Notes on the Dynastic Sequence of Bonampak, Part 1

PETER MATHEWS

With the publication of Heinrich Berlin’s classic study of Emblem Glyphs in the Maya inscriptions (Berlin 1958) and Tatiana Proskouriakoff’s papers on the dynastic sequences of Piedras Negras and Yaxchilan (Proskouriakoff 1960, 1963, 1964) serving as inspiration, a steady advance has been made in the study of historical content in the Classic Maya inscriptions. Berlin’s paper on Emblem Glyphs identified the Emblems of Tikal, Naranjo, Yaxchilan, Piedras Negras, Palenque, Copán, Quirigua, and Seibal. Various papers published since 1958 have attempted to identify the Emblem Glyphs of other sites (Marcus 1973; Miller 1974; Justeson 1975), but it has only been in the past few years that major attempts have been made to update Berlin’s original findings (Kelley 1976: 213–219; Marcus 1976). We can now say that the Emblem Glyphs of some fifteen sites can be identified with assurance; another twelve to fifteen Emblem Glyphs are known but cannot yet be securely identified as to site (Mathews 1977).

In 1975, while researching a paper on the early lintels of Structure 12 at Yaxchilan, I noticed three occurrences of an Emblem Glyph which at that time had not been identified. I remembered that a similar Emblem Glyph occurred on Stela 1 at Bonampak, and, on checking, I found that it also occurred on most of the other Bonampak monuments. The publications since that time of Kelley (1976) and Marcus (1976) show that they had independently reached the same conclusion. Figure 1 contains all the occurrences of the Bonampak Emblem Glyph which I have been able to find.¹

Using this Emblem Glyph to identify references to (and rulers of) Bonampak, we are now in a position to make some comments on the dynastic sequence of the site. Early references at Yaxchilan to Bonampak rulers indicate that Bonampak’s history dates back to Early Classic times and that, in the Early Classic Period, the site was a very important one.²

Bonampak, of course, has become famous through the magnificent murals of Structure I, discovered by Giles Healey in 1946. There are numerous publications on Bonampak, the most important being the report of Ruppert, Thompson, and Proskouriakoff (1955, hereafter referred to as RTP 1955). This is a comprehensive study of the architecture, art, iconography, and epigraphy of Bonampak and is accompanied by copies in color of the murals by Antonio Tejeda F. Thompson’s comments (RTP 1955: 35–37) on the dates of the monuments are especially pertinent to the present paper.³

My paper will make minimal use of the Bonampak murals. It is to be hoped that this essay will augment the studies of the murals currently being undertaken by scholars of the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Bonampak Stela 2 (fig. 2). The first date on Stela 2 is recorded as “6 Muluc 17 Yaxkin, G6, E,” which would call for the Long Count position 9.19.18.3.9. However, as Thompson (RTP 1955: 36) pointed out, this late date is consonant neither with the glyphic style nor with the figurative style of the stela. Thompson suggested that the date be put one Calendar Round earlier, at 9.17.5.8.9 6 Muluc 17 Yaxkin. As we shall see shortly, this emendation must be made for another reason beyond that of style.⁴

The inscription of Stela 2 goes on to record the date as the accession date of a ruler who is named at D1. The accession is recorded by the “toothache” and “affix cluster” glyphs (Proskouriakoff 1960). The name of the ruler is composed of the prefix TI26 and the superfix TI68 (alho), with a main sign which is a conflation of the “sky” sign
(T561a) and the muan-bird head (T748): I shall call him “Chaan-Muan.” At E1 is a reference to his mother, as we shall see later.

Following a Distance Number of 9 kins, 7 uinals, and 13 tuns, a new date of 9.17.18.15.18 12 Etz’ nab 1 Ceh is reached. The protagonist of this second clause is a woman, whose name and titles are recorded at E6–E8. Perhaps her main name is the crosshatched sign T602 (pa) and skull (E7). For this glyph is also located at Elb, following a glyph composed of an inverted vase affixed to the head of a rabbit. The inverted vase has recently been interpreted as a glyph expressing the relationship between child and mother (Schele, Mathews, and Lounsbury 1977). It would thus appear that this lady was the mother of Chaan-Muan. (This argument finds support from the text of Bonampak Stela 1, as we shall see.)

