
CONTENTS

	<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>vii</i>
	Foreword— <i>Marilyn A. Masson</i>	<i>xiii</i>
	Introduction— <i>John M. Weeks</i>	<i>xix</i>
	Table 1. Contents of CIW <i>Current Reports</i> , vol. 1 (1–14) and vol. 2 (15–41), 1952–1957	<i>xxv</i>
	Preface to the <i>Current Reports</i> , 1952— <i>H.E.D. Pollock</i>	1
1.	Map of the Ruins of Mayapán, Yucatán, Mexico, 1952— <i>Morris R. Jones</i>	3
2.	The Great Wall of Mayapán, 1952— <i>Edwin M. Shook</i>	9
3.	Residential Property Walls at Mayapán, 1952— <i>William R. Bullard Jr.</i>	25
4.	Excavations in House Mounds at Mayapán, 1952— <i>Karl Ruppert and A. Ledyard Smith</i>	31
5.	Cenote X-Coton at Mayapán, 1953— <i>Robert E. Smith</i>	43
6.	Chacchob, Yucatán, 1953— <i>H.E.D. Pollock and Gustav Strömsvik</i>	53
7.	Archaeological Reconnaissance in Tabasco, 1953— <i>Heinrich Berlin</i>	65
8.	A Portal Vault and Temple at Mayapán, 1953— <i>Gustav Strömsvik</i>	85
9.	Some Small Ceremonial Structures of Mayapán, 1953— <i>Robert M. Adams Jr.</i>	91
10.	Excavations in House Mounds at Mayapán II, 1953— <i>A. Ledyard Smith and Karl Ruppert</i>	111
11.	The X-Coton Temples at Mayapán, 1953— <i>Edwin M. Shook</i>	125

12.	Cenote Exploration at Mayapán and Telchaquillo, 1954— <i>Robert E. Smith</i>	135
13.	Boundary Walls and House Lots at Mayapán, 1954— <i>William R. Bullard Jr.</i>	143
14.	Three Temples and their Associated Structures at Mayapán, 1954— <i>Edwin M. Shook</i>	157
15.	The Northern Terminus of the Principal Sacbe at Mayapán, 1954— <i>H.E.D. Pollock</i>	179
16.	A Round Temple at Mayapán, Yucatán, 1954— <i>Edwin M. Shook</i>	187
17.	Excavations in House Mounds at Mayapán III, 1954— <i>Karl Ruppert and A. Ledyard Smith</i>	193
18.	Exploration on the Outskirts of Mayapán, 1954— <i>Robert E. Smith</i>	207
19.	A Presumed Residence of the Nobility at Mayapán, 1954— <i>J. Eric S. Thompson</i>	217
20.	The Temple of Kukulcan at Mayapán, 1954— <i>Edwin M. Shook</i>	227
21.	Excavations in Three Ceremonial Structures at Mayapán, 1955— <i>P. E. Smith</i>	239
22.	Colonnaded Buildings at Mayapán, 1955— <i>Edwin M. Shook and William N. Irving</i>	249
23.	Exploration in Quintana Roo, 1955— <i>Gustav Strömsvik, H.E.D. Pollock, and Heinrich Berlin</i>	271
24.	An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Northern Quintana Roo, 1955— <i>William T. Sanders</i>	277
25.	A Noble's Residence and Its Dependencies at Mayapán, 1955— <i>Donald E. Thompson and J. Eric S. Thompson</i>	307
26.	Early Ceramic Horizons at Mayapán and Santa Cruz, 1955— <i>Robert E. Smith</i>	321
27.	Another Round Temple at Mayapán, Yucatán, 1955— <i>Edwin M. Shook</i>	329
28.	An Altar and Platform at Mayapán, 1955— <i>Donald E. Thompson</i>	337
29.	A Residential Quadrangle: Structures R-85 to R-90, 1955— <i>Tatiana Proskouriakoff and Charles R. Temple</i>	343
30.	A Vaulted Temple at Mayapán, 1955— <i>Howard D. Winters</i>	387
31.	Excavation of a Colonnaded Hall at Mayapán, 1955— <i>Howard D. Winters</i>	397
32.	Three Serpent Column Temples and Associated Platforms at Mayapán, 1955— <i>Howard D. Winters</i>	407
33.	A Dwelling and Shrine at Mayapán, 1956— <i>Ann Chowning and Donald E. Thompson</i>	423
34.	A Round Temple and Its Shrine at Mayapán, 1956— <i>Ann Chowning</i>	433
35.	Exploration of the Cave of Dzab-Na, Tecoh, Yucatán, 1956— <i>Gustav Strömsvik</i>	445
36.	Excavations in House Mounds at Mayapán IV, 1956— <i>A. Ledyard Smith and Karl Ruppert</i>	451
37.	The Southern Terminus of the Principal Sacbe at Mayapán, Group Z-50, 1956— <i>H.E.D. Pollock</i>	481
38.	Skeletal Remains from Mayapán, 1956— <i>Edward I. Fry</i>	493
39.	House Types in the Environs of Mayapán and at Uxmal, Kabah, Sayil, Chichen Itza, and Chacchob, 1957— <i>Karl Ruppert and A. Ledyard Smith</i>	507
40.	Deities Portrayed on Censers at Mayapán, 1957— <i>J. Eric S. Thompson</i>	521
41.	Notes on Vertebrate Animal Remains from Mayapán, 1957— <i>H.E.D. Pollock and Clayton E. Ray</i>	539
	Editor's Note, 1957— <i>H.E.D. Pollock</i>	551
	Appendix: Inventory and Lot Descriptions from Carnegie Institution Current Reports on Mayapán— <i>Compiled by Marilyn A. Masson</i>	553
	<i>Glossary</i>	611
	<i>References</i>	613
	<i>Index</i>	619

