

GENERAL REMARKS

In labeling parts of this structure we must allow for at least two periods. As indicated in the cross-section of Fig. __, a probable building platform and main platform styled Str. R-7-2nd had to be widened before the final building could be accommodated, so here as elsewhere within the palace series we have a hint of increasing palace building depths as time went on. The known building, Str. R-7-1st, is the latest. It is probable, but not definitely known, that much of the main platform supporting the latest building platform, and its stairways, belongs in time with Str. J-7-2nd or some still earlier period.

Confining attention for the moment to what definitely belongs in the latest R-7-1st period, it is possible that full information would require breaking it into two phases. Instead of this, as indicated in the reconstruction of Fig. __, for descriptive purposes the right portions of building and building platform have been labeled R-7a-1st, the left portion R-7b-1st, using designations which do not necessarily imply differences in time of construction. The left end wall (right in the figure) and the more or less centrally placed transverse wall mark the extremes of Str. R-7b-1st. Several numbered reference points are placed in the figure, and the latter wall reaches the front of the building between the piers at Points 3 and 6. Digging showed that it was necessary to extend the original building platform to the right before the pier of Point 3 could have been placed on it. Before the time of this extension the right end of the platform was in the position expected if it was designed to serve the building of Str. R-7b-1st only, or a predecessor of the same length and depth. There was an inconclusive hint or two that such a predecessor did exist, and if so, the original shortness of the building platform permits but does not positively suggest any difference in age between the two parts of the final building. On the other hand, on the basis of known corners of walls and piers, doorways of Str. R-7a-1st, apart from two theoretically restored extra wide doorways in the latter. It seems necessary to allow that the original, shorter, building plat-

form may belong in an early phase of Str. R-7-1st, and that one of the two portions of the final building may or may not be a secondary addition to the other. The simple designation "Str. R-7-1st" may be taken as referring to the entire final building and building platform; "Str. R-7" includes these together with the main platform; and sometimes, notably in cataloguing objects, this entire complex was divided into right and left portions with the labels "Str. R-7a" and "Str. R-7b".

The basis for the reconstruction of the R-7-1st building is taken up in some detail below. A great deal of it is in broken line, and for Str. R-7b-1st, in the main this is not because of failure to dig but because intact masonry could not be found where we postulate its former presence. The identifiable piers were in very bad condition, even at the base, a fact which makes it plausible to assume complete disappearance of others. It may be taken as certain that Str. R-7-1st was a long double-range palace with front and rear porticoes, the most doubtful elements being the indicated plans at the ends. Very shallow debris on the floors, as well as absence of vault-slabs and specialized cap-stones, shows that the roof was non-vaulted.

The writer first examined the building mound in 1932 by cutting a cross-trench to floor level through the shallow debris, somewhat left of the center of Str. R-7-1st-b. No masonry showed before excavation, though patterned "humps" in the surface showed the location of the medial wall and one or two piers. Systematic notes on debris contours were not made at this time or later. In 1937, while working elsewhere in the South Group Court the writer assigned our best "wall man" to work out the building plan, and to examine the left (southeasterly) end of the megalithic stairway. The building of Str. R-7b-1st was given a rather thorough going-over, with less complete but considerable attention to that of Str. R-7a-1st. Intact masonry was extremely difficult to find, and some, though probably not much semi-intact masonry, was doubtless destroyed in the search for it. Significant points were accurately located and drawn up by Proskouriakoff. In 1939 the right front corner of the main platform served by the megalithic stairway was cleared, and ex-

amined by the writer.

DETAILS AND BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

Main Platform
Terraces

The base-surface for the building platform was about 4.40 m. above the level of the floor of the South Group Court to the front, but only about 2.80 m. above bedrock where the latter was exposed in excavating the South Group Ball Court to the rear (see Part IV, Fig. 7). Some sort of basal platform was therefore probably always needed here for any important building, but the final platform height is much greater than necessary for a mere basal platform serving to level off uneven ground. We have therefore styled the unit of construction rising from the court as the "Main Platform", though it does not stand entirely free, and perhaps is only a portion of a more general system of platforms southwest and southeast of the ball court (see Part I, Fig. 3).

