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PREFACE
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Dr. T. P. Culbert, my thesis advisor, provided me with the raw data which made the thesis possible. He also provided me with unlimited amounts of his time. His tolerance and availability are two traits I would hope to emulate as a teacher.

Dr. Raymond H. Thompson, my graduate advisor, and Dr. William A. Longacre are both to be thanked for providing help and encouragement when those two essentials were most needed.

Dr. Paul S. Martin of the Chicago Natural History Museum very kindly allowed me the time for finishing and revising the thesis at a time when I was working with his expedition.
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ABSTRACT

There are about 70 excavated burials with some 200 associated pottery vessels from the Late Classic period (A. D. 600-800) at Tikal, a large Maya center in Guatemala. The purpose of this thesis is to present a description of the Late Classic mortuary ceramics and to investigate the traditions of burial offerings as these are exhibited in the ceramics. To accomplish this last an analysis was undertaken of the function, distribution, and cultural significance of the vessels and their contexts.

The descriptive section is a straight-forward listing and categorizing of all the data available from field notes pertaining to the 70 Late Classic burials and includes vessel form, designs on the vessels, and the location of the burials in their cultural contexts.

A discussion and listing of pertinent information about burial ceramics from several other Maya sites supplies comparative data for the conclusions reached in the interpretive section.

The final or interpretive section presents information on the patterns, or traditions, which are seen in the burial ceramics. These traditions are established by investigating the supposed functions of the vessels, their frequency of occurrence, and the cultural contexts in which they are found. Inferences about chronology and cultural change
are made from these traditions or patterns. These in turn are compared with similar material from other Maya sites.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND DESCRIPTION

Culture is a system. Moreover it is a system whose parts bear concrete and determinable relationships to one another. Leslie White (1949) has suggested that these relationships fall into a hierarchical scheme the major divisions of which he has designated as the economic, sociological, and ideological levels of culture. This division of all the phenomena coming under the term culture has been a very convenient device for those archaeologists who think that the remains of societies might be interpreted in such a way that a broader view of any particular culture history could be obtained than was formerly thought possible. Currently the most outspoken proponent of this view in American archaeology is Lewis Binford (1962) whose work is stimulating and at least mildly controversial.

The influence of the ideas and personalities mentioned above is becoming more and more marked in American archaeology, introducing both new methods and new theories to the field. In this thesis none of the new techniques for which this method of thinking is noted are practiced. Rather, what has motivated me here is the spirit, not the letter, of the school. What this means in practice is a feeling for Maya culture, not as a group of traits, but as a system which is
manifested more or less totally in the archaeological record. And more, this view means that the artifacts of that extinct society are the remains, not just of the economy of that culture, but of its social order and ideology as well. With this view in mind it at once becomes clear that the world of inferences to be drawn from an artifact class, like whole pots from burials, is expanded many times over what a more conventional view of culture would permit.

The burials and the vessels associated with them which are considered in this paper all come from Tikal, Guatemala. This Maya center, which ranks among the foremost of Maya sites, has been the subject of ten years of excavation and restoration by the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania and the Guatemalan government. The site is in the Guatemalan department of El Peten, in an area covered by deep jungle and inaccessible by road.

Tikal is most well known for its Late Classic (A.D. 600-900) remains, which are much more common than remains of earlier periods in the over six square miles of site so far mapped. Here only the Late Classic, the divisions of which are called Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2, is considered. Tepeu 1 is not generously represented in the data, but there is enough material for some inference. Tepeu 2 is well represented.

The meat of this essay is an experiment. It is an attempt to see just how far and how soundly inferences can be made "from pots to people." Explicitly, what will fewer than 200 whole burial vessels tell
about the civilization which produced them? Do they reveal any of the mechanisms which governed, or which are seen operating in Maya culture? I think they do.

The experiment rests on a description of the vessels, the first major section of the thesis; on some basic observations and low level inferences drawn from the descriptions, the second major section of the thesis; and finally on two hypotheses which are the core of the third and final part of the work. The first two sections are valuable because of the basic and sound information they provide. The last section is controlled speculation which I hope might be stimulating.

This chapter contains the descriptive data upon which all of the interpretations in the later chapters are based. There are 69 Late Classic burials which contain 197 vessels. The information is arranged by burial and the chief emphasis is given to a description of the associated vessels.

A number of terms are used in this chapter which need to be defined. The definitions are in as close accord as possible with those in Robert Smith's *Ceramic Sequence at Uaxactun* (1955); otherwise they are definitions composed especially for the ceramic material at Tikal.

Tepeu I is characterized chiefly by the Saxche and Sibal Ceramic Groups. Within these, Saxche Orange Polychrome and Sibal Buff Polychrome are the most common. The basic colors involved in them are red, black, cream, buff, and orange. Orange and buff are the
background colors on which various combinations of the other colors appear.

Tepeu 1 ceramics are usually characterized by a pink paste and no underslip. The paste is sometimes called Standard or Saxche.

The vessel forms characteristic of this period are forms 11, 13, and 15. Form 11 is a barrel or keg-shaped vessel. Form 13 is a shallow tripod plate with a basal flange or ridge. And form 15 is a round-side bowl with an unrestricted orifice.

Tepeu 2 fine wares fall mainly into the Pic Polychrome Group. The most common subdivisions of this group are Palmar Orange Polychrome, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, and Chantouri Black on Orange. The colors involved in these types are basically the same and occur in the same combinations as those in Tepeu 1. The painted designs are the chief distinguishing marks between Tepeu 1 and 2.

Paste in Tepeu 2 is buff or tan, but varies over some range from pink to red to yellow. Standard buff is the usual term to identify Tepeu 2 ware paste.

The vessel forms for this period are forms 10, 12A, 12B, and 14. Form 10 is a vertical-side cylinder. Form 12A is a tripod plate with flaring sides. Form 12B is a flat-based bowl with out-curving sides and form 14 is a flat-based bowl with straight sides. Forms 12B and 14 are essentially the same, except for the difference in curvature of the sides.
Paste refers to the clay mixture of which the pot is constructed. Underslip refers to the color of the first layer painted on the vessel. It can often be completely covered by other painted layers. It occasionally happens that vessels, especially in Tepeu I, will have no underslip.

All of the above characteristics apply to the fine wares discussed in this thesis. There is, however, another pottery tradition at Tikal which is more common. This second tradition is comprised of the domestic wares, which are not discussed here because they are almost completely absent from the Late Classic graves at Tikal.

The ceramics included here are often called ceremonial wares due to their association both with graves and with the middens associated with the ceremonial buildings at Maya sites. These vessels were in much more common use than the term ceremonial would imply. Their remains are frequent in domestic middens and examples of them in graves often show evidence of prior use.

Drilling or punching a hole in the base of a vessel is a ritualistic device for sacrificing the object, for "killing" it. This is a common practice with mortuary vessels and is frequently found in grave pottery at Tikal.

Soil conditions at Tikal are such that painted ceramics in graves fared very poorly. Sometimes the entire painted surface of a vessel has been destroyed. More often, enough of the surface is left only for identification of the underslip and some of the polychrome
features. This is the reason for the less than complete descriptions of many of the vessels. "Weathering" is the term used for describing this eroded surface condition.

**Description of the Mortuary Vessels:**

**Their Location Temporally, and by Tomb**

**Burial 14**

Tepeu 2

located in a small housemound which is in a north and east position in a group of small mounds; Str. 4F-15-1st.

2 vessels: Form 12B, heavy buff underslip, pink paste (but not Tepeu 1), the base curves slightly inward and the sides are unusually high.

Form 14, heavy buff underslip, pink paste (but not Tepeu 1).

**Burial 16**

Tepeu 2

located in a small housemound which is in a north and east position in a group of small mounds; Str. 4F-15-2nd.

2 vessels: Form 12B, standard paste, a thicker base than is usual for this form.

Form 12B, standard paste, traces of a red slip, shorter than is usual for this form; both of these vessels are noticeably similar.

**Burial 17**

Tepeu 1

located in a very small mound, one which is the eastern-most building in its particular group; Str. 4F-43.
1 vessel: Form 15, an odd red paste, possibly Saxche; an incised line running around the rim of the outside, the sides themselves curve slightly inward at the top.

Burial 21

Tepeu 2

located west of a small house mound which is in a north and east position in a group of small mounds; west of Str. 4F-15-1st.

2 vessels: Form 10, buff underslip, standard paste.

Form 12B, buff underslip, standard paste, neatly killed in mid-base, probably by drilling. This example is higher than usual for this form.

Burial 26

Tepeu 2

located in a large house mound; it is the westernmost building in a large group; Str. 4E-31.

1 vessel: Form 12B, medium buff underslip; design not clear except for rim bands. The interior is red, the lip is black, there are traces of red and black paint on the exterior which may be sufficient for classifying the vessel as Palmar Orange Polychrome.

Burial 28

Tepeu 2

located in the same situation as Burial 26.

1 vessel: Form 12A, buff underslip, pink paste; feet have been removed and in addition there is a kill hole in the base which is off-center.

Burial 30

intermediate

located in a large house mound; this is the westernmost building in a large group; Str. 4E-31.
3 vessels: Form 11, buff underslip, standard Tepeu 2 paste; traces of red slip appear on the exterior which may indicate that the vessel may have been monochrome red.

Form 12A, buff underslip, pink paste, perhaps a red on orange exterior; the feet are still attached.

Form 12B, buff underslip, pink paste, rather coarse; killed by drilling the base.

Burial 31

Tepeu 2

located in a small house mound, in the middle of a group of mounds; Str. 4F-3.

3 vessels: Form 10, buff underslip, pink paste.

Form 12A, buff underslip, pink paste; very thin, slender legs.

Form 12B, buff underslip, pink paste; a black on red interior, and a neatly executed kill hole.

Burial 33

Tepeu 1 (or possibly Early Classic)

located in a quarry, near a house mound; Str. 4F-1.

1 vessel: Form 15, yellow-pink paste, perhaps Tzakol; the whole surface is very badly eroded.

Burial 34

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 33.

1 vessel: Form 12A, aberrant, black interior. Possibly there was a ring-shaped base to the vessel.

Burial 38

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 33.
3 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, pink paste; traces of design in red and orange outlined in black.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, pink paste; outer rim painted in red and orange, the orange and red are separated from the orange interior by a black line. There are traces of glyph-like designs on the orange interior. The feet are missing.

Form 12B, pink paste, no underslip; there is a kill hole in the base, neatly done.

Burial 39
Tepeu 2

located in a small house mound or temple, possibly the easternmost building in a small group; Str. 4F-7.

3 vessels: Form 10, buff underslip, standard pink paste.

Form 12B, buff underslip, coarse tan paste; high sides, killed by drilling. There are traces of red-orange on the interior surface only. saucer-like form, red design on the outer wall and red stripe probably on rim lip.

Burial 40
Tepeu 1

located in the same situation as Burial 39.

1 vessel: Form 11, Tepeu 2 paste; there are traces of red on buff on the exterior.

Burial 42
Tepeu 2

located in same situation as Burial 39.

3 vessels: Form 10, buff underslip, standard paste.

Form 12A, buff underslip, standard paste. The feet have not been removed. There are traces of dark red on the upper surface of the rim.
Form 12B, buff underslip, standard paste; central kill hole. There are traces of dark red on the entire inner surface.

Burial 45

intermediate

located in a small housemound; Str. 4F-26.

3 vessels: Form 12B, buff underslip; very slightly outflaring sides; remnants of black on red decoration.

Form 14, probably monochrome red inside and out; slightly oblique, narrow grooving around the exterior.

Form 15, buff underslip, monochrome red paste; rounded bottom, remnants of black on red decoration.

Burial 49

Tepeu 2

located in a small housemound or temple which is the easternmost building in a group; Str. 2G-59-1st.

3 vessels: Form 10, standard paste. The exterior has oblique-fluted grooves around it.

Form 12B, pink paste. The sides are very slightly outcurved.

Form 12B, pink paste; a high sided form of this type. It has been killed.

Burial 50

Tepeu 2

located in a small housemound or temple which is the easternmost building in a group; Str. 2G-59-2nd.

3 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard paste; remnants of red-orange decoration.

Form 12B, buff underslip, pink paste; almost no outcurve to the sides; red and orange alternating in long, thick wavy lines on the interior and exterior. There is a large, neat kill hole.
Form 14, buff underslip, pink paste. There is vertical fluting on the exterior and remnants of orange paint.

Burial 53

Tepeu 2

located in a small house mound or temple which is the easternmost building in a group; Str. 2G-59.

1 vessel: Form 10, standard paste.

Burial 54

intermediate

located in a medium sized house mound which is the easternmost building in a group; Str. 2G-59-2nd.

3 vessels: Form 11, Sibal Buff Polychrome; black bands around the orifice enclose a red band, the rest of the exterior has undistinguishable black on buff decoration.

Form 12B, Sibal Buff Polychrome; interior: red and orange alternating in long, thick, wavy lines; exterior: black and red bands alternate at the top; and hollow square with a central dot design encompasses the lower two-thirds.

Form 12B, Sibal Buff Polychrome; the exterior has large, alternating rectangular blocks of red and orange around it. The interior is too weathered for identification. There is a black lip band. The sides round off to the base, a trait rare in the 12B form.

Burial 56

Tepeu 2

the location is the same as that of Burial 54.

1 vessel: Form 10, standard paste.
Burial 58

Tepeu 1

located in the same small house mound as Burial 54.

4 vessels: Form 11, Saxche Orange Polychrome, buff underslip, Saxche paste; there is red and orange evident on both the interior and exterior, but no designs remain distinguishable. The mouth is quite wide for Form 11.

Form 13, Saxche Orange Polychrome, Saxche paste and no underslip; the exterior is red to flange; the interior is red and orange in an undistinguishable design. The feet are still attached.

Form 15, Saxche Orange Polychrome, Saxche paste; the exterior has a red square and red half-moon alternating around the surface. The background is orange. There is a very small, flat base.

an odd form; a bowl with outcurving lip; no underslip; probably monochrome orange or yellow.

Burial 66

Tepeu 2

located in a small house mound which is one of a group of two; that containing the burial is north of the other; Str. 3F-24-3rd.

3 vessels: (no information on one):

Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff underslip and standard paste. The exterior is vertically fluted and was decorated with some combination of black, red and orange designs. The interior is orange, with a red lip.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard paste; the exterior is black on very bright orange. There are a few remnants of designs.
Burial 68

Tepeu 2

located in a small house mound which is the north building in a group; Str. 3F-26.

3 vessels: Form 10, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, pink paste. The general design is black and red on cream. There is also exterior vertical fluting.

 Form 12A, buff underslip, pink paste. The feet are still attached.

 Form 12B, buff underslip, pink paste. An attempt to drill the base was not finished. Both 12A and 12B are too weathered to identify type.

Burial 70

Tepeu 2

located in the fill of Plaza 3F-2 (an outlying area), just west of a small house mound or temple which is the easternmost building in a group; Str. 5G-7.

4 vessels: Form 10, (no information).

 Form 12B, (three vessels); the three are equal in most respects; all have heavy buff underslip, standard paste. One is killed.

Burial 71

Tepeu 2

located in a small house mound which is in the northeast section of a group; Str. 5G-7.

4 vessels: Form 10, from the Pic Polychrome Group, buff underslip. The remaining decoration is black and red.

 Form 12B, red paste, slightly outcurving sides. There is a kill hole in the base.

 Form 12B, buff underslip uncertain, buff paste; very few fragments of the decoration left. The sides flare out slightly.
Form 12B, Zacatec Black; the base is rounded out slightly, the walls curve out moderately. There are rattles in the hollow base. Remnants of black paint are visible.

Burial 75

Tepeu.2

located in a small temple which is situated on a platform. The mound is in an eastern position with regard to the other buildings of the group; Str. 5G-11.

4 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff underslip, tan paste. There are narrow vertical grooves around the exterior, and a horizontal one near the lip. There is a red band around the lip and black quatrefoils with hollow centers around the exterior.

Form 12A, Chantouri Black on Orange, paste is tan, buff underslip. There are black bands around the lip and flange; the rest including the interior is orange. There is moderate outcurve to the sides, and the feet are still attached.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff paste. Around the inside rim alternate quatrefoils and Kan Crosses. The inside center is decorated with the wide, alternating red and orange wavy lines technique. The sides curve out moderately. The legs are missing. There is a kill hole in the base center.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, buff underslip. The interior is in the wavy, alternating red and orange line technique. The outside base is also in this style. The outside walls are decorated in a black and white checker-board design all around the vessel. There are white, red, and black lines around the bottom.

