during the two katuns before
Is it reasonable to suppose that, before every-hotun-marking gegan

at 10.5.0.0.0, the third hotuns only would have been marked? This can be

answered affirmatively. The Maya probably were concerned with the moon-ages

at katun-ends, and must have learned that they tend to drop by 5 or 6 days

per katun. This means that they tend to drop a little more than one day only

(6 × 29.53 = 1801.33; 1801.33 − 1800 = 1.33).

per quarter-katun, i.e. per hotun. But these average changes are subkect to

two

lunar variation and calculating error, so that successive hotun-ends might

Herein lies a possible partial reason for odd hotun-marking

actually be observed to show precisely the same moon-ages. This means that

the third hotun, but not the first or second, might be at same-age as the

the 3rd hotun,

katun-end. Thus it might seem fitting to carve the record for that, as well as

all-important

for the katun-end itself, though the labor of permanently recording

a Suupplementary Series record for the two earlier hotun-ends might not, at first

seem required.

We have a very strong indication that Stelae 25 and 26, marking

with same-age relationships

9.8.15.0.0 and 9.9.15.0.0 were connected in the Maya mind , and with each other.

They were placed togwther on the same stelae platform; And on Stela 25, the

date 12 Cauac 12 Zac is located at 9.8.10.4.19, while on Stela 26, a date

4 Zip 11 Chuen is located at 9.9.14.2.11. Between these two dates there are

~~265 days more than~~ are 10372 days,

The earliest period-markers of the Maya area generally mark katun-ends, but not the intervening "odd" hotuns. According to Morley's readings, outside of Piedras Negras the earliest such "odd" markers are two at Copan, at 9.9.5.0.0 and 9.10.0.0.0. (Morley, 1938, Vol. IV, pp. 386-387) Only here at Poedraz Negras is there a convincing series showing marking of every hotun, and this does not begin until 9.10.5.0.0. Morley carries this back to 9.8.15.0.0 by assignin plain and illegible stelae to 9.9.0.0.0, 9.9.5.0.0, 9.9.10.0.0 these being, (Stelae 28, 24, and 27 respectively) respectively, Stelae 28, 24 and 27. The assignments are with three question-marks and obviously depend on the notion that, once legible marked, an odd hotun was marked the practice of marking each in turn must have begun. The evidence at Copan is against this assumption, so far as it goes; but if a faulty surviving record conceals such a development there, the evidence is that it began with the first and not the third odd hotun-end, as assumedfor Piedras Negras.

Morley assigns the two Piedras Negras stela which we agree were plain to katun-ends, 9. 7.0.0.0 and 9.8.0.0.0. This is predictated on the theory that all stelae are known. But here in the South Group both carved and plain stela were undoubtedly erected on the summit of a pyramid (the two surely plain ones, Stelae 42 and 44, andthe carved one, Stela 29). It is is quite

possible that two pther carved ones, marking the katuns-ends 9.7.0.0.0 and 9.8.0.0.0 have fallen from such positions and lie hidden on the slopes of Strs. R-4 and/or R-5. We found Stelae 44 in such a position, at one side entirely invisible without excavation.

The assumptions behind Morley's admitedly very doubtful assignments are thus seen to be very weak ones. Instead let us assume that erection of plain (probably painted) stelae was an early trait which was replaced by carved stela after the first carved stela was erected; and that the plain stelae here were katun-markers, like early carved ones elsewhere. We can then assing the illegible but possibly or carved Stela 24 to Katun 7, Katun 8 or Katun 9, and assume that two or these three katun-ends were marked by still-to-be-found carved stelae in the South Group. The four plain stelae must go to katuns preceding 9.5.0.0.0, when carved markers rather surely have appeared. We then have the following list of markers:

at other sites
There is no evidence for marking of "odd" hotuns so early as this

days than true average lunations. The age at these two dates was in the neighborhood of 24 or 25 days.

While the above assignments involve theory, I believe they are preferable to Morley's, and accounts best for known facts. They give us a minimum date of 9.10.0.0.0 for the earliest of the known plain stela. But three (and probably all) were ere ted after ~~xxxxxxxx~~ry constructionsin the court, preceded by ceremonial secpndary to pyramids in the court, so 9.0.0.0.0.0 is a fair minimum estimate for the age of the earliest pyramid.

and carved panels (such as "Lintel" 12)

during which, however, plain stelae may have been erected.

We can get at a minium estimate, tentative in nature, of the duration of this period, if we make the reasonable guess that when erection of carved plain stelae (presumably painted) ceased, stelae began, erection of painted "plain" ones ceased. I am satisfied by very careful exam nation of the stones themselves that Stelae 27 and 28 were plain. There is no evidence from Morley's sure readings that the ends of first and second hotuns of the katuns were being marked until 9.10.5.0.0 (Stela 31), though third-hotun ends were marked at 9.8.15.0.0. and 9.9.15.0 (Stelae 25 and 26). The third hotun-end may have had special significance, and there is not particular reason why Morley should place the admitedly illegible Stela 28 at 9.9.0.0.0, instead of the elligible (though possibly carved) Stela 24; nor why he should use Stela 27 to fill a gap at 9.9.10.0.0. He still lacks monuments to fill out the series of hotun-ends following 9.8.0.0.0. The following arrangement seems to me more probable:

Plain Stela	
Plaint Stela	
Plain Stela	
Plain Stela	
Stela 30	9.5.0.0.0
Stela 29	9.6.0.0.0
?	9.7.0.0.0
?	9.8.
Stela 24	9.9.0.0.0
Stela 41	9.10.0.0.0

Plaint Stela*	9.1.0.0.0
Plain Stela*	9.2.0.0.0
Plain Stela*	9.3.0.0.0
Plain Stela*	9.4.0.0.0
Stela 30	9.5.0.0.0
~~Stela 29~~	9.6.0.0.0
~~Missing~~	9.7
~~Missing~~	9.8
Stela 25	9.8.15.0.0
~~Stela 24~~	9.9.0.0.0
Stela 26	9.9.15.0.0
Stela 41	9.10.0.0.0

Stelae 29, 24 and two missing stelae

St. 28 24 = 9.9.5 ; 27 9.9.10.

* One of four, Stelae 42 and 44 on Str. R-3; Stelae 27 and 28 before Strs. R-10 and R-1 respectively.

It is by no means impossible that two carved stelae had been placed on the top sof the pyramid Strs. R-4 and/or Str. R-5, and are hidden in debris at their bases. Allowing for this, we can envisage a katun-marking stela pattern starting at 9.10.0.0.0, with a transition into a full hotun marking stela pattern in Katun 8 and 9, the full hotun-marking pattern starting with the second half of the baktun.

This gives us a controlled guess-date of 9.1.0.0.0 for the earliest of four plain stelae, but at least three of these and probably the fourth functioned with secondary construction. So we may claim that 9.0.0.0.0 for the beginning

and possibly with carved panels (since "Lintel" 3, re-used elsewhere, is early in style and its contemporaneous date was/probably according to Morley, 9.5.0.0.0 or 9.4.0.0.0). We have no yard-stick for measuring this pre-carved-stela period except the constructional phases themselves, and the probability that four plain stelae, all in this court, were katun-markers during this period. Resorting to this assumption, in logic we must guess that the contemporaneous date of Stela 30 may have been 9.6.0.0.0,

A careful inspection of Stela 27 and 28, as well as of Stelae 42 and 44, convinces the writer that were plain

2 Quarter - 22 n 23
+ 23 n 24