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INTRODUCTION

The unsung pioneer in the study of Palenque’s dynastic history is Heinrich Berlin, who in three seminal studies (Berlin 1959, 1965, 1968) provided the essential outline of the dynasty and explicitly identified the name glyphs and likely accession dates of the major Early and Late Classic rulers (Stuart 2005:148-149). More prominent and well deserved credit has gone to Linda Schele and Peter Mathews (1974), who summarized the rulers of Palenque’s Late Classic and gave them working names in Ch’ol Mayan (Stuart 2005:149). The present work is partly based on the transcript by Phil Wanyerka of a hieroglyphic workshop presented by Schele and Mathews at the 1993 Maya Meetings at Texas (Schele and Mathews 1993).

Essential recourse has also been made to the insights and decipherments of David Stuart, who made his first Palenque Round Table presentation in 1978 at the age of twelve (Stuart 1979) and has recently advanced our understanding of Palenque and its rulers immeasurably (Stuart 2005). And this is by no means to overlook the definitive work on the Palenque dynasty by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2000, 2008), the essentials of which have been incorporated herein.

In a very real sense, history at Palenque begins with Pakal the Great. This renowned Palenque ruler recorded vital information on his dynastic forebears on three large tablets in the structure atop the Temple of the Inscriptions and on the lid and sides of his sarcophagus deep within the temple mound. This tradition was carried forward and augmented by Pakal’s son K’ínich Kan Bahlam (see “Palenque’s Dynastic Texts” on Pages 4-5). We are fortunate indeed in having this written record and, thanks in large part to the scholars named above and others cited herein, the ability to read it.

“THE OLMEC”

The Palenque rulers named by K’ínich Kan Bahlam in the inscription inside his Temple of the Cross may be divided into the mythological, the legendary, and the historical. Clearly mythological is the personage said to have acceded into rulership in 2305 BC at 827 years of age. Clearly historical is the dynasty founder, who came to the throne in AD 431 at the age of twenty-two. But in between are two others who are identified glyphically as lords of Palenque. Acceding in 967 BC is an individual named Uk’ix Chan,¹ whose lifespan is human—he became king at the age of twenty-six—but whose
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Recent finds at San Bartolo in Guatemala may be said to have closed the gap between the beginnings of Maya civilization and that of the Olmec: The Maya timeline in Figure 1 should be extended back to reflect sophisticated mural paintings at about 100 BC and an already developed writing system at about 300 BC. Meanwhile increasing numbers of sites are being reported with Middle Preclassic material. And recent investigations at Palenque have documented a Late Preclassic (300 BC - 250 AD) occupation substantial enough for Palenque to have ranked as a regional capital (López Bravo et al. 2004:12). While the idea of a king at the site of Palenque in 967 BC would still have to be considered the stuff of legend, there remains an outside chance the Uk’ix Chan is a dimly remembered Palenque lord who acceded elsewhere, as Schele and Mathews (1993:33) suggested in their Texas workshop.

This proposition is perhaps even more tenable with another “Divine Lord of Palenque” who first came to the attention of scholarship in 2004, with the discovery of carved stone tablet in Temple 21. Bearing the same name as a later Palenque king (nicknamed Casper because his name glyph cannot be read), he is said to have supervised a “housing” ritual involving deities in 252 BC. While this earlier Casper just fits within the Late Preclassic time frame, it may be significant that he is not named in K’inich Kan Bahlam’s dynastic record.

\[1\] The name may be roughly translated as “The Bloodletter of the Snake,” bearing in mind that \(k’ix\) is more of a nickname than a decipherment for the ‘bloodletter’ portion.

---

**Figure 2.** K’inich Kan Bahlam impersonating Uk’ix Chan on the sanctuary jamb panel of the Temple of the Cross (drawing by Linda Schele).

### MYTHOLOGICAL AND LEGENDARY RULERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Year</th>
<th>Death Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?-Muwaan Mat</td>
<td>3120 BC</td>
<td>2325 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uk’ix Chan</td>
<td>993 BC</td>
<td>967 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper</td>
<td>252 BC</td>
<td>252 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

?-Muwaan Mat: 12.19.13.4.0 8 Ajaw 18 Sek (3120 BC)
a: 2.0.0.10.2 9 Ik 0 Sak (2325 BC)

Uk’ix Chan:
b: 5.7.11.8.47 1 K’an 2 Kumk’u (993 BC)
a: 5.8.17.15.17 11 Kaban 0 Pop (967 BC)

Casper: 7.5.3.10.17 10 Kaban 5 Muwan (252 BC)

(Drawing by David Stuart.)
In Merle Greene Robertson’s atmospheric painting of Pakal’s tomb deep within the Temple of the Inscriptions (above), note the glyphs carved on the edge of the Sarcophagus lid. These record the death dates of a number of Pakal’s ancestral and dynastic predecessors. The sides of the Sarcophagus were carved with ancestral portraits and name glyphs (below).
The East and Central Tablets of the three Temple of the Inscriptions Tablets (the Central Tablet is depicted above) expand upon Pakal’s dynastic record (drawing by Linda Schele). The Tablet of the Cross, the stone carving that graced the inner sanctuary of K’inich Kan Bahlam’s Temple of the Cross (below), records the mythological, legendary, and historical accessions of Palenque rulers. The accession of the mythological ruler best known in the literature as Lady Beastie is recorded at F7-F8; that of the legendary Uk’ix Chan is at P1-P2; and the first historical accession—that of the dynasty founder K’uk’ Bahlam—is recorded at Q7-P8.
This ruler, whose name glyph combines the royal symbols of the quetzal (k’uk’) and the jaguar (bahlam), is considered the founder of the Palenque dynasty. Although other, earlier candidates for this role appear in the inscriptions of Palenque (a legendary figure called “Bloodletter of the Snake” is said to have acceded in Olmec times), K’uk’ Bahlam is the first from a reasonably historical era corresponding to the foundation of other Classic Maya royal lines (Martin and Grube 2008:156). His “Toktahn Lord” title associates him with an unknown location that appears to have been the original seat of the dynasty (ibid.:156).

K’uk’ Bahlam’s four-year reign overlaps with that of Siyaj Chan K’awiil II at Tikal, at the height of Teotihuacan influence on the Maya. The name glyph of the Teotihuacan warlord Siyaj K’ahk’ may appear on a stucco pier of the Palace, leading to the inference that Teotihuacan may possibly have been involved in the foundation of the Palenque dynasty just as it was involved in establishing a new line at Tikal (ibid.:156).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:156) and is presented as a baseline for further discussion.

K’uk’ Bahlam founded the Palenque dynasty on March 10, 431 of the current era. At this time in Europe, the fall of the Roman Empire was ushering in the Middle Ages. K’uk’ Bahlam’s name glyph, as depicted above, consists of a quetzal bird—k’uk’—in Mayan—with a jaguar ear, the jaguar being bahlam in the particular Mayan language of the Palenque inscriptions. Thus we are secure in translating his name as “Quetzal Jaguar.”

2 A recently discovered stone censer stand portrays one of the Palenque kings named K’uk’ Bahlam, as the subject can be identified by a quetzal (k’uk’) headdress and jaguar (bahlam) ears (Martin and Grube 2008:174). Following a suggestion by David Stuart, Mary Miller and Simon Martin (2004:230) note that, in view of the object’s role in ancestor veneration, it probably represents the dynasty founder rather than his Late Classic namesake, K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II. David Stuart (personal communication 2004) points out that the portrait’s headdress, in addition to conveying K’UK’ and BAHLM contains centipede-framed solar symbols representing K’INICH. Hence the Founder, like his Late Classic dynastic descendant, appears to have been named in full K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam.

3 The Siyaj K’ahk’ name, followed by an ajaw title, can be seen in a drawing accompanying one of Alfred Maudslay’s photographs of the Palace (Maudslay 1889-1902:Vol. IV, Plate 34), although the context is unclear since most of the text is missing (Martin (2003:note 17).

4 This date is based on the Modified GMT 584285 correlation and expressed in the Julian calendar. The Gregorian equivalent is March 11, 431.
K’uk’ Bahlam has also been called Quetzal and Kuk. He was previously referred to as Bahlum-Kuk because bahlum means jaguar in modern Ch’ol, the Mayan language which is spoken in and around Palenque today. The two parts of the name Bahlum-Kuk were “reversed” by Linda Schele and Peter Mathews (1993:38) based on a spelling employed by a later ruler of Palenque, K’uk’ Bahlam II, who took the founder’s name. As it appears in the Tablet of the 96 Glyphs (Figure 3), we see the phonetic complement ma appearing as three dots beneath the main sign of the name of K’uk’ Bahlam II. A phonetic complement at the end of a word signals the pronunciation of the final consonant—in this case the m sound at the end of bahlam. That’s why Schele and Mathews suggested that Bahlam and not K’uk’ is the final part of the glyph that combines them.5

There has been considerable debate about the dates of K’uk’ Bahlam, owing to an apparent scribal error in the calculation of the Distance Number between his birth and his accession to rulership as recorded on the Temple of the Cross Tablet (Schele and Mathews 1993:35). The great Mayanist Floyd Lounsbury even felt that K’uk’ Bahlam should be associated with the time of the Olmec.

Based on work by David Stuart on the dynasty of Copan, Linda Schele and Peter Mathews (1993:35) realized the importance of dynastic founders to the Maya. Since K’uk’ Bahlam is properly considered to be the founder of the Palenque dynasty, his dates should be immediately preceding those of the next rulers, whose dates are less controversial. As a historical personage, K’uk’ Bahlam has been assigned a birthdate in historical time: March 30, 397 (in the Maya calendar, 8.18.0.13.6 5 Kimi 14 K’ayab).

A passage from the Temple of the Cross Tablet (Figure 4) records the date of K’uk’ Bahlam’s birth—5 Kimi 14 K’ayab—in the first two glyph blocks.5 (A bar representing the number five is to the left of the ritual calendar sign Kimi in the first glyph block [P4], while two bars and four dots—each bar counting five and each dot counting one—are to the left of the solar month sign K’ayab in the second [Q4].) At P5 is the verb for “birth,” the glyph for which was referred to as the “upended frog” when it was first identified. (It is possible that it actually depicts an iguana. The “upended frog” portion is the top left half of the glyph block; the right half and the whole bottom together form a verbal suffix.) At Q5 is K’uk’ Bahlam’s name.

The text continues (Figure 5) with a Distance Number at P6-Q6 that counts forward from the time of K’uk’ Bahlam’s birth to his accession, or coronation as ruler. Distance Numbers count how many days, months, years, k’atuns (twenty-year periods), and sometimes even greater intervals of time are to be added to or subtracted from a given

---

5 If you imagine drawing an imaginary grid of vertical and horizontal lines on an inscription, the roughly square cells that result are called ‘glyph blocks’ and are designated by their coordinates on the grid, e.g., P6 of Figure 5 (Harris and Stearns 1997:3). “Most inscriptions begin in the upper left and are read downward in pairs” (ibid.). Thus, the reading order of Figure 5 is P6, Q6, P7, Q7, P8, Q8, etc.

6 It turns out that phonetic complementation cannot be relied on to signal which of two words combined in a single glyph block is to be pronounced first. But confidence in the present instance is encouraged by the fact that a stela at Naranjo names a K’uk’ Bahlam—with the reading order explicit—within a generation of Palenque’s K’uk’ Bahlam II (Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2000).
date to arrive at a different date. This particular Distance Number records fourteen days (four dots and two bars) and five months (the bar lying horizontally on top of the sign for “month”) in glyph block P6, two years (the left portion of Q6), and one k’atun (the right portion of Q6). Thus a total of twenty-two years and 114 days are added to K’uk’ Bahlam’s birth (indicated by the “upended frog” at P7) to arrive at the date of his accession. The verb for accession (at Q7) is a “flat hand” holding out two glyphs, the one on the left bearing the color “white” and the one on the right representing the headband of rulership. “White” is sak in Mayan, and the headband is huun. Sak Huun is the name of the headband and also a name of the Jester God, a Maya deity associated with rulership. At P8 is a glyph reading tu ubaah that has been interpreted to mean either that the headband was held for the king (or tied on his head), or that he held (or tied) it himself. At Q8 is the ritual calendar date of the accession, 1 K’an, and at P9 is the solar date 2 K’ayab. The passage ends with a glyph at Q9 identifying K’uk’ Bahlam as a “Holy Cloud-Center Lord.”

As distinct from the other rulers of his dynasty, K’uk’ Bahlam does not bear one of the Palenque “emblem glyph” variants, such as the bone glyph signifying the kingdom’s name, Baak or “Bone.” (It is possible that the name of the kingdom was Baakal or Baakel, a variant of the word for bone that might have the significance of “Boney” or “Bone Place”—see “Emblem Glyphs” on page 13.) Instead he has the glyph (bottom glyph in Figure 6) reading Toktahn Ajaw, “Cloud-Center Lord.” The complete emblem glyph form, K’uhul Toktahn Ajaw, “Divine Cloud-Center Lord,” also appears with the name of K’uk’ Bahlam (Figure 7b).

At first glance, neither of the glyphs in Figure 7 can be read syllabically as to-ko-TAHN to give Toktahn. Reading the component signs7 of the glyph block in Figure 7a in the normal order, we have ko-to-TAHN, but Maya scribes are known to have been playful with the order in which they arranged the glyphs. In Figure 7b, we appear to have only to-TAHN. (The entire left side of the glyph block is the logograph K’UH, “god,” which

---

7 Signs are the smallest meaningful visual units in hieroglyphic writing. Logographs are signs that represent complete words. Syllabic signs, composed of a consonant and a vowel, are used in combination to write out words in the script or, singly, as phonetic complements, clueing how a certain logograph is to be pronounced. This essay follows the convention of transcribing logographs in boldface capital letters and syllabic signs in lowercase bold.
in this context is properly construed in its adjectival form k’uhul, “godly, holy, divine.” The two circular elements on top, together representing the word ajaw, “lord,” are read last.)

But in an inscription from the Temple of the Sun (Figure 8) recording that an event involving a later ruler, K’an Joy Chitam I, happened at Toktahn, we find (at P5) the spelling to-ko-TAHN-na. (At P2-Q2 is the date 12 Ajaw 8 Keh. P3 depicts a hand holding a mirror, which reads “he was held,” referring to K’an Joy Chitam, whose name appears at P4. Q4 reads “it happened at.” And P5 is Toktahn, with to over ko on the left, and TAHN over the phonetic complement -na on the right.)

It seems, then, that what we have in Figure 7b might be an “underspelling,” where to is written in the place of tok and a literate Maya would have known to supply the implicit consonant -k. This would be transcribed to-(ko). Such underspellings are common in Maya texts, and this very word is frequently underspelled in the name of the Tikal ruler Chaak Tok Ich’aak (Grube and Martin 1998). Another possibility is that the sign which elsewhere stands for the syllable to is logographic TOK in this context. Whether transcribed to-(ko)-TAHN or TOK-TAHN, the word formed is Toktahn.9

It is also noteworthy that the wife of Pakal the Great is referred to as being a Toktahn noble. On the left in Figure 9 is the name glyph for Pakal’s wife, Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw, from the Palace Tablet. On the right is the partially eroded glyph for Toktahn Winik, “Cloud Center Person.” The left half of the glyph block is to over ko over TAHN. The right half is WINIK, over the phonetic complement -ki.

Schele and Mathews consider “Cloud Center” to be a place name and associate it with the valley in which the Group of the Cross and other structures are built. As Schele explained to the 1993 Maya Hieroglyphic Workshop, “This is where we believe the first king of Palenque lived and that is somewhere near Temple 18A. I believe that when the archaeologists go back into that area they are going to find a lot of other Early Classic tombs and perhaps even the Founder himself (Schele and Mathews 1993:37).”

Ed Barnhart of the Palenque Mapping Project offers a different suggestion (see Figure 10):

The heart of the Picota Group is the irregularly shaped Picota Plaza. The irregular shape is caused by the protrusion of structures P23, 24 and 25 into the plaza, creating two distinct sections of plaza space. The western part of the plaza contains the La Picota Stela (the feature for which the area is named), the Picota aqueduct, and a well-preserved staircase climbing nine steps up from its southern boundary. Towering above the Picota Plaza to the south are a series of three terraces topped by structure P14 and its associated courtyard group. Structure P12, located five meters to the southeast of P14 has an area of collapse in its top revealing a subterranean tomb chamber below.

---

9 As Marc Zender explains (personal communication 2000), the sense is that K’an Joy Chitam was held in an office or featured in a ceremony, the sign for which appears as the second half of Q3. According to Zender (personal communication 2000), the “hand-with-mirror” is actually the full-form of K’AL “to hold”—the mirror is just normally hidden by SAK-HU’N (royal headdress), TUUN (year), K’AWIIL (deity of rulership), or whatever other object is being affected. The evidence for this is on Stela 1 of Sacchana (and elsewhere), where the traditional period-ending U-K’AL-wa TUUN-ni statement is written with the TUUN-ni pulled away from the hand and in the next glyph-block, all of which causes the mirror to “reappear” in the full-form of the K’AL sign.

9 Marc Zender (personal communication 2000) notes: The logographic alternative must be the correct one, since elision of “hard” consonants like /k/ is practically unknown in the world’s syllabic scripts, and because this case would be unique in the known corpus of Maya elision (which otherwise impacts only l, m, n, w, and y).
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In form and geographic placement, the line of temple-like structures running from the structure P14 eastward to the Group I platform are reminiscent of the line of structures in Palenque’s primary center created by Temple XII, XIII and the Inscriptions. Both areas have temples built into the hillside overlooking a plaza. Acknowledging that XII, XIII and the Inscriptions are funerary monuments, a similar function is suspected for these southern temples of the Picota Group. Collectively, the presence of a large plaza, a stela, an elaborate aqueduct and a line of funerary temples along the south edge give the Picota area a distinctly “central precinct” character. The large nearby structure designated the Escondido Platform further supports that conclusion. Palenque appears to have had not one, but two “centers.”...
The discovery of this second center at Palenque leads to a hypothesis with potential to answer a growing question regarding the members of Palenque’s early royal lineage. Despite decades of excavation in Palenque’s central precinct archaeologists have found little evidence of royal family activities earlier than the time of Pakal. The exceptions, the XVIIIa tomb (Berlin 1943b) and the Reyna Roja (Gonzalez Cruz 1998), are still under debate as to the antiquity of their time periods. David Stuart has read Palenque hieroglyphic texts referring to a place named “Tok Tan” as the origin place of the Palenque lineage, a place he believes to be separate from the primary center (p.c.). Could the Picota Plaza be the center of the dynasty’s original family members? Its size, suspected age, and obvious association with the site’s residential community make it a possibility worthy of further archaeological investigation. (Palenque Mapping Project 1999 Field Season Report, submitted to FAMSI)

As we will consider in connection with another inscription (Figure 25), Toktahn may have been the original seat of the Palenque dynasty, which was subsequently moved to Lakamha’ (in all probability the area surrounding the Palace) by the fourth Palenque ruler Butz’aj Sak Chiik. The area around Temple 18A, proposed by Schele and Mathews as the location of Toktahn, is very close indeed to Lakamha’, and it would hardly seem to have warranted an inscription recording such an insignificant move. Even the La Picota Group is only a ten minute walk from the Palace.

A stucco portrait of K’uk’ Bahlam I, the dynastic founder, may appear on Pier B of the Temple of the Inscriptions, as suggested by the quetzal feathers and jaguar muzzle in the headdress (Figure 11). As Merle Greene Robertson observes:

The figure wears a short jaguar pelt skirt divided at the front in a curve across the hips. The jaguar spots are indicated by deep oval cuts which are crosshatched. The skirt is bordered with horizontally laid feathers finished off with vertically hanging feathers of equal length. The combination of fragile bird feathers and tough leather on the same garment is notable. ... Very little of the beaded cape worn by this figure remains, but enough survives to indicate that it was shorter than usual and was made of small round beads. The figure also wore a necklace of large round beads. ... The flamboyant blue feather headdress completes the figure’s scant attire. (Robertson 1983:31)

In his right arm K’uk’ Bahlam holds a baby K’awiil, recognizable for the fact that one leg is a serpent. In the other hand, K’uk’ Bahlam holds the serpent’s head.

Up until 1999 this was all we could say about K’uk’ Bahlam, but in that year Guillermo Bernal
Romero made a presentation to the Palenque Round Table about a monument that had been found in fragments six years earlier in Temple 16 by Arnolodo González Cruz’s INAH project (Bernal Romero 1999; González Cruz and Bernal Romero 2000). Referred to as the K’an Tok Tablet (K’an Tok is not to be confused with Toktahn), it was assembled in proper chronological order by Bernal Romero (2002). The tablet (Figure 12) narrates the accessions, supervised by Palenque rulers, of a series of secondary lords into an office or station identified by what David Stuart (2005:133) has termed the “banded bird title” (previously read, or misread, as itz’at). Bernal Romero associates these subsid-iary officials with a separate site in the Palenque sphere called K’an Tok, but David Stuart finds it more probable that they resided in Palenque proper (Stuart 2000:Note 4).

The accessions on the K’an Tok Tablet take place over a period of some three centuries, extending from at least AD 460 in the time of Palenque’s second ruler to at least AD 767 in the time of its sixteenth (see Stuart 2005:134 for his reconstructed K’an Tok dates and those of Peter Mathews; also see Bernal Romero 2002). The initial date of the tablet has been tentatively reconstructed as 8.19.19.3.0, 7 Ajaw 18 Muwan (February 13, 435) by Peter Mathews (personal communication 2001; Stuart 2005:134). This date, if reconstructed properly,\(^\text{10}\) is only a matter of months before the accession of Palenque’s second ruler, suggesting that it may have been one of the last acts in the short reign of K’uk’ Bahlam.

\(^{10}\)This is a big “if” since the coefficient for the Muwan sign (glyph B2 in Figure 13) is missing, as is the Distance Number linking to the next date. But Mathews makes a persuasive case based on considerations including the space available for the Muwan coefficient, the possibilities that accord with the 1 Ajaw (glyph A1), and the order of magnitude of the partial Distance Number (D2) leading from the third date (6 Chuwen 19 Sak at C3-D3) to the missing second date—with the first date, the 7 Ajaw ? Muwan at issue, necessarily being earlier than this.
The glyph on the right is from the Temple of the Inscriptions West Tablet. Like all emblem glyphs, it has three components. In the first of these it is generally possible to recognize drops of precious liquid, possibly blood, being scattered as in an offering. This logogram is transcribed K’UH and transliterated in the implicit adjectival form k’uhul, “divine.” The two circular elements on top of the emblem glyph together form a logogram for AJAW, “lord.” The other component changes from kingdom to kingdom and represents the given polity. The Palenque emblem glyph in its standard form has as its changing element a bone or an animal skull, both read as BAAK. Baak, or “bone,” was the core component of the ancient name of the Palenque kingdom.

Just above on the left we see a “wavy bone” allograph of the Palenque emblem glyph. (Allographs are hieroglyphic signs with a different appearance but the same meaning, that substitute freely for one another. The wa suffix underneath the bone sign complements the AJAW superfix.) Next over to the right is an animal-skull allograph of the emblem glyph. (Here the la complement, the little “blobs” at the bottom which quite frequently appear with the Palenque emblem glyph, suggests that the ancient name of the kingdom might well have been Baakal or Baakel, perhaps with a meaning of “Boney,” rather than Baak, “Bone.”) At one time it was thought that the “bird” emblem glyphs at the right were also allographs, so that all the emblem glyphs illustrated above had the same reading. But then it was realized that the bird substitutes in other contexts with phonetic ma-la, mat, and David Stuart (2005:83) has shown that in the emblem glyph it is a shortened spelling for the important mythological location, Matwil. Thus the bird emblem glyph would read “Divine Matwil Lord.”

Here, above on the left with the name of the first Kan Bahlam, we see the Palenque emblem glyph allograph with the “wavy-line” bone (Temple of the Inscriptions, East Panel: K1-L1). And on the right, with the name of the Lady Yohl Ik’nal, is the emblem glyph allograph with the skull of an animal (TI, East Panel: L4-K5).

Ajen Yohl Mat, the son of Lady Yol Ik’nal, also has the animal skull emblem glyph (TI, East Panel: N4-N5), while Muwahn Mat has the bone emblem glyph (TI, East Panel: R8-Q9).

There are instances where both the “bird” emblem glyph and one of the “bone” allographs appear together in the same context, as illustrated above. Here, in a passage from the Palace Tablet, we see the name of the famous Palenque ruler K’inch Janaab Pakal followed by a “Ballplayer” title and two different emblem glyphs. The “bird” emblem glyph is read K’uhul Matwil Ajaw, and the “bone” K’uhul Baakal Ajaw.
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CASPER
Second in the known Palenque sequence

ch’a-?. Drawing and transcription after Martin and Grube (2008).

Born: 8.19.6.8.8 11 Lamat 6 Xul (August 8, 422).

Acceded: 8.19.19.11.17 2 Kaban 10 Xul (August 9, 435).

Reigned: AD 435-487.

This king, whose name eludes decipherment, acceded at age thirteen and ruled for over fifty years (Martin and Grube 2008:157). He is portrayed on a bowl carved from travertine (a soft stone originating in cave deposits) that constitutes the one and only inscribed object from the Early Classic at Palenque (its artistic quality counters the once-prevalent imputation that the kingdom’s early rulers were mere village chieftans who were unreasonably glorified in the inscriptions of their descendants) (ibid.:157). The text on the bowl reads yuk’ib ch’ok ch’a-? k’uhul baakal ajaw, “the drinking cup of the prince Casper, divine lord of Palenque” (ibid.:157).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:157).

For the resemblance to the “friendly ghost,” and because his real name could not be read, the second ruler of Palenque was given the nickname “Casper” by Floyd Lounsbury at the First Palenque Round Table. There is still controversy about the reading, so the undignified nickname remains. In his catalog of Maya glyphs, Eric Thompson (1962) called this main sign “Xipe,” for its resemblance to the flayed human skin associated with the Aztec deity Xipe Totec. Alfonso Morales Cleveland and Merle Greene Robertson have suggested a resemblance to a manatee. The prefix to the left of the main sign is clearly ch’a, but the main sign itself will never be read until a phonetic substitution is found (where the logogram is spelled syllabically). Casper has also been referred to as 11 Rabbit (by David Kelley, because his birth date, 11 Lamat, correlates with the day “rabbit” of Highland Mexican calendars).

A passage from the Temple of the Cross Tablet (Figure 13) records the Calendar Round date of Casper’s birth—11 Lamat 6 Xul—in the first two glyph blocks (P10-Q10). (To the left of the ritual calendar sign Lamat is a dot for one and two bars, each representing five. On either side of the dot are “placeholders,” which the Maya used to give a balanced appearance to the glyph block.) In our calendar, Casper’s date of birth was August 9, 422. In the Maya “Long Count,” this is written 8.19.6.8.8. At P11 of the inscription is the verb for “birth,” and at Q11 is Casper’s name.