At G1–F3 is named Chaan-Muan: here the “Chaana” and “Muan” names are separated into two glyph blocks (G1–F2). G2–F3 name him as “captor of ’ah-5-skull.”

It would be reasonable to assume that glyph block F1, lying as it does between the woman’s name and that of the ruler Chaan-Muan, is some kind of relationship glyph. As we have seen, there is evidence that this lady is Chaan-Muan’s mother. Therefore, the glyph at F1 presumably records the relationship between mother and child.

At G3a is a glyph (T1.122.533) which specifies the relationship between child and father (Schele, Mathews, and Lounsbury 1977). We can thus expect the name of the ruler’s father to follow. The name is at G4; it is transcribed T228 (ah).58(zac): 742. The main sign is an animal head, which Thompson (1962: 323) suggested is that of an ocelot. A reptilian species—a lizard or some amphibian—is perhaps a preferable identification. The father has the title of ahau (F5), an “ahpo bat” title (G5), and is a “Bonampak bacab” (F6–G6).

The woman portrayed standing behind Chaan-Muan is most likely his wife. In the caption above her (H1–H4), she is named “Lady Yax-rabbit from Yaxchilan”; she has the title “lady bacab.”

It appears that the ruler Chaan-Muan underwent a rather painful ceremony shortly before posing for his portrait for Stela 2. His mother, in front of him, holds a stingray-spine penis perforator, and both women hold a bowl with bark-paper strips onto which the sacrificial blood will drip.

Bonampak Stela 1 (fig. 3). The Initial Series date of Stela 1 is badly weathered. Thompson (RTP 1955: 35) reads it as 9.17.0.0.0 13 Ahau 18 Cumku. However, this date is before the accession of Chaan-
Muan, who is named at H2–H3 as the protagonist of the Initial Series clause. The erection of a monument to a ruler before his accession is most unlikely, so other possibilities for this date should be sought. Thompson saw the baktun coefficient as 9, the katun coefficient as 17, possibly 18, and the day-sign coefficient as 13 or 12. At G1 is a tun sign followed by the “half-period” glyph. I would suggest that the tun sign (only the lower two-thirds are visible) is in fact the remains of the haab date “8 Pax.” The half-period glyph signifies that the date is a “lahun tun-ending” date. At G2 is the “tun-in-hand” glyph, indicating that the date is a tun-ending. And at G3 is the “hand-scattering” verb, which almost always occurs on period-ending dates. The only date which fits all these criteria—including those of Thompson—is 9.17.10.0.0 12 Ahau 8 Pax. Moreover, the “variable element” of the Initial Series introductory glyph appears to be the head of a jaguar god of the underworld, for the month Pax.

This date, 9.17.10.0.0, is the first hotun-ending in Chaan-Muan’s reign, and it is he who is named as protagonist and he who is portrayed on the monument holding spear and shield. Chaan-Muan’s name is recorded at H2–H3; the sky sign is in head-variant form.

The clause continues with a glyph which expresses the relationship between child and mother (Schele, Mathews, and Loulsbury 1977); at Ib–I is the female name which we have already seen at Stela 2. We can now say without doubt that this lady was Chaan-Muan’s mother. At Ka is the glyph which records the relationship between child and father, and the glyphs at Kb–O give the names of Chaan-Muan’s father, almost exactly as were given on Stela 2.

*Bonampak Stela 3* (fig. 4). The text of Stela 3 opens with the date “5 Ahau 3 Muan, G9, F.” This date can only be 9.17.15.0.0 5 Ahau 3 Muan, the second hotun-ending of Chaan-Muan’s reign. The verb is again the “hand-scattering” event, recorded at A3–B3. Following some of his titles, Chaan-Muan’s name is recorded at A5–B5, and at A6 is the Bonampak Emblem Glyph. B6 probably recorded the “alpo bat” title which his father also had.

The glyphs (CI–CII) incised below A6 are not clear enough to permit decipherment. There appears to be at CI a Distance Number which consists only of kins and uinals and which leads forward to a day 12 Cauac 16 (17) Zip. This is, however, little more than a stab in the dark. The glyphs are badly weathered; most of those below C4 are beyond recognition.

