9. 1926–1928

For three seaso–ns from 1926 through 1928, Charlot was employed as a draughtsman and then writer at Chich'en Itza by the Carnegie Institution of Washington (Ewing 1972: 70–120). There he encountered the Maya and their cultural world, so different from the Aztec, an example of the truism "Many Mexicos." Charlot spent the remaining months of those years in Mexico City, where he shared his archeological copies and studies with his colleagues and pursued his own artwork and writing. This period of his life is divided between those two locations.

9.1. THE YUCATAN PENINSULA

In an undated letter of 1925 to Anita Brenner ("Received your letter. poetry"), Charlot makes his first mention of Sylvanus G. Morley: "I think I'll get in touch with Morley the archeologue ['archeologist']. He is in town y me interesa ['interests me']." Morley had initiated and was now directing the Chich'en Itza excavations of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. After convincing the Carnegie directors, he proposed the project to the Mexican government, and on February 1, 1924, the Carnegie Institution was granted a nineteen-year exclusive right to the site, an agreement that was later extended to 1940. In fact, Mexican archeological and restoration teams would also be working in different areas of the site (Ewing 1972: 83 f., 120–135). The first diggings in the 1925 season identified the mound of what would prove to be the Temple of the Warriors as the principal object of study, in large part for its promise of artworks including paintings.[1]

Those who came into contact with Morley described him as a force of nature. Entering the Carnegie Institution in 1933, Edwin Shook thought Morley "was like a little hurricane in that very sedate Washington office of elderly historians and scientists" (Shook 1990: 247). Morley hired Shook immediately and proved himself to be "the greatest guy you could ever meet" (257), "bubbling, enthusiastic" (249): "If anybody showed any interest, he'd give it, just pour it out, as the generous man he was" (250). Alfred Kidder praised him as a hard worker, warm, outgoing, and energetic; Kidder found Morley's personality latin: a ready courtesy, mental quickness, intuition about people and situations, and lack of hypocrisy (Kidder 1948: 267, 269 ff., 274).

Morley's salesmanship was famous: "Morley had the ability to put you on fire, make you squirm with intellectual excitement."[2] Besides face-to-face persuasion, Morley wrote popular as well as scholarly books and articles. In his own words, he wanted to "sell the public on the Maya" (Thompson 1949: 296). Morley's enthusiasm and knowledgeable tours would enchant the many visitors to the site, from scholars to the general public, from administrators of the Carnegie Institution to Mexican government officials.[3]

Among the latter, was the famous governor of Yucatan, Felipe Carrillo Puerto (18741924). Assuming office on February 1, 1922, Carrillo Puerto initiated a broad program of progressive, socialist legislation.[4] An important part of this program was publicizing Maya achievements to promote respect for and self-respect in the oppressed Indian population. Part Maya himself, Carrillo Puerto was

knowledgeable about Maya history and culture and supported archeology to further his goals.[5] The road from Dzitas to Chich'en was constructed to make the site more accessible. Similarly and controversially, restoration of the ruins was given priority equal to scholarly goals with the result that Chich'en Itza is today the second most visited archeological site in Mexico.[6] The central place of Chich'en Itza in the discussions of the 1920s is seen in the fact that it was on Vasconcelos' itinerary to reconnect Rivera and other artists to their homeland (1982 *Memorias* 2: 88). Chich'en Itza is also mentioned by writers like List Arzubide (1927: 82) and Goldschmidt (1927: 95 ff.).

After Carrillo Puerto was executed on January 3, 1924, during the De La Huerta revolution, Morley maintained a positive relationship with his successors. Morley must have gained prestige from his connection to a great hero of the Mexican Revolution, who came to be honored in both Christian and Maya religious terms.

A secret until after Morley's death was that he had been "arguably the best secret agent the United States produced during World War I," reporting German activities and providing political and economic information on Mexico (Harris and Sadler 2003: 38; 240 f., 267). The same traits that made him a great project administrator made him a great spy master:

> As for Sylvanus Morley, he demonstrated a remarkable ability to gather intelligence. His effectiveness stemmed in large measure from his gift for dealing with people, for he moved easily through various strata of society, from peons to presidents. Morley had an omnivorous curiosity about virtually everything, yet this curiosity was coupled with a strong sense of mission. As it became clearer that there were no German submarine bases to be found, increasingly he provided economic and political intelligence, making use of his wide circle of friends and acquaintances. In the process, he established a network of subagents, the network covering much of Central America and southern Mexico. This was arguably the best American intelligence network in World War I. (Harris and Sadler: 315)

While recognizing the bad socio-economic situation in Yucatan, Morley opposed revolutionary socialist reformers to the point of advocating that the United States take Yucatan as a protectorate and even help establish the whole peninsula as "an independent state" (Harris and Sadler 2003: 244250, 257). He extended such ideas to Mexico and Central America (Harris and Sadler 2003: 269, 289). Using archeology as a cover, Morley continued informally to supply information to American intelligence after he left the service on March 1, 1919, until 1922, and argued for establishing a service dedicated to the region (Harris and Sadler 2003: 270283, 189 ff.). When Franz Boas denounced espionage activities by archeologists and other scholars, Morley and his allies defeated him, although Boas's view is now normative (Harris and Sadler 2003: 284–289, 316). In this context, Morley's genuine friendship with Carrillo Puerto is an anomaly (Harris and Sadler 2003: 292).

Morley had appointed Ann Axtell Morris—wife of the field director, Earl Morris—as copyist of artworks, at which she proved adept. But he probably thought help was needed in view of the expected

finds in the mound of the Temple of the Warriors (Brunhouse 1971: 225). From Charlot's diaries, Morley clearly tested him to work as a draftsman:

> July 9, 1925: "matin : vu Mr Morley pour servir de dessinateur l'année prochaine" 'morning: saw Mr. Morley to work as draftsman next year.'
> September 18, 1925: "allé au musée dessin pour Morley" 'went to museum drawing for Morley.'
> October 12, 1925: "commencé passer à l'encre dessin Sylvanus Morley" 'started passing to ink drawing for Sylvanus Morley.'
> October 13, 1925: "fini dessins S. M." 'finished S. M. drawings.'

These drawings may have included or resembled more realistic ones like that illustrated in Glusker (2010: 200; Conger 1992: 527/1926). Morley was sufficiently happy with Charlot's work to offer him the job at which he worked for the next three years. The two met frequently in Mexico City before Charlot's first season (Diary 1926: January 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14). Morley grew to appreciate Charlot as a colleague after finding he could write scholarly texts—to the point of calling him "the 'find' of the year" (Weston 1961: 158). Brenner wrote: "the head of the expedition pronounced him the discovery of the season" (*Idols* 305). Charlot worked with Morley also in Mexico City, for instance, helping him with a lecture in which Morley mentioned Charlot.[7] Morley and Charlot became close friends as well as collaborators in what could be at times a teasing relationship.[8] Charlot impersonated Morley in a pageant: "je joue Morley. succès" 'I play Morley. success.'[9] Charlot also gave a drawing of a tree and painted a plaza on a curtain for the house Morley was to occupy with his new fiancée (Diary 1927: March 4, 6, 16). On her visit to Chich'en Itza, Brenner wrote, "Jean is a favorite of Morley's."[10]

The Chich'en Itza project had many attractions for Charlot. Most basically, with doors closing on him in Mexico City, he needed a job, however lowly. He had his hopes: "I am going soon to Yucatan and I hope that this can change a little my mind and give me some sort of interest, would it be only by hard working" (JC to AB "When Orozco said he was going to New-York"). Weston wrote of Morley's offer: "The salary small—250 pesos a month—but all expenses paid and R. R. fare" (1961: 149). Small as the salary was, a misunderstanding about it caused an emotional crisis (Diary 1926: June 28 August 12). Charlot and his mother were in desperate need of a steady income.

Charlot also felt strongly the intrinsic interest of Maya culture about which both Morley and the English archeologist J. Eric Thompson were enthusiastic.[11] Charlot had been fascinated by archeology since his childhood study of Mexican artworks and relationship with Désiré Charnay, who had visited Chich'en Itza and been captivated by the site.[12] Charlot's grandfather and erstwhile assistant of Charnay, Louis Goupil, wrote him: "As-tu trouvé d'autres ruines azteques [*sic*] depuis celles de Désirée Charnais [*sic*]. Si oui fais-les connaître" 'Have you found other Aztec ruins since those of Désiré Charnais. If so, let me know them.' Neither Charnay nor Goupil had been forgotten in Mexico, as Charlot wrote to his grandfather in an undated letter:

> En todas partes hay recuerdos de Charnay y sus libros siguen muy leidos por los archeologos. Todos me hacen grandes saludos y me apretan la mano con gran emocion cuando saben que yo soy de la familia Goupil y casi me da eso respeto para mí mismo.
>
> 'Everywhere people remember Charnay, and his books continue to be much read by archeologists. Everywhere people salute me highly and give me their hand with great emotion when they know I belong to the Goupil family, and they almost give me that respect simply because of who I am.'

The Carnegie expedition staff shared the muralists' concern for the Indians and intention of using the Indians' cultural achievements to improve their social and psychological condition. As opposed to many scholars in Mexico and the United States, the project staff—with some reservations—was convinced of the continuity between the ancient Maya and their contemporary descendants.[13] Edwin Shook found that Thompson "always had a very broad interest in pulling the living Maya into the picture, and in exploring the continuity from the conquest on."[14] Charlot later praised Morley for publishing "photographs and diagrams that confront the ancient Maya with the living Maya who tills today the harsh Yucatan soil. It gives us knowledge and a respect of both" (May 1947: 208). Even today, the Indians construct the same houses depicted on temple bas-reliefs, and women treasure their traditional clothing.

Charlot's diary of late 1925 and early 1926 refers so often to his being sad that he seems to have been suffering from depression. The clue, I believe, to his mood can be found in a connection he makes in a passage cut from his *Mexican Mural Renaissance*: "It was soon after this forced retreat from the fresco field that I met Doctor Sylvanus G. Morley" ("Writings Related to *MMR*, Passages Cut). That is, leaving Mexico City seemed to put an end to a period of his life defined by his hopes for a Mexican mural career. Even after he had been excluded from the walls and many of his colleagues were leaving for other cities or even countries, Charlot may have hoped that the early days of the movement would return. Moreover, he had entered the early movement with the intention of being born again as a Mexican whose art flowed from his inner being. Now along with his future, he was being deprived of what he considered his core identity. Charlot's subtitle to his *MMR—1920–1925*—is full of emotion as well as history. Even though he was spending over half the year in Mexico City in 1926 to 1928, he felt himself less a member of its art movement. He told me that he could not extend his *Mexican Mural Renaissance* beyond 1925 because he would have had to write merely as a historian and not as an eye-witness participant as well. That is, continuing his personal creative work was not enough for him to feel that he fully belonged to the movement. He thought of himself, not individualistically, but as part of a team effort. This explains his intense involvement in the work of his colleagues and publicizing them in his historical and critical writing. Weston seems to felt a similar finality in Charlot's leaving, noting in his diary on January 23, 1926:

> Even knowing Jean is to be vastly benefitted by his change, it was sad to view the breaking up of "Independencia 50," so long his home. He leaves today for Yucatán and I question if I shall ever see him again." (1961: 149)

Charlot's emotional and physical depression lasted through 1927 and reoccurred later, suggesting other causes and even a chronic condition.[15] One probable cause was his unstable, even tempestuous relationship with Anita Brenner, discussed earlier.

Yucatan seems another planet: a huge flat peninsula of limestone heaved up by the impact of the meteor that destroyed the dinosaurs. Rain sifts through the limestone to form caves and underground lakes, whose roofs can collapse to form *cenotes*, water holes, from small to gigantic. The land is covered with dense forest or jungle that stretches like a green carpet to the horizon. The uneven planting admits shafts of light through which birds flash suddenly brilliant. The jungle provides loveable toads, armadillos, and deer (A. A. Morris 1931: 134 ff.). Dorothy Rhoads—sister of Morley's wife, Frances—adopted a faun, and Charlot illustrated her children's book *The Story of Chan Yuc* (1940). More common are mosquitoes carrying fatal diseases, scorpions, grasshoppers in plague numbers, and armies of ants.[16] Even more dramatic are the jaguars, crocodiles, and snakes, one fourteen feet long (A. A. Morris 1931: 28 f., 221). Looking out over the jungle cover from the top of a pyramid, one can see the top of another temple miles away. Most of the staff fell under the jungle's spell, but Morley hated it and felt it had harmed his health.[17]

As to the people, Brenner wrote, Yucatan

> is entirely another country. There is no more intimate connection with Mexico than with Argentina, for instance. People, customs, routine, antecedents, language—everything is different. One thing about them is salient and has impressed me deeply —they are an intellectual, philosophic, poetic people…not an essentially plastic people like the Aztecs and their corollaries. (Glusker 2010: 382)
> Delighted with the sweetness of the people. They have throaty, melodious faces and speak with rhythm like a song: They are gentle and kindly, have none of the desire to "ridicule" or get the best of a stranger that is always evident in a Valley of Mexico Indian especially. (Glusker 2010: 376)

Charlot had the same impression:

> There was a second experience, very different experience from that I had in Mexico City, and that is my doing archeological work in Yucatán. Yucatán is part of Mexico politically, but actually is a peninsula which has its own race, the Mayan Indians, and is practically independent, I would say, even nowadays, from Mexico, certainly as far as race and habits go. I went there for the Carnegie Institution of Washington...There I copied literally hundreds of bas-reliefs and, of course, met Mayan Indians, so different from Aztec Indians.[18]

When I was in Mérida in the 1990s and asked a policeman whether the streets were safe at night, he answered, "This isn't Mexico."

The complicated trip to Chich'en Itza reinforced the impression of Yucatan being a distant country. One traveled by train from Mexico city to Veracruz, itself a city for touring and shopping. There

one embarked on a vessel to Progreso on the north Yucatan coast—either an expensive, comfortable ship or a cheap boat, a little "like a Hudson River ferry."[19] On their visit of April 25, 1927, Anita Brenner and Lucy Knox were "just enchanted with life, the beautiful blue water, the wind" (Glusker 2010: 374). The boat trip could take from some two and a half days to four. On arrival, Anita and Lucy were charmed by Progreso: "So in we rode, along a beautiful white road. catching a glimpse of neat little round white houses—The people have throaty, melodious voices. Everything is very clean & white" (376). (On their return, Anita found Progreso a "Horrible town, hot as hell" [410].) A car brought them twenty miles south to Mérida, which Anita found as romantic and full of music as it is today (376 ff.). Anita and Lucy lunched at the Gran Hotel, where the archeological staff often stayed. Opened in 1901, its "Belle Époque" architecture has been conserved in all its picturesqueness. From Mérida, a narrow-gauge railroad took visitors on the six-hour journey to Dzitas, a line since abandoned with the terminal now in ruins and filled with foraging pigs. Dzitas was the connecting point for other trips from Chich'en Itza, for instance, to Valladolid and Cobá. From Dzitas, one traveled by mule coach or car through the little town of Pisté to Chich'en Itza over a narrow, rough road finished on July 14, 1923, by Governor Carrillo Puerto in order to make the ruins accessible, part of his program to publicize and celebrate the Maya achievements of the past.[20] Some of the road remains today as it approaches the Ball Court and passes by a dedicatory stone.

Among the people who would be closest to Charlot were the Morrises, Earl (1889–1956) and Ann Axtell (1900–1945), married in 1923.[21] Earl was the field director—"the head archeologist and superintends the digging"[22]—and Ann Axtell was working as a draftsman. Charlot would become close to both. Earl had been famous since the age of three-and-a-half for his uncanny sense for excavation.[23] Charlot felt he was psychic:

> Earl Morris had a real psychic sense. He knew beforehand what he was going to find and where. It bothered him because he wasn't religious. The big example of this was that he knew he was going to find the Chac Mool in the inner temple. After he did, he went around with his face in his hands all day, frightened by the experience of having been right. The same with the medallion. Others had looked elsewhere but he just went in and found it alone on the first digging. His favorite tool was a simple digging stick. He would go up on a mound, poke the stick in at a certain point, move it slightly, and the whole mound would begin to fall away around him, revealing a wall or whatever he knew was underneath.[24]

On October 25, 2006, I discussed this with Elizabeth Morris, Earl and Ann Axtell's daughter and herself a respected archeologist. She knew Earl's reputation for what is called "archeological intuition" in the field and remembered his knowing beforehand what would be found in an unexcavated mound; he *knew* where to dig. This special "luck" is based on experience and intuition, a special gift not given to all. When Earl was able to predict where bas-relief panels would be found, the Maya workmen were very impressed.

Ann Axtell had studied in France at the American School of Prehistoric Research where she developed a love of prehistoric art.[25] After marrying Earl, she proved skillful at archeology, copying

artworks and publishing both scholarly and popular texts.[26] She and Charlot argued constantly about their work, but their ultimate conclusions reveal their general agreement (e.g., A. A. Morris 1931). Elizabeth Morris described their combination of intense collaboration and frequent argument as what archeologists call a joking relation: competition, intimacy, and affection.

Whether Charlot and Ann Axtell had an affair has been a topic of gossip since their seasons together at Chich'en.[27] Charlot was strongly attracted to the intelligent, artistic, beautiful, and needy woman, e.g.:

> Ann m'apporte ses aquarelles tentation *excessivement présente* de l'embrasser. retenu par présence Lowell mais *intense*.[28]
> 'Ann brings me her watercolors *excessively present* temptation to embrace her. held back by Lowell's presence but *intense*.'

According to Charlot's diary, Ann made the advances and sought to define their relationship.[29] But Ann also needed attention and could flirt:

> m'arrangerons avec Ann et Lowell. Ann fait l'amour aux 2. nous à elle (Diary April 24, 1927)
> 'we will arrange me with Ann and Lowell [Houser]. Ann flirts with the two. we with her.'

> soir : enivré un peu avec Ann et Lowell. Ann m'approche *devant* Lowell[30]
> 'evening: a little high with Ann and Lowell. Ann approaches me *in front of* Lowell

Charlot and Ann caused comment by their conduct: staying close together including physical contact, taking walks alone, visiting each other at their cottages and in their rooms, and so on.[31] Ann kissed Charlot at his birthday party (February 8, 1927) and excited the jealousy of a colleague, J. Linden Smith:

> curieuse jalousie de Smith contre moi à cause d'Ann et aussi de ma peinture. (Diary March 15, 1926)
> 'Smith's curious jealousy of me because of Ann and also of my painting.'

Charlot noted: "longue conversation avec Morley spécialement sur Ann : ils se *veulent*" 'long conversation with Morley especially about Ann: they have grudges against each other' (June 27, 1927). The word *veulent* 'have grudges' is underlined five times.

Charlot's diary is clear about he and Ann allowing themselves certain liberties and "imprudences," but not a sexual relationship (e.g., Diary March 12, 1927). In Mexico City, Charlot indulged in necking and even bundling, but not intercourse. Even so, he was riven with guilt, which he recorded in his diaries. Moreover, Charlot might have been attracted to married women, but none of his identifiable infatuations were married. The scrupulous Charlot recorded only one "légère imprudence" 'light imprudence' with a married woman, discussed below (January 1, 1928). Adultery can be considered worse than fornication in moral theology because it involves a third person (they can both

send you to hell). Charlot had intense feelings of respect and affection for Earl, which would have blocked any possible thoughts of cuckolding him. Charlot treasured his relationship with Earl, but his relationship with Ann was awkward and at times embarrassing.[32] Both Ann and Charlot tried to accommodate Earl: e.g.:

> Ann me dit sa résolution par respect pour Earl de ne plus avoir les quelques contactes physiques que nous avons eu avant[33]
> 'Ann tells me her resolution out of respect for Earl to no longer have the few physical contacts that we had before.'

The later history of Charlot's relations with the Morrises was one of great closeness, which would have been impossible for Charlot had there been a shadow of deceit hanging over them. When Charlot had a breakdown after his mother's death, the Morrises took him in and cared for him (e.g., Glusker 2010: 668). Elizabeth Morris told me that in the mid-1950s, Charlot traveled to the University of Colorado to see Earl on a surprise visit. Earl had just finished a class session and was coming out of the lecture hall when he saw Charlot in the hallway. They greeted each other with such an enthusiastic bear hug that all the students laughed. I agree with Elizabeth Morris that Charlot was "a good family friend" (October 25, 2006).

In his diary, Charlot mentions Ann Axtell's nervousness, which worried him as much as Nahui Olin's:

> soir : très courte promenade avec Ann mais elle est très agitée. (March 10, 1927)
> 'evening: very short walk with Ann, but she is very agitated.'

> soir : Ann vient et reste dans le hamac très nerveuse crise de voir etc… (April 8, 1927)
> 'Ann comes and stays in the hammock very nervous crisis of seeing, etc.'

Ann Axtell later suffered from alcoholism.[34] Donald McVicker felt she was hurt by the pressures and obstacles of a woman in the man's field of the time.

Charlot did not usually talk religion unless others broached the subject.[35] He noted in his diary:

> Ann me demande de la préparer à la mort et cesser. [mon Dieu que je sois utile S.V.P.]…préparé à la mort Ann (February 20, 1927)
> 'Ann asks me to prepare her for death and ceasing. [my God, that I may be useful, if it pleases you]…prepared Ann for death.'

> soir : conversation avec Ann sur catholique : elle veut se faire catholique. (merci mon Dieu)[36]
> 'evening: conversation with Ann about Catholic: she wants to make herself Catholic. (thank you, God)

Charlot was happy when she later became a Catholic:

> reçu lettre Ann Morris : elle s'est baptisée catholique. *grande joie et remerciement* 6 h : prière à l'église pour S^te^ Anne. (Diary July 22, 1929)
> 'received letter from Ann Morris: she has had herself baptized Catholic. *great joy and gratitude* 6:00 PM: prayer at Church for Saint Anne.'

A strong argument against Charlot's having an affair with Ann Axtell is that he was in a very passionate relationship with Anita Brenner at the time, which he expressed in his diaries and letters to her (Chapter 5). When Anita visited Chich'en Itza with Lucy Knox, April 27–May 8, 1927, she found a deprived Charlot ready to explode with sexual energy to the point of kissing her by force:

> Jean and I alone with the moon, therefore it could not have been otherwise. He made me rather angry because he kissed me, by force, on the porch [with others present]… But withal, I liked it…He says that with me he is like a man who is, or rather has been, thirsty for a long time. He kisses me like that. He cannot restrain himself more than somewhat, and here he is with thirty years' accumulation… (401 f.; also 392)

Charlot noted in his diary:

> soir : Lucy Anita Lowell sous le porche j'approche Anita contre la volonté elle se met en colère puis réconciliation (May 5, 1927)
> 'evening: Lucy, Anita, Lowell under the porch. I approach Anita against her will. She gets angry, the reconciliation.'

Charlot and Anita would spend the day working, he teaching her about the expedition and she doing sociological research in the surroundings (Chapter 1). In the evening, they would socialize with others and then go off by themselves, e.g.:

> soir : longue soirée sous le porche avec Ann Anita Lucy et Lowell. puis seul avec Anita en hamac.[37]
> 'evening: long evening under the porch with Ann, Anita, Lucy, and Lowell. Then alone with Anita in the hammock.'

This conduct tempted them to "imprudences" (Diary May 2, 7, 1927). Charlot described to me the Maya custom of necking in a hammock being rocked gently with one toe by the man. Anita's visit strengthened their relationship: "I'm in a curious state, never experienced to this degree, of *enamoramiento* [being in love] with Jean" (Glusker 2010: 414).

Charlot's spending his time with the group and alone with Anita made "Ann folle de jalousie" 'Ann mad with jealousy' (May 3, 1927). Anita wrote a long description, comparing Ann to herself:

> Ann…is well described by both Lowell and Jean as brittle, fragile, glittering. There is a dash and quickness to her like a thin sharp blade. She is wrong inside, having no center or pivot of her inner self, and therefore always striking sparks and discontented mostly. Her conversation is incoherent, clever, entertaining, at its best delightful, at its worst pathetic. She has been feeling pretty rotten inside since almost immediately

> after we arrived, and of course this is quite natural since Lowell and Jean spend most of their off time with us, although she is with us also, it is the also that hurts her. She has been irradiating high-tension waves so that they've reached me, producing at times a reaction of sadness, trouble in the air, a mood frequent with me a long time ago, but rare now since I've found the serenity that comes of accepting facts. (Glusker 2010: 389)

Charlot became close also to the English archeologist J. Eric Thompson, who was the same age and with whom he roomed in the 1926 season Thompson spent at Chich'en Itza.[38] Charlot later provided illustrations for his book *Maya Hieroglyphic Writing* (1960), which were appreciated by Thompson:

> I am indebted for the charming way in which he has interpreted for me the Maya concept of the journey of time. (ix)
> [Since most academic analysis communicates Maya religion badly] We are, accordingly, fortunate in having the aid of Jean Charlot in bringing to life this vivid concept. He has captured its qualities of mysticism and striking beauty in the frontispiece of this volume.[39]

Charlot in turn appreciated Thompson's work.[40] Charlot and Thompson both had a feeling for Maya religion and were convinced of the continuity between the classic Maya and the contemporary Maya community.

The positive relationship between the Charlot and Thompson was anomalous. Thompson was notorious for using his authority to abuse his opponents, a practice that retarded Maya studies.[41] Shook found Thompson did not share his information and "tended to be very abrasive, and had virtually no students"; "a brilliant guy, but terribly unkind to people, almost rude" (1990: 250). Coe states: "it was a brave or foolhardy Mayanist who dared to go against his opinion" (1999: 123; also 153). As seen below, Charlot had fundamental disagreements with Thompson, but they remained fast friends.[42]

Charlot was amazed at Thompson's Englishness. He told me that once he was trekking beside a lake in the jungle around Cobá with Thompson and an Indian crew. Thompson looked at his watch and said it was time for tea. Charlot said they could not make tea in the middle of the jungle; they did not even have fresh water. Thompson said they could get water from the lake, but Charlot objected that it was covered with green plants and scum. Thompson pointed out a clear spot in the very middle, and Charlot countered that the lake was notoriously full of crocodiles. Thompson instructed the crew to tie a rope around his waist. He would wade out to the middle of the lake to get the water, and if they saw a crocodile approaching him, they should pull him back to shore. Thompson got his water and made his tea. My father was impressed by the strength English people gain by heroically practicing their everyday rituals.[43]

Charlot formed a friendship also with George Vaillant (April 5, 1901–May 13, 1945). Brenner wrote of him: "He is just crazy about Jean."[44] Charlot continued to meet Vaillant in the United States

(e.g., Diary 1928: October 29, 32) and gave him an oil painting, *Rocking Chair, Yucatan*, as a wedding gift (CL 150b). Charlot was anxious to learn from the many experts he was meeting:

> Hay un Señor Gann (muy documentado y lo aprovecho) que sale en busca de una nueva ciudad y si encuentra frescos me manda llamar.[45]
> 'There is a Mr. Gann here (very well informed and I make the most of him) who goes out in search of a new city, and if he discovers frescoes, will order me to be called.'