The text continues (Figure 14) with a Distance Number at P12-Q12 that counts forward in time from Casper’s birth, the verb for which is repeated at P13, with his name at Q13. This Distance Number of 13 years, 3 months and 9 days leads to the Calendar Round date for
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Casper’s accession, 2 Kaban 10 Xul (8.19.19.11.17). Casper was only thirteen years old when he became ruler, a circumstance infrequently mentioned in discussions of the “child-ruler” Pakal (who accessed at age twelve). The verb for accession is not stated explicitly at this point in the inscription. Instead, another distance number—6 months and 3 days (P15)—counts forward from the time of the accession (with the verb explicit at Q15) to the period ending of the ninth bak’tun (R2). In his 1993 Texas Maya Meetings presentation, Peter Mathews described this as a “couplet expression,” where the first half of the couplet states a date but does not say what happened on that date, while the second half says what happened but doesn’t repeat the date. The passage reads, “It was three days and six months [P15] from when the white headband was tied [Q15] by him [P16] Casper [Q16] and then it happened [P17] 8 Ajaw 13 Keh [Q-7-R1] he completed [S1] 9 bak’tuns [R2] at Toktahn [S2].”

It is noteworthy that this celebration of the ninth bak’tun happened at Toktahn. Like K’uk’ Bahlam I, Casper was a “Holy Cloud Center Lord.” The transition from the last day of the eighth bak’tun to the “seating” of the ninth bak’tun on the date 9.0.0.0.0 was the most important period ending in the Maya Classic. (The glyph at R2 of Figure 14 is read 9 PIK, bolon pik, the Mayan for 9 bak’tuns. The glyph at S2 is to-ko-TAHN-na, with the syllables in the proper order to spell Toktahn.)

Two historical events involving Casper are known from the recently restored Palenque monument known as the K’an Tok Tablet. As noted previously, this inscription narrates the accession of a number of secondary lords. One of these accessions occurred on a date that Peter Mathews (Stuart 2005:134) and Guillermo Bernal Romero (2002:411) reconstruct as 9.0.9.5.9, 3 Muluk 17 Muwan. At A9 in the passage isolated in Figure 15a is the accession verb that we have seen before, featuring the “flat hand” K’AL and above it the headband HUUN. At A10 is the name of the acceding individual, K’ahk’ Chaak (Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2001).

After some missing glyphs, the passage continues (Figure 15b) and we see the name of the Palenque king under whose auspices the accession took place. At glyph C2 of Figure 17 we read K’UH(UL) to-ko-TAHN-AJAW, “Divine Cloud Center Lord.” Because of the date, this was clearly Casper.
Bernal Romero (2002:409, Figure 9) has suggested that another of the K’an Tok lords was Casper’s yitz’in, or younger brother, based on a reading of the left half of glyph B10 (Figures 15a and 16) as *yi-tz’i-na. Another passage of the K’an Tok Tablet states that on a securely reconstructed date of 9.1.5.5.11 6 Chuwen 19 Sak (November 19, 460) (Stuart 2005:134) (Figure 17, C3-D3), another K’an Tok lord named Ahk, or “Turtle,” acceded under the auspices of the “Divine Cloud Center Lord” (glyph D6). The Turtle name, spelled a-ku, is at C5. In the left half of C6 is U-KAB-ji-ya, ukabjiiy, “he oversaw it,” and immediately following it in the right half of that glyph block should be Casper’s name. Linda Schele read the superfix (above the anthropomorphic head in the drawing) as the syllable pi, because that glyph is sometimes written with two “stone” signs side-by-side. Simon Martin (personal communication 2000) suggests instead that it is the syllable ch’a that appears elsewhere with Casper’s name. Figure 18 presents a photograph of Casper’s name and title from this part of the inscription. Due to the erosion of the stone, the superfix above the head on the left doesn’t look very much like either a pi or a ch’a, except to the eye of an experienced epigrapher like Simon Martin, but Peter Mathews and Stanley Guenter have confirmed the reading (Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2001). Presumably the main sign is the head variant for the “ghost” glyph.

The head variant in Figure 19 has the Casper glyph that we have been looking at as its mouth. It was first recognized as another way of writing Casper’s name by David Stuart, as will be discussed shortly. Here it appears on a ceramic vessel identified as K7147 in Justin Kerr’s numbering system. (To view this and other rollout photographs in Justin Kerr’s corpus of Maya ceramics, visit MayaVase.com or the FAMSI website.)

In the same passage of the K’an Tok Tablet (Figures 17 and 20), we see the syllables spelling Toktahn in the expected order, to-ko-TAHN. (The normal reading order for a glyph block is left-to-right, top-to-bottom, which in this case would result in K’UH(UL) AJAW-to-ko-TAHN. But the Maya changed the order under certain circumstances; here the AJAW is read last.)
The Rulers of Palenque

In the caption identifying a figure depicted on a travertine vase in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (Figure 21), the third glyph is clearly the Palenque emblem glyph, read “Divine Palenque Lord,” a title carried only by rulers of Palenque. David Stuart has observed that the prefix of the center glyph is ch’a, as in Casper’s name. And he has proposed that the next part of the glyph is the head variant of Casper’s main sign. On the right in the illustration is the figure from the travertine vessel, a portrait therefore of Casper. On this vessel he is referred to as a divine lord of the kingdom of Baakal. But elsewhere he bears the Toktahn title.

The “Casper” name also appears on the stunning new monument discovered in Palenque’s Temple 21 in August of 2002. Centered among the figures depicted in the carved figural scene is Pakal the Great. Pakal’s caption says that he is impersonating a deity named with the head-variant “Casper” glyph. On the left in Figure 22a is the deity-impersonation glyph. On the right is the “Casper” head variant (just like on the Dumbarton Oaks travertine vessel), prefixed by the syllable ch’a.

In the main inscription of the monument, the “Casper” name recurs, this time in the context of a Palenque ruler supervising a ritual in the year 252 B.C. In Figure 22b we see the head variant of the “Casper” name on the left (again prefixed by ch’a) and the Palenque emblem glyph on the right. Needless to say, this is not the ruler that we have been discussing, nor is it likely to be a truly historical ruler at the site of Palenque, given the date in the Preclassic period.

---

11 The first glyph is ch’o-ko, ch’ok, literally meaning “youth” or “emergent” (Josserand 1999). The emblem glyph is the “wavy bone” spelling of Baakal, the name of the Palenque kingdom. The little God C head in the superfix of the emblem glyph is part of the word k’uhul, “divine.” It is technically referred to as a compound sign element, since it appears in conjunction with the “droplets” element, and together they stand for the logogram K’UH (k’uhul is the adjectival form). The AJAW is a “conflation,” or a merging, of the normal two “balls” into one.
The Rulers of Palenque

**BUTZ’AJ SAK CHIIK**

*Third in the known Palenque sequence*


Also known as Manik. Reigned: AD 487-501.

Born: 9.1.4.5.0 12 Ahaw 13 Sak (November 14, 459).

Acceded: 9.2.12.6.18 3 Etz’nab 11 Xul (July 28, 487).

Brother: Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I?

A seventh-century sculptured panel recently discovered in Temple 17 and now in the Palenque site museum refers to a dedication ritual of some sort performed by Butz’aj Sak Chiik in AD 490 (Martin and Grube 2008:157). It involves the Palenque place name Lakamha’ (“Big Water”) and may refer to the founding of the royal seat in the central area around the Palace after previously having been in Toktahn (ibid.:157).

With the exception of conforming the spelling to Martin and Grube (2008), the foregoing is based on *Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens* by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:157). Their sources include Arnoldo González Cruz (1994) for the Temple 17 Panel and David Stuart and Stephen Houston (1994) for Toktahn.

There are only two references to the third king of Palenque in all the known inscriptions, one from the Tablet of the Temple of the Cross and one from the Temple 17 Tablet (Figure 23). This ruler’s name has also been spelled Butz’ah, and it is important to realize that the “j” in the current spelling is pronounced as in Spanish, with the raspy glottal sound of the Spanish letter *j*.

The left half of the name glyph at the top of this page (which comes from the Temple 17 Tablet) is read bu-tz’a-ja. The last syllable (represented glyphically by the moon sign) is “reversed” by the principles of the writing system to make Butz’aj. The right half of the glyph block reads SAK-ch[i]ku (with ku in brackets to represent that it is infixed in the chi sign). The hand representing the syllable chi is well known from the month sign Manik. Erik Boot (2000) has proposed that the name

*Figure 23. The Temple 17 Tablet (photo by Joel Skidmore).*
Butz’aj Sak Chiik means “Smoking Lark.”

Figure 24 shows the passage of the Temple of the Cross Tablet referring to Butz’aj Sak Chiik. It exactly parallels the passages from this same monument referring to the two previous rulers. After a Distance Number in the first three blocks (18 days, 1 month, 8 years, and one twenty-year period or k’atun) is the verb for “birth.” The next two glyph blocks (R5-S5) are the name of Butz’aj Sak Chiik. The left portion of R6 is read i, “and then,” while the right portion is the verb for accession, spelled SAK-HUUN-K’AL, but with the normal reading order modified to produce k’al sak huun, “the headband was tied (or held).” In the final two blocks are the Calendar Round date of the accession, 3 Etz’nab 11 Xul (9.2.12.6.18). Note that the Calendar Round for the birth date is missing, but it can be inferred by using the Distance Number to count backwards from the accession. Since there is no explicit tie to the Long Count (such as Casper’s celebration of the ninth bak’tun) it would not be possible to locate Butz’aj Sak Chiik precisely in time, since Calendar Round dates repeat every 52 years. But because this inscription follows Casper’s, with its clear Long Count date, and precedes another with equal clarity, we can be certain of Butz’aj Sak Chiik’s position in time.

The inscription from the Temple 17 Panel (Figure 25) begins with an Initial Series Introductory Glyph (A1) and a long count of 9 bak’tuns (B1), 2 k’atuns (A2), 15 tuuns (B2), 9 months (A3) and 2 days (B3)—or 9.2.15.9.2—leading to the Calendar Round date 9 Ik’ (A4) end of Yaxk’in (A8). On that day, Butz’aj Sak Chiik (B6) did something (B5) at Lakamha’ (A6). The exact reading of the verb is unclear, but it seems to have the sense of a making a dedication (Boot 2000). Lakamha’, literally “Big Water,” refers to the city of Palenque, as distinct from the kingdom, which was called Baak or Baakal (Schele and Mathews 1998). We have seen how the emblem glyph associated with the founder of the Palenque dynasty is read as “Divine Toktahn Ajaw” and how his successor Casper sometimes goes by this title in lieu of his regnal name. It is possible that Toktahn was the original seat of the dynasty, which was subsequently moved to Lakamha’ (in all probability the area surrounding the Palace) by Butz’aj Sak Chiik.

Note for more advanced students: SAK-chi-ku is transliterated as Sak Chiik. The double “i” in Chiik is an epigraphic convention intended to indicate that the vowel is “complex.” In ancient Mayan it might, for instance, have been long, meaning that the normal short-i sound was extended or prolonged. The hieroglyphics experts realized that the Maya scribes were signaling vowel complexity because the phonetic complement -ku has a different vowel than the syllable which it complements, chi. As noted previously, the consonant of a phonetic complement is intended primarily to indicate how the end of the word that it complements is to be pronounced, in this case signaling the k sound at the end of Chiik. But secondarily, if the vowel of a phonetic complement is different from the vowel of the preceding syllable, this indicates vowel complexity in the preceding syllable. This is the principle of disharmony, a term originally coined by the great Russian epigrapher Knorosov, who made the essential breakthrough in cracking the Maya hieroglyphic code. David Stuart, Stephen Houston, and John Robertson discovered the principle by which disharmony indicates vowel complexity (Houston et al. 1998). The exact nature of this complexity in any given case is still a matter of debate. There are four possibilities: long vowel, internal velar (raspy glottal h sound), reduplicated vowel (where the vowel is repeated with a glottal stop in between), or preconsonantal glottal. In the current instance these would be illustrated orthographically as Chiik, Chihk, Chi’ik and Chi’k. While the exact nature of the complexity is being debated, many epigraphers are using a doubled letter—technically the convention for a long vowel—to stand for a complex vowel in general.
AHKAL MO’ NAHB I
Fourth in the known Palenque sequence


Also known as Chaacal I and Akul Anab I.

Born 9.1.10.0.0 5 Ajaw 3 Sek (July 5, 465).

Acceded: 9.3.6.7.17 5 Kaban 0 Sotz’ (June 3, 501).

Died 9.4.10.4.17 5 Kaban 5 Mak (November 29, 524).

Reigned AD 501-524.

Brother: Butz’aj Sak Chiik?

The Temple 17 Panel mentions this ruler together with his immediate predecessor Butz’aj Sak Chiik in connection with some sort of dedication ritual that seems to mark the removal of the royal seat from Toktahn to Lakamha’ (Martin and Grube 2008:157). Butz’aj Sak Chiik still had a decade to rule on the AD 490 date of the event, and Ahkal Mo’ Nahb is referred to on the monument with the title *ch’ok* “youth, prince” (ibid.:157). The fact that the two were born only a few years apart suggests that the succession passed from brother to brother rather than father to son (ibid.:157).

For some reason still unaccounted for, the extensive dynastic records of the later ruler K’inich Janaab Pakal begin with Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I rather than the dynasty founder K’uk’ Bahlam I (ibid.:157).

That there were troubled times for the Palenque kingdom attendant upon or just subsequent to the death of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I is suggested by the fact that his successor had long since come of age yet did not accede until four years later (ibid.:158).

The foregoing is based on *Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens* by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:157-158). Their sources include David Stuart (1999b) for our current understanding of this ruler’s name.

The birth of the fourth Palenque ruler coincided with a major period ending. 9.1.10.0.0 was the exact halfway point of the twenty-years between 9.1.0.0.0 and 9.2.0.0.0. Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I acceded 36 years later. He is the first Palenque ruler for whom we have a date of death as well as birth and accession. He was just over 59 when he died. Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I and the two other Palenque rulers who bore this name have been variously referred to as Akul Anab, Chaacal, Cauac-Uinal, and Chaac. And the name could change again as the hieroglyphics experts and linguists make further advances.

The name glyphs in Figure 26 and Figure 27a are read *a-ku-la MO’-na-bi* as a result of David Stuart’s revised decipherment (1999a). Previously they had been read *a-ku-la a-na-bi*, to make Akul Anab.

Figure 26. Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s name glyphs from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions (A12-B12).
But Stuart suggested that the bird’s beak on the left side of the second glyph block was that of a macaw rather than a parrot, as had been previously thought (Stuart 1999a). Macaw is mo’ in Mayan, while the parrot beak represents the syllable a, so Anab became Mo’ Nab. Or rather it became Mo’ Nahb in the spelling employed by Martin and Grube (2008), with the “infixed” or preconsonantal h indicating a complex vowel, as demanded by the principal of disharmony.13

In Figure 27b is another spelling of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s name, this one from the Sarcophagus of Pakal the Great. Here syllabic na-bi has been replaced with the logogram for nahb, the water lily. (A logogram is a sign that conveys an entire word, rather than just a syllable. In this case, a water lily blossom represents the word nahb, “water lily.”) This is another case where the normal reading order is changed somewhat, to a-ku-la-MO’-NAHB. (The ku—not labeled in the drawing—is in the

13 Note for advanced students: The principle of disharmony is described most fully in a paper by Stephen Houston, David Stuart, and John Robertson entitled “Disharmony in Maya Hieroglyphic Writing: Linguistic Change and Continuity in Classic Society” (Houston et al. 1998). Disharmony affects the transcription of both a-ku-la and MO’-na-bi. A turtle head sometimes substitutes for a-ku, and the Mayan word for “turtle” is ak or ahk (depending on dialect and historical reconstruction of the original, or proto-Mayan language, and its descendant, the language of the hieroglyphic texts). David Stuart realized that the phonetic complement ku in the syllabic spelling, in addition to supplying the k, might be indicating a disharmonic spelling. (A spelling is disharmonic when the vowel of the phonetic complement is different from the vowel in the word being produced. In this case, the u in -ku is different than the a in the word for turtle. Synharmony, by contrast, pertains when both vowels are the same, as would have been represented in this case by the spelling a-ka.)

The ancient Maya scribes used disharmonic spellings to indicate a complex vowel in the word being formed. In this case, if indeed the -ku is intended to signal disharmony, the word for turtle would be aak, ahk, a’ak or a’k rather than ak. Judging by the development of modern Mayan languages, we would pick ahk from these choices, and we are almost certain that the ancient Maya pronounced the word with an internal velar h sound. That is why David Stuart (1999a, 2005) proposed the spelling Ahkal.

Complicating the matter is the existence of a spelling of “turtle” as a-ka in the inscriptions of Tonina. Here the synharmony results in ak, not ahk. This suggests that, no matter how they actually pronounced the word for turtle, the scribes did not spell it with a complex vowel. This has led Søren Wichmann and Alfonso Lacadena to propose that the u in a-ku-la must have a value of its own, since it is not signaling disharmony. Thus the name would have been Akul rather than Ahkal. Or rather it would have been Akuul, since the a in the phonetic complement -la is disharmonic and would have signaled the complex vowel represented by the double-u.

Further, Wichmann and Lacadena believe that the ancient Maya never spelled velar h. Thus the disharmony of na-bi would produce the complex vowel of naab, na’ab or na’h, but never nahb. And therefore the Palenque rulers’ name would be Akuul Mo’ Naab (or Akuul Mo’ Naahb, where the complex vowel is represented by the long a while the h is written to reflect the *nahb form reconstructed for the proto-Mayan language by Kaufman and Norman [1984]).

Wichmann and Lacadena argue that consonant+i complemented by consonant+u always produces the long vowel represented by the double-u in Naab. Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube are not as certain, but in the first edition of Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens (Martin and Grube 2000) they also used the spelling Naab in order to indicate that the vowel has a complexity of some yet-to-be-determined sort. David Stuart is considering the implications of the a-ka example from Tonina, but finds the evidence of both epigraphy and linguistics too equivocal to disprove velar-h. And Martin and Grube (2008) now defer to Stuart’s spelling of the name Ahkal Mo’ Nahb in Stuart 2005.
Figure 27c presents another variant spelling of Ahkal Mo' Nahb, also from the Sarcophagus of Pakal. In this case we see the full form of the *nahb* water lily logogram, composed of a “spotted winal” with a water lily blossom on top of it. The word Ahkal is “underspelled” since the -*la* is absent and must be inferred.

The instance of the name in Figure 27d, from the Temple of the Cross Tablet, is damaged by erosion, but you can make out the macaw’s beak (MO’) on top of the sign for the syllable na. Thus we have *a-ku-la MO’-na-bi*, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb.

Martin and Grube (2008:156) illustrate this ruler’s name with a glyph from the Temple 17 Tablet (Figure 28), which we would transcribe as *a-ku-la MO’ NAHB*.¹⁴

The Temple of the Cross Tablet records the birth and accession of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb (Figure 29). First we see a distance number of 17 days, 7 months, 16 years and 1 k’atun—the “1” being represented by a thumb, the first digit used by the Maya in counting (Marc Zender, personal communication 2000). The verb for birth is at S9, followed by its Calendar Round date, 5 Ajaw 3 Sek. The name of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb is at R11, while at S11 is the verb referring to the white headband of rulership which was tied or held, either by or for him (R12). This occurred on 5 Kaban 0 Sotz’. (To the left of the bat representing the solar month sign Sotz’ at R13 is a sign that means “the seating of.” The Maya thought of the last day of any given month of twenty days as being the seating of the following month. In this case, the seating of Sotz’ occurred on the twentieth day of the preceding month, Sip. Instead of writing this as 20 Sip, we write it as 0 Sotz’ in order to make it correspond to the way the Maya conceptualized it.)

As we have seen, distance numbers are added to or subtracted from Long Count dates to arrive at other such dates. In the present inscription, the distance number counts forward from Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s birth on 9.1.10.0.0 to arrive at his accession on 9.3.6.7.17. Long Count dates enumerate the number of days that have elapsed since the Maya

---

¹⁴ Note for advanced students: Martin and Grube (2008:156) transcribe this glyph as *a-ku-AL MO’ NAHB*. To account for their -*AL*, we must introduce yet another complicated concept into the discussion. Astute readers will have noted that in David Stuart’s model, the *ku* in *a-ku-la* works disharmonically with the *a* to make *akh*, while the *la* must be somehow “reversed” to make the -*al* ending of Ahkal. To explain this phenomenon, Stuart and Stephen Houston have posited the principal of “morphosyllables.” They suggest that, for instance, the upside-down *ajaw* heads that are customarily read as the syllable *la* were originally a logogram *AL*, which became the syllable *la* while retaining its logographic function in certain contexts. Thus the transcription *a-ku-AL*.

The spelling Mo’ results from the fact that no Mayan word starts or ends with a vowel (other than certain parts of speech which can appear in compound word formations and complicate the situation). The apostrophe represents the Mayan consonant known as a “glottal stop”—an explosive sound made in the back of the throat. Thus Mo’ ends with a consonant, as expressed by the apostrophe, and, technically speaking, Ahkal begins with one (this would be represented by spelling it ‘Ahkal). When spoken properly you can hear the glottal stop at the end of Mo’, but there is no comparable sound produced at the beginning of ‘Ahkal. Epigraphers have decided not to use this initial apostrophe in spellings for the public, such as those of the rulers’ names, because it only results from the technicality that the word should start with a consonant.
Creation in 3114 B.C. They begin with a period of 400 years that we refer to as a bak’tun, then record the number of k’atuns, years, months and days. (Thus Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s accession date of 9.3.6.7.17 counts 9 bak’tuuns, 3 k’atuns, 6 years, 6 months and 17 days since the beginning of time.) But distance numbers in the Maya texts appear in the opposite order. In the current text (Figure 29), the distance number is written 17 days, 7 months, 16 years and 1 k’atun. So in order to facilitate the mathematical calculation by which it is added to the Long Count, we reverse this and write it numerically 1.16.7.17.

Ahkal Mo’ Nahb is the first ruler for whom we have mentions other than in the text of the Temple of the Cross Tablet. Here in Figure 30 is the badly eroded beginning of the first panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions. It records that on the period ending of 9.4.0.0.0, 13 Ajaw 18 Yax, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb made an offering to his gods, GI, GII, and GIII, the deities known as the Palenque Triad.

“GI,” “GII,” and “GIII” are designations given by Heinrich Berlin to Palenque’s patron deities, whose names we still do not know for certain. J'um Nal Yé, “One Maize Revealed,” has been suggested for GI (Freidel, Schele and Parker 1993), but David Stuart (2005:161) considers this decipherment to be flawed. Unen K’awiil, “Baby K’awiil” seems secure for GII (Martin 2002), while all we can say about GIII’s name is that it begins with K’inich, “The Sun-god.”

The distance number at A10-B10 counts forward from this celebration to the accession of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I. At A11 is a verb similar to that which we saw for the “seating” of a month. Here it refers to the seating on the throne. At B11 is ta-HUUN-na, where huun (the long vowel indicated by the disharmonic suffix -na) is the headband of rulership. Here the eroded portrait head may be that of the Jester God, also known as Huun or Huunal.

The Distance Number of 13 years, 10 months and 3 days must be either added to or subtracted from the long count date 9.4.0.0.0. Subtracting it leads back to 9.3.6.7.17. And if we look up the Calendar Round for this date, we find it to be 5 Kaban 0 Sotz’, which we saw in connection with Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s accession on the Temple of the Cross Tablet. Thus we can be sure of the Long Count date for that reference as well (Schele and Mathews 1993:46).
The Rulers of Palenque

The Temple 17 Panel (Figure 31) indicates that Ahkal Mo’ Nahb may have served as witness to the re-founding of Palenque in a new location. As we saw before in discussing this ruler’s predecessor, the glyph at B5 may refer to the “dedication” of Lakamha’ (A6) by Butz’aj Sak Chiik (B6). As Erik Boot explains (2000), the verb in the first half of A7, yi-ta-hi, can be translated “he looked on (to him)” or “he observed him.” The person observing Butz’aj Sak Chiik as (apparently) he dedicated the kingdom of Palenque in a new location is identified in the next glyphs. The second half of A7 is often translated as “youth,” although Kathryn Josserand has suggested a more accurate sense of “emergent one” (David Stuart, personal communication 2000). B7 reads a-ku-la-MO’-NAHB, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb. In the reading by Erik Boot, the inscription continues: “(On 9.3.6.7.17 at) 5 Kaban [A8] 0 Sotz’ [B8], then he receives the white headband [C1] on his head [D1], Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I [C2], Divine Lord of Palenque [D2].”

On 9.3.13.15.7 10 Manik’ (Figure 32, C8) 15 Ch’en (D8) (September 24, 508), Ahkal Mo’ Nahb supervised the accession to office of a K’an Tok lord. The full accession formula, beginning with the “flat hand” at C9 of Figure 32 and continuing through D9, reads K’AL-ja HUUN tu-ba-hi ta-AJAW-wa ?-o-wa-li, k’ahlaj huun t-u-baah ta-ajaw ...o’-o’-il (Marc Zender, personal communication 2003), where the question mark represents the undeciphered term that David Stuart (2005) refers to as the “banded bird title.” At C10 is the name of the acceding individual and then his title (D10), K’AN-to-ko wa-WE’-la, the first part being K’an Tok and the second being the as-yet-undeciphered title of these subsidiary lords. Based on the work of David Stuart, Marc Zender (2000) translates WE’ as “to eat bread-like foods (i.e. tamales).” He suggests (personal communication 2001) that the K’an Tok lords may have been officiants at feasting rituals of the sort that Dorie Reents-Budet (2000) has documented as an important aspect of Maya court life.

There is reason to believe that Ahkal Mo’ Nahb may have been behind the expansion of the Palenque realm onto the Tabasco plain. Rulers of site of Tortuguero are known to have carried the same “Bone” emblem glyph as Palenque in the Late Classic when we have inscriptions from that site dating to the time of Pakal the Great. And an inscription from Tortuguero looks back to a lord named Ahkal K’uk’ from the same era as Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I, suggesting that Tortuguero may have been founded by a branch of the Palenque dynasty around AD 510 (Martin and Grube 2000:165).

The final piece of biographical information for Ahkal Mo’ Nahb is the statement of his death from the Sarcophagus of Pakal. The right half of the glyph block in Figure 36b is the spelling of his name, a-ku-(la) MO’-NAHB, that we have seen before, with the full form of the nahb water lily to the right of the macaw beak (the water lily blossom appearing on top of the “spotted winal”).
The left half of the glyph block has the verb **OCH** on top of the syllable **bi**. In Mayan, **och** means “to enter,” while **bih** means “road.” “He entered the road” is a way of saying “he died.”

