

KAKUPACAL AND THE ITZAS

By David H. KELLEY

University of Nebraska

In a previous paper (Kelley, 1962a, pp. 304-6), I suggested that a series of five glyphs, occurring together frequently at Chichen Itza, should be read Kakupacal, the name of a "valorous captain of the Itzas". In that study, the emphasis was on the nature of the Maya script, and the historical and glyphic context of the series had to be passed over lightly. In the present paper, the primary emphasis is on the historic meaning of this identification, but continuing differences of opinion as to the interpretation of the script make a brief summary of the phonetic evidence necessary. Hence, this paper contains 1) phonetic evidence for the reading *ka-ku-pa-cal-l(a)*; 2) contextual evidence indicating that this sequence is a personal name; 3) historic evidence referring to the known captain of the Itzas, Kakupacal.

1. *Phonetic evidence*

The Russian scholar, Yuri Knorozov, in an important series of papers, has attempted to show that some Mayan hieroglyphs are used in a purely phonetic way, in which two graphemes may be used to represent a single morpheme, and that such glyphs stood for an initial consonant and a following vowel. My reasons for accepting this view, in its general outlines, have been presented in detail previously (Kelley, 1962a). In the light of an extensive critique by Thompson (1963), I would be prepared to admit the possible validity of an alternate reading of some variants of the month Mac (*ma/mac* rather than *ma-aac*), but otherwise stand by my previous views.

The glyph series which I read Kakupacal occurs fourteen times in the inscriptions of Chichen Itza, with some slight variations. In terms of Zimmermann's transcription system, the most typical form would be 166-84:1302-1300-81-1320. In Thompson's system, it would be 669.604.

586:25:178 (with substitutions of T27 or T205 for T25, and of T254 for T178). T178 frequently, but not always, appears doubled. Three of these five glyphs appear in Landa, and the full phonetic value is given for all three of them. T669 is Landa's *ka*, T604 is Landa's *ku*, and T25 is Landa's *ca*. Evidence outside Landa is particularly good for T604. The doubled form T604.604 occurs in the *Dresden* codex as a way of writing 'quetzal', and T604:219 appears as 'vulture'. These meanings were apparently first recognized by Cyrus Thomas (1888), who read them respectively as *kukuitz* and *kuch*; Seler (1892) read the quetzal group as *kukul*, and Thompson (1958, p. 305) read simply *kuk*. I follow Knorozov (1955a, p. 89, nos. 164, 167) in reading *ku-l(u)*, 'quetzal', and *ku-ch(e)*, 'vulture'. For other evidence on the interpretation of T219 as *che/ce*, see Kelley (1962a). Barthel (1955, p. 15) has identified the glyph as a bird's nest (Yucatec *ku*) with eggs in it, an identification already made by Brasseur de Bourbourg (as pointed out by Barthel, 1964, p. 224). Although Thompson seems to think that T604 alone stands for 'quetzal' (*kuk*), the reading *ku* seems widely accepted. However, the glyph is not crucial between a phonetic or non-phonetic interpretation, since *ku* also means 'god' and can stand alone as a morpheme.

While there are a number of plausible readings of the glyph T669 as *ka* in various contexts, none of them is compelling in itself. Thompson (1950, p. 266) suggested several possible readings, including *et*, *mach*, and *kab*. Barthel first accepted the reading *et*, but now accepts *kab* (Barthel, 1964, p. 224). This is certainly the most plausible reading from an ideographic viewpoint, as *kab* means 'hand', and the glyph is certainly a hand. Barthel points out that the sequence T669.602 would then mean 'hand of god', a Mayan euphemism for the flint knife used in human sacrifice. He leaves the following sequence unexplained.