The scene of Stela 3 shows Chaan-Muan dressed in elaborate costume, not the least of which is a large mosaic headdress. In one hand he holds a bag and, in the other, a spear-thrower—quite rare in Classic Maya art. He stands over a captive who is making the submissive gesture of placing one hand on the opposite shoulder. The prisoner has armbands of rope and a “chest protector” similar to ones depicted at Yaxchilan and in Lintels 1 and 2 at Bonampak.

From the epigraphic date contained in these three stelae, we can infer the following: the ruler portrayed on all three stelae, whom I have called Chaan-Muan, acceded to power at Bonampak on 9.17.5.8.9 6 Muluc 17 Yaxkin. On the dates 9.17.10.0.0 and 9.17.15.0.0, he took part in ceremonial period-ending rituals, and on all three dates he stood for his portrait. We know neither his birth date nor that of his death. Only on Stela 3 is Chaan-Muan explicitly stated to be from Bonampak. From both Stelae 1 and 2 we know the names of his mother and father. His father is also stated to have been from Bonampak and presumably preceded Chaan-Muan as ruler. From the evidence of Stela 2, it appears that he married a lady from Yaxchilan.

*Bonampak Lintels 1, 2, and 3.* The three lintels of Structure 1 at Bonampak show almost identical scenes. All show conquest scenes where a richly dressed conqueror stands over a fallen and almost naked prisoner. The captor in each case holds a spear with one hand and, with the other, grasps the hair of the captive. The different dress of the conquerors portrayed in the three lintels indicates that different personages may be involved. The inscriptions accompanying the scenes in these lintels indicate that this is indeed the case.

*Bonampak Lintel 1* (fig. 5). In Lintel 1, as in the other two lintels of Structure 1, the inscription is arranged in single vertical columns on each side of the pictorial scene. The text is somewhat similar to that of Lintel 8 at Yaxchilan (Proskouriakoff 1963: 150–152), where first the date, then the verb, then the name of the captive, and then that of the captor are recorded.

Thompson (RTP 1955: 37) suggested that A1 recorded 8 Eb or Cimi. He could not identify glyph A2, but it appears to me to be 10 Cumku, which would call for a day Ik, Manik, Eb, or Ezb’nak. We may therefore be fairly confident that the date re-
Fig. 4. Bonampak Stela 3
corded at A1–A2 is 8 Eb 10 C affirmed. The best position in the Long Count is 9.17.16.3.12.

A3 is the “capture” glyph, read by Knorozov (1967: 99) as chucah, a reading which I accept. The name of the object of the capture is recorded at A4; it is the name “ah-5-skull.” We have already seen that on Stela 2 (G2–F3) Chaan-Muan is referred to as “captor of ‘ah-5-skull.”’ Since the subject of the clause on Lintel 1 is indeed Chaan-Muan (recorded at B2), it is clear that this lintel is commemorating the conquest. The Stela 2 date of the clause where Chaan-Muan is referred to as “captor of ‘ah-5-skull”’ is a little more than two years after the capture date.

The scene on Lintel 1 shows Chaan-Muan grasping the hair of his captive as a symbol of conquest. Chaan-Muan is dressed in a jaguar-skin “T-shirt” and wears a mosaic skull on his back; on his front is a “chest protector” (?) of cotton or rope similar to the one worn by the captive on Stela 3 and to ones worn by rulers of Yaxchilan. Chaan-Muan carries a spear in his right hand, and a flexible shield is attached to his left wrist; “ah-5-skull” still holds on to his shield but is weaponless and almost naked.
Bonampak Lintel 2 (fig. 6). The inscription begins (A1–A2) with the Calendar Round date 4 Lamat 6 Cumku (although the month glyph is damaged, enough remains to identify it as Cumku without much doubt). The most likely Long Count position for this date is 9.17.16.3.8. It will be noted that this date is just four days earlier than the date we have seen on Lintel 1; more will be said of this later. The verb is recorded at A3 as the “capture” glyph, chucah; the name of the captive follows at A4. It is uncertain whether glyphs A5–A8 belong with the phrase of the captive, of the captor, or part with each. I suspect, however, that the name phrase of the captor begins either at A6 or at A7.

At any rate, glyphs B2–B4 record “capctor of ?-macaw, of Yaxchilan.” This is one of the common titles of “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” of Yaxchilan (Proskauroff 1964: 190–200), who was the successor to “Bird-Jaguar” of Yaxchilan. “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” is also named in the short glyphic caption near the bottom of the scene on Lintel 2 (D1–D3). The other small glyphic caption (Cl–C4) probably refers to the captive.

