

Throne 1.

The evidence for our restoration and assembly of this carved stone unit ^(shown in the frontispiece) is given in detail below. Our basis for classifying it as a "throne" is the scene depicted on Lintel 3. There the central figure sits on a throne the component elements of which are, in essentials and in many details, identical with those found here. This example was found under circumstances leaving little doubt that it was forcibly torn down and broken up, whereupon Structure J-6 was abandoned. These circumstances will also be related in more detail below. From an ^{esthetic} ~~artistic~~ point of view the destruction is very regrettable, for the ^{(but the evidence of intentional destruction by the aborigines is} preservation of the fragments is almost perfect. Bright orange-red paint, in many places in good condition, still covers nearly all of the sculptured surfaces.

The throne cannot be dissociated from the building. It consisted of a large flat table, supported at the front by two slab-like tapering stone legs, their bottoms let into the floor. The rear rested on a depressed ledge at the front of a masonry bench. The bench completely filled a niche in the rear wall of the room. Its surface was at the same level as the table-top, the supporting ledge being lowered by the thickness of the latter. Table and bench were therefore in effect one continuous surface.

On the bench, at the rear, centered behind the table, was the elaborately carved slab which we are calling the "screen" for want of a better term. This was set on edge against the back wall of the niche, and formed a background for the priest or ruler who in all probability sat cross-legged on the table.

change
The niche, somewhat wider than the throne, was roofed with vaults sloping toward the center from deep off-sets at the sides, and sloping toward the front, over the throne, from the rear (see ^{Section A-B, Plate} ~~Fig.~~ 1). This

of considerable scientific interest.

(we believe) to a flat "ceiling" at the level of the spring of vaulting, extended ~~an unknown distance up into~~ the main rear vault of the room, forming a sort of canopy over the bench and table, open, of course, to the front. Our evidence for the top of the niche is not conclusive.

As we have stated ^{above} ~~elsewhere~~, the throne looked directly out on Court 1 of the Acropolis through the central of five doorways at the head of the monumental stairway, ~~of Structure J-3. This doorway is~~ ^{which} directly in line with the three doorways piercing Structure J-2 on the opposite side of the court, and so leading to the West Group Plaza, where ^{the large inscribed stone table,} Altar 2, was possibly on the same line.

The front edge of the table ^(or seat of our throne) (so far as recovered) bears a single line of 14 glyph-blocks, and on a basis of our restoration there was room for five more. The edges at the sides were plain, if we may judge from a single fragment recovered, showing a perfectly smooth edge, 42 cms long. The possibility remains that there were glyphs on the sides, extending only part way to the rear.

Both side and front faces of each leg bear glyphs, six glyph-blocks to a side and ten to a front face, or twenty-two on each leg. The principal inscription appears to read ~~read~~ from left to right on the table-edge, thence to the left edge of the left leg; thence to the front, read in double column; thence down the right edge of the left leg; and from here to the right leg, which was read in the same order as the left.

The screen ^{seems} ~~appears~~ to be a large serpent mask, front view, with teeth and mouth curls at either side, two nose plugs in the center. If this interpretation is correct, the eyes are formed by two large squarish ^{openings} perforations, cut clear through the stone except for the two nearly life-sized human busts set within them. These face the center from either side. They were in large measure cut free from the stone and were silhouetted against the rear wall of the niche, though the faces were carved in low relief. Hands and shoulders more nearly

approach a full-round treatment. When in position, the supposed eyes of the mask were in reality shallow niches within the stone, about ^{30 cms high,} 34 cms wide, / and about 16 cms deep.

Decorative elements at either side of the mask include vertical panels of four glyph-blocks each, and there is a horizontal panel of four additional glyph-blocks above the mask, at the center. The ~~sixteen~~ twelve glyph blocks on the screen are carved in much lower relief than those of the table, some of them being little more than deeply incised. There were thus a total of seventy known glyph-blocks, with considerable probability that five or more are missing from the table-edge.