INTRODUCTION

Between 1914 and 1958 the Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW) sponsored extensive archaeological, ethnographic, linguistic, historical, and other related investigations in the Maya region of southern Mexico and northern Central America. During these four decades, the CIW was the leader in the field, with monetary and human resources that no university or other research program could match, then or since. The more than 300 publications produced by CIW researchers remain important, indeed essential, resources for modern scholars.

A summary of the development and accomplishments of the CIW program in the Maya region is available elsewhere (Weeks and Hill 2006:1–26) and need not be repeated here. However, some historical background is necessary to properly contextualize the CIW *Current Reports*.

The administration of the Carnegie Institution of Washington supported archaeological research in southern Mexico and northern Central America

for some four decades following its initial approval of a proposal submitted by Sylvanus G. Morley. In 1937 Vannevar Bush replaced John C. Merriam as president of Carnegie Institution of Washington. Bush was a distinguished physicist and dean of the School of Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He was President Franklin D. Roosevelt's primary science advisor during World War II. He also served as chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (1939–1941), chairman of Roosevelt's National Defense Research Committee (1940), and director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development (1941–1947). He provided oversight for some 200 defense-related ventures, including the development of nuclear fission and the Manhattan Project. Under his direction, CIW scientists became heavily involved in war work, and it was Bush's idea of federally funding science that led to the creation of the National Science Foundation in 1950. Not surprisingly, Bush was no

supporter of more humanistic disciplines, including anthropology and archaeology.

As Bush implemented his plan to close the CIW Department of Archaeology, department director Alfred V. Kidder proposed a number of potential final projects. One proposal asked the CIW to underwrite the cost of developing the use of radiocarbon dating for archaeology. This was followed by proposals to undertake a large longitudinal project at the Classic period Maya metropolis of Tikal, as well as a program that would divert attention from the Maya to relationships between the two major centers of civilization in the Americas, Mesoamerica and the Andes. None of these were accepted by the CIW, although excavations at Tikal were soon initiated by the University of Pennsylvania Museum with Edwin M. Shook, a CIW archaeologist, as Field Director. Despite these disappointments, however, Kidder was able to negotiate a final CIW field project in the Maya region of Mayapán.

MAYAPÁN: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE

Mayapán is one of the largest Mayan archaeological sites dating to the Late Postclassic period (ca. AD 1200–1542), the period immediately preceding the Spanish conquest of the area. The site is located about fifty kilometers southeast of Mérida, the capital of the southern Mexican State of Yucatán, and includes a nine-kilometer-long defensive wall enclosing an area of approximately 4.2 square kilometers. Within this area, the Maya constructed more than 4,000 buildings, most of which are residential. The site was densely populated with an estimated population of 10,000 to 15,000 people.