The Sarcophagus lid gives the date for this as 5 Kaban 5 Mak (9.4.10.4.17 or November 29, 524) (Figure 33a). This Calendar Round occurred about 24 years after the accession of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb. So we know that he was born in 467, acceded in 501, celebrated the k’atun ending in 514, and died in 524, aged about 59 years. We also know that he was born about six years after the previous ruler, Butz’aj Sak Chiik. The proximity of birth dates suggests that they might have been brothers. Butz’aj Sak Chiik became ruler when he was about 28 years old. If he died a few months before his brother acceded (the normal interregnum at Palenque), he would have been about 42 at death. Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I, who was about six years younger, then ruled for twenty-three years.

Ahkal Mo’ Nahb is portrayed on the east side of Pakal’s Sarcophagus (Figure 34). It is interesting to speculate why he should be the first of the dynastic ancestors depicted here and in the inscriptions on the Sarcophagus lid, while the dynastic founder and the two kings who succeeded him are omitted. Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2000) points out that Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I is the first Palenque ruler to bear the Palenque emblem glyph rather than being identified as a lord of Toktahn. Guenter suggests that Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I was the first ruler to move from Toktahn to Lakamha’, the flat area near the Palace. The next king, K’an Joy Chitam I, is associated inscriptionally with a childhood event that took place in Toktahn. This would have taken place before Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I moved the royal center.

In the Sarcophagus sculpture, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb can be identified visually by the macaw beak in his headdress. He is also named in a hieroglyphic caption, together with the “wavy-bone” variant of the Palenque emblem glyph. The reader may consider to what extent this is likely to be a realistic depiction of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I, because he died in the year 524 and the Sarcophagus was not carved until sometime around Pakal’s death in 683.
This king’s rulership seems to have begun in troubled times for the Palenque kingdom; although he had long since come of age when his predecessor died, he did not accede until four years later, when he was thirty-nine (Martin and Grube 2008:158).

K’an Joy Chitam’s heir apparent seems to have been established when he was but five-and-a-half years old, when he received a junior title in a ceremony at Toktahn in AD 496 (ibid.:158). This was six years after the “dedication” of Lakamha’, suggesting that court functions still took place at the earlier royal seat (ibid.:158).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:158). Their sources include David Stuart (personal communication 1998) for the “tooth-ache bundle” in this ruler’s name glyph reading hoy/joy.

The fifth ruler of Palenque did not take the throne until four years after the death of his predecessor. We know that Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I died in December of 524, while K’an Joy Chitam did not accede until February 25, 529. This interregnum is long by Palenque standards—usually the time differential between one king’s death and the next king’s accession is a matter of months. It was not because Palenque was waiting for K’an Joy Chitam to come of age, since he was already 39 when he acceded. The biography of K’an Joy Chitam I is also significant for the fact that he lived to be almost seventy-five, a ripe old age by Precolumbian standards. His long life and long reign (36 years), together with achievements unknown to us, seem to have earned him the high regard of his successors. He is mentioned in the inscriptions of K’inich Janaab Pakal I, K’inich Kan Bahlam II, and K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III (in the recently discovered texts of Temple 19).

K’an Joy Chitam was previously referred to as K’an Hoy Chitam, the “H” in Hoy clueing the pronunciation for English speakers, who may be excused for injecting a little too much “joy” into the current spelling of this ruler’s name. The hieroglyphics experts are trying to arrive at a consistent spelling system in order to minimize confusion in the long run. The advantage of representing the Spanish “jota” or j-sound in the place of English h is that it is a better guide to how the given word was actually pronounced by the ancient Maya. When authentically spoken, the “Joy” in K’an Joy Chitam starts with a raspy velar sound, being produced in the back of the mouth on the velum, or soft palate.
K’an Joy Chitam has also been referred to as K’an Hok’ Chitam, Kan-Xul, and Hok. All of these names arise from the reading of what has been dubbed the “toothache glyph,” number T684c in Thompson’s 1962 catalog. This was originally read as hok’, but when Linda Schele began to have doubts about this reading she decided to disregard the bundle-knot altogether in naming this ruler. Instead she referenced the k’an-cross and the rodent from the month sign Xul, to arrive at Kan-Xul. But then confidence was regained in the reading hok’. And Nikolai Grube read the three balls at the bottom of the glyph as the phonetic complement ma, which meant that the name of the animal must end in m. The peccary, chitam, has just the sort of blunt nose depicted. These developments led to K’an Hok’ Chitam, which was changed to K’an Hoy Chitam when the reading of the “toothache” glyph was further refined. And finally, as previously noted, Hoy was changed to Joy (with the Spanish j-sound) to convey a better sense of the actual Mayan pronunciation.

Figure 35 presents a key to the reading of K’an Joy Chitam’s name: K’AN-na JOY[CHITAM]-ma. The k’an-cross sign is a logogram conveying an entire word rather than just a syllable, so it is transcribed in capital letters: K’AN. We can be confident of this reading because the final n is indicated by the phonetic complement na. The bundle-knot on top of and encircling the peccary’s head is the logogram JOY, while the rodent itself is the logogram CHITAM. This is transcribed in brackets—[CHITAM]—to indicate that it is infixed within the sign for JOY. Finally, the phonetic complement ma clues the final consonant m of CHITAM. The name can be translated as “Yellow (or Precious) Tied Peccary” (Martin and Grube 2008), or “Yellow (or Precious) Young Peccary” (Marc Zender, personal communication 2000).15

The Temple of the Cross Tablet gives us the dates for the birth and accession of K’an Joy Chitam (Figure 36). The passage begins with a Distance Number of 16 days, 6 months, 19 tuns, and 1 k’atun. (A tun is the Maya solar year of 360 days. It is more properly spelled tuun, with a long vowel.) This counts forward from the birth of K’an Joy Chitam to his accession on 5 K’an 12 K’ayab (R17-S17). The verb for “birth” is at R15, followed by the ruler’s name at S15. R16 is transcribed in the normal reading order i-SAK-HUUN-K’AL, but the proper grammatical order is i k’al sak huun, literally “then it was tied (held), the white headband.” The next glyph block is tu-u-baah, “on his head.” The two blocks together refer to the accession to rulership. This occurred on 9.4.14.10.4, 5 K’an 12 K’ayab (February 25, 529). The date of birth is not given, but we can subtract the distance number from the accession date and look up the Calendar Round for the Long Count number that we arrive at (Schele and Mathews 1993:49). This is 9.2.15.3.8, 12 Lamat 6 Wo (May 4, 490). So K’an Joy Chitam acceded when he was about 39 years old.

An eroded passage from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscrip-

15 Recently, Erik Boot (personal communications, May/June 2001) has proposed two emendations to our understanding of this ruler’s name: Firstly, he has pointed out that in the western Maya region kitam was likely to have been the variant for chitam (note spellings ka-ba > kab “earth,” k’a-ma > k’am “to receive”). Secondly, whereas the general rule is that color terms come before other adjectives modifying a noun, in this case k’an is modifying only the kitam part of the name rather than the entire name; thus: Joy K’an Kitam.
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tions (Figure 37) ties the accession of K’an Joy Chitam to a Period Ending. The last glyph of the passage (D6) reads “the 5th k’atun” (note the bar for the number five lying sideways on top of the k’atun symbol). This would be 9.5.0.0.0, as confirmed by the Calendar Round 11 Ajaw 18 Sek (D5-C6). Starting with this date and subtracting the Distance Number of 16 days, 7 months, and 5 tuuns (D1-C2), we arrive at 9.4.14.10.4, 5 K’an 12 K’ayab, which we recognize as K’an Joy Chitam’s accession date from the Temple of the Cross Tablet. K’an Joy Chitam also celebrated a Period Ending on 9.6.0.0.0 and possibly also 9.5.17.0.0 and 9.6.10.0.0, and he may have participated in an unknown event on 9.5.17.17.3 (Schele and Mathews 1993; Wald 1999). But the eroded condition of the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions makes it difficult to be certain.

We know of another event from the life of K’an Joy Chitam from a Temple of the Sun inscription that we looked at previously, while discussing Toktahn (Figure 38a). On 9.3.1.15.0 12 Ajaw 8 Keh (November 19, 496) he participated in an event or ceremony that seems to have been reserved for royal heirs. He was about five and a half years old at the time. Glyphs P3-Q3 read K’AL-wa-ny ta-‘OOK-TE’le, k’al-wan-

Figure 37. Passage from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions.

Figure 38. (a) Passage from the Temple of the Sun Tablet. (b) Passage from the West Panel of the Temple 19 Platform (drawing by David Stuart).

We know of another event from the life of K’an Joy Chitam from a Temple of the Sun inscription that we looked at previously, while discussing Toktahn (Figure 38a). On 9.3.1.15.0 12 Ajaw 8 Keh (November 19, 496) he participated in an event or ceremony that seems to have been reserved for royal heirs. He was about five and a half years old at the time. Glyphs P3-Q3 read K’AL-wa-ny ta-‘OOK-TE’le, k’al-wan-

Thanks to the 1999 discoveries in Temple 19, we know that K’an Joy Chitam was still remembered by much later generations of Palenque rulers. The West Panel inscription from the Temple 19 Platform begins with a date from his reign, 7 Ajaw 8 K’ayab (Figure 38b, glyphs A1-B1) 9.6.7.0.0 (February 11, 561). As explained by David Stuart (2005:91-92, 194, 199), the verb (at B2) is PAT-wa-ni, pat-wan, “it is fashioned, built,” and the object fashioned is yo-ko-bi-li, y-ok(i) b-il, “his okib” (A3). Stuart suggests that the undeciphered word okib might refer to the Temple 19 platform itself, or rather a similar object that existed in the time of K’an Joy Chitam. The owner of the okib is named in the next two glyphs (B3-A4) as YAX-ITZAM?-AAT TUUN-AJAW. At block B4 is another verb, U-CHOK?-CH’AJ-jii, u-chok-ch’aj-ij, “he throws (scatters) incense upon it.” And finally at A5-B5 comes the name of the person performing this action, K’an Joy Chitam, Holy Lord of Baakal. Thus K’an Joy Chitam consecrated the dedication of the okib of Yax Itzam Aat Tuun Ajaw by the casting and burning of incense (Stuart 2005:91).
The same Yax Itzam Aat Tuun Ajaw would appear to be named in another inscription from Palenque, from the North Sanctuary jamb panel of the Temple of the Sun (Stuart 2005:93) (Figure 39a and b). This gives a parentage statement for the Palenque ruler K’ínich Kan Bahlam II, saying that he is the son of K’ínich Janaab Pakal (p3 in Figure 39a) and Ix Tz’akbu Ajaw (p6). At p7 is the glyph that David Stuart has deciphered as U-MAM-ma, u-mam, “his maternal grandfather,” and then the following glyphs name the grandfather of K’ínich Kan Bahlam as YAX-ITZAM?-ti (p8) TUUN-AJAW (p9) o-ki-bi (p10) AJ-3-K’UH (p11), with the AAT from the Temple 19 Yax Itzam Aat name possibly conflated in some way with the ITZAM? glyph, as suggested by the -ti suffix (Stuart 2005:94).

What, if anything, does this tell us about K’an Joy Chitam? Before answering this question, we need to consider a few more pieces of information about the Temple 19 inscription and the ruler who commissioned it, K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III. We’ll revisit some of this information when we come to that ruler, but for now it is sufficient to note that glyphs on the Temple 19 platform refer to him as Okib K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb (Figure 39c), while his name caption on the even more recently discovered inscription from Temple 21—in many ways a companion monument to the Temple 19 platform—reads, “Okib was his ch’ok name, K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb” (Figure 39d). The Temple 21 monument states that this ruler’s mother, Ix Kinuw Mat came from a site called Uxte’ K’uuh (Figure 39e), a place name that also occurs, together with Okib, in the name of the figure depicted in the scene on the West Panel of the Temple 19 Platform, Salaj Bolon Okib Aj Uxte’ K’uuh (Figure 39f). In some as yet unexplained way, these disparate pieces of information may be seen to come together in the name of Yax Itzam Aat Tuun Ajaw Okib Aj Uxte’ K’uuh, the grandfather of K’ínich Kan Bahlam II (and the great-grandfather of K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III). Therefore it may be reasonable to conclude that this ancestor is being featured in the opening inscription on the West Panel of the Temple 19 Platform, and that K’an Joy Chitam is mentioned because he presided over the ceremony as the reigning monarch.

We have the date of K’an Joy Chitam’s death from the Sarcophagus of Pakal the
Great—9.6.11.0.16 7 Kib 4 K’yab (February 6, 565) (Figure 40). On the left of the second glyph block is the verbal expression OCH-bi, och bih, “he entered the road (i.e., he died).” On the right side is the ruler’s name, with the K’AN sign and a na phonetic complement superimposed on top of the JOY bundle-knot enwrapping the CHITAM peccary. As indicated previously, K’an Joy Chitam lived to be almost seventy-five.

The portrait of K’an Joy Chitam I from the west side of the Sarcophagus of K’inich Janaab Pakal (Figures 41 and 42a) can be identified by his peccary (chitam) headdress, with a k’an cross in the eye. Also his name appears in a hieroglyphic caption, followed by the rabbit-skull variant of the Palenque emblem glyph. “K’an Joy Chitam’s face has the heavy, squarish look of a stockily built person,” observes Merle Greene Robertson (1983). Comparing this portrait with that of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, for instance (Figure 42b), does suggest that the artist has portrayed a particular physical type, perhaps even a particular individual. As K’an Joy Chitam died in the year 565 and Pakal’s Sarcophagus was not carved until sometime around his death in 683, it might seem unlikely that anyone remembered what he looked like. But we have a portrait of the earlier ruler, Casper, on a travertine vase (Figure 21), and it is not unlikely that there were portraits of other rulers on paper or ceramics.
This king followed his grandfather on the throne with one intervening ruler. Because he shared his grandfather’s name, some inscriptions that at first appear to refer to him by his own name are actually calling him *u mam ahkal mo’ nahb*, “the grandson of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb” (Martin and Grube 2008:158).

Enthroned eighty-five days after the death of the long-reigning K’an Joy Chitam I, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II himself ruled for just under five years (ibid.:158).

The foregoing is based on *Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens* by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:158). Their sources include David Stuart (personal communication 1999) for the *mam* reading.

The inscriptions devoted to the sixth ruler of Palenque are in exact parallel with the last two rulers that we have looked at. The Temple of the Cross Tablet refers to the birth of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II and provides the date of accession—9.6.11.5.1, 1 Imix 4 Sip (May 2, 565). A Distance Number permits us to calculate the birth date—9.4.9.0.4, 7 K’an 17 Mol (September 3, 523). The text of the Temple of the Inscriptions records a period ending celebrated by this ruler, with a Distance Number that counts back to his accession, confirming the evidence from the Temple of the Cross. The Sarcophagus of Pakal the Great gives us the death date for Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II—9.6.16.10.7 9 Manik’ 5 Yaxk’in (July 21, 570). So he acceded when he was 41 and ruled only five years before dying.

In Figure 43 we see the name of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II from the Temple of the Inscriptions. It is transcribed *a-ku-la MO’-na-bi*. (The syllabic signs are lowercase: a, ku (sometimes referred to as the Kawak sign, from its appearance in that calendric day name), la, na, and bi. The macaw beak *MO’* is uppercase because it is a logogram, conveying an entire word rather than just a syllable.)
For a complete discussion of the name, see Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I.16

The passage from the Temple of the Cross Tablet regarding Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II (Figure 44) reads, “Seventeen days, 4 months, two years, and two k’atun’s from when he was born (U2), then the white headband was tied (T3) by him (U3), [name] [relationship] Ahkal Mo’ Nahb (T5), on 1 Imix 4 Sip.” (There is still some controversy about whether the sak huun, the white headband of rulership, was tied or held, on, for, or by the ruler.) We can’t read the name at T4. Apparently this was the pre-accession name of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, in other words his name before he became king and adopted the name of a previous ruler. On the Palace Tablet and elsewhere, the Late Classic ruler who took the name of the first K’an Joy Chitam, is identified by a combination of his pre-accession and regnal names. Something similar is at work here. But the glyph at U4 can now be read as u-mam, a relationship expression meaning “his grandfather/grandson,” as deciphered by David Stuart (2005:93) and written up an unpublished article that can be downloaded from his weblog (Stuart 2007). Thus, the inscription is identifying Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II by his grandfather’s name, saying, in effect, “he acceded as king, the grandson of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I.” Note that the Calendar Round of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II’s birth is not recorded on the Temple of the Cross Tablet, but the distance number permits us to calculate it.

Because the passage from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions (Figure 45) parallels the information for other rulers, we can reconstruct the meaning of the eroded glyphs. At H4-H5 is a Distance Number of 19 days, 12 months, and 1 tuun (or 360-day year). This counts forward from the accession of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II to the period ending of 9.6.13.0.0, 9 Ajaw 18 Muwan. G6 is transcribed CHUM-[mu]-wa-ni-ya (the mu is in brackets because it is infixed within the sign for CHUM). This is transliterated chumwani(y) and translated “he was seated” (Wald 1999). H6 is ta-HUUN-na, ta huun, “with the headband.” Together G6 and H6 are another way of expressing accession. At G7 is the ch’ok “youth” or pre-accession name of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb that we saw from the Temple of the Cross inscription. It is quite noteworthy that his rulership name is absent in this context. Instead we have the u-mam, “grandfather/grandson” expression at H7. The name of the grandfather, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb.

16 In an email dated November 26, 2000, Marc Zender adds the following: To the discussion regarding changes to this name, I would add four things for a larger historical perspective: (1) some very late inscriptions (on pottery, for instance) do use the “macaw” beak as an allograph for a, and many of us made the mistake of projecting this late alternation back in time without evidence; (2) the well-known a-na-bi title was considered to be a substitution for the MO’-na-bi portion of the name, and the somewhat “loose” early readings of the central portion of Pakal the Great’s name as Aj-na-bi only reinforced this unfortunate misconception; (3) even in the midst of all of these misleading connections, David Stuart, myself and others were already considering the “macaw” beak as an occasional MO’ because of substitutions of the same beak for the macaw head in the inscriptions of Copan (in the Mo’-Wits or “macaw mountain” toponym); (4) the “clincher,” however, was the discovery of the more complete Temple XIX spellings, where the same alternation between the “macaw” beak and the entire Macaw Head appeared. This, coupled with the realization that Pakal the Great’s ja-na-bi and the other a-na-bi titles were not related, assured us that this beak was MO’ and MO’ alone throughout most of the Classic period. There’s even more baggage (some of it still quite popular) attached to this terrible little warning story, but that’s best saved for a future article.
I, is implicit. G8 shows a “flat hand” like that which we have seen in the k’al sak huun expression for accession. Here it is holding a Kawak sign with a -ni suffix, which converts the Kawak sign from syllabic ku into the word tuun, “year.” This is a common expression for period-ending celebrations. Despite the erosion, we know that this is the reading because of the context, since H9 refers to 13 tuuns. And the Calendar Round 9 Ajaw 13 Muwan (H8-G9) fits with the thirteenth tuun seating 9.6.13.0.0. Thirteen was a sacred number to the Maya, so they celebrated the seating of the thirteenth tuun as well as more obvious (to us) intervals like the tenth (half-way through the k’atun). This particular period ending was chosen for the inscription regarding Ahkal Mo’ Nahb because he did not live to the k’atun seating of 9.7.0.0.0.

On the left in Glyph 21 from the Sarcophagus of Pakal the Great (Figure 46), OCH-bi is transliterated och bih, literally “he entered the road,” metaphorically “he died.” On the right is the name of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II: the syllables a and ku (with la implied) over the logograms MO’ and NAHB, hence a-ku-(la)-MO’-NAHB. Since there is no u-mam expression referencing his grandfather, it is clear that he took Ahkal Mo’ Nahb as his own regnal name. Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II is not depicted on the side of the Sarcophagus like the two rulers before him. This may be because he did not leave an heir in the direct line of dynastic descent. Instead of a son following him on the throne, he was almost certainly succeeded by his brother. (See the next ruler, K’an Bahlam I.)

KAN BAHLAM I
Seventh in the known Palenque sequence


Also known as Chan-Bahlum I.

Born: 9.4.10.1.5 11 Chikchan 13 Ch’en (September 18, 524).

Acceded: 9.6.18.5.12 10 Eb 0 Wo (April 6, 572).

Died: 9.7.9.5.5 11 Chikchan 3 K’ayab (February 1, 583).

Reigned 572-583.

Brother: Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II?

Kan Bahlam I followed Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II on the throne of Palenque in AD 572. Because they were born just a year apart, it is probable that they were brothers (Martin and Grube 2008:158).

This ruler is the first Palenque king known to have employed the k’inich “radiant” appellative of the Sun God as an honorific element of his own name (ibid.:159).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:158-159).
The seventh ruler of Palenque was forty-seven years old when he came to the throne, on April 8, 572 (9.6.18.5.12, 10 Eb 0 Wo). This was almost two full years after the previous ruler, his brother Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I, died. The name glyph of Kan Bahlam (Figure 47) combines elements of a snake and a jaguar; the curving vertical lines coming up from the bottom of the head represent the belly scales of a snake, while the tongue and eye are those of a snake as well.

Kan Bahlam was originally called Chan-Bahlum because this is “Snake-Jaguar” in modern Ch’ol, a Mayan language spoken in the environs of Palenque today. But a glyph from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions (Figure 48) shows a phonetic prefix that signals a reading of KAN rather than CHAN. The sign in question is the fish fin, representing the syllable ka, on the snake-jaguar’s forehead. This contributes the k in KAN. Kan is “snake” in Yukatek Mayan, and Yukatekan words show up in the inscriptions of Palenque because “there was close language contact between Ch’olan and Yukatekan speakers in the northwest lowlands during Classic times, if not earlier” (Stuart 2000). The phonetic complement ma signals that the two words being spelled together probably ended with m, so we suspect that this ruler’s name was Kan Bahlam, not Bahlam Kan.

Kan Bahlam I is the final ancestor mentioned in the inscriptions of the Temple of the Cross Tablet, a monument commissioned by his dynastic namesake, Kan Bahlam II (Figure 49). He is introduced with a sudden variation in the pattern of the narrative whereby a Distance Number of between 25

---

17 It was Terry Kaufman who pointed out that the word for “jaguar” in the Classic Period was bahlam, not bahlum (Schele and Mathews 1993).

18 In the drawing, the jaguar-snake appears to have the logogram for WINIK, “person,” in its mouth (jaguars are not known to be man-killers, although some of their feline relatives have a taste for human flesh). Schele and Mathews (1993) suggest that the mouth holds the syllable na, as a phonetic complement to KAN. But Simon Martin (personal communication 2001) has determined from Maudslay’s casts of the inscription in the British Museum that the drawing is in error. What appeared to be something in the jaguar’s mouth is actually spots on its lower jaw.

19 While David Stuart’s point about Yukatekan words at Palenque is not necessarily intended to apply to kan “snake,” it may well do so. It is worth quoting Stuart at length for a better understanding of the general principle. Here he refers to a spelling on the stucco panel from Palenque’s Temple 19:

The spelling K’a-ma raises an important issue about linguistic variation in the Classic inscriptions. We are accustomed to reading this “receive” verb in its expected Ch’olan form ch’am, which has for several years been the more established value of the “ajaw-in-hand.” This was based originally on an example from Panel 2 from Piedras Negras, where the logograph takes the prefix ch’a- and the suffix -ma as phonetic complements, clearly indicating the Ch’olan pronunciation. K’am, however, is the Yukatecan cognate. The situation is not unique, for Palenque is unusual for its occasional use of Yukatekan spellings in place of expected Ch’olan forms. Other examples include zu-ku for zuku, “elder brother” (elsewhere spelled as Ch’olan za-ku, zakan) and ka-ba for kab, “earth” (in Ch’olan this would be chaib). These words alone do not indicate that Palenque was a Yukatekan site, for the overwhelming phonological and morphological patterns in Palenque’s inscriptions are decidedly Ch’olan (Houston, Robertson and Stuart, in press). Rather, such spellings are best seen as subtle indications of close language contact between Ch’olan and Yukatekan speakers in the northwest lowlands during Classic times, if not earlier. The same connection is reflected in Chontal, a Ch’olan language, where “earth” is kab instead of chaib (Kaufman and Norman 1984), exactly as indicated in Palenque’s texts. (Stuart 2000)

However, ancient Palenque’s predilection for borrowing words from Yukatekan is not the only way to account for the spelling of this ruler’s name. It has been suggested that kan was an ancient word for the Vision Serpent or a related supernatural, and a distinction is being made here between a common snake and a deity (Simon Martin, personal communication 2000).
and 42 years counts forward from the birth of a given ruler to his accession. Here we see the comparatively much smaller Distance Number of 1 day, 1 month, and 1 year (U6-T7) counting forward from the birth (U7) of the previous ruler, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II (T9), to another verb for birth rather than accession (U9). The glyphs U9 and T10 read “and then he was born Kan Bahlam.”

The short interval of just over a year between the births suggests that Ahkal Mo’ Nahb and Kan Bahlam were brothers, probably sons of the fifth Palenque ruler, K’an Joy Chitam I. The latter ruled for over 35 years and died at the advanced age of seventy-four. So his elder son Ahkal Mo’ Nahb did not inherit the throne until he was in his forties. When he died after ruling for only five years, his younger brother Kan Bahlam followed him on the throne. The Calendar Round date at the end of the passage, 7 Kan 17 Mol (U10-T11), is that associated with the birth of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb rather than Kan Bahlam, as might have been expected given the sentence structure.

The accession of Kan Bahlam I marks the second time since the dynasty’s founding in 431 that the succession seems to have passed from brother to brother rather than father to son (the previous instance being Butz’aj Sak Chiik and Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I). There would be further instances in years to come.

The change in formula that we saw in the previous passage signals what Kathryn Josserand (1991) has called the Peak Event of an inscription. The consistent linking of births to accessions in the text up to this point changed abruptly to the tying together of two birth dates. Now the rhythm of the text will be affected again by a change in syntax. Here we see what appears to be a return to the previous pattern of the inscription (Figure 50). A Distance Number of 7 days, 4 months, 8 tuuns, and 2 k’atuns (U11-U12) counts forward from the birth (T13) of Kan Bahlam (U13) on 9.4.10.1.5 (September 20, 524) 11 Chikchan 13 Ch’en (T14-U14). And then instead of the expected verb for accession, there immediately follows another Distance Number—2 days, 8 months, and 18 or 19 tuuns (T15-U15)—again apparently counting forward from the birth (T16) of Kan Bahlam (U16) to the expression for accession: “and then the white headband was tied onto his head of (or held for or by him)” (T17-U17).

We know from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions that Kan Bahlam acceded on 9.6.18.5.12, 10 Eb 0 Wo, and it turns out that the first of the two Distance Numbers here leads to that date. The other Distance Number leads to no other stated event. As Linda Schele has commented, “...it just hangs there in an incomplete sentence.” Schele continues, “In oral discourse peak events are often marked by hesitation, reversals of syntactical strategy, and other kinds of disturbances: here, the hanging sentence may be just such a disturbance. Certainly, it connects to no recorded date in the entire corpus of Palenque” (quoted in Wald 1999). Schele has also suggested that the shorter distance number must lead to an important pre-accession event such as an heir designation ceremony that did not have to be stated explicitly to an audience familiar with royal ritual and dynastic history (ibid.).

