The hieroglyphic stair discovered at Naranjo remains one of the most important and most discussed monuments in Maya studies. In part this has to do with its unique context as well as its evocative narrative. It was in 1905 that the Austrian explorer Teobert Maler documented and photographed the carved monuments at the archaeological site of Naranjo in what is now Guatemala. Among these is the hieroglyphic stair, composed of twelve panels and three sculptures representing human crania (Maler 1908:Pl. 24) (Figure 1). During subsequent visits in the succeeding years, early epigraphers such as Sylvanus G. Morley (1909) studied the calendrical data preserved in the glyphic corpus. In the early 1970s, Ian Graham thoroughly documented the hieroglyphic stair as a basis for producing detailed and accurate drawings of each of the panels as part of the Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions project (Graham 1978:107-110, 1980:152, 154). Graham’s documentation remains the pivotal record of this hieroglyphic stair, since the monument has succumbed to the predation of looters, two panels having disappeared altogether, whereas others have been displaced to a variety of locations, including the collections of the British Museum in London and those of the Museum of Natural History in New York and the bodega of the Parque Nacional Tikal in Guatemala (Graham 1978:107).

With the advent of decipherment, Tatiana Proskouriakoff (1993:40-41) and Michael Closs (1984:78, Table 1) defined the range of dates of the hieroglyphic stair as spanning the two decades between AD 623 and 642. The latter undoubtedly represents the date of the stair’s dedication (Morley 1909:550-554), during the reign of K’an II (r. AD 618–658), king of Caracol, located 42 km to the southeast in what is now Belize (Figure 2). Oddly, the main themes of the hieroglyphic stair are tied to the martial successes of Caracol and the
As such, the monument appears to have been raised in AD 642 by K'an II and would have remained at Caracol, perhaps forming part of the axial stair of Str. B5, until a few decades later when it was moved to Naranjo and integrated into the architecture of Str. B18 (see Morales 2009). The fragment found at Ucanal may have been left there unintentionally as part of the triumphal return march or could alternatively represent a local trophy, signaling their participation in this conflict on the side of Caracol in both AD 626 and 631, and there is a decided focus on Caracol actors, such as K'an II and his allies, to the detriment of Naranjo (see Martin and Grube 2000:73; Tokovinine 2007:15-16). Accounting for the context in which the hieroglyphic stair was found, Linda Schele and David Freidel (1990), in an ambitious early synthesis of Maya history, proposed that this monument must have been raised at Naranjo by victorious Caracol dynasts, during a period of subservience, in order to herald the foreign victors to the local population on a prominent public monument. As Schele and Freidel stated: “Lord Kan II recorded the history of his wars […] on the Hieroglyphic Stairs erected in the capital of his defeated enemy, Naranjo,” going on to remark, “Adding insult to injury, he recorded [such] rites not at his home city but at Naranjo on its subjugation monument, the Hieroglyphic Stairs” (Schele and Freidel 1990:174, 178).

However, the story appears to be more complicated than this. For one, the panels of the hieroglyphic stair at Naranjo were set in a jumbled and unintelligible order, with some panels even mounted on their sides, an apparent attempt to render the narrative illegible for the most part. For another, a panel of the same hieroglyphic stair has been found in the middle of the playing alley of the ballcourt at the site of Ucanal, approximately midway between Caracol and Naranjo (see Graham 1980:152, 154) (Figure 3a). Considering the decidedly Caracol-centric vantage of the narrative presented on the hieroglyphic stair, Simon Martin (2000:57-58, Fig.12) has proposed that this monument was most likely raised at Caracol. Indeed, as part of the extensive program of excavations at Caracol, Arlen and Diane Chase uncovered—in the collapsed architecture at the foot of Str. B5 in the monumental epicenter—a fragment of a carved panel that is identical in terms of size, format and stone that Martin suggests comprised part of the same hieroglyphic stair (see Grube 1994:113, Fig. 9.14a) (Figure 3b). The idea is that this monument was subsequently dismantled and transported to Naranjo (via Ucanal?) as a type of trophy or war booty, an event that could have taken place in the latter part of the seventh century, following the defeat of Caracol at the hands of K’ahk’ Xiw Chan Chaahk of Naranjo in AD 680—as attested in the stucco text of Str. B16 at Caracol (see Martin and Grube 2000:73; Helmke and Kettunen 2011:17; Krempel and Davletshin 2011:27-30). As such, the monument appears to have been raised in AD 642 by K’an II and would have remained at Caracol, perhaps forming part of the axial stair of Str. B5, until a few decades later when it was moved to Naranjo and integrated into the architecture of Str. B18 (see Morales 2009). The fragment found at Ucanal may have been left there unintentionally as part of the triumphal return march or could alternatively represent a local trophy, signaling their participation in this conflict on the side of Caracol.