The site appears to have been constructed and occupied during the 300 years before the arrival of the Spaniards. Mayapán figures prominently in the various Maya chronicles that were written shortly before the conquest. Together with Uxmal and Chichén Itzá, it was thought to have formed a confederacy that exercised control over most of the Yucatán peninsula following the period of Mexican invasion. This assessment is no longer tenable as Uxmal is known to have been abandoned about 300 years before Mayapán was founded, and Chichén Itzá was reduced to the status of a minor center during the time Mayapán flourished. Bishop Diego de Landa, in *Relacion de las Cosas de Yucatán*, gives a lengthy description of a Maya capital and describes it as concentrically having temples and plazas in the center, the houses of lords and priests around this center, then the houses of the most important people, and finally the houses of the lowest classes.

Because the residential architecture corresponds to Bishop Diego de Landa's sixteenth-century description of Maya houses, the identification of the residential structures is comparatively definite and precise. According to historical accounts, Mayapán was abandoned about a century before the conquest of Yucatán, in about 1441 after conflict between competing ruling lineages.

Modern exploration of the ruins of Mayapán began with John Lloyd Stephens and Frederick Catherwood. They spent a day at the ruins and provided clear descriptions and illustrations of the two principal temples in the ceremonial center, the "Castillo" (Str. Q-162) and the "Caracol" (Str. Q-152). Stephens's observations were astute and he rightly assessed Mayapán as the ruin of a Maya city, in spite of the obvious differences between it and the other cities with which he was more familiar, like Copán and Uxmal. Moreover, he recognized that Mayapán was the same city described by the Spanish chroniclers as having been abandoned shortly before the Conquest. This fact was an important link in his argument that the Maya ruins "were not the works of people who have passed away, and whose history is lost, but of the same races that inhabited the country at the time of the Spanish conquest, or of some not very distant progenitors" (Stephens 1843, 2:307). This observation, so simple, clear, and obvious to this Emersonian New Yorker, was dismissed by his continental successors, not to mention most North Americans and even the Yucatecan intelligentsia.

Approximately two decades later, the French abbé Charles Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg visited the site and provided a few additional details. He attempted to correlate some of his observations with Landa's description of the site. In general, however, "all of Brasseur's work is a weird pot-pourri of sound sense, great learning, absurd theories, groundless fantasies, and proof that is no proof, the whole in a spirit as remote as possible from the scientific" (Bernal 1980:108). Brasseur de Bourbourg was followed by the colorful Augustus Le Plongeon, in 1881, whose theories were even more removed from reality than were Brasseur's. It has also been reported that Teobert Maler drew Stela 1, but there is no published mention of a trip by him to the site.

EARLY CARNEGIE WORK AT MAYAPÁN

In the earliest decades of the twentieth century, no substantive work was done at Mayapán. It was not until the 1930s that more modern and scientific archaeologists took a look at the site. Not surprisingly, most of those archaeologists were affiliated with the Carnegie Institution of Washington and

its hydra-like program of Maya research. Lawrence Roys visited the site in 1936 (Pollock 1962:3) and wrote an article that attempted to trace the evolution of Maya architecture (Roys 1941). T. A. Willard visited the site in these years as well and provided an entertaining account of his trip (1941:221–233).

The first serious and detailed work at Mayapán was a survey undertaken by Ralph T. Patton, partly at his own expense but under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution. The survey was conducted because “the archaeological importance of Mayapán . . . appeared to be far less than its political preeminence in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries . . . would have demanded” (Morley 1938c:141).

Patton’s survey followed the Great Wall in its circuit around the site and also included the ceremonial center. He traced the circuit of the Great Wall and briefly described its construction. He showed that the masonry was dry-laid of large irregular blocks. It measured about nine kilometers long, three to four meters in thickness, and about two meters in height on the exterior. The parapet along the outer edge, the interior stairways, and nine of the portals were identified. The survey of ceremonial center revealed the presence of colonnades and four round structures, both rare forms of architecture in the Maya canon. The survey also located a number of stelae with short-count dates that Morley interpreted (Morley 1938c:142). It is apparent from other evidence, described below, that Patton located and mapped the main sacbe at the site and the large residential groups associated with it. Morley concluded that “although Mayapán reached a position of first importance only at the close of Maya history when architectural decadence was well under way, its size satisfactorily agrees with the political preeminence ascribed to it by both the native and the Spanish chroniclers” (1938c:142). Although Pollock later avowed that Patton’s map was of great help to Morris Jones in making the final site map (Pollock 1962:3) and Brainerd used part of his map of the ceremonial center as an illustration (Brainerd 1958:347), Patton’s work was never published.