Burial 76

Tepeu 3 (?),

located in a small palace mound, which in its group is the westernmost structure. The context is indicative of Tepeu 3; Str. 5G-12.
1 vessel: Form 12A, the sides are much higher than is usual. The surface black but basic orange showing through underneath. The feet are small, squat and rounded; the sides curve out moderately.

Burial 77

Tepeu 2

a dedicatory burial in a medium size temple mound, which is on the west side of the West Plaza; Str. 5D-11.

6 vessels: Form 10, three horizontal black bands--two at neck, one at base; two diagonal black bands across the body; a red-orange background.

Form 10, red lip band; orange background on the body on which rows of black quatrefoils appear--three to a row in three horizontal rows. Beneath the lip band are six very stylized glyphic designs.

Form 10, narrow vertical grooving on the exterior and horizontal lip groove. The exterior background is orange, with black quatrefoils superimposed. There is a red lip band.

Form 12A, there is a black band on the inside rim and three Kan Crosses spaced equidistantly on the interior sides. There is a single Kan Cross in the inside center. The background interior and exterior are basically red-orange. The feet are still attached.

Form 12A, on the interior bottom in black is a glyphic design. On either side is a single, long bar with a series of hollow dots arranged along side both of them. There are "X" marks through the hollow centers of the dots. The feet are missing.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome; two black bands occur around the lip of this vessel and two also around the base. A series of horizontally descending black dots--from large at top to small at bottom--appears within vertical lines as the major motif. This motif is repeated a dozen times around the exterior. The outside
bottom is ringed with alternating, radiating red and orange lines. The interior has a wide red lip band. The interior bottom resembles the exterior bottom.

Burial 78

Tepeu 2

located in a mound of uncertain nature; Str. 4H-16.

4 vessels: Form 10, probably undecorated.

Form 12A, Pic Polychrome Group; buff underslip, red monochrome base. The interior is monochrome red. The feet are missing and there is a kill hole in the base.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff underslip, buff paste. There are remnants of red, orange, and black designs. The walls curve out moderately.

Form 12B, very similar to the above vessel in form and size. There are no other type data.

Burial 80

Tepeu 2

located in a small temple which is on a platform; the temple is the easternmost structure in the group except for the platform edge.

3 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome. There is a glyph band around the rim. The exterior background is black; there are flat-sided circles of orange with black dots in their centers evenly spaced in four horizontal rows all appearing to be superimposed on the background.

Form 12A, Pic Polychrome Group, standard paste. There are two black bands on the interior lip and two around the exterior base. The two on the exterior have an orange one inbetween. The exterior sides have an orange background with stylized glyphs, brackets and crescents superimposed. There are also many lines of small dots. The exterior base
has a row of black hollow circles between the legs. The interior has an orange background. What is left of the interior surface design shows a black human figure dancing in a monkey costume. The feet of the vessel are missing and there is a central kill hole. This kind of design is reminiscent of Tepeu 1.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, standard paste; a black rim band, followed by a band of eight Kan Grosses outlined negatively in black which appear on the exterior. The lower half of the bowl alternates three black dots in pyramid formation and a bracket arrangement of black crescent shapes on a cream background. This form is a slightly variant one of 12B.

intermediate

located in a small temple which is the easternmost building of the group; 4G-9

5 vessels: Form 10, an unnamed orange-incised type. There is a band of glyphs around the rim. Three finely incised gargoyle-like water birds encircle the exterior. One is holding a highly stylized fish in its long beak.

Form 13, Saxche Orange Polychrome, pink paste. There are remnants of a black design on the exterior walls, the underslip is cream. There is a design band on the interior walls; the interior is red and black on orange. There are possibly the remains of a dancer design on the inside base. The feet are missing.

Form 13, Sibal Buff Polychrome. The interior base has the remains of a human dancing figure; it is badly preserved. The center is surrounded by a circular band of various sized and colored rectangles and dots. The exterior base has a notched flange.

Form 13, (no information).
Form 14, Chantouri Black on Orange, buff underslip, yellow paste. The interior is orange with a wide lip band of red. The exterior has remnants of black on orange designs. The form is tall for its type.

Burial 82

intermediate

location unknown.

I vessel: Form 11, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, standard paste. There is a red lip band; the exterior background is black and is interspersed with flat-sided, cream colored circles. These are in three horizontal rows around the vessel. Inside each circle is a concentric one of red and then one of black and finally one of cream. The vessel is short for its type.

Burial 83

intermediate (?)

located in a small temple, the easternmost building in a group; Str. 4G-9.

3 vessels: Form 10, possibly a foreign type. The paste is hard and buff colored. The cream underslip seems to cover all of the vessel except the base outside. This is not the thin, chalky cream underslip (typical of Tikal at this period), but is harder and better polished. Over this is a thin orange slip which also covers the interior. There probably was a band of brown over the lip inside and out. There is no sign of designs.

Form 13, Kuleb Polychrome Group. The exterior is completely plain. The interior has a cream underslip, and remnants of red and orange designs. The paste is pink and coarse. The feet are removed and there is a kill hole.

an odd form, basically like 12B. It has straight sides with a moderate angle, a slight basal flange and a slightly curving-in base. The three, small,
hollow feet are removed. The exterior is black and red on orange; the interior is red and orange. The lip band in and out is red and is wide. The flange is orange.

Burial 86

Tepeu 2

located in a large housemound, probably a palace, which is the southern-most building in its group; Str. 4G-10.

4 vessels: Form 10, pink paste; narrow vertical grooves around the exterior with a horizontal groove just below the mouth.

Form 12A, buff paste; decoration completely weathered. The three large, round feet are still intact.

Form 12B, an unnamed orange-incised type; very crumbly buff paste. Exterior was probably painted monochrome; there are double incised lines at the lip and base and there may have been incised panels between.

Form 14, Pic Polychrome Group; the interior has red and orange fragments over a heavy buff under slip. The exterior is completely weathered. There is a kill hole in the base.

Burial 87

Tepeu 2

located on bed rock; in or near Str. 4H-18.

4 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome; heavy cream under-slip. The interior is orange with a broad red lip band which overlaps to the outside. The exterior is covered with six vertical rows of alternating squares of black and orange in a checker-board pattern. There is a red band around the exterior base.

Form 12A, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, yellow paste. The walls both inside and out are covered with alternating black and cream and black and red
checker-board designs. The inside base is purple-red. The lip is red. There is a heavy cream underslip. The feet are missing and there is a kill hole in the base.

**Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard paste, no underslip.** The exterior has a red lip band and a black band around the base. There is a wide orange panel between. The interior is orange with hollow, orange filled red squares on the sides. The legs are still attached. The vessel is a short form of this type.

**Form 12B, Chantouri Black on Orange, heavy buff underslip.** The interior is all orange. There is a double black lip band and a black band at the base—all on the exterior. The exterior is mainly orange; there are blotches of black remaining on it however.

**Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, heavy buff undercoat, yellow paste.** The interior has dark and light red alternating vertical bands on the walls. There is a black lip and a black base band. The
remainder of the outside is orange. There is a kill hole in the base.

Burial 89

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 88.

3 vessels: Form 10, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, buff paste and under-slip. The interior is orange with a red lip band which overlaps to the outside. There is a black band around the lip and base on the exterior. The outside background is orange. A large buff rectangle outlined in black occurs with buff and red Kan Crosses around the exterior. The design appears twice. There is a hollow base with rattles. There are four perforations in the base.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff underslip. The interior is monochrome orange with a black lip band overlapping slightly to the outside. The exterior background is orange with large black sexfoils outlined in red superimposed on it.

Form 14, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff underslip, hard yellow paste. The interior is monochrome orange with a red rim band which overlaps to the exterior. There are two thin black bands on the outside rim and one at the base. The exterior has wide orange panels alternating with thin red bars all around the body.

Burial 90

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 88.

3 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, heavy buff under-slip. The exterior shows black and red on orange remains. There is a wide red lip band inside and out.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, heavy buff undercoat. The interior is orange with red and black
glyph-like designs on it. These are stylized, some being simply brackets or crescent-shaped figures. The interior base and side are covered in this fashion. There are traces of black on orange on the exterior. There is a black rim band. The feet are removed.

Burial 91

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 88.

3 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, thick buff under-slip. The interior is dark red smudged. There is a red rim band extending inside and out. The exterior has an orange background with black quatrefoils which have hollow orange centers. There are two horizontal rows of these, each row containing four.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, medium buff undercoat, yellow paste. The interior is monochrome orange. There is an exterior red rim band followed lower by a thin black one. The lower section is unclear. There is a hole well off-center which may be a kill hole.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, medium buff undercoat, yellow paste. The interior is monochrome orange. There is a red rim band which carries over to the outside. There is a black band below this and one around the base. The rest is orange with an occasional black, vertical bar.

Burial 92

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 88.

1 vessel: Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, thick buff underslip, yellow paste. The interior is monochrome red; this laps over to form a rim band on the exterior. The lower section of the exterior has a red and cream checker-board pattern. There is a central kill hole.
Burial 93

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 88.

2 vessels: Form 14, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, heavy buff under-slip, yellow paste. The interior is orange with a red lip band extending to the outside. Below this is a thin, black band. The rest of the exterior was probably monochrome orange. The sides are very high for this form.

Form 14, heavy buff underslip, pink paste. The interior and exterior are monochrome orange with a red lip band inside and out. There are traces of black on the exterior. There is a central kill hole.

Burial 95

intermediate (or possibly Tzakol—Early Classic)

located in a small to medium size temple which is one of a group of structures; Str. 4H-4.

4 vessels: Form 11, (quite close to form 10). The interior is slipped only on a broad band below the lip. The exterior is slipped to the base, which is plain. The slip is black except as it varies to orange around the base.

Form 12A, this is a variant of this form having an unusual vertical flange around the base. The vessel is monochrome orange except for the exterior base. The paste is yellow. The feet are still attached.

an odd form reminiscent of the Tzakol plate form. This is a shallow dish with a ring base.

a basically domestic form. It has a large bulbous base with a wide flaring orifice. It is a coarse plainware. There is a kill hole in the side. The vessels in this burial have a crude and coarse paste, more so than do most.
Burial 96

intermediate (possibly Tepeu 1)

located in a small to medium temple mound, one of a group of structures; Str. 4H-4.

4 vessels: Form 10, similar to form 11; it is slightly round-sided. It has an odd red paste, a plain interior, an unslipped exterior. There is a glyph band around the rim and herring bone lines with circles between them—all done in white on the unslipped surface. The vessel is imported.

Form 13, Saxche Cream Polychrome, buff underslip. The interior is orange with red bands at and just below the rim. The exterior is red. The feet are still attached.

Form 13, The interior of this vessel has a buff lip, a brown band below that and is red-orange over the rest of the interior. The exterior is completely unslipped. The legs are missing, but there is no kill hole.

Form 15, The interior of this vessel is orange monochrome with a brown lip band which carries over to the outside. The rest of the exterior is monochrome orange.

Burial 97

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 96.

3 vessels: Form 10, Pic Polychrome Group, pink paste; the exterior shows traces of red and black. There is a heavy buff underslip under the exterior.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, standard paste, heavy buff underslip. The rim flares more than is usual for this type. The interior is orange with a wide red rim band overlapping to form a wide band on the outside. The rest of the exterior has a series of crossed, double black lines forming a diamond-like design. In the center of these diamonds are hollow orange circles. The vessel is killed.
Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard paste, buff underslip. The interior is completely orange. There is a red rim band overlapping both sides. On the exterior below that are two narrow brown bands. The rest is monochrome orange.

Burial 99

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 96.

3 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard paste, buff underslip. The interior is unslipped. There is a red lip band which carries to the outside. The exterior is orange with traces of red and brown. The sides are slightly out-curved.

Form 12B, Pic Polychrome Group, orange paste, buff underslip.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, yellow paste, heavy buff underslip. The interior is monochrome red; the exterior rim is red. The outside was red and black on orange. There is a central kill hole.

Burial 100

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 96.

3 vessels: Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, yellow paste, buff underslip. There is an unslipped interior with a red lip band which carries to the outside. There are remnants of brown and orange in an unclear alternating pattern on the exterior. There is a central kill hole.

Form 12B, Zacatei Cream Polychrome, yellow paste, buff underslip. The base is moderately in-curved. The interior is orange with a red rim band below a brown lip band. The brown carries to the exterior, and is followed by a red, a brown, a wide orange, a thin brown and a final basal orange band.
Form 14, Palmar Orange Polychrome, medium buff under-slip, yellow paste. The sides curve in slightly at the mouth. This vessel is much like the one described just above: the interior is identical, and the exterior is also, except for some crescent shapes in brown on the wide orange band. There is a hole in the joint of the side and base.

Burial 101

Tepeu 1

location: same as Burial 96.

1 vessel: Form 15, an odd orange paste. The vessel is completely monochrome. Nearly straight sides round at the base. The exterior has gouged incised glyphs all of which are the same and quite complex. The vessel is monochrome orange, and is probably imported.

Burial 102

Tepeu 2

context uncertain.

1 vessel: Form 12B, Pic Polychrome Group, yellow paste, heavy buff under-slip. The interior is monochrome red with a black lip band which laps over to the outside rim. Red is the exterior background with black crescent shaped brackets enclosing a series of black dots.

Burial 103

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 96.

1 vessel: Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, yellow paste, buff under-slip. The interior was monochrome red or orange; the exterior, red and purple on cream. The vessel is tall for this form.
Tepeu 2

Burial 104

location: same as Burial 96.

1 vessel: Form 14, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, yellow paste, heavy buff underslip. The interior has vertical alternating red and orange wavy lines over the surface. The lip is black, and there are four each of thick alternating black and cream lines. These are horizontal and may be part of a panel or may continue about the entire exterior.

Tepeu 2

Burial 105

location: same as Burial 96.

4 vessels: Form 10, Chantouri Black on Orange, yellow paste, medium buff underslip. The interior is orange with a red lip band which continues to the exterior. The remainder of the exterior is totally black.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, yellow paste, heavy buff underslip. The whole vessel is covered in the wide alternating red and orange wavy band technique. It has a widely out-curving lip, and three small, solid feet.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome. The interior of this vessel is decorated with the wide alternating red and orange wavy band technique. The exterior has crossed bands running at right angles to each other forming a diamond-shaped pattern. The bands are cream with black dots running through them in parallel lines. The diamonds have black backgrounds with somewhat squarish sexfoils of cream in the middle. There is a central kill hole.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, buff undercoat. The interior is orange with a wide red rim band which extends to the outside as well. The main exterior band of decoration contains a black-outlined, cream colored Greek fret. This alternates with orange squiggles.
Burial 113

Tepeu 2

uncertain context.

1 vessel: Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, monochrome red paste, heavy buff under slip. The interior is monochrome orange. The lip is black and the majority of the exterior is orange except for basal bands of red and red and orange saw-tooth designs.

Burial 116

Tepeu 2

located in Temple I dedicatory; Str. 5D-1. The burial is actually associated with the temple under and earlier than Temple L

18 vessels: Form 10, The exterior of this vessel has a vertical band of glyphs alternating with a large, complex, rectangular design, perhaps glyphic in nature. This combination appears twice on the vessel surface, and may be incised rather than painted.

Form 10, This is probably the most remarkable decorated vessel in the collection. The scene is the typical, and in fact almost invariable one for this vessel form; it is one of a seated dignitary being presented with offerings; there are usually groups of people in attendance. This vessel possesses that scene but to its best developed extent. The plumed and otherwise typically garbed Maya functionary is seated cross-legged on a dias and is being presented with a platter of solid substance offerings by one attendant and with a sheaf of feathers by a second. Both the attendants are highly decorated with ornaments. The two are on the dias ascending to the seated figure. There are, in the rest of the scene, two groups of three and four people respectively. One group of three is on its knees; these are quite well robed but seem to be less important than the second group, that of four. This last group contains four individually distinct persons, one of whom is obviously spokesman. He is elaborately garbed
and is the only person whose body is standing full face except for the person on the dias. All other heads are in profile. The three persons behind the spokesman are dressed finely and are portrayed as individuals. There are glyph bands connected with the man on the dias, the presenters, and the leader of the presenting group and two of his subordinates. Glyphs appear in three horizontal rows on the dias base.