Figure 51 shows the reference to the reign of Kan Bahlam I from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions. Because it follows a
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formula of counting by a Distance Number from an accession date to a Period Ending, we are able to reconstruct most of the eroded portion. In this case, the Distance Number of 8 days, 12 months, and 1 tuun (I2-J2) counts from what must have been the seating verb at I3. This is confirmed by the next glyph (J3) which reads “with the headband,” because *chumwaniy ta huun*, “he was seated with the headband,” is the same statement for accession that we saw with the previous ruler. Kan Bahlam’s name must have followed at I4 because the syntax demands it and we see the Palenque emblem glyph at J4. The 7 Ajaw at J5 is a tip-off that we are looking at a k’atun ending, since all k’atuns start with an Ajaw date. We know that the previous ruler, Kan Bahlam’s brother Ahkal Mo’ Nahb celebrated the 9.6.13.0.0 Period Ending but did not live to see the end of that k’atun. Thus we are given to suspect that the observances for 9.7.0.0.0 would have been conducted by his successor. And in fact 7 Ajaw 3 K’an’k’in (J5-J6) is the Calendar Round for the Period Ending 9.7.0.0.0 (December 7, 573). If we subtract the Distance Number from this date, we arrive at a date of 9.6.18.5.12, 10 Eb 0 Wo for Kan Bahlam’s accession, which, as we saw, checks out against the longer of the two Distance Numbers from the Temple of the Cross Tablet. The present passage continues with the verb *ya-k’a-wa*, *yakaw*, “he offered it” (J6) U-PIK, *upik*, “the skirt(s), dressings (of)” (I7) U-K’UH-li, *uk’uhi*, “his gods” (J7). The 13 Ajaw 18 Keh Calendar Round at I10-J10 is the date of another Period Ending celebrated by this ruler, which occurred five years, or one-fourth of a k’atun, after 9.7.0.0.0, on 9.7.5.0.0. This calendric period was called U-HO’-TUUN-ni, *uho’tuun*, literally “the five year” (I12). The glyph at J11 seems to be the possessive U followed by the syllables pi-hi, for *pih*, “bundle” (Schele and Mathews 1993) but is actually U followed by the logogram PIK, *pik*, “skirt(s), dressings” (see Stuart [2005:166] for the PIK reading). These are possessed by the “gods of” (J12) Kan Bahlam (K1) “Divine Bone Lord” (L1). “Bone,” or Baak in Mayan, was the name of the ancient kingdom of Palenque—or it was the root of the name Baakal, which is how the kingdom’s name is spelled here: note the la suffix. (The sign to the right of the “wavy bone” is *wa*, a phonetic complement to *AJAW*).

Kan Bahlam is accorded two references on the Sarcophagus Lid of Pakal the Great. The Calendar Round of the first of these—7 Ajaw 3 K’an’k’in—is familiar to us from the Temple of the Inscriptions, where it was associated with the 9.7.0.0.0 k’atun ending (Figure 52). And here we see that the left half of the next glyph has infixed in its bottom element a symbol which occurs in the day-sign Kawak, distinguished by a y-shape which often looks like a bunch of grapes, and a semi-circle of dots around another semi-circular element. This can be the sign for *tuun* (“year”). Here it is conflated—or merged together—with another glyph which we’ve seen before in the accession verb *chum*, “seating.” Taken together this refers to a tuun seating, which is to say the begin-

Figure 51. Passage from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions.

Figure 52. Glyphs 22-24 from the Sarcophagus Lid text.
ning of the new k’atun. (Incidentally, this provides an anchor date for the text on Pakal’s sarcophagus.) On the right half of the third glyph block, of course, is the name of Kan Bahlam. The vertical lines represent the belly scales of a snake, and the eye is that of a snake as well. The balls underneath are the phonetic complement ma, signaling the m at the end of bahlam, the jaguar aspect of the ruler’s name. On top of the Kawak sign, it should be noted, is syllabic U, the possessive “his.” In other words, this is the tuun seating of Kan Bahlam.

The Sarcophagus passage continues (Figure 53) with the statement that Kan Bahlam died on 11 Chikchan 3 K’ayab (9.7.9.5.5 / February 3, 583). The Calendar Round is stated first. The left side of the middle glyph block is read OCH-bi, och bih, “he entered the road.” The right side of the middle glyph block is KAN[BHAHLAM]-ma. The third glyph block is the animal-skull variant of the Palenque emblem glyph. The skull is read BAAK, “bone,” the ancient name of Palenque. The entire left-hand portion of the glyph block is the logogram K’UH(UL), “divine,” while the “balls” on the top-right are AJAW, “lord.” Like the other Palenque rulers, Kan Bahlam was a “Divine Palenque Lord.” Kan Bahlam acceded at age 47 and died at 58. His reign was just a few weeks short of eleven years.

Kan Bahlam I is also depicted on the side of Pakal’s sarcophagus. The caption for his portrait is an intriguing puzzle (Figure 54). Here we see the logograph K’INICH above the name Kan Bahlam (KAN[BHAHLAM]-ma), suggesting that this seventh king of Palenque was actually named K’inch Kan Bahlam. The word k’in means “sun” and more particularly the sun-god, while -ich is an ancient nominal suffix that might not affect the translation (Marc Zender, personal communication 2000). Thus K’inch might simply be “Sun (God),” although Martin and Grube (2008) prefer “Radiant.” All but one of the known kings of Palenque after and including Pakal the Great adopted K’inch as part of their names. For instance, one of Pakal’s sons called himself K’inch K’an Joy Chitam, which is the name of Palenque’s fifth ruler with the addition of “K’inch.” It is possible that Pakal styled himself K’inch Janaab Pakal in order to distinguish himself from his probable grandfather, Janaab Pakal.

K’inch, originally thought to be a title, has come to be considered part of the name proper, although the pendulum may be swinging back again. The eldest son of Pakal ruled as K’inch Kan Bahlam. He quite evidently took the name of Kan Bahlam I as his rulership name, and in keeping with his father’s precedent he might well have ruled as K’inch Kan Bahlam even if his remoter predecessor had not been named K’inch. Complicating the picture is the consideration that all references to previous kings of Palenque were inscribed by Pakal the Great and his successors. We have no contemporaneous records of what these earlier kings called themselves. It is possible that the full name of Kan Bahlam I was K’inch Kan Bahlam, and that other early kings had K’inch as part of their names as well.

With the single exception of the reference to Kan Bahlam I on the Sarcophagus (Figure 54), there is no evidence that K’inch was used in the name of any Palenque ruler before Pakal. Or so I thought until 2001 when David Stuart (personal communication) pointed out that the Palenque censer stand portrait which probably depicts K’uk’ Bahlam I (Miller and Martin 2004:230, Plate 127) has a k’in sign in the headdress, suggesting that K’inch was part of the name of Palenque’s Founder.

Citing a paper then in preparation by Pierre Robert Colas (published in 2003), Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2001) argues that K’inch is a title when it appears at the beginning of names. He points out that in Palenque’s “El Bulto” Tablet from Temple 16 and the Tablet of the Slaves, the names of the kings Kan Bahlam II, K’an Joy Chitam II, and Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III are all written without K’inch. Furthermore, in fuller spellings of the names of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III and K’uk’ Bahlam II, the K’inch part seems to be joined with preceding Yajawte’ titles. Guenter thinks that K’inch in frontal position is only a title and could merely be a short form for Yajawte’ K’inch.
Below (Figure 55) is the portrait of Kan Bahlam I from the west side of the sarcophagus of K’inich Janaab Pakal. He can be identified by his headdress, part serpent (kan) and part jaguar (bahlam). Also his name appears, as “K’inich Kan Bahlam,” in the hieroglyphic caption previously discussed.

In his sculptural portrait, Kan Bahlam “wears a magnificent part-serpent, part-jaguar headdress. The same jester god as in the figures on the north and south ends of the sarcophagus perches on top of the jaguar head. ... [Kan Bahlam] I and the northern figure on the west side (the first Pacal) are the only ones to wear goatees (Robertson 1983).”

Figure 55. Portrait of (K’inich) Kan Bahlam I from Pakal’s sarcophagus: (a) drawing by Merle Greene Robertson [1983:Fig. 191], (b) photograph by Merle Greene Robertson [1983:Fig. 192], (c) close-up of the photograph.
Lady Yohl Ik’nal was one of a very small number of Maya women of the Classic era to carry a full royal title and rule in her own right for a complete term; she reigned for a full twenty-one years (Martin and Grube 2008:159).

Lady Yohl Ik’nal was probably the daughter of the previous ruler, Kan Bahlam I, who seems to have died without leaving a male heir, although she could have been his sister (ibid.:159).

The House C Hieroglyphic Stairway of Palenque’s Palace records a military assault and probable sacking of Palenque on a date that is best interpreted as falling on April 21, 599 (ibid.:159-160). The personal identity of the attacker remains obscure but his kingdom was definitely the “snake-head” polity of Kaan (which was possibly not yet centered in Calakmul in Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s time) (ibid.:101, 103, 160). The patron deities of Palenque are said to have been “thrown down,” which can be taken metaphorically to mean Palenque’s defeat or literally to refer to the despoiling of its sacred effigies (ibid.:160).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:101, 103, 159-160). Their sources include Guillermo Bernal Romero (1999) for the reading of the queen’s name as Yohl rather than Ohl.

Although the Maya preferred patrilineal descent, where the right to rule passed through the male line from generation to generation, Lady Yohl Ik’nal ruled Palenque in her own right for over two decades. This was a troubled time in the kingdom’s history. We know that there were probably at least two attacks on the city during Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s reign. It is likely that previous, unrecorded warfare had eliminated male candidates for rulership, thereby accounting for the accession of this queen.

Lady Yohl Ik’nal is also properly referred to as Ix Yohl Ik’nal, since the “head-glyph” that begins her name is read in this context as a logogram for the “female agentive,” IX. This can be translated “Lady” and identifies the following name as being that of a woman. The remainder of this ruler’s name is a study in the history of hieroglyphic decipherment. At various times Lady Yohl Ik’nal has been called Lady Olnal, Lady Kan-Ik, Lady Ik and Lady K’anal-Ik’al. This profusion of names has resulted from refinements to the reading of the constituent glyphs. (The author is indebted to Simon...
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Let’s start with the glyph that is labeled OHL in Figure 56. A logogram for the word “heart” in the sense of “core,” this glyph is distinguished by the circular element on the top and the U-shaped bracket in the middle with two bands or lobes descending from it. These elements are characteristic of the calendric day-sign K’an, hence the appearance of “K’an” or “Kan” in earlier versions of this ruler’s name. These same glyptic elements are also characteristic of the month known as Kumk’u in Yukatek Mayan. In the Ch’olan of the inscriptions, this month is called Ohl. That this is the proper reading of the glyph in this case is confirmed by the suffix -la, which signals the final “l.” (Since the suffix is disharmonic, we know that the vowel in Ohl probably had the raspy velar sound represented by the letter “h” in the spelling. But the epigraphers are still allowing for the possibility that the vowel might instead be long or reduplicated, as indicated by the spellings Ool and O’ol.)

Now let’s consider the second of the two name glyphs (Figure 56). We’ll return to the T-shaped element in the middle, but for now let’s look at the vegetation on the top, the logogram NAL, “place.” Linda Schele (1993) has identified the elements on the sides as corn silks, sometimes present as part of the logogram. The la suffix may complement NAL (we will consider this again later).

Now let’s talk about the T-shaped element in the middle of the second name glyph. This is evocative of the calendar day-sign Ik’ and accounts for the “Ik’” component of the current name of Lady Yohl Ik’nal, as well as the former names Lady Ik, Lady Kan-Ik, and Lady K’anal-Ik’al. Like all day signs, the glyph for the day Ik’ is surrounded by a “cartouche,” sometimes called a “TV set” because of the general shape and the “legs” on the bottom (the “legs” are not always part of the cartouche). Absent the cartouche, this glyph is number T503 in Thompson’s 1962 catalog. Glyphs are generally read differently when outside the calendar cartouche, and this accounts for the absence of “Ik’” in the name “Lady Olnal,” one of the names by which this ruler was once known. Reasonable epigraphic deduction had led to the conclusion that T503, with its T-shaped element, should be read as NAL when outside the day-sign cartouche. Thus the second name glyph above, which as we have seen also has NAL on top, was thought to be the “full-form” of NAL.

This came about when close attention was paid to the hieroglyphic expression for the verb “to die.” Sometimes referred to as the “wing-death phrase,” the two glyphs in Figure 57 are read together as K’A’-yi-ya U-SAK-?-IK’-li, k’a’ayiiy usak ? ik’il, “his white breath was extinguished.” Ik’ means “wind,” which in the context is “breath.” Note that here T503 is read as IK’ despite the fact that it is not surrounded by the day-sign cartouche. This is a highly unusual situation, as we shall see. Inci-
dentally, in this metaphor for the departure of the soul, the “wing-glyph” (top left in the illustration) was once read erroneously, but understandably, as “flown away.”\(^{21}\)

As an example of the way that glyphs are read differently when inside and outside the calendar cartouche, the “face” sign indicated with a question mark in Figure 57 is read as \textit{AJAW} when it is surrounded by the cartouche in the day sign Ajaw. When the cartouche is absent, however, as in the death-phrase metaphor for the soul, the reading is different, as indicated, for instance, by a \textit{mi-} prefix on a pot from Naranjo (suggesting a word that begins with the letter \textit{m}).\(^{22}\)

Once the death phrase was more carefully scrutinized, Barbara MacLeod, Linda Schele, and Nikolai Grube noted two instances from the Hieroglyphic Stairway at Copan where the \textit{IK’} sign was replaced by the glyph T23 from the Thompson catalog, which is ordinarily read as the syllable \textit{na} (Figure 58). Here we seem to have \textit{i-K’A’-yi U-SAK-?-na-li}, \textit{i k’a’ay usak ? nal}, “then his white ? place diminishes (or diminished).” In other words, it looks very much like the T503 sign, which was always \textit{IK’} when inside the day-sign cartouche, must be \textit{NAL} when it appeared outside the cartouche, as suggested by the phonetic substitution \textit{na-li}, \textit{nal}. Hence the decision to call the ruler Lady Olnal.

But then David Stuart found an instance at Rio Azul of the T23 sign, syllabic \textit{na}, inside the day-sign cartouche for the month Ik’ (Figure 59). While we don’t actually have phonetic proof for any of the day-sign readings, no epigrapher ever imagined that the day-sign Ik’ was anything but \textit{IK’} when the cartouche was used, as this is the word in most Mayan languages.

Thus this T23 \textit{na} inside the cartouche at Rio Azul had to be acting as a purely graphical element, in the same way that the logogram for \textit{K’UH(UL)} “divine” often incorporates elements otherwise read as \textit{YAX} or \textit{K’AN}. These are “compound sign” elements that do not affect the reading of the logogram. For instance, the animal-skull variant of the Palenque emblem glyph in Figure 60 is read \textit{K’UH-‘AJAW-BAAK-la}, \textit{K’uh[u]l} Baakal Ajaw, with no reference to the \textit{k’an}-cross symbol that is incorporated in the \textit{K’UH} logogram (in other contexts, the cross would be read as \textit{K’AN}).

And if T23 \textit{na} was acting as a compound sign element to IK’ inside the cartouche at Rio Azul, then it must be substituting for \textit{IK’} on the Copan Hieroglyphic Stairway, on the principal of pars pro toto, the part representing the whole. Thus in Figure 58 we read \textit{i-K’A’-yi U-SAK-?-IK’-li}, \textit{i k’a’ay usak ?}

\(^{21}\) A note from Marc Zender: The proper reading of the wing-shell death-phrase is \textit{K’A’-yi-ya U-?-[U]-SAK-IK’-li}, \textit{k’a’ay-iyy u-? [a]-sakik’-li}, “his ?, his white breath, got extinguished.” The “Ajaw face” must be read before \textit{SAK}, something that becomes clear in the few instances where the signs (normally conflated) are pulled apart. Also, a couplet is strongly suggested here, given the subordination of the color adjective sak to whatever noun it is that the Ajaw face invokes.

\(^{22}\) The “Ajaw face” in the death expression was once read as the word for “flower,” but David Stuart (personal communication 2003) points out that there is another logogram for “flower.”
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ik’il, “then his white ? breath diminished.”

And so the pendulum swung back again, to calling an Ik’ an Ik’t. Whereas there must always be a cartouche around the face to make AJAW, IK’ does not always require the ring or cartouche (Figure 61). And in very rare instances, it can be represented by its compound-sign element T23 na.

So now we have IX’-OHL-la-IK’-NAL-la, Ix Ohl Ik’nal, “Lady Heart Wind Place” (Figure 62). As a name, this is not quite syntactically or conceptually complete. And this is where the “Y” in Lady Yohl Ik’nal that you’ve been wondering about all this time comes in. As we have just seen, reading the glyphs above literally leads to the transliteration Ix Ohl Ik’nal, “Lady Heart Wind Place,” whereas the epigraphers are fairly certain that her name must be Ix Yohl Ik’nal, “Lady Heart of the Wind Place.” The Mayan y- indicating possession (English “of”) is understood but has dropped out of the spelling by the phenomenon of “pronoun deletion” that turns out to be quite common with personal names.

A good example involves the Copan ruler Waxaklajuun Ubaah K’awiil, formerly known as 18 Rabbit. On the left in Figure 62 his name is spelled 18-U-ba-[K’AWIIL], waxaklajuun ubaah k’awiil. This can be translated “18 Are the Images of K’awiil,” where the U indicates the possessive, “of.” On the right in Figure 62, the ba (or BAAH) gopher and the flames from the K’AWIIL logogram have been conflated into a single sign. But the reading is essentially the same: 18-U-ba[K’AWIIL]. Waxaklajuun Ubaah K’awiil.

Now compare the two examples in Figure 63, where the U is completely missing, but we know that it is implicit because of the other spellings that we have seen. The glyph on the left (from Copan Stela H) has an anthropomorphic K’awiil. It reads 18-ba-[K’AWIIL]. In the glyph on the right, the ba gopher and the K’awiil are conflated, for 18-ba[K’AWIIL], waxaklajuun baah k’awiil. But the ruler’s name is not Waxaklajuun Baah K’awiil, “18 Are the Images K’awiil.” This makes no sense syn-

23 The -li suffix provides the -iti which marks the compound noun “white-y-wind” as being possessed, i.e. “his,” with the name of the possessor customarily appearing in the next glyph blocks (Marc Zender, personal communication 2000).
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tactically. We have to “read in” the “of.” The way this is transcribed is with the U in parenthesis: 18-(U)-ba-K’AWIIL in the example on the left in Figure 63, and 18-(U)-ba[K’AWIIL] on the right.

In the same way, our Palenque queen’s name makes no sense unless we read in a possessive, “of.” Because it occurs before a vowel, the U that we saw in Waxaklajuun Ubaah K’awiil becomes a y- (provided by the syllable yo) in Lady Yohl Ik’nal. And there is confirmation for this deduction to be found in the recently restored K’an Tok Tablet from Temple 16 (Figure 64). Here the yo is unusual, having aspects of the appearance of NAL, but it is difficult to see what else it could be in the context. And it can reasonably be said to confirm our suspicion of pronoun deletion in this case. In Figure 64, we read IX-yo-OHL-la NAL-IK’-la, or in proper order IX-yo-OHL-la IK’-NAL-la, Ix Yohl Ik’nal, “Lady Heart of the Wind Place.”

Again, the “heart” in this case is not the human organ, but is used in the sense of “the heart of something.” This had a highly resonant meaning to the ancient Maya, as ohl was also the name of the portal used in vision rites (Freidel, Schele, and Parker 1993:215), although ohl should not be translated “portal.”24 In Maya iconography the portal to the Otherworld has a characteristically quatrefoil shape (Figure 65).

As for the Ik’ or “wind” portion of the name, this too was vitally important to the Maya. Palenque’s patron deity, “Lady Beastie,” was born on 9 Ik’. There are numerous Ik’-shaped windows throughout the Palace and other structures of Palenque (Figure 66). David Kelley has written extensively on the significance attached to this day name. And David Stuart (2005) continues this analysis in considering the many 9 Ik’ dates in the newly discovered inscriptions of Temple 19. Simon Martin (personal communication 2000) points out that Ehecatl, the beaked Mexican Wind God, is both a day name and a deity associated with “the breath of life”—in short, Ik.

24 Note from Marc Zender: It used to be thought that the text from the altar of El Peru Stela 38 (Figure 65) described how “First Father” was reborn through a crack in the back of the cosmic turtle by referring to *ti-yo-‘OHL-la a-ku, “ti yohl ahk, “in the heart of the turtle.” [The asterix indicates that the reading is reconstructed, the original sign being effaced.] But a closer look at the photographs and Ian Graham’s drawing for the Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions reveals that what was taken for a *ti is actually *tu. And *tu-yo-‘OHL-la a-ku, *(ti)-u-y-ohl ahk is an impossible construction for “in the heart of the turtle” in prestige Eastern Ch’olan, the language of the inscriptions. There is now ample evidence that this collocation is merely a “name-tag” or “caption” for a king named Tu[tum] Yohl Ahk or “covered is the heart of the Turtle.” Similar names are known from a variety of sites and contexts, with varying degrees of spelling and underspelling.
We don’t have a birth date for Lady Yohl Ik’nal, because the Temple of the Cross Tablet, from which we derived the birthdates of previous rulers, stops with her father, Kan Bahlam I. We do have her accession date however. A passage of the Temple of the Inscriptions East Panel (Figure 67) counts forward 12 days, 14 months, and 9 tuuns from her seating (L3) with the royal headband (K4) until the “tying” of the tuun (L5). This last glyph shows a flat hand holding a kawak symbol (here read TUUN and not ku because of the ni suffix). This must refer to the k’atun ending of 9.8.0.0.0 because of the calendar round 5 Ajaw 3 Ch’en (K6-L6). The next three glyphs (L7-K8) read ya-k’aw u-pik u-k’uh-k’i, “she offered it, the skirt of her gods.” Her name follows at L8, with the Palenque emblem glyph at K9. (Her name and emblem glyph also appear at L4-K5 in connection with the accession verb.) Note that the OHL element of Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s name is here conflated with the IX, for a spelling transcribed as IX[OHL]-NAL-IK’-la. As discussed previously, the possessive y- must be inferred.

For the first time in our consideration of Palenque dynastic history, we are able to refer to events other than birth, death, accession and period-ending celebrations. Unfortunately, the two events in question are warfare-related, with Palenque on the losing end. The first of these is recorded on the Hieroglyphic Stairway of the Palace’s House C (Figure 69). The passage (Figure 68) begins with the accession of K’inich Janaab Pakal in the first glyph block (A6). Reading the four collocations of this block from left to right and top to bottom, we have HUUN-K’AL-ja tu-U-BAAH K’INICH-JANAAB pa-ka-la, huun k’alaj tu ubaah k’inich janaab pakal, “he tied the headband on his head, K’inich Janaab Pakal.” This ruler, “Pakal the Great” will not accede until decades after Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s rulership, but a Distance Number (in the first three glyphs of B6) may count from his accession back to her time.

---

25 Epigraphers had previously read Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s period-ending offering as pih “bundle,” specifically the bundle of years represented by the 9.9.0.0.0 period ending itself. But Marc Zender (personal communication 2003) points out that the sign in question elsewhere means “8,000” (the number of years in a piktun), and only pik means “8000” in Ch’olan (from Proto-Mayan “peek “8,000”). That pik also means “skirt” (from Proto-Mayan “pik “falda”) works well in the deity-dressing ceremonies of the inscription, alongside “earspool” and “necklace.”
Figure 69. The House C Hieroglyphic Stairway: (a) photograph by Maudslay (1889-1902: Vol. IV, Plate 23); (b) drawing by Annie Hunter (ibid.); (c) drawing by Linda Schele.
The Distance Number and the first part of the Calendar Round date that it leads to were already eroded when Alfred Maudslay visited Palenque in 1891. The second part of the Calendar Round, the month sign, was in worse condition since it was on a stair tread rather than a riser. Maudslay made a mold of the entire inscription, but he only photographed the risers (Figure 69a), so decipherment of the month sign has involved either consulting the casts in the British Museum or the drawing of the casts made by Maudslay’s artist, Annie Hunter (Figure 69b). At the third Palenque Round Table, Peter Mathews advocated in favor of 2.12.3.3 for the Distance Number, counting forward from Pakal’s birth to (9.11.1.16.3) 6 Ak’bal 1 Yax (Baudez and Mathews 1979).26 See Figure 70a above for Linda Schele’s drawing of the Distance Number and 70b for the Calendar Round.

Mathews subsequently retracted this in favor of Floyd Lounsbury’s solution of (9.10.18.8.8) 6 Lamat 1 Sip for the Calendar Round (and a Distance Number of 3.1.3.3 connecting this with a Calendar Round of 7 Chuwen 4 Ch’én later in the inscription). Mathews and Linda Schele did not agree with Lounsbury about the associated Long Count, however, deciding to place the event on 9.8.5.13.8 (April 23, 599), during the reign of Lady Yohl Ik’nal (Schele 1994).

In a paper presented at the Palenque Round Table in 1995, Simon Martin reported that a detailed analysis of Maudslay’s casts in the British Museum confirmed that Lounsbury had reached the correct solution regarding the Calendar Round, 6 Lamat 1 Sip (Martin 2000:110). Martin’s sketch of the month sign in Figure 70c shows the superfix for the month Sip.

The war event verb associated with this date is in the top right of glyph block C1 in Figure 71, the ax representing the word ch’akaj, “to chop or break up, damage” (Orejel 1990; Looper and Schele 1991). The collocation just to the right of the ax has also been a problem in decipherment owing to its eroded condition. Finally Simon Martin was able to decipher it as LAKAM-HA’ based on his

---

26 This date was originally put forward by Eric Thompson (1954).
examination of the Maudslay casts. Lakamha’ is the name of the area in the center of Palenque near the Palace (Schele and Mathews 1993).

What we are talking about here is an attack on the very center of Palenque in which, according to one interpretation, the very gods of the Palenque Triad (nicknamed GI, GII, and GIII) were “thrown down.” The collocation above has been read as *ya-le-je*, *yalej* and interpreted as a passive verbal construction, “they were thrown down” (Grube 1996) (Figure 72).