There are two possible reasons why “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” of Yaxchilan should be given such prominence at Bonampak. First, we have seen that Chaan-Muan of Bonampak had a wife who was a lady from Yaxchilan. If she was related to “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant,” then he and Chaan-Muan would have been relatives by marriage. Second, and perhaps more significant, is the fact that “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant’s” conquest occurred just four days earlier than that of Chaan-Muan (it is most unlikely that the two dates could be placed in different Calendar Rounds). Indeed, it is possible that the two conquests were part of the same series of battles. It is possible—though this is speculation—that the rulers of Bonampak and Yaxchilan allied themselves for a series of battles or raids on some other site or sites. In the second part of this study, we shall see that the ruling dynasties of Yaxchilan and Bonampak had a very close relationship dating from Early Classic times. Thus, such an alliance in Late Classic times for military purposes is not implausible.

There is virtually no doubt that the Long Count position of the date on Lintel 2 is 9.17.16.3.8. One Calendar Round earlier is before “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant’s” birth, and one Calendar Round later he would have been well over eighty years of age. From the evidence of Lintel 13 at Yaxchilan, it appears that he was born on 9.16.0.14.15 1 Chicchan 13 Pop. The date we have for him is on Lintel 10, 9.18.17.12.6 7 Cimi 14 Zip.

The scene on Lintel 2 shows “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” in the process of making his conquest. He holds a spear in his right hand, and a flexible shield is attached to his left wrist, while his left hand grasps the hair of his captive. “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” wears an elaborate headdress, a human skull on his right shoulder, a mosaic skull (like that of Chaan-Muan on Lintel 1) on his chest, a woven loincloth, and sandals. He also wears the distinctive type of “chest protector” (?), of cotton or rope, which is also worn by Chaan-Muan on Lintel 1, by the captive on Stela 3, and by “Shield-Jaguar” and “Bird-Jaguar” in Yaxchilan scenes. But it is the feather headdress of “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” which especially calls for comment. In the topmost plume of feathers of the headdress, the feathers are all clipped in a very distinctive way. The same style of clipping also occurs on Stela 21 of Yaxchilan, which is a “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” monument.

Bonampak Lintel 3 and Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1 (figs. 7 and 8). The text of Bonampak Lintel 3 opens with a Calendar Round date 3 Ix 1 Ceh or Yax. Thompson (RTP 1955: 37) gave 1 Ix as a minor possibility and thus offered four alternatives for this date:

A 9.17. 9.11.14 3 Ix 1 (2) Yax
B 9.18.13.17.14 1 Ix 1 (2) Yax
C 9.18. 1.16.14 3 Ix 1 (2) Ceh
D 9.16.13. 9.14 1 Ix 1 (2) Ceh

Of these, Thompson said, “A is the best reading and C the second best; B is a poor third and D very improbable” (RTP 1955: 37). I personally favor 1 Ceh over 1 Yax. For the moment, I shall leave discussion of the Long Count position of this date in abeyance. It can be seen that 1 is clearly recorded as the month coefficient, whereas with a day Ix a month coefficient of 2, 7, 12, or 17 is called for in the normal form of Classic Maya dates. I shall also leave discussion of this for later.

The verb of the clause is recorded at A3. As is the case with the other two lintels of Structure 1, the verb is “capture,” chucah. A4 presumably records the object of the capture, the name of the captive. It is unclear whether A5 belongs with the name phrase of the captive or introduces that of the captor. The glyphs at A6 through B5, however, record the name phrase of the captive. This can be seen most clearly by comparing the glyphs A6–B5 on Lintel 3 with the name phrase of the ruler who is portrayed on Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1 (Coe and Benson 1966: 26–35). The ruler’s name is recorded twice on Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1: at D1–D5 and again at L4–L6.
The glyph at A6 on Lintel 3 of Bonampak Structure 1 is "Knotted-eye Jaguar." In the second part of this study, we shall see that this is the name of an earlier ruler from Bonampak (ca. 9.7.15.0.0) and also of an early ruler of Yaxchilan (ca. 9.4.0.0.0–9.6.10.0.0). "Knotted-eye Jaguar" is also recorded at C4 of Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1. At A7 of Bonampak Lintel 3 is a glyph whose main sign is a knotted hank of hair or rope. The same glyph, but with T228 substituting for the prefix T12, is recorded at D5 on Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1.