The artworks discovered at Chich'en Itza were so numerous that more draftsmen had to be engaged. Charlot recommended Lowell Houser for the 1927 season—who was hired and stayed for the 1928—and Weston, who declined.[46] Charlot admired Houser's work (Diary February 14, 1927) but found him sometimes unwilling to take instruction.[47] Charlot spent much time with Houser and became so attached that he wept when they had to separate: "adieu à Lowell [et Pablo]…pleuré il me manque beaucoup" 'adieu to Lowell [and Pablo]…wept I miss him very much.'[48]

The Yucatan rainy season from May to December made outside work impossible, so the excavation season was scheduled to start in early January and continue until the heat went beyond intolerable to impossible (A. A. Morris 1931: 48, 145). The heat could still be terrible during the digging season:

> AM : dessins friezes [*sic*] : plein soleil et triple chaleur. bien étourdi toute la journée après. (Diary June 7, 1928)
> 'Afternoon: drawing of friezes: full sun and triple heat. very dazed all day after.'

My mother felt that Charlot's continuous working under the Yucatan sun made him chilly anywhere else, so that the rest of his life, he almost always wore a sweater: "Even the *warmest* Hawaiian weather had him in a sweater" (Zohmah Charlot ca. 1993). The heat created problems beyond discomfort. Thompson reported that they had to copy inscriptions with handkerchiefs around their wrists to prevent sweat from dripping on the paper (1963: 15).

Anita Brenner described the daily schedule on her 1927 visit:

> One breakfasts between five thirty and six and everybody scatters between six and seven…
> At eleven thirty the tocsin…sounds for lunch. Siesta until two, then back to work until teatime, that is, of course five. Dinner at six, and then dancing , or bridge, or whatever it may be. People scatter or fall into little groups of cliques…One dresses for dinner, white trousers are the order of the day. (Glusker 2010: 387; 389 f.)

The hacienda's magnificent kitchen, with its chimney covering most of the far end wall, survives today. From it Morley's Chinese cook served excellent food. Morley would sit at the head of the table deploying his talents as a raconteur, and visitors and staff would be seated in hierarchical order down to the opposite end.[49] After dinner, people could amuse themselves in the hacienda with phonograph records and cards (e.g., Brunhouse 1971: 61, 207 f.). When Morley pushed Charlot to play bridge, he invented fantastic rules, claiming they were French (Thompson 1963: 39). Walks in the ruins *au clair de lune* were

enchanting as was looking at the stars from the temple platforms. Morley organized phonograph concerts in the Ball Court and elaborated pageants and masques of various degrees of complication.[50] At one costume party, "Jean read people's minds, as Lucy's medium, and made a hit" (Glusker 2010: 404). At a pageant in the Ball Court, Charlot successfully played Morley (Diary March 20, 1927). Charlot's 1927 stencil print *Mayan Head*:

> was for a small poster for a theatrical program the archaeologists put on. We played "The Rise and Fall of the Mayan Empire" the archaeologists as actors with masks, at night in the old Ball Court. The Mayan villagers came from far-off places to see, and liked it.[51]

Charlot also created masks, describing one for Anita Brenner's visit:

> una mascara toda pintada que tu servidor ha copiado hoy Domingo con el proposito de serte util : Es la unica expression plastica de lo que llamas vacilada : tragico . comico . humoresque etc… Te gustara, creo yo.[52]
> 'a mask all painted that your servant has copied today, Sunday, with the intention of being useful for you: It is the unique plastic expression of that which you call *vacilada*: tragic, comic, humorous, etc….I believe it will please you.'

For one pageant at least, Charlot was uneasy about the staff darkening their skin and festooning themselves with feathers (JC to AB "Ya no escribes?"), and he was unhappy with his costume:

> Esta noche hay representacion en el Juego de Pelota. Tu servidor esta en un papel de mestiza con pechos de papel de periodico. Se ofende mi dignidad y te dara risa, pero no me dieron de escojer. (JC to AB "Todo aqui ya esta muy social")
> 'Tonight there was a show in the Ball Court. Your servant was in the role of a mestiza woman with newspaper breasts. My dignity was offended and it would have made you laugh, but they didn't let me choose.'

Daytime fun included swimming in a *cenote* (A. A. Morris 1931: 188–193, 202–211). A handwritten note of Charlot's survives: "I have your bathing suit. We are waiting for you at the cenote." Most of this fun did not demand money, and the spirit of the staff was "frugal" (Shook 1990: 249).

Morley, his family, some staff, and visitors were accommodated in the main house, a small but exquisite hacienda still in use today (e.g., A. A. Morris 1931: 126; Fig. 23). The proprieties and comforts were insured by Morley's wife Frances with the help of a Chinese house staff (A. A. Morris 1931: 136–139). Two small, thatched houses were for the staff bachelors (Brunhouse 1971: 206 f.). Charlot was Thompson's " room-mate at Chichen Itza for several months in 1926" (Thompson 1960: ix; 1963: 38).

The close proximity and intense labor of the staff provoked friction and intrigue: "We were in Merida a few days. it was a rest after the end of the season so saturated with politics and petty hates" (JC to AB "Since my last letter"). At one point, Morley was pushing Charlot to marry his secretary: "Creo que Morley me quiere casar con su secretaria. Es muy politico pero a mi no me gusta la politica" 'I think

that Morley wants to marry me to his secretary. It's very political but I don't like politics.'[53] Such doings inspired gossip in which Charlot himself uncharacteristically joined.[54] Chich'en gossip has survived into our century. One scholar described Thompson to me as an "old busybody." A main topic of the continuing gossip is Charlot's relationship with Ann Morris, discussed above. In retrospect, Charlot found the interpersonal frictions alarming enough to compare to those in art departments:

> The subject of the quota of art-making and art-speaking is something that is easy in theory. The difficulty comes from the personalities that teach in the art departments. I don't know if all of you have lived or not within an art department, but it is not an unusual experience. It is like living in a big family; they have the same squabbles, the same troubles. Usually the friction comes between art critics and practicing artists.
>
> I am reminded of one time when I was in the jungles of Yucatán. There was a little group of white people cooped up with hundreds of natives. Things went along pretty well for a while, but somehow rubbing elbows every day distorts the point of view. In my work with art departments, I have had a little bit of the same feeling that I had in the jungles. But I think that feeling should remain in the jungles, and if we want to get better things in art education, we should try to bring peace among the teachers of art. (Charlot September 1947)

Despite such problems, life-long friendships were formed as described above. Charlot had found the personnel "charmants" 'charming' when he first arrived (Diary January 30, 1926); "people so nice that they would enjoy even our jokes."[55] On returning the next year, Charlot noted in his diary:

> joie de tous revoir. émotion <u>d'immense</u> dans Morley Morris Ann et Lowell larmes. soit à Dieu (January 21, 1927)
>
> 'joy to see everyone again. emotion of something <u>immense</u> in Morley, Morris, Ann, and Lowell tears. render it all to God.'

The expedition was dependent on the local community for a labor crew of from thirty-three to fifty to a hundred, supplies, and good will (Brunhouse 1971: 208 f.). In 1926, the social environment was unsettling. The Caste War of Yucatan had started in 1847, and the Mexican government had claimed victory in 1901 and again in 1915. But both sides were still suffering from the atrocities they suffered, and incidents were recorded as late as 1933. Charnay reported the terror felt at Chich'en Itza in the early years of the war (1885: 257). Thompson felt in equal danger from the Mexican army (Thompson 1949: 294). Post-war banditry replaced much ideology, and "The near-by village of Piste was a hotbed of banditry."[56] The bandits in the workforce blended in, and the archeologists generally felt safe because of the Indians devotion to their boss, Earl Morris (A. A. Morris 1931: 97). The Indians also felt a vested interest in the finds as Charlot, for instance, reported:

> matin : Earl découvre le chac-mol. plus sculpture. tous les ouvriers viennent le voir. aussi les visiteurs : magnifique de couleur. (Diary March 21, 1927)

> ‘morning: Earl discovers the chac mol. more sculpture. all the workers come to see it. also the visitors: magnificent with color.’

Morley also had friendly, even sentimental relations with the Maya, and he and his wife were intensely concerned with their welfare (Kidder 1948: 272, 274). But Charlot felt that caution should be exercised:

> They had to keep a close watch because they were surrounded by Mayans who could become hostile. The main workers on the project came from a bandit village. One idiot photographer would pose the women naked and then try to rape them. He made it dangerous for all. He explained to pop that if the girl looked *down*, that wasn’t art; but if she looked *up*, it was.
>
> On one expedition, dig, the Indians kept asking whether they’d found gold today. They explained over and over again that no, they weren’t looking for gold. The Indians were very polite, but would continue to pose the question.[57]

But ignorance could always create misunderstandings:

> There was an archeologist there, come to study the Mayans. At Chichén, he was surrounded, of course, by a veritable sea of pure-blooded Mayans. But he complained that he couldn’t find any. All had said in his questionnaire that their mothers were Spanish. The archeologists made enquiries and found the Indians had thought he was asking whether their mothers *spoke* Spanish, and had written yes because it was prestigious that one could. (Tabletalk Undated, early to mid 1970s)

Like the Morrises and others, Charlot was impressed by the skill of the native laborers.[58] When I was a child, he spoke to me about their handiness at solving difficult construction problems with odd bits of wood and rope. His artwork shows that he considered them the descendants of the geniuses who had originally designed and built Chich’en Itza. The workers impressed also with their strong personalities (e.g., A. A. Morris 1931: 96). Charlot, like Morley, learned some Maya to communicate better with them, a knowledge that helped him in his understanding of Maya art.

Charlot’s closeness to the Maya is revealed in his being invited to participate in a religious ceremony, an invitation he refused. As a Catholic, he felt participation was forbidden, but he was interested in and respectful of the syncretic religion of the workers (e.g., Brunhouse 1971: 156 f.). Anita Brenner was struck by the religion of the Indians:

> The people here, while they are pagan, and speak with spirits, and sacrifice, and all of that, are yet not so Catholic even as the Mexican Indians, who are little enough linked to the priest. [59]

Caves have been used for rituals from Precolumbian times until today, one of which has been “desacralized” to be opened to non-Maya. Like some other staff members, Charlot felt the religious dimension of the land and its religious buildings: “A jungle is picturesque, but for the painter it is also a

place of awe" (*AA* II 187). Charlot reported having a religious experience related to the mosaic disc at the Temple of the Warriors.[60] Other staffers adopted rituals. Thompson encouraged "the habit of burning copal to the Maya gods every Monday morning before work."[61] Morley said he wanted to give Kukulcan an *abrazo* in heaven.[62]

Although the Carnegie Institution was supposed to have an exclusive right to excavate at Chich'en Itza, one or more Mexican teams were at least occasionally at work. In an unpublished typescript, Donald McVicker describes one directed by the artist Miguel Ángel Fernández under Gamio and the Dirección de Antropología. References in the English-language sources are sparse and vague, and relations between the Carnegie and Mexican teams are hard to define.

Charlot and Ann Axtell Morris worked mostly on the Temple of the Warriors complex, but on their own time, they began to copy the frescoes in the Temple of the Jaguar at the ball court (also called the Temple of the Tigers and the Temple of the Tiger).[63] The building had been designated for reconstruction by the Mexican government, and Charlot and Ann were worried about damage to the frescoes. For instance, their room was being used as a tool shed.

The frescoes had been well preserved when first viewed by Edward H. Thompson, the owner and pioneer explorer of the area.[64] But Adela Breton found them "unfortunately, much destroyed" with the destruction continuing: "the wreck which becomes each year more deplorable, now that the removal of the trees and plants which protected the exterior allows the tropic rains to pour down the walls" (1906: 165 f.). Indeed, much damage was done between Breton's work and that of Charlot and Morris (Mary McVicker 2005: 78).

The importance of the frescoes had been recognized as early as their being copied and studied by Breton: "These wall paintings are of the highest interest, not only from the point of view of archeology but from that of Art. In color, drawing and design they can hold their own any where…" (Breton 1906: 165). Besides making the most complete copies ever done of the murals, Breton anticipated many of the views later expressed by Charlot and Morris. She was interested in "arms and accouterments" and speculated about "mathematical relationships" in the placement of the shields (Mary McVicker 2005: 144). She focused on the peculiarities of individual artists:

> There were certainly two artists employed, and their methods were different. One was a master who knew exactly what he meant to do, and did it in a calm methodical way, with certainty and swiftness of brush in the sweeping outlines. The other, more impetuous, dashed in figures just as they came into his head, after he had fixed the positions of the shields. These positions (at any rate on the south wall) are not hap. hazard [*sic*], and it might be worth while for a mathematician or astronomer to study them. (Breton 1906: 167)

That neither Charlot nor Ann Axtell Morris mentions Breton's work is puzzling.[65]

José Vasconcelos had taken Rivera to Chich'en Itza as part of his program to remexacanize him. Rivera was impressed:

> Rivera stood in awe inside the precious inner chamber of the Temple of the Tigers, still ablaze with twelfth-century frescoes. Those best preserved combine complex geometric planning with lively anecdotic storytelling. To the Paris painter, still fresh from café talks of subject matter versus pure plasticity, this Sistine Chapel of the Americas acted as an Indian reminder of the classical postulate that both ingredients may blend to perfection.[66]

Charlot was equally impressed and, besides his copying of the remains, wrote several studies of the murals.[67]

Charlot also viewed other Maya sites. On March 30, 1926, he and several colleagues visited Uxmal, where Morley had done some mapping in 1909:[68]

> départ 6h pour Uxmal en 2 autos. magnifiques ruines comme parlé des mirages gravés.
>
> 'departure 6:00 AM for Uxmal in two automobiles. magnificent ruins. as described, graven MIRAGES/visions.

On the next day, they motored to Kabah, where Charlot was impressed by the Palace of the Masks:

> très beau. escalier en têtes de masques. panneaux masques. painted capstone. (Diary March 31, 1926)
> 'very beautiful. staircase in heads of masks. mask panels. painted capstone.'

Charlot and Herbert J. Spinden slept in the ruins, explored them further in the morning, and left for Labna, where Charlot admired the Gateway Arch.[69]

The most fruitful outside trip was May 23–26 or 22–28, 1926, to Coba—the Coba group, the Nohoch Mul Group, Macanxoc, and Kukikan. This was the third and breakthrough visit. Morley had received news of the site and sent "Thompson to decipher the glyphs and Charlot to draw the sculptures."[70] The area is dense, wet jungle, with Macanxoc the lushest. Crocodiles inhabit the lake whence Thompson drew water for his tea. Charlot's working conditions were bad (Thompson, Pollock, and Charlot 1932: 135). Charlot's diaries note the conditions:

> départ 5 h arrivée 1 h Kobah les ruines : Castillo et stelas très ~~offacés~~ effacés. puis vu ruines avec Carmen (Diary May 23, 1926)
> 'departure 5:00 AM [from Valladolid] Coba the ruins: Castillo and stelae very worn down. then saw the ruins with Carmen [Chai].'
>
> départ 6h pour voir : hombres de piedra après 1 h marche nous les trouvons : ce sont 8 magnifiques stelas old empire toutes encore en place dans leur chambre. copié (Diary May 24, 1926)
> 'departure 6:00 AM to see "men of stone." after one hour of walking, we find them: they are eight magnificent old empire stelae all still in place inside their room. copied'

> départ 6 h arrivée 1p h ½ après horrible marche dans les lianes et arbres à Cuci-Kan : une ville entourée de murs avec 2 très grands palais principaux. masques. retour affolé par la fatigue. (Diary May 25, 1926)
> 'departure 6:00 AM. arrival at Kukikan 1:00 PM after horrible march in the vines and trees: a city surrounded by walls with two very big principal palaces. masks. return maddened with fatigue.'
>
> matin -- travaillé sur stelas. AM départ pour retour (Diary May 26, 1926)
> 'morning: worked on stelae. afternoon departure to return.'

The Coba visit achieved important results. Morley was so impressed that he made another trip to the site with Thompson to double-check the dates.[71] Brenner reported Morley saying in a lecture that Charlot and Thompson had "made the most important discovery at Cobá district that has been made in Maya explorations for five years. He praises Jean much."[72] Charlot himself wrote later:

> Especially rewarding proved an exploration of the jungle-locked walled city of Cobá-Macanxoc, together with the English archeologist, Eric J. Thompson. There, we discovered stelae of such an early date that the chronology of the Northern Maya—referred to up to then as that of the New Empire—had to be revised. ("Writings Related to *MMR*, Passages Cut)

He spoke of Coba in a 1945 radio interview:

> Charlot:
> Sin duda alguna, la experiencia más vívida que tuve fue el viaje que hice en compañía del gran amigo y gran arqueólogo Eric Thompson, que condujo al descubrimiento de las ruinas mayas de Coba-Macanxoc, ciudad llena de fechas, que cambiaron por cierto la historia escrita hasta entonces sobre los mayas del norte.
>
> Verna:
> ¿Dónde está localizada esta ciudad?
>
> Charlot:
> Muy adentro de la selva, entre dos lagos. La descubrimos con miles de dificultades, pero era un hallazgo que valía la pena. Figúrese, no más... hay fechas que datan de 300 años antes de lo que las personas enteradas pensaban que eran las fechas verdaderas del imperio maya. (September 14, 1945)
>
> 'Charlot:
> Without any doubt, the most vivid experience that I had was the voyage I made in company of my great friend and great archeologist Eric Thompson that led to the discovery of the Maya ruins of Coba-Macanxoc, a city full of dates that changed

certainly the history written up to then of the Maya of the north.

Verna:
Where is this city located?

Charlot:
Very much inside the jungle, between two lakes. We discovered it with thousands of difficulties, but it was a find that was worth the trouble. Imagine, no more…there are dates that date from 300 years earlier than those that informed people thought were the true dates of the Maya empire.'

Charlot's studies were included in the official report.[73] He always considered the Macanxoc stelae masterpieces of Maya art. This visit was also credited with the discovery of Macanxoc itself (Glusker 2010: 318), although Charlot was amused by the fact that Maya children accompanying them on their walk kept singing, "They're going to discover Coba! They're going to discover Coba!" (compare Thompson 1963: 52).

Charlot visited Yaxuna in 1927 "accompagné par 39 avec fusils et machettes" 'accompanied by thirty-nine with rifles and machetes.'[74] Charlot visited an unidentified site in 1928 and took the opportunity to swim and walk in the modern port of Sisal.[75] Charlot paid a quick visit to Ek' Balam.[76] Charnay had found the site in the late nineteenth century, but archeology had to wait for the 1980s. In 1928, Charlot found the ruins "bien peu" 'very little.'

On his Yucatan trips, Charlot also attended other cultural events like theater (April 3, 1928) and cinema (1928: May 31, June 1). He was especially interested in the folk culture practiced intensively at Mérida and elsewhere:

fête à Dzitas magnifique petite de 12 ans petite et fleurie (February 27, 1927)
'fiesta at Dzitas magnificent little girl twelve years old small and flowery.'

soir : cirque et vu pitre yucatèque connu au Mexico. (June 28, 1927)
'evening: circus and saw Yucatecan clown known in Mexico City.'

11 h : voir brute avec pitre yucatèque. soir : avec Lowell : ciné et pitre sur la plaza Santa Anna. (June 29, 1927)
'11 A.M.: see beast with Yucatecan clown. evening: with Lowell: cinema and clown on the Plaza Santa Anna.'

plaza empapelada. très beau. (May 31, 1928)
'plaza decorated with papers. very beautiful.'

These experiences provided Charlot with new subjects for his visual arts, e.g.: "petite aquarelle jarana !" 'little watercolor of *jarana* dance!' (Diary February 19, 1926); "foire Mérida" 'Mérida fair' (Diary May 15, 1927).

Charlot described his situation in Yucatan in a letter to his young niece Arlette Bouvier:

> Je suis très loin, très loin de la France, dans un pays où les hommes ont des chapeaux plus hauts qu'eux, de gros pistolets à la ceinture et parlent une langue que tu ne comprendrais pas. Quand je reviendrai à Paris et que nous aurons fait connaissance, si tu veux, je t'apprendrai à parler l'espagnol. J'aurai aussi beaucoup d'histoires à te raconter, comment on voyage dans les grandes forêts où il y a des tigres qui vous regardent passer (comme en France les vaches regardent passer les trains) et comment il faut coucher dans des hamacs à cause des serpents. Il y a des petits serpents qui ne mangent que des lapins et ils sont si paresseux qu'ils s'endorment avant d'avoir fini d'avaler, avec les deux oreilles du lapin qui leur dépassent par la bouche.
> Il y a aussi des maisons très grandes, en pierre, comme on en voit à Paris, mais elles sont au milieu de la forêt, personne n'y habite et il y a de gros arbres qui leur poussent sur le toit.
> Bref, tu vois que nous aurons à nous dire beaucoup de choses. (ca. 1926)

> 'I am very far, very far from France, in a land where the men wear hats taller than themselves, big pistols on their belts, and speak a language you would not understand. When I return to Paris and we have gotten to know each other, I will teach you to speak Spanish, if you want. I will also have many stories to tell you: how one travels in the big forests where there are tigers who watch you pass (as in France the cows watch the passing trains) and how you need to sleep in hammocks because of the snakes. There are little snakes who eat only rabbits, and they are so lazy that they go to sleep before they've finished swallowing them with the two ears of the rabbit sticking out of their mouth.
> There are also very big houses, in stone, as you see in Paris, but they are in the middle of the forest, no one lives in them, and big trees grow on the roof.
> So you see that we will have many things to tell each other.'

9.1.1. ARCHEOLOGY

The archeological methods used at Chich'en Itza were those of the 1920s rather than the more exacting ones that were already being developed by younger scholars. Although Earl Morris's southwest experience was helpful, no system of digging or "recording plans, sections, or elevations" was used or taught.[77] Nonetheless, the practical results are still being studied, especially the connection to restoration (Elizabeth Morris October 25, 2006).

9.1.1.1. Drafting

That the Carnegie expedition was on the cusp between the older and the newer methods can be seen in its being "perhaps the last such archaeological publication to be illustrated mainly with drawings

instead of photographs."[78] Fortunately, drawings and paintings had advantages. Besides the natural deterioration of murals:

> Souvenirs seekers have done their work of destruction, travelers have inscribed their names or scribblings since pre-Hispanic times. On account of this, a patient study through careful tracing does more justice to the work than does direct photography.[79]

Moreover, drawings could clarify better than photography the discrepancy between the bas-reliefs of the columns and their coloring:

> It can be added that the copyist's work was not concluded in the field. Given the unusual and most delicate relation of color to line on the originals, in which the painted version does not always coincide with the sculptured, he thought it advisable to work on the lithographic color version, himself fixing the color outline on the 141 plates necessary for these reproductions. The result is as accurate as could be procured.[80]

The illustrations for the official report reveal how exacting this work was: the outline drawing of the bas-relief had to be overlaid with one or more color areas that did not correspond exactly to the preparatory sculpture (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931). The color photography of the 1920s would not have been able to record this information, and color negatives and prints were subject to severe deterioration. Thus the copying of Charlot and Ann Axtell Morris is important because the color has now disappeared from the exposed columns. Also, paintings are now the only full record of other colored architectural features (e.g., A. A. Morris 1931: 240 f., 246 f., 249).

Morley assigned Charlot to copying the sixty square roof supports in front of the Temple of the Warriors. Commonly confused with these, the court on the side of the temple—bordered by 200 round columns and square pillars—was called with romantic exaggeration the Court of a Thousand Columns. When we were told about this as children, Charlot teased us by saying he copied all thousand columns. Charlot felt he would have been better used on the murals:

> Morley made a mistake to put [Ann Axtell Morris] on the painting. He should have put her on the sculpture, which I did, because she could trace it. I think I could have got the spirit of the painting better. She was more interested in subject matter, and I was more interested in style. I went on Sundays and did the little copies I have upstairs. She got it all in, but missed the artistic side a little.
>
> On the other hand, she was very good at reconstructing the whole from the blocks. I don't think I could have done that. Of course we argued about some things, but she did a better job than I could have done.[81]
>
> Ann Axtell Morris did the murals usually while he did the columns, but she just got the content, not the style. Her work was too hurried. (Tabletalk February 27, 1979)

Morley had appointed Ann to the task before Charlot was employed and probably did not want to move her (A. A. Morris 1931: 149 f., 165–175).

But Charlot had a special ability that gave him an advantage in copying especially a mural like that of the Temple of the Jaguar, discussed below: he was able to animate a line with a sense of direction. Since childhood, his lines had pointed with a purpose. Human beings are trained to follow a pointing arm and finger through the intervening space to their object. Good artists can exploit this way of seeing to guide the viewer's engagement with the picture. Lines are placed to direct the viewer's gaze to whatever point or points the artist desires. In this way, the artist can tell a story and communicate a message. The mural of the Temple of the Jaguar is filled with spears that mark short sections of longer trajectories. Completed in the viewer's mind, those longer lines construct the over-all geometric composition of the mural. Directionality is essential for any such linear composition, the very type Charlot would find appropriate for his major Yucatan subjects, as I discuss below.

A full study of Charlot's archeological copies is needed, but unfortunately requires their location. A large number, including the Carnegie Institution of Washington Collection, were given to the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University (Coe 1999: 183). The items are listed and some illustrated on the museum's web site (http://pmem.unix.fas.harvard.edu:8080/peabody/view/objects/aslist/search$0040?t:state:flow=90aa4388-b3b9-4989-8196-8b136edf2582). Most of Charlot's own holdings were donated by him to INA, the Instituto Nacional de Antropología, in Mexico City in 1968, on the occasion of his retrospective. Maria O'Higgins, Pablo's widow, told Maria Leon-Portilla that she remembered driving Charlot to the main office in the Colonia Roma so he could give the items personally to the director, then Guillermo Bonsill. Maria O'Higgins emphasized the quantity of the material, all packaged in tubes. Pablo had examined the artworks and was very impressed. A smaller number of items is housed in the Jean Charlot Collection, and one large altar painting was donated to the National Museum of Mexican Art in Chicago. The number of surviving items is remarkable.

Charlot's diary records constant work and a surprisingly quick production of detailed copies: e.g., "dessiné 11 côtés colonnes" 'drew 11 sides of columns' (Diary May 12, 1927). Charlot would usually draw the outlines in ink line first and then do a watercolor to record the colors: "20 dessins en couleur fresque" '29 drawings in fresco color' (Diary April 18, 1926). He was also painting more impressionistic watercolors, sometimes of the same subject: "fini dessin colonne 12 (1) commencé aquarelle de la même" 'finished drawing column 12 (1) started watercolor of the same' (Diary March 5, 1926). Charlot did not find the copying mechanical: "matin : bonne copie du Tlaloc" 'morning: good copy of the Tlaloc' (Diary April 11, 1926). Discoveries were exciting:

> Las pinturas encontradas son importantissimas. Hay prisioneros pintados y tienen black and white stripes como los actuales…Lo que estoy copiando tiene monumentos con perspectiva italiana. Otra cosa que no debe ser. (JC to AB "No he recibido nada tuyo todavia")
> 'The discovered paintings are most important. There are prisoners painted and they

> have black and white stripes like those today…What I'm copying now has monuments in Italian perspective. Another thing that shouldn't be.'
>
> Earl a découvert pyramide interne avec couleur très conservé. je commence aquarelle. (Diary May 28, 1926)
> 'Earl has discovered an inside pyramid with color very conserved. I start watercolor'
>
> on découvre l'autel. il est très beau. (February 18, 1927)
> 'the altar is discovered. it is very beautiful.'

