Introduction

For many people, a museum is a place where interesting "things" can be accumulated, displayed, and stored. In the case of The University Museum, the range of items collected and cared for is particularly diverse. As a museum of archaeology and anthropology, it contains weaving tools from pre-Columbian Peru, bricks and drainage pipes made by the ancient Sumerians, wooden drums from central Africa, and images of Buddha made in 20th century Japan. As this list implies, the artifacts are of interest for many reasons. A few are great works of art, assuming importance because of their aesthetic qualities. All are of value as tangible records of human history and achievement; they help to document the development of technology, of social and economic systems, and of belief systems. The full significance of each object can be understood, however, only if it has a context. This context is provided by anthropological and archaeological research that relates an artifact's manufacture, use, and meaning to the society that produced it.

In the case of ethnographic materials, such records are in the form of interviews, diaries and notes of observers, historical documents, drawings, photographs, and videotapes. When the ethnographic record is relatively complete, the cultural context of artifacts may be obvious. For example, the ethnographic sources for the objects in the Museum's newest exhibition, "The Raven's Journey," are unusually rich. Within the exhibit, these artifacts from Alaska can be looked at in two different ways: as superb pieces of craftsmanship they can be appreciated in themselves; through photographs and labels, they can be understood as pieces of equipment being used by the Indians and Eskimos who created them.

The Raven's rattle in context. In this photograph of three men taken in front of their clan house around 1900, the rattle is held by the man in the middle as one of the symbols of his chiefly rank. (Vincent Scholeff Collection, Alaska State Library [neg. PCA 1-181])

Wooden Raven rattle made by the Tlingit Indians, collected by Louis Shorridge in 1923 (NA 9495).

In the case of archaeological materials, two steps are needed to supply a meaningful cultural context. An initial record of associated materials is obtained during excavation in the form of field notes, photos, and scale drawings. An artifact is thereby placed in context within the "site"; its relationship to other artifacts, debris, architectural remains, and any other features, such as hearths or pits, is defined. The second step, the reconstruction of cultural context, relies on principles derived primarily from anthropological and also from other social and natural sciences. These principles specify the relationship between characteristics of the artifact (e.g., form, use, archaeological context) and patterns of human behavior. Understanding the function and meaning of archaeologically recovered artifacts may be relatively simple. For example, the presence of an iron spear next to the body of a child in a city destroyed in warfare communicates a message to every member of modern society. With less familiar kinds of artifacts, however, interpretation may be difficult. Archaeologists studying our remote ancestors disagree as to whether it is even possible to know the way in which specific kinds of stone tools were used.

In each of the articles in this and the next issue of Expedition, the author describes an artifact (or group of related artifacts) from the Museum's collections, traces its history, and discusses its role in the society that created it. They serve to remind us that a museum consists not only of inanimate objects and the building that houses them, but also of the scholars who bring the artifacts and their documentation together to interpret them, thereby making them meaningful to you, the visitor.

Robert H. Dyson, Jr.

A Ruler in Triumph

Chocolá Monument 1

CHRISTOPHER JONES

At times the lack of a published line drawing will prevent an exquisite piece of sculpture from receiving the attention that it deserves. Such is the case with Chocolá Monument 1 (also known as Stela 1), a large fragment of Maya bas-relief carving from Guatemala (Figs. 1-2). The piece has been displayed at The University Museum since the 1920s and has been published several times in photographs and descriptions (Kidder and Sarno 1909:fig. 91; Miles 1965:253-258, fig. 3d; Morley, Brainerd, and Sharer 1985:fig. 3.11; Parsons 1966:70-71, fig. 17b). The high quality of relief carving and incision has long been recognized by these and other scholars, but the form and strength of the composition are not brought out adequately either in the published photographs or in the glass case in the Mesoamerican gallery of the Museum where the piece has been displayed for at least 30 years.

The drawing by Carl Boett, which accompanies this article (Fig. 1) is the first line rendering of the surviving carving. It should help to establish the Chocolá monument as one of the best examples of Maya fine-line relief known. A photograph is also included (Fig. 2), which differs from the drawing in showing questionable elements of plaster restoration done in the 1930s and still in place.