It is my guess that the scene here is akin to an ambassadorial reception. Representatives from some institution either from within or outside the immediate society are presenting goods to a personage more powerful than themselves. The representatives are obviously of high rank, judging both from their costumes and from the individuality with which each is portrayed.

Form 10, This vessel presents a simplified version of the seated dignitary–suppliant motif. The same scene is repeated twice only the glyph bands being different from scene to scene. The elaborately bedecked seated figure is gesturing to a kneeling, obviously subservient individual. The scenes are separated by vertical panels of odd, non-glyphic designs. A glyph band circles the vessel rim.

Form 10, There is only a seated dignitary in this vessel's panels. In one the individual is quite corpulent and is seated before a cylinder vessel. There are glyphs about his head. The second scene either contains a different individual or the former in a very much dieted state. They are probably not the same individual. A strangely shaped container with fruit piled high sits before him. Glyphs appear around his head. Bands of stylized glyphs separate the scenes and also appear under the bench the person is seated on. A glyph band circles the vessel rim.

Form 10, The scenes here, too, contain only one figure seated on a wicker bench which is covered with jaguar skins. He wears an elaborate feather headdress. Both scenes are identical and are
separated by vertical columns of squarish quatrefoils. There is a glyph band around the rim of the vessel.

Form 10, There are two panels on this vessel, both contain a seated individual, not the same one in both cases however. They are giving orders, advice, favors (?) to a second person. In one scene the second person is kneeling; in the other the second individual is standing. Fancy quatrefoils fill the separating bars between scenes. A glyph band surrounds the rim.

Form 10, Here a seated individual in fancy headdress is seated on a backed platform with a cylinder vessel in front of him. It is appropriate for drinking or eating although there is no indication of its contents. It seems more suited as a drinking vessel. Beneath the platform in one of the two nearly identical scenes is a vessel which is in the domestic series—globular body, narrow, flaring neck—a liquid holder seated on a support. In the second scene the vessel under the bench is a tripod plate of standard dimensions holding fruit. The scenes are separated from each other by a vertical panel. One panel contains a woven mat design, the other squarish quatrefoils. Glyphs in a band run around the rim.

Form 10, The two panels on this vessel are nearly identical. There is a seated figure on a jaguar skin covered bench. He wears a very elaborate head piece and is leaning forward gesturing with his outstretched left hand. The same person may be pictured in both scenes. A column of stylized glyphs separates one side of the two panels and a column of quatrefoils separates the other. A glyphic band surrounds the rim.

Form 10, (no descriptive information available).

Form 10, There are two very similar panels each containing a seated figure on the traditional bench. He, it is probably the same person in both scenes, is holding a feathered wand. He is
wearing a fancy headdress and is gesturing with right hand. Small panels containing halved squarish quatrefoils separate the two chief scenes. Glyphs parade in a band about the rim.

Form 10, The two scenes on this vessel are essentially similar with a seated individual confronting a kneeling one. The glyph bands change between the scenes, but the individuals and the setting do not. The seated figure has the least fierce, in fact probably the kindest, face that I have seen in Maya art. A glyph band occurs about the rim.

Form 10, The chief scene on this vessel contains a masked, seated figure with an elaborate headdress; a standing figure who holds the garment and fetter of a small, dwarfish person who is obviously in subjection. The scene is quite animated and the middle person, probably a prisoner, is in evident discomfort. One glyph paired with a second alternates around the rim.

Form 12A, A typical tripod plate with the feet still attached. (No other descriptive information is available.)

Form 12A, This is an aberrant tripod plate with a pourer on one side and small cup-like section opposite. This could be a dipper. The round, knob-like legs are still in place. On the interior base, there is a black, glyph-like design containing a sectioned, dot-filled cartouche. There is a second, mainly black, smaller cartouche with pyramided black dots on either side. A kill hole is in center base.

Form 12A, The legs are still attached to this plate. No description is available for the exterior. The interior sides and base are lined with panels having the precipitating rain cloud pattern, i.e. a large black oval with a descending series of black dots. There is a black rim and a black band at the juncture of the sides and base. The base center contains a black outlined, stylized glyph pattern.
Form 12A. This tripod plate contains essentially the same designs as the preceding one except for the center base which contains a black-outlined Maltese Cross. The exterior sides are in the wide alternating red and orange wavy line pattern. The feet are still attached.

Form 12B. The interior and exterior sides have three stylized masks inside and out. These are cream, outlined in black and alternate around the vessel with black and cream hatchings. The interior base has a single mask with surrounding hatchings. The whole appears quite Tzakol-like. The masks could be representatives of a stylized jaguar or Tlahuani figure.

Form 14. The information is incomplete on this vessel. A band of panels with the precipitating rain cloud motif appears around either the interior or exterior walls. There are traces of red on the interior base.

Tepeu 1

location: same as Burial 128.

2 vessels: Form 11. This is basically Saxche in decoration, but the whole is too badly weathered for certain identification. This vessel is shorter than most in this form.

Form 13A. This is basically a Saxche polychrome, but is very badly weathered. The feet are still attached.

Burial 132

intermediate

located in a fairly large temple which is the easternmost building in its group; Str. 7F-30.

3 vessels: Form 11. This is monochrome orange with buff paste and no underslip. The outside is smudged and is almost black inside. The shape is close to form 10.
Form 11, Perhaps Saxche Orange Polychrome, buff paste. The interior is orange with some black. The exterior has a black rim and a black band below the rim. The rest is orange. Stylized glyphs occur in groups of three in one of the bands.

Form 12B, This is a large, plain vessel with an odd fairly coarse paste. No other information available.

Burial 133

Tepeu 2

uncertain context; Str. 3H-3.

1 vessel: Form 11, Sibal Buff Polychrome, yellow paste. This vessel has a squat, concave base, a monochrome orange interior, and a black lip. Below the lip is a red band, two narrow black lines and a subsequent orange band. A band of red and black figures appears next on a buff background. Red and buff bands reach the base.

Burial 135

Tepeu 2

located in a small temple, the easternmost building in a group; Str. 6C-41.

3 vessels: Form 10, Chantouri Black on Orange, buff underslip and paste. The exterior has oblique fluted grooving with double horizontal grooves around the rim and base. There is black on orange decoration in addition on the outside.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff paste and underslip. The interior may have been red. There is a red lip band both inside and out. The exterior has flat-sided, red circles on a black background.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, coarse pink paste, buff underslip. The interior is monochrome orange. A red lip band extends to the outside. The exterior decoration is gone.
Burial 137

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 135.

3 vessels: Form 10, The paste and underslip are buff. The interior has a black lip band which carries over to the outside. Vertical grooving painted orange covers most of the exterior body. There is a second black band below the lip.

Form 12B, Zacateel Cream Polychrome, buff underslip only on the outside. The lip band extending inside and out is red. The inside is monochrome orange. The exterior body is covered with a black and cream checker-board design.

Form 14, This vessel is almost the equal of the one just above. It is Zacateel basically with buff underslip, and buff paste. There is a red lip band inside and out. Groups of red and orange squares outlined in black alternate with cream squares in a checker-board pattern.

Burial 139

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 135.

6 vessels: Form 10, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff paste and heavy buff underslip. The interior is orange; there is a red lip band extending over both sides. The exterior body is grooved, painted orange and has a horizontal row of black quatrefoils with hollow centers around the surface.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard buff paste and buff underslip. The interior is red on orange with a large glyph-like complex in the center base. The exterior is orange with a black band about the base.

Form 12B, The paste is pink. The exterior has black-painted, oblique grooving.
Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, pink paste, buff underslip. The interior walls are orange and black; the inside base is monochrome red. The exterior walls are some uncertain combination of red, black, cream, and rose.

Form 12B, Ucumacinta Plain; there is an off-center kill hole.

Form 12B, Ucumacinta Plain; this vessel is small for its type.

Burial 140

intermediate

located in a fairly large temple, the easternmost structure of its group.

4 vessels: (no information on one)

Form 10, Zacec Black. The exterior of this vessel is apparently all black; there is no underslip. The form of this vessel is very close to form 11, the barrel shape.

Form 11, Saxche Orange Polychrome. There is a black exterior lip band below which is a band of glyphs which are black on orange backgrounds. The remainder of the outside is orange.

Form 11, Sibal Buff Polychrome, buff paste. A black lip band extends to both sides. The main bands of design are series of parallel oblique and vertical lines enclosed in brackets and frets. These are all in red, black, and white.

Burial 141

Tepeu 2

located in a small temple which is the easternmost structure of its group; Str. 3G-20.

1 vessel: Form 12B, Weathered to the point where only the buff paste and underslip are identifiable.
Burial 142

Intermediate

Location: same as Burial 141.

3 vessels: (no information on one)

Form 12A, weathering permits identification of only a buff underslip and pink paste. There is a center kill hole which was drilled only from the inside of the plate.

Form 15, pink paste, buff underslip; no other information.

Burial 147

Tepeu 2

Located in a small temple, the easternmost structure of its group; Str. 6B-9.

2 vessels: Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome. This tripod plate is decorated in a style similar to Tepeu 1. The interior base shows a lone dancer in a manner very similar to those classic examples from Tepeu 1 at Uaxactun (R. E. Smith 1955: vol. 2, fig. 73). The interior walls contain a series of panels with stylized glyphs and medallions. The feet are still attached.

A form which is similar to both 12B and 14. It is Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff paste and medium buff underslip. The interior has a series of intersecting red bars in an unclear pattern. On the exterior appear alternating and locking orange and black Greek keys. This wide band covering most of the body is defined at top and bottom by a black band.

Burial 149

Intermediate

Location: same as Burial 147.

3 vessels: Form 11, Palmar Orange Polychrome, standard paste, buff underslip. The interior of the example is
plain. There are consecutively orange, red, and black bands from the rim down to a band of red on orange designs which fills the remainder of the surface.

Form 12A, This example is very weathered. It has a buff paste and buff underslip. The feet are removed.

Form 12B, Only the buff paste and underslip are identifiable on this badly weathered vessel.

Burial 150

intermediate

located in a fairly large temple, which is the easternmost structure of its group; Str. 7F-30.

4 vessels: (no information on one)

Form 10, Zacatel Orange Polychrome, buff paste and underslip. The sides round to the base. There is a conical cover which is very rare in this time period. The interior is orange except for a narrow, black lip band. The exterior is divided into three horizontal sections, the top and bottom are the same and consist of a series of vertical red bars between bands. The middle section contains glyphic heads and numerals, and they are black on an orange background. The cover contains two concentric circles of squares and rectangles. The pattern is outlined in black, on a white ground.

Form 11, Saxche Orange Polychrome. This is a short example of this form. The upper half of the interior is orange, below it is plain. Panels of narrow orange, cream, and black horizontal lines cover the exterior surface except where interrupted once on each side by black and orange quatrefoils.

Form 13, Saxche Orange Polychrome, pink paste. On the interior base are four sets of two glyphs each. Each is distinct and does not seem to be stylized. They are painted in black.
Burial 154

Tepeu 2

located in a small temple, one which is the easternmost structure of its group; Str. 3C-15.

3 vessels: Form 12A, Pic Polychrome Group, pink paste, buff under-slip. The interior is weathered beyond identification. The exterior is monochrome red. The feet are removed. There is a kill hole.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome. The interior may have been black and red. Around the exterior surface appear panels with black dots and crescents alternating with black bars arranged in the form of a Maltese Cross.

Form 12B, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff paste. The lip is black, the rest of the exterior red.

Burial 155

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 154.

3 vessels: Form 10, The only material remaining is the buff paste, buff underslip on the exterior and the unslipped interior.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome, buff paste and underslip. The exterior has black lip and base bands. Between is a row of four stylized faces of masks. These are outlined in black. Between these are orange panels. The faces are squarish, and the features represented by dots. The exterior surface is monochrome red. The feet are still in place.

Form 12B, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, buff paste and underslip. The interior seems to have been monochrome red. The exterior decoration is gone.
Burial 156

Tepeu 2

location: same as Burial 154.

3 vessels: Form 10, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, pink paste, buff underslip. The red lip band extends to both interior and exterior. The exterior lower two-thirds has a red, black, and cream checkerboard design. The background and half the squares are cream; the red and black alternate in oblique rows.

Form 10, Yuhactal Black on Red, buff paste and underslip. The exterior has a red lip and base bands. Large portions of the exterior are orange; some of the interior is red.

Burial 157

Tepeu 2

located in a small temple, which is the easternmost structure of its group; Str. 6B-9.

3 vessels: Form 10, This form has buff paste. The exterior is obliquely fluted, and apparently the exterior is buff colored. This example is tall for its type.

Form 12A, Palmar Orange Polychrome. On the interior base is a complex design with a central face mask surrounded by scrolls and curving lines. It would seem to have been outlined in black. Red bars occur on the exterior, their nature is unclear. The feet are missing.

Form 14, Zacatel Cream Polychrome, buff underslip. The interior is orange with a cream band just below the dark red lip band. The latter carries to the exterior, is followed by a rose and then by an orange band. Below there is a panel of designs too weathered for identification.
CHAPTER 2

COMPARATIVE DATA FROM THE MAYA LOWLANDS

For purposes of comparison within the Maya area there follows a summary of pertinent mortuary ceramic materials from some sites other than Tikal. Reports on Uaxactún, Copán, San José, Holmul, and Zaculeu have been investigated for the appearance of data which will support the thesis presented in the interpretive section of this work. Ideally, this section should show how the patterns discussed in the interpretive section are spread throughout the Maya area. A lack of time and data combines to prevent a really exhaustive exploration, however, and the reader must be satisfied with a sampling of material from some sites.

Arrangement of material is a problem in this section since an attempt is made to present evidence from other Maya sites in terms of a framework set up specifically for Tikal. The descriptive section which precedes this one used a classification of type, vessel form, and temporal period derived from Tikal ceramics. For convenience and for uniformity the same classification is used here. Therefore it has been necessary to adapt, and possibly do injustice to, materials from some of the sites. The Tzakol-Tepeu sequence has not been imposed on all the data, but the designation Late Classic has in all cases been
used even though all authors may not use it in their reports. The place in the sequence and my inspection of the vessels illustrated in the reports are the chief criteria for placing a local phase within the Late Classic.

From a given number of burials at a site (1) the average number of vessels per burial is listed; (2) where possible, the ratio of solid to liquid containers is obtained; and finally (3) the relative amount and variety of decoration on the mortuary ceramics is discussed. Provenience of the burials is mentioned as the information available permits. The grave vs. tomb (or housemound vs. temple-pyramid) dichotomy is listed if the information is available. These first three points are investigated specifically because the hypotheses discussed in the next half of this thesis become more valid as they are supported by comparative data, although of course they are not invalidated by the lack of support outside of Tikal.

**Uaxactun**

For Uaxactun no adaptation of the terminology for temporal, type, and form classification is necessary. The division of periods presented here for Tikal in fact comes from Uaxactun. All the material used here comes from Robert Smith's Ceramic Sequence at Uaxactun (1955). In the most general terms all the patterns noticeable for Tikal burial ceramics can be found at Uaxactun. The Late Classic at this
moderately sized Maya center is divided into Tepeu 1, 2, and 3; for each period there are nine burials. The average number of vessels in any particular burial in any of the three phases is about two. The maximum and minimum numbers are four and one.

For all sites other than Tikal the killing of vessels seems to be quite rare. The occurrence is either not reported, an eventuality unlikely to occur when so many sources are used, or Tikal alone is able to claim that practice as a part of its ceremonials. Since the practice of killing will be used to aid in distinguishing between containers designed for liquids as opposed to those for solids at Tikal, the lack of that trait in other Maya centers is something of a hindrance in drawing this useful but elusive dichotomy. In the case of Uaxactún, as for all the other sites which are used, those forms approaching or equaling forms 10 and 11, the cylinder and barrel-shaped vessels respectively, are called liquid holders. Therefore on the basis of form, the ratio of liquid to solid holders in the graves in Tepeu 1 at Uaxactún is one to three. In Tepeu 2 the ratio is one to two.