Not long thereafter, in 1942, George Brainerd undertook the first intensive excavations at Mayapán, again under the auspices of the Carnegie (Brainerd 1942, 1948:21–23). Thirteen trenches were excavated, yielding a collection of more than 32,000 sherds. Brainerd was able to identify limited stratigraphic change in pottery types, notably the succession from Coarse Slateware (now Peto Cream ware) to Coarse Redware (now Mayapán Red ware), and the increasing frequencies of effigy censer fragments through time. In these observations, he anticipated

the findings of Robert Smith (1971) and established the main features of the Mayapán ceramic sequence. Brainerd’s analysis and conclusions were not published, regrettably, until the later and much more detailed investigations of the Carnegie Institution at Mayapán were almost complete.

Toward the end of Brainerd’s work at the site, E. Wyllys Andrews IV arrived and spent a month studying the architecture. He cleared, partially or completely, eight buildings, in addition to performing a number of other small excavations (Andrews 1942:261). He noted the reuse of Puuc-style stones in the Mayapán-period architecture but observed no standing Puuc architecture. He recognized the Temple of Kukulcan as a slightly reduced copy of the Castillo of Chichén Itzá and noted the resemblance of the largest of the round temples at Mayapán to the Caracol at Chichén Itzá. He described the Mayapán masonry in some detail, including the salient differences between it and the masonry at Chichén Itzá (1942:262). He also commented on the remarkable similarity between the Mayapán architectural style and masonry and that of the east coast of Yucatán. Based on his excavations at a number of sites in northern Yucatán, Mayapán included, he was able to sketch an outline of architectural evolution in Yucatán that stands to this day: Early Classic and early Late Classic block masonry was succeeded by Puuc masonry, followed by Mayapán-style masonry (1942:262–263).

CARNEGIE INSTITUTION WORK AT MAYAPÁN

By 1950 the work of CIW in Guatemala and the Petén lowlands was closed down, and the Late Postclassic period site of Mayapán was selected for extensive historical and archaeological investigation under the direction of Pollock. This research was to examine the final expression of pre-Hispanic Maya culture.

A meeting of the permanent Carnegie archaeologists was convened in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in July 1950 to discuss the upcoming field season. It was determined that the office, laboratory, and storage facilities were to be located in Merida and the field quarters in Telchaquillo, a small village a few kilometers distant from Mayapán. A five-year contract was executed at the end of October between the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Secretariat of Public Education of the Government of Mexico through the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

The operational goals and objectives of the research were summarized succinctly by H.E.D. Pollock (1958:446):

The program was designed to be compact and to reach the stage of drawing conclusions in a predictable number of years. It was, of course, based primarily on archaeology but with considerable reliance on the results of previously performed historical research. The locus of the research was the Yucatán peninsula, and the period under consideration was the approximately five centuries preceding the Spanish conquest. The focal point of field operations was the last important center of aboriginal Maya civilization, the ruins of Mayapán. Subsidiary operations were archaeological surveys and exploration in outlying areas thought to be important in the period under study, and an examination of certain known centers of Maya rule after the fall of Mayapán and during the final hundred years before the Spanish completed the conquest of Yucatán. The essence of the program, aside from the more usual archaeological objectives, was an experiment in linking the results of archaeological research with the knowledge derived from aboriginal and early Spanish written records in an effort to discover how much of the intellectual, or at least nonmaterial, content of a bygone civilization could be recaptured.

Extensive and detailed investigations were conducted at the site by a large team of experienced archaeologists over a period of five years (1951–1955) under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The staff of the project included many prominent Mayanists of the day, such as Edwin Shook, Tatiana Proskouriakoff, Robert Smith, A. L. Smith, J. Eric S. Thompson, H.E.D. Pollock, and Karl Ruppert, not to mention a group of graduate students and others who directed the daily work and wrote the field reports.