1 Carving on the front surface of Chocolá Monument 1. (Drawing by Carl Boett.)

2 Studio photograph of Chocolá Monument 1, showing erroneous plaster restoration done in the 1930s. Collected by Robert Burkitt, and donated to The University Museum around 1922 by Mr. Henry Kammel, representing the Chocolá Plantation Company of Hamburg, Germany. (UM no. NA 13005)
Discovery of the Chocóla Monuments

The Maya site at Chocóla consists of a series of earthen mounds lying on a flat, gently sloping piece of ground between the headwaters of two streams. It is one of several sites, including Izapa, Abaj Takalik, and El Baal, which lie along the broad plains of southern Guatemala and Chiapas (Fig. 3), an area presently supporting coffee, sugar, and cattle plantations of great size and wealth.

Information on the discovery of the Chocóla stone monuments is available to us through a report and letters written by Robert Burkitt to George Byron Gordon, then director of The University Museum (University Museum Archives [hereafter UMA]: Burkitt Box 2, Folder 5). The two men were close friends, and Burkitt had worked with Gordon as archaeological supervisor at Copan, Honduras. Burkitt's description of Chocóla, his excavation of one of its mounds, and a sketch map of the site were published by the Museum directly from these letters (Burkitt 1950).

Writing sometime between 1920 and 1924, Burkitt relates (in his idiosyncratic orthography) that several large stone objects, including the finely sculptured one, were discovered by workmen on the Chocóla plantation while plowing between the earthen mounds before planting. Burkitt himself was not present, but gives a description obtained from the workmen:

The stones were mostly under ground: but some of them struck the plough, and were a nuisance. And all the stones on the map, and several not on the map, were lately dug up and dragged out of the cane. Some of the stones dragged out were carried away and used to building; while others, which were considered to be curiosities worth saving, were dumped at the sides of the paths with which the cane field is intersected.

The places on the map as merely the present places of stones that remain on the cane paths. (UMA: Burkitt Box 2, Folder 5)

A description of the ten stone monuments described by Burkitt and a map of their find spots are provided (see box and Fig. 4).

The Archaeological Context of Chocóla Monument 1

The sculptured stela had been destroyed in ancient times, broken into fragments. This must have involved some effort, since Burkitt describes Chocóla Monument as a "dark grey porphyritic stone of extreme hardness." He describes it at the time of discovery as follows:

The three pieces ov the stone made a block, which was, as you see it, about eighty centimeters high, sixty wide, and from thirty to sixty thick; and weighed I suppose the better part ov a ton. . . You see how the thickness ov the stone varied. The face ov the stone, excepting for the reliefs, was a plane surface. The back was curved; but with a surface so smooth and even, that you might supose the stone had been intend-ed to be engraved on that side too. (UMA: Burkitt Box 2, Folder 5)

In an attempt to determine the nature of the site, Burkitt mapped surface features without, however, placing the stone monuments in relationship to them. Mounds B, C, and D were all wider north-south than east-west; Burkitt therefore suggested that they faced east. If this is the case, then Monuments 4 and 5 (two oblong stones) and 1 and 10 (the sculptured stela and an altar) would be approximately aligned on the front axis to Mound D—the highest at the site. This alignment is similar to one in front of the largest mound at the nearby and probably contemporary site of Izapa (Lowe, Lee, and Martinez 1982:20 map, Mound 60). The other Chocóla monuments also appear to be related to the mounds in a formal way: Monuments 7, 8, and 9 (two round stones and an arch) were found east of Mound E, and Monuments 2, 3, and 6 (a plain slab, a slab with "cups," and a carved cylinder) were just off the southeast corners of Mounds D and C. All but one of the monuments lie within a central plaza at the site as defined by Mounds D, C, E, F, and an unnumbered mound to the east (Fig. 4).