The right (northwesterly) corner was investigated with a minor amount of excavation at the base only. There is little doubt that there were two terraces, probably of equal height. The lower was certainly something more than 1.95 high, rising at an angle of about 73 degrees from horizontal. The corner was round and probably not inset. The debris higher up, as well as the position of the base in relation to the building, suggested a rather wide top for the lowest terrace.

The lower terrace at this corner seemed to rest directly on bedrock and disintegrated bedrock, with floor material resting against it. There was uncertain evidence that the first prepared base-surface for it was about 23 cm. above its base; if so, this was later raised by a secondary floor about 43 cm. above the base.

Stairways A megalithic stairway "covers" much of the main platform, in an off-center position with respect to it, but approximately centered with respect to the South Group Court as a whole. Unexpectedly, there was surely

4

an additional stairway of small width at the extreme right, as suggested in the plan Part I, Fig. 3. While none of this was seen, its characteristically protruding mound of debris was unmistakable. It is not centered even with respect to Str. R-7a-1st considered alone, and so does not argue against thinking of both parts of the building as a unit, whether or not they were constructed at one time.

Megalithic Stairway Data on this stairway is far from complete but all expected gross features were noted. The lowest megalithic flight of steps serves a projecting shoulder-forming platform about 1.50 high - significantly lower than the minimum height for the lower of the supposed two terraces at the extreme end of the main platform. The megalithic flight covers about 13.00 m. of the projecting platform, leaving about 3.30 m. of its face exposed on the left end and, presumably, an equal amount on the other side. The shoulder platform, at the left end which we exposed, was vertical. Available notes fail to show that its front face was sloping, but there is nothing to indicate that it was not. At the base the steps projected 2.55 from the shoulder platform. The amount of projection of the latter itself was not noted, but this was certainly somewhat more than 3.00 m.

Fig. 6 shows a profile of the lower megalithic flight of steps based on hasty notes and sketch, with less than the desirable number of level controlled by the instrument. There were four megalithic steps and, apparently, a fifth riser formed by the top of the shoulder-platform itself. There were marked inequalities in heights of risers and depths of treads. The third step, where examined, appears to consist of two courses of large stones but we had the impression that the lower one is the top of some earlier construction. If treads and risers were not meant to be equal, the tread of the second step was surely an extra wide one. The flight carried one up 1.50 m. in a horizontal distance of 3.20 m., the actual pairs of riser heights and tread depths, from bottom up, measuring .22 and .66 m.; .25 and 1.15 m.; .46 and .70 m.; .23 and .68 m.; .31 m. Battered risers were definitely noted for the two lower steps, and are not allowed for in the above figures for depths of treads. If, for purposes of comparison, we assume an intended equal-

ity in all step dimensions, and allow about 10 cm. for the slope-back of all risers, and about 5 cm. for a possible slope-up of treads, the risers would average 25 cm. in height, the treads 70 cm. in depth.

We located what was taken to be the lowest step of the expected second flight of fabricated steps. This element was 35 cm. high, and was set back 1.07 m. from the front edge of the shoulder platform. The latter presumably formed the final riser of the first (and otherwise megalithic) flight. The second flight must have risen about 2.90 m. to reach the top of the main platform, which formed the base surface of the building platform. A control measurement showed the latter as 4.39 m. above the base of the lowest megalithic step.

The megalithic flight, and perhaps the whole stairway, is probably to be dated with the lower of two court floors, though the evidence was not properly recorded. Two court floors were noted in the angle where the shoulder terrace abuts the main platform; at a later time there seemed to be reasonably certain evidence of two court floors at the right corner of the main platform, the material of the upper one being about 15 cm. thick. The material of the lower, on which this rested, was about 10 cm. thick, resting in turn on a thin deposit of small pure rock fill, perhaps 20 cm. thick. The later reached or nearly reached bedrock at the point examined, as did the wall of the main platform, against which the deposits of floor material and fill rested. Thus, if the lower portion of the main platform is a single unit and the megalithic stairway served it from the beginning, the stairway belongs in time with the earlier floor. This is the simplest assumption.