The best evidence outside Landa for the value *ca* for T25 is to be found in variants of the names for the months Zec (usually miswritten Tzec) and Mac. In virtually all compounds in which T25 is found, the fish-head or the full fish (T738) sometimes occurs as a substitute. For the month Zec, the *Dresden* gives Landa's letter *c* followed by T25. Since *c* in Spanish is pronounced *se*, I have assumed that this is the correct reading, giving *se-c(a)*; the Spanish *z* was actually used to indicate a Yucatec Maya *s*-sound, so this is an exact correspondence. For the month Mac, one sometimes finds the compound T74:738. T74 is Landa's *ma*, and T738 is the fish-head. Thompson, who first recognized a fish-head which seems to be read as *xoc*, 'shark, count', identifies this fish with the *ca* fish (Thompson, 1944, pp. 5-10).

I believe that the *xoc* head and the *ca* head can be distinguished despite many common characteristics. In a number of places where Thompson would read *xoc*, 'count', I would read *ca*, 'then', supporting Landa, although I have no clearcut proof.

This leaves two elements not considered by Landa. The final 'inverted Ahau' (T178) precedes the *kin* glyph (T544) in the long recognized glyph for 'east'. In Yucatec, the word for 'east' is normally *likin*, more rarely in religious texts *lakin*. Linguistically, one would assume that the form *likin* represents assimilation from *lakin*. If the sequence T178:544 represents 'east', which is *lakin*, and if T544 is universally recognized as *kin*, it hardly seems to be stretching the evidence much to regard T178 as *la*. This is preferable on etymological grounds to *li*. DeRosny early suggested a reading *l*, *li*. Any alternative interpretation would depend on using some non-Yucatec word for 'east'. In any case, in terms of the interpretations made by Knorozov and myself, either *-l(i)* or *-l(a)* would be acceptable in the reading *Kakupacal*.

The only glyph in the series which is dependent on a reading first made by Knorozov is the identification of T586 as *pa*. Knorozov (1955a, p. 73, n° 109) identified T715 as *pa*. This glyph differs from T586 only in the absence of the internal hatching of T586. Frequently, glyphs in the codices differ from those on the monuments only in the presence of cross hatching on the monuments where the equivalent in the codices are open. On the basis of a considerable number of plausible but not fully probative readings, I had accepted Knorozov's reading of T715 as *pa*. The identification of T715 and T586 is implicit in Zimmermann's classification of a cross-hatched glyph from the codices with the open ones (cf. Kelley, 1962a, p. 289).

Independently of the phonetic values, I had already decided that this 5-grapheme sequence represented a name. In terms of Knorozov's studies, and of readings which I had fully accepted, this sequence could only be read *Ka-ku-pa-ca-l(a)*, i.e. *Kakupacal*. *Kakupacal* is known as the name of an Itza captain, and is apparently to be read *Kak-u-pacal*, 'Fire-his-shield'. The etymological division *kak-u* does not coincide with the glyphic division *ka-ku*; this and the visual difference between T586 and T715 actually prevented me from recognizing this name even after I had decided that it should be a name.

The sequence T586:25:178 and its variants also appears in a number of other inscriptions. In these, it should be read *pacal*, 'shield'. Good verification of this is to be found at Palenque. Thompson regards T602 as a local variant of T586, with which I fully agree. Three parallel phrases from the Temple of the Inscriptions show that the sequence

T602:25:178 may occur with a shield ideograph or that either this sequence or the shield ideograph may occur separately in otherwise similar contexts. To me this suggests the use of determinatives, in the Egyptian sense, in which the ideograph 'shield' and the phonetic rendering '*pa-ca-l(a)*' complement one another, so that either the ideograph distinguishes between two possible meanings of the word *pacal*, or the phonetic *pacal* indicates which of several words for shield is intended.

There is one piece of interesting but far from definitive evidence from Yaxchilan. Barthel has pointed out the parallelism of the sequence I read *pacal* and a passage on Lintel 46. There, at F8, is T1.44:669. 586:25:178 and in G8 is T60:751. The text refers to the reign of "Shield Jaguar" (Proskouriakoff, 1963) whose usual glyphs are found in G5. Here G8 is the so-called "knotted Jaguar", and to find a phonetic series which I read *pacal*, 'shield', preceding this seems to me suggestive, if somewhat puzzling.