Only Mounds A and B were excavated by Burkitt (1930). He did not find the expected burials, but discovered that Mound B was built in two stages. The inner mound stood about 6 meters high over a leveled and smoothed gravel layer. The outer mound tapers off to a plaza fill approximately 2 meters deep. This suggests that the earth which covered most of the stone monuments is of the same strata as that of the outer mound. Assuming that the other mounds of the site have two layers also, either the monuments were set up before the outer mounds were raised, or they were covered by earth eroding later from the outer mounds. In either case, Monument I itself was certainly not found in its original setting and thus cannot be chronologically tied either to the mounds or to the other stones.

Design

Burkitt's notes make it clear that the Chocóla monument was originally found in three fragments that fit together. His description of a curved, smooth-surfaced back makes it almost certain that the surviving fragment is from a stela rather than from an altar, since the latter would have had a flat bottom surface. The surviving width of the front is 85.4
Archaeological Salvage at Chocolá

The Maya site at Chocolá consists of 11 or 12 earthen mounds, the largest of which (Mounds B, C, D, and J) are over 12 meters high and aligned north-south. The site map published by Burkitt (1930) has several inaccuracies. Mound D had inadvertently been left unlabeled, and Mound H was mislabeled as “Mound N.” The location of the stone monuments was indicated by Burkitt as he found them—that is, after they had been moved by the plantation workmen. The map presented here (Fig. 4) has therefore been altered to reflect what was probably their original location as given in Burkitt’s notes. The sculptured stone (Monument 1) and an altar (Monument 10) were found far to the east of Mound D. Burkitt writes:

When I first saw them, the pieces were lying along the cane path, not far from the round stone, and on examining the stone I found that the figures fitted, I had them set up on the round stone to look at.

It now appeared from my Indian informant, that the sculptured stone and the round stone, which I had accidentally put together, had actually been found together: and even some what in the position in which I had put them, that is to say, one above the other. The place they had come from was a little to the south west, where there is a slight height ov ground.

The plough struck some stone, perhaps one of the sculptured pieces: and getting out one stone led to find another. One below an other, in the earth, they found the three sculptured pieces, and at the bottom, as deep as a man the round stone. Underneath the round stone, after they had dragged it out, we were to several broken pots.

Burkitt comments further that the sculptured stone is obviously a fragment from a larger monument and that other fragments might show up in further digging, but this apparatus was never undertaken. He also points out that the sculptured stone was not of a proper shape to be a Monument 10 with the figure upright and was furthermore too wide for the lower stone to serve as pedestal. This implies that the altar itself was under 1 meter in diameter, and that the discovered setting could not have been one for the sculpture. The ceramic vessels under the altar suggest a primary setting for Monument 10.

Not far from Mound H and about on a line between H and G were found two stones, one on top of the other. The lower one (Monument 3) was oblong, measuring about 100 by 120 by 50 centimeters, with cups or hollows in its flat top surface. Burkitt tells us that the larger of the two deep cups measures 25 centimeters in diameter and 12 centimeters deep, with straight sides. The shallow ones are around the edges. Perhaps all of the cups served as mortars for grinding, as suggested for similar ones secondarily placed on Lapa monument fragments (Norman 1976:551, 289). On top, “about half an arm’s length projecting from the ground,” was an upright stone (Monument 2), “a good deal taller than a man” and about a meter wide. Monument 2, “having nothing on it, went to the maston.” Burkitt drew a sketch of the original position of the monuments (Fig. 5), and of the cups on Monument 3 (Fig. 6). Two photographs of the cup stone survive in the Museum Archives, one of which is included here (Fig. 7).

Directly east of Mound D were found two large oblong stones, side-by-side and partially buried in the ground. One had cups on the upper surface (Monument 4) while the other did not (Monument 5). Southeast of Monument E was a single upright stone (Monument 6) above "a fathom and a half [3 meters] high" according to Burkitt’s informant. Its lower part was cylindrically shaped and ornamented with vertical lines; the upper part was rough, and protruding from the ground. This stone was also taken and broken up by masons. In a little hollow south of Monument E and east of E, a round stone (Monument 7), apparently cylindrical like Monument 10 and Classic Maya altars, was found buried about 1 meter under the ground. A smaller shape less conglomorate stone (Monument 8) lay on top, “which my man spoke ov az eyes and ears” and which Burkitt concluded was a naturally formed stone of irregular shape. Over this stood another stone in the shape of an arch (Monument 9), which “might have been something less than breast high.” Unfortunately this curious and unique monument had been struck by the plough and broken apart by the masons. Burkitt includes a sketch of this grouping as well.