The length of the screen is 1.86 meters at the top, 1.82 meters at the bottom; the height at the left is .59 meters, at the right .61 meters. The thickness varies from 14 to 16 ~~metres~~ cms, allowing for inequalities on the back, which was only roughly smoothed. Top and side edges were nicely tooled. On them are very plain remnants of smooth white plaster which have been broken off along a well-defined line a centimeter or two in from the back, showing clearly where the plaster had formerly turned up against the rear wall of the niche. The bottom edge of the stone is quite rough, and devoid of plaster. A sizable roughly semi-circular section has been cut out of the bottom, just to the left of center. This is not a break, though it was crudely done. It must have been made before or while the screen was in position, as there were traces of smooth white plaster along the bottom, but on the front face, showing where the plaster surface of the bench met the screen; and these traces followed the curve of this cut-out semi-circle. The plaster on this edge of the screen was unfortunately removed, but shows, though none too clearly, on field photographs.

A large part of the table-top was either thrown out on the stairway and exposed to the weather, or so broken up as to be unrecognizable. We

have restored its width as equal to the bottom length of the screen, that is, 1.82 cms, though we might have chosen 1.86 cms, the screen length as measured at the top, or anything between. The depth (front to rear) as restored is 92 cms, a less certain dimension, but surely correct to within fifteen or twenty cms. The thickness at the edge is 13 cms, which increases a centimeter or so toward the interior of the stone. The top was flat and nicely smoothed, as was the edge of the single fragment of the side recovered. The bottom was only roughly worked.

A description of the left leg suffices for both, as they are practically identical in form and size. Viewed from the front, it tapers from a width of 29 cms at the top to 21 cms at floor level, which is indicated very plainly by white plaster broken off just below the glyphs (see Fig.). The distance from the line of breakage to the top is 52 cm, which equals the height of the ledge which supported the table top at the rear within a cm. The corresponding measurement on the right leg exactly equals the height of the ledge (53 cms); adding the thickness of the table top we get 65 cms as the height of the table. The leg continues to taper for about 13 cms more. This portion was let into the floor, and is very rough. The thickness of the leg is only 12 cms so that it is essentially a slab, rather than a column or pier like the legs of the great table altars of the plazas.

The niche, up to a height of about was perfectly preserved, and on the left was in position to 2.20 meters above the floor. Below its vaulted roof it is a simple rectangular recess in the rear/wall of the room, 2.40 meters wide and 50 cms deep (See plan, Fig.). It was completely filled by a masonry bench, already referred to, the front of which was flush with the wall of the room. The bench, 65 cms high, was badly disrupted at the center, but it was perfectly clear at the sides that the front edge had been lowered to form a ledge 15 cms wide, and

12 cms below the main surface. This is the ledge previously referred to as having the same heights as the effective heights of the table legs. Remnants of the plaster surface were in place at both ends of the bench, establishing its full height beyond question.

The plaster floor in front of the niche was badly broken, but by skinning off the surface we were able to locate within reasonable limits the horizontal position of the left leg. This we place in the center of a hole in the concrete base of the floor, which was filled with soft and darker material in which fragments of the white surface plaster were mixed to a depth ten to twenty cms. The hole was about 60 cms in diameter, its center 60 cms out from the bench and 60 cms to the right of the left end of the niche. The base of the right leg was found in a position corresponding to this point, on the right. It was partly imbedded in similar broken area, though larger and less well-defined. It was still partly upright, twisted out of place, though the sculptured faced still faced more or less to the front, with a large fragment of the table top against it. Probably it had not been entirely torn from the floor, though much disturbed, and we may consider our location of the legs in restoration as quite close to correct.

We have arbitrarily added 10 cms. for front over-hand, and the distance from the front edge thus established, to the rear of the supporting ledge of the bench, cms, is the depth of the table top as restored.

The photograph (Fig.) shows plainly that as originally constructed the ledge extended to either end of the bench. On the right side it is perfectly preserved for a distance of 45 cms. from the end. This would seem to indicate that the table was as wide as the niche. But this would mean an overhang at the sides of about 45 cms. A scale drawing will demonstrate that an overhang of much less would still be

out reasonably probably proportion. Lacking proof, our best assumption is that the table was the same width as the screen, which gives a reasonable overhang, more important, agrees with the throne shown on Lintel 3.