In Tepeu 1 and 2 at Uaxactún most of the vessel forms fit readily into the categories established for Tikal, but for this thesis the forms of Tepeu 3 are not categorized and are simply noted as being in the domestic, not the ceremonial fine ware tradition. That is, they are the common cooking ware. Tepeu 3 at Uaxactún is characterized in the mortuary ceramic tradition by an almost complete replacement of fine
ware by undecorated domestic wares. What fine ware persists is usually imported and incised rather than painted.

Painted design style holds constant for both centers through the Tepeu sequence. Most of the fine wares are painted with various abstract and geometrical figures. A few have only the basic monochrome undercoat, but most have any combination of a vast catalogue of design elements and techniques imposed on top of this monochrome in a fairly predictable range and combination of colors. Many of the elements persist or develop through time both within the in-site tradition, and also throughout the whole geographic region investigated. Besides these rather prosaic examples of Maya craft there are distinctive naturalistic scenes which appear on the interior of some tripod plates and on the exterior of some cylinder vases. The ceremonial or ritualistic scenes recorded on these ceramics can, although they do not at Tikal and only occasionally do at Uaxactun, reach heights of artistic excellence even when considered within our own scheme of aesthetics. Virtually all mortuary ceramics in Tepeu 1 and 2 fall within the range of decorated fine ware tradition. The most finely painted ceramics are usually found in the richest tombs. Their presence is an indication of the prestige and wealth of the entombed individual. In Tepeu 3 at Uaxactun painting disappears and along with it go most of the vessels associated with the fine ware tradition.
The location of burials at Uaxactun varies between housemound locations for half of the Tepeu 1 and 2 graves and locations in pyramid tombs for the other half. The housemound burials average one vessel less than the pyramid graves in both Tepeu 1 and 2. All the Tepeu 3 burials were found in locations in ceremonial structures. These burials are usually cists, not tombs.

That Tepeu 3 burials are found only in the heart of the center and in cists in the ceremonial buildings is taken to indicate that during this period of decline among the Maya the dwindling population moved to the center of the sites and lived and buried in the most prominent buildings. Tepeu 3 refuse is most commonly found in the central areas of Tikal and Uaxactun, but even here it is not plentiful (Culbert, personal communication).

Copan

Uaxactun is 11 miles north of Tikal. Copan is about 200 miles to the south and east of Tikal. While Uaxactun is considerably smaller than Tikal and probably subsidiary to it for most of its history, Copan competes easily with Tikal as one of the foremost known and excavated Maya centers. John Longyear in his Copan Ceramics (1952) presents the burial data from that site which are used here. Longyear uses the term Full Classic to refer to what are called here Tepeu 1 and 2. Perhaps he even includes some late Tzakol. It is in any case impossible
to break the burials into Tepeu 1 and 2 categories. There are 35 burials with 93 vessels in association placed in the Full Classic. The burials are divided by Longyear into graves, which are simple burials; and tombs, which are elaborate interments in chambers in structures. The average number of vessels per grave is two; for tombs 3-5.

Estimating the utilitarian function of vessels is much more difficult for Copán than for Tikal or Uaxactún. Many of the forms present at Tikal and Uaxactún are also found at Copán, but there are some new forms which it is difficult to categorize. Vessels are classified functionally on acknowledgedly insecure grounds, i.e. by size and shape. Miniature vessels, vessels with restricted, narrow orifices and what Longyear calls cups, small cylinder vases in our terminology, are all called liquid holders. With this arrangement a fairly constant one to two ratio of liquid to solid containers is discovered for the Full Classic. Doubts about the actual occurrence of such a ratio in individual burials have up to this point been unjustified for Tikal and Uaxactún. When forms 10 or 11, the liquid containers, occur, such a ratio or one quite close to it usually exists at those sites. Statistics have not been lying up to this time. The occurrence of this pattern of ratios in specific burials at Copán is not outstanding. This may be one of the weaker, less meaningful mortuary traditions at Copán, or Copán may be on the periphery of the area characterized by this trait.
Decorations on Copán ceramics are impressive. Of all the sites mentioned here Copán undoubtedly has produced the finest collection of painted ceramics. The quality as well as quantity of the paintings exceeds that of Tikal, the site with the only real competitors. Through both archaeological preservation and through simple technical superiority Copán has yielded a collection of decorated ware which, while it follows a pattern of mortuary distribution similar to Tikal, does so in the manner of a wealthier and more artistically capable center. The basic collection of design elements which are current at Tikal and Uaxactún are also present at Copán. Techniques like incising, and a technique of wide alternating red and orange wavy bands, also appear at Copán, and in the usual time periods. That is, incising is infrequent in the Late Classic but becomes the dominant decorative technique at the end of the Late Classic and early Post-classic. The wide, alternating red and orange wavy bands technique is common through the phases of the Late Classic.

Aside from the almost predictable store of design elements common to the region delimited so far, the most noteworthy artistic occurrence at Copán is the scenes depicted on the sides of the cylinder vases. The same sorts of ritually clad individuals occur as on Tikal and Uaxactún cylinders but in action which varies from dancing to handcrafting to marching in formal processions. Most cannot be interpreted
as being biographical to the individual with whom they were interred as is possibly the case at Tikal.

Of the 35 burials used here from Copán, 17 come from tombs (using Longyear's definition of that term) and 18 come from graves. Most of both come from two specific burial areas at Copán and some of the tombs come from interments in ceremonial structures.

San José

San José, British Honduras, is a small, minor, and rather poor Maya center about 60 miles due east of Tikal. It was excavated by J. Eric Thompson and his publication (1939) is the source of the information used here. San José's history has been divided into phases I through V. Phases III and IV seem, on inspection of the photographs, to be Late Classic; that is, contemporaneous with Tepeu I and 2, while phase V seems to be either Late Classic or early Post-classic. It closely resembles Tepeu 3. There are 23 burials used here from the San José phases III and IV with 41 vessels in association with them. All the graves were in artificial fill with very little difference in contents among them. The average number of vessels per burial is slightly less than two. The actual range of vessels is between one and four.

A ratio of solid to liquid holders is impossible to arrive at for San José, due both to the infrequency with which the cylinder form occurs and also to the appearance of a new soup-dish like form, a form
for which there is no category in our classificatory scheme. A designation of function for the vessels is hardly possible without constructing a new set of evaluation criteria. It is safest, then, to say that within the framework set up for judging vessel function, the pattern of ratio between functions does not exist at San José except in the most attenuated form. To prove the last point, there are five burials with cylinders in them; these generally show a one to one ratio with solid holders within the same grave. Solid holders are generally any other sort of included vessel.

Decoration is almost a meaningless term when the ceramics from San José are discussed. They are all rather wretched. Painting is almost non-existent; it is almost as though the center were too poor to support a group of specialists for that purpose. Incising is always prevalent at San José. It is most well developed in the last phase, V, the Post-classic, the period when incising becomes common at Uaxactún and Tikal also. Before period V incising varies from glyphs and uncomplicated designs to simple striations—vertical and horizontal, punchings and similar pokings at the still pliable clay.

Holmul

Holmul is northeast of Tikal and is about as far from Tikal as is Uaxactún. The site is famous for its early periods and is not at all remarkable for later horizons. Our materials come from the Merwin,
Vaillant (1932) report of the site. Three of the Holmul phases are interesting here, Holmul III, IV, and V. Holmul III equates as far as can be seen with Tzakol 3 and Tepeu.1; Holmul IV also falls into that class. Holmul V seems to be fully Late Classic and can be equated with Tepeu.2. Burials are listed by skeleton; all those used here were found in association with rooms of structures. This is the location for almost all burials unearthed at the site. For all periods at Holmul there were 25 skeletons recovered, 11 of which had pottery in association with them. There are six skeletons with associated vessels which might be useful here, but only two are certainly Tepeu; the rest have some distinct Tzakol features.

Eliminating one of the skeletons and context as being too Tzakol-like for consideration, there is a total of 20 vessels for five burials, making an average of four vessels a burial. The range is from two to six vessels per burial. The keg and barrel shapes occur in four of the interments and a ratio of one to two in liquid to solid holders results.

Decorations on ceramics at Holmul as a rule are quite fine. They are very unlike the mediocre, scantily decorated examples from San José. The design elements exhibit the same general range seen at all the sites so far investigated. There seems to be a distinct unity on this subject within at least that part of the Lowland area investigated here. Some of the cylinder vases are excellently done; they can easily
match those from Copan in quality of design execution and can outmatch the general run at Tikal.

Statistically, Holmul deserves little more than an interested glance. The body of data is really too small to allow talk of substantiating trends or patterns. The site is undeniably in the mainstream of Maya burial traditions, at least as they are discussed here. General vessel form and decoration are easily identified and placed in Classic periods and the phases within those. But specific figures for averages and ratios of occurrences should be viewed as demonstrating little, since what they are based on is too little and too unique.

Zaculeu

The last site discussed here for comparative purposes is Zaculeu. This site is in the Guatemalan Highlands and could therefore be expected to offer some test of the size of the area covered by the traits being investigated. Information used here comes from the report by Woodbury and Trik (1953). An incomplete sampling of the burials is taken here since once the investigation of the burials was begun it was quickly found that the data diverged widely enough from Tikal so that handling it with classifications set up for Tikal became unsatisfactory. A number of vessels have forms not encountered in Lowland sites, and those which looked familiar often had to be squeezed, and not very comfortably, into the already existing categories.
Therefore all that can be noted with safety is an average for the number of vessels per burial, and some general comments on decoration. A chronological correlation between the Zaculeu phases, Atzan, Chinaq, Qankyaq, and Zinahul, and the general Lowland sequence has been at best difficult and is, at the kindest, rough. Atzan, from inspecting the vessels associated with burials from that phase, seems to span the end of the Early Classic and the beginning of the Late Classic. It may lapse farther into the Late Classic, but here the Chinaq phase seems to fit most comfortably, although not remarkably well. The Atzan phase at Zaculeu yielded 33 burials, 21 of them having some sort of pottery in association. The Chinaq phase yielded 36 burials of which 19 had associated ceramics. There is a selection of 21 burials used here. Twelve come from the Atzan phase, eight from the Chinaq. Eighty-two vessels are in association. The average for both phases added together is four. However, Atzan taken alone averages a little over four, while Chinaq alone averages about three. The sample eliminates burials without ceramics, but otherwise fairly represents the burials from the two phases. No attempt at determining a ratio based on function will be made.

Decoration seems scarce at Zaculeu. The vessels are well finished, but are only rarely polychromed.

Many of the burials, usually the richer, are located in ceremonial structures, especially in ceremonial positions, that is, in the
center line of a structure. Otherwise there seems to be no plan to the
distribution of the burials within the structures. Since the archaeologi-
cal investigations at Zaculeu concentrated chiefly on structures and
associated plazas, these are the locations of the vast majority of the
burials found.

In addition to the sites discussed above a number of others
were investigated. These were, for one reason or another, found
uns usable. Often the collection of burials was too small to warrant
reporting here. This is the case with Piedras Negras (Coe 1959); and
Nebaj (Smith and Kidder 1951). More frequently, however, there was
insufficient information concerning the burials and their contexts for
use here. Barton Ramie and Mountain Cow (Willey et al. 1964), Baking
Pot (O. Ricketson 1931), and Cerro de Las Mesas (Drucker 1943) fall
into this category. Kaminaljuyu (Shook and Kidder 1952) has sufficient
material, but diverges too widely on too many points to be considered.
There is a large group of vessel forms different from those in the Low-
lands, and the style of ceramic painting diverges markedly from any-
thing for this period in the Lowlands.

I hypothesize on the basis of the spread of traits shown above
in this section that the similar occurrences indicate the spread of a
consistent set of ideas regarding Maya mortuary customs. These, of
course, reflect an aspect of Maya religion and therefore can be said to
indicate the geographic extent of the ideological force behind Maya culture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of vessels</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12A</th>
<th>12B</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uaxactun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-21</td>
<td>1 (foreign)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-42</td>
<td>1 (domestic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial No.</td>
<td>No. of (graves) vessels</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12A</td>
<td>12B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>odd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(tombs)

<p>| 1 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | Full Classic |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |     |
| 3 | 4 | 4 |   | 1 |   |   |   |     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of vessels</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12A</th>
<th>12B</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>odd</th>
<th>odd</th>
<th>odd</th>
<th>liquid</th>
<th>solid</th>
<th>undeter-</th>
<th>holders</th>
<th>holders</th>
<th>mined</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(tombs--continued)</td>
<td>Copan--continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of vessels</th>
<th>Form 10</th>
<th>Form 11</th>
<th>Form 12A</th>
<th>Form 12B</th>
<th>Form 13</th>
<th>Form 14</th>
<th>Form 15</th>
<th>odd forms</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San José IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>San José III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skeleton vessels</th>
<th>No. of vessels</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12A</th>
<th>12B</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>odd forms</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (not used)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Holmul IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(without Skeleton 1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of vessels</th>
<th>Forms 10</th>
<th>Forms 11</th>
<th>Forms 12A</th>
<th>Forms 12B</th>
<th>Forms 13</th>
<th>Forms 14</th>
<th>Forms 15</th>
<th>odd forms</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partial Atzan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atzan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1--Continued

Zaculeu
CHAPTER 3

A TYPOLOGY OF TRADITIONS

A large part of this thesis is descriptive; it fulfills a task which needed to be done. And of course this is by nature unexciting; in a word it is dull, especially to the non-professional. However, with the material at hand it is possible to construct a number of hypotheses about some of the more general aspects of Maya civilization at Tikal as those are reflected in the burial ceramics from that center. In this section, framed under the scientifically safe procedure of inference, can be presented some thoughts on the nature of Maya culture history for the Late Classic at Tikal. This will serve as a framework for presenting some of the ideas which have been investigated in the course of this thesis. To claim to discover the nature of Maya culture is a presumption which will not be made here, especially in view of the fact that all there is to deal with in this essay are some specialized ceramics. But on the other hand, the basic assumption will be made that these ceramics can and do reflect some of the elements and some of the processes of Maya culture history. This assumption is not presumptuous. Without it archaeology can be little more than emaciated history. What can be presumptuous, however, is the extent to which that people's history is reconstructed. In other words, how far can inference be
pushed? No sweeping picture of a people's history can be put forth here. There are rather a number of trends or patterns in that history which can be reduced to a few generalizations about Maya culture in the vicinity of Tikal, and perhaps for a wider area.

The Late Classic is the final and climactic period of excellence for the Maya of the Petén. In that period we can see the apogee of all those elements of culture which we connect with the phrase Maya civilization. This is the period which not only produces Sunday supplement stories but which also sustains Mayaphiles in their conviction that all good in the New World results from these intellectuals in the Lowlands. This is the period without which the Maya would not be loved, would not be called a mysterious, lost civilization, and without which the Maya probably would not be so diligently researched. Nevertheless, Morley is not writing this essay and the grandeur of the Maya will not appear. It will not appear not because I want to avoid it, but because I have neither the materials nor the background which would allow that grandeur to take shape. The reader should be put on very firm notice that not only do I think the Maya were an exceptional folk, but that their culture encompassed a set of processes which are found only when certain comparatively high levels of cultural achievement have been reached.

Maya culture in the Late Classic at Tikal and vicinity is divided into three phases, Tepeu I, 2, and 3. These are dated from A.D. 600 to A.D. 900 or 1000. For that time period it is my interest to
postulate a firmly based and long established on-going tradition among the Maya. This tradition can be called direct or elaborating (Thompson 1956), but here it will be called a Great Tradition, one which so permeates a culture that it is not only long-lived, but is manifested in all ramifications of the culture it characterizes. It is the presence of this homogeneous attitude, or perhaps even philosophy, toward cultural life which permits us to identify the bearers through time and through their coherent approach to cultural problems over a wide geographic area. Naturally the formulation of such a tradition allows for a suitable presentation of the regularities that exist in Maya culture for the period under discussion.