Anticipating modern trends in graduate student training, Mayapán included the first training program in the Maya region to actively employ groups of graduate students from various universities. Many of these students went on to productive careers as archaeologists and anthropologists. These included Robert McC. Adams and Howard Winters from the University of Chicago; William R. Bullard, David de Harport, Edward I. Fry, William N. Irving, William T. Sanders, Philip E. Smith, Donald E. Thompson, and Raymond H. Thompson from Harvard University; Ann Chowning from the University of Pennsylvania; Joseph A. Hester from the University of California, Los Angeles; and Charles R. Temple from Yale University.

This final CIW archaeological project was the first attempt at an extensive field investigation and typological and functional analysis of domestic structures, the first attempt to excavate a sample of the entire range of structural types at a single

Maya site, and the first systematic attempt to view a single Maya site within a regional framework. In addition, functional analyses were conducted on the larger civic and religious structures, and there was extensive use of the direct historical approach made possible by ethnohistorian Ralph L. Roys's historical research.

As early as the 1930s department director Alfred V. Kidder was concerned about the inability of fieldworkers to publish the results of their investigations in a timely manner. This problem was certainly not unique to the CIW program and continues to be a persistent problem today for a variety of reasons, such as the difficulty in raising funds for publication, the lack of time available to the average archaeologist for writing, and the casual attitude toward the "issuance of reports as an essential and immediate sequel" (Wauchope 1965:159). As possible solutions Kidder advocated shorter field seasons, the use of fewer workers, the preparation of annual publications, and the completion of up-to-date finished manuscripts before the start of a new field season or project. In 1940 a new publication series, *Notes on Middle American Archaeology and Ethnology*, began under the editorship of J. Eric S. Thompson. This series was a minor, albeit highly valuable, device for making available important information not likely to appear elsewhere. The papers included were brief notes on specific specimens or topics, and when the series ended in 1957, 131 short, but useful, papers had been published.

To ensure the rapid dissemination of the Mayapán Project's results two series of papers described the work being undertaken and reported the preliminary findings. These were volumes 50 through 57 of the *Year Books* and numbers 1 through 41 of the *Current Reports*. A total of forty-one *Current Reports* were published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington from 1952 to 1957. These publications were intended to be part of the reporting of the results of a program of archaeological and historical researches concerned with Yucatán and adjacent areas begun in 1949 and completed in 1956 (Table 1). Research reported in the *Current Reports* (CR) series included compilation of a site plan for Mayapán (CR no. 1), excavation of the wall enclosing the site (CR no. 2), excavation of specific structural types within the site core including temples (CR nos. 8, 14, 16, 20, 27, 30, 32, 34), excavation of ceremonial buildings (CR nos. 9, 21, 28), and excavation of residential and administrative buildings (CR nos. 19, 22, 25, 29, 31, 33). Beyond the site core, investigations were made of house mounds and domestic buildings (CR nos. 4, 10, 36, 39), boundary walls between these units (CR nos. 3, 13), and more peripheral sites (CR nos. 6,

7, 18, 23, 24). Other investigations reported include sacbes or "roads" (CR nos. 15, 37), cenotes (CR nos. 5, 11, 12), caves (CR no. 35), pottery (CR nos. 26, 40), and human (CR no. 38) and animal (CR no. 41) skeletal remains.

The *Current Reports* series was intended as a means of rapid but preliminary publication of field results (Coe 1956). A synthesis of the project's accomplishments was later published by Pollock, Roys, Proskouriakoff, and Smith (1962). A formal type-variety analysis of the Mayapán ceramics was issued in 1971 by Robert E. Smith in his monumental *The Pottery of Mayapán: Including Studies of Ceramic Material from Uxmal, Kabah, and Chichén Itzá*. By this time the Department of Archaeology at the Carnegie Institution of Washington had ceased to exist and Smith's study was published by the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University. The original field notes are available at the Peabody Museum.