The segments recording these defeats are interesting for the manner in which they refer to Naranjo as the patient of martial actions. The first of these is the downfall of AD 626 that is recorded on Stela 3 of Caracol, which reads *jubuy aja’sul*, or “they of Naranjo were toppled”—using the toponym *Sa’ul* (“where atole [maize gruel] abounds”), written *SA’-la* prefixed by the general agentive *aj*-. The second is that of AD 631 and is recorded on both Step 6 of the hieroglyphic stair found at Naranjo, but also on the front caption of Caracol Stela 3. On both of these monuments, the defeat involves the “star war” verb, which is paired off with the same toponym, although these are spelled *SA’-di* for *Sa’ul*, suggesting an *u’ > uu* shift sometime around AD 630 (and presumably earlier in spoken forms).
why, despite our best attempts to reconstruct the narrative, there are evident gaps (Table 1), indicating that not all of the panels that originally constituted the hieroglyphic stair have found their way to Naranjo.

Integrating these panels into a nonsensical order as a public monument at Naranjo thereby essentially nullified all pretenses of Caracol power and supremacy that the monument originally conveyed in its original setting. What still plagues us are these gaps, since there are evident lacunae in AD 626, between 627 and 630, between 633 and 636 and, most troubling, the relatively lengthy gap between 637 and 642. As such, whereas it has always been hoped that additional segments of the hieroglyphic stair would be uncovered that would shed light on the original historical discourse, it was not something that could realistically be expected. The discovery on June 3, 2016, of precisely such a segment at the archaeological site Xunantunich in Belize thus came as a pleasant surprise to one and all. Here we will describe the context and circumstance of the discovery of the panel in question and will anchor its dates to the chronology of the hieroglyphic stair, which helps to fill the final gap of AD 637–642, leading up to the dedicatory date that closes the narrative of the monument.

Context and Circumstances of Discovery

Prior to the discovery of this monument, three carved stelae (Stelae 1, 8, and 9), one carved altar (Altar 1), and two carved panels (Panels 1 and 2) had been discovered at Xunantunich (Helmke et al. 2010). The panels constitute the most recent finds, Panel 1 having been discovered by Jason Yaeger as part of the Xunantunich Archaeological Project in 1997, in a fragmentary state in association with Str. A11 of the northern palace complex (Yaeger 1997:35-36); whereas Panel 2 is also fragmentary and was discovered in 2003 by Jaime Awe, in association with Str. A32, the large audiencia of the Castillo, the southern palatial complex of the site (Awe 2008:164; Helmke et al. 2010:101-103). Panel 3 is the most recent discovery at the site and was unearthed at the base of Str. A9 as part of on-going excavations by the Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance (BVAR) project, under the direction of Jaime Awe, which has been operating at the site since 2015 (Figure 4).

Prior to the BVAR project, both Thomas Gann (1925) and Richard Leventhal conducted limited investigations on Str. A9. Gann’s work focused primarily on the summit of the 12-meter high pyramidal building which he designated as Mound E (Gann 1925:61). Gann’s (1925:62) investigations in 1924 uncovered a simple burial containing the remains of an adult individual “[t]wo feet beneath the surface” of the summit platform. Accompanying the human remains were a fragment of a chert projectile point, an obsidian blade, two jade earpools, and a “saucer-shaped” ceramic vessel that had been placed over the head of the individual (Gann 1925:61). The vessel is also described rather vaguely as yellow and red, painted with geometric designs (Gann 1925:54, 62). Gann eventually discontinued his excavations approximately “six feet” below the summit of the structure. Leventhal’s investigation were conducted in the first half of the 1990s as part of the Xunantunich Archaeological Project (XAP) and consisted solely of a one meter–wide trench on the southern flank of the pyramid
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(Jamison 2010:132-133). Besides the basal terrace of the structure, no other cultural feature was identified by the XAP investigations.