An interesting and not fully understood masonry construction had been placed against the left end of the shoulder platform. It may well have been a secondary addition. It extends about 1.80 m. along the platform wall, starting 1.20 m. back from the base of the front corner, and projects out 1.30 m. from the wall. This feature is about 70 cm. high. Toward the rear (right as one faced the end of the platform) it apparently blanked out an earlier masonry affair which provided several planes, as if for stucco-work.

Building Platform

This platform was 46 cm. high where measured behind the megalithic stairway and there it was vertical. Where measurements were feasible a narrow plinth-forming exposure of the top was indicated, about 10 cm. in amount.

Building

Plan This building was in a very advanced state of ruin, a situation expectable in view of the slight amount of protecting debris. The piers shown in Fig. ___ at Points 1 and 2 (on Str. R-7a-1st) and Points 4 and 5 (on Str. R-7b-1st) could be followed at the base on all. The writer's notes show that he considered that all four sides of the pier at Point 3 were identified, but in surveying for the plan Proskouriakoff located only the one corner shown in solid line. The other three piers of Str. R-7a-1st were not searched for and it is possible that the two reconstructed on the right (left in the figure) are mistakenly postulated. On the other hand, the postulated extensions of solid wall at the other end were by no means certain. Only parts of the inner face of the end wall itself could be made out with assurance. The jamb at Point 6 may be part of a pier, rather than the end of a solid wall. The result of our uncertainties is that, even if there was approximate symmetry of Str. R-7-1st we cannot be sure of the plan at either end. What is shown in reconstruction is what seemed most probable from known points and the disposition of debris at either end. Possibly we should have shown solid walls in the facades at either end, or at neither end.

A noticeable low hump of debris marked the approximate position of the pier of Point 6, and the entire absence of any continuous ridge of debris along the front of Str. R-7b-1st justifies one in considering it was, at least in the main, a portico type building at front as well as rear.

Solid-line portions of the drawing show what was found of the inner faces of the right end walls of Strs. R-7a-1st and R-7b-1st respectively. The medial wall of the latter was followed for its entire length on the rear side, and appeared on the front face wherever dug for. The point of view of the drawing prevents showing the fact that it was found behind the position of the bench in the front gallery,

and that part of the inner face of the end wall could be identified. The latter seems to make the extremely narrow wall-jamb here a certainty, though it was only about .70 m. wide, compared with a width of 1.60 m. for the corresponding doorway at the other end of the same medial wall. The search for the medial wall of Str. R-7a was confined to the front face and the right end. It could be followed from the end wall as shown, but broke off without reaching a corner. There very likely was a doorway through this wall, perhaps more than one, but evidently not the wall-jamb type of Str. R-7b-1st.

The precise placing of piers in the reconstruction (and hence of doorways in the facades) requires explanation. A satisfactory number of measurements on the four piers which survived entire at the bases gives a reliable average of about 95 cm. for thickness and width, and the medial wall of Str. R-7b-1st was .96 to 1.00 m. thick. We are surely justified in assuming .95 is a fair average thickness of transverse walls. The medial wall of Str. R-7b-1st, where measured, was a trifle thicker than this average for piers. At the front of Str. R-7a-1st the distance between corresponding corners of adjacent piers is 2.85 m., indicating a doorway width of 1.90 m.; using this and .95 m. for pier-widths and wall thicknesses checks well with the control afforded by two located transverse wall faces. For Str. R-7b-1st we have one directly measurable doorway width, 1.70 m.; on its right the doorway width was also about 1.70 m. if the transverse wall involved (located further forward) was straight. Thus, slightly narrower doorways in Str. R-7b-1st are rather definitely indicated. However, between the jamb located at Point 6 and the nearest located side of a pier, the distance is 8.10 m., while two missing piers and three doorways of the indicated average dimensions would require only 7.00 m. A discrepancy of 1.10 m. cannot be laid to carelessness in laying out two piers. In the reconstruction the problem has been solved by postulating an unusually wide rear central doorway of 2.80 m., and assuming the same for the front. The points concerned were accurately located by Proskouiakoff. The fact that the jamb at Point 6 may have been that of a pier, with an additional doorway, does not affect

the fact that there was 1.10 m. too much of space for three doorways and two piers with dimensions corresponding to known ones.