Some of the copying was recording what would be lost in the excavation: "dessiné escalier devant l'autel avant la destruction" 'drew staircase in front of the altar before the destruction' (January 24, 1927); "Earl démolit l'escalier devant l'autel. bonne sculpture derrière" 'Earl demolishes the staircase in front of the altar. good sculpture behind' (January 25, 1927). The dig uncovered surprises, notably the turquoise mosaic found in a stone box.[82]

> As seen above, Morley and the others were happy with Charlot's work:
>
> He descubierto, copiado en colores y mandado pintura maya importante a Carnegie Institute. It was a good beginning y Morley muy sastisfecho [*sic*]. (JC to AB "Your first letter was a great pleasure")
> 'I have discovered, copied in color, and sent important Maya painting to the Carnegie Institution. It was a good beginning and Morley is very satisfied.'

Charlot could produce work that transcended the capabilities of the normal archeological draftsman:

> Se quedaron muy contentos de mi trabajo. Les hice en color copia de un fresco con todo, las raspaduras, el yeso, la pared, y me consideron como "especialista["]. (JC to AB "Recibi tu carta estupida Francis")
> 'They remain very happy with my work. I made them a color copy of a fresco with everything—the scratches, the plaster, the wall—and they consider me a "specialist."'

Charlot's exact copies reveal that he was capable of *trompe-l'œil* effects—for instance, of surface textures—that he did not employ in his personal work. Moreover, Charlot was adept at reassembling fragments, as described by Earl Morris:

> Then came the problem of which set belonged to which column. This point was in some cases easy to confirm, but in others it necessitated the most sensitive perception to pick out the minute details by means of which identification could be made. Jean Charlot, who had been with us two seasons, devoting his uncanny skill to copying and studying the bas-reliefs we had uncovered, after hours of concentrated effort was able to fix the previous positions of them all. The points upon which he rested his decision were so obvious, once he had pointed them out, that it seemed astonishing that anyone with an observing eye would have failed to note them. But so it is in every calling:

> there are many who can follow, but rare is he who can point the way. (Earl Morris 1931: 149)

Charlot also had the eye of a good digger: “Todos los dias descubro pinturas mayas. No sé adonde tenian los ojos estos archeologos!” ‘Every day, I discover Maya paintings. I don’t know where the archeologists have their eyes’ (JC to AB “Si te hago pensar”).

Charlot’s intensive work at Chich’en Itza was important for his own thinking and art. Copying great works was practiced as a foundation of the Classical art education in France. As seen in Volume 1, Chapter 3, Charlot remembered copying a Hokusai drawing when he was a toddler. From copying on the floor in his mother’s studio and during promenades and sessions with his nanny, Charlot went on to art classes in the Ecole Hattemer, Condorcet, and the corridors of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. On his own, he copied masterpieces in the Louvre and Aztec codices from the Goupil collection. In Yucatan, he related his work as a copyist to the form of his studies in France: “This gave me an opportunity to study the historic Maya culture, especially through the discovery and copying of Mayan stelae” (Charlot Spring 1937). Indeed, some Maya art recalled his models in France:

> No one has really studied Mayan figure painting; it’s great. It has none of the difficulties of the Greeks or the Egyptians. Only some nineteenth-century academicians were able to do the same complicated things.[83]

Copying enabled Charlot to enter into the mind of the artist, whether Western, Indian, or Hawaiian:

> it’s like you go to the Louvre or to the Metropolitan Museum and you copy the Old Masters. You don’t pretend that you are an Old Master. But by repeating the lines, the proportions, and so on, you gather something that the guys who did the things—it may be Titian, it may be Poussin, it may be the old Hawaiian—had I wouldn’t say in mind, but the very rhythm, the very rhythm of their hand, of their wrist, and so on, is repeated as you copy the petroglyphs. (Interview March 26, 1978)

Charlot approached his copying as an artist, entering into the relationships between observation, experience, education, and practice:

> The mental aesthetic ideal and the material conditions of work are the two elements whose successful union produces an original art style. Both are considered in this study in the light of the writer’s experience, during the past ten years, as a creative painter and sculptor. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 233)

Charlot considered his copying an authentic artistic practice, signed a number of his copies, and used good materials for them, like woven paper. He was saddened when one of his copies was damaged as we moved into our Kāhala house in 1957 and was happy to have a long, high wall in the living room on which he could hang one of his full-sized oils of an altar from the Temple of the Warriors.

Charlot wrote of his enjoyment of copying:

> Me gusta mucho el trabajo que es d'estar sobre un andamio a copiar columnas en el sol. Me pongo anteojos negros para no sentir tanto el calor. *[Illustration with caption]*. Muchas mas columnas. Cada una 4 lados, 8 dibujos. (JC to AB "Estas un poco demasiado")
> 'I like very much the work, which is to be on a scaffolding to copy columns in the sun. I wear dark glasses so as not to feel the heat so much. *[Illustration with caption]*. Many more columns. Each one has four sides, eight drawings.
>
> Just arrived el "mas grande" pintor de archeologia, Joseph Linden Smith que tiene cosas en los museos de todo el mundo. Estoy aprendiendo sus trucos como niñito debutante pa' despues hacer unos J. Linden Smiths yo tambien. Primera profesion que me gusta, esta.[84]
> 'Just arrived the "greatest" archeological painter, Joseph Linden Smith, who has things in the museums of the whole world. I am learning his tricks like a little child debutante so that afterwards I can make some J. Linden Smiths myself. This is the first profession that pleases me.'

Copying provided Charlot with a first-hand contact with the Maya artists, a basis for his critical understanding of them as individuals and as members of schools and historical moments. Also, bringing to bear his own experience as a liturgical artist, Charlot could recognize the processional orientation of figures towards an altar as a depiction of ritual; he had himself used the device in his first mural design, *Processional* (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 241 f., 340 f.). In an old form of headdress, Charlot could recognize a parallel with the antique vestments of the Catholic Mass, "discarded except for liturgical use" (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 244). The same process applied to ritual objects: "It can be supposed that such a knife, uncommon then as a war weapon, was retained for ritual or sacrificial uses" (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 252). His latest experiences also prove useful: he connected the use of live glowworm larvae on a costume in an ancient mural to its contemporary use in the area (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 289).

Charlot broadened his experiential basis with scholarly studies of artworks like codices (Dresden, Persianus, Tro-Cortesiansus, Vienna, Zouche), archeological and ethnographic reports, and literature and language. He viewed and copied artworks at the Bellas Artes and its library, the National Library, the Bibliothèque Française, and museums in Mexico City and Yucatan.[85] He also read widely, including such pioneering but discredited explorers as Jean-Frédéric Waldeck (1766?–1875) and the couple Augustus Le Plongeon (1826–1908) and Alice Dixon Le Plongeon (1851–1910), whom he felt had recorded useful information.[86] He took notes on their publications and made drawings of the illustrations. Charlot's interest in depreciated archeologists was probably based on his sympathy for Charnay, who was suffering the same fate. Charlot was characteristically drawn to underdog artists as well, like Pintao and Louis Eilshemius.

As seen above, Chapter 3, Charlot was gratified whenever he found that an aspect of his art or that of his colleagues accorded with unrelated Mexican works like folk statues and *pulquería* painting.

Charlot's work at Yucatan was a further occasion to gauge the Mexicanidad of their movement. Charlot's description of a mural at the Temple of the Jaguar could almost be made of his *Massacre at the Main Temple*:

> The artist has played a masterly game of geometry, using as units the circle which is the shield and the straight line which is the spear. Both elements dovetail into a series of pyramiding forms…All those diagonals surging upwards from the outside towards the center bring a compositional order the more admirable for using as its means the very excess of action depicted. (*AA* II 52 f.; November 1938)

Finally, Charlot wrote of Maya as of Aztec art that understanding and appreciating it was easier after the development of modern art in Europe (May 1947).

9.1.1.2. Writing

Charlot was soon assigned to write about the artwork as well as to copy it: "Now after we finished those diggings, between times when I went there only to do drawings, they had found that I could read and write, so they asked me to write about the sculptures that I had copied."[87] The writings that impressed Morley were probably those of Charlot's first reports.[88] Charlot thus graduated to co-author of the final report, *The Temple of the Warriors at Chichén Itzá, Yucatán* (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931), which was very well received, for example by Alfred V. Kidder:

> This is the first definitive publication upon a unit of the Chichén Itzá project. In content and in illustration it sets a new standard in the presentation of results of excavation in the Maya Field. (Weeks and Hill 2006: 105)

Charlot also co-authored *A Preliminary Study of the Ruins of Cobá, Quintana Roo, Mexico* (Thompson, Pollock, Charlot 1932) and wrote numerous scholarly and popular articles in the field.

Both Earl and Ann Axtell Morris were good writers. Their daughter, Elizabeth, praised the final report as more articulate than the usual archeological texts of the time: the individual styles were not flattened by over-editing and the three authors were not inhibited about including revelatory anecdotes (October 25, 2006). Lowell Houser also helped Charlot, probably with the English as Brenner had (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 233). Charlot probably also helped to organize a lecture by Morley in Mexico City, because he expressed disappointment when few came: "soir : conférence Morley ni Lupe ni Shore ni Paine ni Ledesma viennent ni Amelita del Rio" 'Morley lecture. Neither Lupe nor Shore nor Paine nor Ledesma come nor Amelita del Rio.'[89]

The Morrises were knowledgeable about art, so their acceptance of Charlot onto their team is meaningful. However, their writings about Maya art—like Morley's and Thompson's—are less understanding and appreciative than Charlot's, a symptom, I believe, of their lesser estimation of Maya religion.[90]

First and foremost for Charlot, Maya art was valuable in itself:

> Maya hieroglyphic writing is a problem of dominant importance, but Maya art, if studied per se, could help us bring to light some additional points about the essence of one of the most thoroughly civilized moments this world has known. (1928 Maya Esthetic)
> frescos mayas, que es el mas importante descubrimiento pintura desde las cosas de Creta[91]
> 'Maya frescoes, which is the most important painting discovery since the things of Crete.'

Maya art should be approached with the same respect as other great non-Western traditions, like Chinese ink painting: "The would-be critic has to make an effort toward greater sophistication, and to stand, not as a judge, but as a pupil" (1928 Maya Esthetic). As much as he wrote on Maya art, Charlot still had ideas to pursue like a study of "Mayan figure painting," mentioned above (Tabletalk July 17, 1978).

Accordingly for Charlot, Maya art should be studied as thoroughly and rigorously as Western. An artwork is inseparable from its individual creator, its message, and its context. For instance, in his University of Hawai'i lectures on cave art, he examined first the surviving artwork. He then used his findings to describe the artist; for instance, particularly feathery strokes were incompatible with the wrist needed for heavy spear throws. He then widened his focus progressively towards the artist's way of working, his life, world, and views. The Maya artist began with "preparatory sketching from living models" (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 234). He then used those sketches freely for several purposes, like an "adjustment to the needs of monumental style":

> The repetition of lines insignificant for descriptive purposes—but agreeable aesthetically—and the disregard for important features point to an artist dealing freely with his own sketches and from an artistic point of view, repeating himself, but doing this as unobtrusively as possible and creating or suppressing details at will—an attitude quite different from that of a mere copyist."[92]

Besides observation and variation, the Maya artist inherits a treasury of artistic devices, for instance:

> The spectator *sees* both arms with equal clearness and is scarcely aware of the stratagem. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 316)
> the glyphs made up of several human figures do not seem crowded, simply because the artist used a single limb, optically, to correspond to two different bodies.
> The solution of artistic problems by means of 'substitution' is one of the most striking achievements of Maya art.

Charlot himself adopted this device, for instance, in his depictions of the folk play *Bato y Bas* (e.g., Clippings unnumbered, before 52). Evidence of teamwork among the Maya artists was also useful for interpretation (compare Schele and Mathews 1998: 29). For instance, discrepancies between early and final carved versions "permit a glimpse into the mind of the sculptor and throw some light on his solutions

of artistic problems" (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 316). All elements must ultimately be appreciated as a living whole:

> This method of using a work of art as merely an accumulation of descriptive data fails to reveal or define its most individual feature, which is style.[93]

The identification of style enables Charlot to recognize the personality of the artist, for instance:

> The work is technically inferior to the best work of similar subjects in the Maya area. But what it lacks in workmanship or in dignity it gains in freedom. The artist evidently enjoyed his work. His close observation of personages is ingenious and shrewd. It is true that the lack of a theoretical canon of beauty makes his work little fitted to embody, as of old, an impersonal collective feeling, but his more individual outlook on the world led him to fresher and unexpected realizations, especially in portraiture. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 265)

Understanding style also makes possible a recognition of the artist's social and historical context:

> This sustained collective impersonal style points also to sacerdotal or aristocratic pressure on the artisan, and, in turn, to a rigidly organized social régime. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 342)

Finally, the viewer can return to the individual artist and his personal message, which both inhabits and transcends his social position and historical moment: "his intelligent feeling for the material used, his peculiarly mathematical emotion, and the tragic core that underlies its 'abstract' veneer" (Charlot June 1936).

Brenner found that Charlot was considered "the authority on this art," though she was happy to find a color he had not mentioned (Glusker 2010: 397). She recognized also that he was applying his art historical study to the problems of the project: "He was found to know much about Maya art that could enlighten archaeologists as to the Mayas" (*Idols* 305). Charlot himself was pleased when his drawings began to be published and his reports cited (JC to AB "Ya no escribes, verdad").

Maya art provides multiple foci besides art history. Arthur G. Miller writes:

> This paper is an analysis of the subject matter of the mural paintings…Discussion of the sophisticated painting style of these murals, although very much related to their inherent meaning, is here omitted. (Miller 1977: 198)

However, the "very much related" raises inevitable problems. For instance, should the depiction of red hills be understood as recording or as an example "of obvious stylization of mountains as place signs" (Miller 1977: 213).

Charlot and Ann Axtell Morris were interested in content and found that their copying provided a detailed study, for instance, of the elaborate costumes depicted:

> Most of those things are more difficult to understand because the figure is masked. This is a priest also who is disguised as a jaguar. Actually he is not entirely masked. His face was painted blue for the forehead, black for the cheeks. He had only what we could call a mouth mask. The mouth mask and the tongue are those of a leopard. He's dressed up in a leopard skin also.[94]

The work of analysis was complex. Ann Morris reports that she:

> inquired sweetly of my harassed co-worker, "Jean, what would you say if I were to show you a figure with a death god's head, a warrior's quilted defensive sleeve, a jaguar's clawlike hand, a priest's long dress, and a god impersonator's sandals?" Jean threw up his hands, stared at me with glassy eyes, and then with the single-minded purposefulness of those going quite mad, put on his hat and left the building. (1931: 185)

Just as with clothes in *costumbres* artworks, an analysis of the Maya costumes was essential for understanding the murals and reconstructing their society. Charlot wanted to pursue his study of Maya costume but found little interest. He wrote an article on the subject that has been lost: "I wanted to know if Morley had received and if received, had read a paper mio [my] (Fashion in dresses as a method of dating monuments) to the Congress" (JC to AB "It would be useless to recriminate"). The project became a joke he told on himself:

> I continue to be an authority on the 14th century costume and habits of the Maya (concerning which I have had one inquiry within the last eight years) and also to paint (Charlot Spring 1937).
>
> After doing those things, I became the greatest expert on something that, I'm sorry to say, I could never cash in on, and that is on the costumes, dresses, and so on, of the Mayan people in the fourteenth century. It's astonishing how few people are interested in that topic. But supposing that a Mayan entered this room, a Mayan of the fourteenth century, I would know immediately what his profession was, what he did, what his relations were, and so on and so forth. For example, this gentleman is a priest. He's a priest, and in one hand, he's holding a little fan, because the mosquitoes are impossible in Yucatán and were forever impossible. In the other hand, he uses something which looks like a devil's fork and may have been used, I would say, just for that, just as a fork. Then around his neck there is a human bone. That human bone, if you look carefully, has little holes in it and was used as a flute for sacred music. He has something like a tibia, I don't know what, in his hat also which is human. You come to like those guys, you know. They are very original. (March 8, 1972)

Costumes and accouterments are now given the attention they deserve (e.g., Schele and Mathews 1998: 243).

Charlot also made a point that differed fundamentally from the consensus supported by Morley and Thompson that the Maya hieroglyphic texts were exclusively mathematical, calendrical, astronomical, and ceremonial, but not historical (Coe 1999: 122, 129, 143). That view accorded with the common contrast of peaceful Maya to war-like Aztecs. Charlot did recognize those elements and their importance:

> The very great majority of these texts, as we read them on codices and monuments, happen to be, not literary, but mathematical, treating of astronomical computations, of the movements of the sun and moon and the planets. Thus the backbone of Art, the mental skeleton that the Maya priesthood offered to the artist to clothe thus with his own esthetic passion, is mathematical. Numbers, being measure and rhythm, are poetry in essence, but accessible only to a few. In order to attract crowds, it must be clad in less metaphysical garments. This was the role of the Maya artists, sculptors, modellers, and painters. They made this dry, if noble, dogma partake of the richness of the landscape, yet not following it in its disorder, but creating a human tropic of a new shape and meaning. (Charlot 1928 Maya Esthetic)
>
> The more popular art objects show, of course, a wealth of grinning gods, old gods, black gods, and among them the young beauty of the Maize God. Thus did the artist grind food for popular sentimentality, something to cling to when one ignores mathematics and yet needs a faith and a moral.

Charlot also saw in Maya art "one of the wealthiest mines of theogonical motifs and abstract forms the world has ever known" (1928 Maya Esthetic) and used that aspect in his analyses:

> astronomical rather than aesthetic considerations seem to have determined the form, as the layout of the figure apparently reveals it to be the sign used to signify a starry heaven. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 291)

But a fundamental paradigm change was made when Charlot recognized individual depictions as portraits of historical figures rather than personifications of abstractions or astronomical calculations (e.g., Brunhouse 1971: 165). A host of oddities—singularities, eccentricities—differentiated many figures beyond any utility for personification. For instance, a rare beard seemed to indicate a "historical or mythological character."[95] This practice was so widespread as to reveal a movement:

> new qualities appear, one of the most conspicuous of which is an emphasis on character which in some cases reaches caricature. This intensity, however, is not the result of comic intent, but of an eager desire to record, in their original strength, the features of the model. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 342)
>
> Behind the godly mask magnificently carved, the artist reveals to us, and to us only, the profile of the priest who impersonates the god, a dry, shrewd, scientific person wholly disdainful of the tremendous sensation that his disguise creates. (Charlot 1928 Maya Esthetic)

Art hitherto thought to be of abstract content could now be recognized as historical and used for new purposes, a crucial step forward in Maya studies:

> Our interpretation of the architectural and artistic program of the Temple of the Warriors complex draws heavily upon the skill and brilliance of Jean Charlot, an artist and iconographer. Charlot, along with Ann Axtel [*sic*] Morris and Earl Morris… published articles on the bold and comprehensive architectural excavations and restorations carried out in these buildings by the Carnegie Institution of Washington earlier in this century. Charlot proposed the hypothesis that the reliefs are attempts at public portraiture. He based this evaluation upon the fact that the artists depicted individualistic detail both in the warriors' regalia and in their faces, where preserved. (Schele and Freidel 1990: 502, note 42)

Precursors of this historical view could be found, especially Herbert J. Spinden, whom Charlot met in Yucatan and later read.[96] But Charlot was offering a new argument against the well-established consensus view, an argument that would be appreciated only when a historical view was revived and accepted decades later (Coe 1999: 167181, 205 ff., 217).

Charlot also used a tool of art history that has not even yet been widely adopted in archeology: the establishment of stylistic sequences. Charlot was able to use such sequencing correctly: "He speculates that these stylistic differences marked a chronological sequence, a speculation now supported by the re-dating of his twelfth-century murals to the ninth century" (McVicker 1999). The standard one was first applied to Maya art: primitive → classical → baroque. But the standard sequence was complicated in Yucatan by the presence and decipherment of date glyphs that did not fit the sequence, both at the site and in comparison with other sites. Thus at Macanxoc, "If any order of development could be suggested for such a series, it would be from naturalistic to symbolic," but this would conflict with comparative material from elsewhere (Thompson, Pollock, and Charlot 1932: 187). Thus Charlot was compelled to conclude that "personal or other local influences, unknown to us, have reversed what otherwise would seem to have been the logical cultural sequence." After discussing other conflicts between conventional stylistic sequencing and dating by glyphs, Charlot concluded: "This well illustrates the difficulty of attempting to force all art phenomena into a single mould and to interpret such phenomena by a single set of rigid rules."[97] Conventional sequencing can be complicated by factors such as provincial cultural lags, artistic and technical skill, taste, and so on.[98] More nuanced sequences are required:

> If it be true that all art evolution passes first through a period called primitive, when strong and unique convention rules representation, next through a period of classicism, when nature and style are fairly equilibrated, and finally through a period of eclecticism, when the artist works freely, accepting what he wants from past tradition, then the columns in the Temple of the Warriors are certainly of this third

> period. No special convention rules them. The sculpture represents with the same mastery, the beauty of a young warrior and the ugliness of an old woman, characteristic of this last stage in art evolution. Furthermore, the pseudo-primitivism of the line which conceals under an apparent carelessness a perfect knowledge of perspective, points also to this last stage.[99]
>
> Maya art has many phases. Its cycle, as is known, starts from archaic forms toward classical purity. It goes then through the overripe excesses of baroquism toward its natural disappearance with the civilization that had given it growth. Just before the end, a reaction of purism or neo-archaism gave birth to some of its most exquisite monuments. (1928 Maya Esthetic)

In historiography, art sequences have often been used to identify breaks with the past, whether through internal disruptions or external invasions. The dominant view in the 1920s, echoes of which can be found even today, was that the distinctive Chich'en Itza art and architecture had been the result of a Toltec invasion. But Charlot's work revealed "the striking fact that a development can be traced from pure Maya style to pure Nahua style…by a series of imperceptible transitions."[100] That is, Chich'en Itza was not the result of an external invasion but of an internal development. Had Charlot's employment as an archeologist continued, he would have pursued the idea:

> He said a big unfinished work of his was to show there was no real difference between Mayans, Toltecs, etc.: they were all "People of the Plain." He can find elements of each "style" everywhere. No real difference. (Tabletalk February 27, 1979)

Charlot's study led him into an over-critical opinion about Miguel Covarrubias' pioneering work on the Olmec: Charlot felt Covarrubias was confusing a style with a people as had been done at Chich'en Itza with the Toltecs. Others were equally negative and thought of the Olmec as Covarrubias' *dada* (e.g., Coe 1999: 60 f., 155 f.). Later Charlot recognized that Covarrubias had been right.

Charlot also made a contribution to the deciphering of Maya writing and displayed an unexpected knowledge of the language in his discussion.[101] Charlot suggested possible multiple uses of glyphs, ideas that were taken up by others, for instance:

> Charlot also noted the intriguing presence of glyphlike elements floating above a number of the individuals. These symbols are not recognizable as true Maya glyphs, but they do seem to distinguish these people one from another. (Schele and Freidel 1990: 502, note 42)

This idea was later elaborated:

> The names of the figures in this mural appear next to their heads, although these name signs are not traditional Maya glyphs…The represent names as pictographs that could be read equally well in any language and by illiterate people…The Itza, like their counterparts elsewhere, wanted everyone in Mesoamerica, Maya speakers and non-

> Maya speakers alike, to know who their founding ancestors were. (Schele and Mathews 1998: 221)

One glyph was particularly important for Charlot himself:

> Some of them seem to express action, as if they were verbs; for example, a hand grinding on a *metate* appears in figure 233*f*, and this would probably illustrate the verb, *to grind*, instead of the substantive, *metate*. It would seem also that in these glyphs phonetic or charade writing appears, rather than direct picture writing. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 311)

Charlot identified:

> three distinct types of glyphs; some represent the name of the man depicted under the glyph…others refer phonetically to some action of this man…; and others represent a direct attribute of the prisoner. (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 313)

At the time, Morley and Thompson were tending to deny any phonetic signs, but such signs are now recognized (Coe 1999: 76, 115–122, 140 f., 159 f, 162–166).

The glyph evoked Charlot's own experience both in Yucatan and in Mexico:

> In Chichén Itzá, in the Court of the Thousand Columns, a stuccoed name glyph shows a hand kneading dough over a stone metate. In nearby huts... living hands perform the same task daily. (*AA* II 183, 185)

As a child in France, Charlot had gazed on nineteenth-century statuettes of women at the *metate*. In Mexico, the subject became one of his favorites and remained so all of his life. At some point, the glyph broadened its significance for him and provided more evidence of the continuity of his work with the art history of Mexico as a whole:

> The Aztecs in Mexico in some temples and the Mayans in that particular Temple of the Warriors had come more or less to the same conclusions that I had come to when they think of summing up in one gesture the verb *action* in terms essential to Indian life.[102]

Charlot wanted to continue his archeological work after the third season, but the Carnegie Institution did not retain him. He had, however, made a contribution to the field that can be detected in the later work of others (e.g., Ewing 1972: 168–177).

9.1.2. ART

Besides his work as a draftsman, Charlot pursued his creative art in response to Yucatan with new subjects and innovations in style inspired by them: "Charlot was, of course, more than a copyist. He was always an artist first" (McVicker 1999). For Charlot, moving from scholarly copying to artistic

response was engaging a further cognitive dimension. The special talent of the artist was a holistic vision:

> Try as they may, neither archaeologist nor ethnologist has pinned down by statistics of factual minutiae the spiritual complexities of the Mayan, as intricate as his own jungle flora and fauna. In this album, Alfredo Zalce, in true artist fashion, does what the scientist fails to do, reconstructs whole breath-taking vistas from the one legible modern glyph, the Indian body… (*AA* II 183)

The artist's talent and training for recognizing similarities enables him to reveal the connections between different aspects of a culture and thus establish its over-all form.