From Burkitt’s letters to George Byron Gordon, University Museum Archives: Burkitt Box 2, Folder 5:

3 Burkitt’s sketch of the original positions of Monuments 2 and 3 according to his informant, with the capped stone (Mon. 3) lying under the upright one. (University Museum Archives)

6 Burkitt’s sketch of the deep and shallow cups on the top surface of Monument 3. (University Museum Archives; see also Fig. 7)

The Maya site at Chocolá consists of 11 or 12 earthen mounds, the largest of which (Mounds B, C, D, and J) are over 12 meters high and aligned north-south. The site map published by Burkitt (1930) has several inaccuracies. Mound D had inadvertently been left unlabeled, and Mound H was mislabeled as “Mound N.” The location of the stone monuments was indicated by Burkitt as he found them—that is, after they had been moved by the plantation workmen. The map presented here (Fig. 4) has therefore been altered to reflect what was probably their original location as given in Burkitt’s notes. The sculptured stone (Monument 1) and an altar (Monument 10) were found far to the east of Mound D. Burkitt writes:

When I first saw them, the pieces were lying along the cane path, not far from the round stone, and on examining the stone I found that the figures fitted, I had them set up on the round stone to look at.

It now appeared from my Indian informant, that the sculptured stone and the round stone, which I had accidentally put together, had actually been found together: and even some what in the position in which I had put them, that is to say, one above the other. The place they had come from was a little to the south west, where there is a slight height of ground.

The plough struck some stone, perhaps one of the sculptured pieces: and getting out one stone led to find another. One below an other, in the earth, they found the three sculptured pieces, and at the bottom, as deep as a man the round stone. Underneath the round stone, after they had dragged it out, we were to several broken pots.

Burkitt comments further that the sculptured stone is obviously a fragment from a larger monument and that other fragments might show up in further digging, but this apparatus was never undertaken. He also points out that the sculptured stone was not of a proper shape to be a Monument 10 with the figure upright and was furthermore too wide for the lower stone to serve as pedestal. This implies that the altar itself was under 1 meter in diameter, and that the discovered setting could not have been one for the sculpture. The ceramic vessels under the altar suggest a primary setting for Monument 10.

Not far from Mound H and about on a line between H and G were found two stones, one on top of the other. The lower one (Monument 3) was oblong, measuring about 100 by 120 by 50 centimeters, with cups or hollows in its flat top surface. Burkitt tells us that the larger of the two deep cups measures 25 centimeters in diameter and 12 centimeters deep, with straight sides. The shallow ones are around the edges. Perhaps all of the cups served as mortars for grinding, as suggested for similar ones secondarily placed on Lapa monument fragments (Norman 1976:551, 289). On top, “about half an arm’s length projecting from the ground,” was an upright stone (Monument 2), “a good deal taller than a man” and about a meter wide. Monument 2, “having nothing on it, went to the maston.” Burkitt drew a sketch of the original position of the monuments (Fig. 5), and of the cups on Monument 3 (Fig. 6). Two photographs of the cup stone survive in the Museum Archives, one of which is included here (Fig. 7).

Directly east of Mound D were found two large oblong stones, side-by-side and partially buried in the ground. One had cups on the upper surface (Monument 4) while the other did not (Monument 5). Southeast of Monument E was a single upright stone (Monument 6) above "a fathom and a half [3 meters] high" according to Burkitt’s informant. Its lower part was cylindrically shaped and ornamented with vertical lines; the upper part was rough, and protruding from the ground. This stone was also taken and broken up by masons. In a little hollow south of Monument E and east of E, a round stone (Monument 7), apparently cylindrical like Monument 10 and Classic Maya altars, was found buried about 1 meter under the ground. A smaller shape less conglomorate stone (Monument 8) lay on top, “which my man spoke ov az eyes and ears” and which Burkitt concluded was a naturally formed stone of irregular shape. Over this stood another stone in the shape of an arch (Monument 9), which “might have been something less than breast high.” Unfortunately this curious and unique monument had been struck by the plough and broken apart by the masons. Burkitt includes a sketch of this grouping as well.