The 2016 BVAR investigations had two major goals: (1) to horizontally expose the terminal phase of architecture on the eastern façade of the pyramid (and subsequently conserve it), and (2) to trench the mound to determine whether the structure was erected in a single construction phase or multiple. Erected at the eastern base of Str. A9, along the primary axis of the central outset stairway, is Stela A4 (following the designation of Sylvanus Morley), and excavations below and just behind this monument uncovered two sub-floor caches. One of these contained nine obsidian eccentrics. The other cache contained more than twenty chert eccentrics and large chert flakes (Figure 5). Panel 3 was subsequently discovered during excavations of the stair-side outset to the south of the central stairway. The collapse debris that engulfed, and thereby fortuitously preserved, the monument also damaged the panel somewhat, yet only as negligible chips.

### Table 1. Chronological summary of the narrative preserved in the panels that together comprise the hieroglyphic stair discovered at Naranjo (using the 584286 GMT+1 correlation coefficient). Portions in gray have not been recovered and are conjectural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Count / DN</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gregorian Date</th>
<th>Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.9.10.0.0</td>
<td>2 Ajaw</td>
<td>13 Pop</td>
<td>22 March 623</td>
<td>Step ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 3.4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.13.4.4</td>
<td>9 K’an</td>
<td>2 Sek</td>
<td>29 May 626</td>
<td>Step 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.13.8.4</td>
<td>11 K’an</td>
<td>2 Ch’en</td>
<td>17 August 626</td>
<td>Step 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.14.3.5</td>
<td>12 Chikchan</td>
<td>18 Sip</td>
<td>5 May 627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.??.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 3.??.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.17.11.14</td>
<td>13 Hix</td>
<td>12 Sak</td>
<td>5 October 630</td>
<td>Step 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1.4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.18.16.3</td>
<td>7 Ak’bal</td>
<td>16 Muwan</td>
<td>28 December 631</td>
<td>Step 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1.1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 6 &amp; ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.0.0.0</td>
<td>1 Ajaw</td>
<td>8 K’ayab</td>
<td>28 January 633</td>
<td>Step 6 &amp; ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.3.2.12</td>
<td>2 Eb</td>
<td>0 Pop</td>
<td>5 March 636</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1.13.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.4.16.2</td>
<td>8 Ik’</td>
<td>5 K’ank’in</td>
<td>25 November 637</td>
<td>Step 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 10 &amp; ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.5.12.4</td>
<td>4 K’an</td>
<td>2 Yax</td>
<td>3 September 638</td>
<td>Step ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.10.0.0</td>
<td>13 Ajaw</td>
<td>18 K’ank’in</td>
<td>7 December 642</td>
<td>Step 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.** Archaeologist Jorge Can exposing the glyphic medallions of Panel 3 (photograph by Kelsey Sullivan).
and spall along what is now the upper edge (i.e., the original side of the panel that would have been concealed by architecture in its original context). The monument had actually been placed on its side, resting at an angle against the southern stair-side outset. The context suggests that the monument had been placed against the stair side sometime after the final construction of the structure had been executed. At some later date the plaza floor was resurfaced and lipped up to the lowest portion of Panel 3, suggesting that it had not been moved in antiquity since its secondary redeposition at the base of Str. A9. No notable artifactual concentrations nor features have been found in association with the panel. With continued excavations and analyses we hope to obtain materials that can help us to establish the date of the monument’s redeposition at the base of Str. A9, since this would go a long way to clarifying the process(es) by which this monument found its way to Xunantunich.

Xunantunich Panel 3

Panel 3 is the most recent and significant addition to the monumental corpus of Xunantunich (Figure 7). As recovered the panel measures 87 cm wide, 141 cm high, and 22 cm thick (all maximal measures). Nearly half of the text is in a pristine state of preservation or only moderately weathered, with only one exception where one initial segment has spalled off in antiquity, removing the entirety of one glyph and part of another. The glyphic text is arranged in two superimposed medallions, measuring on average 41 cm wide by 38.5 cm high. It is noteworthy that the upper one is missing its superior frame. The straight edge of the upper section of the panel, coupled with this missing superior frame, suggests that yet another adjoining section was initially set atop, but one that has not been recovered as yet. The relief separating the foreground from the background ranges between 5 and 6 mm, whereas the smaller incisions delineating the features of the glyphs average at around 1 mm.