The agent of this attack is clearly from the Snake polity (later based in Calakmul but probably centered elsewhere at this time, possibly in Dzibanche). The collocation at bottom right of glyph block D1 (Figure 73, left) shows the snake head of that kingdom’s emblem glyph, with the *ka* prefix indicating that in this case “snake” is to be pronounced *kan* instead of *chan*.27 Preceding the emblem glyph is a name which Simon Martin, in his first attendance at the Texas Maya Meetings, identified as that of a known king of Kaan (Figure 73, center).28

As Nikolai Grube relates in his paper on Palenque’s role in the great Late Classic conflict between Calakmul and Tikal (Grube 1996), this Snake king also turns up on Caracol Stela 3, in a context about 27 years before the Palenque text that we are considering (Figure 73, right). The Caracol date is 9.6.18.12.0 (August 14, 572), while the Calakmul attack on Palenque is on 9.8.5.13.8 (April 23, 599). Simon Martin, who first connected the Palenque and Caracol instances of the name at the 1991 Advanced Seminar of the Texas Maya Meetings and later in his paper on the codex ceramics king list (Martin 1997), has dubbed him “Sky Witness.”29

---

27 It has been suggested that the emblem glyph of Snake was pronounced *kan* instead of *chan* because the inhabitants or rulers of the early Snake kingdom spoke Yukatekan, but Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2003) finds it more probable that the *kan* pronunciation reflects the parent proto-Mayan language. He sees the early Snake Kingdom as being proto-Ch’olan/Tzeltalan rather than Yukatekan in its language affiliation and asserts that archaeology can be used to support this epigraphic argument.

28 The polity’s name is spelled Kaan rather than Kan because of attested KAN-nu spellings (although not of the EG).

29 The “Sky Witness” nickname arises from a spelling of this king’s name with the St. Andrews cross element infixed in a glyph that symbolizes a seeing eye. There is no reading at present for either of these conflated elements. The second glyph is clearly *CHAN-na*, *chan*, “sky” (*ka’an* in Yukatek). And as the entire name is sometimes preceded by *U*, the possessive indicator, the complete transcription, (*U*)?-?*-CHAN-na*, is translated “?? of the Sky” (Martin 1997).
Bearing on the question of who attacked Lakamha’ on 9.8.5.13.8, 6 Lamat 1 Sip (April 23, 599), in Figure 74a we see the entire name-string that follows that ch’akaj verb. All of these glyphs could be the titles and names of the Snake king. A difficulty with this interpretation is that we know that a Snake king other than Sky Witness acceded on 9.7.5.14.17 (September 4, 579). At first it seems like a solution to this puzzle might lie in the glyph reading ya-AJAW-TE’, yajawte’, literally “Lord of the Tree.” This is a known title, which might well pertain to the Snake king whose name follows. But if it were the possessed form uyajawte’, “his Lord of the Tree,” it could refer to the preceding glyphs, which would then be the name of a character who served as the Yajawte’ of the Snake king. If such a lesser, “possessed” lord outlived the king who “possessed” him, he might well have continued to be known as the Yajawte’ of that ruler. However, deletion of the possessive pronoun in such a context would be highly uncharacteristic of Maya inscriptions. Furthermore, there is strong reason to believe that yajawte’ is part of a combined form with the “chi-throne” glyph before it, as Yaxchilan Lintel 21 D4 has a single glyph block reading ya-AJAW-‘CHI-THRONE’-TE’ (Simon Martin, personal communication 2003). Another possibility is that this “Sky Witness” was namesake of the Snake king who was a junior member of the royal family but not himself a ruler. But arguing against this is that the “chi-throne” title was so lofty that probably only a king would carry it.

This is far from the only mystery of the Stairway inscription, surely one of the strangest and most epigraphically frustrating of all monumental texts (Simon Martin, personal communication 2006). The basic message seems to be the revenge taken by Pakal for the Kaan defeat, in keeping with scribal rhetoric whereby a “humiliating encounter” is admitted to in the context of a subsequent glorious victory (Houston 1993:110). But in this case, the revenge came a full sixty years later, when Pakal captured a number of prisoners on 9.11.6.16.11, 7 Chuwen 4 Ch’en, in AD 659.31

---

30 Here are the dates bearing on which Snake king was in power at the time of the House C Hieroglyphic Stairway (HCHS) ch’akaj event:

- 9.6.18.12.0 (572) “Sky Witness” of Kaan named on Caracol St. 3
- 9.7.5.14.17 (579) accession of “Scroll Serpent” of Kaan
- 9.8.5.13.8 (599) HCHS ch’akaj event associated with “Sky Witness” of Kaan
- 9.8.15.14 (611) “Scroll Serpent” of Kaan sacks Palenque

31 After the 2002 Maya Meetings in Texas, David Stuart initiated a reconsideration of the alternative dating of the Stairway’s ch’akaj event in an email to Simon Martin, copied to Nikolai Grube and the author. Stuart pointed out that the date of 9.11.16.3, 6 Ak’bal 1 Yax had the advantage of putting the “humiliating encounter” in 654, with the revenge following in 659—more of a rhetorical “tit-for-tat.” Martin was willing to entertain the proposition because he had come to understand that the “half-Lamat” glyph was a representation of the Cosmic Crocodile’s eye, where the upper eyelid covered half the star sign (Figure 74b). From this point of view, the potential Lamat sign in the Calendar Round for the Stairway date was effectively upside-down (Figure 74c). And Martin adduced evidence of a very “starry” Ak’bal sign at Tonina (Figure 74d).

In emails to Stuart and other epigraphers, Stanley Guenter pointed out that the 654 date created at least as many problems as it solved. His researches on Bonampak Lintel 4 together with Peter Mathews and Armando Anaya showed that the Stairway’s mention of an Itzamnaaj Bahlam of Yaxchilan was consistent with the likelihood that there was indeed a king of that name at Yaxchilan in 599, but not in 654. Furthermore, the ch’akaj “chopping, damaging” of Palenque would have happened only 68 days before the dedication of a new building in the Palace (House E, on 9.11.2.1.11, 9 Chuwen 9 Mak). Stuart responded that we have no way of gauging the destructiveness of a given conquest event, but he himself continued to be troubled by the dating issue and, in December 2005, asked Martin to reexamine the photographs taken by the author during Martin’s second inspection of the Maudslay casts in 2003. Martin, who had meanwhile realized that the Calendar Round for Pakal’s accession date on the Hieroglyphic Stairway contained precisely the same “upside-down” half-Lamat, reviewed the evidence and came down in favor of his original position. Stuart consulted the photographs and concurred.
Four years after the “axing” of Lakamha’, Palenque is attacked again, this time by Bonampak, on 9.8.9.15.11, 7 Chuwen 4 Sotz’ (May 16, 603). Lintel 4 from Bonampak Structure 6 (Figure 75) was first interpreted to this effect by Nikolai Grube in his presentation at the Eighth Palenque Round Table (Grube 1996). The Calendar Round of 7 Chuwen 4 Sotz’ is at A1-B1, followed by the verb ju-bu-yi, jubuy, “throw down” (C1). The direct object is U-TOOK’-(U)-PAKAL, u took’ u pakal, “his flint-shield” (D1). The flint-shield is a symbol of warfare associated with royalty. In accession monuments at Palenque, such as the Palace Tablet of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II (Figure 76), the flint-shield is presented to the king by his mother, while his father presents the “drum-major” headdress. The shield bears a flayed human face.

The possessor of the flint-shield in this inscription is AJ-LAKAM HA’, “He of Lakamha’” (B1-C1). As we have seen, Lakamha’ is the toponym, or place name of Palenque, while Baak (or Baakal) is the name of the polity. (The tree-symbol for LAKAM is bent over with the weight of dripping honeycombs.) The glyph at D1 reads U-KAB-ji-(yi), ukabjiiy, “by the action of” or “he oversaw it.” The name glyphs of the Bonampak ruler who threw down the flint-shield of He of Lakamha’ appear at E1-E4. The first half of E3 is an unusual spelling of y-ajaw, “his/its lord” (we know this because the same name component is spelled ya-AJAW on Bonampak Stela 3). The second half of E3 is CHAN-na, chan, “sky,” while E4 is the logogram for MUWAHN, “hawk.” Thus the Bonampak ruler is
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referred to as Yajaw Chan Muwahn. Although, as noted, the flint-shield is associated with royalty, it does not necessarily follow that He of Lakamha’ is the Palenque ruler, Lady Yohl Ik’nal herself. When a ruler is associated with a toponym, the designation is Ajaw rather than Aj, “he of” (or “she of”), although the K’UH(UL) prefix of an emblem glyph is often absent on enemy monuments, essentially as a sign of disrespect. One cannot rule out an intentional slight against Palenque’s female ruler in this context.32

In any case, the took’ pakal may reasonably be said to be Palenque’s, so this inscription is construed as a successful warfare act against Palenque. However, David Stuart has pointed out that there is a modern place name Lakamha’ near Bonampak (Schele and Mathews 1993). (The modern name is Lacanja, which refers to a small river to the west of Bonampak, from which the site of Lacanja gets its name [David Stuart, personal communication 2003]). When Palenque is referred to on the monuments of other sites, it is called Baak, never Lakamha’, although the context in these monuments is an invariably a reference to Palenque’s ruler, identified by emblem glyph (with or without the “Divine” prefix). Palenque lacks a toponymic version of its emblem glyph, with the location Lakamha’ in the place of Baak, the kingdom’s name. Bonampak’s political affiliations at this time are not known, but the site was later under the control of Tonina, a known enemy of Palenque.33

Grube (1996) sees no evidence that Bonampak ever controlled Palenque or reaped any lasting benefit of this raid. He prefers to see it as typical of an “opportunistic war,” where the temporary weakness of a rival is exploited. In this case, Palenque had recently suffered at the hands of the Snake kingdom, a polity dwarfing Bonampak in power.

To recapitulate, we have Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s accession in 583, the Snake ax event in 599, and Bonampak downing the flint-shield of Palenque in 603. Lady Yohl Ik’nal dies a year later, in 604. Somewhere between 587 and her death, she is recorded as supervising the accession of a K’an Tok lord (Bernal Romero 2002). As discussed previously, the K’an Tok Tablet from Temple 16 (Figure 77) records a series of such accessions, presided over by the Palenque rulers Casper, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I, Lady Yohl Ik’nal, K’inich Janaab Pakal, K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II, K’inich Janaab Pakal II, and K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II.32

32 Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2003) points out that a number of times on Naranjo Stela 12 Itzamnaaj K’awiil of that kingdom is simply referred to as “He of Naranjo.” Guenter contends therefore that Aj Lakamha’ could refer to the ruler of Palenque.

33 It should be noted that the Calendar Round of Bonampak Lintel 4 is not anchored in the Long Count, and since Calendar Round dates recur every 52 years, the possibility cannot be discounted that this event transpired one or more Calendar Round cycles earlier or later. But Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2003) feels strongly that the war by Yajaw Chan Muwaan of Bonampak cannot be moved up to 655. Sculptured Stone 4 of Bonampak ties Yajaw Chan Muwaan to his immediate successor, who only shortly after acceding flees to Yaxchilan and is portrayed receiving a crown from a king named Itzamnaaj Bahlam. Guenter points out that unless we wish to completely throw out the later records of Yaxchilan, we know that Bird Jaguar III was ruling that city in 655, and so Bonampak Lintel 4 cannot date to 655, with 603 easily being the favored date for the monument.

Figure 77. The K’an Tok Tablet (photograph by Joel Skidmore).
In this passage (Figure 77) which can be dated to 9.8.10.5.8 (AD 603), the headband of K’an Tok officialdom (A2) is donned by a lord whose name reads in part Janaab (B2). He is identified as a K’AN-to-ko wa-WE’-la (B3), the first part being “K’an Tok,” the second undeciphered. Glyphs A4-A5 read U-KAB-ya IX yo-OHL-la-NAL-IK’-la K’UH(UL)-AJAW-BAAK-la, ukab(jii)y Ix Yohl Ik’nal K’uhul Baakal Ajaw, “under the auspices of Lady Yohl Ik’nal, Divine Palenque Lord.” Guillermo Bernal Romero considers the K’an Tok lords to have been a kind of sajai, which is to say a lord of secondary rank under the ruler (Bernal 2002). Sajals sometimes served as provincial governors, and Bernal Romero has theorized that K’an Tok was a site separate from Palenque itself. David Stuart, on the other hand, sees no reason to assume that these “junior lords” held office outside Palenque (Stuart 2000:Note 4). It is interesting to note that, in contrast to the other accessions on the monument, this accession under Lady Yohl Ik’nal is explicitly stated to have occurred at a place called Ki’us (Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2000).

In Linda Schele’s drawing of the name glyph of the K’an Tok lord whose name begins Janaab, there appears to be a trace of the snout of the suutz’ bat, making the name Janaab Suutz’ (Figure 78b). However, Peter Mathews and Stanley Guenter have closely examined the monument and determined that the glyph is Ajaw, spelled out with a full head variant and a -wa suffix underneath, as can be better seen in the photograph (Figure 78a) (Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2001). The head variant of JANAAB is recognizable because it appears elsewhere on the Tablet with the characteristic flower petals around the eye (Figure 78c).

Lady Yohl Ik’nal died on 9.8.11.6.12, 2 Eb 0 Mak (November 7, 604). There was initially some difficulty with this dating, which Floyd Lounsbury was once more instrumental in resolving. Because he felt that the calendar rounds on the lid of Pakal’s sarcophagus should be in chronological order, he read the first block in Figure 79 as 2 Eb “end of” Keh. (This is conventionally written 0 Mak, because the twentieth day of any given month was thought of by the Maya as the “seating” of the following month. Thus the first day of Mak is written 1 Mak, while the last day of the preceding month, Keh, is written 0 Mak.) The sign over Keh (top right

---

34 It is interesting that at least three K’an Tok lords had “Janaab” in their names, like Palenque’s greatest ruler, K’inich Janaab Pakal. This ruler’s grandfather, the “first” Janaab Pakal, never ruled in his own right but was known to hold significant power in Palenque, overseeing the accession of at least one lesser lord. Conceivably he came from the clan that provided several K’an Tok officials.

On the other hand, Stanley Guenter finds it unlikely that Janaab Pakal was a K’an Tok lord. Noting the accession of another K’an Tok official named Janaab Ajaw during the reign of Palenque ruler K’inich K’an Joy Chitam, he writes (email dated August 8, 2001): “There is absolutely no evidence one way or the other, admittedly, but, given that the scribes noted that the second Janaab Ajaw was a grandson of K’inich Janaab Pakal I, I would be surprised if they didn’t mention that the earlier lords had an even more direct relationship to the rulers (such as being in the lineage of the future kings).”
of the first glyph block) is quite unusual. It contains elements that we have seen before in “seating” glyphs, so there was a temptation to read it “seating of.” But a calendar round of 2 Eb 0 Keh would not have fallen chronological order with the other dates on the Sarcophagus. Finally Lounsbury’s hunch was vindicated when it was realized that the half-head with its prominent mouth and mustache is the head variant for a superfix that appears with the tuun sign in standard “end of” expressions.

Lady Yohl Ik’nal is portrayed twice on the side of Pakal’s sarcophagus. In both cases she wears an ik’ pectoral consistent with her name. Accompanying the first portrait (Figure 80, left), her name is spelled out (as IX-(yo)-OHL[IK’]-NAL) in an adjacent hieroglyphic caption, followed by the “wavy-bone” variant of the Palenque emblem glyph.

In the second portrait (Figure 80, right), the caption reads IX-(yo)-OHL-la NAL-IK’-la, with a second caption composed of K’UH(UL), “Divine,” in one glyph block, and AJAW-BAAK, “Palenque Lord,” in another. In neither of these portraits does Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s headdress relate directly to her name, as was the case with Ahkal Mo’ Nahb and K’an Joy Chitam as discussed earlier. Linda Schele and Peter Mathews (1998) have pointed out the quetzal bird in the headdress and suggested that the Mayan word k’uk’, “quetzal,” also means “sprouts” or “new growth,” and by extension “descendant.” “She may be so marked for two reasons: to reinforce that she sprouted from Kan-Balam I, the prior king, and to acknowledge that she represented ‘new growth’ (Schele and Mathews 1998:120).”

Schele and Mathews continue: “As a woman, she belonged to the patriline descended from the

Figure 80. Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s portraits from the Sarcophagus sides.
founder, K’uk’-Balam, but her children did not. Because they belonged to the lineage of their father, her accession caused a break in the descent line from the founder. It was a matter of concern for her children and their descendants, including Pakal, to legitimize this lineage shift” (1998:120). Schele and Mathews feel that Lady Yohl Ik’nal may be depicted as one of the nine stucco figures on the walls of Pakal’s crypt. Stucco Figure 7 (Figure 81) is the only one wearing a long beaded skirt.

Lady Yohl Ik’nal was one of only two known Maya queens who served full terms ruling in their own right, and she was the first to reign as such. Although her times may have been severely troubled by the Calamul and Bonampak incursions, she ruled for twenty years and seems to have been treated with due veneration in the records left by Pakal and his son, K’inich Kan Bahlam II. As noted, she is featured not once but twice on the sides of the Sarcophagus. The text recording her accession and period-ending celebration, on the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions, is in parallel with the texts of the male rulers.

However, an inscription recorded by Maudslay on the westernmost pier of the Temple of the Inscriptions designates Pakal’s son, K’inch Kan Bahlam, as the “10th Successor” (Figure 82). The glyphs read (left-to-right, top-to-bottom) BAAK[WAY]-AL K’INICH-KAN[BAHLAM]-ma 10-*U-*TZ’AK-bu K’UH-BAAK-la-AJAW-wa, baak(el) wayal k’inich kan bahlam u lajuun tz’ak’bu’ k’uh[ul] baakal ajaw, “The Spirit-Companion’s Own Bone, K’inch Kan Bahlam, 10th-Ordered-Thing, Divine Palenque Lord.”35 (The translation is by Marc Zender. “The Spirit-Companion’s Own Bone” is a known title or preaccession name of Kan Bahlam II.) It was Werner Nahm who interpreted the partially effaced glyph as a formula for counting rulers seen at other sites such as Tikal (Simon Martin, personal communication 2000). What this means is that K’inich Kan Bahlam considered himself the tenth ruler in the line beginning with K’uk’ Bahlam I. And the only way to make Pakal’s son the tenth ruler is to refrain from counting Lady Yohl Ik’nal and whoever might have ruled while Pakal was coming of age.36

35 Marc Zender notes: The baak(el) wayal compound has been translated “Bony-Sorcerer,” but there can be little doubt that “sorcerer,” “magician,” etc. aren’t original glosses for way, but rather the influence of Christian precepts and the bigotry of Spanish missionaries. An analysis of the analogous Nahua nahuat and Mixean tonal makes it clear that “co-essences” or “spirit-companions” do not overlap with concepts of sorcery or black-magic, but are just body-parts pure and simple, like hearts or heads.

Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2003) begs to differ and agrees with those who see wayal (or waywal) as a word for “shaman, wizard.” Pointing out that the head variant of this glyph is a human wearing an assortment of decorations including semicircular facepainting around the eyes and mouth, he sees this clearly functioning as a title and asserts that if way is “dream” or “alter ego,” then wayal should be someone who dreams or transforms into his alter ego.

36 If indeed Lady Yohl Ik’nal was omitted from the dynastic count, this may be simply a matter of an ancient Maya prejudice against female rulers. (The Lady of Tikal, who almost certainly ruled during Tikal’s Middle Classic, seems to have been omitted from the numbered sequence of Tikal kings [Simon Martin 2003:24].)
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AJEN YOHL MAT

Ninth in the known Palenque sequence


Also known as Aj Ne’ Ohl Mat, Ac Kan, Ah Lawal Mat. Reigned AD 605-612.

Acceded: 9.8.11.9.10 8 Ok 18 Muwan (January 1, 605).

Died: 9.8.19.4.6 2 Kimi 14 Mol (August 8, 612).

Mother: Lady Yohl Ik’nal?

As this ruler followed Lady Yohl Ik’nal on the throne of Palenque, it is likely that he was her son (Martin and Grube 2008:160). Another important figure in Palenque at this time, Janaab Pakal, may have been her consort or a second son; not to be confused with the later K’inich Janaab Pakal the Great, he carried a full emblem glyph even though he never ascended the throne (ibid.:161).

Under Ajen Yohl Mat, Palenque’s sphere of influence extended as far as the Río San Pedro Mártir, where the ruler of the strategically located site of Santa Elena acceded under his auspices (ibid.:161).

It was in Ajen Yohl Mat’s seventh year of rule that a catastrophe was visited upon Palenque. The glyphic panels of the Temple of the Inscriptions record that on April 4, 611, Palenque was “axed” and probably sacked by Scroll Serpent of Kaan (ibid.:161). In Maya historical rhetoric, such humiliations are usually contrasted with successful revenge, but here the absence of any ultimate victory by Palenque suggests that the disaster somehow explains the events that follow (ibid.:161). Although Ajen Yohl Mat and Janaab Pakal survived the attack, both were dead within sixteen months and a dynastic crisis ensued (ibid.:161).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:160-161). Their sources include Mathew Looper and Linda Schele (1991) for the 611 attack.

The ninth king of Palenque ruled for a short eight years during a time of troubles that may have begun during the reign of Lady Yohl Ik’nal, who was probably his mother. Ajen Yohl Mat is the first of three known historical figures at Palenque to have had “Mat” as part of their name. He was originally referred to as Aahc-Kan (and Ac-Kan). “Aahc” and “Ac” entered into it because of the first collocation on the left in Figure 83a was initially read as AHK, “turtle.” But the turtle sign substitutes with the logogram for AJ, the male agentive “he of,” in the other known spelling of this ruler’s name (Figure 83b). So the turtle must be phonetic a. As such, it is an underspelling of aj (or ah in the earlier orthography). This led to reading the ruler’s name as Ah K’an and Ah Lawal Mat. “K’an” entered into it for reasons that we discussed with Lady Yohl Ik’nal. The logogram OHL appears in the

Figure 83. First part of Ajen Yohl Mat’s name: (a) from the Sarcophagus of Pakal, (b) from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions.
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month sign known in Colonial Yucatec as K’an, and it was originally thought to have that value here (Figure 84a). Then for a brief time it was read as wa (hence Ah Lawal Mat) before the epigraphers settled on OHL, which means “heart” in the sense of “center.” Yohl is the possessed form.

The “La” part of the previous reading Ah Lawal Mat came from the suggestion that the “scroll” element on top was phonetic la rather than logographic NE’ or syllabic ne, as it turns out to be. It is actually a depiction of a tail, and it also occurs in the glyph for the deity GII of the Palenque Triad (Figure 84b), whose name Nikolai Grube reads as Nen K’awiil (Schele and Mathews 1993). This produced the suggestion that the ruler’s name might be better rendered Aj Nen Yohl Mat, but at the time most epigraphers were still not sufficiently comfortable with their understanding of aj ne’. Simon Martin (personal communication 2000) remarked: “I’d like to know whether it’s ajen, aj nen, aj ne’ etc. before having more of an idea.” But he also noted that there is a reference for nen ol in the Cordemex.

So as of the year 2000 and the publication of Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens, the name was given as Aj Ne’ Yohl Mat, while David Stuart preferred a variant spelling of the “tail” logogram leading to Aj Neh Yohl Mat.

That year, in an email to Alfonso Lacadena and others, Marc Zender suggested that the fringed “blobs” underneath the parrot in the spelling from Pakal’s Sarcophagus (Figure 84a) are the syllable je. This would give a-je-ne, or Ajen for the first part of the name (construing the scroll element to be syllabic ne rather than logographic NE’ or NEH). But Zender himself cautioned that the subfix in question could as easily be vestigial parts of the parrot’s wing. And Stanley Guenter (personal

---

Note: It was always likely from a grammatical point of view that the OHL in this name was possessed. As David Stuart (email, 24 October 2003) comments,

I think YOHL or OHL are perfectly good transcriptions of the sign, since in the modern languages it often seems to operate like an inherently possessed nominal or relational noun (that is, a “center” or “heart” can usually only exist in relation to a larger space or body). The same thing seems to be true for OOK, “foot,” where we find the yo- prefix dropping in and out of spellings.

Stuart (2005:114) reads one of the name captions from Temple 19 (that of the leftmost figure on the south face of the platform) as Yohl Mat Ich Baak and translates the first part of this as “center (or heart) of the mat bird.” Together with the fact that the possessive indicator y- in front of the OHL in the name of Lady Yohl Ik’nal of Palenque is spelled but a single time in all the inscriptions referring to this queen, this instance of “Yohl Mat” in a name seemed to provide strong support for the inference of a possessive in this case. Then Nikolai Grube’s discovery of Ajen Yohl Mat’s name on Santa Elena Monument 1 in the museum in Balancan, Tabasco, clenched the Yohl reading. According to Simon Martin (personal communication 2003) the superfix over the OHL even has traces of the central vein of the yo leaf (Figure 85).
communication 2001) pointed out that Seibal Stela 7 has the same bird’s head with wing, in a position where it has to be simple a.

Then discovery by Nikolai Grube of this ruler’s name on Santa Elena Monument 1 in the museum in Balancan, Tabasco, added further support for the Ajen reading. The critical collocation (Figure 86a) is heavily damaged by erosion but begins with AJ- and ends with -ne. In between is a large (and thoroughly damaged) sign. Epigraphers Simon Martin, Stanley Guenter, and Marc Zender felt that it would logically be -je-, as ajen is a word that is known to be spelled out in inscriptions elsewhere. And Zender (email 2003) points out that the difference between AJ-ne and hypothetical a-je-ne is exactly the variation one sees in U-CHOK-wa and U-cho-ko-wa or AJ-K’UH-na and AJ-K’UH-huna, whereby vowels can go unwritten at logograph boundaries. Evidently the authors of Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens were sufficiently persuaded of the arguments for ajen that, as we saw at the beginning of this chapter, they give the name as Ajen Yohl Mat in the second edition of their book (Martin and Grube 2008).

And finally, to consider the last part of this ruler’s name, ma-ta is a syllabic spelling of Mat. Thus, in Figure 86a, we have AJ-ne-OHL-la ma-ta, ajen [y-johl mat, Ajen Yohl Mat. The Mat portion of the name also appears in the pre-accession name of the later ruler K’inich K’an Joy Chitam and in the name of his brother, Tiwool Chan Mat, who died before he could rule but passed the right of succession on to his son, who became K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III.

It has been suggested by Sharon Bowen and Lloyd Anderson (1993) and independently by William Ringle (1996) that Mat was the name of a lineage or clan at Palenque. In the genealogy of Palenque rulers proposed by Linda Schele and David Freidel (1990), Ajen Yohl Mat had a brother, Janaab Pakal, who died before he could rule but passed the succession on through his daughter, the mother of K’inich Janaab Pakal (“Pakal the Great”) (Figure 87). Two sons of K’inich Janaab Pakal bore the Mat name, but they were not in the same lineage as Ajen Yohl Mat according to this genealogy, because clan membership, like the right to rule, would have passed through the male line by the principle of patrilineality. And the children of Lady Sak K’uk’ would have belonged to the lineage of her husband, K’an Mo’ Hix, rather than her father, Janaab Pakal.