All the evidence taken together seems to me to strongly support a reading *Kakupacal* for the entire series. To find a meaningful sequence of this length, composed entirely of phonetic glyphs, is the best possible type of support for the general thesis as to the nature of the Maya writing which is advocated by Knorozov. Given the importance of this problem, it seems desirable to assess the context as fully as possible, to see if there is really good evidence for regarding this sequence as a personal name.

2. T669.604.586:25:178 as a personal name

In a previous study (Kelley, 1962b), I attempted to show certain features which seemed normally to be associated with personal names in the Mayan inscriptions. The clearest evidence for the present problem lies in the occurrence of the *Kakupacal* sequence immediately preceding a glyph containing T565. This glyph, with varying affixes, normally falls between two sets of names or titles. I have assumed that it denotes some sort of relationship; normally, but not always, a sexual relationship between a male and a female. If this is the case here, the following glyphs may be a woman's name. There is no compelling evidence for or against this latter view.

Good evidence may be found in the relationship of the supposed *Kakupacal* glyphs to the 'fish-in-hand' glyph. Proskouriakoff (1960, p. 470) has pointed out that the latter is normally associated with a ritual or observance connected with a snake deity. The 'fish-in-hand' appears structurally as a verb in Classic Peten sites, and the subject is normally

a historic individual, identified by recognizable names or titles. In the *Casa Colorada*, this verb appears in glyph block 20 and the 'kakupacal' sequence in glyph blocks 22-23. I cannot explain the intermediate glyphs (which include *tut kinil* 'imix' *tu* —), but doubt that *kinil* is, here, 'day' and suspect it is, rather, 'priest'. Glyph block 24 opens with the mannequin death's head, which I regard as a variant of the masculine *ah*, and which characteristically appears in titles. Finally, in glyph block 25 is a so-called '*ahau* variant' which is, I suspect, the Emblem Glyph for Chichen Itza. Such a sequence is most appropriate in connection with a personal name. The 'kakupacal' glyphs also precede the putative emblem glyph in other cases, usually with an intervening glyph block.

At a more general level, this sequence of glyphs is the commonest sequence at Chichen Itza. In most other sites, the commonest glyphs, aside from known calendrical glyphs, are personal names or titles of rulers. To me, this has supporting weight in identifying this sequence as a personal name. In Barthel's interpretation, this involves frequently repeated references to the sacrificial knife. While it is clear that some of these texts refer to ceremonialism, as Barthel has clearly shown, such an extreme emphasis seems to me to go far beyond what we know from other Mayan sites, or from other parts of the world. Moreover, the evidence suggesting that any other glyphs at Chichen Itza are historical names is very scanty.

3. *Kakupacal in Mayan historical documents*

It is an unfortunate fact that the documentary materials for Maya history are so inadequate and the state of Maya historiography so poor that there is very little agreement on the interpretation of the few sources we have. This disagreement extends even to the translation of the basic sources from Maya. There is general agreement on the role of Quetzalcoatl-Kukulcan as a Toltec who played an important part at Chichen Itza, but there is no agreement as to his absolute date, as to his relative date within the Toltec period, or as to his relationship with the Itzas. If we are to understand even the few historical references available to us, we must know who the Itzas were and we must have some sort of chronological framework. The latter question is tied in various ways to the correlation problem, although the relatively few attempts to use the material for this problem have been marred by naïveté. The view that every time the Itzas are said to have left their homes, the site which they left was completely abandoned seems un-

likely. The apparent intended chronology of the colonial Maya chronicles has been accepted with little examination.

An adequate study of the Mayan historical documents would have to include a discussion of all disputed points of translation, a consideration of the inter-relationships of our sources, a full analysis of both Mexican and Mayan sources on Quetzalcoatl, and a new study of the correlation problem. The much more limited attempt here is to present another interpretation, with mention of some of the opposing views and some of the reasons which may be presented for the variety of existing opinions.