The color and nature of the fine-grained crystalline limestone, coupled with the use of medallions and the style of the glyphs all suggest that this panel finds its origin at Caracol and was a monument raised during the reign of K’an II. In addition, there are some paleographic features that betray that this panel is an integral part of the original hieroglyphic stair, since we find the same use and form of fillers on day signs, including that of 1 Kaban on Panel 3 (Figure 6a), 1 Ajaw on Step 6 at Naranjo (Figure 6b), and the same date on Altar 19 at Caracol (Figure 6c). In addition, the head variant of the haab with its “digit” coefficient and the placement of the phonetic signs bi and ya below, are nearly identical, when one compares Panel 3 (Figure 6d) with Panel 6 at Naranjo (Figure 6e). These features all indicate

Figure 5. The cache of nine eccentric flints in situ (photograph by Kelsey Sullivan).

Figure 6. Shared paleographic features in the monuments of K’an II. The almost flame-like fillers found with day signs: (a) Xunantunich, Panel 3 (pZ2b); (b) Naranjo, Step 6 (N3a); (c) Caracol, Altar 19. The spelling of the haab in Distance Numbers, with the same head variants, and placement of the bi and ya syllabograms below the main sign: (d) Xunantunich, Panel 3 (pZ2a); (e) Naranjo, Step 6 (M3b).
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that these monuments may well be the product of the same scribes and/or sculptor, yet there are also differences in shared signs between the medallions of Panel 3, such as YAX (pY2a vs. pY3a), WINIK (pY2b vs. pY4b), mi (pZ1a vs. pY3b), and ya (pZ2a vs. pZ4a). These latter differences suggest that the medallions were carved by different sculptors and reveal that the hieroglyphic stair was carved by multiple “hands,” although ones that may have been following a painted template produced in a single hand, or alternatively a variety of sculptors exhibiting the same degree of variance that characterizes any single workshop. It will be interesting to follow up on this very preliminary paleographic assessment in the future and to expand it to all the monuments raised during the reign of K’an II.

Calendrics

The text preserved on the panel can be divided into three clauses, with intervening calendrical information between each. The first two clauses are headed by complete Calendar Round statements, with complete Distance Numbers between the first and the second clause, specifying the amount of time between each of these events. Whereas there are some parts that are now illegible, the entirety of the chronological information can be reconstructed (Table 2). The first Calendar Round is mostly obliterated since it was recorded in the section that is now heavily spalled. Nevertheless, the edge of the day sign K’an and parts of a dot and two superimposed bars for the coefficient can be discerned. The Calendar Round of the second clause is split between the medallions and can be read without difficulty as 1 Kaban 5 Yaxk’In. The Distance Number linking the first and second clauses consists of 8 days, 14 “months” (winal) of twenty days, and 1 “vague year” of 360 days. The numerals are all expressed in bars and dots, with the exception of the coefficient for the year that represents a finger and as such functions metonymically as a digit for “one.” Together this Distance Number accounts for a little less than two years and allows us to reconstruct the initial Calendar Round date as 11 K’an 2 Sak. This date matches the remaining outlines of the day sign and its coefficient.

Figure 7. Photograph and drawing of Xunantunich Panel 3 (both by Christophe Helmke).
The Distance Number leading from the second clause to the third consists of 3 days, 8 “months,” and 2 “years,” amounting to approximately two-and-a-half years. Based on these parameters, the Calendar Round date of the third clause should be 13 Ajaw 18 K’ank’in, although this information has been suppressed on Panel 3. This Calendar Round occurs seven times in baktun 9, yet as a date involving 13 Ajaw this may refer to a period-ending event and precisely such an anchor is provided by the 9.10.10.0.0 Long Count date, which corresponds to December 7, 642. As such, this is the most promising anchor for the chronological data provided on the monument. An anchor to such a prominent lahun tun period ending may also explain its suppression in the text, since it would have been well known and implicit to the reader.

This interpretation of the chronological information is significant since it fits into the missing AD 637 to 642 sequence towards the end of the historical narrative recorded on the hieroglyphic stair discovered at Naranjo. In addition, the latest date recorded in the panels of this hieroglyphic stair is precisely this 9.10.10.0.0 period ending (Step 5), which strongly suggests that this is the dedicatory date of the entire monument. The very last date recorded on the extant panels of the hieroglyphic stair at Naranjo records an event in November 637 (Step 10)—the jubilee celebrating the completion of the first k’atun in rulership of K’an II—and goes on to record another Distance Number leading to another event (Figure 8). What remains of the Distance Number comprises 2 days and 14 “months,” or a little more than nine months later. Whereas this Distance Number does not link directly to the Calendar Round that starts the text of Panel 3, the missing gap amounts to precisely one twenty-day “month” or winal. This is important as the temporal interval is significant in emic terms and also implies that there is another, as yet undiscovered panel that related an event that transpired in September 638. Considering the format of the narrative in these medallions, such an intervening clause could easily be accommodated in such a medallion.