For this paper the framework for the postulated Great Tradition consists of two parts and is wholly encompassed within a second framework, that of time. Only because this presentation needs a theoretical base to make contact with anthropological reality is the concept of the Great Tradition used. It really means Maya high civilization. It is a whole group of what will soon be called minor traditions; what Redfield has called little traditions, folk traditions (Redfield 1963: 41-2). But more than these it is the common bond or theme which gives consistency and acts as cement to all of the lesser members of the whole culture of which the Great Tradition is the ideological unifier. A Great Tradition is a subject really over and above this thesis; its only use here is to allow both the reader and writer to use it as a tool, a vehicle with
which to place one of its postulated manifestations, one of its segments, the mortuary tradition, into proper place. This mortuary tradition is the second part of the framework mentioned in the first sentence of this paragraph. The mortuary tradition for the Late Classic is not only a few little or folk traditions combined in a certain way; it is, and this is what makes it part of the Great Tradition, one of the manifestations, so it will be claimed, of the dominant philosophy and outlook which characterizes the core of Maya high civilization. What that core is is not important here, for this is not an essay on Maya worldview. All it is necessary to see is that besides containing many little elements of lesser traditions, essentially folk customs, a mortuary tradition in a civilization ought to and, I claim, does show evidence of the driving philosophy of that civilization. The driving philosophy is the Great Tradition.

The second framework mentioned above, that of time, gives temporal depth to the traditions talked about. The temporal dimension here is called Tepeu. The Tradition probably really encompasses the whole Classic era, but only the Late Classic, Tepeu 1, 2, and 3 can be considered here. Tepeu is a group of traits; it is chronology; it is almost not culture. It only represents the time space in which a society characterized by a group of traditions lived. Tepeu here is a word which means no more than time and a few of the characterizing traits of some time segments. The traits are picked arbitrarily by archaeology, and it
is almost an accident that they have any connection with culture. Certainly they do not represent any consistent attitude to that phenomenon on the part of archaeologists.

"An elaborating tradition is characterized by an increasing complexity resulting from the addition of traits or attributes which are integrated in a single line of development. Not only quantity and variety of traits are involved, but also their organization and embellishment" (Thompson 1956: 44). For the Maya of the Late Classic, and in fact for the whole of the Classic, the term elaborating tradition will connote, if we change the term to read Great Tradition, a holistic or all-encompassing approach to the major problems of existence. In other words, a Great Tradition is one in which a culture's various levels (the Whitian hierarchy: economic, social, and ideological) are harmoniously adjusted to one another so that in answer to a given economic base there is a corresponding supporting social system. More than that however, and making a Great Tradition and civilization different from any internally consistent culture at a lower level of organization, it has an ideo-religious or political force which is powerful enough to impose consistency in a culture over a large area and which affects a culture enough so that various secondary institutions are founded; some of these are strongly reminiscent of some of Childe's criteria for civilization (Childe 1950: 53 ff.).

A Great Tradition cannot be found and will not exist without an established elite which both defines and enforces the crystallized code
of the ideological level of culture. A Great Tradition can exist only insofar as there is a means whereby the ideological fragment of a culture is institutionalized and given power of direction over the other levels of culture, even to the point where it can at least momentarily cause the fossilization of the economy and social organization of a culture. With institutionalization, the ideological elite will, in its elaboration of power, found the suggested secondary institutions. These are of course most likely to be oriented to religion, and will be potent enough so that defined religious rites and obligations stemming from them will affect a large part of the total culture. In short, then, a Great Tradition results when the ideological level of culture is important enough to spawn and to direct the shape of secondary institutions such as a defined art style, the use of exact and predictive sciences (astronomy and mathematics), monumental religious edifices, and a recognizable mortuary tradition. A Great Tradition may take the bases or kernels of these secondary institutions from folk customs, or little traditions, but it so uses them to produce a use, rationale, and articulation for each of them in terms of the larger Tradition, that they cease to be folk customs and become instead manifestations of the dominating force in a society. Art, architecture, science, and mortuary practices all have roots in peasant practices of a culture, and they are all transformed, in a sense founded as secondary institutions, when absorbed, integrated, and elaborated by a culture evolving into a civilization.
A clearly class structured society initially with a priesthood is a natural adjunct of a Great Tradition. In the course of defining itself a Great Tradition would often raise the local agricultural pantheon of gods to a hierarchy of specific deities whose rites and obligations it would be the priests' duty to both minister and interpret. The priesthood is the encoder and enforcer of the ideology of a Great Tradition, at least in its initial stages.

A Great Tradition and civilization can be equated. The former term has been used to emphasize the dominance of the ideological level of culture over the other levels of culture in this developmental stage. A great Tradition is different from the other criteria for civilization in that it is the rationale, the raison d'être, which the culture, a civilization, has encoded for itself and has instituted a body of men to preserve and enforce. Insofar as philosophies are expressed in the artifacts of civilization, then the artifacts should demonstrate the effect of this consistent viewpoint.

When noted cross-culturally the appearance of Great Traditions can be connected with that era Julian Steward has called the Era of Regional Development and Floreescence (1949). Besides the fact that these elaborated traditions which witness the appearance of a virile ideological factor occur as recognizable, and necessarily as predictable levels in the culture histories of several nuclear areas, it is equally valid that each Tradition has its own uniquely identifying traits. This
is not to be an essay in cross-cultural regularities; such an essay would be difficult to produce without comparative data. But insofar as the development of a major evolutionary period is the framework for our consideration of a group of data, it seems only reasonable that some of the already defined characteristics of that era be used. It appears, in other words, that the Late Classic at Tikal and vicinity falls neatly into an already established category in the scheme for the formulation of the development of early cultures. These local flowerings found and mature what is designated a Great Tradition.

For the Classic Maya the Great Tradition can be illustrated in many more ways than can be shown here. And furthermore to allow for the development of the subject matter covered in this thesis the illustrations of not only the continuity, but also of the directing influence of the ideological level of culture must be limited to the mortuary tradition. The descriptive data are going to be used to show two things: the fact that there are elements of Maya folk customs, of minor traditions, to be seen in the Late Classic burial practices, and that these are encompassed and surrounded by, if in fact not integrated into, the mortuary tradition as a whole. The second point is that while these practices are found within the mortuary tradition, that tradition, since it is claimed to represent one of the manifestations of the Great Tradition, contains evidence to demonstrate that it is more than a collection of folk practices. It is a unified attitude which is the result of an encoded set of ideological
concepts. The idea of the whole thesis is that these two points can be substantiated archaeologically. There are some interesting data which can be pulled from the preceding section of this thesis which fit into the concept of minor traditions and there are some which will support the concept of a Great Tradition.

More interesting, however, are the data which can be used to suggest the nature of the transitions between the various phases in the Late Classic at Tikal. In other words, what are the dynamics of the Great Tradition? The two transitions, one from Tepeu 1 to 2 and one from Tepeu 2 to 3, are capable of demonstrating the nature of the Tradition. The action of the elements of culture seen in the processes of change will place them solidly as folk customs, or as parts of a Great Tradition, that is, belonging specifically to some secondary institution. These transitions also offer a fascinating chance to speculate on the nature of the periods within the Late Classic and the nature of the changes from one period to another. They provide an opportunity to investigate the moving factors behind the changes in the Late Classic great and minor traditions as these changes are exhibited in the mortuary ceramic practices.
CHAPTER 4

THE GREAT TRADITION: LITTLE TRADITIONS
AND SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

A Great Tradition is the Weltanschauung of a civilization. Little traditions are folk customs. These show various degrees of integration into a civilization. Secondary institutions are groups of specialists, craftsmen to astronomers to scribes, the result of a finely developed division of labor. These are men operating a special system with defined goals and a set group of means for obtaining these goals. Potters and painters use a set of forms and symbols which holds meaning, sacred or profane, in the culture; astronomers construct a calendar in a highly time-oriented society; scribes perpetuate a record and maintain the codes which are the ideology. There are many diverse groups like these in a civilization and each owes its existence to a central ideology and that ideology's efforts to maintain itself. Besides specialized groups of men secondary institutions are defined sets of ideas, specific practices which stem directly from the driving force in a culture, the Great Tradition. As before, secondary institutions are art and architectural styles, religious rituals, burial customs. These specific ideas are often coupled with the men who practice them, as, for example, in art. Burial customs in a civilization are probably
defined by priests and may or may not be presided over by them, but without a motivating body, the customs will not remain either complex or consistent. This is especially true if the customs are esoteric or are used in themselves as a rationale for the existence of a group of ritual functionaries. In short, secondary institutions are closely dependent on the ideological level of culture.

A number of features of Classic Maya culture are established in the Early Classic Period and are maintained through the Late Classic. The sculpturing of stelae with elaborately adorned priests and dignitaries, the inscribing of sides and backs of these stone monuments with Initial Series dates and hieroglyphic texts in a presumably commemorative fashion, and their erection with associated altar stones at the foot of pyramid stairs is one such tradition. Tomb or crypt burials in the ceremonial centers is another. . . . Ceremonial caches or special offerings unassociated with burials are another Early Classic trait which continues throughout the Classical period (Willey 1964a: 152).

I would like to add to this catalogue of continuities the mortuary tradition in the sense that this tradition is delimited solely in terms of funerary ceramics for present purposes.

With the statement above in mind it will be useful now to try to characterize the ceramics for the various periods listed under the name Tepeu. In the next dozen or so pages will be found some observations, some low level inferences largely based on numerical averages and some statements about whether or not I think a particular trait in the ceramic data is more likely a folk custom or is the result of a group of ritual functionaries imposing the requirements of an ideology.
Here I am interested in discovering any manifestations of the Great Tradition. Operating with the data available from this thesis I can cite a number of traits which give a view of the burial ceramics for the Tepeu sequence. These traits are, in fact, a combination of design elements and technical data, such as paste, slip, and a presentation of some numerical patterns which are evident and possibly meaningful culturally. In sum, they ought to demonstrate the homogeneous nature of at least the first two-thirds of the Late Classic. Within each period of the Tepeu sequence the nature of the tradition will be defined, for example, direct, elaborating, reducing (Thompson 1956).

The information given in the rest of this section comes mainly from two sources. Photographs of all the drawings of the pertinent vessels from Tikal were used as a primary source of original data, as well as the field notes associated with them. To amplify and support these Robert Smith's Ceramic Sequence at Uaxactun (1955) was extensively used.

Tepeu 1 initiates the Late Classic period. It is represented in our collection by nine burials, and by 19 vessels associated with those burials. There are a number of other burials, 15 in fact, which contain Tepeu 1 materials. These are, however, mixed with Tepeu 2 period ceramics and are not included in this section. The graves which contain a mixture from both periods are called intermediates, but a separate section like Tepeu 1 or 2 is not created for them since they seem to have
no original characteristics, but rather combine only designs and shapes from the preceding Tepeu 1 and the succeeding Tepeu 2 (Culbert 1961: 36). Tepeu 1 basic ceramic types are the Sibal Buff and Saxche Orange polychromes. These are the two chief categories into which most of the Tepeu fine wares fall. Only the fine wares are dealt with here because inclusion of domestic wares in burials is so infrequent.

Because only fine wares were used in mortuary practice, and domestic wares were so obviously excluded, this is easily seen as one of the more readily noticed of patterns visible in the data. I believe this pattern emanates from the influence of the Great Tradition. It is so predictable from burial to burial, and predictable through the complete range of the social scale, richest to lower class, that in a society which was so manifestly inequalitarian, it is hard to escape the conclusion that some powerful factor was enforcing this uniformity. I think that factor was religious dictum.

The vessel forms characteristic of Tepeu 1 are a barrel-or-keg-shaped vessel (form 11); a basal flanged tripod plate with rounded feet (form 13); and a round-side bowl with an unrestricted orifice, the diameter of which is greater than the height (form 15). These are the standard forms which without much variation can be used, when found in an archaeological context, to identify this specific period. The forms of course must be matched with the ceramic types, Sibal and Saxche, which also characterized the period, for certain identification.
In terms of these shapes the Tepeu I period can further be characterized at Tikal by the fact that graves contain an average of two vessels apiece, the deviations falling between one and four. For the period as a whole there are about equal numbers of forms 11, 13, and 15; that is the barrel shape, the plate, and the bowl.

It is significant that when form 11, the barrel, appears in a burial there is usually at least one other vessel. Sometimes there are two others, and these are usually the plate or the bowl, forms 13 and 15. Sometimes both occur with the barrel. Also of interest is the fact that while form 11 is almost never killed, form 13 frequently is. As an explanation for these two facts I would suggest the hypothesis that the barrel, form 11, is functionally intended as a liquid container, specifically a drinking vessel. The other two forms, I think, are containers for solids and were probably used as dishes. A drinking vessel with a hole in it is quite useless, not so eating ware.

On the basis, then, of supposed function and a somewhat constant ratio of appearance, the suggestion is made that perhaps this pattern reflects a specific Maya practice, probably connected with religious obligations to the dead. This may be a sacred meal for the dead. Possibly it was one eaten by the living in commemoration for the dead at a funeral. Vogt (1964) makes a point of Maya ceremonial eating and the stress of equal sharing in ceremonial meals. Might not the ancient Maya have either provided the dead with a ritually prescribed
### Table 2
Seriation of Late Classic Burials at Tikal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>Vessel Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepeu 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>SxOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>SxOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>SbBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>SbBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>SxOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>SxOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>SxOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepeu 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SxOP = Saxche Orange Polychrome; SbBP = Sibal Buff Polychrome; ZCP = Zacatel Cream Polychrome; POP = Palmar Orange Polychrome; CB/O = Chantouri; X = presence, but no type designation; when more than one untyped vessel occurs in a form category, the number occurring is shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12A</th>
<th>12B</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tepeu 2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CB/O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>CB/O</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>ZCP (2)</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>CB/O</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Burial No.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12A</td>
<td>12B</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepeu 2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>ZCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepeu 3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meal, or possibly have shared in a dedicatory one themselves? Does it seem possible that the living relatives shared a final dedicatory meal for the dead and then ritually destroyed or sacrificed the prescribed vessels? The explanation is not solid and the Maya practice not clearly understood, but the practice itself, whatever its exact nature, is going to be called one of the elements of the mortuary tradition, that is, something which owes its existence and meaning to the understandings and demands inherent in formal religion. This practice is therefore part of the Great Tradition. The same hypothesis will be broadened and strengthened when the appropriate forms in Tepeu.2 are considered.

The appearance of life forms on pottery seems rare in both Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2. Life forms are more marked and frequent in Tepeu 1 than in Tzakol where the painting of life forms is initiated. The Tzakol life forms are usually fantastic creatures which are portrayed in curvilinear fashion around the outside wall of a flanged plate. The quality of design, although not the life forms themselves, carry over into Tepeu 1. There are occasional wavy, stretched-out creatures in Tepeu 1, but the idea appears to be changed to kinked, sausage-like elements which appear in the same or analogous locations on the pottery. In Tepeu 2 where geometric forms predominate, life forms do not seem less frequent than in Tepeu 1. Tepeu 1 human figures, usually dancers or other ceremonial persons, appear on the flat interior surface of the tripod plates. These scenes can contain one figure, many times a
dancer, or less frequently portray ritual scenes with several people involved. This style of painting is restricted pretty much to Tepeu 1. The only parallel to these scenes in Tepeu 2 is found in the superbly decorated examples of form 10, the cylindrical vase. These latter, although perhaps made indigenously at Tikal, merely participate in a tradition initiated and brought to flower elsewhere. While there is little if any direct evidence for it in the specific data from Tikal, it is nevertheless reasonably safe to say, judging from occurrences at Uaxactun, that other life forms, like cockroaches and similar water-loving insects and birds, make occasional appearances on Tepeu 1 pottery. The insect forms appear with more frequency in Tepeu 2, however. Perhaps the safest generalization to be made about life forms and their occurrence at Tikal and Uaxactun for the Tepeu 1 period is that they are rare. The most outstanding examples are the plate scenes; the other examples, the insects, etc., are few and rather abstract; they are not a major motive.

Life forms, especially the depiction of people, are always done in a consistent style, with a seemingly prescribed set of conventions and techniques. Maya art on this point is as unique and as unified as Egyptian or Byzantine art: so restricted in subject and execution that as a result it is instantly recognizable. This art style, a secondary institution, is a direct manifestation of a Great Tradition.

Few of the vessels from Tepeu 1 burials were killed ritually by drilling or punching a hole in the base. This is not startling
considering the sample size. The tripod plates have their legs knocked off. This is another sort of killing, but even this is rare in Tepeu 1. There are, for Tepeu 1, five barrel-shaped jars. These are rarely if ever killed. There are six tripod plates. Some of these have their feet missing. This is the most frequently killed form. There are four straight-sided bowls, none of which is killed.