As always, the artist starts with experience and observation. In cultures like Indian and Hawaiian, the physical setting provides the foundation of physical, intellectual, and spiritual nourishment: "A jungle is picturesque, but for the painter it is also a place of awe" (*AA* II 187). On that primordial experience is based the impressive natural science of the Maya in flora, fauna, agronomy, and astronomy. Study of the jungle resulted in "the spiritual complexities of the Mayan, as intricate as his own jungle and fauna" (*AA* II 183). In environment, history, and religion are interwoven "rustic present to imperial past, the intricacies of jungle shapes to those of spiritual meanings as local, and not a whit less complex" (*AA* II 185). The artist's physical focus ensured the appreciation of a culture as "local," belonging to a particular place, a major emphasis in Charlot's thinking and work: "Even the light is totally different from the light of the Mexican plateau" (Charlot March 8, 1972). Even in his copying, Charlot was attentive to the light:

> dessiné colonne au soleil (Diary February 16, 1927)
> 'drew column in sunlight.'
>
> matin : fini lumière matin sur colonnes (Diary June 3, 1927)
> 'morning: finished morning light on columns.'
>
> matin : colonnes Ch M temple lumière artificielle (March 16, 1928; also March 17)
> 'morning: columns of Chac Mol temple artificial light.'
>
> joli lumière[103]
> 'pretty light'

The ruins were particularly romantic in the moonlight, inspiring frequent walks.[104]

Charlot would emphasize the environment far more in Hawai'i, but following his Classical training, the main clue to a final vision in France and Mexico would be "the one legible modern glyph, the Indian body" (*AA* II 183). The challenge in Yucatan was that the Maya body seemed the opposite of the Aztec: "The Mayan was long, the Aztec squatty" and thus their art was "antithetic."[105] Charlot described his July 1926 portrait of Princess Xiu, CL 121 *Mestiza with Orange Fan* (called "grande yucatèque" 'Great Yucatecan Woman' in the diary for July 1, 1926):

> This is, for example, a typical Mayan *mestiza*, as they are called, though she's a pure Mayan Indian. You can compare her with the portrait of Luz to see that there is no relationship between the two races.[106]

Charlot apparently chose as his first oil subject in Yucatan a model who was the antithesis of his main Mexican model, and she would continue to inspire depictions of slim *mestizas*.[107]

In France, Charlot had followed convention by using an attenuated body as a representation of holiness in liturgical art. His stylistic change in Mexico to blocky Aztec figures as the expression of the good life was a major development in his work. Now in Yucatan, he encountered an Indian body that demanded yet a different style: "the bush born Mayan, long and lean muscled, elegant to the point of ambiguousness."[108] The Maya body expressed a different deportment: [today's Maya] "still retain a regal courtesy and sophisticated manner" (May 1947: 208). The Maya canon demanded a style different from the Aztec:

> The extreme elongation of the Chichen figures is absolutely incompatible with the Mexican's love for short, squat representations. These are two very different concepts of beauty.[109]

The slim, tubular Maya body provided lines rather than bulk, and Charlot developed a new style of composition, not with Aztec masses but with Maya lines. Compositional lines would be articulated through body outlines rather than passing through the center of the mass. Maya figures would have their long, slim limbs extended and not sit on the ground with their knees up, forming a cube as in many Aztec statues.

Besides form, the Maya had a distinctive skin color that provided the base or key to their color sense in the same way as their own skin color did for Aztecs, African-Americans, and Hawaiians. On unearthing a column with its color intact, Charlot wrote Brenner:

> Los rojos y azules son muy intensos pero oscuros, con un amarillo de paja y grandes trazos negros. La llave de la harmonia es el color de la piel de la gente de aqui. (JC to AB "No escribes nada, a mi")
> 'The reds and blues are very intense but dark, with a straw yellow and large black lines. The key to the harmony is the color of the skin of the people from here.'

The Maya body connected the artist to the Maya past. Charlot said of *Mestiza with Orange Fan*:

> In the back, a classical temple with a classical molding, which is one of the most beautiful that I know, representing something that has been tied and gives at the place in the center where it is tied. (March 8, 1972)

The above reference to "flat-shaped forehead" or receding forehead shows that at least some Maya were maintaining the traditional practice of skull shaping by using planks to flatten the infant's malleable forehead in order to create a canonical beauty, that is, maintaining continuity with their ideal body type. Charlot mentioned to me another practice without saying that he actually saw examples: dangling an object closely in front of an infant's eyes to make him cross-eyed, an expression of intense focus. Charlot

compared this to his own problem as a child that he thought might have been caused by a ribbon hanging from his hat in front of his eyes.

Charlot's experience and that of other expedition members was of the continuity between the ancient and the contemporary Maya: "Not only was he acutely aware of continuities in form between builders ancient and modern, but he also observed the same continuities in daily life" (McVicker 1999). The Maya workers reconstructing the pyramids were visually the same as those who had originally constructed them (Glusker 2010: 377). Elizabeth Morris told me that Maya workers called Earl *Ingeniero* 'engineer' because excavating was like constructing in their estimation (October 25, 2006). Charlot could speak of his historical treatments as if they were contemporary depictions:

> This is a view, I would say—I told you I would use those things nearly as postcards—a view of the excavations that we were doing with Mayan diggers and Mayan masons in that Temple of the Warriors. (March 8, 1972)

From the Maya body, Charlot's vision expanded to the world they built. The thin cylinders of the male Maya torso and limbs seemed incapable of the massive achievement of the temples and pyramids:

> How such languid-looking androgynes were able to build and keep in working order the complex machinery of their society is better understood by those who have seen Mayan masons lazily lift and carry on their heads weights under which one of our strong men would stagger. (*MMR* 3)
>
> [The ancient monuments] were put together by men like the Mayan stone mason whom I watched once, lifting a heavy block to a flat-shaped forehead with misleading languor.[110]

Whereas the female body was Charlot's focus among the Aztecs, in Yucatan he took the male body as the revealer of the culture. Accordingly, Charlot focused on the female sphere in Mexico—the interior home life of the family—but on the exterior public life of the men in Yucatan: building and hunting. Yucatecan women were also depicted in public places like village dances and the church. Charlot does not seem to have penetrated to the Maya hearth but, even in family scenes, stopped at the doorway or on the porch with its hammock (e.g., M79, 150).

A classic example of Charlot's Yucatecan Maya style is CL 169 *Builders, blue sky. Chichen Itza*, 36" X 29", November 1929. In his diary Charlot used the title "les grands ouvriers," 'the great workers,' indicating—as with "grande yucatèque" 'Great Yucatecan Woman,' above—that the subject had attained a finished, full dignity of expression (Diary 1929: November 17, 18). The bodies of the builders are abstracted into tubes for the torso and limbs and ovals for the profiles of the head. The torso and right arm of the foreground worker mark a true vertical down the Golden Section, while his right foot on the ground marks the true horizontal. Along with the tools, the legs and the arms of the two background workers intersect diagonally at the foreground worker's belly to create the over-all X-composition of the

painting. The workers' spread legs are echoed in the three pyramids in the deep background, an alternation of solid pyramid bounded by space and pyramidal void created by the solid legs. The pyramids' crowning temples echo the stone block on the foreground worker's receding forehead. Charlot is expressing a major theme of this subject—person and culture are related—as discussed below. The unusually fluid background expresses, I believe, the impression of the jungle with its apparently formless and indeterminate mass. But the same X-composition can be dimly perceived in it, an indication that the abstractions of culture are indeed based on the less visible structure of nature. Finally, the coloring and lighting are unusual for Charlot with blues and greens contending in a sunrise glow that reddens the ground and touches the face of the foreground worker. The light has an atmospheric richness different from the clarity of the Mexican plateau. As Charlot wrote above:

> The reds and blues are very intense but dark, with a straw yellow and large black lines. The key to the harmony is the color of the skin of the people from here.

Charlot is referring to a green tinge in the skin of some native Mexicans that gave rise to the expression *indio verde* 'green Indian.'

Also different from Charlot's Mexican practice is his use of more than one body canon. In 1926, Charlot had painted CL 121 *Mestiza with Orange Fan* as the announcement of his exploration of a new body type. But in Thomas Gann's 1926 book he found a photograph of Princess Felipa Xiu, a woman of almost Mexican body type (Gann 1972: illustrations p. 7 [unnumbered]). Felipa Xiu fascinated Gann:

> the old lady now dwelling in this humble little adobe hut, dressed in a poor old patched, ragged *huipil* and *pik*, working hard day by day with her hands to keep herself and family with sufficient food, is really the only genuine descendant of a once great, aboriginal, American, reigning family, who can trace their descent back for a thousand years…
>
> But she was not lacking in some of the best attributes of royalty, for she met me with a pleasant smile and a natural and unaffected dignity; woman-like, asking only one thing when she agreed to sit for her photograph—permission to tidy her hair and put on more becoming attire.
>
> I was afraid that, instead of the national costume, she would appear in the skirt and blouse of civilisation, but not so—this scion of a fallen royal house knew more of the eternal fitness of things than I suspected, and appeared in a new *huipil* and *pik*, both beautifully embroidered in various bright colours by her own hard-worked hands. (1972: 88 f.)

Charlot had a different impression, which informed his large 1932 oil CL 284 *Princess Xiu. Yucatan*, an anomalous image that he never developed further.[111] He accentuated the face's hint of anxiety in the photograph. He opened up her left hand to resemble a claw resting on her knee. Most important, he added an infant at her feet, but instead of being cared for by the adult, it crawls unprotected on the ground away from her. If Charlot was using the child in his usual way of indicating the future, he was at his most pessimistic. One viewer felt in the image the witchcraft still practiced in Yucatan (Gann 1972: 133137).

Although his Mexican men and women are both stocky, Charlot's Maya women can be either slender or fleshy and voluptuous like, for instance, his *jarana* dancers.[112] Charlot felt the strong sensuality radiating from women's village social circles, especially in activities such as hair dressing. Charlot's treatments of Maya women could be very similar to those of Aztec (M79). Similarly, the slim tubular shape of the male body could be varied with stockier models, especially when paired with a voluptuous female. For instance, in the 1930 lithograph M104 *Jarana (Couple)*, the male dancer has been bulked up to fit his female partner. The same process has been used in a watercolor study of a male-female-child family group. Anita Brenner felt that Charlot depicted the Maya accurately, although she understood his work differently from him:

> elastic full-fleshed & deeply curved bodies—highly sensual—no leeriness, no asceticism, no backs made broad by burden & hips wasted away from walk[ing], like the Mex. Indians…
> The Yucatecans like this, just as Jean draws them—Egypt, no more, no less. (Glusker 2010: 379)

Charlot himself was not comfortable with the reference to Egyptian art, despite similarities, but he himself could refer to "estilo Tuthankahmen" 'Tutankhamun style' (JC to AB "Los cambios libro V. Arroyo"; "Te mando mi fotografia junto a uno de los menotes que descubri").

In Mexico, Charlot had adapted the Aztec visual device of using a single line for portions of the outlines of two different bodies. In Yucatan, he was apparently impressed by Maya hieroglyphs whose content pushed strongly against all sides of the frame (Chapter 3). The object depicted appears to have been stuffed forcibly into the frame and is straining everywhere to get out. Henceforward, Charlot will use this device as an alternative to his regular figure and ground variations. An advantage of the device is that figures and frame support each other, as in the lithograph *Flight into Egypt*.[113] Figures can also push against the frame even when space is available, which adds energy to the composition (e.g., M245, 276, 513). In contrast, an unusual provision of space contributes to the story-telling, as the *Volador* posing against the sky (M522). As seen in Chapter 3, the French artist, Amédée Ozenfant, criticized Charlot's 1944 Black Mountain frescoes, *Inspiration* and *Study*, for crowding the space, indicating the precise difference of this Maya sensibility from the conventional European.

In Yucatan, Charlot's pattern of production was the same as the one he used on arriving in Mexico. He did a large number of sketches, similar to his Mexico City street sketches, but of the very different Yucatan world. A major difference from his Mexico sketches is the regular use of facial profiles, often with shoulders presented from a frontal point of view as in the bas-reliefs Charlot was copying and also in Egyptian art (e.g., Glusker 2010: 331, 382). This preference dominates his early prints on Yucatan themes.[114] The resulting effect can be seen by contrasting his Maya builders group subjects with his 1925 lithograph M69 *Temascal* with its Aztec bodies. The latter is articulated by the women's massive bodies in a space receding stepwise in depth. The Maya builders are hieratic in strongly two-dimensional compositions. The heads of the *Temascal* bathers are globular masses, whereas the profiles of the builders are two-dimensional outlines. *Temascal* is designed in mass, the builders in line.

Beyond these considerations, Charlot was attracted to the "unmistakable Mayan profile, with hanging lower lip, beak nose, and receding forehead" (Charlot May 1947: 208) and could use it even in three-dimensional compositions (e.g., M97). Donald McVicker writes:

> Although the elongated Maya figure may have become exhausted as an aesthetic theme, the Maya profile continued to haunt Charlot. In his comments on another print from 1933 "Cargador at Rest" (Morse 1976: 123 [#207]), he admits it is a "mixture of things" Aztec and Maya because he was "still mixed up with the Mayans as far as the profile goes." As late as 1937 he would still etch a "Mayan Head" (209 [#392]). (1999)

Laurance Schmeckebier writes that Charlot started in Yucatan "the use of a new Indian type (i.e., the continuous nose-and-forehead curve of the Mayan profile)" (1939: 163).

But the Maya profile was already much discussed in the field, for instance, by Charnay.[115] Also, in his postwar French liturgical work, Charlot had developed a similar, experimental profile. An early Street Sketch, US-005, of the M207 *Cargador at Rest* figure mentioned by McVicker above, creates a continuous facial outline with a strong, single stroke. In the forests and ruins of Yucatan, the Maya profile was a continual esthetic challenge. Perhaps Charlot's earliest published archeological illustrations were of the Maya profile in Thomas Gann's 1926 *Ancient Cities and Modern Tribes*.[116] Also, the profile had more point in Yucatan than in Charlot's liturgical work. It was related to the 1920s project of creating a new Mexican art based on Precolumbian sources, for instance, by adapting indigenous and folk art expressive devices to the needs of contemporary fine artists.

Charlot developed a smooth version of the Maya profile, one in which the distortion was extreme but did not call attention to itself as, for instance, on the cover of *The Boy Who Could Do Anything*.[117] An aid in this was Charlot's Classical art education with its training in the geometric analysis of natural forms. He added also, I believe, his study of the glyph style, discussed above, in which the figures are pushed to the edges of the whole image. In his Maya profile, he pushes the features to the edge of the outline curve.

Charlot proceeded to put his developed Maya profile to new uses. The basis was the realization that in Maya art "each letter and each figure is a pictorial glyph pregnant with esthetic values" (May 1947: 208). The Maya profile itself was particularly important for "retaining humanistic content despite the strange markings that identify each personage as a sound or a number." Extending the tradition, Charlot used the profile to develop a new historical-humanistic image. In CL 124 *Builder on ladder, Yucatan*, of July 1926, Charlot depicts an ancient Maya builder in profile, climbing a ladder with a dressed stone block resting on his receding forehead (Glusker 2010: 377). Photographs of modern workers show them carrying such stones on *top* of their heads with the help of hats (Glusker 2010: 377, 384, 396, 400). Charlot did write that he had seen a worker rest a stone on his "flat-shaped forehead." In

Great Builders I,[118] Charlot proposes a sequence of practice from bottom to top: at the base of the pyramid, two builders carry stones with their raised arms above their head (like A. A. Morris 1931: Fig. 11[b]), while at the top, two builders have rested them on their receding foreheads. As he developed the image, Charlot increasingly left the stone in its more natural shape, lessening the dressing and making it resemble more the human skull. Culture was thus brought closer to nature.

But the main point of the image remained the relation of the builder to his culture. The contact of forehead and stone emphasizes the intellectual character of Maya architecture, avoiding the impression of builders as mere physical labor. Also, the receding forehead was an artistic practice based on an ideal of beauty, a testimony to the intensity of Maya dedication to culture. Connecting the forehead to the building stone revealed the continuity and totality of Maya culture from the body to the city. Even more, resting the stone on the receding forehead continues and reinforces the molding of the head. Molding a person into Maya culture begins in infancy and continues through life. People create and are created by their culture.

> So zealous were the Mayans in their belief in their own peculiar ideal of beauty that artists were called to produce it not only in stone but in living flesh. With a set of planks and a twist of rope they tampered with the new-born to force its growth along the lines of slanting forehead and elongated skull that alone seemed beautiful.[119]

Copying the Chich'en Itza artworks stimulated Charlot's own creativity, which resulted in a large number of freer compositions:

> a series of my sketches done in Yucatán from Mayan murals. Not facsimile copies, but not free interpretations either. In other words, they were not formal archaeological copies; they were done for myself. You can, of course, see some of the origins of my style here. (M250)

> Aunque trabajo poco por mi, he hecho bastante dibujos a linéa. (JC to AB "Me hizo mucho la noticia muerte Amado")
> 'Although I do little work for myself, I have made a good number of line drawings.'

Another extension of Charlot's copying were paintings that were still-lifes as it were of the same objects. He would change his observation from the exactitude of a copyist to the response of a colleague. In his diary, he records producing paintings *pour moi* 'for me' (Diary 1927: April 1; 1928: February 19, 20, April 5, 7, 22). These were both in watercolor (April 1, 1927) and in oil (1928: April 5, 7, 22). Charlot did not include the oils in his Checklist, but remembered them very well.[120] He requested that the Peabody Museum, Cambridge, send him his painting of Mayan fresco on a block, and he discussed it with me with great affection:

> I said it was like his paintings of folk *objets d'art*. He agreed. He said he did his paintings of the single blocks in his spare time at Chich'en.
> He really loved that painting (both his and the one depicted). He said the Mayan one was very interesting: it features the lime; the red streaks are from the sinopia; the blue

> in the back is a painting this Mayan one was done over. JC explained the costume. (Tabletalk February 27, 1979)

Charlot was interested both in the final work and the artist and his process.

Charlot also did impressionistic watercolors of ruins that communicate a mood rather than providing a detailed copy. He depicted the archeological staff in several watercolor and oil sketches, usually humorous. There was a smooth spectrum in his work from copying through increasing degrees of creativity. Charlot drew and painted landscapes (e.g., CL 148b), villagescapes, and the hacienda complex where the staff lived (e.g., Glusker 2010: 568). Some of these subjects were developed into formal themes, although this was usually done outside of the busy digging season. For instance, in the 1928 woodcut M77 *Hammock*, he produced a final work from his hacienda sketches: "The subject is my own hut at Chichén Itzá, so I must have made a drawing in situ and cut the wood later."

Charlot developed a number of themes from his Yucatan experiences. I provide early instances.

Jarana is found in both prints and paintings (CL 149; M97, 104). Charlot explained the dance:

> The *jarana* is the most typical of the folk dances of Yucatán. It has its own special music. It's not *her* hat. If a man admires a woman, he gives her his hat to wear while she dances. Then afterward she returns it to him. If she's a really beautiful woman, she dances with two or three hats on her head.[121]

Rocking Chair in oils and prints (CL 150b).

Hammocks (CL 77, 158).

Charlot was also drawn to slim mestiza beauties (CL 156, 157) as well as voluptuous ones (M87). As late as 1935, Charlot developed his subject *The High Comb*: "The model is a Yucatecan girl, perhaps twelve years old, the age when they start looking for a husband" (M269). An exotic subject is *Leopard Hunter*, initiated with a January 1928 oil (CL 150) and later used for prints:

> That's Yucatán. The Mayan men would come back to the hacienda with the dead animals. I remember one of the hunters had been mauled on the arm. They hunted at night. They would put lanterns on their heads to attract the leopard.[122]

Charlot continued to be interested in the family with a number of mother and child subjects (e.g., CL 153 *Mestiza, child on hip*; M79 *Mama Spanks*; CL 361 *Mama Spanks, with arch*). A family of father, mother, and child was treated in a drawing and a watercolor.

A major subject developed at Chich'en Itza was *Builders*, which can be followed through Charlot's oils and prints (McVicker 1999). My study needs to be supplemented by his drawings and watercolors of the same subject, when they become available. I reemphasize here points made above. The subject is based on direct observation of the Maya workers who were reconstructing the ruined temples and other buildings at the site. Charlot was fascinated by the tenuous appearance of the slender

Maya torso and the massive stone blocks they were able to lift with seeming ease, a puzzle he depicts often (*MMR* 3; *AA* II 185).

> Charlot emphasized the continuity between the ancient Maya and the Maya of his day:
>
> This shows our Mayan workers lifting carved stones. There's an obvious parallel to the original pyramid builders (M73)
> Besides archaeology, we had the live workers for models, who were of pure Mayan stock. They carried stones with the same gestures we saw in the bas reliefs. In some of the lithographs I made a point of having a bas relief look like a portrait of the live worker. (M206)

Charlot expresses this continuity in several ways. The very title *Builders* is more appropriate for the ancient workers, but Charlot applies it both to them and the modern ones, implying their equivalence. The modern workers are depicted using an plumb bob just like their forebears. The only ancient stone-cutting tools—the grooved hammer, the pecking stone, and the celt (Ewing 1972: 103)—are similar to the modern hammer and chisel. Charlot injects a deliberate ambiguity into some pictures as to whether the subjects are ancient or contemporary builders. Some depictions can be clearly recognized as being of ancient workers by their lack of any modern elements (CL 124, 168, 187, 203, 352, 357, 359; M91, 206). *Great Builders II* (M75) is clearly the image of the Chich'en Itza dig. Contemporary workers use modern tools such as wheelbarrows, shovels, pick-axes, and crowbars (CL 125, 126; M74 ["Sketch for workers in the ruins"], 75, 83, 93). The crowbar could be wooden—it has a pronounced bend—so I will not use it as a criterion. Hammer and chisel could be either ancient or contemporary (CL 203) as could hats or caps.[123] Except perhaps for M84, a figure found only in contemporary scenes is a drinking worker (CL 126, 151; M75). However, with the exception of M75 *Great Builders II*, the overall impression is of the building rather than the rebuilding of the temples. Some have only a small indication that they are contemporary, like shovels (CL 169, 204, 358, 359; M148). But most viewers would have the impression, which I did until I looked closer, that the subject was of the original builders.

Charlot used several devices to create this impression. The clothes have been simplified to their commonalities so as to represent both ancient and contemporary. The bald heads are unhistorical and prevent dating by hair style. The skull deformation is ancient but was still occasionally practiced. A worker using a hammer and chisel seems more appropriate to building (M74, 81, 83). Even more important is the use of the Maya visual devices Charlot adapted, as seen above. The clearest one is the depiction of the head in profile along with the shoulders from the frontal point of view, described above. This device can be used by itself (CL 125, 155, 204, 359) as can a thoroughly profile presentation of both head and body (CL 124, 169, 203, 358; M148). Both these presentations can be used together (CL 168; M74). They can also be used together with other figures Charlot developed: a worker leaning 3/4 forwards and down (e.g., M73, 74; CL 352) and a worker drinking in ¾ view (CL 126, 151; M75, 84). Other figures are developed, for instance, using particular tools. Charlot is following the Classical practice he learned in childhood of developing figures and combining them for larger compositions, as seen in the two *Great Builders* series (M74, 75, 83, 93) and oils such as CL 236 *The drinker, Chichen*

Itza. The more the Maya device is used, the greater the two-dimensional hieratic character and impression of great age. Charlot is seeing the contemporary workers through Classical Maya eyes. In contrast, thoroughly profile and ¾ points of view create a three-dimensional contemporary impression, the latter being an especially Western device. Charlot uses more of the latter in the more contemporary scenes and more of the former in those that appear more ancient. In his combinations, Charlot is expressing both continuity and development, but the emphasis on continuity brings it closer to identity.

In the *Builders* series, Charlot develops some of his most complex linear designs. In my view, this is his homage to Maya art and architecture in which the same principles apply as in linear composition: the stability of plumb line vertical and true horizontal related to the edges with diagonals injecting energy and motion. The *Builders* artworks are a lesson in Charlot's manipulation of these elements. M91 *Maya Workers* is an accumulation of diagonals that communicates intense activity. In M74 *Great Builders I*, one forwards-leaning figure faces right and, below him, a second left, creating a twist traced by the rope they are handling. In M75 *Great Builders II*, a twist is produced by the shoulders of the workers at bottom center.

These compositions culminate in the second series of *Great Builders*: M83 *Great Builders I* of July 1929–February 1930, and M93 *Great Builders II* of February–May 1930, based on M83. Charlot worked hard on both prints: "I really struggled with these prints, because I was interested in them" (M83). M83 was finished only in its thirteenth state. Although profiting from the experience of M83, Charlot still had to restart M93 before finishing it in its second state.

Charlot used all the devices and organized most of the figures he had developed in his previous oils and prints. For instance, he used the two figures from his first *Builders* print (M73) in the middle left section of M83 and the middle right of M93, adding a second figure to help pass up the stone to the worker leaning forwards. Charlot also added new figures, like the worker standing in a hole at the middle bottom edge. This figure both expresses the action of excavation and takes the viewer to a level lower than the bottom edge, complicating the analysis of the composition. Charlot created a similar figure in his first Hawai'i mural, *Relation of Man and Nature in Old Hawai'i* of 1949. In M83 and 93, Charlot included the drinking excavation work depicted in M75. In M93, he raised slightly the level of his vision closer to the pyramid base as in M74.

In my opinion, the over-all composition is inspired by Charlot's study of the battle scene in the Temple of the Jaguar, of which he made a careful copy (illustrated Charlot November 1938):

> The artist has played a masterly game of geometry, using as units the circle which is the shield and the straight line which is the spear. Both elements dovetail into a series of pyramiding forms…All those diagonals surging upwards from the outside towards the center bring a compositional order the more admirable for using as its means the very excess of action depicted. Each individual drama cooperates into constructing this ideal pyramid which is the hidden goal of the artist…[Two lines are] substantially at the place where the golden sections would be, a unique proof of the universal aesthetic appeal of this venerable proportion. (*AA* II 52 f.)

But instead of the Jaguar's squeezed no-man's land between the contending forces, the center of *Builders* is the pyramid itself that the workers are constructing. Like the Jaguar mural with its short spears and small shields, Charlot used multiple figures and short lines—tool handles, staffs, sides of blocks, and so on—to articulate his composition. Although Charlot recognized longer lines in the Jaguar mural, he himself provided more prominent ones—ropes, ramps, terraces, ladders, and walls—to lead the viewer through the mathematical complexity of his design. For instance, the top level of the temple seems to trace the horizontal divide of a Golden Section. An added complication is that Charlot has bent some of the longer lines that represent wooden articles. For instance, on one side of the upper terrace, two workers push wheel barrows over a bending wooden bridge. In contrast, on the other side, a worker stands on a straight but slanted capital of stone. Charlot is referring, I believe, to the use of earlier wooden architecture in the development of stone, a point he often emphasized for Greek architecture:

> The classical Mayan moulding is a very beautiful, very impressive thing. It translates into stone the primitive elements of wood architecture, such as the binding together of twigs. (M206)
>
> In the back, a classical temple with a classical molding, which is one of the most beautiful that I know, representing something that has been tied and gives at the place in the center where it is tied. (March 8, 1972)

Another Classical problem that Charlot dealt with in the murals was the relationship between two- and three-dimensionality. The Jaguar mural was stylistically Maya: "In its absence of modeling, of cast shadows, of atmospheric perspective, it differs from our own realistic school" (Charlot November 1938: 628). As seen above, Charlot used two-dimensionality to evoke a Maya style for a Maya subject. Moreover, the use of woodcuts—with their two-dimensional forte—and lithographs—with their greater capacity for three dimensional expression—provided a field in which Charlot could explore the problem through the media themselves. The simultaneous creation of oil paintings on the same subject introduced a third medium, in which three dimensions were inevitable given the contents of the paintings. Finally, the subject of *Builders* was being developed in a period in which Charlot was exploring the special qualities of lithography. As seen above, his earlier lithographs had been outline drawings (M47, 48–55, 68). M69 *Temascal* of 1925 is the first lithograph in which he exploits lithography's capacity for creating bulk through shading, which Charlot avoided in woodcut. His next lithograph, M79 *Mother and Child* of 1929 is a fully realized creation of this type, continued in M82 *La Nana* of 1929.