A central problem for the present purpose is the interpretation of the evidence referring to the Itzas. They have been regarded as southern Mayas, intrusive among the Yucatecan Mayas during the Classic Period, as derived from Classic Period Yucatecan Mayas (both of which views imply that they represent the 'Chichen Itza Maya's of the Toltec period monuments), as the Chichen Itza Toltecs, or as one of several sorts of post-Toltec intruders. For Barrera Vásquez (1948, p. 50), the Itzas arrived in Bacalar between 415 and 435 A.D., and "discovered" Chichen Itza about 60 years later. They left Chichen for Chakanputun between 672-692 and returned to Chichen between 968-987, k'atun 4 Ahau, which he identifies as 10.8.0.0.0 of the long count, in agreement with the Thompson correlation. He thinks that the Itza arrived for the second time at about the same time as the beginning of Toltec influence at Chichen Itza.

Spinden (1913, pp. 216 ff.) has a similar interpretation, as do several other Maya scholars. In these cases, the argument rests on assuming the essential accuracy of the chronicles in their present form. If the dated references to the Itzas put the Itzas at Chichen Itza during the Classic Period, then the Itzas must be Chichen Maya. The implicit argument is a compelling one, but the implicit premise that the dates are accurate seems much more dubious.

Jakeman (1945, p. 166 ff.) points out that the Itzas, although called "foreigners to the land" are also called the rulers, the great men, the "lineages of the land" —in short, that they are identified as the priestly and ruling class. He likewise connects their name with that of Itzamna, an important culture hero and patron deity of the writing and calendar systems. He finally identifies them with the ruling class of the Mayas from the beginning of the Classic (or earlier?) onwards, but regards them as a distinct ethnic unit in the population. Jakeman suggests that they may have originated in the Tabasco region, and were perhaps originally speakers of Chontal "or perhaps an ancient

extinct language of that region before its occupation by the Chontal Mayans." (Jakeman, 1945, p. 185).

Barthel (1964, *passim*) thinks the Itzas were a group of Cholti, from the Palenque region, who were responsible for the Mayan inscriptions at Chichen Itza. He claims to read "Ti-ch'een" as a primitive form of Chichen. However Classic Period *ti* remained *ti* in Yucatec, and Yucatec *chi*, 'mouth', has parallels in *ch* forms in other Mayan languages, so the proposed equation is linguistically impossible. He also claims to recognize the ethnic name *Chol-ti*, with a more doubtful reading of "Itza". In spite of the fact that I am in essential agreement with his conclusions, I am unable to accept any of these three readings as valid. The more general statement of similarities between the pre-Toltec inscriptions of Chichen and the inscriptions at Palenque is, however, entirely valid.

According to Tozzer (1957, I, p. 36), the Itza "have most often been regarded as 'foreigners' who occupied Chichen Itza during the Tula-Toltec period and were responsible for 'new Chichen'." This "conventional" view has probably rested mainly upon the facts that the most impressive materials from Chichen Itza are those of the Toltec period, that the name of Chichen Itza is so intimately connected with the Itza, and that the Itzas are referred to as speaking brokenly. It is also often based on chronological reinterpretations of the Mayan chronicles. Probably the strongest proponent of this view has been J. Eric Thompson, who states it well, and adds several additional arguments (Thompson, 1954, pp. 98-100). He quotes the statement that Kukulcan came with the Itzas, assigns the coming of both to a katun 4 Ahau which he dates from 967-987 A.D., and points out that some scholars have favored 978 A.D. as the date for the expulsion of Quetzalcoatl from Tula. Thompson likewise points out that the *Chumayel* refers to the Itza emblems as the bird, the flat precious stone, and the jaguar, and that the bird and the jaguar are very important in Toltec representations at Chichen Itza. While there can be no doubt of a special prominence attached to these symbols at Chichen, the jaguar throne is already characteristic of Classic Maya sites, and even birds are not completely absent. Thompson wavers between the view that the Itza are true Toltecs (of the highlands) and that they are "thoroughly Toltecized" Mayas, perhaps Chontal.