38 David Stuart (emails and personal communications 2002-2003) agreed that this was a good possibility. But he remained a little concerned that ajen should be spelled out so unconventionally at Palenque (as AJ-ne), especially since ajen is a lexeme we don’t understand. In his monograph on the inscriptions of Palenque’s Temple 19 (Stuart 2005), he gives the ruler’s name as Aj Neh Yohl Mat.

Figure 86. (a) AJ-*je-ne collocation from Santa Elena Monument 1 (photos by Joel Skidmore). (b) Ajen Yohl Mat’s name from the East Panel of the Temple of the Inscriptions.

Figure 87. Family tree of Lady Yohl Ik’nal, as proposed by Schele and Freidel (1990).
But in an alternative genealogy proposed by Karen Bassie-Sweet (1991), Janaab Pakal was Lady Yohl Ik’nal’s consort (Figure 88). The children and grandchildren of their daughter, Lady Sak K’uk’, were all in the lineage of her husband, K’an Mo’ Hix. That this genealogical proposal accounts for Ajen Yohl Mat and the two sons of K’inich Janaab Pakal having “Mat” in their names does not, of course, prove the hypothesis that Mat was a lineage. Simon Martin comments: “There is a poor record of identifying patronymics or wider groupings in the inscriptions (every once in a while someone has a go at the ‘Skull-Jaguar’ families at Yaxchilan, quite erroneously in my view). One that does seem valid is that on Yaxchilan on Lintel 23 (front) where, despite some uncertainties as to the precise syntax, the K’abal Xook element seems to have been handed down from the father. Perhaps Mat does work, but we need verification to be anywhere near sure (email to the author, copied to a group discussing the Muwaan Mat name and related topics, June 4, 2000).”

The Mat-as-lineage hypothesis was proposed originally based on the observation that the “bird” variant of the Palenque emblem glyph is not an allograph of the “bone” variant. (Allographs are signs with a different appearance but the same meaning, that substitute freely for one another.) There are instances where both the “bird” variant and one of the “bone” variants appear together in the same context, as illustrated in Figure 89a. Here we see the name of the famous Palenque ruler K’inich Janaab Pakal followed by a “Ballplayer” title and two different emblem glyphs.

This might be a good time to quickly review what we mean by “emblem glyph.” All emblem glyphs have three components (Figure 89b). In the first it is generally possible to recognize drops of precious liquid, possibly blood, being scattered as in an offering. This logogram is transcribed K’UH and transliterated in the implicit adjectival form k’uhul, “divine.” The two balls on top of the emblem glyph together form a logogram for AJAW, “lord.” The other component changes from kingdom to kingdom and represents the given polity. The Palenque emblem glyph in its standard form has as it changing element a bone or an animal skull, both read as BAAK. Baak, or “bone,” was the core component of the ancient name of the Palenque kingdom.

In Figure 89c we see a “wavy bone” allograph of the Palenque emblem glyph. (The wa suffix underneath the bone sign complements the AJAW superfix.) In Figure 89d is an animal-skull allograph of the emblem glyph. (Here the la complement, the little “blobs” at the bottom which quite frequently appear with the Palenque emblem glyph, suggests that the ancient name of the kingdom might well have been Baakal, perhaps with a meaning of “Boney,” rather than Baak, “Bone.”) At one time it was
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thought that the “bird” emblem glyphs (Figure 90c-d) were also allographs, so that all the emblem glyphs illustrated in Figure 90 were considered to have the same reading.

But then the same glyph was found in another context, where a phonetic substitution revealed the true reading of the logogram. On the Jambs of Temple 18 we see the name of the father of the Palenque ruler K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III (Figure 91). The distinctive long-lipped glyph, T231 in Thompson’s 1962 catalog, is known to read TIWOOL because of a substitution on the Tablet of the Slaves. Next to the head sign is the CHAN sky-glyph over the phonetic complement na. Thus we know that the name began Tiwool Chan. The bird which appears as the last part of the name is the same as that in the Palenque emblem glyph (compare Figure 91 with Figure 92a). The salient characteristics are the upturned beak, the teeth, the forward-curling tongue, the fringed eyelid, the cheek feathers and the crest. (The humped beak and the feathery crest are intended to represent some sort of waterbird, most likely a cormorant [Stuart 2005].) It is clearly the same logogram in both cases.

In Figure 92b is another spelling of the name from the Temple 18 (this one from the loose stucco glyphs of that structure). The first part is the same, the long-lipped glyph read as TIWOOL. The sky glyph has been replaced with the number four, but it has the same reading, CHAN. But the bird element has been replaced with the syllables ma and ta, spelling mat. This substitution proves that the bird, both in this name and in the Palenque emblem glyph, is also MAT. (And thus the father of K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III was named Tiwool Chan Mat.)

The Mat bird also appears in the name of Palenque’s ancestral deity, often referred to by the nickname Lady Beastie. In Figure 93 we see the full name and title string of the deity in the first three glyph blocks followed by the Mat emblem glyph in the fourth. We’ll return to a discussion of this name when we consider the next Palenque ruler. For now, note how the bird in the emblem glyph also appears in the name of the god. The epigraphers agree that “Mat” is part of Palenque’s most important deity.
“Mat” also appears in the name of the supernatural location where the gods of the Palenque Triad are born. On the Temple of the Foliated Cross Tablet, the Palenque ruler K’inich Kan Bahlam II stands on top of a shell from which emerges (or into which is pulled) the primordial corn plant with the head of the maize god (Figure 94). The shell is labeled “Matwil.” (The actual reading order of the syllables is ma-ta-la-wi, since the scribe has scrambled them a little for artistic effect, but the transliteration is matwil or matwiil, where the doubled letter represents the long vowel signaled by the disharmonic suffix. So as not to have too many alternatives floating around, I am going to disregard the apparent disharmony and spell it matwil after Stuart 2005.)

In Figure 95a we see that GII of the Palenque Triad (Unen K’awiil) arrived at Matwil. The verb for “arrival” is at the left. The next glyph over reads ch’o-ko, ch’ok, literally “emergent one” and in this context probably “youth.” And indeed the glyph for GII himself shows the deity in the recumbent posture with which the Maya represented babies. (Note the tail, which conveys the syllable ne. This syllable is doubled in GII’s name in an inscription at Comalcalco, to produce U-ne-ne, unen, “baby” [Martin 2002:62].) The glyph on the far right tells the location of the arrival, ma-ta-wi-la, Matwil.

It is no coincidence that the ancestral deity, whose name contains “Mat” and who is said to have acceded in Matwil, is identified with the Mat emblem glyph (on the right in Figure 95b). And in Figure 95c we have the same title, split into two glyph blocks following the deity’s name—but with a significant difference. The middle glyph is K’UH-ma-ta-wi-la, K’uh(ul) Matwil. The glyph on the right is a-AJAW-va, Ajaw (the center sign being part of the full form of the AJAW logogram). Together the two glyphs are translated “Divine Matwil Lord.” A comparison of Figure 95b and the evident substitution in Figure 95c raises the possibility that the bird glyph—MAT in all cases—can serve in the emblem glyph as an abbreviation (or “underspelling”) for Matwil. Perhaps the rulers
of Palenque began to refer to themselves as divine lords not just of Baak, the real-world polity, but also of Matwil, the mythological birthplace of the gods. David Stuart (November 26, 2000 email to “Stan, Marc, Joel, and all the ships at sea”) points out that one of the early Subterraneos supports calls K’inich Janaab Pakal a K’UH(UL)-ma-ta-wi-AJAW. Stuart and Stephen Houston (1994) have suggested that Matwil (or Matawil, as it was spelled at the time) was a mythological place of tribal origin, as Aztlan was to the Aztecs. Arguing in favor of the reading of the emblem glyph as Matwil is the frequent -la suffix. Arguing against it is the appearance of ma-ta, Mat, with no -la suffix in the names of Ajen Yohl Mat, Tiwool Chan Mat, Ix Kinuw Mat, and the ch’ok name of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II—although it should be noted that this nominal element does not necessarily equate to the emblem glyph, which David Stuart (2005) reads as K’uhul Matwil Ajaw, “Holy Lord of Matwil.”

Returning to a consideration of the Mat-as-lineage topic, in Figure 96 we see that the quasi-mythological ancestor of the Palenque rulers (whose name, U “Spine Chan appears at F13 of this passage from the Temple of the Cross Tablet) was said to be a Holy Lord of Matwil (E15). Barring this instance, no Palenque ruler before K’inich Janaab Pakal bore the Matwil emblem glyph. This is consistent with the hypothesis that the Mat patriline was introduced by the father of Ajen Yohl Mat (the grandfather of K’inich Janaab Pakal). By this argument, the female rulership of Lady Yohl Ik’nal occasioned a dynastic “sidestep,” before which the rulers were of a different patriline and therefore did not bear the Matwil emblem glyph. In assessing this proposition, it is important to bear in mind that we lack contemporaneous records for the rulers before K’inich Janaab Pakal, and that what we know of them comes from his inscriptions and those of his son. Furthermore, their inscriptions about the previous rulers are limited to those which we have considered, so it may be a coincidence of available space that the only other emblem glyph to appear with these rulers other than the Bone is that of Toktahn. (Bowen and Anderson [1994] have suggested that Toktahn was the lineage previous to Mat.) At any rate, by the Mat-as-lineage hypothesis the quasi-mythological dynastic founder was also the founder or patron of the Mat lineage.

William Ringle (1996) has pointed to the painted inscription from House E of the Palace in connection with the Mat lineage hypothesis (Figure 97). (The photograph shows more detail than remains today on the wall above the Oval Palace Tablet.) The Palenque ancestral deity can be see at D, followed by the Matwil emblem glyph at E. At C is the outstretched hand that we have in accession verbs. Above, in the place of the usual headband of rulership, is the Mat bird. According to Ringle, this “would seem to make explicit [the deity’s] role as ruler of the mat segment.” As an alternative hypothesis, Ringle has proposed that Mat might refer to a barrio, in other words a “neighborhood” or physical location within Palenque. (In this context, one would want to consider the possibility that Toktahn is also such a location, bearing in mind that earlier rulers are said to have performed ceremonies “at” Toktahn, as previously discussed.)

To conclude the Mat lineage topic and resume our consideration of the ruler Ajen Yohl Mat, we might just observe that the inscriptions pertaining to him, such as the one from the East Panel of the Temple
of the Inscriptions (Figure 98), accord him the Baak emblem glyph alone (L12). (Again, the inscriptive references to this ruler are meager, and the absence of the Matwil emblem glyph might be coincidental, owing to considerations of space on the given monument.) Here a distance number of 10 days and 8 months counts forward from the accession of Ajen Yohl Mat. The expression for accession in this case is CHUM-[mu]-wa-ni-ya, chumwaniiy, “from when he was seated” (L10) ta-AJAW-le, ta ajawle[l], “in the lordship” (K11). The ruler’s name is at L11-K12: AJ-ne-OHL-la ma-ta, Ajen Yohl Mat. At L12 is the Palenque emblem glyph: K’UH-AJAW-BAAK, K’uh[ul] Baak[al] Ajaw, “Divine Palenque Lord.” The date of Ajen Yohl Mat’s accession was 9.8.11.9.10, 8 Ok 18 Muwan (January 1, 605). (As with Lady Yohl Ik’nal, we don’t have a birthdate for Ajen Yohl Mat.)

The distance number in the previous passage counts forward to the first glyph at M1: u-tuun-ni-k’al, uk’al tuun, “he tied the tuun.” (It is by counting backwards from the distance number from this period ending celebration that we calculate the accession date that was implicit in the previous passage.) The period ending was celebrated on 9.6.13.0.0, 5 Ajaw 18 Sek, as we see from the calendar round at N1-M2. The glyph at L2 (13-TUUN-ni, oxlajuun tuun, “13 tuuns”) indicates that this was the end of the thirteenth year within a k’atun rather than a k’atun ending. The next three glyphs underline this fact: ma-chaj, machaj, “there was no” (M4), chu-[mu]-[TUUN]-ni, chum tuun, “tuun seating” (N4), yi-li-a-ji, yilaaj, “that he witnessed.” We know from another inscription that Ajen Yohl Mat did not live to see the seating of the next k’atun, which is just what this passage is saying. The ruler’s name follows at N4-M5: AJ-ne-OHL-la ma-ta, Ajen Yohl Mat. Note the head variant of the syllable ta, a beast with a distinctive earring, a skeletal jaw and an upturned snout like that of the Mat bird. It is not, however, a variant of the Mat bird, which would be read MAT instead of ta. (The Mat bird does appear elsewhere in this context, but the reading is ma-MAT, the ma being a phonetic complement, rather than syllabic ma-ta.) At N5 is the animal-skull variant of the Palenque emblem glyph: K’UH-RAJAW-BAAK, K’uhul Baak(al) Ajaw, “Divine Lord of Baakal.”

It was during the reign of Ajen Yohl Mat that one of the most traumatic events in Palenque history occurred. The passage from the Temple of the Inscriptions continues (Figure 99) with a distance number of 14 days (M6) and 6 months (N6) counting forward from 13 Ajaw (M7) 18 Mak (N7) (9.8.17.9.0). The verb (M8) is ch’a-ka-j, ch’akhaj, “it was axed/chopped.” And the object of this action was LAKAM-RA’, Lakamha’, “Big Water” (N8), which is the name for the center of Palenque. In short, an enemy con-
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quered and sacked Palenque.

The passage continues (Figure 100) with the Calendar Round date 4 Ix (M9) 7 Wo (N9) (9.8.17.15.14) on which the attack took place. At M10 is the expression U-KAB[jil], u kabij, “he oversaw it,” followed by the undeciphered name of a king at N10, with his emblem glyph at M11, K’UH-AJAW-KAN, K’uh(ul) Kaan Ajaw, “Divine Lord of Kaan.” The complete passage may be translated as “14 days and 6 winlas after 13 Ajaw 18 Mak, Lakamha’ was axed on 4 Ix 7 Wo by the doing of Scroll Serpent, Divine Kaan Lord” (Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2001).

The emblem glyph in this passage was originally thought to refer to the polity of Pipa’ (or Pomona, elsewhere recorded as an enemy of Palenque) and not the Kaan polity, as you will see if you read Nikolai Grube’s (1996) account of the warfare against Palenque during the reigns of Ajen Yohl Mat and his mother, Lady Yohl Ik’nal. The emblem glyph of Pipa’ (Figure 101b-c) is quite similar to the eroded emblem glyph of the Kaan polity from the Temple of the Inscriptions (Figure 101a).

But then Simon Martin recognized the name of the Kaan king known as Scroll Serpent, who who ruled at the turn of the seventh century (glyph N10 in Figure 100). (There’s still no reading for the actual name represented by the serpent with a scroll-like volute emerging from its gaping jaws. The sign on the left is the possessive pronoun U, “his, hers, its,” that forms part of a number of royal names associated with the Kaan polity [Martin 1997].)

A subsequent inscription from the same tablet (Figure 102) begins with a reference to the k’atun ending 9.9.0.0.0. (We see “9 bak’tons, 9 k’atuns” at O6-P6.) To review the unfortunate events of the k’atun leading up to this date, there were the Kaan and Bonampak aggressions that took place in the time of Lady Yohl Ik’nal and the second Kaan attack during the rulership of her son. As a result, the inscription reads sa-ta-yi K’UH-IXIK, satay k’uh[ul] ixik, “lost is the divine lady” (O8-P8), sa-ta-yi K’UH-AJAW-wa, satay ajaw, “lost is the lord” (O9-P9), a couplet expression of obscure but clearly woe-

39 The Distance Number earlier in this passage counts forward from the nearest Period Ending, which serves to anchor the date of the event in the text. This Period Ending, 9.8.17.9.0 is one-eighth of a k’atun. Eighth-k’atun dates are rare at Palenque, but fairly common at neighboring Tonina. We’ll discuss them again in connection with the Palenque ruler Janaab Pakal II.

40 The emblem glyph of this passage was generally taken to be that of Calakmul, although Stanley Guenter (personal communication 2001) points out that a careful reading of Martin and Grube (2000) suggests the lords of the “Snake polity” did not make Calakmul their capital until sometime in the early seventh century, probably subsequent to this event.
ful meaning (Martin and Grube 2008:161). It might even imply that members of the royal family had died or been killed, since there seems to have been another problem with the succession after the death of Ajen Yohl Mat, as we will see when we consider the next ruler.

A passage from the lid of Pakal’s sarcophagus (Figure 103) relates the death of Ajen Yohl Mat on 2 Kimi (A) 14 Mol (B) (9.8.19.4.6, August 11, 612). The verb for death is at C: OCH-bi, och bi[h], “he entered the road.” He had ruled for less than seven years. There is no portrait of Ajen Yohl Mat on the side of Pakal’s sarcophagus, as there is for Pakal’s other predecessors going back to Ahkal Mo’ Nahb I. But as we have noted, Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II is not depicted either. And as we shall see in our consideration of the next Palenque ruler, it is possible that this ruler is omitted as well. In the cases of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II and Ajen Yohl Mat, it has been suggested that they are not depicted because they did not leave heirs in the direct line of dynastic descent.41 It has even been speculated that Ajen Yohl Mat received short shrift on Pakal’s sarcophagus because his reign, marked as it was by the devastating Kaan attack, was something of an embarrassment to subsequent generations at Palenque. But this historical innuendo has now been silenced by a discovery made by Nikolai Grube in the museum at Balancan in the state of Tabasco.

The photographs in Figure 104 show five glyphs of Santa Elena Monument 1. Located on the Río San Pedro, Santa Elena has been identified by David Stuart as the home of the “Wa-bird” emblem glyph known from the inscriptions of Palenque, Piedras Negras, and Site Q (Simon Martin 2003, citing David Stuart, personal communication 2000). The incomplete text of Monument 1 from Santa Elena records the accession a local ruler, whose name glyphs appear in the photographs.

The first glyph on the left is the “flat-hand” accession expression reading u-k’ahlaj huun tubaah. (Under different lighting, the collocation on the left side of the glyph appears to be AJ, but Simon Martin [personal communication 2003] has examined the monument in the museum and in the photographs and determined that it is the ergative U.) The glyph on the right is the “Wa-bird” emblem.

41 In an unpublished commentary on the newer texts at Palenque, Linda Schele (1997) observed that the death date of Ajen Yohl Mat in the Sarcophagus inscription is recorded out of sequence with that of Janaab Pakal. This historical individual—not to be confused with K’inich Janaab Pakal the Great—is portrayed on one of the sides of the sarcophagus, while Ajen Yohl Mat is not. Schele and Peter Mathews accounted for this anomaly by asserting that the portraits on the sides of the sarcophagus are those of direct ancestors, while the sarcophagus lid records the deaths of both kings and members of the immediate family of Pakal the Great. Schele (1997) adds:

Furthermore, whenever two of these rulers were born close enough together to be considered brothers, only one of the pair was represented on the sarcophagus sides. This pattern led us to identify Ah Nenol-Mat and Hanab-Pakal as older brother-younger brother. In our interpretation Hanab-Pakal died before he could take the throne, but he was the father of the next king—Lady Sak-K’uk, and grandfather of Hanab-Pakal, the Great.
The inscription states that the accession of the Santa Elena ruler was supervised by the king whose name and emblem glyph appear in Figure 105. The glyphs of the center photograph are the easiest to read. On the right is a clear ma superfix over a clear ta syllable, yielding mat. This was the smoking gun for Nikolai Grube, who immediately recognized the left collocation as OHL and the emblem glyph in the photograph on the right above as the skull allograph of the Palenque emblem glyph (note the K’UH(UL) droplets).

The only part of the photograph on the left that can be read with any certainty is the “tail” sign at the bottom, for ne. But the remains of the collocation on the left are entirely consistent with the AJ that begins this ruler’s name. (For the effaced central sign and another photograph, see the earlier discussion on page 56.)

There is no date on Santa Elena Monument 1, so it is impossible to say whether the event overseen by Ajen Yohl Mat took place before or after the Kaan attack on Palenque. But clearly the Palenque ruler had been playing power politics in Tabasco, asserting (or perhaps re-asserting) control over a hub of the Río San Pedro, a major trade artery leading toward the central Maya lowlands and the Kaan polity’s rival Tikal. (This was the route that the Teotihuacan warlord Siyaj K’ahk’ seems to have followed in conquering that kingdom.)

We know from another inscription that a Kaan king supervised an accession in 662 at Moral-Reforma, not far from Santa Elena on the fertile plains along the banks of the Usumacinta. It would have been in the context of vying for influence in Tabasco, and quite possibly with the provocation of Palenque scoring a coup in that regard by asserting overlordship over Santa Elena, that Kaan attacked Ajen Yohl Mat on his home ground on 9.8.17.15.14, 4 Ix 7 Wo (April 7, 611).

We are given another insight into the Santa Elena connection on a stone incensario stand that was found in Group IV (Figure 106). (It was in
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Group IV that the Tablet of the Slaves was also discovered. It probably depicts Aj Sik’ab, who acceded into the high office of ti’ sakhuun (possibly meaning spokesperson for the king) during the reign of Ajen Yohl Mat. He wears a cut-feather headdress with goggle rings associated with Teotihuacan.

The text on the flanges of the monument states that on 9.8.17.10.14, 8 Ix 12 Muwan (December 28, 610), one or more individuals acceded into the office of yajaw k’ahk’ under the supervision of Janaab Pakal. The Calendar Round associated with this event, 8 Ix 12 Muwan, appears just above the earflare on the left side (Figure 107a). The top glyph on the right side (Figure 107b) is k’ahlaj huun, followed by tubaah, for the standard accession formula. The third glyph reads ta-ya-ja-wa-K’AHK’-il, “into [the office of] yajaw k’ahk’.” The next glyph is the name of Aj Sul (AJ-su-lu), a sublord who will go on to serve Pakal the Great and appear on other monuments at Palenque.

The text continues around the side and onto the back of the flange. It goes on to state that three days later something happened to a lord of Santa Elena, an event which is connected somehow with the accession of Aj Sul as yajaw k’ahk’ (Schele 1997). The left side of the top glyph in this photograph by Simon Martin (Figure 108) reads i-u-ti, i uht, “then it happened,” followed by the Calendar Round 11 Kaban (right side of the top glyph) 15 Muwan (left side of the second glyph). The right side of the second glyph is the verb which tells what happened to the Santa Elena lord. Before we go on to examine it, let’s note two things about the photograph. First, the carving is rather crude by Palenque standards. Second, the erosion is not so severe as to interfere unduly with the reading of the signs.

---

42 This is the “other” Janaab Pakal who was discussed in connection with the sarcophagus of Pakal the Great. The idea that it might have been a group accession comes from Marc Zender (personal communication 2003).
The verb bearing on the fate of the Santa Elena lord is highlighted in Figure 109a. Next to it are two very similar verbs that occur later in the same inscription. The one in the middle (Figure 109b) is pretty clearly mu-ka-ja, muhkaj, “was buried.” This is the kind of verb we expect to see on monuments of this type, which seem to have served as funerary memorials.

The glyph on the right (Figure 109c) probably reads OCH-ja, ochaj, “entered.” This would seem to be a cryptic death expression, lacking as it does any indication of the thing entered, be it “water” or “road.” We have seen how Pakal’s sarcophagus states that Ajen Yohl Mat “entered the road,” meaning he died. On Tikal Stela 31 occurs the famous passage where Jaguar Paw of Tikal is said to have “entered the water” on the very day of the arrival of the “strangers” from Teotihuacan. But there is nothing sinister going on in the present instance, as the subject of this apparent death verb here is Aj Sik’ab, the ti’ sakhuun depicted on the monument.

That leaves us to puzzle over the glyph on the left (Figure 109a), which describes what happens to the lord of Santa Elena just three days after Aj Sul is sworn into the office of yajaw k’ahk’. The collocation on top can be said to have either the diagnostic curve of the mu in the Figure 109b or the curve of the “partitive marker” on the “fist” sign for OCH that we see in Figure 109c. (When Maya glyphs show a body part, they always indicate where it was severed from the body. The dot in the middle of the curve may be the bone, seen in cross section.)

Continuing our examination of the mystery glyph in Figure 109a, we might ask if the center collocation is ka, as in Figure 109b. And is the sign below it ja, again as in Figure 109b? This is by no means obvious. And if the sign on top is OCH rather than mu, then -ka-ja would make no sense. Marc Zender (personal communication 2003) suggests that the signs have at least the general shape of OCH-U-CH’EN, a war expression meaning that Aj Sul (and the others who acceded into the office of yajaw k’ahk’ with him) attacked the center of the kingdom of the Santa Elena lord.

Whatever the fate of the Santa Elena lord, it came only months before the Kaan attack on Palenque. On the available evidence, it is impossible to say whether Kaan had wrested Santa Elena from Palenque control and Aj Sul scored a victory in trying to gain it back (but provoked the Kaan attack on Palenque in the process), or whether the stone incensario records the death of a Santa Elena lord loyal to Palenque (who might conceivably have been killed by Kaan). Since we don’t know the date of the accession on Santa Elena Monument 1, it is even conceivable that this assertion of Palenque overlordship in Tabasco followed the Kaan attack.

---

43 It is worth noting that one of the other Palenque monuments that names Aj Sul—a block that was reused in the masonry of one of the North Group temples—shows him in a military context. Another indication that the office of yajaw k’ahk’ has strong associations with warfare comes from the Tablet of the Slaves, which records an impressive string of military triumphs achieved by the yajaw k’ahk’ Chak Suitz’.

---
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MUWAAN MAT

*Tenth in the known Palenque sequence*


Also known as Lady Sak K’uk’ and Lady Beastie. Reigned AD 612-615.

Acceded: 9.8.17.18 9 Etz’nab 6 Keh (October 19, 612).

The glyphic panels of the Temple of the Inscriptions record the following sequence of events. On April 4, 611, Palenque suffers a disastrous military defeat at the hands of Scroll Serpent of Kaan (and we know from another text that Palenque’s king Ajen Yohl Mat dies sixteen months later, on August 8, 612) (Martin and Grube 2008:161). On October 19, 612, a new Palenque ruler named Muwaan Mat is enthroned (ibid.:161). On May 9, 613 occurs the major period ending of 9.9.0.0.0; and instead of the ceremonies which are said to have been performed on all such calendrical occasions in the rest of the inscription, the failure to honor the gods in ritual is explicitly recorded: at this juncture the text states, *satay k’uhul ixik, satay ajaw*, “lost is the divine lady, lost is the lord” (ibid.:161). The exact meaning may be obscure, but the sense is clearly mournful (ibid.:161). Just who was this acceding ruler Muwaan Mat?

The name is that of a mythological figure at Palenque, the mother of Palenque’s trio of patron gods (ibid.:161). The supernatural Muwaan Mat was born in 3121 BC, seven years before the “zero date” of the Maya Long Count calendar and the beginning of the “current creation” (ibid.:159). Some three quarters of a millenium later this mythological figure brings forth the deities known as the Palenque Triad (ibid.:159). In 2305 BC, Muwaan Mat accedes with the title “Divine Lord of Matwiil”; this accession is said to have been *unaah tal*, “the first” (Martin and Grube 2000:159, 161). This suggests the possibility that the ancestral deity assumed the throne a second time in AD 612 as a metaphorical regent because Palenque’s royal patriline was broken and the most legitimate human claimant to the throne, the future K’ínich Janaab Pakal, was but nine years old (ibid.:161). Alternatively, the name Muwaan Mat cloaks the identity of a ruler that Palenque would have preferred to forget, such as a puppet installed by Kaan (Martin and Grube 2008:161).