A8 of Bonampak Lintel 3 has no parallel in Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1, but A9 does—at D1–C and L4–K5. There are five signs in this sequence: T12 (for which I accept the reading ah), T58 (zac), T580 ("muluc"), T188 (le), and T5 ("chuen"). In the two expressions on Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1, the "chuen" is in head-variant form, being infixed in the forehead of a skull.

B1 of Bonampak Lintel 3 is too weathered to permit secure identification, and B2 has no parallel in the Kuna-Lacanha lintel. B3, however, is perhaps equivalent to the bat head glyph at C5 and L6 on Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1. At B4 on Bonampak Lintel 3 is the Bonampak Emblem Glyph, which is also recorded on Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1, at D4.
Thus we see that, of the eight glyphs which comprise the name phrase of the captor on Bonampak Lintel 3, five occur in the name phrase of the ruler portrayed on Kuna-Lacanja Lintel 1. Even though the glyphs are in different order, there is virtually no doubt that the same ruler is being referred to.

This fact, of course, bears on the Long Count position of the date on Bonampak Lintel 3. Let us review the full text of Kuna-Lacanja Lintel 1.

This lintel, now in the Dumbarton Oaks collection in Washington, D.C., has been fully described and its text analyzed by Michael Coe and Elizabeth Benson (1966: 26–35). I shall therefore keep my comments on the monument brief.

The text begins with the Initial Series date 9.15.15.0.0 9 Ahau 18 Xul, the end of 15 tuns (A1–B6). The verb of the clause (C1) is “his tun-in-hand,” and then at D1–C6 come the names and titles of the ruler whose “tun” it was. At D1–C2 is “ah-zac-‘muluc-le-‘chuen;” and then at D2 comes a title which I follow Floyd Lounsbury (personal communication) in reading ah-nabe(y), “the first.” This is followed by two more titles and, at C4, by the name “Knotted-eye Jaguar.” Then, at D4, comes the Bonampak Emblem Glyph, which is fol-
lowed by a “bat” title and then (D5) by the glyph whose main sign is the knotted hank of hair or rope. C6 is probably another title.

At D6 through J4 is a statement of “Knotted-eye Jaguar’s” parentage: his father (E–F), a “Jaguar,” had some of the same titles (C 1) as his son, and the mother of “Knotted-eye Jaguar” was a “Lady Knot-Ix.” She also had a title in common with her husband and son; hers, however, is prefixed by a female head (J4).

The second clause begins with a Distance Number of 17 kins, 0 uinals, and 3 tunas, to be counted back from the Initial Series to an earlier date, 9.15.11.17.3 4 Akbal 16 Xul. On this date occurred the “seating” of “alz-zac-‘muluc-le-chuen’” (L4–K5), some of whose titles are recorded again at L5–L6.

From Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1, we can see that “Knotted-eye Jaguar” acceded to power on 9.15.11.17.3 and was still ruling on 9.15.15.0.0. The closest Long Count position of the date of Bonampak Lintel 3—if my proposed reading 3 Ix 1 Ceh is accepted—is 9.15.9.3.14, just two years before his accession. Any other placement of this date in the Long Count is hardly possible.

It has been noted that the date is recorded in the form 3 Ix 1 Ceh. Thompson (RTP 1955: 37) argued that this is an example of the “Puuc” style of dating (Proskouriakoff and Thompson 1947, Thompson 1952). He could not find any other occurrences of this type of date at Bonampak, although it is possible that the date at C2–C3 of Bonampak Stela 3 is another example.

In summary, it is clear that, although Lintel 1, 2, and 3 of Structure 1 at Bonampak commemorate conquests, the conquerors are different.

The victor on Lintel 1 is Chaan-Muan, who was probably the one who commissioned the building of Structure 1, the carving of the lintels, and the painting of the murals. The captor on Lintel 2 is “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant,” a contemporary of Chaan-Muan’s and the ruler of Yaxchilan. The captures recorded on Lintels 1 and 2 are only four days apart.