Tozzer (1957, I, p. 1) writes "According to the theory offered here, the Itza are not to be identified with the Toltec, who entered the country and left their unmistakable imprint on Chichen, beginning about 1000. They are here regarded as a relatively unimportant Mexican group who arrived in the city a few years after it had been

'destroyed' about 1200." This view depends on various rearrangements of the entries in the chronicles, and agrees to a large extent with Roys, although there are some differences of interpretation. Roys (Pollock, Roys, Proskouriakoff and Smith, 1962, pp. 40-1) points out that the Itza were called *dzul*, 'foreigners' and *u nunil Ah Itza*, 'the Itza who speak our language badly', remarking that *nunil* is an obvious borrowing from Nahuatl *nontli*, 'dumb', but that their literature indicates a Maya cultural background.

Roys (p. 45 and elsewhere) points out that the Xiu were anti-Itza, whereas the Cocombs don't seem to have been. To me, this suggests a quite different interpretation than has been customary. The Xiu have a Mexican name, and their account of their origin, in the chronicles, mentions Tulapan and Chiconauhtlan, Nahua names, as places from which they came. The word which they use to say that the Itza speak badly is identified by Roys as a Nahua word. The Cocombs, on the other hand, have a Mayan name, and, in general, seem more Mayan, although there are some indications of claims of Mexican descent among them, too. I would suggest, therefore, that the description of the Itza as "foreigners" is from the viewpoint of the Mexican intruders, represented by the Xius. People seldom think of themselves as the foreigners even when they are in a new land. I would also suggest that the original language which the Itza spoke badly was Nahua and that they spoke it badly because their native tongue was some Mayan language, probably Yucatec. The fact that the Itza "captain", Kakupacal, has a thoroughly Mayan name supports the view that the Itzas were Mayans. The contrast with the "Seven Men of Mayapan" and their Mexican names is marked.

While we have relatively little information about Kakupacal, he is mentioned in a number of seemingly independent sources. Cogolludo (1954, vol. I, p. 352), in his relation of deities, says that there was one "...que fingieron traía en las batallas una rodela de fuego, con que se abroquelaba, llamado *Kakupacal*, vista de fuego". The account of Gaspar Antonio Chi (a Xiu source), repeated in a number of *Relaciones de Yucatán*, has been reconstructed and translated by Jakeman (1945, p. 97) as follows: "the inhabitants of the said town (of Itzamal) were conquered by Kak-u-pacal and Uilu, valorous captains of the Itzas, formerly of the city of Mayapan." In one of the versions, the name of Uilu was miscopied *cien*, and Kakupacal has been supposed to have had a full hundred Itza captains under him. Jakeman's reconstruction makes it abundantly clear that the "100 Itza captains" never existed. In the *Relación de Motul*, it is said that Motul was conquered 140 years after it was founded. "Al cabo de los bino

contra el señor que entonces hera del dicho pueblo de mutul otro señor y capitán llamado Rarupacal, con gente de guerra y le mató y depobló al pueblo." Tozzer's translation (ed. Landa, p. 24, f.n. 129) is "at the end of which time they turned against the leader who then was another leader and captain of this pueblo of Motul called Kakupacal. With warriors they killed him and depopulated the town". It seems to me, however, that a more reasonable translation would make Kakupacal the conqueror rather than the conquered. Since we do not know when Motul was supposed to have been founded, the apparent precision of the date of Kakupacal in that account does not help us much.

Kakupacal and his companion, Tec Uilu, recur in the third chronicle of Chumayel (Chronicle V, of Barrera Vásquez and Morley, 1949, hereinafter referred to as "the fifth chronicle"). The translation by Barrera Vásquez is followed, save for the omission of interpretative remarks and the correction of Kakupacal to Kakupacat, which is what the sources have. Since *pacal* is now known to be a word for shield (Roys, 1962, p. 51) and to bear a fiery shield (Barrera Vásquez and Rendón, 1948, p. 72), there seems to be no justification correcting the texts from *pacal* to *pacat*. The fifth chronicle reads "8 Ahau, this is the katun when they established themselves, the remainder of the Itza, who went under the trees, under the bushes, in Tanxulucmul, thus the place is named. From there they proceeded, when they established themselves in Sacactun Mayapan, thus the place is named. In tun 7 or 8 Ahau, the katun, this same is the katun in which Chakanputun died because of Kakupacal and Tec Uilu." This fifth chronicle has more names and more precise dates, with none of the strange repetitions found in Chronicles I-III, which are actually three copies of a single document). These factors indicate that the fifth chronicle is more reliable than the others. This chronicle dates the arrival of Bishop Toral in tun 6, of katun 9 Ahau. Since we know Toral arrived in 1562, simple calculation puts "tun 7 of 8 Ahau" in 1189. However, this would be impossible in terms of the usual placement of the katun 13 Ahau which ended about the time of the Spanish conquest. Because of this, and because the three copies of the first chronicle were formerly regarded as three independent documents, the testimony of the first chronicle has usually been preferred. The three versions have been given separate numbers by Barrera Vásquez and Morley, but here all are referred to as 'the first chronicle'.