Of course the wider central doorway remains a matter of inference and not of definite physical proof. One bit of evidence argues against it: if the R-7b-1st building was laid out as a perfectly rectangular one, with corresponding front and rear facades, the right edge of the bench in the front gallery (to be noticed later) was about in line with the side of one pier, while the other end was about 75 cm. short of the corresponding line of the other pier forming the supposedly extra wide doorway behind which the bench was placed. Parallelogram distortion plus careless laying out may have displaced the front piers noticeably, but still, if the postulated wide rear doorway was duplicated on the front, the bench was probably not accurately centered behind it.

Wall-heights The maximum surviving height of intact masonry was about 40 cm., and the maximum debris height above the floor level was very little more except over part of the middle transverse wall of the building as a whole, where it was about a meter high. Debris in the central portions of the galleries could be as little as 20 cm. but in places was as much as 30 cm. (see Fig. ___). The presence of a stone table throne in a building with only base-walls of masonry seems extremely unlikely, and we conclude that the walls rose to roof height, though the physical evidence is less satisfactory than might be desired.

Roof Type One naturally compares this building with the other non-vaulted palaces. A factor to consider is the fact that it was in much worse condition than any of them, though surely to a large extent this was not due to collapse of the building platform. One wonders if the roof was of thatch here, while beam-and-mortar roofs on the other non-vaulted palaces contributed a certain amount of protective debris which was absent here. Debris depths on the floors here were probably somewhat less on the average, though numerous and accurately controlled profiles were not made. The presence in the Str. R-7b-1st portion of central doorways which may have been much wider than the others might be taken as an indication of

9

the lighter thatch type of roof. The wall-pier index for these doorways only (if they existed as reconstructed) is only 30, the same as at the probably thatched Str. O-18. However, the same index for the definitely known piers and doorways here comes out as 50 for Str. R-7a-1st and 56 for Str. R-7b-1st. In general, at least, the facade was but little more "open" than that of Str. S-17, which showed comparatively deep debris. The wall-span index here, 49, is greater than in any other non-vaulted palace, including the double-range Str. J-12-1st, so that on cross-section it is the most massive of the non-vaulted series. Even if the postulated two extremely wide doorways existed here, we do not have a combination of extremely low wall-pier and wall-span indices, as we do for Str. O-18. We can only say with assurance that the roof was not a vaulted one, and that if there were any thatched palaces in our known series, this was probably one of them; but the notion that its roof-type differed from that of other non-vaulted palaces has little firm foundation, and all may have been beam-and-mortar.

Throne There can be no reasonable doubt that a stone table throne occupied the position shown in Fig. __, behind the central of five doorways in the left front gallery, (if our reconstruction of the facade is correct) while this doorway, in turn, was more or less centered with respect to the megalithic stairway and the South Group Court. The general position is analogous to that of Throne 1 of Str. J-6 on the Acropolis. This table was not carved, however, and data on it is not as complete as it might have been.

There was no sign of a back-screen, nor of a masonry bench-like support for the rear. There was no niche in the medial wall, so presumably such a rear support (and very possibly a masonry back-screen) was merely placed against that wall, as at Str. J-18 and J-11. We could make out no sign of either of these missing elements, but they may easily have completely disintegrated under the action of the forest. The butt of one leg was found in place, let into the floor 70 cm. forward of the medial wall. A substantial piece of the other leg, lacking both ends, was

found loose about a meter to the left, that is, not far from its probable original position. Most of the seat-slab was recovered, and, considering the lack of deep protecting debris, partial incompleteness is not in itself good reason for supposing there was intentional breakage. As one views the stone in the photographs (Fig. ___) the surviving parts of the edge extend from about the middle of the end on the right down to and along the lower edge and then up in a curve to about the middle of the end on the left end. The straight portion at the top is also original edge. All surviving edges were rather well tooled, but it is quite evident that the slab was rounded off at one corner. The surface shown was the uppermost and is badly flaked. The other surface (found down) appeared to follow a somewhat wavy natural cleavage plane. The maximum dimensions are 2.05 by about .80 m., with thickness varying from 15 to 17 cm.

