate that many of the major Chichen-Maya style buildings were constructed and dedicated within a period of some eighteen years from A.D. 906 to 954 GMT. The last phase of the Caracol and the High Priest's Grave seem somewhat later. The High Priest's Grave date is particularly significant because it is associated with a pure Toltec-Maya structure. Kelvey (1982: 3) suggests that it must be approximately contemporary with the tomb and pyramid, which he views as a degenerate copy of the Castillo, so we may have to reconsider the traditional date of Chichen Itza's abandonment (A.D. 1066). In the first attempt to demonstrate the presence of historical material in the chronicle of Chichen Itza, Kelvey (1986: 99) suggested that a certain sequence of glyphs Watering through) to 10.3.17.0.0 (A.D. 906, GMT, Caracol Stela). Because most of these dates correspond to inscriptions on lintels, they indicate that many of the major Chichen-Maya style buildings were constructed and dedicated within a period of some eighteen years from A.D. 906 to 954 GMT. The last phase of the Caracol and the High Priest's Grave seem somewhat later. The High Priest's Grave date is particularly significant because it is associated with a pure Toltec-Maya structure. Kelvey (1982: 3) suggests that it must be approximately contemporary with the tomb and pyramid, which he views as a degenerate copy of the Castillo, so we may have to reconsider the traditional date of Chichen Itza's abandonment (A.D. 1066). In the first attempt to demonstrate the presence of historical material in the chronicle of Chichen Itza, Kelvey (1986: 99) suggested that a certain sequence of glyphs Watering through) to 10.3.17.0.0 (A.D. 906, GMT, Caracol Stela). Because most of these dates correspond to inscriptions on lintels, they indicate that many of the major Chichen-Maya style buildings were constructed and dedicated within a period of some eighteen years from A.D. 906 to 954 GMT. The last phase of the Caracol and the High Priest's Grave seem somewhat later. The High Priest's Grave date is particularly significant because it is associated with a pure Toltec-Maya structure. Kelvey (1982: 3) suggests that it must be approximately contemporar...
for east. Lukis (Kelley 1976: 181). The correctness of the reading palap has been confirmed at Pa-

pali, mentioned on the dated Chichen Itza Maysa monum

ent. It should be pointed out, however, that the col-

FIG. 12 Characteristic name glyphs of the Chichen Itza 'rulers

defined by Davoust and Kelley. (Drawing by Barbara Fanik.)

for several texts then include a title that has been read as 'Ah Pacal' (Ah Puchab). Four of the Monjas
texts then have the cause/aud/boquer glyph with verbal affixes followed by a title, Muyel Uakan. Most of the
texts then continue with ti+s. Three texts then follow with ah ke-2, which is followed in turn by a hand
with crossed-bands inify. Three other texts substitute a bird head within another head, followed by si, for the band/crossed bands. After this fairly standard clause are the varying passages giving the names of various individuals. These names occur as the grammatical subject at the start of the clause. That these differing sets of glyphs name indivi-
duals is confirmed by the fact that only one clearly refers to a female.

The meaning of the verb in this clause is still obscure according to both Davoust (1982: 26) and Kelley (1982: 25). The object of the verb is, if read phonetically, ah puchab, which in Yucatec means 'the lord of the lintel, self, or being'. Kelley speculates that this might identify the protagonist as the person to whom the lintel is dedi-
cated, or it might refer to the throne (benc) as a symbol of ruler-
dom. Unfortunately, the meaning of the remainder of the clause is even less clear.

Three of these parallel texts, those on L.4 of the Monjas, L.3 of the Temple of the Three Lintels, and the Initial Series Lintel, refer to 'Jawbone-Longbone.' Davoust (1986: 26, 28) believes this to be the earliest ruler mentioned in the inscriptions. Kelley (1982: 6) suggests that 'Jawbone-Longbone' was the father of Nakayax, a relationship specified on L.1 of the Monjas, where Nakayax's name follows that of 'Jawbone-Longbone' in the central glyphic panel (Fig. 14). "Tin Tul' (Great Rabbit) is mentioned in four similar passages on L.2 of the Monjas, and L.1 and L.4 of the Temple of the Four Lintels. His name glyph resembles that of Yaxbalan, which also forms part of the appellative phrase of "Baby Yaxbalan from Yaxbalan."
The social control exerted by these rulers must have been considerable.

Transition in the Yucatan

The inscriptions of Uxmal and Chichen Itza are important because they are among the latest known texts from the Maya area. They were produced primarily in the period from 10.2.0.0.0 (A.D. 900) to 10.3.0.0.0 (A.D. 990) and then occupy a position during the Terminal Classic which seems to straddle the demise of southern Classic Maya civilization and the introduction of stronger central Mexican influences in the art, architecture, and culture of northern Yucatan. Although not every section of each text can be deciphered, significant advances have been made in revealing the historical content of these inscriptions. The inscriptions of both Uxmal and Chichen are, despite some localized usages, neither foreign nor intranslatable. Instead, many of the texts refer to specific individuals associated with dates, titles, relationship glyphs, and emblem glyphs. The dynamic material in the north is paralleled to some extent, although there is less emphasis on the personal biography of rulers and more on ritual commemorations of ancestors. Beyond the general shared interest in dynastic history, several of the personal names, such as those of Kukulcan, Yax Tuun, Lord Chac, and others, are closely related to recognizable rulers of southern sites. These texts cannot solve every
problem still remaining in our attempts to understand the transition from the Terminal Classic to the Early Post-Classic period in northern Yucatan, but they do affirm that several major centers in the area were governed by powerful Maya dynasties during the period from A.D. 869 to 909. The social control exerted by these rulers must have been considerable, and they presumably maintained commercial and political relations with other areas of Mesoamerica, ties which are reflected in the various foreign and “non-classic” elements evident in the art of northern Yucatan at this time. The inscriptions do, however, confirm that during this period these two great cities were basically Maya in social organization and worldview. It was not until the Toltecs of Tula took a more covetous interest in the peninsula that the situation changed, and power was concentrated at Chichen Itza. The political organization of Chichen Itza was greatly altered, as is clearly seen in the dramatic new forms of Toltec-Maya art and architecture, and the near total absence of hieroglyphic inscriptions after 10.4.0.0.0 (A.D. 909).
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