It was formerly believed that the Muwaan Mat name in the inscription is a pseudonym for Pakal’s mother, Lady Sak K’uk’, who could quite conceivably have served as regent while her son came of age (the Palace Tablet shows her handing him the royal crown at his accession in 615) (ibid.:161). But this argument is invalidated by David Stuart’s demonstration that the mythological Muwaan Mat is male (ibid.:161).


To begin to come to terms with this most mysterious of Palenque rulers, let’s review the evidence as presented by Martin and Grube above and by Stanley Guenter in his masterful treatise on the Temple of the Inscriptions texts (Guenter 2007). A key passage of the Temple of the Inscriptions East Tablet tells us that it was six months and fourteen days after 13 Ahau 18 Mac (Figure 110, M6-N7)
that Lakamha’ (N8) was *ch’ahkaj, “axed/chopped”* (M8) on 4 Ix 7 Wo (M9-N9) by Scroll Serpent of Kaan (N10-M11).

The text continues in the next passage: Ten months and two days (N11) after the seating into lordship (M12-N12) of the ruler named in glyph O1, that ruler placed the stone on 3 Ajaw 3 Sotz’ (O2-O3). This was the ninth k’atun (P3). In token of this 9.9.0.0.0 period ending, the ruler named again at glyph O5 gave clothing (O4) to the gods (P4).

However, any suspicion that this was to be a period ending celebration like the ones preceding it in the East Tablet inscription is dashed by the next passage. Here is the mournful statement, *sa-ta-yi K’UH IXIK, sa-ta-yi AJAW, satay k’uhul ixik, satay ajaw,* “lost is the divine lady, lost is the lord” (Martin and Grube 2008.:161) (Figure 110, O8-P9). And the passages that come next are distinctive for their repetition of the word *ma* “not,” describing actions that were *not* taken. At O10, with reference to a god or gods, is *ma-u-na-wa-ji, ma u nawaaj,* “he was [or they were] not presented publicly” (Guenter 2007:21). At P11 is *ma-ya-k’a-wa, ma yak’aw,* “he did not give” (something to the gods). And again, at Q4-R4, *ma-ya-k’a-wa, ma yak’aw,* “he did not give.”

Again the agent in all this negativity is named with the glyph at R6. This combination of *muwaan “hawk”* (recognizable for the feathers of a smaller bird in the mouth) and *mat “cormorant”* (Stuart 2005:22, n.1, 182)—with an undeciphered sign on top—is very familiar from the mythology of Palenque. David Stuart (2005:Fig.145) has assembled the vari-
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Figure 111. Name variants of the Triad Progenitor: (a) Tablet of the Cross, F8, (b) Tablet of the Cross, B17-C1, (c) Tablet of the Sun, C12-D13, (d) Tablet of the Foliated Cross, C10-D11, (e) Palace, House E paintings, (f) Palace, House D, Pier E, (g) Palace, House A façade (drawings a-d by Linda Schele, e-g by David Stuart).

ants of the name from various Palenque inscriptions (Figure 111). It is apparent that there are other nominal elements beside the hawk/cormorant with its undeciphered superfix. But this is the core name, which can appear by itself, as we saw in glyphs O1 and O5 of Figure 110.

In Q6-R6 of Figure 110, however, it is preceded by a head sign. Until very recently this was taken to be the IX or IXIK indicator of female names. Thus the mythological Muwaan Mat was taken to be female and named “Lady Beast-with-the-Upturned Snout” by Lounsbury (1976:218) and “Lady Beastie” by Linda Schele (Schele and Freidel 1990:245-251). And this in turn led to the assertion that the accession recorded on the Temple of the Inscriptions East Tablet at M12-P1 was that of a mortal queen, namely Lady Sak K’uk’, the mother of Pakal the Great. Since the Oval Palace Tablet (Figure 112) shows her handing the royal headdress to Pakal with no male parent in sight, it seemed reasonable—it still seems reasonable—to conclude that she was at least regent between the death of Ajen Yohl Mat and the accession of Pakal at age twelve three years later.
In an earlier era of glyphic discernment it was felt that ?-MUWAAN[MAT] was another way of spelling SAK-K’UK’. And even after this idea was abandoned, the notion persisted that the name of Palenque’s patron goddess was a stand-in in the Inscriptions text for the rulership, or effective rulership, of Lady Sak K’uk’. But then David Stuart (2005:181-182) demonstrated that the head sign preceding Muwaan Mat wasn’t IXIK but rather IXIM, “maize,” marking Muwaan Mat as an aspect of the maize deity. And thus the ruler who acceded between Ajen Yohl Mat and Pakal was more likely to be male.

At the conclusion of his discussion of the identity of the mythological Muwaan Mat, Stuart (2005:183) observes that “gender was a pliable concept among some Mesoamerican supernatural beings,” and he notes that the maize god’s beaded skirt is worn by women in Classic Maya art, as well as by male impersonators of the maize deity. This is the “hermaphroditism” that Martin and Grube allude to in considering the extent to which Lady Sak K’uk’ is ruled out by Stuart’s identification of Muuwan Mat as an aspect of the maize god (Martin and Grube 2000:232, Palenque note 15). See the further discussion of this fascinating issue in Guenter (2007:19-20, 22).

---

44 Stuart (2005:181) explains out that the IXIK glyph (Figure 113a) has strands of hair on the forehead, while the forehead of the IXIM glyph (Figure 113b) bears the distinctive tassel of the young tonsured maize god first identified by Karl Taube (19805).
K’INICH JANAAB PAKAL I

Eleventh in the known Palenque sequence


Also known as Pacal, Pacal the Great, 8 Ahau, and Sun Shield. Reigned AD 615-683.

Born: 9.8.9.13.0 8 Ahaw 13 Pop (March 23, 603).

Acceded: 9.9.2.4.8 5 Lamat 1 Mol (July 26, 615).

Died 9.12.11.5.18 6 Etz’nab 11 Yax (August 28, 683).

Wife: Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw.

Father: K’an Mo’ Hix.

Mother: Lady Sak K’uk’.

Sons: Kan Bahlam II, K’an Joy Chitam II, Tiwol Chan Mat?

Monuments: Oval Palace Tablet, Hieroglyphic Stairway, House C texts, Subterranean Thrones and Tableritos, Olvidado piers and sarcophagus texts.

Burial: Temple of the Inscriptions.

Although his reign began in a time of adversity for the Palenque kingdom and he ascended the throne as a child, Pakal went on to rule for sixty-eight years and has come down to posterity as the best-known of Maya kings, albeit his fame derives mostly from his magnificent burial (Martin and Grube 2008:162). When he was eight years old, Palenque was invaded by Scroll Serpent of Kaan (ibid.:161). A dynastic crisis was precipitated with the death of Ajen Yohl Mat sixteen months later, and it seems that the young child of Lady Sak K’uk’ and K’an Mo’ Hix was settled upon as the ultimate heir to the throne (ibid.:161). His parents might well have wielded political power on his behalf as he came of age and probably for years after his accession as a twelve-year-old in AD 615 (ibid.:161).

It was apparently in 626 that Pakal married Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw, a woman with ties both to the original Palenque royal seat of Toktahn and to the site of Uxte’k’uh; she bore him sons (and successors) in 635 and 644 (ibid.:162).

The only other event known from Pakal’s early years is from around 628 (he would have been twenty-five at the time), when the capture one of his high officials, an aj k’uhunu, by Piedras Negras provides a glimpse of conflict in the west (ibid.:162-163).

Pakal’s first construction project was the Olvidado in 647; this “Forgotten” Temple far to the west of the Lakamha’ site core bore the first surviving inscription from Palenque since the inscribed bowl of Casper over a century and a half earlier (ibid.:163). There must have other contemporaneous records in the interim, and they are perhaps buried in construction fill after having been destroyed by
invaders (ibid.:163). Glyphs from Pakal’s own reign were re-used in the walls of the North Group (ibid.:162).

The Palace was Pakal’s most ambitious construction project; he began in 654 by adding monuments to rooms of the original Early Classic level and then building House E on a new higher platform (ibid.:163). Possibly because it was the only Palace building not painted red, House E was called the sak nuk naah, “White Skin? House”; it housed a throne room featuring the Oval Palace Tablet (ibid.:163).

The East Court of the Palace, an impressive ceremonial space marked by military triumphalism, was demarcated on the west by House C (dedicated in 661), on the south by House B (also from around 661), and on the east by House A (from after 668) (ibid.:164). (Pakal’s second son, K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II, would later add House A-D on the north [ibid.:164].)

The base of House A, on the east side of the court, was arrayed with megalithic sculptures of prisoners, the central ones bearing capture dates in 662 (ibid.:164). Facing this on the west is the hieroglyphic stairway leading up to House C.

The House C Hieroglyphic Stairway records an attack on Palenque by the “snake-head” polity of Kaan in 599, in the time of Lady Yohl Ik’nal (ibid.:159-160, 164). This is followed by an obscure passage involving a ruler of Santa Elena named Nuun Ujol Chaak (previously mistaken for the king of Tikal with the same name) and (apparently) Itzamnaaj Bahlam II of Yaxchilan (ibid.:121, 164). The inscription’s narrative culmination records the taking of six prisoners by Pakal in 659 (ibid.:164). All six are depicted in sculpture along the base of House C, three on either side of the stairway (ibid.:164). One of them, Ahin Chan Ahk, can be identified as coming from Pipa’, a place name associated with Pomona in Tabasco (ibid.:164-165). The death of another lord from this site in 663 is referred to in an inscription from the West Court, on the opposite site of House C; here six captives from the site of Santa Elena are named in glyphic panels (ibid.:165).

Six days after the captures detailed on the Hieroglyphic Stairway, the Temple of the Inscriptions tablets record that the Santa Elena king Nuun Ujol Chaak “arrived” at Palenque, evidently as a prisoner (ibid.:165). Thus Santa Elena appears to have been restored to Palenque’s control, as it had been under Ajen Yohl Mat (ibid.:161, 165). To the extent that the Hieroglyphic Stairway asserts a restoration of Palenque’s power in the region, it is undermined by subsequent events; within two years, Piedras Negras appears to have conquered Santa Elena, and Calakmul engineered the re-accession of the Moral-Reforma king under the auspices of Yuknoom Ch’een (ibid.:109, 165).

Pakal must certainly have started the Temple of the Inscriptions, intending it as a monument to himself. The completion of its texts and the final architectural touches were left to his son and successor, K’inich Kan Bahlam (ibid.:165).


The opening passage of the House C Hieroglyphic Stairway records Pakal’s birth on 9.8.9.13.0,
8 Ahaw 13 Pop (March 23, 603) and ties it to his accession on 9.9.2.4.8, 5 Lamat 1 Mol (July 26, 615). At A1 of Figure 115 is the Initial Series Introductory Glyph, followed by the head variants for the numbers and calendric periods 9 bak’tuns (B1), 8 k’atuns (A2), 9 tuns (B2), 13 winals (A3) and 0 k’ins (B3), 8 Ajaw (A4) 13 Pop (B4). The “upended frog” glyph for “birth” is at the upper left of A5, together with Pakal’s name and emblem glyph in the rest of that block. In B5 is a clear distance number (12 years, 9 months, and 8 days) and an eroded 5 Lamat 1 Mol. And in A6 is the k’ahlaj huun t-u-baah headband-tying expression for accession and K’INICH JANAAB pa-ka-la.

A passage of the Temple of the Inscriptions East Tablet ties Pakal’s accession to his observance of the seating of the tenth k’atun on 9.10.0.0.0, 1 Ajaw 8 K’ayab (January 24, 633). Following Stanley Guenter’s (2007) reading, after the distance number in R9-Q10 of Figure 116 we have CHUM[mu]-wa-ni-ya, chumwaniiy, “was seated” (R10), ta-AJAW-le, ta ajawle(l), “in lordship” (Q11), K’INICH-PAKAL[JANAAB]-la, K’inich Janaab Pakal (R11), K’UH-AJAW-BAAK-wa, K’uh(ul) Baak(el) Ajaw (Q12). At R12 is u-TUUN-ni-K’AL, u k’al tuun, “his stone presentation” (or placement or binding).

The passage continues at S1-T1 with the Calendar Round 1 Ajaw 8 K’ayab, then CHUM[mu]-(TUUN)-ni, chumtuun, “(the) stone seating” (S2), u-10-WINIKHAAB, u laju’n winikhaab, “the tenth k’atun” (T2), u-LAM-(TAHN), u tahn lam, “in the middle of the sinking” (S3), PIK, pik, “(of the) bak’tun” (T3).

It is highly significant that what comes immediately before this passage of the Inscriptions tablets is the mournful language “lost is the divine lady, lost is the lord,” followed by the listing of ritual actions not taken by Muwaan Mat (see p. 68 above). In the final passage of the East Tablet, Pakal goes on to record that he gave clothing to the gods, and then he devotes the entire Central Tablet to a highly detailed and extensive listing of rituals that he performed. From the point of view of his own life story, he makes it known that his accession followed one of the darkest chapters in his kingdom’s history and then he came in and made it right.

In a similar fashion, the House C Hieroglyphic Stairway contrasts the Kaan invasion of 599 (see p. 44ff above) with Pakal’s military victories of 659. Much of the Stairway inscription remains enigmatic, but the essential message would seem to be this contrast between the bleak state of the kingdom which Pakal inherited and the successes which he himself brought about.
K'INICH KAN BAHLAM II
Twelfth in the known Palenque sequence


Also known as Chan Bahlum II. Reigned AD 684-702.

Dynastic title: Tenth in the line.

Born: 9.10.2.6.6 2 Kimi 19 Sotz’ (May 20, 635).


Died: 9.13.10.1.5 6 Chikchan 3 Pop (February 16, 702).

Father: K’inich Janaab Pakal I.

Mother: Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw.

Brothers: K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II, Tiwol Chan Mat?

Monuments: Tablets and Alfardas of the Temples of the Cross, Sun and Foliated Cross; tablets and facade of the Temple of the Inscriptions; Temple 17 Panel; Death’s Head; Jonuta Panel; Temple of the Cross Stela.

Because his father lived so long and built such an impressive monument to himself (the Temple of the Inscriptions and its tomb), K’inch Kan Bahlam did not accede until he was forty-eight years old and had a hard act to follow architecturally — but he more than rose to the challenge (Martin and Grube 2008:168). That he first completed his father’s funerary temple is clear from the fact that his accession is referred to at the end of the lengthy text of its three hieroglyphic tablets (ibid.:168). He also commissioned the sculptures on the building’s piers with stucco figures holding in their arms the infant manifestation of the god K’awiil (Martin and Grube 2000:168). An associated text, now mostly destroyed, names Kan Bahlam as the “tenth in the line,” a dynastic count that works only if Lady Yohl Ik’nal and Muwaan Mat are omitted (Simon Martin, personal communication 2000; Martin and Grube 2008:168).

The Temples of the Cross, Foliated Cross and Sun were dedicated together in AD 692 (Martin and Grube 2008:169). Each is consecrated to a different god of the Palenque Triad, and each has a sculptured tablet bearing a central icon after which the given building has been named: a cross (actually a “world tree”), a “foliated” cross, and the jaguar god of the night sun (ibid.:169). On either side of these tablets are images of Kan Bahlam, a taller one portraying him as an adult and a shorter as a youth (ibid.:169). The glyphic texts connect the dynastic line begun by Kan Bahlam’s father with the foundation of Palenque in deep mythological time, providing legitimation for the patriline (ibid.:169). Reference is also made to a more recent event associated with a planetary conjunction in 690 (a date which is also recorded on a jade with Kan Bahlam’s portrait that was thrown into the Sacred Cenote at Chichen Itza) (ibid.:169).

Kan Bahlam marked the 9.13.0.0.0 k’atun ending of 692 with Palenque’s solitary figural stela.
The Rulers of Palenque

(ibi.:169). In the military and political realms he substantially expanded Palenque’s sphere of influence. He re-installed the king of Moral-Reforma who had acceded under Kaan supervision in his father’s time, suggesting a widespread authority over the Tabasco plain. Rulers of La Mar and Anaite on the Usumacinta in the close vicinity of Piedras Negras and Yaxchilan took him as their overlord (ibi.:170, 181-182). This is deduced from the depiction of lords of those two sites, said to be the vassals of Palenque, as captives at Tonina (ibi.:170, 181-182). That Palenque warred with Tonina itself is clear from texts from Temple 17 and the Temple of the Sun, which reference a 687 attack on Tonina after which Ruler 2 of that site is never heard from again (ibi.:170).

Kan Bahlam was buried on the very day of his death in 702 (ibi.:170). There is every reason to believe that he was interred in the Group of the Cross, but his tomb has never been found (ibi.:170).

Except as noted, the foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2000:168, 2008:123, 168-170, 181-182). Their sources include Werner Nahm (personal communication) for the “tenth in the line” dynastic count; Karen Bassie-Sweet (1991) and Floyd Lounsbury for the identity of the Cross Group figures; Dieter Dütting (1982) for the astronomical conjunction; Tatiana Proskouriakoff (1974) for the Sacred Cenote jade; Stephen Houston (personal communication 1996) for the burial on the same day as death; and Peter Mathews (personal communication 2002) for the Temple of the Sun reference to the 687 attack on Tonina.

The final passage from the Temple of Inscriptions tablets recording the accession of K’inich Kan Bahlam begins at glyph T8 of Figure 117a with the Calendar Round 8 Ok 3 K’ayab. At S9-T9 is the headband-tying (or -holding-/presenting) expression for accession, and at S10-T10 is the acceding king’s name and emblem glyph: K’INICH-KAN[BAHLAM]-ma K’UH-AJAW-BAAK-la-wa. In Stanley Guenter’s (2007) reading, the passage continues, ya-k’a-wa-1-TAHN-na, yak’aw ju’n tahm, “he gave caring?” (S11); 9-EHT?-NAAH, Balu’n Eht Naah, “(to the) Nine Image? House” (T11); u-K’ABA-u-MUK-li, u k’aba u mukil, “is the name of his tomb” (S12); K’INICH-PAKAL[JANAAB]-K’UH-AJAW-BAAK-la, K’inich Janaab Pakal, K’uh(ul) Baakel Ajaw, “K’inich Janaab Pakal, Divine Lord of Palenque” (T12).

The text text from the front of the Inscriptions temple naming Kan Bahlam as the “tenth in the line” is discussed on page 53 above.

Back in the days when it was still considered likely that the smaller figure on the three Cross Group tablets (Figure 117b) was Kan Bahlam’s father Pakal, it was said of the heavy cloth bands wrapping his chest and the “thick twisted cloth” hanging down the figure’s back that “...the costume clearly portrays him in his role as denizen of Xibalba” (Schele and Freidel 1990:242). More recently David Stuart (2000) has compared the twisted textile costume element to that worn by the (presumably living) figures on the west face of the Temple 19 Platform (Figure 117c).
An insight into Kan Bahlam’s military campaigns is provided by monuments associated with Ballcourt 1 at Tonina (also known as the Sunken Ballcourt), which was probably built by Tonina ruler K’inch Baaknal Chaak (Figure 118). Here sculptures of prisoners with their arms tied behind their backs were tenoned out from the sides of the ballcourt (Figure 119). Underneath each prisoner was a carved stone shield with a feather border and glyphs identifying the captive (Figure 120). The photograph in Figure 121 is a detail of the shield from Figure 120. The captive is named as Sak Bahlam, and he is said to be the ya-AJAW, “lord of” a king bearing the BAAK-AJAW emblem glyph of Palenque. That king is K’inich Kan Bahlam. Here in the ballcourt at Tonina he is referred to fittingly (and with who knows what intended irony) by the ballplayer title “Aj Pitzal” (Martin and Grube 2008:181).

Glyphs of the Temple 17 Tablet (Figure 122) record that on 10 Chuwen 4 Sak (9.12.15.7.11, September 9, 687) (A1-B1) occurred the warfare event och u-ch’een, “he entered the cave/city” (A2). The object of this military incursion (B2) was the “Puh-Drum” (where puh is “cattail reed” and the jaguar skin-covered drum has a marker of ‘hollowness’ at bottom left and an IK’ infix to indicate its identity as a musical instrument [Marc Zender, personal communication 2007]). This was evidently a specific location at Tonina (Grube et al. 2002). This place is possessed by Ruler 2 of Tonina, whose name glyph is at A3. The agent of the action is mostly missing, but the part remaining at A5 is the Baakel Wayal title of K’inich Kan Bahlam.
K’INICH KAN JOY CHITAM II

Thirteenth in the known Palenque sequence


Also known as Kan Xul II and K’an Hok’ Chitam II. Ruled AD 702-711.

Born: 9.10.11.17.0 11 Ahaw 8 Mak (November 2, 644).


Father: K’inich Janaab Pakal I.

Mother: Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw.

Brothers: Kan Bahlam II, Tiwol Chan Mat?

Monuments: Palace Tablet; Del Río Throne?; Warrior Panel; Temple 14 Panel?; Dumbarton Oaks Panel.

K’inich K’an Joy Chitam was fifty-seven years old when he followed his brother K’inich Kan Bahlam II on the throne of Palenque (Martin and Grube 2008:171). That he had been groomed as successor for quite some time is indicated by the fact that he had taken the title baah ch’ok, “head prince,” eight years earlier, in AD 684 (ibid.:171).

Historical assessment of K’inch K’an Joy Chitam has centered around a single monument from Tonina; this shows the Palenque king as a bound captive next to a short text saying that Tonina waged war against the center of Palenque (ibid.:171). Evidently Tonina had effected revenge for the defeat of Ruler 2 by K’inich Kan Bahlam II (ibid.:170, 181).

In contrast to the normal custom of depicting captives stripped of their finery, it is noteworthy that the Tonina monument shows K’inich K’an Joy Chitam retaining his royal regalia (ibid.:171). All the same, the inference had been that he was sacrificed or held in captivity for a protracted period of time. But then David Stuart made a convincing case that K’inich K’an Joy Chitam was in fact restored to his kingship; Stuart pointed to a damaged but legible passage of Piedras Negras Stela 8 which associates the Palenque ruler’s name with a date in 714 (ibid.:171). And an inscription from Palenque’s Temple 16 states that he oversaw a ceremony in Palenque in 718—albeit presumably as a vassal of Tonina or a tribute-payer (ibid.:171). These two dates—both clearly post-capture—mean that there is no reason to question the account of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam presiding over the 720 dedication of his most significant architectural achievement, the gallery connecting Houses A and D of the Palace; this dedication is recorded on the Palace Tablet, the impressive monument displayed within the gallery (ibid.:171).

The Palace Tablet remains enigmatic, however. Its figural relief depicts K’an Joy Chitam receiving the symbols of royalty from his father Pakal and mother Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw (ibid.:171). But the glyphic caption to this scene records the birth and naming ceremony, not of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam but of someone named Ux Yop Huun, as if this mysterious character were depicted as the regal centerpiece of the scene. And the main text of the monument, which refers to events in the life of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam, ends by saying that the gallery being dedicated belonged to Ux Yop Huun. K’inich K’an Joy Chitam, in turn, is not the direct agent but the overseer of the dedication, as if perhaps his role were limited by the warfare and capture events of nine years earlier. Conceivably Ux Yop Huun was some form of regent, although this remains to be clarified.
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The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:170, 171, 181). Their sources include Stephen Houston and David Stuart (1997) for the baah ch‘ok title; Linda Schele and Peter Mathews (1991) for the capture by Tonina; and David Stuart (2004) as noted above.

As the first edition of Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens was published before David Stuart’s 2003 article “Longer Live the King: The Questionable Demise of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam of Palenque,” it did not benefit from Stuart’s presentation of evidence that K’inich K’an Joy Chitam was released from captivity in Tonina. And the first edition also came out before Simon Martin discovered the true identity of K’an Joy Chitam’s captor. To recapitulate the story with the inclusion of these important new findings, the glyphs on the right side of Tonina Monument 122 (Figure 122) impart that on 13 Ak’bal 16 Yax (9.13.19.13.3, August 26, 711) there was a ‘star war’ action against the “cave/city” of the king who is depicted on the monument and named in the glyphs on his leg as K’an Joy Chitam, Baakel Ajaw.

Based on what was known about the Tonina dynasty when the first edition of Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens went to press, the reasonable inference was that it was K’inich Baaknal Chaak who avenged the capture of his predecessor by Palenque (see page 76 above) by penetrating into the very center of Palenque to capture its king in 711. Although we still don’t have a death date for Baaknal Chaak, there was good reason to believe that he was still ruler of Tonina at this time.

But then Simon Martin visited the newly opened Tonina site museum in August of 2000 and discovered an inscription bearing on the date on which Baaknal Chaak’s successor became king. This was in 708, three years before the capture of K’inich Kan Joy Chitam of Palenque. In the photograph in Figure 123 we are looking at the name of the captor, which begins with K’inich (“Great Sun”) and ends with K’ahk’ (“Fire”). Since the second glyph has not been deciphered, he is known as Tonina Ruler 4.

The age at which Ruler 4 became king is still unclear. He was either just over two years old or fifty-five. Lending support to the younger age is another glyph from the same monument in the Tonina museum (Figure 124). The right half is a title sometimes born by kings, Bakab, which may refer metaphorically to the deities who support the earth and sky. The left half reads ch‘ok, which means “young” or “emergent.” It is quite possible that the king of Tonina was all of five years old when he (or his military chiefs) captured the...
As for what happened next, the assumption has generally been that K’inic
K’an Joy Chitam was sacrificed by his captors (Schele and Freidel:424), al-
though Linda Schele (1992) also suggested that he might have been held
prisoner in Tonina for a protracted period. However, David Stuart (2003)
points to three different inscriptions that suggest that K’inic K’an Joy Chi-
tam lived on and continued to rule in his home kingdom of Palenque. The
first of these in the Palace Tablet, which records the dedication of House
years after the capture. The final passage of the inscription (Figure 125)
calls the building a K’AL[HUUN]-*NAAH, k’al... huun naah, “headband-
ying (-holding) house” (Q14) and says that it belongs to an individual
carrying the title Ux Yop Huun (“Three Leaves Headband”) (R16). Stuart
(2003:1) points out that this title occurs elsewhere in personal names. On
the assumption that K’inic K’an Joy Chitam never returned from Tonina,
Floyd Lounsbury suggested that this was a reference to a younger brother
of K’inic K’an Joy Chitam who completed the construction of House A-D
(Schele and Mathews 1993:141).