Very probably when the throne was in place, the portions of the ledge extending beyond the table, at the sides, were filled up to the level of the rest of the bench.

The position of the screen against the back wall of the niche is indicated by the Lintel 3 scene, and practically proved by the line of broken finishing plaster along the back of the top and side edges, and along the front face at the bottom.

Small bi-conical holes similar to those on Altar 2 were drilled through edges Screen and table-top. One is placed at the center of the screen, passing through the top edge and emerging in the border above the central glyph panel. There is another 33.5 cms to the right, but none in the corresponding position to the left. Two more are at the extreme upper corners, that at the left emerging on the front, the other at the right edge of the stone. Below each of these is an additional perforation passing from the end to the face of the stone. That on the left is 32.5 cms., that on the right 36.5 cms. below the top.

Five similar perforations pierce the lower edge of the recovered portion of the table top. All lead from the point face to the bottom surface of the stone, passing behind the lower plain border. Counting from the left of the recovered glyph blocks, there are perforations after the third, fifth, seventh, ninth and eleventh glyph blocks. We might expect another between the thirteenth and fourteenth blocks, but there is none there. There are thus three known glyph blocks on either side of the extreme left and right perforations, and possibly we should conclude that the third and central perforation was at the center of the table. As physically restored, the center line of the table

passes through the middle of the ninth known block, leaving room for a hypothetical additional block at the left and four at the right. The known glyphs are consistently 9.5 cms in breath, so that, even considering the table as 1.86 in width (the length of the screen at the top) we are limited to 19 glyph blocks on the front. To give a symmetrical arrangement of both glyphs and perforations we would restore only four instead of a possible five blocks, two at either end of the known series.

Because an unexpressed or missing calendar round date 10 Chuen 19 Zip occurred between the calendar round date on the table and the first one on the left leg, and also because secondary series connecting the calendar round dates are missing or unexpressed, we have restored the maximum number of blocks, and placed four of them at the right and one at the left.

The known glyphs are definitely in their correct order, as proved by the fractures of the stone; except that the fractured surfaces between the fourth and fifth glyph blocks are **sacked** off so that the fit is not perfect. We consider doubt here as practically non-existent. There is nothing to prevent interpreters of the text from adding or subtracting hypothetical blocks at either end of the front, within the limits indicated; or further to assume that the band extended back four or five glyphs on either side.

Because of the good state of preservation of the walls of the niche, it follows that any force of stones falling from the building onto the throne must have been directed almost straight downward - that is, nothing could have fallen on it but roof-stones. The four units of the throne were broken into 44 fragments of sufficient size to merit numbering and location in position, to say nothing of three or four dozen small chips, and the pieces of the table not found.

All but two of the fragments were found scattered in confusion on the floor in front of the niche. Nearly all the major pieces were cleared, photographed and drawn in position before removal, (See Plates and). Fragment 5 is the lower portion of the nose of the mask, between the "eyes", and to get to the position found had to travel six meters horizontally * dropping only about one meter from its original height.

Fragment 2 is the right end of the screen, weighing nearly 200 pounds, yet its center is about 1.00 meter to the right of the right end of the niche and only about .60 meters out from the wall, and must have described a curve around the corner of the niche to arrive at the position found, an impossible condition in a natural collapse. Fragment 19, on the other side, is the base of the left leg, found nearly 1.50 meters to the left of and behind the point where it was originally imbedded. In a natural fall, the table top would have fallen on it and kept it, with other parts of the same stone, in approximate position. Part of the headdress of the right-hand bust, of the screen and the head of the left figure were found on the stairway, close to the top and over seven meters to the right of the center of the doorway before the throne.

Such instances of relationships requiring human action for their explanation can be multiplied indefinitely. That the destruction occurred before (possibly immediately before) that of the building, is rendered extremely probable by the fact that nearly all fragments (which covered a wide area) lay in immediate contact with the smooth plaster surface of the floor. This probability becomes a certainty from the fact that they were immediately overlain by fallen vault-slabs from the roof, to a depth at the rear of meters, effectually sealing them from any movement after the collapse of the roof.