The difference between the first two *Great Builders* (M74, 75) and the second (M83, 93) can be largely understood through Charlot's desire to exploit the peculiar strengths of the two media—woodcut and lithography—while not losing the tension between two- and three-dimensionality that pervades the *Builders* series. That is, he wanted to unite both esthetics, Maya and Western. For instance, two-dimensionality is created by having background figures as big or bigger than foreground ones: the builder with a shovel at the top right is bigger than the two in the center foreground (M75); the same figure with a shovel is used along with the two pushing wheel barrows (M83); the same figures are found in M93. Charlot adapted this device from the use of "The human figures" in the Jaguar mural:

> the more they recede the more they increase in scale, a most unusual effect to an eye trained, as ours is, in the postulates of Italian perspective. The chieftains in the foreground, drawn directly over the dado, are less than half the size of the warriors that are to be seen behind the houses of the village, perhaps a mile off in space. This puzzling feature is yet a proof of the scientific care that the artist took to fit his mural to the problems of architecture and point of view. The room is narrow enough so that a man squatting as one was intended to do, would find those lower personages on his horizon line and close to his eyes, but would get a more and more diagonal view as his eyes moved up the wall. The increase in size of the personages at the top is corrective of such a condition, and gives a squatting man the illusion that all people depicted are the same size. (November 1938: 629)

In Charlot's lithographs, the middle section is a recession in space with figures diminishing in size with distance—with the larger side figures, top and bottom left, following the device of the Jaguar temple. Other two-dimensional devices are evident, such as depicting the temple frontally and using more light in the background than the foreground.

Three-dimensionality is expressed through diminishing scale in sections, a few discreet receding lines, and the shading and modeling of the figures: "Beautiful chiaroscuro for the Great Builders" (M83). The effect might resemble a low bas-relief for some viewers, and such artworks are found at Chich'en Itza. Charlot was happy enough with the three-dimensionality to paint a copy for George Vaillant in oil, CL 172 *Temple Builders* of 1930. But the joining of two esthetics was a challenge so difficult that the plate of M83 was exhausted: "All day work on Great Builders. We pull proofs but the zinc goes bad!" Charlot stated: "I remember the first one was transferred onto stone, because we couldn't rework the zinc so much." The "transfer" can be supported by M93's being a mirror image of M83. But M83 was, in fact, finished, and M93 is a new version on stone: "On stone—whites scratched, finer grain than No. 1" (M93).

The development of the *Builders* subject up to M83 and M93 was a high point in Charlot's design and technique. He was, I believe, inspired by his study of Maya art at Chich'en Itza and elsewhere and was intent on absorbing what he had learned into his own art. He continued to pursue this purpose. In July 1930, Charlot painted one of his greatest oils: CL 187 *Builder, moonlight. Chichen Itza*.[124] The subject was a figure he had used often in his earlier works: a worker climbing a temple carrying a large, undressed stone on his receding forehead. The art is represented by the deformed skull rather than the stone, that is, the Maya are formed by the culture they construct.

Even though Charlot treated this subject only a few times, he included it in his 1933 *Picture Book*, a record of his regular themes (M133). Charlot returned to several of his *Builders* subjects in August 1933 (CL 352, 358, 359), including a "Small replica of 187" (CL 357). In September 1933, he reached a synthesis he was seeking through the *Builders* series with the lithograph M206 *Three Pyramid Builders*: "Evening at K[istler] with Zohmah. A litho: Yucatan Workers".

Charlot told Peter Morse: "here Mayan art is the base." That is, Charlot had absorbed what he had learned and the product was now perfectly his own. He took the two figures from his first *Builders* print, the woodcut M73 *Small Builders*: the bottom worker hands a large, carved stone up to another worker who bends forwards in ¾ view to receive it. Charlot has then added at the top the figure from CL 187 *Builder, moonlight. Chichen Itza*. Two-dimensionality is created through the frontal point of view of the architecture and the new design of the bending figure. The three-dimensionality is communicated by the tender modeling, so that even the profiles become masses. The temple comprises three receding spaces: the space before the front wall; the first platform on top of that wall and backed by the tripartite column top; the platform on top of the column. One figure is connected to each space, but rather than diminishing in scale as they recede over the three spaces, they grow larger. The standing figure in front is the smallest, the middle figure is medium size, and the most distant figure on the column top is the biggest. Charlot is using his earlier devices in more compressed form. Charlot also joined composition by lines and masses: the line of the taut rope rising from bottom right is continued through the center of the mass of the right arm of the bending figure.

The capacity for absorption and the resulting complexity are Charlot's homage to his fellow artists. The personal vision comes from his childhood lack of three-dimensional space perception. The figures carve out their space against a background of stone.

9.1.3. THE IMPACT OF CHICH'EN ITZA

Charlot's three seasons at Chich'en Itza were important for his life and work: "Pues estos tres años, 1926–1929, definieron mucho mis ideas artísticas" 'So those three years, 1926–1929, defined very much my artistic ideas.'[125] He became in fact identified with his work in Yucatan: "The field the critics allotted me was the Mayan… I was suspected of carrying Mayan motives by the pocketful to buck up waning memories."[126] Carlos Mérida assessed the experience more seriously:

> La obra arqueológica de Yucatán la conozco yo poco, porque él se relacionó con arqueólogos de fama continental, y me parece a mí, que lo que él buscaba era encontrar los orígenes de un tipo de trabajo que a la larga habían de influenciar su estilo, como así ha sucedido. Si primero las influencias fueron directamente del tema popular, más tarde tal vez, él fue influenciado directamente por sus trabajos yucatecos. (Mérida January 29, 1971)
>
> 'The archeological work of Yucatan I myself know little because he was in contact with archeologists of continental fame. And it appears to me that what he was seeking was to find the origins of a type of work that in the long run had to have influenced his style, as in fact it happened. If at first the influences came directly from the popular theme, later perhaps, he was influenced directly by his Yucatecan labors.'

Donald McVicker summed up his article "The Painter-Turned-Archeologist: Jean Charlot at Chichen Itza":

> Charlot is unique in that he is the only well known artist of his era in Mexico who worked directly as a member of scientifically conducted archaeological expeditions. As a result of his experiences he could speak and write with an authority and understanding of art, archaeology and ethnology beyond that of any of his peers. His experiences taught him to critically examine the archaeologists' impact on pre-Columbian art history.[127]

After Charlot's Carnegie employment was not renewed, he did not revisit Chich'en Itza until 1968, the year of his Mexico City retrospective:

> He was amazed to see the changes when we looked again at all the places he'd stayed (back in 1924 [*sic*]), on our '68 visit. The "Sacred Well," where they used to swim had *not* changed! He was upset by the big tourist hotels which had been built. (Zohmah Charlot ca. 1993)

He played guide to Zohmah—"show Z bldgs. including Morris, Valiant [*sic*], my hut"—but noted the damage since the 1920s: "Monjas (remains of fresco.)," "fresco T. Tigers destroyed" (Diary April 28, 1968). At the museum in Mérida, he noted, "Where are the Chichen frescos? See [Director] on subject" (April 29, 1968).

Charlot always retained a warm feeling for his seasons at Chich'en Itza. Nonetheless, he could be troubled by his archeological work distracting him from his primary fine arts mission. On leaving Chich'en Itza at the end of his last season there, Charlot seems to have been surprised by "mes grandes sensations de liberté" 'my big sensations of liberty' (Diary June 13, 1928); "continue sentant liberté" 'continue feeling liberty' (June 14, 1928).

9.2. MEXICO CITY

During Charlot's stays in Mexico City, he seems to have been pushing himself to compact his normal annual amount of work into the available time. Besides his own art making, writing, studying, and theater- and movie-going, he was socializing constantly with family, colleagues, and friends, and catching up on their work in their studios and exhibitions. Charlot planned ahead for his stays, for instance, making lists of people to see:

> Orozco
> Ledesma
> Nahui
> Xavier 475º de Febrero
> Carlos (Diary June 30, 1926)

A diary entry displays the bustle of Charlot's days:

> 9 h appelle Geneve Mrs Paine allé chez Pintao : il propose 14 000 piastres pour la collection puis voir tableaux Clausell à université puis chez moi puis moi chez Clausell choisir tableaux pour exp. puis chez Lozano puis vu fresque Pacheco.

> déjeuner Prendes. AM : vu Lozano. puis B. A. vu Pacheco. (Diary December 23, 1927)
>
> '9 AM call on Miss Paine at [the hotel] Geneve. go to Pintao's: he proposes 14,000 pesos for the collection. then to see Clausell's pictures at the university. then to my place. then I go to Clausell's to choose pictures for exhibition. then to Lozano's. then saw Pacheco's fresco. lunch at Prendes. Afternoon: saw Lozano. then Bellas Artes. saw Pacheco.'

My discussion must be summary.

Charlot seems to have spent much time with family, who had missed him: e.g., "arrivé à hôtel Colon où maman et reçu avec cris de joie par toute la famille" 'arrived at the Hotel Colon, where mama was, and received with cries of joy by the whole family' (June 18, 1928). The strengthening of Mexican bonds was countered by a weakening of those with the French family back home. Louis Goupil died on December 5, 1926, which Charlot learned some days later: "reçu nouvelles mort de papa. maman très triste" 'received news of death of papa. mama very sad' (Diary December 15, 1926). Also, Odette stopped writing: "De Paris silence de tous" 'From Paris silence of everyone' (AGC to JC April 1, 1928); "Aucune nouvelle de Paris" 'No news from Paris' (April 29). The reason was revealed later:

> Recibi malas noticias de Francia : Mi hermana tuvo que divorciarse y anda muy mal de dinero – y con su niña. No queria que lo supiera mi Maman y hay dos años que no habia escrito -- y ya tengo nuevas responsibilidades de este lado. (JC to AB "Todavia no estoy bien")
>
> 'I received bad news from France: my sister had to divorce and is doing very badly as regards money—and with her little daughter. She did not want my mama to know, and for two years that she has not written—and now I have new responsibilities from that side.'

Relations between Jean and Odette would remain awkward on his side until the end of his life.

Charlot reconnected with French friends mentioned elsewhere in the diaries (e.g., Madeline Bersin, Jean Salles, the Proals, et al.) and with priests and confessors like Lejeune and the clerics at Coyoacán (Diary December 18, 1926). He saw former girlfriends like Nahui Olin: "soir : rencontré N. et Santoyo elle va faire du ciné. retour de Los Angeles" 'evening: met Nahui and Santoyo. she will work in cinema. return from Los Angeles.'[128] Most important, Charlot was reunited with Anita Brenner, and as seen in the 1926–1928 diary entries, their relationship followed the pattern of earlier years. Charlot and Brenner approach each other, commit "imprudences," suffer remorse, attempt contrition, distance themselves, and reconcile. As seen in Chapter 5, their poverty and Charlot's Roman Catholic views on marriage and reproduction made their marriage and even cohabitation impossible. For two such sensual people, sexual frustration increased to being a constant problem. Nonetheless, they saw each other almost daily and continued to work intimately together on *Idols Behind Altars*.

Charlot spent much time with members of the *familia* of artists and friends, like Lupe and Federico Marín, and Luz Jiménez and her daughter Concha. The list of artists mentioned in Charlot's diaries is a who's who of the period.[129] Charlot also made new acquaintances like Leon Venado, "le tisseur de sarape" 'the weaver of serapes,' whose subtle color sense Charlot admired and whom he portrayed with his guitar.[130] His relationship deepened with some artists he had previously met, like Rufino Tamayo:

> AM : chez Paul. avec lui allé voir Tamayo : très sympathique maison. son père vend des bananes. bons tableaux. (Diary September 18, 1928)
> 'Afternoon. at Paul's [O'Higgins]. went with him to see Tamayo. very simpatico house. his father sells bananas [at the market]. good pictures.'
>
> I went to see Tamayo : I like his water-colors : the colour is very fine. (JC to AB "I don't remember if I send you the address of V. Arroyo's little girl")

Charlot always wished that Tamayo had retained a stronger connection to his roots and had reservations about his work that he expressed only rarely and in private, as to Anita Brenner:

> Tamayo esta bien pero que enorme distancia hay del bien al mejor. (JC to AB "Received a good letter").
> 'Tamayo is good but what an enormous distance there is from the good to the better.'
>
> Lo de Tamayo parece bueno, pero no se sostiene abstraccion hecha del asunto : para probarlo ponlas al reves : pierden Me parece siempre mucho mejor que Lozano. Es pintura criolla, de esos criollos con enfermedad de la sangre y algo africanos (limitacion. orgullo.) pero no es indio. Es muy lejos del indio. (JC to AB "Una carta tuya!")
> 'Tamayo's work appears good, but does not sustain itself, abstraction made of the subject. To test it, turn the paintings upside-down: they lose something. He always seems much better to me than Lozano. It's creole painting, from those creoles with infirmity of blood and something African (limitation, pride), but it is not Indian. It is very far from the Indian.'

Charlot's diaries show how interested he was in learning what his colleagues had been doing while he was in Yucatan. He was usually pleased:

> Goitia: "magnifiques études pour résurrection des morts" 'magnificent studies for the resurrection of the dead.'[131]
>
> Orozco: "chez Orozco voir ses nouveaux tableaux" 'at Orozco's to see his new pictures' (Diary October 20, 1927)
>
> Lozano: "il a de belles choses et aussi Castellanos" 'he has beautiful things and also Castellanos' (Diary July 6, 1927)

Pacheco: “vu Pacheco et sa fresque : enfant joie. très jolie” ‘saw Pacheco and his fresco: infant joy. very pretty’ (Diary August 31, 1927; also November 8)

Revueltas: “vu ses dessins dont quelques très bon” ‘saw his drawings several of which are very good’ (Diary September 5, 1927); “11 h Revueltas pour aller chez lui vu ses tableaux. bonnes choses de Tehuantepec” ‘11 AM met Revueltas to go to his place. saw his pictures. good things of Tehuantepec’ (Diary October 31, 1927); “exp Revueltas : personne et fort jolis tableaux” ‘Revueltas exhibition: nobody and very pretty pictures’ (Diary December 9, 1927; also October 3, 1928); “some of the canvases were really interesting, especially some Tehuanatepec ones” (JC to AB “When Orozco said he was going to New-York”; also “Como me haces sufrir con tu silencio”); “unos debujos a liña (paisajes) mejores que todos nos otros y muy humildes” ‘some line drawings (landscapes) better than all of ours and very humble’ (JC to AB “Otra cartita tuya”)

Carlos Mérida: album (Diary June 18, 1928)

Díaz de León: “livre de gravure” ‘book of engravings’ (Diary August 3, 1928)

On the other hand, Charlot did not like a newly founded school of sculpture (Diary 1927: July 16, September 5, October 11). As seen above, Charlot also attended, participated in, and sometimes helped organize exhibitions.[132] A written record, his correspondence with Edward Weston, reveals how intense and various Charlot’s efforts were to understand and support his friends (e.g., Andrews 2011: 50 f.).

Charlot showed his colleagues his own work (e.g., Diary August 3, 1928) as well as his copies and original work from Chich’en Itza to which Brenner reacted strongly: “Then to Jean’s to see his Yucatán stuff, both of which (copies and his own stuff) almost frightened me with their beauty.”[133] Schmeckebier notes that this work “furnished a new store of motifs from which Rivera and the other folklorists were able to draw.”[134]

Through these three years, as seen in the last chapter, Charlot’s work with Orozco increased. Charlot’s articles on Orozco explained him to the New York art world, and in Mexico City, Charlot was gathering materials and organizing the production of photographs for exhibitions and publicity. Relations between the two were warm. When Charlot, returning from Yucatan, met Orozco, he noted: “grand plaisir de le revoir” ‘great pleasure to see him again’ (Diary July 6, 1927). Charlot’s mother, Anne, found Orozco a great friend and help in 1928 when she and Jean were planning to join him in New York City:

José-Clemente se montre vraiment bon et sincère ami pour nous. Peut-être pourrons-nous lui rendre q.q. service au point de vue home car il a l’air bien désemparé loin des siens, quoique plein d’espoir pour la réussite de ses projets. (AGC to JC Lundi, 1928) ‘José Clemente is showing he is a good and sincere friend of ours. Perhaps we could be of some service to him from the point of view of *home* because he seems quite at sea so distant from his own, even though full of hope for the success of his projects.’

> Orozco agit vraiment bien avec moi, il tient ses promesses. Il m'a envoyé des pages entières de journaux avec chambres et appartements à louer… (March 26)
> 'Orozco is acting really well with me. He keeps his promises. He sent me whole newspaper pages with rooms and apartments to rent…'
> Le pauvre Orozco était très en peine d'eux, je comprends pourquoi il ne les a pas encore reçus.[135]
> [When worried because the pictures Charlot sent have not arrived] 'Poor Orozco is very pained because of them. I understand: because he still has not received them.'

> Cela me fait plaisir ce que tu me dis de Jose-Clemente; il ne m'avait pas parlé de son atelier mais de "grandes espérances" ?? Je suis bien, bien contente qu'on lui rende justice. (May 8)
> 'What you say to me about José Clemente pleases me. He had not spoken to me about his studio but about "great expectations"?? I am very, very happy that people are taking him at his true value.'

Charlot's relations with Rivera were cordial: "vu Diego : plaisir de le voir" 'saw Diego: pleasure to see him' (Diary August 1, 1928); "He escrito a Diego muy amable" 'I wrote Diego. Very amiable' (JC to AB "Recibi tu carta estupida Francis"). The two artists and their families socialized together.[136] Charlot helped Rivera's assistant Pablo O'Higgins: "aidé Paul à retoucher fresques Diego" 'helped Paul retouch Diego frescoes.'[137] Charlot translated for Diego's classes, although the master sometimes failed to appear (Diary 1926: August 11, 12, October 28; Chapter 3). Charlot helped with the photographing of Rivera's work for Brenner (August 15, 1927). Charlot and Rivera organized an exhibition together (October 7, 1926). Charlot and his mother went to see Rivera's and Orozco's paintings (July 4, September 6, 1927). Charlot admired the artworks Rivera showed him: "chez Diego : il a l'air malade et gentil. bon tableau de Tehuantepec" 'at Diego's: he seems sick and nice. good painting of Tehuantepec' (October 2, 1928). Charlot attended Rivera's lecture on art in Russia and admired the work Rivera himself had done there: "vu aquarelles et tableaux de Russie de Diego. très bon" 'saw watercolors and pictures of Russia by Diego. very good' (1928: August 4, 19). Charlot also traveled again to Chapingo to see Rivera's work in progress: **"**fresque Diego bonne et très bon <u>morceau</u> de nu" 'Diego fresco good and very good <u>section</u> of nude.'[138]

Despite their current good relations, Charlot remained wary of Rivera: "Veo a nuestro amigo Diego pero por tantas razones no quiero tratar seguido con el" 'I see our friend Diego, but for so many reasons do not want to deal regularly with him' (JC to AB "Veo a nuestro amigo Diego"). Charlot was aware of Rivera's capacity for escapades:

> Se fue Diego para Russia con cajas de cuadros y probable intencion de quedarse algo en Paris. Pasa *por Nueva York*. A ver si echa alguna bombita pero no puede gran cosa. ("Gracias por el diario tuyo. *Lo necesitaba*")
> 'Diego left for Russia with crates of paintings and probable intention to stay a while

in Paris. He come *by way of New York*. We'll see if he throws some little bomb, but he cannot do much.'

Although Mexico City offered few opportunities for gallery exhibitions, Charlot was active in what was available and, more important, in exhibitions that publicized Mexican art in the United States like his exhibition at the Art Center of New York, April 25–May 1, 1926, organized by Walter Pach and discussed above. A list with details is found in Charlot's manuscript "Bibliographie et Expositions." (April 1931).

Charlots exhibition of *papeleros*, *temascal*, and little oils was held at the Cervantes gallery opening October 17, 1926. Positive reviews were elicited from important writers like Vera de Cordova (Ch 23-5). Xavier Villaurrutia wrote in *Revista de Revistas*:

> Jean Charlot expone un buen lote de telas. Todas ellas tienen importancia y demuestran cuánto ha ganado en fineza de expresión y colorido. Entre los cuadros pequeños, hay algunos verdaderamente deliciosas y deseables. (1926)
>
> 'Jean Charlot exhibits a good lot of canvases. All of them are important and demonstrate how much he has gained in fineness of expression and coloring. Among the little pictures are some truly delicious and desirable.'

Jorge Cuesta wrote in *El Universal Ilustrado*:

> De Charlot preferimos dos cuadros; un grupo de varias figuras y una mujer y niño en verde y tierras rojas, ambos pequeños. Pero no abandonamos los otros más compactos, menos contenidos. Hay en ellos un dibujo impaciente o una construcción elaborada, que salva la estricta atención, aunque no porque corrige, sino porque modifica. Nos hace notar Villaurrutia también la resistencia que le oponen las cosas del país, lo que remedia en forma semejante. Su color, por otra parte, es acertadísimo. (Clipping 35)
>
> 'Of Charlot's we prefer two pictures: a group of various figures and a mother and child in green and red earth, both small. But we don't abandon the others that are more compact, less contained. There is in them an impatient drawing or an elaborate construction that merits strict attention, although not because it corrects, but because it modifies. Villaurrutia also makes us note the resistance that the things of our country oppose to him—that which he remedies in the above form. His color, on the other hand, is most certain.'

As noted elsewhere, both the above writers were not ideological allies of the muralists, and their positive remarks reveal the good taste and broad-mindedness of the members of the Mexico City art world.

Charlot's participation in the exhibition for the opening of the Opportunity Gallery in October 1927, organized by Pach, has been mentioned in Chapter 7. In the same month, he showed "several

studies in oils of Aztec Indians" at the Frank Loeser Company of Brooklyn (1927 Current Exhibitions Seen in New York Galleries).

A bigger exhibition was a group show that opened at the DeWitte Memorial Museum in San Antonio, Texas, in November 1927, and then traveled to Houston (December) and San Francisco (January 1928; Charlot April 1931). Emily Edwards was organizing in San Antonio and was later joined by Anita Brenner, where Charlot sent her a copy of *Forma* and a painting by Clausell (JC to AB "Que mal escribes"; "Yo se muy bien que no puedes escribir mucho"). But troubles with the show and lack of communication caused Charlot "grand ennui. me couche" 'great worries. I go to bed' (Diary November 20, 1927). With the show opened, Charlot did not know whether his artwork was included (JC to AB "Una carta tuya"). Finally, he heard "No han puesto mis cuadros!" 'They didn't include my paintings,' nor his woodcuts or lithographs (JC to AB "Me hubiera gustado"). Charlot tried to guess what the reason might be: "Sera porque la galeria era chica, o porque Diego no mandaba mas que un cuadro?" 'Could it be because the gallery was small, or because Diego sent only one painting?' ("Me hubiera gustado"). He worries that his works might have been lost or held by customs. Besides the plan to travel the show to Houston and San Francisco, Charlot needed his works for the 1928 Art Center show in New York City and for shows in Boston and Berlin about which I have no information (JC to AB "Otra cartita tuya"; "Una carta tuya; "Recibi carta tuya"). When Charlot received clippings about the San Antonio show, he could not understand what the critics were saying about him (JC to AB "Perdoname si te he hecho pena"). Somehow, the troubles were resolved, and "Emily apporte de l'argent de l'exp S Antonio merci mon Dieu" 'Emily brings some money from the San Antonio exhibition Thank you, God' (Diary December 10, 1927). Whether this was from sales or expenses is not stated.

In January 1928, Charlot participated in an exhibition of former members of the Sindicato—such as Orozco, Guerrero, and Pacheco—at the Galerie Beaux Arts in San Francisco. Reviews were reportedly favorable, but I have found no further information.

Charlot was a major participant in the "most important group show to date," *Mexican Art* at the Art Center in New York City, January 19 to February 14, 1928.[139] Organized by Frances Flynn Paine and financed by the Mexican government and John D. Rockefeller, the exhibition displayed the works of many of the best contemporary artists. Charlot was represented by eighteen works, the most of any participant, and the cover of the catalogue was illustrated by his *Great Malinches*.[140] He himself received good, if puzzled, notices:

> La obra "Madre e hijo" de Charlot es una concepción tierna y original, parece extraño que el niño tenga un carácter tan serio y la madre aparezca a la vez dulce y austera; pero ambas figuras se esbozan dentro de una decoración rítmicamente dibujada. (*El Universal*, Feb. 25, 1928; Clipping 47)
>
> 'The work *Mother and Son* of Charlot is a tender and original conception. It seems strange that the child has such a serious character and the mother appears at once sweet and austere. But both figures are sketched within a rhythmically drawn design.'

> The exhibition of Mexican art left one with a sense of red hot sun and heavy, baking earth and the large and lumbering passions of untrained humans. Many of the canvases, notably those of Jean Charlot, were arresting in the power of their forms and the brutish simplicity of their manner. The best of them were tinged with the alien darkness of superstition; lowering skies and weirdly moving figures. But, as I said, the earth still lies too heavy on the primordial brows of their makers. (*Creative Art*, February 1928; Clipping 48)

The general feeling was, however, that the exhibition was another in a series of failures to present the new Mexican art to the United States. Far away in Yucatan, Charlot blamed "lack of comprehension" (Andrews 2011: 62). When he himself traveled to New York City, he would make every effort to ensure that there should be no such "lack" for Orozco's 1929 retrospective at the Art Students League.