The formal closing of the department's offices and laboratory in Merida took place on January 1, 1958. In March and April field equipment was moved to Merida and eventually most field and office equipment was presented to Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. The property of the field house in Telchaquillo was returned to its owners. Remaining scientific equipment, office equipment, and all scientific records were given to the Peabody Museum. Additional gifts of scientific interest were made to the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, the Middle American Research Institute at Tulane University, and to the R. S. Peabody Foundation for Archaeology in Andover, Massachusetts.

The permanent staff of the Department of Archaeology continued active careers as scholars and researchers. Harry E.D. Pollock (1901–1982), the department's director, joined the Peabody Museum as Curator of Maya Archaeology until 1968 when he retired with the title Honorary Curator. Tatiana Proskouriakoff (1909–1985) was appointed Research Fellow in Maya Art at the Peabody Museum and maintained a productive career as a scholar. Karl Ruppert (1895–1960) resigned from the Carnegie Institution in October 1956 after thirty-two years of service and retired to Santa Fe, New Mexico. Edwin M. Shook (1911–2000) accepted a position with the University of Pennsylvania in 1955 as director of the Tikal Project, at that time the largest archaeological project in the New World. He later continued his archaeological work on the Pacific Coast and in the highlands of Guatemala. A. Ledyard Smith (1901–1985) joined the staff of the Peabody Museum in 1958 and participated in excavations at

Altar de Sacrificios and Seibal in the Maya lowlands. His brother, Robert E. Smith (1899–1983), served as Research Associate of Middle American Ceramics at the Peabody Museum from 1965 to 1968 and then as an honorary research associate until his death in 1983. Gustav Strömsvik (1901–) retired to Norway after thirty-one years in the department. J.E.S. Thompson (1898–1975) was elected a member of the Faculty Board of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge University, and was later knighted by Queen Elizabeth II in 1975.

POST-CARNEGIE INSTITUTION WORK AT MAYAPÁN

Clifford T. Brown, now a professor at Florida Atlantic University, conducted excavations in the residential zone of Mayapán starting in the early 1990s. These were the first excavations at the site in more than forty years. Brown discovered patterns of artifact style and function at the site, finding that the types of artifacts differed among households and groups of households in different parts of the site.

Carlos Peraza Lope, an archaeologist affiliated with the Yucatán office of the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, has been excavating and consolidating the major buildings in the ceremonial center since 1996. He has uncovered remarkable murals on several buildings. He also excavated a scatter of human bones that may date to the destruction of the site, a deposit originally found by Robert Adams (CR no. 9).

Almost fifty years after the Carnegie Institution of Washington investigations at Mayapán, the site was again the focus of a major archaeological study. The State University of New York at Albany's NSF-Supported Economic Foundations of Mayapán Project, directed by Carlos Peraza Lope, Marilyn Masson, and Timothy Hare, had as its primary goal the reconstruction of the production and consumption patterns of the various social sectors of the site. From 2001 to 2004 the project completed a surface survey of thirty-six milpas (encompassing 52.99 hectares) across the site area, representing 131 systematic surface collections from domestic refuse deposits. In addition, 189 test pits, 63 of which were near structures outside the city wall, were excavated. This team also completely excavated three domestic structures outside the monumental zone. Results of the field project are being formulated and a project bibliography is available at <http://www.albany.edu/ims/mp-bib.html>. Fieldwork has resumed under NSF support, and in 2008 the Economic Foundations project concentrated on the outlying ceremonial group of Itzmal Ch'en by the far east gate, excavat-

ing a large colonnaded hall, a mass grave, and a small house next to the group's cenote. The project also surveyed eight 1 km by 250 m transects extending in four cardinal directions outside the city wall, locating 347 previously unknown structures linked to Mayapán, its nearby contemporary settlements, and earlier sites. This important work, the subject of Bradley Russell's completed 2008 University of Albany dissertation, expands the known geographic extent of the Mayapán settlement zone to a distance of around 500 meters in all directions, with interesting variation in settlement density.

PRESENT VOLUME

In 2006 the University Press of Colorado published *The Carnegie Maya: The Carnegie Institution of Washington Maya Research Program, 1913–1957*. This volume made available to scholars once again the extensive data published in the *CIW Year Book* series. The present volume continues this project by republishing the *CIW Current Reports* series. The *Current Reports* are published as they appeared originally with a few exceptions. Obvious typographical errors have been corrected, and some place-names have been modernized. The content has not been changed.