The first chronicle differs radically from the fifth chronicle. Most events are put in different katuns by the two sources, and some events which have a single clear date in the fifth chronicle seem to have

multiple dates, sometimes 260 years apart, in the other chronicles. Events put in katuns 1 Ahau by the fifth chronicle are put in katuns 8 Ahau by the first chronicle. These distortions suggest the use of two (or more) different katun counts. For this reason, it is difficult to equate events in the chronicles with assurance. According to the first chronicle, the *paxci Chakanputun*, the 'abandonment' or 'depopulation' of Chakanputun occurred in a katun 8 Ahau placed from 928-948. I believe that this 'depopulation' of Chakanputun corresponds to its 'death' by Kakupacal and Uilu, assigned to the same katun name, but placed at 1189, a 260-year cycle later.

At any rate, it seems quite clear that there was a tradition of two Itza captains named Kakupacal and Tec Uilu who were responsible for the conquest or depopulation of Motul, Itzamal, and Chakanputun, and who established themselves at Mayapan. They were associated with Chichen Itza in our sources only in the sense that any Itza leaders might have some connection with the settlement which bears their name. Since archaeology indicates that the Mayapan settlement belongs principally to the post-Toltec period, and since I think the fifth chronicle is the most reliable source, I am inclined to accept the 1189 date for Kakupacal. I would presume that the presence of the Itzas indicates a Mayan resurgence.

The inscriptions from the monuments at Chichen Itza which have been interpreted as mentioning Kakupacal have a very restricted chronological distribution, from 10.2.0.15.3 to 10.2.12.2.4, a period of less than twelve years. All fall in katun 1 Ahau. This interpretation depends on acceptance of Thompson's "new method" for reading Yucatecan dates (Thompson, 1937), which seems to me entirely reliable. In the Thompson correlation, they range from 869 to 881 A.D., in the Spinden correlation from 609-621 A.D. If the chronicles could be relied on for their dates, either of these would be too early for the companions Kakupacal and Tec Uilu. However, I have emphasized the notorious untrustworthiness of the dates in the chronicles, and the correlation problem is still far from settled. As long as only the name Kakupacal is known, I do not think we can be sure whether this is the same individual known from the historical documents, or some predecessor of the same name. If we could find the name of his associate, Tec Uilu, in the inscriptions, it would go far to support the view that the same individual is mentioned, and that the chronicle dates are wrong.

One does find, in close association with 'kakupacal' the glyphs T35:568. T568 has been widely regarded as associated with sacrifice, but I have followed Knorozov in reading it *lu*. It is by no means certain that T35:568 refers in any way to a personal name; judging solely by

our present limited knowledge of context, I would have been inclined to think it a title of Kakupacal and others. As a speculation, I would suggest that it might be Uilu (probably to be read *wi-lu*, or *bi-lu*, not *u-il-u*). In the Monjas, it directly precedes the glyphs which I read *ah kak*, 'the burner', and which seem to be associated with fire-drilling ceremonialism.

Glyphs which frequently follow those of Kakupacal are T669:117. 178, which seem to be a title or qualifying phrase. These should be read *ka-* — *-la*, but I do not know what the word may be. In the fifth doorway of the Monjas, this sequence follows 'kakupacal' and immediately precedes the T35:568 sequence previously mentioned.