Another interesting feature is that all the other panels represent only a single medallion, whereas Panel 3 clearly differs in this regard, since it bears two superimposed medallions. The best explanation would be to identify Panel 3 as the facing of a stair-side outset, flanking the right side of the stair. This also makes sense in terms of the narrative since the events recorded on Panel 3 constitute the very end of an account that would have spanned the width of the stair and presumably been read from the viewer’s left to right. These interpretations thereby also imply that the very beginning of the narrative, presumably that recording the previous lahun tun period ending of 9.9.10.0.0 (corresponding to March 22, 623), twenty years before, would also have been equally rendered on such a large stair-side panel with two superimposed medallions. From the historical record preserved at Caracol, especially that recorded on Stela 3, it is clear that the first significant event after the

---

### Table 2. The chronology of Xunantunich Panel 3 and its integration in the overall chronology of the hieroglyphic stair discovered at Naranjo (using the 584286 GMT+1 correlation coefficient). The section is gray has not yet been recovered and is conjectural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Count / DN</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gregorian Date</th>
<th>Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.10.4.16.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ik’</td>
<td>25 November 637</td>
<td>NAR Step 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.5.12.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>K’an</td>
<td>3 September 638</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.5.13.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>K’an</td>
<td>23 September 638</td>
<td>XUN Panel 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1.14.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.7.9.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kaban</td>
<td>7 July 640</td>
<td>XUN Panel 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2.8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.10.0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ajaw</td>
<td>7 December 642</td>
<td>NAR Step 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>K’ank’in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 8.** Step 10 of the hieroglyphic stair found at Naranjo (after Graham 1978:110; drawing by Ian Graham © President and Fellows of Harvard College, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, PM# 2004.15.6.3.34).
accession of K’an II to the throne in 618 (on 9.9.4.16.2), was the lahuntun period ending of 9.9.10.0.0. This may help to explain why this period ending is given such prominence on the monuments of K’an II and serves as the starting point of the hieroglyphic stair’s narrative.

Historical Events: Clause 1

The event of the first clause is recorded succinctly as the intransitive verb *kam* or *cham*, “die,” suffixed by the root intransitive suffix –i (pZ1a) (Figure 9). Precisely the same type of event and spelling is seen on Step 13 of the hieroglyphic stair found at Naranjo, which records the death of the Snake-head king Tajo’om Uk’ab K’ahk’ in AD 630 (Figure 3a) (Table 1). The tradition of recording the death of overlords of the Snake-head dynasty is a practice that K’an II may have inherited from Yajawte’ Kinich II, his father, since the death of Sky Witness in 572 appears to be dutifully recorded on Stela 3 of Caracol (Martin and Grube 2000:104). On Panel 3, the patient of this verb, the individual who is said to die on this day, is named in the following glyph (pZ1b). This subject is the so-called Lady Batz’ Ek’, a nickname ascribed to this nominal segment on account of the apparent prognathism of the portrait glyph (see Stone et al. 1985; in comparison, Carl P. Beetz [1980] had nicknamed her “God C Star”). Lady Batz’ Ek’ was the mother of K’an II, and as such, this was clearly a significant turning point in his life to warrant commemoration on this monument. Since we now know that Lady Batz’ Ek’ died in September 638, it explains why her passing was not mentioned on Stela 3, which was dedicated just the year before in November 637 (the latest date on the stela is 9.10.4.15.18, an event that was explicitly said to have been witnessed by Lady Batz’ Ek’). In addition to the references to Lady Batz’ Ek’ in the monuments of Caracol, she is also named as part of the parentage statement of K’an II on so-called Lintel 1 (Grube and Martin 2004:56-57) and Step 3 of the hieroglyphic stair discovered at Naranjo (Simon Martin in Grube 1994:107, Fig. 9.13). As the son of a junior wife of Yajawte’ Kinich II, K’an II was at pains to promote the status of his mother, not least since he succeeded the reign of his half brother, Knot Ajaw (see Martin and Grube 2000:90-91). This helps to explain why Lady Batz’ Ek’ figures so prominently in the monuments of K’an II, which cite her birth, her arrival at Caracol, the many events that she sanctioned and witnessed, and ultimately her death, as recorded on Xunantunich Panel 3. Her name has not been adequately deciphered at present, since it includes a series of different logograms that are resisting coherent decipherment. We will comment on her name before addressing some of the implications of her death statement.