The date of the conquest scene on Lintel 3 is almost fifty years earlier than the dates on Lintels 1 and 2. Lintel 3 records a conquest by a ruler whose names were “Knotted-eye Jaguar” and “alz-zac-‘muluc-le’chuen.” This person was a ruler of Bonampak and acceded to power less than thirty years before the accession of Chaan-Muan. We know that the father of Chaan-Muan was “alz-zac-T742.” The name of the Lintel 3 ruler also begins with “alz-zac-”; it is possible that the T742 animal head of Chaan-Muan’s father’s name is equivalent to the “‘muluc-le’chuen” of the Lintel 3 ruler, in other words, that they are one and the same person.

If this is accepted, Chaan-Muan would be referring to his own conquest, to that of his father, and to that of his contemporary at Yaxchilan. This pat-

Fig. 8. Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1. Photograph courtesy of Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University.
tern is not without precedence, for Structure 44 at Yaxchilan, which is “Shield-Jaguar’s” “war memorial” temple, has references to ancestral conquerors in addition to “Shield-Jaguar’s” own conquests.

From the evidence of Lintel 3 of Bonampak and Kuna-Lacanha Lintel 1, we are now in a position to summarize the known dates of “Knotted-eye Jaguar.” He acceded to power on 9.15.11.17.3 4 Akbal 16 Xul and was alive to celebrate the next hotun-ending date, 9.15.15.0.0 9 Ahau 18 Xul. The date of his conquest was most likely 9.15.9.3.14 3Ix 1 Ceh. The fact that this conquest took place some two years before his accession should not cause us concern: a similar pattern can be seen at Yaxchilan, where there are records that rulers made conquests before their accession. Indeed, Proskouriakoff (1963: 155, 161; 1964: 197) has speculated that success in war might have been a prerequisite for the assumption of power at Yaxchilan.

Bonampak Lintel 4 (lintel of Structure 6; RTP 1955: fig. 16a). The text of this lintel opens with the date 7 Chuen 4 Zotz’ (A1–A2). Little more of the inscription can be interpreted at this time. However, at E3–E4 (in what is probably the name caption of the ruler portrayed) is recorded Chaan-Muan—although it should be noted that the “Chaam” part of the name carries affixes different from those we have seen in other references to Chaan-Muan.

The two Long Count positions of the date on Lintel 4 which are closest to the accession date of Chaan-Muan are 9.16.8.0.11 and 9.19.0.13.11 7 Chuen 4 Zotz’. The former is seventeen years before Chaan-Muan’s accession and thus is most unlikely, for the portrait on Lintel 4 is that of a ruler who carries the ceremonial bar as a symbol of rulership. The latter date is also unlikely, for it is a full twenty years after the latest known date for Chaan-Muan. Thus we are forced to conclude that it is most likely a different Chaan-Muan who is being referred to on Lintel 4. The style both of the glyphs and of the pictorial elements of Lintel 4 would favor an early date, and Thompson’s (RTP 1955: 35) proposal of 9.8.9.15.11, or possibly 9.11.2.10.11 7 Chuen 4 Zotz’, is the best choice. This would imply that the Chaan-Muan of Lintel 4 is a namesake (or near namesake) of the Chaan-Muan of Stelae 1, 2, and 3.

Bonampak Sculptured Stone 1 (fig. 9). Sculptured Stone 1 is a very beautiful and important monument, but the two dates it contains cannot be deciphered with absolute assurance. Thompson (RTP 1955: 35) interpreted the glyph at C2a as 1 Ahau, which he said “may be a reference to
9.10.0.0.0 1 Ahau 8 Kayab.” He further suggested that the date at A1–B1 was — Cauac 2 Zac.