The front edge of the floor, is the doorway before the throne, was found sunken and disintegrated, with fragment 5 of the throne lying in this depressed area below floor level. This destruction of the floor was not found elsewhere. The pier to the right (facing the building) was so undermined that it had collapsed entirely, the bottom courses, still in relative position, behind tilted up at the rear. All other piers stood to heights varying from to meters. These circumstances suggest the possibility that this pier was purpose-ly made to collapse, though they fall far short of proof.

With one exception, all recovered fragments of the table top are parts of the front edge, or fit such parts. A great deal more than one-half, including the back part, is missing. All the rest of the throne, except missing small fragments, were found. There appears to have been some selective process involved. These pieces, of all others, could not have fallen outside the building in a natural collapse. If the aboriginal destroyers removed them, leaving nearly all the sculptured fragments in the building, the fact is noteworthy. We do not believe we removed them unknowingly.

All debris removed from the throne room, between points 2 meters on either side of the niche, was carefully segregated between dry-walls of our own construction on the stairway. The lowest 30 cms of this area was removed with knife and trowel, every stone examined, and the earth eventually was sifted. After we had recovered and assembled all the pieces (including many tiny fragments) from the building, and knew exactly what was missing, the debris from it and collected on the stairway was removed by two picked men, who had been at work recovering the known pieces for two weeks, had seen them assembled, and who had proved exceptionally sharp-eyed throughout. Had the missing pieces of the table top been thrown out by the pick-and-shovel work above the

30 cm level, this second search should have yielded some of them. Many stones were submitted but none passed the test for thickness, color of the stone or smoothness of the top.

In conclusion we should state that all debris on the whole surface of the stairway was removed by workmen instructed to examine every stone, and two pieces from the screen were found only about a meter from the right (northeasterly) edge, near the top. If there remain any parts of the throne which have not completely weathered, they are probably buried in the angle between the stairway and flanking terraces, where our excavations were slight

Addendum

Sizes of glyph-blocks seem to indicate considerable variation in the care with which they were laid out. Those on the table edge are very consistently 9.5 cms wide and 9.5 cms. high. Those in the upper central panel of the screen are ~~10.6~~ 10.6 cm high, the two end glyphs ~~10.9~~ 10.9 cms wide and the two central ones ~~10.8~~ 10.8 8.5 cms wide, perhaps an intentional symmetrical arrangement. The heights of the glyphs in the side panels are 4 cms in each case, but the width of the left panel is 6 cms, that of the right only 5 cms.

Glyphs on the edges of the legs vary around 7 cms in height; the widths on the two left edges being about 7.5 cms but on the right sides 8.5 and 9 cms. (left and right legs respectively. The glyphs on the front faces of the legs vary from 8.5 cms to 9.5 cms in height; the widths from 12 cms down to 9 cms. The last variation is of course mainly due to the tapering of the legs. The greatest care seems to have been taken where differences would be most easily detected - in the central panel of the screen and on the table-edge.

B

5

The photograph (Fig.) shows plainly that as/constructed the ledge extended to either end of the bench. On the right side it is perfectly preserved for a distance of 45 cms from the end. This would tend to indicate that the table was as wide as the niche. However, this would mean an overhang at the sides of about 45 cms beyond the sides of the legs as already located. A scale drawing will demonstrate that ~~this~~ an overhang of considerably less than this would still be out of reasonable proportion. Lacking proof, ~~xxxxxxsurely justified in xxxxxxx~~ our best assumption is that ~~assuming~~ the table was the same width as the screen, which gives a reasonable overhang and agrees with the throne depicted on Lintel 3.

Very probably ^{when the table was in place} the portions of the ledge extending ^{beyond at either side} ~~to the sides~~ of the table ~~xxxxxx~~ when in place were filled up to the level of the rest of the bench, but lacking evidence, ~~for it~~ we have not done this ⁱⁿ on our restoration.

Insert A.

There ^{were} ~~are~~ thus a total of 70 known glyph-blocks, with considerable probability that five or more are missing from the table edge.

4/25/66