At Q17 is the still-undeciphered ye-te-je expression followed by K’INICH-
K’AN-JOY[CHITAM], K’UH(UL) BAAK-la-AJAW (R17-Q18). In Stuart’s
words, “There the main inscription ends, without any other indication of
another royal figure at the house dedication. I have long taken this as good
evidence that the king is present and an active participant in the dedication

In further support of his argument, Stuart produces a new piece of evidence.
Stela 8 from Piedras Negras (Figure 126) names K’AN-JOY[CHITAM]
faintly but legibly at X10, with a clear Palenque emblem glyph at W11.
The date is 9.14.2.11.9, 6 Muluk 7 Mol (July 7, 714)—three years after the
capture—and the context suggests that K’inic K’an Joy Chitam was “po-
litically independent to some degree, and had direct relations with distant
kingdoms only a few years after the Tonina defeat” (Stuart 2003:2).

And, finally, Stuart points to a passage of the K’an Tok Tablet (Figure 127),
a monument that was not available for its evidence bearing on the fate of
K’inic K’an Joy Chitam until the Palenque Round Table in 1999 and its
subsequent publication (Bernal Romero 2002). According to Stuart (2003:2),
the date is 9.14.7.0.15, 6 Men 13 K’ank’in (No-

Figure 125. Final passage
of the Palace Tablet (drawing
by Linda Schele).

Figure 126. Passage of Piedras
Negras Stela 8 (drawing by
David Stuart).

Figure 127. Passage of the K’an
Tok Tablet (inking by David
Stuart, after preliminary drawing
by Linda Schele and Peter
Mathews).
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K’INICH AHKAL MO’ NAHB III
Fourteenth in the known Palenque sequence

K’INICH-AHK-AL MO’[NAHB], “Radiant Turtle Macaw Lake?”

Also known as Chaacal III and Akul Anab III. Reigned AD 721-736.

Born 9.12.6.5.8 3 Lamat 6 Sak (September 13, 678).

Acceded: 9.14.10.4.2 9 Ik’ 5 K’ayab (December 30, 721).

Wife: Lady Men Nik.

Father: Tiwol Chan Mat.

Mother: Lady Kinuw.

Brother: K’inich Janaab Pakal II?

Son: K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II.

Monuments: Temple 18 texts, Temple 19 bench and texts, Temple 21 texts; Tablets of the Orator and Scribe; Bundle Panel; House E Painted text?

Whereas the succession had passed from brother to brother (as distinct from the more customary father to son) in the case of K’inich Kan Bahlam II and K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II, it was even less direct in the case of the latter and K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III (Martin and Grube 2008:171-172). In all probability, however, K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb achieved his legitimacy by virtue of being the son of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam’s younger brother (ibid.:172). K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s father, Tiwol Chan Mat is associated with Lady Tz’akbu Ajaw, the wife of K’inich Janaab Pakal the Great, in the stucco text from Temple 18, and he was probably her son (ibid.:172). His burial in 680 was supervised by Pakal himself, suggesting that the great Palenque king was his father (Martin and Grube 2000:172). Thus K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb was a grandson of Pakal and the nephew of his two predecessors as ruler, K’inich Kan Bahlam and K’inich K’an Joy Chitam (Martin and Grube 2008:172).

Compelling evidence for this comes from a stucco scene with glyphs that was formerly displayed on the back wall of Temple 18 (ibid.:172). The three brothers—K’inich Kan Bahlam, K’inich K’an Joy Chitam and Tiwol Chan Mat—stand side by side. Kan Bahlam and K’an Joy Chitam are identifiable by their childhood names, while all three are labeled ch’ok “prince” (ibid.:172). The figure seated before them as the focus of the scene is almost certainly their father, K’inich Janaab Pakal, for a caption text conveys words that are being spoken to him: “You are satisfied, you put them in order” (ibid.:172). In other words, Pakal is presiding over a ceremony in which he has established the order of succession from brother to brother (ibid.:172).

Temple 18 is K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s building, and this tableau—dated to 679—is a statement of his right to rule as the son of one of the chosen heirs (ibid.:172). Ahkal Mo’ Nahb was one year old at the time of the ceremony; his father would die the following year (ibid.:172).

K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s reign is significant for the prominence he accords to secondary figures, implying that he relied on their support (ibid.:173). An important captive taken by the military leader Chak Suutz’ was featured on two prominently displayed relief sculptures known today as the Tablet of the Scribe and the Tablet of the Orator (ibid.:172-173). (The westward expansion of Palenque’s
sphere undertaken by K’ínich Kan Bahlam—and perhaps Pakal before him—clearly continued in that the captive in question was a sajal of Yo’nal Ahk II of Piedras Negras [ibid.:162-163, 170, 172]. The date of the capture may be 725 [ibid.:172].)

Other subordinate figures are depicted helping Ahkal Mo’ Nahb to move a large textile-covered bundle on the eponymous Bundle Panel of 731 (Martin and Grube 2000:173). And it is to a yajaw k’ahk’ of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb that we owe the splendors of Temple 19; this “Lord of Fire” commissioned the building with its magnificent limestone tablet on a central pier (depicting Ahkal Mo’ Nahb together with his yajaw k’ahk’) as well as the sculptured platform gracing its northeast corner (Martin and Grube 2008:173). The latter features a text of over two hundred glyphs, much of it recounting the mythological beginnings of Palenque, and a figural reenactment of this supernatural foundation in which K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb impersonates the Palenque patron deity GI while another grandson of Pakal named Janaab Ajaw portrays God D in the act of overseeing his accession (Martin and Grube 2000:173, 2008:173). This is K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s accession in the current era as well, and it is witnessed by five nobles of Palenque—another example of prominence accorded to secondary figures (Martin and Grube 2008:173).

K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s reign also saw the construction of Temples 18, 18a and 21 in the southern extension of the Cross Group (ibid.:173). Hieroglyphic door jams installed in Temple 18 tie his accession to that of the mythological Muwaan Mat in 3121 BC; Temple 18 contained three tombs of an earlier era, two of which have yielded a wealth of jade objects (Martin and Grube 2000:173).


To begin with a few notes on the foregoing, Martin and Grube (2008:172) give this king’s accession date as December 30, 721 in the Julian calendar. While the difference with the Gregorian is as usual only a matter of days, in this case it has the effect of throwing the accession into a different year: January 3, 722.

K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s father was formerly nicknamed “Batz” because of the long-lipped glyph that spells his name. On the stone pier tablet from Temple XIX, however, the glyph is suffixed by la, which, together with a ti-wo phonetic substitution on the Tablet of the Slaves, suggests Tiwool. The complete name is given on the Tablet of Slaves as ti-wo-CHAN-na ma-MAT, for Tiwool Chan Mat.

That K’ínich K’an Joy Chitam, like his brother before him, had failed to produce a male heir might seem the simplest way to account for the deviation from the normal custom of father-to-son succession, but it is conceivable that it was preferred in this case that the rulership pass from brother to brother (Simon Martin, personal communication 2002). As David Stuart (2002) has pointed out, the stucco relief on the back wall of Temple 18 once depicted standing figures labeled by titles or personal names as the future rulers K’ínich Kan Bahlam II and K’ínich K’an Joy Chitam II, together with a third figure identifiable as K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s father, Tiwol Chan Mat. Seated before them is K’ínich Janaab Pakal I, and adjacent to Pakal are glyphs which address him in second-person speech, “You are satisfied with putting them in order.” The inference is that Pakal had decreed how the succession would pass, not just after he him-
self had died and his eldest son succeeded him, but beyond. Whether or not this arrangement was dictated by the failure of K’ínich Kan Bahlam and K’ínich K’an Joy Chitam to produce male heirs is impossible to say. But it is noteworthy that the scene is dated to just after the birth of K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb (Stuart 2002). At the very least, the figural representation and the text together may be taken as further evidence that K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s father, like K’ínich Kan Bahlam and K’ínich K’an Joy Chitam, was a son of Pakal.

K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s reign is significant for the prominence he accords to secondary figures. This was formerly seen as a consequence of the capture of his predecessor by Tonina, with a consequent interregnum during which support for the maintenance of royal continuity would have been essential. But the probability that K’ínich K’an Joy Chitam was neither sacrificed nor held in prolonged captivity by Tonina (see Stuart 2003) demands some other explanation. Perhaps there were other claimants to the throne despite K’ínich Janaab Pakal’s putative decree that the succession pass from brother to brother and then to his grandson K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb.

K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s birth on 9.12.6.5.8, 3 Lamat 6 Sak (September 13, 678) is recorded on the Jambs on Temple 18. In Figure 130, we see 9 bak’tuns (A3), 12 k’atuns (B3), 6 tuuns (A4), 5 months (B4), and 8 days (A5), 3 Lamat (B5), 6 Sak (A13), with the birth glyph in the left half of B13. The right half of B13 and the left half of A14 comprise the pre-accession name of K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, which seems to have been Ch’ok Chuluk, possibly “Emergent Lizard” (Stuart 2005:115). The right half of A14 is the ‘son of father’ glyph, followed by the father’s name, Tiwool Chan Mat (B14-A15).

A parentage statement for K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s mother is contained in the text from the recently discovered Temple 21 platform (Bernal Romero 2002). At A4 is the U-1-TAHN-na, u juun ta’lin, “the cared one of” expression relating a mother to her child. The part of her name at B5-A6 is Ix Kinuw Mat (Stuart 2005:21). She is also named in a caption on the Tablet of the Slaves, where she sits opposite her husband Tiwool Chan Mat, flanking their son K’ínich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb (Wald 1997).
K’INICH JANAAB PAKAL II
Fifteenth in the known Palenque sequence

Also known as Upakal K’inich. Reigned >742>.

Brother: K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III?

Monuments: Bodega No. 1144.

Bygone visitors to Palenque’s Temple 19 were once greeted in the doorway by a towering stone sculpture of Palenque ruler K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III. On another side of the pier on which this was mounted was an equally impressive sculpture in polychrome stucco. This depicted K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s successor, named on the monument as Upakal K’inch. The accompanying inscription calls him baah ch’ok (“head prince,” or principal heir to the throne) (Martin and Grube 2000:174).

But the second of the two monuments referring to Upakal K’inch as baah ch’ok is even more interesting. Discovered by Arnoldo González Cruz in 2002, a sculptured platform inside Temple 21 depicts K’inich Janaab Pakal in the center of its scene, the great king grasping a sacrificial bloodletter. On either side are seated his descendants, K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III and Upakal K’inch (Martin and Grube 2008:174). There is no date given for the scene, but Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s child name is highlighted in the accompanying text. This suggests that if an actual historical event is being referenced, it must have occurred between the birth of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb in AD 678 and the death of Pakal in 683 (ibid:174). And if Upakal K’inch was present, he must have been Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s brother rather than his son (ibid:174).

On succeeding K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, Upkal K’inch took the name of his ancestor, K’inch Janaab Pakal, styling himself in full Upakal K’inch Janaab Pakal to distinguish himself from his illustrious predecessor (ibid.:174).

In addition to the stucco portrait from Temple 19 and the sculpture from Temple 21, K’inch Janaab Pakal II is named in glyphs and portrayed on fragments of a panel that came originally from the Palace (ibid.:174).

In 742 Upakal K’inch oversaw the accession of a subsidiary lord (ibid.:174).

It was during the reign of Upakal K’inch that Lady Chak Nik Ye’ Xook of Palenque traveled to distant Copan for a marriage that produced that site’s sixteenth ruler, Yax Pasaj Chan Yopaat (Martin and Grube 2000:174, 2008:209).

Based on the observation that the figure of Upakal K’inich sculpted on the platform from Temple 21 (Figure 133) looks, if anything, older than the accompanying figure of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, David Stuart (personal communication 2002) suggested that Upakal K’inich was the brother rather than the son of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb. (Simon Martin [in Miller and Martin 2004:232] arrived at the same conclusion based on the logic outlined above.) In this context, it is worth pointing out that the baah ch’ok title was adopted by the future Palenque ruler K’inich K’an Joy Chitam II on the occasion of his older brother’s accession. And although it is not conclusive evidence, it might be added that Maya kings often took the name of their grandfather upon their accession. Notably this is the case at Palenque, where one inscription refers to Ahkal Mo’ Nahb II simply as “grandson of Ahkal Mo’ Nahb.” As a brother of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III, Upakal K’inich would have been a grandson of K’inich Janaab Pakal.

For the Temple 19 stucco pier see David Stuart’s “Ritual and History in the Stucco Inscription from Temple XIX at Palenque” (Stuart 2000)—online at Mesoweb/PARI—and The Inscriptions from Temple XIX at Palenque: A Commentary (Stuart 2005).

The 742 investiture was one of a series recorded on the “K’an Tok Panel” from Temple 16. According to Peter Mathews (personal communication 2001) the date was 9.15.10.10.13 8 Ben 16 Kumk’u (January 29, 742).

The glyphs of Bodega No. 1144 (Schele and Mathews 1979:No. 81) were originally taken to be a reference to K’inich Janaab Pakal I since that name is clear, but fragmentary PAKAL-la glyphs before “K’ICH JANAAB-pa-ka-la” would have gone toward providing the Upakal portion of the full regnal name, Upakal K’inich Janaab Pakal II (see the discussion on pages 86-87 and Figure 139 below). A companion fragment with his face and headdress graces the cover of Maya Cosmos (Freidel et al. 1993).

Lady Chak Nik Ye’ Xook is thought to have brought an heirloom with her from Palenque to Copan — a jade Olmec head recarved with glyphs bearing a royal name similar to that of Upakal K’inich (Schele and Miller 1986; Martin and Grube 2000:174). This namesake is more likely to have been king of Comalcalco than Palenque, given that the two sites shared the same “bone” emblem glyph (Marc Zender, personal communication 2000).

It was in August, 1998, that an exploratory trench in the ruins of Palenque’s Temple 19 encountered the first fragments of the painted stucco relief panel that led to the identification of Upakal Kinich Janaab Pakal. Under the auspices of the Group of the Cross Project, the pieces of the panel were
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excavated and preserved (Figure 133). Photographs of the stucco glyphs from the panel were sent to the Project’s hieroglyphic specialist, David Stuart, who immediately sent back a reading for most of the glyphs (Figure 134).

Stuart’s fellow expert Simon Martin, who was in Palenque at the time, translated one of the loose glyph blocks as **ba-ch’o-ko**, *baah ch’ok*, “head prince” or “heir to the throne” (Figures 135, 136). Martin observed that this block could be fit together with another, which was a name or a title previously unknown at Palenque, Upakal K’inch, “Shield of the Sun God.”

Subsequent reconstruction of the stucco panel by the Project’s restoration experts confirmed that Upakal K’inch, the figure depicted in the sculpture, was indeed identified by the glyphs as heir to the throne. The question remained, was Upakal K’inch a title once used by K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III himself, before he went on to become king, or was it the name of his eldest son and heir, a previously unknown prince of Palenque? At this juncture, Stuart had not yet suggested a third possibility, that Upakal K’inch was K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s brother rather than his son.

From the inscription of the Tablet of the 96 Glyphs, it was known that K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III was ultimately succeeded in 764 by a son who ruled as K’inch K’uk’ Bahlam II. But almost nothing is known about the period after Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s own accession to rulership in 721. Could it be that K’inch K’uk’ Bahlam had an older brother who ruled in the interim?

New information bearing on this question came to light a year later when Guillermo Bernal Romero presented a paper to the Palenque Round Table in July, 1999. Bernal had assembled the broken pieces of the hieroglyphic tablet discovered by Palenque archaeologist Arnoldo González Cruz in Temple 16 and now known as the K’an Tok Tablet. As we’ve discussed elsewhere herein, the inscription concerns the investiture of a series of officials by rulers of Palenque over a period of more than three hundred years. As reconstructed by Bernal, one of these officials was sworn into office on January 29, 742, about midway

45 At the time, there was also the possibility to be considered that the stucco panel depicted another “head prince” altogether, such as a son of the ruler before K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, who might have died before he became king. Although it might seem unlikely that K’inch Ahkal Mo’ Nahb would have created a monument to a prince other than himself or his own heir, David Stuart (personal communication 2000) cautioned that the hieroglyphs themselves rarely provide the information we need for these sorts of conjectures based on historical context.
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between the accession to rulership of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III and that of his son K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II. It is certainly plausible that K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III was still ruling two decades after his accession and that he himself supervised the installation of the K’an Tok official. But if so, we would expect to see his name on the tablet.

Instead, we find the familiar glyphs of K’inich Janaab Pakal—“Pacal the Great.” The name appears in the center of Figure 137 (the third column from the left, the second full glyph block from the top) and at the lower left of the closer view in Figure 138. The two elements on the left of the glyph block together make K’INICH. PAKAL is the shield sign, while JANAAB is the flower inset into its middle. The elements underneath the shield are read together as the phonetic complement -la, to reinforce the final l in Pakal.46

The problem is that this famous Palenque ruler was long dead at the time the particular K’an Tok official was installed. Bernal’s conclusion? The prince Upakal K’inich from Temple 19 had taken the name of Palenque’s greatest king, K’inich Janaab Pakal, when he himself became ruler of Palenque. Unfortunately the glyphs just before the key passage of the K’an Tok tablet are effaced, but there is certainly room for “Upakal K’inich” in the block preceding “K’inich Janaab Pakal” (at the upper right of Figure 138). In fact it is possible to discern the sign for K’INICH at the bottom of the broken glyph. The evidence was sufficient for Bernal. He dubbed the new Palenque ruler U Pakal K’inich Janaab Pakal.

One more piece of evidence could be brought to bear. In their 1979 catalog of the Palenque archaeological storeroom, Linda Schele and Peter Mathews had presented fragments of a limestone tablet from the Palace (Figure 139). Another piece was found subsequently and determined to be a fit. This fragment, a portrait head, was featured on the cover of Maya Cosmos by Schele, David Freidel, and Joy Parker (Figure 140). Vestiges of an adjacent inscription identify the individual portrayed.

46 The next glyph block to the right of Pakal’s name in Figure 138 is the Palenque emblem glyph in its rabbit-skull variant, for K’uhul Baakel Ajaw, “Holy Palenque Lord.”
Two of the glyphs are completely intact and clear, spelling **JANAAB pa-ka-la**, Janaab Pakal (Figure 141). In 1979, Schele and Mathews assumed that this was name of Palenque’s greatest ruler. But this is only part of that ruler’s name: the K’inich is missing. Only a fragment of the preceding glyph survives, but the part remaining is clearly Pakal.\(^\text{47}\) Thus we have:

```
[missing]-PAKAL-la-[missing]
```

**JANAAB-pa-ka-la**

In other words, a perfect fit for:

Upakal K’inich

Janaab Pakal.

Back in 1998, these lines of thought were not possible because Bernal had not yet presented his paper. The archaeological team and its consultants proceeded on the basis of the available information, making inferences from the dates on the Temple 19 stucco panel and another inscription that was discovered early in the next season (Figure 142). These inferences throw an intriguing light on Palenque history.

The hieroglyphics experts Stuart and Martin quickly agreed on the three dates associated with the panel. One represented the 9.14.0.0.0 k’atun ending of AD 711, while the other two were exactly two and a half tuuns on either side of this date. Stuart noted that the latest of the three dates on the stucco panel was exactly twenty years after a date recorded on the Temple 18 Jambs, commemorating an event in the life of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III, on 9.13.2.9.0, 11 Ajaw 18 Yax (September 1, 694) (Morales 1998). K’inich Kan Bahlam II was king at this time, and the future K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III was fifteen years old.

And what of the occasion depicted in the stucco panel on 9.14.2.9.0, 9 Ajaw 18 Sek (May 19, 714), a ritual enacted by Upakal K’inich during the rulership of K’inich K’an Joy Chitam? The Temple 19 stucco panel tells us that he was “head prince” at the time, but this can’t be so since the future K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb would have held that position. It seems more likely that the *baah ch’ok* designation for Upakal K’inich is retrospective from the time when the stucco inscription was carved, when he would actually have carried that title (Stuart 2005:40).

Back in 2000, the assumption was that Upakal K’inich was the son of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Naab and would therefore have been about fifteen years old when he performed the ritual on 9.14.2.9.0, like his father before him a k’atun earlier. But now David Stuart (2005:40) has given us strong reason to believe that Upakal K’inich was the brother rather than the son of K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb, which suggests that on 9.14.2.9.0 Upakal K’inich would have been closer to Ahkal Mo’ Nahb’s thirty-six years of age. And thus Upakal K’inich could well have been a *baah ch’ok* in his fifties when Temple 19 was dedicated.

\(^{47}\) The elements underneath the PAKAL “shield” are the phonetic complement la.
All we know of this king is that a Pomona text dating to 751 closely associates his name with the accession of local ruler (indicating that Pomona was a Palenque client at this juncture) (Martin and Grube 2008:174). The fact that K’inich Kan Bahlam III is not mentioned in any surviving monuments at Palenque itself suggests that his reign was short and/or troubled (ibid.:174).

Palenque is known to have been defeated around this time, according to an inscription at Tonina; a broken panel depicting a war captive of K’inich Tuun Chapaat displays a Palenque emblem glyph, but the royal name that goes with the title is missing (ibid.:174, 187). Thus it is impossible to say whether the captive is the king himself or one of his vassals (ibid.:187).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:156, 159). Their sources include Guillermo Bernal Romero (2000) for first adding the name of K’inich Kan Bahlam III to the list of Palenque rulers based on the inscription at Pomona.

The solitary reference to K’inich Kan Bahlam II is from the inscription on Pomona Stela 7, which was discovered in the early 1990s by Roberto García Moll, and was commissioned by Pomona ruler K’inich Ho’ Hiix Bahlam in celebration of the period ending of 9.16.0.0.0 2 Ajaw 13 Sek (May 9, 751) (Marc Zender 2004, citing Stanley Guenter, personal communication 2003; Schele and Grube 1995:II-115). The final passage of the monument states that the period-ending ceremonies were undertaken by the king with the assistance of Jewel Jaguar, his ti’sakhuun, and accompanied by K’inich Kan Bahlam, K’uhul Baakel Ajaw (Zender 2004, citing Bernal 2000:27).
Ironically, it is to the reign of the last significant ruler of Palenque that one of the Classic Maya’s greatest sculptural achievements belongs; the Tablet of the 96 Glyphs is justifiably renowned for the mastery by which its glyphic calligraphy is conveyed in stone (Martin and Grube 2008:174). Its text places K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II in the dynastic line of K’inich Janaab Pakal the Great by recounting the latter’s AD 654 dedication of the Palace building housing the throne room that saw the accessions of subsequent rulers including K’uk’ Bahlam’s father K’inich Ahkal Mo’ Nahb III and K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam himself (ibid.:174).

A recently discovered stone portrait head may depict K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II, as the subject can be identified by a quetzal (k’uk’) headdress and jaguar (bahlam) ears (ibid.:174).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:174). Their sources include James B. Porter (1994) for the calligraphic carving style characterizing the monuments of K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam II.

Of the stone portrait-head incensario stand depicting one of the Palenque kings named K’uk’ Bahlam, Mary Miller and Simon Martin (2004:230) observe:

Given the role of this piece in ancestral veneration, it is more likely, as David Stuart has suggested, that it represents the “founder” of the human Palenque dynasty, K’uk’ Bahlam I, who ruled the kingdom from AD 431 to 435.

(See page 6, footnote 2 above.)

After recording the accessions of Pakal the Great and the intervening dynasts, the Tablet of the 96 Glyphs records that of K’uk’ Bahlam II. Following Distance Number Introducing Glyph at E7 of
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Figure 143, with have a Distance Number of 5 k’ins and 14 winals (F7), 2 tuuns (E8), and 2 k’atuns (F8), leading to 9 Manik’ (H1) 15 Wo (G2), the date of K’ incentive K’uk’ Bahlam’s accession.

At H2 is CHUM-la-ja ta-AJAW-le, chumlaj ta ajawlel, “he was seated in lordship.”

At G3 are the Baakel Wayal and ballplayer titles we saw with K’inich Kan Bahlam II (see pages 53 and 76 above). The second of these is given in its fuller form as AJ-pi-tzi-la-OHL, Aj Pitzal Ohl, where Aj is the male agentive, Pitzal (or perhaps Pizziil) is the adjectival form of the word pitz “ball(game),” and Ohl is “heart”—expressing the idea that K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam has the “heart of a ballplayer” (Marc Zender, personal communication 2007).

Then at G4-H4 we have the name itself, K’INICH-K’UK’ [BAHLAM]-ma K’UH(UL)-BAAK-AJAW, K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam, K’uhul Baak(el) Ajaw.

The right half of G5 has the “seating” glyph again, indicating both pictorially and verbally that K’inich K’uk’ Bahlam was seated on a jaguar-skin-covered cushion or throne.

The location where this accession event took place is stated in the next glyph: at H5 we read SAK nu-ku NAAH, Sak Nuk Naah, “White Skin? House.” This is a reference to House E of the Palace, possibly so called because it was the only Palace building not painted red (Martin and Grube 2008:163).
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JANAAB PAKAL III

Ruler of Palenque

6-? ja-na-bi pa-ka-la, “6 Death ? Shield.”

Also known as 6 Cimi Pakal. Reigned 799-7.

Acceded: 9.18.9.4.4 7 K’an 17 Muwan (November 13, 799).

The name of the last ruler to bear the Baakal emblem glyph of Palenque appears on a carved blackware vessel found in a residential quarter outside the royal precinct, cached in a sub-floor burial (Martin and Grube 2008:175). “Calendar names” like Wak Kimi (“Six Death”) have been taken to be the product of increasingly strong Mexican influence in this late era, but this overlooks the time-depth of contacts between the cultures, particularly in the west of the Maya region (ibid.:175).

The final known inscriptive reference to the Baakal occurs on a fired clay brick at Comalcalco and dates to c. AD 814 (ibid.:175). This does not break the silence at Palenque, however, since Comalcalco also employed the Baakal emblem (ibid.:165, 175).

The foregoing is based on Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens by Simon Martin and Nikolai Grube (2008:175). Their sources include Jean-Michel Hoppan (1996) for the 814 date at Comalcalco.

Chan Ajaw (“Four Lord”), one of the kneeling figures depicted on the sculptured platform from Palenque Temple 19 from AD 731, has a “calendar name” (Stuart 2005:115-117). This name also appears as a sculptor’s signature on an unprovenanced panel depicting Lady Ook Ahiin of Yomop.

The carved blackware vessel bearing the Janaab Pakal name is on display in the Palenque site museum (Figure 144). A placard attributes it to Structure III of Murcielagos Section Group B and describes it as follows:

This vase registers the date 9.18.9.4.4, 7 K’an 17 Muwaan, equivalent to November 13, 799, the latest date known at Palenque. The inscription mentions the accession to office of Lord Wak Kimi Janaahb’ Pakal, the last ruler of Palenque. However, this person didn’t hold the title of k’uhul B’aakal ajaw “Sacred Lord of Palenque,” which implies that he probably was a lower rank dignitary.

Figure 144. Blackware vessel in Palenque site museum (photo by Joel Skidmore).
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