Charlot was continuing his own studies, including reading older authors like Waldeck and the le Plongeons, as see above. He also visited nearby cultural and archeological sites, like Churubusco, Xochimilco, and Tenayuca (Diary August 8, 1926; September 12, 1928). He continued his studies of later Mexican art like the works of José María Velasco (1840–1912), who had used landscape painting to express Mexican identity: "chez la famille de Velasco : admirables paysages" 'at the family of Velasco: admirable landscapes' (Diary September 5, 1927); "muy interessante, bastante cerca los paysagistas frances 1840 pero mexicano" 'very interesting, close enough to the 1840 French landscape artists, but Mexican' (JC to AB "Otra cartita tuya"). Charlot had first seen Velasco's art in the collection of his grandfather Louis Goupil: "two landscapes by Velasco, featuring the volcanos [*sic*]" (*MMR* 179). Charlot occasionally noted lectures he had attended: Pepin on Tasco and Paul Hazard: "très médiocre" 'very mediocre' (Diary 1928: August 24; September 19). Charlot also mentioned a "colloque fresque" 'symposium on fresco' without any details (Diary December 11, 1927). Charlot was also going to the movies several times a week with his mother and friends or alone. The titles, only rarely noted by Charlot, show his interests and the availability of great works in Mexico City:

> 1926: September 13 (*The Last Laugh*, F. W. Murnau, 1924 ["sans seul titre et très bon" 'without a single title card and very good'])
>
> November 7 (*Ben Hur: A Tale of the Christ*, Fred Niblo, 1925)
>
> December 25 ("bon film par Pierre L'Hermite : !!" 'good film by Pierre L'Ermite: !!')
>
> 1927: July 8 ("filme russe : bahia de la muerte magnifique" 'Russian film: bay of death magnificent')
>
> July 18 ("filme russe très bon" 'Russian film very good')
>
> September 26 (*The Gold Rush*, Charlie Chaplin, 1925)
>
> December 18 (*Battleship Potemkin*, Serge Eisenstein, 1925 ["magnifique" 'magnificent'])
>
> 1928: August 5 (*Gentlemen Prefer Blondes*, Malcolm St. Clair, 1928)

October 3 (*The Big Parade*, King Vidor, 1925 [“très bien” ‘very good’])

September 21 (*The Circus*, Charlie Chaplin, 1928 [“impression médiocre” ‘mediocre impression’])

Charlot’s appreciation of Russian cinema prepared him for his later friendship with Sergei Eisenstein.

Charlot’s own writing at the time was divided between his archeological subjects and others. Even in Mexico City, Charlot was in contact and even collaboration with his Chich’en Itza colleagues, like Morley, the Morrises, Thompson, Carleton Beals, Houser, and Vaillant. Morley is mentioned often in the diaries, and Charlot helped organize a lecture for him and wrote articles for the expedition (e.g., Diary 1928: June 8, August 27, 28, 29, September 4). Charlot was providing drawings and perhaps an article for Thompson’s use (Diary 1926: October 19, 20, 31, November 1, 3, December 5). He was working on articles for *Forma* while still in Chich’en Itza (April 25, 1927). Similarly, he was helping Brenner with her writings and wrote an article at her request, “A Note on Maya Esthetic” (1928), which she did not publish to his annoyance (Chapter 1; also, e.g., Diary 1927: November 25, June 8). An important article was on Carlos Mérida—done at Mérida’s request—which impressed the subject.[141] Charlot maintained his interest in children’s art, on which he had published earlier (1925 Prólogo; Diary August 1, 1928). Some writings seem to have been lost: an article or, more probably, a drawing for *Norte* (1928: June 19, 20), an article on fresco (June 25, 1928), and a perhaps unfinished one on sculpture (October 23, 1928). Frances Toor rejected one of his articles for *Mexican Folkways* because she found it too “dark” (JC to AB “Cuando yo estaba en Amecameca”). Charlot also continued working with Vanegas Arroyo. Although his project of a catalogue raisonné was doomed, others were pursued like articles and the inclusion of Posada in *Idols Behind Altars*. Charlot’s quantity of poetry continued to diminish but intensified its positive stylistic qualities described in the last chapter—compression, originality of expression, and striking images—seen especially in his 1927 birthday poem *Pour mes 30 ans*. But the main subjects in 1926–1928 were religious problems and his relationship with Anita Brenner, described in Chapter 5.

Charlot and his mother were spending a great deal of their time introducing visitors and potential buyers and exhibitors to the Mexican art world. In 1927, Frances Flynn Paine (d. October 19, 1962) came to Mexico with an introduction to Charlot to gather artworks for two 1928 exhibitions for the Art Center in New York City: contemporary Mexican art and folk arts.[142] She arrived on December 19, and Charlot took her to the Ministry of Education, to lunch, and then to her hotel. Afterwards he took her to exhibitions of Lozano and Revueltas, the Orozco frescoes, and market stalls (Diary December 19, 1927). He found her “très gentille” ‘very nice.’ Charlot continued working on Paine’s behalf, introducing her to artists—such as Orozco, Revueltas, Alva de la Canal, Ángel, O’Higgins, Pintao, Clausell, Lozano, Castellanos, Ruiz, and Maria Guerrero of popular theatre (Diary 1927: December 21, 23; January 3, 1928; JC to AB “Muchas felicidades de año nuevo”)—as well as to other personages like Lupe Marín (Diary December 21, 1927).

Charlot did errands for Paine (Diary 1927: December 20, 22), gathered artworks for her (December 26, 1927), and helped her buy folk art (January 3, 1928) and visit market stalls (January 4, 1928). He took her to Bellas Artes, exhibitions, and popular theatre (1927: December 27, 30; January 3,

1928). Some meetings may have been purely social (January 2, 1928). Charlot showed Paine his own work (Diary December 21, 1927), but in all her purchases, she did not acquire anything from him (AGC to JC February 8, 1928). Instead according to Charlot's mother, she fell into the hands of Dr. Atl, who sold her mediocre objects at inflated prices and overcharged her for packing.[143] Anne Charlot complained to Jean that they both lacked business sense:

> nous, idiots comme toujours, nous n'avons pour toute cette peine, ces courses et ce travail que 0 centimes. Nous sommes trop bêtes, vraiment (AGC to JC February 1, 1928)
>
> 'we, idiots as always, we have nothing more for all this effort, these errands and this work than 0 cents. We are too stupid, really,'

Paine did, however, take several of Charlot's artworks for exhibition and defended the Charlots to Dr. Atl, saying that "nous avions un goût parfait et plus mexicain que tous les mexicains réunis" 'we have a taste that is perfect and more Mexican than all the Mexicans put together.'[144] O'Higgins argued that Paine was an important intermediary (AGC to JC February 26, 1928), and she did promote Charlot in the United States and became a good and close friend to him and his family. In the mid-1950s in New York City, I knew her as an designer of original projects and a tireless promoter of cultural causes.

Charlot spent much time helping visiting artists like Henrietta Shore (1880–1963), introduced by Edward Weston.[145] Besides socializing (1927: November 7, 15, December 27), Charlot took her to museums, Bellas Artes, the Ministry of Education, the Cathedral of Our Lady of Guadalupe, exhibitions, theatre, and folk dances (1927: October 27, November 11, 21, 24, 29, December 12, 15). He showed her the work of his fellow artists like Orozco, Goitia, and Ángel as well as his own (1927: November 11, 21, December 19). He introduced her to artists and friends like Orozco, Lupe Marín, Goitia, and Lozano (1927: November 24, December 2, 3, 6, 19, 29). Shore painted a portrait of Orozco (December 10, 1927) and of Charlot: "2 h ½ de modèle chez Miss Shore j 5 h 1/2 " '2:30 PM to 5:30 PM as a model at Miss Shore's'; "vu le portrait : il me plait" 'saw the portrait: it pleases me.'[146] In return, Charlot did portraits of her in pencil and watercolor (1927: December 5, 9, 15, 22). These were used in his later oil, CL 159 *Henrietta Shore* of May 1929, and in the 1933 lithograph of the same name:

> "She really looked like that. She didn't like it much. I met her first when she went to Mexico. She had asked permission to do my portrait and that of Orozco—so I reciprocated. I did an article on her. She was a good painter." (M114)

Charlot's article expressed his admiration:

> This bitter protective shield is the fact that she is classified as a decorative artist. That more than many she has worked, loved and suffered, that she buttresses each stroke with a full impact of brain and heart, does not weight in the balance against the fact that she is a woman, that she paints flowers, and that her technique is crystal clean. Henrietta Shore…chose to become the impeccable craftsman of her own passion. Hers being not an invertebrate emotion to be fulfilled in a sketch, but the belief that

> nature, ordered and meaningful to the utmost detail, deserves to be transmuted into paint with equal care.[147]

Charlot's mother was upset that Shore left without saying goodbye: "De Shore aucune nouvelle; je crois qu'elle est repartie sans tambour ni trompette" 'About Shore no news at all. I think she has left without drum or trumpet' (to Jean Charlot January 23, 1928; also February 15, 1928).

Charlot also met Max Gorelik, with whom he remained friends, other artists who were friends of friends, and art writers like Bertram Wolfe, Laurence E. Schmeckebier, and Gabriel García Maroto.[148]

9.2.1. ART

While at Chich'en Itza, Charlot's archeological work left him little time to do things "pour moi" 'for me,' as seen above. The lack of facilities for printmaking restricted the choice of the medium to handwork: stencil (M70) and woodblock "cutting out white lines and printing in watercolor" by hand rather than a press (M78; also M77). Charlot was anxious to get back to his personal creative work in Mexico City:

> Trabajo mucho, sin gran esfuerzo porque es copiar nada mas y descanso mis nervios que lo necesitaban, y tengo algunas ideas para obrarlas a mi regreso. (JC to AB "Nothing from you since a long time")
> 'I work a lot, without much strength because it is nothing more than copying, and I rest my nerves, which they need. And I have some ideas to work out when I return.'

> Acaban de encontrar adentro del templo grande uno mas chico, mas antiguo con pinturas intactas estilo Tuthankahmen que es una preciosidad. Pero ya quiero irme a Mexico a pintar unas cosas que tengo en la cabeza… (JC to AB "Te mando mi fotografia junto a uno de los menotes que descubri")
> 'They just discovered inside the big temple a smaller one, older, with intact paintings in Tutankhamen style, which is precious. But I want to go to Mexico City to paint some things I have in my head…'

As seen above, Charlot's creative work was important for his emotional well-being:

> I feel a little descansado ['rested'] now, but I was so very tired,--nearly sick…I painted three little pictures Yucatan = Woman dancing, worker drinking, woman and baby, and regained a little self-confidence. I feel so utterly helpless when I dont [*sic*] create something. (JC to AB "que direccion tienes?")

Charlot's job situation decreased his own creative work both in painting and in prints. From 1926 through 1928, he produced only nine prints (M70–78). Three were the anomalous ones described above. Another three were the beginning of his Builders series, discussed above (M73, 74, 75). The final three were a continuation of Charlot's previous work on the Aztec nude with Luz Jiménez as the model (M71, 72, 76). Charlot had created many drawings of Luz with a fluid pencil line: e.g., "35 dessins Luz nue" 'thirty-five drawings of Luz nude' (Diary November 16, 1927; also December 9, 1926). Now with

the blunt strength of the woodblock, Charlot pushed to an extreme the massy synthesis towards which he had been working. The Aztec body confronts the Maya, the new object of Charlot's study. Each body pushes the other to its extreme. Each inhabits the world it creates around itself. Charlot's art has developed a second line, and the two will rarely meet (M207).

Besides his own creative work, Charlot followed the print work of his friends, like Carlos Mérida and Francisco Díaz de León (e.g., Diary 1928: June 18, August 3, 9). He continued to work with Vanegas Arroyo on various projects, including printing materials for Anita Brenner. Charlot also reprinted some of the 1924 woodblocks of Siqueiros and Guerrero for *El Machete*:

> fini tirage gravures V. A tiré toutes les gravures X et Alfaro (Diary December 11, 1926)
> 'finished printing engravings Vanegas Arroyo printed all the engravings Xavier and Alfaro.'
>
> tiré gravures sur bois [later note : from Machete : Siqueiros and Guerrero.][149]
> 'printed woodblocks'

Charlot did maintain his productivity in drawings as seen above in his entries on Luz. On the evidence of the diaries, Charlot was also producing a large number of watercolors, but he did not include these in his Checklist, and they need to be collected for study. In the Diaries, some mentions of subjects are not clearly identified as watercolors or oils (Diary 1926: July 28, 29). Watercolors could be used as bases of oils:

> aquarelle danseur AM : huile idem 'watercolor dancer Afternoon: oil idem.' (Diary July 29, 1926; CL 129?)
>
> aquarelle papeleros couchés couvre papeleros huile 'watercolor newsboys lying down glaze newsboys oil.' (August 29, 1926; CL 137)

Charlot prepared the oil CL 150 *Leopard Hunter* with a line drawing and a watercolor (1928: July 5, 6, 7, 25, 26). Also unlisted were most of the illustrations he made for Anita Brenner (CL 140, 141, 142, 143). Finally, the Checklist of oils is incomplete and—unusually for Charlot—occasionally incorrect in dating.

Charlot's 1926 list of oils reveals immediately his desire to use his new Yucatan subjects: *mestizas*, builders, and family life on the porch (CL 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127). He was also continuing his Mexico subjects (CL 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143), to which he added the new one of Malinche dancers, discussed below (CL 129, 130, 131, 132, 133). Curiously, he used only Mexico subjects in 1927 (CL 144, 145,[150] 146, 147, 148) and only Yucatan ones in 1928 (CL 149a, 149b, 150, 150b, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158). As seen above, he continued to use both Mexico and Yucatan subjects till the end of his life.

In general, Charlot used smaller formats in oil to develop a subject, to which he then gave definitive forms in larger ones. In 1927, all his oils were on Mexico subjects and in large format except CL 146 *Portrait of Viorica Suttor*. In 1928, all were in small formats on Yucatan subjects including two

on which he had worked earlier, CL 154 *Bathers*, and CL 155 *Builder ascending platform*. The two small format CL 155 and CL 124 *Builder on ladder, Yucatan*, 1926, culminated in CL 169 *Builders, blue sky. Chichen-Itza*, 36" X 29", of November 1929. In 1926, as discussed below, the large multi-figure CL 131 *Great Malinches I*, 25-½" X 45 ¾", was produced after two small paintings of a single Malinche dancer. CL 136 *Large guitar player I*, 58 ½" X 36", 1926, was also painted after the smaller version CL 134, 15" X 22". In accordance with this way of working, the 1926 CL 137 *Newsboys*, 19" X 37", was noted by Charlot in his Checklist as a smaller version of CL 571 *Newsboys asleep*, 30" X 40", of 1938. Charlot could thus address a subject after long intervals. Charlot's procedure was not rigid, but recognizing it does provide some insight into his finished works. Two more 1926 paintings follow the pattern of Mexico City subject and large format: CL 138 *Nude, back*, 39" X 19", 1926 (Luz nude), and CL 139 *Mother and child, seated frontally (Yellow Robe)*, 32" X 25", 1926. But CL 121 *Mestiza with Orange Fan*, 39" X 22", or *Grande Yucatèque*, is a new subject realized monumentally without smaller preparatory oils, a testimony to the power of the new impression and esthetic Charlot had discovered in Yucatan.

In 1926, Charlot discovered and developed one of his major subjects: the dance of the Malinches, a mock battle between the wives of the Aztec warriors and the mistresses of the Spaniards (Chapter 7). Charlot had been invited by his recent acquaintances, the rich and aristocratic Lucio Suttor and his wife Viorica or Rica, to stay at their Hacienda de la Llave from July 16 to 26, 1926.[151] Charlot became close with Rica, as Anita Brenner did the next year, and spent an unusual amount of time on her portrait.[152] He apparently felt an attraction to her: "légère imprudence avec Rica" 'light imprudence with Rica' (January 1, 1928).

The Hacienda de la Llave had been established near Querétaro since the Conquest and passed into Lucio's family, the Iturbes, when Francisco Iturbe purchased it in the nineteenth century. He demolished much of the old structure, and built an enormous horizontal palace inspired by Versailles and ornamented with eclectic details: "in general a French look" or, in Charlot's words, an "aspect Maximilien" a 'Maximilian look.'[153] The building had an "open place where the market day & fiestas are celebrated" (Glusker 2010: 472), and from 1910 on, a part of the building was dedicated to a school for the workers' children.

The Suttors were friendly and hospitable and had timed the visit so their guests could attend a ten-day fiesta of traditional dances, fireworks, and feasting at the Hacienda.[154] Charlot took notes in his diary and made sketches of costumed dancers on loose sheets that he later had bound as *Sketches from Life*. The "Malinche moment" occurred on the night of his arrival: "soir : danses indiennes. les petites rient" 'evening: Indian dances. the little girls laugh' (Diary July 16, 1926). This short statement can be understood from a later interview, quoted completely in Chapter 7:

> the Indian is not especially sad, romantic; there are some truly gay and truly happy things in him, and those happy things are exteriorized only when he is very young. It's only in the young girls, especially, that you find that angle...So to show that particular happiness of the Indian, I had to use the only moment when it is

> exteriorized, and that is in those little girls. They are happy because they are dressed up very specially for that particular dance, and they are given a lot of permit to act and express themselves. But that is somehow the mood of gaiety. But under the mood of gaiety there is something else which counts a lot for the people who witness that dance, and that is the great theme of the Conquest… (Interview September 28, 1970)

Malinches could even express the tragedy of the Conquest, as Charlot described his *Village Fiesta* at Syracuse University:

> The most dramatic part is the little girl, just because she was tired, maybe, or was hit with the wooden sword, and is not really wounded but is lying down there….there is something in the picture that is more than the simple narrative…That dance of the Malinches is a very small replica of the Conquest of Mexico…and I put a bit of that which I feel very strongly—of great tragedy—in that little girl in the lower left corner. (1960)

At the hacienda, Charlot struggled to find the communicative *malinche* image. The pages of *Sketches from Life* are filled with realistic drawings of tall preteen girls wearing complicated costumes to which Charlot has attached color notes. Malinche costumes are complicated and vary widely according to the locality.

> all the sketches in the book were done from nature while really the dance was proceeding. Then the watercolor swatches were put on afterwards in the evening when I returned home, because they were really done from nature. (Interview September 28, 1970)

Charlot's later interest in certain aspects of the costumes is found from the beginning: zigzag designs (pp. 12, 25), a crown (pp. 15, 21), and a hat trailing ribbons over the back or shoulders (pp. 11, 12, 15, 21, 25), all used in his *Great Malinches I*, discussed below. His modifications towards his realized Malinche image can also be followed. The taller girls are discarded in favor of shorter, younger dancers (pp. 3, 16). The regular dancers' bucket-type hats are gradually enlarged for their brims to touch the arms or shoulders (pp. 3, 15, 16). The rattles are enlarged, and the swords standardized to resemble toy wooden swords and not sticks (pp. 12, 15, 16, 25).

Charlot described to me the step from observation to the creation of his canonical Malinche image as we were looking at the one tiny drawing in *Sketches from Life* that exemplified his later norm (p. 3):

> I didn't have a clear idea of how to make a picture out of it. And George [Vaillant]… said, "Well, that's easy," and he started jumping around and pretending he was a little girl, and between his girth and his weight and his gestures, I had an illumination, really, and most of the *malinches* that happen in my pictures now are a double vision,

if you want: what I'd seen in nature, in the dance, and what George had acted for me. (Interview September 28, 1970)

Charlot immediately exploited this breakthrough. Earlier he had "copié danse" 'copied dance' (Diary July 19, 1926), using the word for his archeological work. Now he recorded developing a real subject, one that had found its image: "grand danseurs" 'great dancers' (1926: Diary July 25, 26). *Grand* 'great' is a word used by Classicist artists—and followed by Charlot—for such a designation: "grande nue" 'great nude,' "grande Yucatèque" 'great Yucatecan woman,' and so on. Malinches became one of Charlot's favorite subjects in several media as can be seen above from the number of oils painted of it in 1926. Charlot again used his watercolors as bases for oils (Diary July 29, 1926).

Although Charlot's intuition of the Malinche image was instantaneous, it was also multi-faceted. Rather than the dancers' arms being at rest as in the sketches from life, they and the legs are thrown out from their reduced torsos into a dynamic X-composition seen often in the earlier Street Sketches. The effect is of an explosion of energy. The body dimensions themselves are changed from the tallish preteen dancers Charlot observed to a shorter, wider form, making the girls younger and almost baby-like. Their emotion becomes more understandable as childish glee. The Malinches are a clear example of the influence of Stefan Lochner, whose childlike angels Charlot admired as an expression of innocence. Finally, the complicated costumes studied in detail by Charlot are simplified into flared blouses and skirts that support the X-composition. The frills of both cohere to the basic form. The hats are made wider, and their brims droop towards the shoulders, unifying the upper body, the shoulders, and the head. A distinguishing characteristic of the subject is the bright, festive colors, last used extensively in France.

An example of Charlot's Malinche figure is the 1933 oil CL 328 *Malinche, with Red Sword*. The girl occupies the center of the small canvas (6" X 8") and stretches her arms and legs towards the nearest corners. The background vegetation supports the gesture, echoing the diagonal of the dancer's right arm and, on the other side, the diagonal of the left arm and the right edge of the skirt. The dancer's feet have been twisted to be seen frontally, emphasizing the two-dimensional quality of the X-composition. The dancer's body is clearly divided at the waist into upper blue blouse and lower red skirt. The side brims of the large, bucket-type hat touch the dancer's upraised arms, uniting head and upper torso by the facing curves of the hat brim and the neck and bodice.

A separate set of diagonals is created by pigtails and apron, which wave backwards pushed by the vigorous forward movement of the dancer. Sword and rattle are tipped backwards to indicate the three-dimensionality of the image, emphasized also in the modeling of the upper half of the figure. Among other problems, Charlot is using the picture to explore the relationship between two-dimensionality—inevitable in an X-composition—and three-dimensionality, needed to articulate the stage of the young dancer's body development.

Charlot returned on July 26 from the Hacienda de la Llave to Mexico City. After a day of errands, he started to use his new subject on July 28: a watercolor of a dancer. He continued the watercolor on the next day and also "commencé huile" 'started oil.' Charlot's Checklist presents problems at this point, but he seems to have painted two small oils of single dancers (16" X 12"; CL 129,

130) and then the major, six-figure CL 131 *Great Malinches I* (25 ½" X 45 ¾"). Charlot considered this work representative of his new subject. He sent it to the 1927 exhibition in San Antonio, and it was used on the cover of the 1928 group Mexican exhibition at the Art Center in New York City. The art supporter Lincoln Kirstein added it to his collection.

Great Malinches I is one of Charlot's most complicated compositions, and I will discuss only a few aspects of it here. The X-composition is programmatically announced by pointing a rattle almost directly at each of the top corners. (Compare the X formed by the crossed swords in the middle of CL 133.) The rattle on the right is crossed by one behind it to form an X. The next rattle in from the right edge is uncrossed. On the left, the first rattle is uncrossed, and the second rattle from the edge is crossed. A rhythmic frieze is thus created along the top from left to right: uncrossed, crossed, uncrossed, crossed. Just below this frieze is a more three-dimensional horizontal band formed by the dancers' hats.

Along the bottom, a looser zigzag frieze is composed of dog, yellow sword, and blue sword. Just above and touching this zigzag is a line of corresponding three-dimensional downward loops formed by the hems of the skirts of the dancers and emphasized by the mid-skirt frills of the two on the right. A zigzag line starts at the foot of the right dancer, goes up her waist and meets the mid-skirt orange frill of the middle dancer. The line dips down and up to jump to the waist of the left dancer and make a final descent. Another zigzag line can be traced down the right arm of the left dancer, up her left arm, down the arm of the middle dancer, up the pigtails of the right dancer, down her right arm, and finally up her left. These lines articulate the up and down movements of the dancers.

Again, Charlot will be coordinating both a two-dimensional X-composition and a three-dimensional one based on the dancers' body mass. For instance, of the three front dancers, the dancer on the right is closest to the picture plane and the one on the left the furthest. But this three-dimensional effect is mitigated by devices that make the back dancer appear closer to the viewer: the back dancer's head is bigger than that of the one in front and she looks directly at the viewer. In addition, her blouse is the brightest as is the section of ground behind her.

The X-composition rules both the dancing figures and the entire composition as seen also in CL 132. The left and right dancers form diagonals that open towards the top like their arms. A long diagonal rises from the right dancer's left foot, then over her leg and waist to the ribbons and raised left arm of the middle dancer. The pigtails of the right and middle dancer cross in the middle. These and more diagonals are created with variations and indirections that prevent them from being mechanical or indeed obvious.

The dancers form a circle with three in front and three almost hidden behind them. The relations between them express the movement of the dance. On the right, the back dancer's black shoe points backwards into the picture space. The front right dancer's foot, also black, echoes the foot behind her and points more towards the side-front. (In a countermovement, the rattle of the back girl points forward and that of the front girl points backward.) The viewer sees that the girls are dancing in a circle. The front dancer's right foot continues this circle, which is continued further by the left foot of the middle dancer. On the left, the foot of the front girl points forwards and that of the back girl points into depth.

The curve of this circle is articulated through the placement of the bodies. The dancer on the right is closest to the picture frame. She faces forward at a three-quarter angle and bends at the waist forming a wedge back into space. The middle dancer is behind her back-to-back and forms a similar wedge facing into depth. On the left, the third dancer faces straight forward although her legs and feet are moving towards the side.

The circle is decidedly rough, a contrast to the crown of the left dancer with its perfect circumference and identical projections (the crown appears in *Sketches from Life*, pp. 15, 21). The Malinches seem to be *possessed by* rather than *instructed in* the dance. Their young brains cannot fully control its impulsive power. The explosive, upraised arms of the single *malinche* subject are reinforced by those of the whole group. The geometric composition creates the effect, not of coordinated symmetry, but of explosive energy, the kind that makes the rich colors vibrate and the dog rush to join in.

Charlot used a Malinche as the illustration for his prospectus for *Picture Book* (1933), "a repertory of motifs I had used up to then" (Morse 1976: 89). The subjects he developed from 1925 to 1928 are M121 *In Church* = CL 122, 123; M122 *The Rocking Chair* = CL 150b; M123 *Fiesta Head-Dress* = CL 156; M133 *Builder*; M136 *Leopard Hunter* = CL 150; M138 *The Iron Bed* = CL 134, 136; M145 Malinche; M146 *Jarana* = CL 149; M148 *Maya Workers*; M150 *Motherly Care* = CL 127; related M138 *The Yellow Robe* = CL 139. The builders subject had many further variations as did the *Jarana*. Charlot wanted to use the same subjects in different media.