The Distance Number at C1–D1a has as its Kin coefficient 12 and as its uinal coefficient 11 (Berlin 1944), both in head-variant form. The tun coefficient is also a head—exactly the same head, in fact, as the Ahau coefficient at C2a. This Distance Number presumably links the date at A1–B1 with the Ahau date at C2a, which we know from the glyph at D1b must be a period-ending date, most probably a katun-ending (Riese 1971: 231–236). I agree with Thompson on the 2 Zac at B1; however, in my opinion a 4, or perhaps 7, Muluc (in the T757 form) is the most likely tzolk'in date at A1. I also at first agreed with Thompson that the head at C2a stood for 1, for the date 9.10.0.0.0 1 Ahau 8 Kayab, or perhaps 9.16.10.0.0 1 Ahau 3 Zip. However, nothing could be made to fit this interpretation. The head for 1 is that of the young moon goddess and usually has a long lock of hair trailing in front of her ear and down her cheek. Since this lock of hair is present neither in the head at C2a nor in the one at D1a, I toyed with the possibility that the two heads might represent not the young moon goddess, for 1, but rather the handsome young maize god, for 8. If this were so, the best date for C2a would be 9.13.0.0.0 8 Ahau 8 Uo (which is Proskouriakoff’s [1950: 118, 185; RTP 1955: 31] style date for the monument), and the Distance Number at C1–D1a would be 8.11.12. Subtracting this interval from 9.13.0.0.0 reaches the date 9.12.11.6.8 3 Lamat 1 Zac. It is curious that all four elements of this Calendar Round date are exactly one day earlier than what I had previously selected as the best possibility for the date at A1–B1, viz., 4 Muluc 2 Zac. Could there have been a scribal error of one day in the recording of the Distance Number at C1–D1a? It would certainly resolve a lot of problems with this text.

I have belabored the calendrics of this stone because the first date was a very important one at Bonampak. For we can see from the glyph at A2 that it was the date of an accession to power at the site. A2a contains the seating glyph, T644, with a jaguar throne subfix, while A2b records Proskouriakoff’s (1960: 469–470) “affix cluster.” The name of the ruler is presumably recorded at B2a; B2b appears to record the Bonampak Emblem Glyph without the usual prefixes.

The inscription continues with the Distance Number leading forward to 9.13.0.0.0 8 Ahau 8 Uo. The glyphs following the “8 Ahau” at C2a may include a name at D2, although these glyphs may be associated with the period-ending date.

The scene incised on Sculptured Stone I shows the new ruler seated on a throne, being presented with a “jester god” (Schele 1974: 42) by one of three dignitaries seated before him. The “jester god” head is usually found as a forehead ornament on Maya rulers. After the presentation portrayed here, the god head was perhaps to be tied, by the long cloth which drapes below it, onto the head of the new ruler.

Bonampak Sculptured Stone 2 (RTP 1955: fig. 16b). Unfortunately, the finely incised inscription on this stone is fairly badly weathered, with the result that many of the glyphic identifications must remain in doubt.

The text begins at A1 with a date. It apparently reads “5 Ahau, G1, 5D, 5C, X2, A9.” The glyph at A2 clearly has a coefficient of 9 and thus cannot be a haab date—Ahau would call for 8. Rather, it is the glyph G1, in the form as it is on Yaxchilan Stela 6. The coefficient of glyph C appears to be 5, but the following glyph is clearly X2, which would call for 1C or 2C. Glyph A7 appears to be “seating of Uayeb,” though it may be an unusual “seating of a tun.” If it is the latter, then G1 is incorrect, for all tun-endings call for G9; if the former, it is also incorrect, for Ahau calls for a haab date coefficient of 3, 8, 13, or 18. It might be mentioned here that Proskouriakoff’s (1950: 118, 185) style date for this monument is “9.9.0.0.0 + ?.”

At A8 is the “step” glyph, a common verb but of uncertain significance. Hardly any details survive of the glyph at A9.

From this point it is even uncertain in which order the text should be read. At K–N (by my designation of the text) is the name of a father, introduced by the T1.122.534 “father-child relationship glyph.” From the glyphs at M–N, we can see that the father is from Bonampak. Unfortunately, his name glyph is not clear.

At O1–O3 appears to be another date. At O1–O2 is a Distance Number of 2 (?) kins or uinals and 3 tuns, and at O3 is the day 9 Ahau. The glyph at O4 is unclear but does not appear to be a haab date.

Summary and Conclusions

We have seen that the Bonampak ruler, here named Chaan-Muan, was responsible for erecting Stelae 1, 2, and 3 at Bonampak. He is also the protagonist of Lintel 1 of Structure 1, and no doubt this structure and its magnificent murals were commissioned during his reign. From Stela 2 we have seen that Chaan-Muan acceded to power on the date 9.17.5.8.9 6 Muluc 17 Yaxkin. He was
alive for the celebration of the hotun-endings 9.17.10.0.0 (Stela 1) and 9.17.15.0.0 (Stela 3). He made a conquest on 9.17.16.3.12 8 Eb 12 Cumku (Lintel 1) and is mentioned on Stela 2 with the date 9.17.18.15.18 12 Etz’ nab 1 Ceh. Assuming that he was responsible for Structure 1 and its murals, he probably lived beyond the date 9.18.0.3.4 10 Kan 2 Kayab, the most likely reading of the Initial Series date in Room 1 (RTP 1955: 57–58).