Apparently the portrait head of her name glyph melds the female profile that stands as the logogram IX(IK), functioning here as the female agentive prefix ix-, with the profile of another portrait glyph with large lips. These large and elongated lips are a characteristic of her name that are also found in the name of the father of Ahku’l Mo’ Naahb III, ruler of Palenque in the first part of the eighth century (see Martin and Grube 2000:172-173; Stuart 2005a), and an individual at Copan (Biró 2010:24). The almost duck-billed and elongated lips are a feature of a particular wind deity that may have been named *tiwool* (Stuart 2005a:25, n.3).2 These readings are based on the substitution set written on Palenque’s Tablet of the Slaves as *ti-wo-CHAN-na*, as well as the spellings recorded on the sculptured pier

---

2 Alternatively, this part of the name could have been read as *tiwo* (Alexandre Tokovinine, personal communication 2013).
of Temple XIX at Palenque, where the name is written with a –l sign.

Grube and Martin (2004:50-52). As such, in more complete form the individual at Palenque appears to have been named Tiwool Chan Mat, revealing a type of "celestial" name wherein the middle segment involves chan or "sky." The same may also be the case with the name of Lady Batz' Ek', especially since her name also includes the logogram EK' "star" as a suffix below the portrait head. Based on onomastic patterns, names that include ek' tend to record the fuller sequence … chan ek', as seen in the well-known examples of the name Chan Ek' in the Lowlands during the Classic and the cognate Kan Ek' of the Itza' during the early Colonial period (Boot 2005:39-49, Map 2.2). What may be the final part of her name is written with a polished celt sign T24, for which David Stuart (2010:291-292) has proposed the value LEM. Assuming that all of these elements have been correctly identified, the complete name of the mother of K'an II may actually have been closer to Ixtwool Chan Ek' Lem.

Her name is also followed by a title, recorded in the following glyph (pY2a), duplicating the one that she bears in the text of Stela 3 of Caracol (see Beetz and Satterthwaite 1981:Fig. 4, B10b). This title is written K'UH-YAX-a-AJAW, which allows for two possible readings (Grube and Martin 2004:50-52). It might provide the title k'uhul yax ajaw, wherein the a vocalic sign serves to mark the toponymic suffix –a' (Zender 2005), which here would provide the toponym Yaxa', the Classic period equivalent of the large archaeological site known as Yaxha, in adjoining Guatemala (Stuart 1985). We prefer the latter option and as such her title would designate her as a royal princess hailing from Yaxha.

Panel 3 also provides us with a clear death statement for Lady Batz' Ek, which is here said to have occurred on September 23, 638. This date is significant because it bears some resemblance to the syllabogram ti. This first sign is followed by a ye syllabogram representing a human hand. Together this may yield an intransitive verbal root, followed by an archaic change
of state suffix –ey. Below this segment is TUN-ni or tuun “stone,” providing the subject of this verb. Thus, this segment may provide a complete, albeit short, intransitive clause, which we initially assumed to record a pre-accession name, or youth name of the royal figure that is said to die. If so, the second part of the name would record the regnal name received upon accession (Eberl and Graña-Behrens 2004; Colas 2014). A similar practice is seen in the case of several rulers who keep their youth names even after assuming the throne, usually preceding the accession name. Thus, for example, K’an II of Caracol was named Sak Baah Witzil (or Sak Witzil Baah) in his youth (Grube 1994:104; Martin and Grube 2000:91; Marc Zender, personal communication 2014), whereas Yaxuun Bahlam III of Yaxchilan was named Ajwak Tuun (Martin and Grube 2000:104), “Itzamnaaj” Bahlam IV was Chelew Chan K’inch (Marc Zender, personal communication 2015), and Yo’nal Ahk III of Piedras Negras was named in part Ik’ Naah Chak (Martin and Grube 2000:151). These examples establish the onomastic pattern wherein some rulers maintained their youth names even after their accessions.