One minor item supporting the view that the "Chichen Maya" were the Itzas is to be found in the glyph sequence: IV:559:528. (Yula I, B5). I accept Knorozov's reading of this as *can tzuc*, the 'four groups' (Knorozov, 1958, p. 285, n° 14). According to Barrera Vásquez and Morley (1949, p. 47), *cantzuculcaboo* was an older name of the Itzas. It derives from this root 'four groups'. Unfortunately, I have not been able to make much of the context of this reference. The statements about the 'four groups' in the fourth chronicle suggest that the term was particularly applied to migrating Itza groups, but this may not have been the older usage. For those who maintain a more ideographic viewpoint, this is probably simply another version of the glyph for 'turkey' with the graphemes reversed. I will leave it to those who hold this view to explain the possible meaning of 'four turkeys' in this context.

If these inscriptions do, in fact, chronicle the deeds of that Kakupacal known from the documents, we may expect to find some record of warfare and conquest in them. Hopefully, there should be references to place names —perhaps even Chakanputun, Motul, or Itzamal. However, I have so far been unable to detect probable place names, much less identify them. The early texts associated with the name of Kakupacal in the Casa Colorada seem to be associated with fire-drilling and other ceremonies, rather than war and conquest. Barthel (1955, p. 10) has drawn attention to the glyphs which he reads *nabte*, 'spear', and which he associates, very reasonably, with war. In the Akabtzip, the jawbone and fan glyphs, which Barthel (1964, p. 228) has shown are symbols of authority, are followed by a glyph with an axe (*bat*) prefixed, followed in turn by *nabte*. Barthel and I agree that the 'moon' glyph preceding the jawbone and fans is to be read as *kalaan*, 'ruler', although I do not accept the prefix as *ah*. Preceding this is the 'imix variant' which I have suggested is to be read *ba* with a knot suffix, which I think is *tab*, 'tie', thus giving the title *batab* (known

in similar contexts from the bones texts of Tikal). Thus, most of these glyphs seem to be titles. *Nabte* is a known Yucatecan family name, so the context here suggests this use, rather than a reference to war as such. Of course, 'spear' is not apt to be a personal or family name in a society where war is unimportant. Thus, despite reference to 'fire', 'spear', 'axe' and 'jawbone' I can find no clearcut references to war and conquest.

Although I have previously drawn attention only to those references suggesting that Kakupacal was the name of one or more historical individuals, there is some evidence that the name was also applied to a deity.

Barthel (personal communication) has drawn my attention to *Dresden 36a* where God B is shown holding a shield from which seems to come smoke or flames. This might suggest that "Fire-his-shield" was some sort of euphemistic name or title of God B. However, the god is holding a torch in his other hand and the flames apparently coming from the shield may well be thought of as deriving from another torch in the hand hidden behind the shield. The mere association of a shield and a torch seem insufficient to justify an equation with Kakupacal, since they might be equally well associated with any deity making war. Interestingly, the glyphic equivalent of this combination is found on Copan, Stela A at B9b1, which I would read T122.624 (although apparently not so read by Thompson). T122.624 in this context may be part of a personal name. The reading *Kap-pacal* is tempting and offers some support to thinking that T122 alone might (sometimes?) be *kak*. If the *u* is held to be implicit in such an ideographic compound, this conclusion would affect a variety of problems of decipherment.