Killing vessels is probably a very old practice among the Maya. I do not know where it is initiated in Maya history, but it could easily be a folk custom practiced long before the Maya have any right to be called a civilization. In any case in the Late Classic and specifically in Tepeu 1, it is closely connected with mortuary ritual. As a guess and as little more, I would suggest that it is one of those elements of peasant culture which Maya high civilization took over and integrated into a formalized religious practice possibly changing its meaning, and certainly making its meaning explicit. Judging by its greater and more consistent appearance in Tepeu 2 it is a custom which is becoming better or more increasingly integrated into the religious rationale backing Maya culture. It is a part of the Great Tradition.

The number of vessels for Tepeu burials varies between one and four, the average being two. The majority of the nine burials from this time period come from either house mound locations or from the smaller mortuary temple-pyramids which are often associated with small clusters of house mounds. These groups, usually arranged
around a quadrangular plaza with the temple-pyramid on the east, pepper the landscape outside of the limits of the central ceremonial complex itself. The consistency in location, in what are essentially lower or middle class contexts and the fair consistency in vessel number per burial, could be combined to infer, if the sample for Tepeul were larger, some points on the social order for Tepeul at Tikal. As it is, all that it is pertinent to say now is that the data here from middle or lower class units are more or less consistent within themselves, allowing only the observation that the small temple-pyramid burials are richer than the housemound burials.

The mortuary ceramic tradition of Tepeul will be called an elaborating tradition. This is done in terms of the 1955 classification of archaeological traditions. "An Elaborating Tradition is characterized by an increasing complexity resulting from the addition of traits or attributes which are integrated in a single line of development" (Thompson 1956:44). Tepeul within itself, since it falls within about a hundred year period, shows very little discernible change when the data at hand are examined. This may reflect the defects in the small amount of material available for examination, but in all probability the lack of change is due to the small amount of time covered by the tradition. Recall, too, that this is an essentially conservative culture, in which significant change is measured in large amounts of time.
A more noteworthy change is, however, not within Tepeu 1, which could not be considered a homogeneous unit if it displayed great change within itself. It is, rather on either side of Tepeu 1 that change is to be seen, the nature of which allows Tepeu 1 to be called an elaborating tradition segment. Certainly the changes in ceramic decoration from the foregoing Early Classic Tzakol period are significant and are toward greater complexity and sophistication among the Tikal Maya. That the trend continues in the same direction in Tepeu 2 will soon be seen. This segment of time, Tepeu 1, witnesses elaborating traditions in the decoration of fine ware mortuary ceramics. The elaboration of those elements assertedly connected with the Great Tradition is seen when Tepeu 1 is compared with both the preceding Tzakol and the succeeding Tepeu 2. In other words there is not only a Great Tradition, but it is a healthy and growing one. It is elaborating, dynamic, making itself felt more and more forcefully throughout the culture in the period, say, from A.D. 500 to 700. It is virile, dominating and imposing its own order on Maya society.

Tepeu 2 is much more generously represented in this sample than either Tepeu 1 or Tepeu 3. There are 49 burials and 119 associated vessels. The basic design types are Palmar Orange and Zacatel Cream polychromes. The vessel forms characterizing this period are a vertical-side cylinder (form 10); a tripod plate with flaring sides and cylindrical feet (form 12A); a flat-based bowl with out-curving sides
An examination of the Tepeu 2 mortuary ceramic data reveals a number of interesting facts. The average number of vessels per burial is three. This is opposed to an average of two in Tepeu.1. There are twice as many 12B forms (flat-based bowls with outcurving sides) as any other, and there is an almost negligible number of 14 (flat-based bowls with straight sides). If forms 12A, 12B, and 14 are added together and called functionally similar, i.e., solid food containers, as opposed to form 10, a liquid container, then the ratio between the former and the latter is three to one. This is a ratio which maintains the prevalence of solid, food-offering containers in the burials.

It is interesting in this context to note that the tripod plate (form 12A) rarely occurs alone in burial contexts. The form occurs 21 times in 20 burials. Its typological ancestor is form 13, the tripod plate of Tepeu.1. This plate would seem to be replaced functionally by forms 12B and 14, flat-based bowls. That is, the plate and bowls look as though they could serve the same purpose. They are roughly the same size and shape, and might even hold similar amounts of like kinds of food. But, in fact, the tripod either had a utilitarian functional purpose different from the bowls or it had a specific ritual use. It could have been the only acceptable or practicable form in a given ceremonial situation. This is a guess but it does explain the carry-over into Tepeu 2 of the plate form, a form which looks to me as though it could have been
replaced in Tepeu 2 by a set of new, functionally equal vessels (12B and 14).

The plate was usually killed, ritually sacrificed, by knocking off the legs. This act was done before the vessel was placed in the tomb for no legs were found in the tombs. It is possible that the act of smashing the legs had specific significance in the mortuary tradition which obviously only a legged vessel could fulfill. If for some reason this act went out of fashion in mortuary customs or died out slowly, or was maintained only by some particular group or class for their ceremonies, then this might explain the relative infrequency of occurrence and at the same time explain the fact that it occurs at all.

Actually, the vast majority of tripod plate forms from both Tepeu 2 and the preceding intermediate stage are found in the common housemound burials. Here it is interesting to point out that data from Tikal housemounds and middens (unpublished data in the hands of T. P. Culbert) show that tripod plate sherds are markedly common here, almost more so than with any other fine ware form. This of course means that this form had not been replaced functionally by the flat-based bowls since it is so common in domestic situations. But its continued use in the less important burials, those burials which are taken to be representative of the lower, either secondary specialist or peasant, class does indicate that this class chose, through its conservatism, or by reason of the ready availability of the tripod plate, to
maintain the custom of interring this sort of vessel with the dead. The wealthier or ruling group at Tikal in Tepeu 2 did not avoid the use of the plate, but showed rather a clear preference for the cylindrical vase. This last form is far and away the most popular and significant in wealthy burials. That the cylinder vase was less available to the populace as a whole is indicated by its comparative infrequency in housemound midden remains.

The causes for what seems to be differential use of both the tripod plate and the cylinder vase are unclear. There is no doubt about the distribution of the cylinder. Too, I think, although I am not sure, that there is a concentration of the tripod plates in lower and middle class burials. This form is to be associated with these groups and not to be thought of as identifying the highest class.

Insofar as this differential distribution is indicative of class structure at Tikal in Late Classic times, and since the existence of social classes is a natural by-product of civilization, it can be asserted that here is another indication of the Great Tradition. This is so because social classes need a rationale to explain the distinctions between one another, and providing consistent and potent rationales is the business of the ideological level of culture: institutionalized rationales is another phrase for the Great Tradition.

The specifics of the development of Maya ceramic decoration in Tepeu 2 are helpful in evaluating the growth of the Great Tradition.
Tepeu 2 is marked by a number of often recurring design elements. These are clearly prefaced both in Tepeu 1 and Tzakol 3. There is, in fact, an unmistakable developmental continuum in a number of motifs which, in one form or another, are seen through the whole of the Late Classic after they were initiated in the Early Classic.

Various forms of the Greek key design and other sorts of frets, three or four types of Kan Crosses—formed by blocking the interior corners of a square—quatrefoils, sexfoils, linked pyramids on mouldings, groups of concentric circles, and groups of bars and dots are all fairly common. These usually take a form easily placed in Tepeu 2 and can be distinguished from their predecessors and successors by minor but visible differences in form or application.

Grooving is not important in Tepeu 2 except for vertical and diagonal fluting on many of the cylindrical vases. Glyphs, too, are rare and much more conventionalized in this period. They are more geometrical in form, and this trend to the geometrical, in fact, characterizes Tepeu 2. There are more geometric patterns per se, and those non-geometrical patterns which have predecessors now appear in more stylized and conventionalized form.

There are some life forms, many of which border on being stylized to the point of abstraction. These are mostly water-loving insects. The human life forms no longer appear on the tripod plate with any frequency, but there are various ceremonial scenes on cylinder
vases. These are elaborate and contain fairly stereotyped scenes of a seated dignitary and one or more subordinate persons. The latter, in obviously deferential positions, are variously offering goods to the important individual, listening to him, or prostrate in front of him in subjection of one sort or another. The scenes are clearly narrative in nature and mean to communicate some specific event or idea to the beholder. Most have glyph bands attached to the scenes which perhaps indicate that an attempt is being made to communicate the lesson or idea illustrated. The paintings are in no way artistic achievements within our own system of judging aesthetic fineness, but do have a pleasant enough charm about them. They are largely uncluttered, a quality lacking in art of later periods in Mesoamerica when there seems to develop an urge to cover every bit of space. These paintings are one of the principal manifestations of the Great Tradition.

The last three paragraphs have discussed those developments in the Maya art style which are new to Tepeu.2 The dozen or so facts mentioned in these three paragraphs must not be seen as divorced from the framework in which they properly belong, that unique form of aesthetic expression which is Maya art. Every one of these "new" items is clearly related in genetic roots and feeling to everything which has gone before in both the Early and Late Classic. They should be thought of as innovations, new combinations of old ideas, all taking place within an established framework, the Great Tradition.
Table 3

Location of Late Classic Burials at Tikal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small housemounds, quarries, and similar "lower class" locations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 near housemound</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4 near housemound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 in quarry</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 in quarry</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3 in quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Large housemounds:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4 small palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1 small palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small family temple-pyramids, located as the eastern structure of a group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial No.</td>
<td>No. of Vessels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 average

Large family temple-pyramid, located as the eastern structure of a group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 average

Dedicatory burial, Temple I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Killing of the vessels of this period elaborates the pattern seen in Tepeu I. The majority of killed vessels are flat-based bowls; some tripod plates are, however, included, their legs being knocked off or their bases drilled. There are no killed cylinders, a fact I would like to see paralleling a similar feature of barrels (form 11) characteristic of Tepeu I. This last observation can be used to support the hypothesis that the barrel and cylinder forms held liquids as opposed to other forms which held solids. The simple conclusion, upheld more by Occam's Razor than by anything else is that containers meant to hold liquids would be valueless in ceremonial or other contexts if they had holes punched or drilled in them.

Furthermore, we have two illustrations demonstrating some of these vessels in use. These consist of paintings of vessels in scenes on the sides of cylinder jars. There are two different examples of the tripod plate form and flat-based bowl holding solids. These are both on vessels in Burial 116. In one, the food is clearly fruit of some sort held in a typical tripod plate. And in the other, some kind of solid offerings are being given to a seated official. The last vessel is aberrant, but is within the flat-based bowl tradition. There are two examples of form 10 in use. These again are on vessels in Burial 116. They look like drinking cups, and are resting in front of a seated official. What they hold is impossible to determine, but they appear to be less suited for eating than for drinking.
The clarity with which this functional dichotomy between liquid and solid containers holds up in Tepeu 2 burials is enough to validate the fact that a specific ratio between the two exists. There are about 50 graves for Tepeu 2. Thirty contain the cylinder jar (form 10). Twenty-seven of the 30 also contain a flat-based bowl (form 12B or 14). Therefore three-fifths of all Tepeu 2 burials demonstrate at least a one to one ratio between the functionally different vessels. Furthermore, this ratio is spread throughout the range of social structure included by the burials we have here for study. I would assert that there is a good ritual reason for this occurrence. It is a standardized practice and I suspect the explanation does not lie in the folk habits of a society, but rather in a body of functionaries who have a powerful say-so in funeral matters. In short, and as asserted before, here is an institutionalized philosophy seen in the artifacts of a dead society.

Standard paste for Tepeu 2 is buff or tan, but this varies over some range from pink to red to yellow. The range of color may be due to firing techniques (personal communication with Paula Krotser). The underslip is uniformly buff or cream. This underslip is one of the chief means of distinguishing pieces of Tepeu 2 from Tepeu 1 in the process of sorting sherds or vessels.

Provenience for the Tepeu 2 burials is quite varied. Locations extend from housemounds to the small, supposedly lineage oriented temple-mounds, to the lesser rural palaces. There are the massive
and rich tombs like Burial 116, but these are, as would be expected, rare. Many of the burials were located in the small temple-mounds which are found on the east side of many of the plazas about which are grouped from two to five housemounds (Coe and Haviland 1964: 15). There was a concerted effort at Tikal in excavating these small temple-pyramids to explore the burial pattern in them (personal communication with T. P. Culbert). General information on these appears in the concluding section of the thesis.

All of these characterizing facts serve to illustrate that, in terms of itself, Tepeu 2 is a slightly elaborating tradition, showing very little change in the course of its development. Since there is no chronological control within Tepeu 2, this statement is at best an unsafe one. Whatever the changes are through time within the tradition for Tepeu 2 they are minor; minor insofar as they fail to suggest a change within the tradition which could be seen on fairly close, although not exhaustive inspection.

In terms of the Late Classic as a whole, Tepeu 2 is part of a single elaborating cultural tradition. It is the apex of Maya high culture at Tikal and is the most remarkable and last period of Maya cultural florescence. Certainly it contains all of the traditions seen in Tepeu 1 and it sees, too, the full force of the Great Tradition manifesting itself in the mortuary tradition.
Tepeu 3 must be passed by with only superficial comment. Depending on the archaeologist, Tepeu 3 is either very Late Classic or early Post-classic. It is only the barest shadow of Maya high culture in the Peten. Remains assigned to this period are not only few; they are only a dim reflection of the immediately preceding flower of Late Classic culture. There is a continuity in Tepeu 3 which connects it to the Late Classic accomplishments and therefore allows some to call it a subdivision of that period. Others recognize it as belonging temporally to the Post-classic. At Tikal, Tepeu 3 exhibits a continuity in vessel forms as well as in a very few design elements from the periods preceding. There are, however, major changes in this period. These changes are of a sort that one suspects may reflect major occurrences in some far more basic area of the culture, like the economy, rather than changes which are limited to mortuary customs alone. In short, and to be developed later, it will be postulated that major changes in the economy, the social structure, or both are reflected in the funerary tradition of Tepeu 3.

There are few Tepeu 3 burials from Tikal. Therefore, the characterization given here depends on information from ceramics in other burial contexts, and from Smith's Uaxactún data. The era is characterized by an almost complete lack of painted decoration on the so-called fine wares. These, for our purposes, are what we are entitled to suppose would have been that class of vessels from which
the mortuary vessels would have been selected had the practices of
Tepeu 3 been fully within the traditions of the preceding two periods.
What decorations there are, in the form of bands, etc., are unquestioned
holdovers from Tepeu 2. There is no doubt about the continuity between
these phases. From the burial information we do have from the period
there is evidence not only of a lessened use of decoration and fine ware
vessels, but of the predominance of monochrome and plain wares in the
burials. By and large the number of vessels per burial seems not to
change, at least on the evidence from Uaxactun. When fine wares do
appear they are often of foreign manufacture; most are incised and,
when painted, all the decorations are simple and small.

It needs to be observed that those representatives of Tepeu 3
fine wares that we do have access to, although either totally lacking
decoration or having but a minimal amount, do nevertheless retain
their quality of manufacture. It would seem that whatever change
affected the decoration of the vessels, the same change was not oper-
ative in either the method or style of pottery making. In other words,
the basic potting tradition did not change radically, but the tradition of
decoration did.

Probably there is not enough material to safely categorize the
nature of the ceramic tradition for Tepeu 3. The likelihood is that it
is a reducing tradition. It "is characterized by simplification through
loss of traits, and perhaps in terms of a less complex organization"
There is, however, no doubt that the change from Tepeu 2 to 3 is a reducing tradition, and the reduction is a sharp one. What is more, there is little evidence for a gentle transition to Tepeu 3, although again, to use the standard archaeological caveat, this may be due to archaeological oversight or insufficient digging. There is no evidence for a smooth transition. How abrupt the transition was, however, it is not really possible to say. At one and the same time it is necessary to say that the transition between Tepeu 2 and 3 was sharp, and it is just as necessary to avoid the old shades of catastrophe and monumental upheaval as explanations for the decline of the Maya. These last spectors have plagued Maya studies long enough. But whether fast or slow, and it may have been fairly rapid, a major change occurred. In fact, the Great Tradition died.

Tepeu 3 is a fascinating period because we can assume that the Great Tradition had either ceased or was ceasing to exert any appreciable influence in this period. Therefore those practices which are found here can be called either remnants of the Great Tradition or folk customs reasserted from some cultural base. Since the elite was gone everything esoteric or poorly integrated into the civilization should have collapsed, or remained, if at all, as a shadow of its former self.