The lintel of Structure 6 names Chaan-Muan as protagonist, but analysis of the date and of the style of the monument, both glyphic and iconographic, leads me to the view that it is an earlier Chaan-Muan who is portrayed. Thompson’s (RTP 1955: 35) proposed Long Count position of the date, viz., 9.8.9.15.11 7 Chuen 4 Zotz’, is most likely correct.

Sculptured Stone 1 can most likely be placed at 9.13.0.0.0 8 Ahau 8 Uo. The first clause of the inscription can probably be placed at 9.12.11.6.9 4 Muluc 2 Zac. On this date was the “ accession as ahpo” of a ruler simply referred to as “ahau of Bonampak.”

Unfortunately, the glyphs on Sculptured Stone 2 are too weathered to permit secure identification. Proskouriakoff’s style date for the monument is just before 9.9.0.0.0 (RTP 1955: 30–31).

From Stelae 1 and 2, we know who Chaan-Muan’s parents were. His father had the name “ah-zac-T742,” where T742 is the head of some reptilian or amphibian creature. Chaan-Muan’s mother is named on both Stelae 1 and 2 and is, in fact, the protagonist of the second clause of Stela 2. On Stela 2, another woman is also portrayed: this lady, from Yaxchilan, was quite likely Chaan-Muan’s wife.

Of the three lintels of Structure 1, only Lintel 1 records Chaan-Muan as protagonist. Lintel 2 records “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” of Yaxchilan as captor. His conquest took place, apparently, four days before the capture by Chaan-Muan which is recorded on Lintel 1. It is no doubt this fact which led to the importance given to “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” among these lintels. It is also possible that “Shield-Jaguar’s descendant” and Chaan-Muan were related through marriage. Lintel 3 records an earlier conquest, possibly by Chaan-Muan’s father.

In the second part of this study, I hope to present all external references to Bonampak. It will be seen that there are several monuments which indicate that rulers of Bonampak had attained considerable importance by very Early Classic times. That Bonampak was still a viable Maya center late in Baktun 9 is evidenced by the activity of Chaan-Muan and the beautiful stelae, lintels, and murals which remain as his testimonial.

Notes
1. The illustrations in this paper (with the exception of fig. 8) are by the author. However, I would like to thank Ian Graham, of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, who kindly supplied me with his field drawings of the Bonampak monuments. Figures 4, 5, 6, and 7 I virtually traced from Graham’s drawings, merely checking details from other sources. For the other illustrations, I used Graham’s drawings to correct details in my own.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Floyd Lounsbury for his helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

2. In this paper I shall cover only those monuments which were found at Bonampak (the sole exception is Lintel 1 of Kuna-Lacanja). In a planned follow-up paper, I shall deal with monuments of other sites which mention Bonampak (such as the early Yaxchilan lintels) and monuments without provenance which can be linked to Bonampak.

3. I should also like at this point to refer readers to a recent study by Dieter Dütting, “‘Bats’ in the Usumacinta Valley: Remarks on Inscriptions of Bonampak and Neighboring Sites in Chiapas, Mexico,” which is scheduled for publication in Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. Since I received a copy of Dütting’s paper after my own manuscript was complete, I shall not make a detailed discussion of his paper here. For the most part, we are in agreement on the structural analysis of the texts, although there are differences in specific readings of glyphs. It should be cautioned here that the readings given in this paper are provisional—as are all readings. Some have already been defended in print; I hope to present arguments for other readings in the second part of this study.

4. The Long Count position calls for glyph G7. Other examples of this form of glyph G are on Copán Altar H (it was this that led Thompson [1950: fig. 34, no. 31] to read the glyph as G6, for that apparently is what is called for by the Initial Series date of Altar H’) and twice on the Palace Tablet at Palenque. Both dates on the Palace Tablet unambiguously call for position G7. So we can see that this form of glyph G on Stela 2 at Bonampak might not be an error at all but, rather, a correctly recorded G7.
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