Nevertheless, an alternative explanation for this segment can be found in parallel clauses inscribed on panels originally from the site of La Corona in Guatemala. One of these, now in the private collection of Thomas Ford, in Massachusetts, has been designated as Element 9 (originally designated as Panel A by Peter Mathews; see Stuart et al. 2015:Fig. 1a, 9); it provides a death statement of the king of the site of Santa Elena in Tabasco (also known as the “wa-Bird” site; see Martin 2003). Interestingly, his death is recorded as CHAM-mi (pB1), followed once more by ti-ye-TUN (pA2), providing a very close parallel construction to that seen on Panel 3 at Xunantunich.3 Similarly, on Panel 2 of La Corona, the accession of one K’uk’ Ajaw is closely followed by his death recorded as i-cham (C6) ti-y-el-tuun (D6). As such, these prepositional subclauses may all somehow specify the manner of their deaths, by means of, or with, an el-tuun (lit. “tooth-stone” or “sharp-stone”; see Grube et al. 2002:85).

Returning to Panel 3 of Xunantunich and following this prepositional sub-clause, we see the regnal name (pZ3b), which includes three bars and three dots for the numeral “18,” and below we find the sequence BAH-ka-KAN. Together this name can be read as Waxaklajuun Ubaah Kan, which is immediately reminiscent of the well-known Copan ruler known as Waxaklajuun Ubaah K’awiil, who lost his head at the hands of the Quirigua king K’ahk’ Tiliw Chan Yopaat (r. AD 724-785), in AD 738.

The individual named on Panel 3 is, however, another, as is made clear by the differing endings of the names, as well as the chronology, since the Copan ruler reigned several decades later, from AD 695 until his untimely death (see Schele and Freidel 1990:315-319; Martin and Grube 2000:203-205; Looper 2003:76; Stuart 2005b). The name Waxaklajuun Ubaah Kan can be translated as “eighteen are the heads/images of the snake” (see Taube 1992:59-68; Zender 2004:200, 201-203) and refers to the manifold aspects or incarnations of the supernatural entity known as the War Serpent (Helmke 2012:76, 78-79). That this serpentine deity frequently adorns military regalia of prominent warriors, both at Teotihuacan and in the Maya area, makes clear its martial attributes and associations (Taube 1992:59-68). Although this name is best known for its use as a theonym, here it is used as an anthroponym of the individual that passed away in AD 640. Interestingly, the same individual is mentioned in an earlier passage of the hieroglyphic stair at Naranjo (Step 1), four years before his passing, on the date 2 Eb 0 Pop, or AD 636 (see Table 1), at which juncture he is said to have been defeated (Figure 11). This setback is recorded with a “star war” verb followed by a poetic couplet or difrasismo, u-took’ u-pakal, literally “his flint and his shield” (see Hull 2003:422-425; Lacadena 2009; Helmke et al. 2010:104). Although metaphorical, this records the toppling of his army in a crushing defeat, an action that is apparently credited to the king of the Snake-head dynasty known as Yukno’m Head (see Martin and Grube 2000:92, 106). What is really significant here is that we know that Yukno’m Head eventually established his court at Calakmul (Martin 2005) and bore the emblem glyph of the Snake-head dynasty, read k’uhul kanu’l ajaw (see Helmke and Kupprat in press).

3 A similar construction is seen on the finely engraved travertine bowl (K4692), where the same expression ti-ye-TUN-ni is also seen, rendered twice, and once significantly after cham-i, forming yet another parallel construction (Marc Zender, personal communication 2016).
This makes the title of Waxaklajuun Ubaah Kan all the more remarkable. Whereas on Step 1 at Naranjo the title is mostly eroded, on Panel 3 at Xunantunich (pY4a) there can be little doubt that he carried the same Snake-head emblem glyph, complete with initial \( \text{ka} \)- phonetic complement for \( \text{kan} \) “snake,” and the final \( \text{la} \) syllabogram for the locative suffix \( \text{u’l} \) (see Lacadena and Wichmann n.d.:21-28). As such, the conflicts that pitted Yukno’m Head and Waxaklajuun Ubaah Kan may well represent differing contenders to the throne, each bearing the same Snake-head emblem glyph. Based on analogous circumstances in the Maya area—and here we can think of Tikal and Dos Pilas (Houston 1993; Martin and Grube 2000:39-43, 56-58)—we are probably witnessing a bout of sibling rivalry, wherein half-brothers leading opposing factions eventually incited a civil war, with a splinter dynasty ultimately relocating to an alternate location, all the while asserting legitimacy and maintaining their claims to the throne. It may thus be these conflicts that are the lynchpin behind these events and the ultimate relocation of the Snake-head dynasty to Calakmul. If this is correctly deduced, then Waxaklajuun Ubaah Kan may have been the last of the Snake-head kings to rule at Dzibanche—apparently the seat of the dynasty in the Early Classic (Velásquez García 2004, 2008a, 2008b; Martin 2005).