Not only the ceramic arts but a fine control of them remains in Tepeu 3. Plain and monochrome vessels predominate in Tepeu 3 remains. The fine wares are significantly diminished in quantity, but
not in quality. This reflects either a holdover of specialists, or it means that potting was firmly based in peasant traditions. The latter is the more likely explanation since Tepeu 3 probably represents several generations. Potting is a necessity of life. It does not go out of style. Moreover, the continued use of fine wares indicates that these had a functional purpose other than the ceremonial. In Tepeu 3, however, they are undecorated, and I think that makes all the difference.

Ceramic painting disappears almost completely in Tepeu 3. Inferred from this is that (1) the two crafts, potting and decoration, were practiced by two different groups during the peak of Maya development and (2) ceramic painting was either too expensive or too inessential to preserve when the culture had to make the profound readjustment seen in the change between Tepeu 2 and 3.

Pottery, about half of it plain or monochrome wares, is still included in the graves of Tepeu 3. This is best documented in the nine Tepeu 3 graves at Uaxactun. It is deposited in roughly the same quantity as it was earlier. The inclusion of pottery in graves is not claimed as anything other than a folk custom. A more or less standard amount of pottery in a grave is probably also a peasant habit, although it is a habit which could have been integrated into the patterns of civilization while those patterns existed.
CHAPTER 5

THE GREAT TRADITION AND ITS TRANSFORMATIONS

In the foregoing pages there has been presented a summation of some of the patterns of arrangement for the data connected with this thesis. The traditions within the Late Classic at Tikal have been outlined; a view of the specifics is now at hand. Call that which has gone before history. It would be useful if what follows can be called anthropology, or at least an anthropological approach to archaeological data.

At the beginning of this essay a Great Tradition was postulated as a means of giving coherence to both the data considered and to the Late Classic at Tikal as a whole. In order to exploit that idea and in order to demonstrate its validity, a number of hypotheses are to be presented here. In the course of investigating them and presenting evidence in their support, it is hoped that it will be demonstrated that despite various facts and trends to the contrary, not only is the Late Classic a homogeneous and on-going tradition, but that it is a tradition in large part dictated by the ideological force supporting Maya culture. That is to say, I hope to make clear that in this prehistoric society the ideological level of culture was potent enough to maintain, among other things, a mortuary tradition for several hundred years. Moreover,
since this tradition of funerary practices is what is dealt with and is the source from which inferences are made to the ideological base of the culture, I hope to indicate the nature of the changes at work in that ideological level of society as they can be seen reflected in the mortuary tradition. That changes of this sort can be manifested in a mortuary tradition is hardly a point in question; rather, the question is how to discover the manifestations.

An examination of the transitions between the phases of the Late Classic is the most convenient and appropriate way to discover both the nature of the changes themselves and the degrees of differences between one phase and another. Tepeu 1 and 2 are defined primarily stylistically. They can be thought of as culture periods, but this concept will do injustice to the close degree of relation between the two. On the basis of style, and in this essay, on the basis of mortuary ceramic style, the two periods are two distinct sections on a single developing continuum. While Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2 if viewed separately from one another would appear to be only superficially related, they can be shown on the basis of seriation, backed by stratigraphy, to be related to such a degree that it is justified to say that one grew out of the other to such an extent that the only explanation for such continuity is indigenously governed change. And more, it is quite probable that in this transition the ideological, here of course is meant the religious, structure of a society was scarcely affected by the changes. It is even
probable that these changes were introduced by the ruling hierarchy, at
the very least they were sanctioned by it. The change marked by the
differences in Tepeu 1 wares compared to Tepeu 2 wares is more than
one artificially and arbitrarily created by and for the convenience of
archaeologists. It is, however, our effort here to demonstrate that
the change was largely unplanned, was not forced, and was not governed
by forces outside the culture.

Here, in the change from Tepeu 1 to Tepeu 2 is the culture
process of maintenance of stability through change. Change may be
conscious or unconscious, but regardless of that, this change is
illustrative of the principle that to preserve an order, a certain degree
of change is inevitable. I think what we see happening in this point of
the Late Classic is a culture engaged in allowing the modicums of change
which are the essence of insuring stability or at least the facade of
stability.

To test the above statements the following hypothesis is pro-
posed: At Tikal the transition in the Late Classic from Tepeu 1 to
Tepeu 2 was a piecemeal, largely undirected, smooth and non-violent
one: one which, if initiated outside the culture, was implemented by
forces within the culture. And if the transition was not indigenously
inspired, then it was imposed on Tikal with a minimum of force or
coercion.
In terms of the Great Tradition the hypothesis states that the changes postulated occurred within the framework of the rationale for Maya culture. The changes are not big, are not disruptive, probably do not disturb Tradition and in fact may bolster it. The changes are changes in fashion; they are neither profound nor disruptive.

The nature of the transition postulated in the last paragraph ought to help demonstrate the changes going on within the Great Tradition. Specifically, of course, the changes in mortuary ceramic customs, as they reflect either the little or the Great Traditions, will give better understanding to the dynamics of change in Maya culture. The concept of a Great Tradition and its concomitant corollaries has helped up to now to structure the patterns that were present in the burial data. The concept was essentially static however, a framework into which facts or events were placed. In this more interpretive section the concept of a Great Tradition should become dynamic and should illustrate its core of continuity through time and also its changes through time.

To begin, it is known from other sources than the material in this study that Tepeu I is prior to Tepeu 2 and that both these are defined, at least ceramically, on the basis of vessel form and design. That these criteria are indicators of temporal change is adequately and independently demonstrated by stratigraphy. As said earlier, all of the vessels considered here are taken from burials, thereby allowing a reasonable degree of contemporaneity to be assigned to those in any
particular grave. Allowance, of course, must be made for heirloom pieces which could falsely weight the sample, but in fact they have proved to be no trouble. A superficial examination of the mortuary vessels will show that there is an unquestioned division between Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2. The vast majority are what can be called "pure" Tepeu 1 or Tepeu 2. That is they are of unmixed style and vessel form (see seriation chart).

However, there are a number of burials which seem to be intermediate between the two divisions. These burials contain a combination of vessels from both divisions of the Late Classic, and/or contain forms from one period which have design styles from the other. It is on the basis of these intermediate occurrences that the transition spoken of earlier is based.

Prior to the investigations on which this thesis is based, the intermediate occurrences mentioned in the last paragraph were poorly understood. They had been considered as a group (Culbert 1961: 39) but not clearly defined. They of course form a clear link between two periods hitherto well defined and understood to be parts of one another in some fashion, but how they appeared in archaeological contexts was unclear. It is the original contribution of this thesis to point out the place this group occupies in the archaeological situation, the nature of the elements of which the intermediacy is constructed, and the nature of the transition it represents. The hypothesis stated a short while ago
can be viewed as a means of presenting these data and also as a means of utilizing that information in some other than a purely descriptive way.

This intermediate group consists of 15 burials. There are in the collection represented in this thesis nine Tepeu 1 burials and 49 Tepeu 2 burials. The small number of Tepeu 1 burials is due to some combination of archaeological change and to the ever-constructing, ever-remodeling Maya. Before it occurs to the reader to suggest that what he sees here is really three distinct groups or possibly only one long period with minor fluctuations, i.e. the Late Classic, it is incumbent on me to discuss these possibilities. The likelihood of the existence of three culturally distinct groups is due to the fragmentary nature of the data and to the fact that we are looking at only a small fragment of the total culture-picture. A gross counting of all Tepeu 1 sherds from all contexts would produce an amount sufficient to convince the reader that the period is legitimate in terms of itself and separate from Tepeu 2. Were this gross procedure used to find some indication of intermediate vessels, the results would probably be just as convincing that an intermediate stage would be simply that—a comparatively short period evidenced by a smaller amount of sherds having forms from one period and designs from another. It is of importance also that in the intermediate period there is nothing original; not one trait that does not appear in either Tepeu 1 or Tepeu 2. The intermediate is merely a combination. The fact that the intermediate occurrences have been
noted before in processing the Tikal data but not defined in their archaeological context adequately demonstrates both the elusive nature and small quantity of this transitional material. To cover the second possibility, that of Tepeu being one long culture period, it is readily admitted that Tepeu is one homogeneous culture period, but it is of such a nature and such duration that the changes in it are great enough so that even Mayanists, fully aware of the conservativeness of the culture, have created a fully valid division, one that is distinguishable throughout the culture.

The archaeological arrangement of these intermediate occurrences of form and style characterize the transition. Following from the data presented on the existence of an intermediate group and on the nature of its intermediacy, there are several points to be made which serve as a logical base on which to build. These are: there is much more likely to be a clean break in ceramic tradition, with very few instances of a previous tradition accommodating itself to a later one, if the change in traditions is a violent one rigidly enforced by some element within or outside the culture. As a logical extension of this, then, it is far more plausible, in the light of no evidence for a rapid, forced change at Tikal, to postulate a more smooth, non-violent, and indigenously enforced switch in the culture between two periods which bear a remarkable continuity in terms of style and vessel form. It seems to be true that burial practices are not so outrageously
conservative as has many times been asserted (Kroeber 1927), but they are probably conservative enough for it to be asserted that if a transition were a clean break in cultural traditions, then burials containing elements from both cultures would be rare or non-existent. The element of conservatism in burial practices would tend to insure that traditions be unmixed, if the traditions were in mutually exclusive or in subservient-dominant positions. And of course it is because of the consistent and stylistically coherent nature of the continuum that we suggest the change is indigenously implemented. It is not that specific ideas cannot have entered from outside the culture in the transition, but their fusion into the culture was accomplished in terms of the already dominant tradition.

The above are the inferences which the data at hand contain which tend to support the hypothesis stated earlier. There is unquestionably a continuity, then, between the Late Classic phases and probably it is due to factors inherent in the culture. I feel that the changes are of such a type, mainly in the techniques of handling pottery form and design, that they indicate innovation at a fairly low level of culture. Innovation means essentially the recombination of old elements or ideas into new patterns. And low level of culture means that the innovations were neither many nor important enough to cause any change in the set arrangement, the articulation between the various levels of culture.
They were too small to cause disruption and were easily integrated into the culture.

Now that the nature of a transition is assertedly demonstrated, what is the place of a Great Tradition in the Late Classic? I would maintain that there are three factors which demonstrate the ideological force upholding the coherence in the culture. Two may be in doubtful use here and might be little traditions, folk customs. A third is not; it is a direct reflection of the Great Tradition. The first is the relatively constant average number of vessels per burial in Tepeu 1 and 2. The second is that in both periods the ratio between holders of liquids and holders of solids remains constant. These two occurrences, it is supposed, are due to ceremonial stricture in the culture. I admit, however, that at least the first point could be due as much to a folk cult as due to an organized religion.

Two is the average number of vessels for Tepeu 1 burials and three is the average number for Tepeu 2. The variations for both periods are usually not more than two vessels more or less than the average. The more or less constant number of vessels reflects either a constant factor like the size of an average tomb or the cost of outfitting an average grave, or it reflects the requirements needed to insure proper fulfillment of some ritual end. This average number interestingly enough carries through to Tepeu 3, after there had been a major decline in Maya civilization, and after painted decoration had disappeared. This may
mean that a set number of containers in a grave was a more elemental segment of the religious tradition, in other words a folk custom. This tradition could be maintained more easily since it was based in the potter's craft, essentially a folk craft, and could be divorced from decoration and its specialists. It therefore endured where the artist disappeared when his more tenuous economic or social base collapsed.

If the vessel forms are looked at functionally as containers of liquids or solid food, it is obvious through the first two phases of the Tepeu sequence, and possibly through the third, that burial offerings demanded, on the average, both sorts of containers in a one to one or one to two ratio. In case of the latter ratio the solid food containers predominated. In other words, a good Tepeu burial, from any period, had associated with it solid and liquid offerings in a predictable ratio and in vessels appropriate to holding them. This example supports my original hypothesis by showing the conservative and constant nature of the mortuary tradition, a tradition which was practiced under one ongoing ritual scheme.

The third factor, and that part of the mortuary tradition which is tied directly to the influence of the Great Tradition, is the painted decoration on ceramics. This style is as distinct and definitive a part of Maya culture as is the architectural or sculptural style. It is also as clearly a secondary institution as are these. That is, it is a direct manifestation of the culture's ideology. First to be considered are the
scene paintings on cylinder vases. This is a new tradition in Tepeu 2, which may have been accepted peacefully and progressively into the culture from the outside. How it was introduced is another question. Whether a new school became dominant among the elite, whether this new group came from outside the culture or just the new idea of the painted cylinder is unanswerable now. It is a new and distinct tradition and it does eclipse the older one of scene painting on plates. The continuity in the rest of the culture is secure and therefore we are reduced to recognizing that either a new elite corps using this esoteric specialty came to power peacefully from the outside or that a new set of ideas came in and was utilized by the already established elite. If either of these last two alternatives is so, however, my hypothesis can read "piecemeal and undirected" only in the sense that the one major directed change we can be almost sure about, the introduction of the painted cylinder, was a potent enough influence to be felt among all the members of the society and was adopted in a very broad way. Here, in other words, is a conscious change at one level of society felt less consciously in all others. An initiated change spread throughout a culture by the process of people keeping up with the cultural times.

The presence of painted fancy wares including vessels with human activity depicted on them is taken to illustrate that the religious system heavily influenced the aspect of culture producing and using these vessels. These highly decorated wares appear in both periods. An
assumption that artists are dominant over potters and hold dominant social positions and are therefore either closer to or are a part of the priestly caste which is being called the body maintaining and defining the Great Tradition is a difficult one to prove. There is however an admirable and convincing attempt at proof by Terence Grieder (1964: 442-8) in which he analyzes Classic vase painting style and connects the artists closely with the theocratic class. He suggests that space and form are handled in such a way and are in such harmony with Maya religious concepts of time and space that the artists either had to be in close contact with the religious hierarchy or were a part of the hierarchy itself. The scenes Grieder speaks of appear on the tripod plate in Tepeu 1, and on the vertical-side cylinder in Tepeu 2. The number of graves containing these forms is great, three-quarters of the total in Tepeu 2, but the number containing these forms decorated in this highly complex fashion is relatively small. Only the most important tombs, those of individuals supposed to have held power in the Maya centers, contain these specimens. It is really not enlightening to demonstrate that in fact that Great Tradition is manifested in the graves of rulers. They, after all, are creatures of the Tradition.

Because of the rarity of the cylinders with scenes of human activity painted on them, I have not been completely able to demonstrate an impact emanating from the dominant elite, the institutionalized ideological level of culture, on the whole mortuary ceramic tradition.
However, I would go one step further to try to prove my case for a mortuary tradition being one of the results of the force of the ideological level of culture when that level governs a society.

It is asserted that the whole tradition of ceramic painting is directed by and emanates from that governing elite. That is, the hierarchy is responsible for the majority, if not all of the painted decorations which appear on Tepeu ceramics: responsible in the sense that the designs probably represent, in the form of symbols, etc., many of the ideas in formal Maya religion. What the assertion boils down to is this: frequently occurring designs like Kan Crosses, the so-called "dress shirt" design (a precipitating rain cloud is another characterization), the yoke, the sausage-shaped bars, the various crosses and frets, scrolls, etc., all probably had cultural meaning and were, furthermore, probably connected with the religion. It does not seem likely that a religion-oriented society would allow such a rich source of symbolic meaning to go unutilized.

Pertinent to the last paragraph are some things Brainerd has to say:

Maya graphic art, like most of the great art styles of the world, is characterized by an over-all unity, easily definable by the recognition of a group of conventions and formalities, ways of representing objects, of drawing designs, to which its products were restricted.

The symbolic meanings of Maya art, although they obviously bore strong emotional appeal to the ancient Maya, are in great part permanently lost. A religious art is impossible to grasp
without a thorough grounding in the religion... The pervasive, molding effects of the religion of the Maya has been well put by Spiden:

...religion, as a communal element in the life of the nation turns the attention of all artists to a common purpose. Through this focusing of the attention, religion leads inevitably to an intensive rather than a diffuse development of art. But once this intensive development has exhausted the possibilities of the established ideas then religion throws its powerful influence against further disorganizing change. Thus religion enriches art and makes it permanent (Brainerd 1954: 56-7).