Charlot did not include in *Picture Book* several subjects that were important to him, such as CL 121 *Mestiza with Orange Fan* or *La grande Yucatèque*. He left out portraits and landscapes such as CL 148b *Yucatan Landscape with hut* of 1928. Charlot had been depicting the *papeleros* 'newsboys' of Mexico City perhaps as early as 1922 (US-005?). He had used them as subjects in drawings and watercolors, two of which survive from 1923 (Chapter 8). He noted the production of watercolors in his diary for 1926 (September 3, 4, 5). His 1924 oil, CL 68 *Dowager and Newsboys*, showed them being trampled by an overdressed rich woman. The 1926 *Newsboys* and the 1938 *Newsboys asleep*, discussed above, are among Charlot's most intense images. He even painted a mock portrait of the dowager in CL 135 *Lady, with hat* of 1926.[155]

In Charlot's large production appear anomalous works—singularities differing in style or subject—that reveal undeveloped options, like the large, troubling 1932 oil CL 284 *Princess Xiu. Yucatan*, discussed above. The large CL 148 *Still-life. Pots,* 28" X 28", of November 1927, reveals another current of Charlot's artistic sensibility (Diary 1927: September 29, November 7, 10,). Charlot almost always placed objects in their context, so accouterments and tools became imbued with human connotations. Charlot expressed this in several ways. For instance, in drawings of Luz, her body sometimes assumes and thus merges into the shape of the *metate*. In his two murals of Hawaiian culture as a whole—*Relation of Man and Nature in Old Hawai'i* (1949 and 1974)—he revealed a similarity of form between the human using the tool and the tool itself. Tools are shown to be an integral part of human culture. Charlot could also portray an object or tool by itself as an icon, like CL 59 *Still-life: Metate* of 1924. In my opinion, even within this subject-group, CL 148 *Still-life. Pots* is special in its haunting evocation of

the spiritual or religious dimension of the culture. Of the Charlot paintings I have seen, only his 1963 CL 910 *Still-life. Pot and* tabua, 30" X 30", makes the same impression on me. A Fijian chief viewing it with me had the same feeling. Such anomalous subjects show that Charlot would have developed new Mexican content had he not emigrated to the United States.

9.1. DEPARTURE FOR THE UNITED STATES

For the three years from 1926 to 1928, Charlot had established a rhythm: working as an archeologist during the cooler season in Yucatan and continuing his normal activities in Mexico City during the rest of the year. At the end of the third season, enough digging had been done to require a formal report, which would need to be produced in Washington D.C.:

> Now after we finished those diggings, between times when I went there only to do drawings, they had found that I could read and write, so they asked me to write about the sculptures that I had copied. That meant that I had to go to the United States. I didn't know where that was. To Washington! because in Washington was the place where we were to do those proofs and copies of proofs and whatnot, and write on the excavations.[156]

The project presented many difficulties, as Charlot wrote to Brenner:

> Quiza sea una locura economicamente (viene mi mama y no bastara con lo de la Carnegie) pero estoy resuelto a vivir muy modestamente, surfrir un poco si es necesario. Con algun trabajo extra mio mi maman podra estar bien, y yo te podre ver de tiempo a tiempo.. (JC to AB January 1, 1928)
> 'Perhaps it is madness economically (my mother is coming and we will not have enough with the salary of the Carnegie), but I am resolved to live very modestly, suffer a little if necessary. With some extra work from me, my mother will be able to be comfortable, and I will be able to see you from time to time…'

Charlot even entertained other prospects in the field:

> Es muy probable que me quedo con el Carnegie permanente con 6 meses de libertad entre "field-season" lo que seria bastante para dar a luz una exposicion cada año. Que mas quiero. (JC to AB "Te mando mi fotografia junto a uno de los menotes que descubri")
>
> 'It is very probable that I stay with the Carnegie permanently with six months of liberty between "field seasons," which would be enough to bring an exhibition to the light each year. What more could I want.'
>
> I don't think I'll return to Chichen. Perhaps Kidder would propose me to study the whole of American prehistoric art! we spoke of that (*secret*). In this case my first season would be mainly museum study and perhaps two months in the field. New-York would be my living place. (JC to AB "A long nice letter")

Kidder admired Charlot's copying:

> Kidder voit mes dessins compare avec originales. compliments. propose travailler librement pour étudier style et compare art [undeciphered]. (Diary March 7, 1928)
> 'Kidder sees my draws compares with originals. compliments. proposes working freely to study style and compare art [undeciphered].'

Anne Charlot's mentions of distant, waterless places and the painted desert suggest some consideration of archeology in the Southwest, an interest of much of the Chich'en Itza staff (AGC to JC March 22, 1928). Charlot characteristically pressed towards a decision: "It seems that we are going in October. This is better my patience ended" (JC to AB "I send you fotos Fidencio").

The emotional difficulty was leaving Mexico with no firm plan to return. As seen above, Charlot had pushed himself through a process of rebirth as a Mexican artist. He had developed his Mexican style, developed new subjects, and realized his first murals. He had identified himself as Mexican and thought he had settled in that country. But the mural renaissance that had so excited and inspired him had ended for him, and further employment as a muralist appeared and ultimately continued to be unavailable. Charlot seemed to have lost his place. Returning to Mexico City in 1928, he found everyone just as he had left them: "Vi a Diego, a Ledesma, a Tina, a Paul. Todos igualitos de siempre" 'Saw Diego, Ledesma. Tina, and Paul. All just as ever' (JC to AB "Mi direccion hasta que me vaya (?)"). Life in the Mexico City art world seemed to have gone on without him.

That some at least of Charlot's view at this time was emotional impression rather than real perception is indicated by how happy his friends were to see him again on his returns from Yucatan and how they talked about him while he was gone. A later friend in Hawai'i, Bess Luquiens, had visited Mexico in 1926 or 1927 and "went to a dinner attended by all the artists there: Pablo O'Higgins, Rivera, etc. She was struck because they all talked continuously of a young Frenchman whom they considered a genius and who was off doing archeological work" (Tabletalk Early or mid-1970s).

Two 1927 diary entries, I believe, suggest that Charlot had been feeling a problem of identity for some time: "lu Claudel : L'échange triste pleure" 'read Claudel: L'échange sad cry' (September 21, 1927); "lu Claudel : l'Otage triste pleure" 'read Claudel: L'Otage sad cry' (September 23, 1927). As an adolescent in France, Charlot had considered himself a "claudélien" 'Claudelian,' using that poet as a model of a French Catholic artist. Since 1922, Charlot had been reshaping his identity and his art for his situation in Mexico. As that situation came to an end, Charlot was being thrown back on his French identity, which might have entailed feelings of failure, loss of place, and anxiety about the future. Charlot was experiencing a second exile.

A particular emotional focus was fresco painting. As seen in Chapter 7, Charlot considered himself primarily a muralist and was most fulfilled when working as such: "I would say that I was supremely happy when I painted that first fresco of mine."[157] Barred from painting his own frescoes—his special vocation—contact with even minor fresco tasks saddened him:

> aidé Paul à retoucher fresques Diego ‘helped Paul retouch Diego’s frescoes’ (September 18, 1928)
> fatigué. grand désire de diversion et fresque ‘tired. great desire for diversion and fresco’ (September 30, 1928)
> fresque et tristesse ‘fresco and sadness’ (November 29, 1928; also November 28)
> fresque. tristesse. ‘fresco. sadness’ (November 30, 1928)

For Charlot, the practice of art produced an incomparable pleasure: “Todo artista de veras encuentra recreación y deleite en hacer arte” ‘Every true artist finds recreation and delight in making art’ (Charlot May 1947). Weston reported: “Jean is a prolific worker. ‘I am never happy unless I am working,’ he said” (Weston 1961: 103). Being prevented from working was disturbing:

> Trabajo mucho, mucho, puede ser que demasiado, pero cuando trabajo estoy en paz, y cuando no, hay un fondo de tristeza. (JC to AB “Don’t accuse me”)
> ‘I work much, much, but it could be that it is too much. But when I work, I am at peace, and when no, there is a base of sadness.’

> It is curious to see how independents are the profesional [*sic*] and private in my life. I work hard and when working am in a perfect equilibrio ‘balance.’ Afuera del trabajo ‘Outside of work,’ nearly desequilibrado ‘unbalanced,’ specially for so many supposed friends, who moved so little to help me. (JC to AB Mayo 3.25)

Any type of artwork was helpful:

> Lo que me contenta es que estoy haciendo grandes progresos in pintura. Mi ultima esta mucho mejor, ya. (JC to AB 27–4–25)
> ‘What makes me happy is that I am making much progress in painting. My latest are already much better.’

But ultimately, as Charlot said, only mural painting satisfies the muralist:

> I have just started a fresco the size of the Michelangelo Last Judgement. I have a nice crew of trained artists and still find my most pleasurable moments sitting high on a scaffold. (JC to AB February 25, 1974)

Charlot used his own experience to counsel Brenner:

> Recuerdas (o ya te parece anticuado eso.) que la belleza y el orden son synonimos y has esfuerzos para conservarte mental y physicamente en el orden. (JC to AB “Your drawings from the subway”)
> ‘Remember (or does this already seem antiquated to you) that beauty and order are synonymous and your have strengths to conserve yourself mentally and physically in order.’

Charlot had already felt bad during the digging season: “I need badly a change. Working less, I think more and feel worst and so very very lonely—” (JC to AB “I am tired those days and dont work

much"). But his feelings seem to have become particularly acute during this last stay in Cuernavaca with his mother and in Mexico City.

> So I would probably join Mother in Cuernavaca and wait there for the papers, then go together by train to New-York…Now that they are all gone or going, I find myself *very* tired and dismembered. I need a few days of peace to regain a better state of mind. (JC to AB "Since my last letter")

> [At Cuernavaca] I was extremely tired at the end of this season, physically and mentally as my last letter surely showed you. I am just beginning to recover, feel convalescent, and weak. (JC to AB "I left Chichen the 10 of June")

> I feel so uneasy here : This little bit of Mexico between Yucatan and the States seems so transitory. I cannot work or feel anything about the present. I am mainly looking towards that near future helped by this neutral surrounding of an hotel atmosphere. The few people I met here seem of the past while you are present, dearest… (JC to AB "Hoy te mando el ejemplar de Forma")

> Lo siento mucho sobre todo por estar tan cansado de las cosas y de las gentes de aqui y necesitar tanto de ti. (JC to AB "A cuenta de unas difficultades del Consulado")
> 'I am very sorry most of all for being so tired of the things and people here and for needing you so much.'

> Estoy cansadissimo y con una depression moral grande. Me siento aqui como encarcelado y no hay fecha ni approximada para recibir los papeles del consulado. (JC to AB "Mi direccion hasta que me vaya (?)")
> 'I am most tired and with a big emotional depression. I feel here as if imprisoned and there is not even an approximate date to receive the papers from the consulate.'

Anne Charlot tried to raise her son's spirits. She reassured him about her health. She has been given a medical checkup and gives him a full report (AGC to JC February 15, 1928; also May 26). She sends him photographs of herself that show: "J'ai repris un peu d'allure et un tout autre maintien et ici on m'appelle l'élégante parisienne !" "I've recovered a bit of good looks and a completely different deportment, and they call me here the elegant Parisian' (AGC to JC April 14, 1928). She would be able to stand even the heat of New York City in August against which Frances Flynn Paine had warned her (AGC to JC February 8, 1928; also April 9).

Anne tells her son how happy she is to leave Mexico, which is increasingly violent (AGC to JC Lundi; April 1, 1928). She sympathizes with the poor farmers whose agriculture has been ruined:

> Les pauvres gens ne sont pas aidés. Ils n'ont pas d'instruments pour labourer, pas de graines pour semer, pas même une chèvre pour donner un peu de lait aux enfants, rien, la misère absolue… (AGC to JC April 29, 1928)
> 'The poor are not being helped. They don't have tools to labor or seeds to plant. Not even a goat to give a little milk to the children. Nothing, absolute misery…'

She will be happy to be in a country with religious freedom: “l’idée de pouvoir enfin entendre la messe me ravit profondément” ‘the idea of being able at last to hear Mass delights me deeply’ (AGC to JC March 31 [b], 1928). She loved Mexico but “j’en ai vraiment assez” ‘I’ve really had enough’ (AGC to JC March 31 [b], 1928).

> Anne writes her son how much she’s looking forward to living in New York:
>
> Les musées, galeries et bibliothèques sont, dit-on, merveilleux; cours et conférences partout, et en toutes les langues; bref, une ambiance intellectuelle et artistique qui nous a bien manquée depuis que nous sommes au Mexique. (AGC to JC Lundi, 1928; also April 14)
> ‘The museums, galleries, and libraries, they say, are marvelous; courses and lectures everywhere and in all languages. In brief, an intellectual and artistic atmosphere that we have really missed since we came to Mexico.’

A friend has written Anne from New York that “elle est enchantée de cette grande ville, elle y trouve toutes les facilités, toutes les possibilités” ‘she is enchanted by this great city in which she finds all facilities, all possibilities ’ (AGC to JC April 9, 1928). Anne will feel like a provincial in Paris:

> Nous reprendrons pied dans une ville civilisée et noyau d’art mondial ce qui nous changera du tout au tout. Que de choses à regarder ! J’aurai l’air de revenir de Pontoise !! (AGC to JC April 29, 1928)
> ‘We will set foot again in a civilized city and center of world art, which will change everything for us. What things to view! I will look like I am coming back from Pontoise!!’

They should not worry but be flexible and optimistic (AGC to JC May 8, 12, 1928). Mostly, they should trust in God:

> Il n’en sera que ce que le Bon Dieu voudra. (AGC to JC February 8, 1928)
> ‘The outcome will be only what God will want.’
>
> Enfin, tout ceci est entre les mains de Dieu; n’arrivera que ce qu’il voudra qu’il arrive. Patience et résignation. (May 12, 1928)
> ‘Finally, all this is in the hands of God. What will happen is only what he will want to happen. Patience and resignation.’
>
> Dieu nous aide visiblement, c’est pourquoi nous ne devons jamais nous décourager et perdre patience. Nos épreuves prendront fin. Espérons et prions. (May 26, 1928)
> ‘God helps us visibly. That’s why we should never be discouraged and lose patience. Our trials will end. Let us hope and pray.’

Anne was encouraging Charlot to adopt his normal religious stance, which he would need during all the difficulties of their move, as he wrote in his diary:

prière remettant *tout* à Dieu finances, douane, séjour à N. Y. (Diary July 31, 1928)
'prayer entrusting *all* to God: finances, customs, stay in N.Y.'

appris que nous ne savons pas la date de départ : tragique et remettre à Dieu. (Diary August 3, 1928)
'*learned that we do not know the depart date*: tragic and entrust to God.'

Money problems were serious in Mexico, and they had heard how expensive New York City was.[158] But Charlot was also feeling exhilarated by the move. On the day they received their papers from France, Charlot experienced "prière même excitation" 'prayer, even excitement' (Diary August 25, 1928). Six days later, he noted "*plus de tristesse*" '*no more sadness*' (August 31, 1928). The discovery of New York would indeed prove exciting. As Isabelle Bonsom writes: "L'artiste fresquiste est nomade et le spectateur pèlerin-voyageur" 'The fresco artist is nomadic and a traveling pilgrim spectator' (2010: 58).

Immigration to the United States was a difficult process for French citizens residing in Mexico. Anne and Jean had to deal with both the French and the United States bureaucracy.[159] Charlot wrote for help to the Carnegie Institution but apparently received none: "My difficulties to pass the border are very real. I wrote ten days ago to Dr Kidder. He could help me from Washington and needs me there in September but no hay ['there is no'] answer yet."[160]

Anne encouraged Jean by simplifying the task of packing:

En q.q. jours tout sera décidé et prêt puisque nous n'avons plus de maison, plus de meubles, plus rien que q.q. malles et nos personnes. (AGC to JC May 11, 1928)
'In a few days everything will be decided and ready because we no longer have a house, no longer furniture, no longer anything except a few trunks and ourselves.'

They found packing artworks was difficult (e.g., AGC to JC February 15, 1928) and had the added stress of hiding in their baggage the pictures that Orozco wanted brought to him without being declared at American customs.

A major difficulty was dealing with Mexican customs about certain artworks that Charlot had collected in Mexico. The Mexican government forbade the exportation of any work deemed of national importance, and although many people simply smuggled pieces out of the country, Charlot was declaring any possibly relevant items. Charlot enlisted Jorge Enciso as an expert to list for customs the works he judged might be exported (Diary 1928: October 16, 18). Customs objected to a Tarascan terracotta of a woman delousing the hair of another, a piece that inspired Charlot's artworks of the same subject, discussed in Chapter 3. Charlot was anxious to keep the piece and tried to enlist the support of José Reygadas, the "government inspector of monuments," whom he had met at Chich'en Itza.[161] The result was disappointing: "voir Reygadas l'idole ne peut pas passer la frontière. je propose échange avec pièce inférieure" 'to see Reygadas. The idol cannot pass the frontier. I propose exchange with inferior piece' (Diary August 6, 1928). Charlot approached Reygadas several times without success: "Also Reygadas refused the permit to take my idol (the two women) out of Mexico. I feel rather low and so tired."[162] Charlot approached a museum, probably the archeological, to offer to exchange the statue:

"musée pour offre idole" 'museum to offer idol' (Diary August 13, 1918). The museum official "refuse définitivement de m'échanger mon idole. 'trop de travail'" 'refuses definitively to exchange my idol for me. "too much work"' (August 15). After considering selling the sculpture and worried also about American customs, Charlot decided to offer it to Rivera and received in exchange a statue of a warrior with a sling that he treasured.[163] Reygadas approved the export of the exchange piece and asked for a photograph of it (September 3, 4, 5). Once the exportable items had been identified, Charlot could fill out the papers, and the customs officials visited him and sealed the luggage (Diary October 19, 20, 1928). Ironically, this procedure created problems for Charlot with the American ones when he arrived in Laredo (Diary October 24, 1928).

As October 23, the departure date, neared, Charlot said his last goodbyes. On October 19, he bade "adieu à Diego." He saw Pintao on the same day and on the 21rst, connecting his name to the word "émotion" 'emotion.' On the 20th, he saw Luz Jiménez and picked up the train tickets. On the 21rst, he paid his devotions to the patroness of the Americas: "été à Guadalupe : intensité d'adoration" 'was at Guadalupe: intensity of devotion.' On the 22nd, he ran errands and suffered "crise de désespoir très intense" 'a very intense crisis of despair.' On the train the next day, he "écrit un peu sur sculpture" 'wrote a little on sculpture' and made a little drawing—a cactus in front of two hills—as they passed through Brisas, the town that he had depicted in so many works years before. At 7:00 AM the next morning, they arrived in Laredo, and Charlot had his first direct impressions of the United States.

1 Morley 1925. A. A. Morris 1931: 103. Brunhouse 1971: 221–225. Charlot spoke often of his experiences at Chich'en Itza, e.g., Charlot August 31, 1966.

2 Shook 1990: 250; 251. Brunhouse 1971: 166 f., 179–185, 187. Morley had won the support of the Carnegie Institution for Chich'en Itza over two other projects of arguably greater importance (Brunhouse 1971: 68–71; Coe 1999: 126 f.; Harris and Sadler 2003: 40 f.). Charlot told me about this himself.

3 E.g., Brunhouse 1971: 209 f., 214, 216–219. Roberto Montenegro's visit occasioned an *approchement*, a mutual approaching of each other. Apparently, they had experienced a rift.

4 Brunhouse 1971: 175–186. Carey 1984: 145.

5 Brunhouse 1971: 176 ff. Carey 1984: 149. Thompson 1963: 55, went to draw "stone men." Zapata Alonzo 1998: 14.

[6] E.g., Ewing 1972: 130, 196. A. A. Morris 1931: 44, "the institution was willing to repair the buildings it excavated, so that they would stand for years like exhibits in an out-of-doors museum." Some scholars worried about the possible conflict between restoration and study, like Adela Breton and even Ann Axtell Morris (Mary McVicker 2005: 149, 198; A. A. Morris 1931: 234 f.; Coe 1999: 128). But Elizabeth Morris felt that restoration was a major contribution and gave a "special quality" to the Carnegie project (October 25, 2006). The same plan of "the preservation of ruins as 'field museums' for touristic and educational purposes" was followed in Southwest archeology (Snead 2001: 133, 166) and is commonplace today. A sad inconsistency of Chich'en Itza and other Mexican sites is the failure to protect uncovered artworks (e.g., Brunhouse 1971: 184).

[7] Mexico City: Diary 1927: January 1 ("Morley arrive il vient me voir très content" 'Morley arrives. he comes to see me very happy'), 2, 5, 7, 12. Lecture: Diary 1927: January 9 ("11h rendez-vous avec Morley. arrangé les plaques pour conférence" '11 AM meeting with Morley. arranged the plates for his lecture'), 10 ("soir : conférence Morley. il me nomme" 'evening: Morley's lecture. he names me').

[8] Thompson 1963: 39. Glusker 2010: 457.

[9] Diary March 20, 1927. On March 1, 1926, at a costume ball, "je me déguise en artiste" 'I disguise myself as an artist.'

[10] Glusker 2010: 392; 309, "He likes Jean much."

[11] Keen 1971: 489; 502, the turn of the century interest in the Maya had stimulated a similar interest in the Aztecs.

[12] Charnay 1885: 275–314. Ewing 1972: 21 f. Andrews 2011: 30 f.

[13] Reservations: Morley 1925: 86; 1931: 102. A. A. Morris 1931: 94 ff.

[14] Shook 1990: 252. Thompson 1963: e.g., 4 f., 126 f., 188 f. McVicker 1999 (references to Donald McVicker omit his first name.):

> Not only was [Charlot] acutely aware of continuities in form between builders ancient and modern, but he also observed the same continuities in daily life. In 1946 he wrote [*AA* II 183], "The scenes sculptured and frescoed on ancient monuments are enacted daily in Indian huts and Indian fields."

For Southwest archeology, compare Snead 2001: 130, 162.

[15] Diary 1926: August 9 ("très dégouté et attristé" 'very disgusted and saddened'); 1927: January 30, 31, February 5 ("grand mal de tête" 'bad headache'), 16 ("un peu malade" 'a little sick'), April 6 ("on brule vieux arbres et fumée. yeux très souffrant. tristesse" 'people burn old trees and smoke. eyes suffer a lot. sadness'), April 10, 11, 12 ("fatigue physique" 'physical fatigue'), 23 ("grande fatigue. AM . très malade et mal de tête" 'very tired. Afternoon: very sick and headache'), 25, May 14 ("dessiné mais grande fatigue" 'drew but very tired'), 15, 17 ("fatigue et tristesse" 'fatigue and sadness'), 24 ("AM : sieste puis avec *grande* fatigue me levais et travaille colonnes tristesse" 'Afternoon: nap then with *great* fatigue got out of bed and work on columns sadness'), June 10, 18, December 9 ("horrible tristesse" 'horrible sadness'), 26; 1928: April 4, 5, 6, May 19 ("grande fatigue et paresse. *tristesse*" 'great fatigue and laziness. *sadness'*).

[16] A. A. Morris 1931: 129134, 143 f. Thompson 1963: 60 f.

[17] Kidder 1948: 271 f. Thompson 1949: 294; 1963: 15. Shook 1990: 250.

[18] Charlot March 8, 1972; *MMR* 134: "a quasi-mythical people, proud of ruins matched only by those of Egypt, and whose social reforms were more extreme even than those of the Mexican plateau." Charnay describes the Yucatecans as beautiful, colorful, and "une race silencieuse et recueillie" 'a silent and recollected race' (1885: 231–236, 240 f.).

[19] Glusker 2010: 373. Thompson 1963: 712. Gann 1972: 68–84, with descriptions of Mérida and the towns along the way. Mary McVicker 2005: 61.

[20] Brunhouse 1971: 206 ("Equipment arrived by rail from Mérida to Dzitas, and from there it had to be hauled seventeen miles over a rough road to Chichén"). Carey 1984: 148. Glusker 2010: 378. The trip had not changed much by 1940; Toor

1940: 221 ("*Chichen Itza:* New auto road directly from Merida to Chichen in 2 1/2 hours . Train at 5 A.M. for Valladolid…Get off at Dzitas and take a car").

[21] E.g., Lister and Lister 1968. Brunhouse 1971: 220–225. Woodbury 1993: 45 ff.

[22] Glusker 2010: 389. Ewing 1972: 86.

[23] Lister and Lister 1968: 7. Brunhouse 1971: 221. Woodbury 1993: 46.

[24] Tabletalk February 15, 1972. Also, e.g., Diary March 19, 1927. Compare Morley 1931: 123 ff.; A. A. Morris 1931: 254 f.

[25] A. A. Morris 1931: 15 f. Woodbury 1993: 46. Elizabeth Morris felt Ann Axtell's later depression was partly due to her worries about occupied France in World War II (October 25, 2006).

[26] Scholarly: Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931; A. A. Morris 1931. Popular: A. A. Morris 1931, 1934.

[27] Elizabeth Morris did not hear from her parents but from third parties that Charlot and Ann Axtell had been "sweet on each other" (October 25, 2006). Donald McVicker emailed me:

> We had lunch with Liz Morris, Ann Morris' daughter. I hope you won't be too shocked to hear that she too had hear the rumor about Ann flirting with your father (and not from old busybody Eric S. Thompson). However, I know that as long as he kept his crucifix in his pocket he was safe. I'd be more worried that Anita would have killed Ann if she had heard such outrageous tales. (April 14, 2004)

[28] Diary April 9, 1928. Many diary entries record Charlot's attraction: e.g., February 27, 1927. Charlot dreamed of Ann (April 6, 1927).

[29] E.g., Diary 1926: June 20; 1927: March 17, April 7.

[30] Diary June 5, 1927. Also, e.g., June 6, 1927.

[31] Charlot Diary, e.g., 1926: February 28, June 17, 19; 1927: February 24, 25, 26, March 1, April 9, 11.

[32] Diary, e.g., 1927: April 14, 16 ("Ann dans ma chambre et elle demande poser la main sous ma chemise… soir : pierre avec Earl et Ann dans les ruines" 'Ann in my room, and she asks to put her hand under my shirt…evening: stone with Earl and Ann in the ruins'). The work plans may have been impacted: "fut avec Ann et Earl. Ann menace qu'elle ne viendra pas la saison prochaine" 'was with Ann and Earl. Ann threatens that she won't come next season' (Diary April 10, 1927).

[33] Diary April 4, 1927. Charlot often dealt with Earl and Ann as a couple (e.g., Diary 1927: March 22, April 3, June 7).

[34] Lister and Lister 1968: 160 f., 167. Elizabeth Morris October 25, 2006.

[35] Diary May 27, 1925 ("Elena Landazurri me parle religion. je lui réponds" 'Elena Landazurri speaks to me of religion. I answer her'); January 5, 1928 ("visite de Helena Landazurri. parlé de Dieu" 'visit of Helena Landazurri. spoke of God'). Compare April 27, 1928.

[36] Diary February 6, 1928. See also April 15, 1927.

[37] Diary April 27, 1927. Also April 29, May 4 ("promenade clair de lune avec Anita" 'moonlight walk with Anita').

[38] Thompson 1960: ix; 1963: vii ("my roommate at Chichen Itza"), 38. Brunhouse 1971: 226 f. Coe 1999: 126 f. E.g., Glusker 2010: 729.

[39] Thompson 1960: 61. See also 1963: vii ("My most grateful thanks to my roommate at Chichen Ita in 1926 for the designs on Coba stelae and for his charming drawings of Maya types"; illustrations 31, 39). Charlot was fulfilling the role of the Maya artist as he described him, as seen in the quotation below (Charlot 1928 Maya Esthetic).

[40] Tabletalk July 17, 1978. Compare Coe 1999: 164.

[41] Coe 1999: e.g., 123–144, 152 f.

[42] Coe 1999: 209, Thompson remained friends with a political opponent.