Clause 3

The third and final clause is only partially preserved and apparently would have continued on another panel. The Calendar Round of this date is not recorded on Panel 3, but as we have seen can be reconstructed as an importantlahunton period ending. All that is recorded on Panel 3 is the verb of the action that transpired on this day (p24b). Here it is written \( \text{i-pi-tzi-ji} \) for \( \text{i-pitz-ij} \), involving the substantive \( \text{pitz} \) “ballgame,” here denominalized by the verbalizing suffix \( \text{–ij} \) (Lacadena 2003), the whole preceded by the conjunctive \( \text{i-} \) “and.” As such the narrative recorded on Panel 3 relates that the period ending involved the celebration of a ballgame, although who was involved is not specified here. There are two other references to the ballgame in the panels of the hieroglyphic stair found at Naranjo (Step 7 and 11), one of which took place in AD 627 (see Table 1) (Figure 12). That ballgame is said to have been captained by the Snake-head king Tajo’m U’k’ab K’ahk’ (r. AD 622–630)—the predecessor of Yuhkno’m Head—and was played in a ballcourt named Ux Ahal Ehbul or the “three conquest stair” (see Martin and Grube 2000:130; Bíró 2013:18-19). This name is that of a legendary ballcourt where the Maize God was decapitated in the distant past, but was also a name attributed to historical ballcourts at a series of different sites across the lowlands, all as material emulations of the mythic precedent (Freidel et al. 1993:353-355). As such, any ballgames played within such courts were in essence replications of mythic events that transpired in the time before creation. Unfortunately we do not know more about the ballgame recorded on Panel 3, since the remainder of the clause would have been rendered on another panel that has yet to be recovered. The other references made to the ballgame, on the hieroglyphic stair found at Naranjo, are mentioned in conjunction with Snake-head kings as their primary agents. As such we can see that there is an intimate relation between the ballgame and the hegemony of the Snake-head overlords (see Helmke et al. 2015).

Concluding Comments

The discovery of Panel 3 at Xunantunich is a significant find on several fronts. Not only does it provide a heretofore unknown glyphic text, but it also helps to flesh out several important historical events during the reign of K’an II at Caracol. It also provides ample support to the hypothesis that the hieroglyphic stair is a monument commissioned by K’an II and that it was raised at Caracol. The secondary contexts and the multiple sites at which the panels of this monument have been recovered are evidence of the power and extent of ancient Maya political alliances and the destructive effects of warfare, especially when wrought by vengeful kings. The death date recorded on Panel 3 also makes it clear precisely when Lady Batz’ Ek’ died and eliminates the B19-2nd tomb as a candidate for her final resting place. The mention of Waxaklajuun Ubaah Kan and his attribution of a Snake-head emblem glyph may help to reconstruct what undoubtedly was a period of instability for the dynasty, eventually resulting in the wholesale relocation of the splinter dynasty to Calakmul. It
was this splinter dynasty that would rise to greatness and extend its sphere of influence and ties of vassalage, dominating most of the politics of the Late Classic period. With Panel 3 we have now been able to close an important gap in the lengthy historical narrative that once graced the hieroglyphic stair of K’an II and, however improbable, we can only hope that additional fragments will come to light in the future. The discovery of Panel 3 confirms the ties that bound Xunantunich to Naranjo in the late seventh century, an alliance that would endure well into the Terminal Classic (Helmke et al. 2010). That the hieroglyphic stair of Caracol was dismantled and scattered among the allies of Naranjo is a testament to the might and forceful impact of ancient Maya politics. Whereas the intention of Naranjo kings may have been to silence a glorious part of Caracol’s history, we are incredibly fortunate to be able to pick up the pieces and reconstruct much of this once forgotten history.
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