In terms of what both Brainerd and Spiden say, it seems within the realm of possibility that not only all the artists but all their subject matter as well was governed in one way or another, directly or less obviously, by the religion of their society, a religion governed and enforced by an active, dominant elite. Even admitting a division among the specialists between those who did the scenes on the cylinders, the true artists, and those who turned out the designs--the more popular, geometric stuff, the craftsmen or the hacks--it is still quite possible to see that the whole range of painting specialists was directly dependent for direction and support on the governing group. This is even easier to see when one examines the precipitous drop of all artistic activity at that period when we are quite sure this ruling elite fell.

Conclusions for the present are that there is good, but not conclusive evidence of the manifestation of the Great Tradition in Late Classic funeral customs. Most burial ceramics are painted and most
therefore are connected with the religious concepts of the society. However, these ceramic types and designs are not limited at all to graves. They were evidently used widely throughout the whole culture. Before the reader says that the painted vessels appear in burials by default as much as by plan, let me conclude that since none of the unpainted domestic ware of the Late Classic appears in the burials of that period, obviously a choice had been made by the society to include wares decorated with religiously meaningful designs in the graves. To this extent, at least, the ideological level of culture was manifesting itself in the mortuary tradition: that tradition being one of the secondary institutions a Great Tradition may establish when it is itself the institutionalization of the ideological level of culture.

Provenience for the burials of the Late Classic and the social implications drawn from them can only be summarized here since basically all the data in this thesis tell us is that there is a wide variety of locations in which burials may be expected and that within the burials themselves the number of vessels can range anywhere from one to half a dozen. Most cluster at the lower end of the scale, around three or four vessels a burial. The poorest burials are likely to be found in odd locations like chultunes or under plaza floors. The burials in the small temple-pyramids, the "family temples, were always standardized, the body extended, head to the north, with pottery vessels of reasonable quality placed in the specially constructed grave. Generally, the more
elaborate the temple, the better quality of grave offerings" (Coe and Haviland 1964: 29). The most important factors here are the strictures of Maya religion, both folk and formal, on the manner of disposing the dead. It is these strictures which have produced the patterns shown in the preceding section of this thesis.

The other burials varied in terms of location, orientation, and position. Graves might or might not be specially constructed. Pottery vessels might or might not be included, and when they were, their number varied from one to four, and were placed anywhere with relation to the body. The lack of any correlation between these variables suggests that the burial accorded any one individual very probably was determined by three factors: his importance, the whim of the surviving relatives, and their means to provide a good burial (Coe and Haviland 1964: 29).

Also, "Associated with all presumed house groups were burials far less elaborate than those found in the importantly located graves or 'tombs' of the Great Plaza-North Acropolis area. The pottery vessels found in these graves often show evidence of prior use" (Haviland 1965: 17).

Coe and Haviland observe that,

.. . for the greater part of the population, a social continuum seems indicated, with considerable range between the rich and the poor. Within this continuum, the lack of evidence of clearly defined castes suggests considerable mobility. This social situation is what we might expect in a large population including economic specialists of one sort or another. It is similar to the situation in present-day Indian society in Mesoamerica, with its lack of formally recognized differential prestige based on wealth, power, and personal achievement (Coe and Haviland 1964: 29).

Certainly a condition indicative of social mobility is shown in the
adjoining table for Location of Late Classic Burials. The average number of vessels from the small house mound burials and from the small temple-pyramid burials is roughly equivalent. If number of vessels can be taken as an indicator of social rank, then the difference between what are two clearly distinct social groups is quite small. Small house mound burials are taken to be "lower class" graves. Small temple-pyramid burials probably represent chief members of lineages. That these two types are not often greatly different from one another may indicate either the democratizing influence of some religious provision, or that in fact there was not a great amount of social distance between classes.

Some apparently domestic groups included their own small temple or shrine. These are identified by their location on the east side of a plaza, their square shape, and the presence of one or more burials placed just prior to new construction. In contrast to those beneath houses, these 'dedicatory' burials are always located on the axis in a specially constructed grave with body extended, head to the north, and pottery vessels of reasonable quality included. The general arrangement of houses and associated buildings around a level court suggests an analogy with modern Maya practice, where similar units are occupied by multiple families in which married couples of two or more generations are related through the male line. Generally, one structure in each group stands apart from the others in terms of size, as well as quality of contemporary pottery and artifacts strewn on living surfaces. In those groups without special family temples, the greater number of burials, and invariably the richer burials, were in or near this house. Such houses perhaps housed the senior family of the group (Haviland 1965: 18).

These family temple-pyramids, usually located as the eastern structure of a group, are represented by 39 burials in this study. It is
postulated that the burials they contain are those of lineage heads or at least of persons of consequence in the extended family living in the associated domestic units. Full-time specialists seem to have made up a large fraction of the population of Tikal and "it seems most likely that the greater part of the population of Tikal was involved in economic pursuits other than farming" (Haviland 1965: 22). It may be that these specialists are the chief candidates for the occupants of these commonly occurring domestic settlements.

This specialist group would be that most directly dependent, aside from the theocrats themselves, on the existing social structure at Late Classic Tikal. They contributed most heavily to the economy and undoubtedly were the group most quickly affected by any fluctuation in the health of the economy. This group lived directly off the ideological elite, its ritual demands, its buying power, and its over-all command on the economy and social structure. Therefore this is the group most responsive to the Great Tradition, aside from the elite. Its living is made off the Great Tradition and when that Tradition fails the group of specialists disappears. And with it goes it craft knowledge and all of those material goods it consumed as an institution of civilization.

Speculations on the Tepeu.1–Tepeu 2 transition have yielded some knowledge about its probable nature. Causes for the transition are very difficult to explain except insofar as the obvious can be stated.
Perhaps the transition is the accumulation of many small unconscious changes in style. This is the usual explanation which really says very little. It allows, however, for the continued sway of the Great Tradition. Of course it is easy enough to say that some sort of assimilation of an idea is taking place in the transition, or that diffusion or innovation initiated the appearance of the change. This is again obvious. Remember, of course, that absolute numbers of vessels in graves increase in this period; perhaps the economy was growing wealthier. Furthermore, fancy scene painting on vessels either continues unabated or increases in Tepeu 2 which shows the undiminished power of both the economy, which had to support the artisan-experts, and the ritual caste who presumably sponsored and utilized and defined the usage for the highly decorated vessels. Tepeu 2 may represent the apex of priestly power at Tikal, the apex of the Great Tradition.

The other changes occurring for the first time in Tepeu 2 are a new slip, some new design elements, and a new kind of vessel leg. The changes show no departure from the range of possible technique, at least as far as can be seen. Therefore what are the processes involved in change from period to period, from Tepeu 1 to Tepeu 2? For the changes in pottery, the process is probably the fusion of new ideas into a basic tradition, the sort of inevitable change that results when a lot of people are working constantly with a plastic material in a tradition which allows a certain freedom in stylistic and formal innovation. All
of this of course may be allowed on the basis of a well exploited and sound economic base. The culture was obviously wealthy, probably more so in Tepeu 2 than Tepeu 1, and the proliferation of already established patterns within an on-going Great Tradition, one directed by a religious elite, is pretty much evidenced by the data covered.

Earlier a hypothesis was proposed to characterize the transition between Tepeu 1 and Tepeu 2. The transition was called piecemeal, smooth, non-violent, and probably indigenously governed. Now, after discussion, what is the status of the hypothesis? Can it be made a theory? Probably not; it has not been disproved, but its demonstration is only partial. But instead of changing it, a change the need for which is not demonstrated, it should be viewed as an inadequately tested explanation. One category of ceramics as a single, individual indicator of change is insufficient for adequate testing. But insofar as the data at hand support the hypothesis, and I believe they do, the hypothesis will, with few reservations, explain the actual condition involved in the transition under consideration and will help characterize the Great Tradition dominating that transition.

The change from Tepeu 2 to Tepeu 3 at Tikal and Uaxactun is characterized in the mortuary vessels by a marked switch from decorated ceremonial vessels to plain mortuary vessels with no decorations. Many of the mortuary vessels even fall within the range of the undecorated domestic wares, something not occurring before Tepeu 3. The
remarkable disappearance of decoration and the marked percentage of domestic wares in the burials is a change of greater dimensions than that operative between Tepeu I and 2, which probably indicates that either a different process is working or that the same process involved in the change from Tepeu I to 2 is here much intensified. Aside from these changes it is worth noting that vessel forms within the fine ware tradition remain constant in Tepeu 3 (R. E. Smith 1955: 92-3). In this period the quality of the pottery is not greatly affected by the disappearance of painting; in fact it is quite possible that the quality has improved. Certainly the forms seem to be no less well made.

To explain these few facts the following hypothesis is proposed:

The transition from Tepeu 2 to Tepeu 3 at Tikal witnesses either the disappearance or the severe restriction of the ideological hierarchy, that group which enforces the Great Tradition. Also, the transition marks the close of the Great Tradition as an active force at Tikal.

Grieder comments that,

with the violation of the pottery surface by representations of the third dimension, the painters emancipated themselves and gained artistic dominance over the potters. We might guess that the artistic dominance of the painters reflects a dominant social position, the painters being part of the priestly hierarchy or closely associated with it. Vase painting by the theocrafts would also account for the sharing of artistic, geometric, and philosophic ideas, the same few individuals being active in all branches of thought (Grieder 1964: 448).

There is no doubt that this tradition fell at the end of Tepeu 2, or rather its fall saw the end of the era. The cause of the fall is the
cause of the fall of the Classic Lowland Maya civilization. That particular riddle cannot be solved here.

Grieder again says, "with the collapse of high culture in the central lowlands, representational painting disappeared. Unlike the potter's arts it had not penetrated the folk culture, but disappeared with the other attainments of the theocratic class which we call Classic Culture" (Grieder 1964: 448). It is easy enough to guess that the economic pressures of an unsettled or declining economy are behind the disappearance of fancy ceremonial wares in Tepeu 3. With the increasing poverty of a culture the specialists painting these excellent ceramics would have been among the first to disappear from the hierarchical accumulation of specialists, ceremonialists, etc., who fed off an economic base hitherto providing a generous surplus. All this is especially true if the decoration on the vessel had meaning only of an esoteric nature, meaning which could be looked on as merely an accretion to the basic practices of the religion which were grounded in concepts connected with agriculture and seasonal prediction, the folk traditions. These concepts and the practices connected with them applied to economic well-being, not to esoteric calendrics and the burdensome worship of what might have seemed an ineffective pantheon in the light of economic troubles. This is only a speculation, but it is backed up by the continuity of basic vessel forms, by the average number of vessels per burial which remains constant, and, perhaps even more
strangely, by the ratio of solid and liquid holders which holds some
degree of constancy. These three features are perhaps better grounded
in Maya culture and therefore survived the collapse of the hierarchy
which enforced other features of the mortuary assemblage.

On the latter point of the ratio of drinking or liquid holders to
solid food or offering holders E von Vogt makes a pertinent point.

The Maya have a highly developed set of rules of etiquette
in relation to eating and drinking. These rules involve character-
istic bowing-and-releasing, greeting, and toasting procedures
that rigidly prescribe proper behavior in ritual eating situations
and express both rank order among participants as well as equal
sharing of the food and drink. In other words, although the order
of serving and eating and drinking follows the rank order of the
participants, all of the participants in a ritual situation end up
receiving an equal share. This pattern is noted in most con-
temporary Maya communities. . . . It is, of course, difficult
to make inferences about this pattern for earlier time levels,
but I suspect it is an old and important feature of Maya life
(Vogt 1964: 387).

If in fact this transition is a question of land exhaustion and
over-exploitation by too large a population coupled with a supposed
decline in the effectiveness of a ceremonial hierarchy, then I imagine
we have discovered--reflected in burial ceramics--a well known process
at work, one which can be called ideological adaptation, ritualistic
retreat, or broadly, economic stimuli reshaping the religious structure.
The Great Tradition is either dead or dying at Tikal. The ideological
force behind the culture no longer shows through with any clarity.
What we seem to come across now is folk religion, the little traditions.
The Great Tradition in the Maya Lowlands

An earlier section presented pertinent information from other sites in the Maya Lowlands and neighboring areas. The ideas developed in this thesis as a whole have validity in terms of Tikal and immediate vicinity. The comparative section is to show the spatial extent of some of those ideas. This survey can, of course, do little more than hint that there did exist at places like Uaxactún, Copán, and Holmul a number of the patterns found at Tikal.

At Uaxactún, a smaller, sister center to Tikal 11 miles away from it, the same divisions of the Late Classic are observed, being defined on the same bases, generally, as those at Tikal. At Uaxactún there are nine burials each with vessels from both Tepeu.1 and Tepeu.2. In these 18 burials with a total of 42 vessels in association, the same mixture of forms from the two periods in one burial is present, and also seen is the combination of form from one period and design from another on the same vessel. Further, there is at Uaxactún a whole set of intermediate forms. Many of these are clear precursors of forms later characteristic of Tepeu.2 which are found in Tepeu.1. The same average number of vessels per burial is present at Uaxactún, although interestingly enough the averages are reversed, Tepeu.1 averages three and Tepeu.2, two. On the hypothesized functional division Uaxactún gives support in that both Tepeu.1 and 2 show a two to one and one to one ratio respectively in solid to liquid holders. Notice that at Tikal Tepeu 1
had the one to one ratio, and Tepeu 2 the two to one ratio. Uaxactún also had a larger number of vessels per burial in Tepeu I than in Tepeu 2. At Uaxactún the most skillful painting on ceramics occurs in Tepeu 1. Could it be that Uaxactún reached its florescence before Tikal as these facts might indicate, or did it simply decline sooner? Or are there enough data for legitimate conclusion?

None of the other centers corroborates the Tikal data as well as Uaxactún does, but none are as close geographically. Zaculeu, in the Highlands, diverges most, but it is in a different cultural zone and could be expected to. San José diverges because it is such a small and poor center. Copán is most heartening. It is 200 miles away from Tikal and supports the Tikal patterns in average number of vessels per burial, in the functional ratio of vessels and more than supports Tikal in the ceramic decoration accomplishments.

No one really doubts the unity of the Lowland Maya area on artistic grounds. I would prefer to stress the similarities found in this too brief survey of Lowland centers. In terms of a Great Tradition, a dominant, but not necessarily politically unified ideological force, the whole of the Petén, and probably the whole Maya region, is a consistent unit exemplifying that unity in material results which is a function of a single ideo-religious system: one geographically pervasive Great Tradition. This is a condition not at all unlike that of the politically independent but religiously similar Greek city-states, or those politically
fragmented, but ideologically identical city-states which populated Italy during her Renaissance.

**Summary: The Great Tradition in Time and Place**

A Great Tradition contains a core of traits which are seen archaeologically as the remnants of what have been called the secondary institutions. These are those aspects of a civilization which a Great Tradition finds. Some of these manifestations of a Great Tradition are a unified art style, a recognizable architectural style, the use of exact and predictive sciences (V. G. Childe 1950: 3 ff.); and I have added the use of a consistent mortuary tradition.

These traits are to be found together in the Late Classic at Tikal. There is very little question that they can be found in the Early Classic at that same center, although probably in different form. How far before the Classic they extend is not possible to say here, but no doubt, all have their roots, insofar as those roots are folk customs, little traditions, in this period. How far beyond Tikal this pattern extends is again not a safely answered question. But in terms of the Central Region, the Petén, as exhibited at Uaxactún, San José, and Holmul, and outside of this region at Copán and Zaculeu, there is a pattern, and my assumption is that the pattern is caused by the Great Tradition manifesting itself at all of these.
To illustrate this and to place the specific topic considered here, the mortuary tradition, into perspective the following chart is presented. The horizontal axis will be the Peten, although it could probably cover a much larger region. The outer boundaries of the outline represent all those traits connected with Maya high civilization, including of course the mortuary tradition. The Pre-classic and Early Classic are drawn here tentatively because they have not been researched with an eye to the data which are used to characterize the Late Classic. It is assumed, though, that the Pre-classic and Early Classic see established in the Peten the roots of Maya civilization. The Late Classic certainly grows in terms of internal complexity and probably in terms of geographic spread; therefore that part of the outline too has to be unclear. Also the spread and extent of the decline in Tepeu 3 and the Post-classic is only poorly understood, making that portion of the silhouette vague. There is no question about the general outline; it is one of a proliferating, elaborating tradition. At what point it emerges as a Great Tradition is uncertain, although I have arbitrarily chosen the start of the Early Classic. But it is, however, quite clear when that Tradition is dead.
The Petén and the extent of Maya culture within it
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