Conclusions

The presence of the name Kakupacal in the inscriptions of Chichen Itza validates the view that the Mayan inscriptions of Chichen Viejo were the work of the Itzas. Even if the name were borne by more than one Itza captain, it is unlikely to have been borne by individuals of completely foreign groups. However, neither the chronology nor the deeds of the Kakupacal of the chronicles seems to coincide with the Kakupacal of the inscriptions on present evidence. The only remaining evidence suggesting their identity is the inherent improbability that the individual most prominent in the inscriptions of Chichen Itza should be distinct from one of the few prominent figures of the historical tradition of later times who bore the same name.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARRERA VÁSQUEZ, Alfredo and Silvia RENDÓN
 1948 *El Libro de los Libros de Chilam Balam*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, México.
- BARRERA VÁSQUEZ, Alfredo and Sylvanus G. MORLEY
 1949 "The Maya Chronicles", *Carnegie Institution*, Pub. 585, Washington, D. C.
- BARTHEL, Thomas
 1955 "Versuch über die Inschriften von Chich'en Viejo" *Baessler-Archiv*, n.f., 3, pp. 5-33, Berlin.
 1964 "Comentarios a las inscripciones clásicas Tardías de Chich'en Itzá", *Estudios de Cultura Maya* 4, pp. 223-244.
- COGOLLUDO, Diego López
 1954 *Historia de Yucatán*. Historia Mexicana, Campeche, 3 tomos.
- JAKEMAN, M. Wells
 1945 *The Origins and History of the Mayas*, Los Angeles.
- KELLEY, David H.
 1962a "Fonetismo en la escritura maya", *Estudios de Cultura Maya* 2, pp. 277-317.
 1962b "Glyphic evidence for a dynastic sequence at Quirigua, Guatemala", *American Antiquity* 27, pp. 323-335.
- KNOROV, Yuri
 1955 "La escritura de los antiguos mayas", *Academia de Ciencias de la URSS*, Moscú.
 1958 "The problem of the study of the Maya hieroglyphic writing", *American Antiquity* 23, pp. 284-291.
- LANDA, see Tozzer.
- MORLEY, cf. Barrera Vásquez.
- POLLOCK, Harry E. D., Ralph L. ROYS, Tatiana PROSKOURIAKOFF, and A. Ledyard SMITH
 1962 *Mayapan, Yucatan, Mexico*, Carnegie Institution, Pub. 619, Washington, D. C.
- PROSKOURIAKOFF, Tatiana
 1960 "Historical implications of a pattern of dates at Piedras Negras Guatemala", *American Antiquity*, 25, pp. 454-475.
 1963 "Historical data in the inscriptions of Yaxchilan, I", *Estudios de Cultura Maya* 3, pp. 149-167.
- RELACIONES DE YUCATÁN
 1898- in *Colección de documentos inéditos relativos al descubrimiento, conquista y organización de las antiguas posesiones españolas de ultramar*, 2nd ser., vols. 11, 13. Madrid.
- ROYS, Ralph L.
 1962 "Literary sources for the History of Mayapan", in Pollock *et al.*, 1962, pp. 23-86.
- SELER, Eduard
 1892 "Does there really exist a phonetic key to the Maya hieroglyphic writing?", *Science* 20, No 499, pp. 121-122.

SPINDEN, Herbert J.

1913 *A Study of Maya art*, Peabody Museum Memoirs, 6, Cambridge, Mass.

THOMAS, Cyrus

1888 "Aids to the study of the Maya codices", *Ann. Report, Bur. Am. Eth.*, 6.

THOMPSON, J. Eric

1937 "A new method of deciphering Yucatan dates with special reference to Chichen Itza", *Pub. 483, Carnegie Institution*, Washington, D. C.

1944 "The fish as a Maya symbol for counting and a further discussion of directional glyphs", *Theoretical Approaches to Problems*, 2, Carnegie Institution, Cambridge, Mass.

1950 *Maya Hieroglyphic Writing: Introduction*, Pub. 589, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

1954 *The Rise and Fall of Maya Civilization*, Univ. of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Okla.

1958 "Symbols, glyphs, and divinatory almanacs for diseases in the Maya Dresden and Madrid codices", *American Antiquity* 23, pp. 297-308.

1962 *A Catalog of Maya Hieroglyphs*, Univ. of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

1963 "Algunas consideraciones respecto al desciframiento de los jeroglíficos mayas", *Estudios de Cultura Maya* 3, pp. 119-148.

TOZZER, Alfred M.

1941 *Landa's Relación de las cosas de Yucatán*, Peabody Museum Papers, vol. 18, Cambridge, Mass.

1957 *Chichen Itza and its cenote of sacrifice*, Peabody Museum Memoirs, 11, 12, Cambridge, Mass.

ZIMMERMANN, Günter

1956 *Die Hieroglyphen der Maya-Handschriften*, Hamburg.