The leg-butt found in position was a slab about 26 cm. wide and only about 6 cm. thick (measured actually as .058 m.); it was set about 15 cm. in the floor and projected a few cm. above it. The other leg fragment was found lying flat. It is about 10 cm. thick, varying from 30 to 27 cm. in width, suggesting a slight taper, since it was broken off at the wider end, and was rounded at the narrower end, which undoubtedly formed the butt which was let in to the floor. Allowing 15 cm. for the sub-floor portion of the leg, the under-side of the seat must have been some unknown amount more than 40 cm. above the floor. The top of the seat was therefore certainly in the neighborhood of 60 cm. or more from the floor, in close agreement with other better known thrones. This leg was rough worked only, like those of the table-throne in Str. J-11 on the Acropolis.

DATING

The known portions of the main platform and megalithic stairway very likely pre-date the R-7-1st building, and perhaps they date with the lower of two floors of the South Group Court. The record is faulty on these points. Continued occupation at this spot down to the time of abandonment is suggested by a sherd at Posi-

tion 2, part of a large flat-bottomed plate or bowl with orange bar decoration.

Whatever may have been the time when the main platform reached its final form, we have no reason to suppose the building was the first one erected here, and definite evidence that at least the right portion (Str. R-7a-1st) was not. However, there is a vague hint that the enlargement of the building platform was not late in the local period of occupation as measured by ceramics. Among the mostly nondescript sherds at Position 1 was a rim-piece from a small and probably simple-silhouette bowl with a painted maroon band containing specular hematite. This may have come from the floor material of the addition to the building platform.

While the data for dating this building is very scarce, what there is is quite consistent with a hypothesis that it belongs in a pre-vaulted roof period. There is no recorded evidence that the throne was secondary to the building, and none to the contrary.

AVERAGE DIMENSIONS

It appears safe to say that all known piers of the building of Str. R-7-1st were intended to be square and to measure about .95 m. on a side, and that the medial wall of Str. R-7b-1st was intended to have the same thickness as the piers. Several measurements were generally about .05 m. more or less than the ^{.95 m.} ~~above~~ average, which is assumed to apply to transverse walls and the medial wall of Str. R-7a-1st as well. Measurements in the front gallery of Str. R-7a-1st and the rear gallery of Str. R-7b-1st indicate roof spans of about 1.95 m. everywhere.

The situation as to door-widths is less satisfactory, but the evidence is fair for considering these to be about 1.90 m. for Str. R-7a-1st, as opposed to about 1.70 m. for directly measurable ones in Str. R-7b-1st. Reasons for suspecting exceptional door-widths of about 2.10 m. in front and rear facades of the latter are noted in the text.

MASONRY NOTES

Typical tabular stone was used in the masonry of platform and building units, apart from stones of the megalithic steps. Floor material appeared to be the dis-integrated remains of lime concrete. Apparently no plaster survived anywhere.

A

B

Box

General Remarks.

Details and Basis for Reconstruction; Str R-7-1st

Main Platform

Tenaces.

Stairways

Right Stairway

Medicine Stair

Building Platform

Building (Str. R-7-1st)

Plan

Wall Heights

Roof Type

Theme

Rating

Average Dimensions

Masonry Notes.

OBJECTS TABLE

(Operations S-23 and S-24 refer respectively

to parts of the structure labeled R-7a and R-7b)

Positions	Sherds
1. Apparently on floor of Str. R-7a-1st, somewhat rear of center; no plaster on floor and floor material is a possible source	S-23-1
2. From surface debris on upper plaza floor, in angle formed by main platform and shoulder of megalithic stairway; plaster noted XXXX on upper floor near main platform; slight possibility of mixture from collapsed hearting of main platform or of secondary feature against shoulder.	S-24-1