[43] Compare Thompson 1963: 59. Brunhouse 1971: 241 f.

[44] Glusker 2010: 198; also 191, 193, 196, 200. Brunhouse 1971: 230 f. Charlot spoke highly of other members of the project, especially Gustav Stromsvik (Brunhouse 1971: 227 f.).

[45] JC to AB "Recibi tu carta estupida Francis." Thomas Gann (1867–1938) was a medical doctor and amateur archeologist. Charlot was happy when he published two of his drawings in his 1926 book.

[46] Houser: Charlot Diary January 2, 1927 ("Lowell le présentait à Morley et arrangeait son départ" 'Lowell. presented him to Morley and arranged his departure'). A. A. Morris 1931: 247. McVicker 1999: "The work turned out to be more than even the most dedicated pair of copyists could handle, and Charlot sent for Lowell Houser, a painter he had known in Mexico"; "Houser and Charlot shared a hut and continued to work together into the 1928 season. They even 'entertained' other artists who visited the digs." Weston: Weston 1961: 158 ff. Both Weston and Charlot would have enjoyed working together. Weston wrote "to be in Yucatán with Jean would be jolly indeed" (1961: 160). Charlot wrote Weston from Chich'en that he had learned much about painting from Weston and asked for disposable bad prints; "I could still learn something" (Weston 1966: 7). See the discussion of Andrews 2011: 33 f. A position may have been offered earlier to Pablo O'Higgins: "Paul à déjeuner. il n'ira pas à Chichen" 'Paul to lunch. he won't go to Chich'en' (Charlot Diary September 4, 1926).

[47] Diary February 19, 1927. Houser 1964:

> Later I was, as he mentioned, with the Carnegie Institution at Washington. They were doing the digging at Chichen-Itza and they had artists making drawings and paintings for the book publication...I worked with Jean Charlot there…I knew him before that in Mexico City. He'd lived there, and then he'd already been a year or two with Carnegie before I joined…He really had charge of the art part of it. Then I worked for him.

[48] Diary June 30, 1927. Also 1928: February 5, April 5, May 29. Brenner had romantic feelings for Houser and thought Charlot might have been jealous (Glusker 2010: 86, 88, 92, 292), but I have seen no evidence of this myself.

[49] Kidder 1948: 273 f. Thompson 1949: 296. Brunhouse 1971: 61, 214 f. Shook 1990: 249.

[50] E.g., Brunhouse 1971: 63, 215.

[51] M43. Charlot Diary March 17, 1927 ("fais pochoir pour programme fête" "Cut a stencil for fiesta program"). On making pageant masks, see 1928: February 4, 7, 9, 11, 12.

A mural on a wall of an outbuilding of the Chich'en Itza hacienda was thought to be by Charlot, but is not in his style. Elizabeth Morris judges that it is also not in the style of Ann Axtell Morris and was probably painted by Lowell Houser for one of the staff pageants.

[52] JC to AB "A decirte la verdad." On *vacilada*, see *Idols* 180–184.

[53] JC to AB "Ya se acabo la season." Glusker 2010: 430. Shook 1990: 248.

[54] Glusker 2010: 457; also 464, 525 f. Charlot noted such events in his Diary: e.g., March 15, 1926; 1927: February 21, June 11, 27; 1928: April 23, May 5.

[55] JC to AB "Ya llegue sin equivocarme"; "No he recibido nada tuyo todavia"; "Ya llegue y empeze el trabajo"; "Since I am here."

[56] A. A. Morris 1931: 93. Compare Gann 1972: 199 ff.

[57] Tabletalk Undated, early to mid 1970s. Thompson 1963: 9 f.

[58] E.g., A. A. Morris 1931: 96, 109. Thompson 1963: 30 ff.

[59] Glusker 2010: 395. E.g., A. A. Morris 1931: 231. Charlot 1928 Maya Esthetic ("Hunters in the bush still make offerings of deer at the foot of carved stelae and burn copal in wooden spoons"); *AA* II 187 ("A jungle is picturesque, but for the painter it is also a place of awe, where the deer hunter still propitiates with copal incense stelae erected by kings long dead").

[60] Charlot Diary March 9, 1928 (see Chapter 5). A. A. Morris 1931: 191 ff., 259 f., 266. Brunhouse 1971: 232 ff.

[61] Shook 1990: 248. Thompson 1963: 8 f., 31, 70, 118, 127144, 148.

[62] Thompson 1949: 296. Jean and Zohmah's first child, Ann Charlot, wrote me on June 23, 1999, while we were both in Mérida, about the similarities she found between Yucatan and Hawai'i:

> These few days we are here together—Roots? Not really. But perhaps being of same blood how Papa *felt* here and how those human feelings relate to his at home & being happy in Hawaii. And why he stayed there. Also Mama happier in Hawaii than Yucatan & to raise children. Merida & Hawaii very similar.
>
> *People*:
>
> Noble, truly friendly, Natural, Broad, warm faces. Same skin color. They like to look at you face to face and touch base. But they decide if you are to be appreciated more as a Person. Reserved. Respect for Ancestors. Use of world "Native" in truest sense.
>
> *Vegetation*
>
> They keep and respect the green.
>
> *Self Pride*
>
> In City, Customs, and Self. And their Past.
>
> *Language*:
>
> Chopped up sound to ear.
>
> *Dress*
>
> Have kept to same over years.
>
> *Music & Art*
>
> Preserved and respected.
>
> *Food*
>
> Found Yucatan and Hawaiian food similar. Example: the way food cut up. Use of spices. Love of onions. Lots of use of innards of animals. Cooking food in leaves, like banana leaves. Presentation.
>
> *Religion*
>
> Firmly rooted in ancient Beliefs. Use of outer material to express inner Beliefs. Maintain Ancient Sacred artifacts. Superstitious.

[63] Diary, e.g., 1926: February 9–13, 15–18, 24–26, March 6, 14. Ewing 1972: 124–127, on Mexican work at the Temple of the Jaguar.

[64] E. H. Thompson 1914: 593. All other references to Thompson are to J. Eric.

[65] McVicker 1999. Mary McVicker 2005: 295.

[66] *MMR* 134. Contrast Vasconcelos 1982 *Memorias* 2, on the same trip, 106 ("todo es uniformemente bárbaro, cruel y grotesco. Ningún sentido de belleza" 'all is uniformly barbarous, cruel, and grotesque. No sense of beauty').

[67] Charlot 1928 Maya Esthetic; July 1935; November 1938.

[68] Thompson 1963: 64; on other trips with Charlot, pp. 4458, 6470.

[69] Diary April 1, 1926. In September 2016, a signed outline drawing of Labna, dated "25," was offered at auction. The inaccurate date was probably added later with the signature when the drawing was sold or donated.

[70] Brunhouse 1971: 241; also 240. Thompson, Pollock, and Charlot 1932: 9 f. Weeks and Hill 2006: 554 f. JC to AB "It seems that we would take only the boat" ("Estas un poco demasiado"). Thompson 1963: 57, discusses Kukikan and identifies Carmen as Carmen Chai, a guide. I thank Mary McVicker for this reference.

[71] Diary June 2, 1926. Gann 1972: 113–128, 248 f.

[72] Glusker 2010: 308; also 318. JC to AB "Nothing from you ni de nadie." The expeditions were mentioned in newspapers (Clippings 39, 40).

[73] Thompson, Pollock, and Charlot 1932: 168, 185–192. Diary November 28, 1926. Charlot and Morley continued to discuss the problems of dating: "chez Morley pour dater stelae par le style" 'at Morley's to date stelae by style' (Diary February 16, 1928).

[74] Diary June 4, 1927. Weeks and Hill 2006: 78.

[75] Diary 1928: April 1, 2. Charlot writes the name of the site as Unnuxmal, Unuxmal, Unuxunuxmal.

[76] Diary 1928: June 4, 5. Weeks and Hill 2006: 655 f.

[77] Shook 1990: 248 f. Lister and Lister 1968: 43 f., 128, 136 f.

[78] Charlot in M74. On Charlot's work as draftsman and writer, Ewing 1972: 108–112.

[79] *AA* II 49. McVicker 1999. Mary McVicker 2005: 206. Houser 1964:

> We copied what Mayan murals were found in the ruins and then a great many were drawings and sculpture. Many times the sculpture was so eroded that actually a photograph didn't show it very well and we had to sort of search out with our hands and then make a drawing.

[80] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 231 f., 260 ff. Bunker 1927: 7 f., a detailed description of the Maya production process. Ewing 1972: 104–108. Schele and Mathews 1998: 28 f.

[81] Tabletalk February 15, 1972. A. A. Morris 1931: 174 f.

[82] Diary March 5–7, 1928. A Chinese artwork was uncovered in an excavation at Mérida, which Charlot copied (Diary January 2, 1927).

[83] Tabletalk July 17, 1978; 1928 Maya Esthetic:

> A cult of human beauty is apparent here, an attempt on the part of the artist to express his ideals through the choice of expressions and most of all through the equilibrium of proportions of the male body. Here palpitates a spirituality incompatible with the Greek athletic ideal that gave such a rustic health to both men and gods. This apparent *morbidezza* is still the apanage of modern Maya men; watching them we naïvely think that their race is in agony from the weight of its too glorious past, yet this past was forged by similarly languid-looking adolescents.

Also, e.g., Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 340–343.

[84] JC to AB "Nothing from you ni de nadie." Diary 1926: February 23, March 15 ("curieuse jalousie de Smith contre moi à cause d'Ann et aussi de ma peinture" 'curious jealousy of Smith against me because of Ann and also of my painting'), April 29, May 1 (Smith tells wonderful stories), 3, 7.

[85] Diary, e.g., 1926: March 18, April 2, 3; 1927: January 20, June 27, September 18, 23, 29, 30, October 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, November 9, 11, 12, 13, 22, 28, December 6.

[86] Diary 1927: September 21, 22, December 6. Waldeck: Diary September 22, 1927. Le Plongeon: Diary September 21, 1927; December 6, 1927: Le Plongeon sur fresque 'Le Plongeon on fresco.' Ewing 1972: 22–25. More respect is accorded the archaeological pioneers today. Charlot also read "Commercias (sic: Comercias) des Indias," which I have not identified (Diary May 30, 1926).

[87] Charlot March 8, 1972; Writings Related to *MMR*: Conclusion ("I followed [Morley] to Yucatán, at first as a draftsman, and later I also wrote about the finds"). Chapter 1 and 3, section 2.7 PreColumbian Art.

[88] Charlot 1926 Quotation; 1926 Report; 1926 Dais. Charlot wrote reports on all three seasons: 1927 Report; 1928 Report Sculptures; 1928 Report Field Season.

[89] Charlot Diary January 6, 1928. Morley had given a lecture earlier "on Maya chronology & hieroglyphics" (Glusker 2010: 39; Charlot Diary January 8, 1926). In November 1928, Morley, Charlot, and others presented information on their work at the Ministry of Education.

[90] Morley 1946: e.g., 364–367, 369, 423, 425. Thompson 1977: 205, 208. A. A. Morris 1931: xvi f., 80 f., 105 f., 115 f.; depreciation of religion, e.g., 183, 193 f.

[91] JC to AB "Me hizo mucho la noticia muerte Amado." Also "No he recibido nada tuyo todavia."

[92] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 315; also 314 ("the drawings are too full of life to be second or third-hand copies from monuments").

[93] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 319; 321–326, description of individual artists.

[94] Charlot March 8, 1972. A. A. Morris 1931: 181–184.

[95] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 241; also, e.g., 255 f., 267, 307 ff. A. A. Morris 1931: 115 ("faces so different from each other that surely they are portraits of actual human beings who one time took part in the city's life"), 183. Gann 1972: 242 f.

[96] Coe 1999: 94, 174 f. Diary 1926: March 27, 29, April 1; 1927: February 6 ("lu Spinden" 'read Spinden').

[97] Thompson, Pollock, and Charlot 1932: 190. Charlot told me of showing to a German scholar a "Baroque" temple buried within a "Classical" one. "No," said the scholar. "Classical before Baroque."

[98] E.g., Thompson, Pollock, and Charlot 1932: 168, 189. Compare Lister and Lister 1968: 98–101. Schele and Mathews 1998: 139.

[99] Charlot quoted in Bunker 1927: 10, probably from an older version of Charlot 1926 Report.

[100] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 302; 304. Glusker 2010: 383. Schele and Mathews 1998: 198–201.

[101] E.g., Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 243, 311 ff. A hindrance to the decipherment of Maya writing was the fact that many scholars in the field had not mastered the language (e.g., Coe 1999: 54, 199, 234, 274 ["How can illiterate scholars pretend to study a literate civilization?"]). I thank Professor Yoshinobu Ota for help with this section.

[102] Interview October 1, 1970. Charlot seems to be developing the idea of a glyph as a determinative: "an unpronounced sign conveying meaning only and indicating a class of words of related meaning to which the referent word belongs" (Coe 1999: 288). The Maya use of determinatives is currently debated and considered, at most, rare (Coe 1999: 27, 31 f., 39, 148, 264).

[103] Diary May 29, 1928. Also May 17, 1927. Glusker 2010: 378, manuscript illustration.

[104] Moonlit walks are mentioned often in the diaries. Charlot writes to Brenner about them: "A decirte la verdad," "Parece que con el apendice," "Conque tu tambien," "Le gustan mis dibujos y da dinero para imprimirlos."

[105] Charlot Winter 1946: 6; March 8, 1972 ("There I copied literally hundreds of bas-reliefs and, of course, met Mayan Indians, so different from Aztec Indians"). Charlot illustrates the different body types humorously in A. A. Morris 1931: 73. See my discussion in Chapter 3.

[106] Charlot March 8, 1972. The Xiu were descendants of an exalted pre-Conquest family and still famous and influential (e.g., Charnay 1885: 239 f.). Morley tried unsuccessfully to connect their contemporary genealogy to the historical one (Brunhouse 1971: 177, 307 f.; 1975: 63; Thompson 1963: 64 ff.). Also Gann 1972: 88 f., 237. Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 245. *AA* II 187.

[107] E.g., CL 156 *Fiesta Headdress, Yucatan*, December 1928; CL 157 *Mestiza Head, profile*, December 1928.

[108] *AA* II 185. McVicker 1999 ("Charlot's aesthetic appreciation of the murals was in part inspired by the elongated proportions of the figures").

[109] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 343. Squat figures are found in Maya art, such as those at Toniná, but rarely, and were little known in the 1920s.

[110] *AA* II 185. Brunhouse 1971: 209 ("Small in build but with strong bodies").

[111] Diary April 8, 1932 ("commencé princess Xiu" 'started Princess Xiu'). Several days are blank at this point in the diary, so the progress and completion of the painting are unrecorded.

[112] E.g., M97, 104, 146. See also M87. CL 149, 152.

[113] M557. Also, e.g., M110, 125, 133, 220, 386, 486.

[114] E.g., the Maya workers and builders subject, and M70, 73, 80, 87, 97.

[115] Charnay 1885: 118, 158, 183, 185, 195 ff., 199, 218, 232 f., 237, 391, 393, 399, 409, 432. E.g., Winning 1968: 474.

[116] Gann 1972: 236 ff.; illustrations pp. 26, 31 unnumbered. The profile on the right in illustration 31 is from a photograph (A. A. Morris 1931: Fig. 20).

[117] Brenner 1942. Also A. A. Morris 1931: 35, 60; contrast 47.

[118] M74. Also M81, 83, 93.

[119] Charlot May 1947: 209. Gann 1972: 240 ff.

[120] Not all Charlot's Chich'en Itza images in the Peabody Museum have been posted on line, but several of those available seem to belong to this group. They are easel-sized oils of single blocks rather than the normally larger archeological copies, and their simple backgrounds locate them in the digs:

> Peabody Number: 62-11-20/25216a; Display Title: "Figure with body painting and wearing tumpline, area 15&16, Temple of Warriors"
> Peabody Number: 62-11-20/252; Display Title: "Warrior. Area 15-16. Temple of Warriors"
> Peabody Number: 62-11-20/25216d; Display Title: "Temple of the Chac Mool, Base of south side, pilaster C"
> Peabody Number: 62-11-20/25216b; Display Title: "Figure with blue earplug. Pilaster D, west side, Temple of Chac Mool"

Other works may have been for Charlot's own interests, such an image of a large part of the front of the Temple of the Warriors (?) contrasting the newly excavated colors with the worn exterior stones (Peabody Number: 62-11-20/27651; Display Title: "Chichen Itza architectural detail").

As elsewhere and at other times, I believe, Charlot produced oils that he did not include in his Checklist. Elizabeth Morris donated to the JCC an unsigned, undated, and untitled oil, 10-1/2" X 13-3/4", that was given to her with the information that it was painted by Charlot. The central part of the oil is stylistically anomalous, but the Maya builders in the background are sketched with Charlot's special dash. The space is composed carefully with heavy jungle background, middle flat land below the sight line, and a higher flat hill in which the two foreground figures are working. Ann Axtell Morris and Charlot are affectionately satirized as dumpy copyists, her with a tiny canvas and he wielding a very large one with an outsized palette. They scrutinize the object of study before them: a modern liquor bottle doubtless found not too deep in the latest dust.

[121] M97. Chapter 7. Thompson 1963: 39 f.

[122] M80. For further references, see McVicker 1999.

[123] Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 244 f. CL 155; M73.

[124] This painting was drastically over cleaned when donated to the San Antonio Museum of Art.

[125] Charlot September 14, 1945. Compare Houser 1964:

> My job in Chichen-Itza was copying these things and I just spent two years doing it, and after I left there I found I was half Mayan. So I knew that a great deal of the feeling of the thing came from that sort of practice. It was a part of me by then.

[126] Charlot Winter 1946. Also M207.

[127] McVicker 1999. Charlot March 17, 1929, is an edited and paraphrased survey of some results of his work for the field.

[128] Diary August 13, 1928. On Santoyo, Glusker 2010: 179 f., 288.

[129] Mentioned in the diaries are Alva de la Canal, Asúnsolo, Best Maugard, Clausell, Enciso, Guerrero, Goitia, Leal, Ledesma, Lozano, Méndez, Mérida, Modotti, O'Higgins, Orozco Romero, Pacheco, Pintao, Siqueiros, and Weston.

[130] Diary August 10, 1926. CL 134, 136. *MMR* 31 f.

[131] Diary September 18, 1926. Glusker 2010: 274.

[132] E.g., Diary 1926: July 27 ("exp Tepchowsky. quelques bonnes choses" 'exhibition Tepchowsky. some good things' [Morris Topchevsky (1899–1947) arrived in Mexico 1924 and stayed several years]), September 17 (Reforma exhibition), December 11 ("Shockuska"); 1927: September 24, 27 (Nahui Olin), October 19, November 10 (children's art), 13, 15 (Lozano), 17, 19 (Lozano and Revueltas), 23, 29, 30; 1928: January 5 (Revueltas), August 1 (children's art and Leal: "bonne toile de Leal" 'good canvas of Leal'), 15 (photography), September 2, 5, October 3.

[133] Glusker 2010: 198; also 222. Also, e.g., Charlot Diary July 13, 1926; August 27, 1928. Chapter 3.

[134] Schmeckebier 1939: 163. See also Mello 2002a: 333, n. 109, on Orozco. On April 30, 2008, Guillermo Tovar de Teresa emailed me:

> Mi querida amiga Lupe Rivera Marin vino a comer a casa hace diez dias y le senale como tu padre le descubrio Mexico al suyo, al gran Diego, y logro transformar el bizantinismo del Anfiteatro en algo mexicano, a su regreso de Tehuantepec, cuyos dibujos de tehuanas reproduce tu padre en su libro.
> Lupe me conto como Elie Faure le recomendó mucho a Diego conocer Yucatan, donde tu padre se hallaba con Morely (*sic*), gracias al contagio de Charnay.
> 'My dear friend, Lupe Rivera Marín, came to dine at my house ten days ago, and I pointed out to her how your father uncovered Mexico to hers, the great Diego, and succeeded in transforming the Byzantinism of the Amphitheater into something Mexican at his return from Tehuantepec, whose drawings of *tehuanas* your father reproduces in his book.
> Lupe told me how Élie Faure recommended strongly to Diego to get to know Yucatan, where your father was with Morley, thanks to the connection with Charnay.'

See also Chapter 3, section 2.2.

[135] AGC to JC April 29, 1928. On an undated fragment of brown paper, Anne writes that she asked someone to send Jean's work to Orozco in New York City and has written Orozco to be ready to receive them.

[136] Diary 1926: January 10 ("chez Diego avec maman" 'at Diego's with mama'), September 4 ("été voir Diego et Lupe avec maman" 'went to see Diego and Lupe with mama'); 1927: July 9, 10.

[137] Diary September 18, 1928. Charlot's other diary mentions of fresco probably refer to such tasks (1927: November 28, 29, 30). Later Charlot reported: "Paul *left* Diego. He gives now classes of English" (JC to AB "I don't remember if I send you the address of V. Arroyo's little girl").

[138] Diary December 16, 1927. The diary mention of Chapingo on August 10, 1927, has not been decoded. Charlot had earlier expressed some reservations about the murals: "Chapingo. bon mais lourd" 'Chapingo. good but heavy' (Diary October 29, 1925).

[139] Charlot April 1931; an unpublished card with information on the exhibition in the JCC. Delpar 1992: 143).

[140] CL 131. Andrews 2011: 58 f.

[141] Charlot 1928 Carlos Mérida. Diary 1928: September 14, 15, 17. JC to AB "I don't remember if I send you the address of V. Arroyo's little girl." Mérida January 29, 1971.

[142] Delpar 1992: 84, 136 ff. On Paine, see Kert 2003: index.

[143] AGC to JC 1928: February 1, 22.

[144] Anne remained suspicious of Paine and regretted working with her (AGC to JC 1928: January 23 [Paine flatters her], February 1, March 3, 31).

[145] Diary 1927: October 15, 24. Andrews 2011: 58 ff.

[146] Diary 1927: November 26, December 13; see also December 3. Henrietta Shore: *Jean Charlot*, oil, Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Shore also portrayed Weston (Conger 1992: 20).

[147] Charlot 1939: 175, 177. See also *AA* I: 193 f.

[148] Gorelik: Diary August 24, 1927. Artists: e.g., 1928: July 13, 17. Maroto: JC to AB "Hoy te mando el ejemplar de Forma"; Diary 1927: August 7, 9, 11, October 3; Charlot 1974: 57. García Maroto 1927 does not mention Charlot.

[149] Diary September 25, 1928; also September 26, 27. JC to AB "Escribiste despues de mucho tiempo": ("Tienes listas las pruebas de Posada y del Machete" 'You have the lists of the proofs of Posada and *El Machete*'). Charlot may have printed these at Ledesma's new school (Diary September 24, 1928).

[150] CL 145 Juana, October 1927, 29" X 23 ½". M102: "Juana was a maid we had in Mexico. She came from the country to the big town to be employed."

[151] Diary June 19, 1926. Charlot mentions meetings with the Suttors, e.g., Diary 1926: October 19, 28, December 2, 30, 31 ("déjeuné chez Suttor. très bon canard à l'arroz" 'lunched at the Suttors. very good duck with rice'); 1927: January 1, 7, 14.

[152] Diary 1926: October 11 ("cheval avec Rica et Lucien" 'riding horses with Rica and Lucien'), 12 ("matin : voiture avec Rica…soir : causé d'art avec Rica " 'morning: car ride with Rica…evening: talked art with Rica'), 13, 14 ("cheval et bain avec Rica" 'horse riding and swim with Rica'), 15, 16 (?), 17 ("adieu à Rica" 'goodbye to Rica'), November 22; 1927: October 11, 18, 19, 26, November 2, 8, 21, 23, 24; 1928: January 1, 3, 18. Portrait: CL 146; Diary 1927: October 12, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28(?). Charlot painted also a watercolor for Rica (August 6, 1926). Brenner: Glusker 2010, Index, nearly all the references are pertinent.

[153] Glusker 2010: 471; Brenner provided a description of the hacienda and its life during her visit from July 31 to August 2, 1927, pp. 469–480, 483, 486, 512. Charlot Diary July 16, 1926.

[154] Charlot later paid a short visit to the hacienda (Diary October 5, 1926) and enjoyed a longer stay from October 9 to 18, 1926, more social than creative without the *malinches*.

[155] Diary August 18, 1926. For related images, see Winning 1968: 160; García de Germenos, 1991: 103.

[156] Charlot March 8, 1972. Also:

> It seems that we go from here August, that we would have to stay in Washington while the book is prepared. (me to survey color-plates) so that New-York would be in end October. I think you would go to Germany and we would see us afterwards. (JC to AB "A long nice letter")

See the contemporary letters of Anne Charlot in Volume 1, Chapter 2.

[157] Charlot March 8, 1972. Rivera had the same feeling, which helps explain, I have argued, his conduct towards those he considered rivals. Rivera was a genius who could occasionally lack taste as in his anthropomorphic plant paintings. Though he could paint bad oils, he could never paint bad murals. They drew out all his interest and energy.

[158] JC to AB "J'ai reçu une jolie lettre de toi." AGC to JC 1928: April 9, May 11.

[159] JC to AB "Con el nº de Julio de The Arts" ("We are leaving here on Wednesday for Mex. No traces of immigration papers yet"); "16." ("The immigration papers are to be ready this week. We would start between the 20 to 25 of this month"). AGC to JC 1928: May 11, 26. Diary 1928: August 25 ("le consulat reçoit les papiers de France nous pourrons partir en Octobre. prière pour être à N.Y. enfin le 15 Sept." 'the consulate receives the papers from France we will be able to leave in October. prayer to be at last in New York September 15'), October 16 ("*reçu mot consulat américain : les papiers seront prêts cette semaine*" 'received word from the American consulate: the papers will be ready this week'), 17 ("consulat américain puis consulat de France" 'American consulate then consulate of France'), 18 ("consulat : on nous donne nos passeports. photos etc…" 'consulate: we are given our passports. photos, etc.').

[160] JC to AB "I am writing your article on Maya art"; also "A cuenta de unas difficultades del Consulado."

[161] Brunhouse 1971: 181. Diary March 19, 1928 ("Reygadas est l'inspecteur mexicain des ruines" 'Reygadas is the Mexican inspector of ruins'). JC to AB "Ya no escribes?" AGC to JC mentions the "idol" in several letters, e.g., March 31 (b), 1928.

[162] JC to AB "I send you the Niño Fidencio photographs." Diary August 2, 1928; Charlot had been in contact earlier with Reygadas, July 9 ("matin j'ai vu Reygadas très poli" 'in the morning I saw Reygadas very polite'), November 19, December 7, 1928. Charlot saw or tried to see Reygadas several times about the statue: 1928: August 8, 18.

[163] E.g., AGC to JC March 31 (b), 1928. Diary 1928: August 19 ("allé chez Lupe : parlé idole" 'went to Lupe's: discussed idol'), September 1. M234. Charlot designed a special display niche for the statue in his living room book case in Honolulu.