From Burkitt’s letters to George Byron Gordon, University Museum Archives: Burkitt Box 2, Folder 5:

3 Burkitt’s sketch of the original positions of Monuments 2 and 3 according to his informant, with the capped stone (Mon. 3) lying under the upright one. (University Museum Archives)

6 Burkitt’s sketch of the deep and shallow cups on the top surface of Monument 3. (University Museum Archives; see also Fig. 7)
A beard can also be seen, as well as possible incised tattooing marks on the forehead. Hanging down from the upraised head and hand is the three-part base normally seen on Maya day-signs. It is complete with three scrolls, three U-shaped elements above them, and liquid (blood?) dripping from the base of the scrolls, all of which appear with the day-signs of Stela 10 from the nearby site of Kaminaljuyu (Fig. 11).

A third head is tied to the front of the wide thick belt of the standing figure (Fig. 10). Although highly stylized in comparison to the other two heads, the major features of the individual on the belt can be distinguished. Its headress is a peculiar lobed element, with knobs within each lobe. The eye is large and round, and the open fanged mouth is surrounded by a rounded cut-out. The petalled ear ornament is incised with a grimacing animal head; a long strip of decorated cloth hangs down from it. Two fringed ends of cloth, probably the loin-cloth, hang from the back of the belt. The forms of both head and belt are almost precisely duplicated on Kaminaljuyu Stela 10 (Fig. 11) on the kneeling figure at lower right, with the head attached at the back of the belt.

Everything described so far pertains clearly to the standing figure and his costume. On the right are several elements that are harder to interpret. A crested bird head, probably a quetzal, looks upward just off the figure's shoulder. A similar bird's head looks at the figure from the extreme right. Parsons correctly points out that the plaster restoration done in the 1920s by the University Museum misinterpreted the first bird head, connecting it to a tapered element that passes in front of the head held in the arms of the standing figure (1920:75). What looks like a fringed serpent head on the restoration (Fig. 2) is now recognized by Parsons as a typical stylized wing belonging to the bird itself. The bird head and wing might thus belong to the decapitated head held in the arm, perhaps as its headdress. The fringed end of cloth or feathers behind the bird head and wing either bends out from the

standing figure's headress or pertains to a completely missing floating head like the "vision serpent" to the right of the standing figure on Kaminaljuyu Stela 10 (Fig. 11, upper right). The vision serpent was so named by Schele (1985) from scenes carved on the stone lintels of Yaxchilan. The serpents have two heads, one larger than another, and are interpreted as visions of supernatural or ancestral beings brought on by bloodletting. As in the Kaminaljuyu and perhaps the Chocóla represen-
tations, the Yaxchilan scenes show a standing male ruler and a kneeling woman who has just given blood and induced the vision.

The bird head to the extreme right, plus the two elements below, are isolated from the other elements and from each other by undecorated background space. At first glance, this suggests that they are hieroglyphs, as the bird head is correctly oriented to face left, and the lowermost element has a possible numeral one beside it. The quetzal birds could properly name the individual whose head is held in the arm, both as part of the glyphic text and as a headdress. On the other hand, all three elements could also work together as the face (with round nose-bead) and headdress of a subsidiary figure, identical to that on Kaminal-

juyu Stela 10 (Fig. 11, kneeling female at lower right). This interpretation seems more likely.

In many ways, therefore, the Chocóla carving is most directly comparable to Kaminaljuyu Stela 10, an exquisite black stone monument which is probably an altar. Not only the intricate modeling and incisions but even specific elements such as the belt-heads and the dripping day-sign scrolls are almost identical and not found on other items of southern Guatemala carving. The similarities lead one to wonder if the two stones were actually carved by the same artist, given the fact that only about 80 kilometers separate the sites. By way of further speculation, it can be noted that the trident-eyed, bearded, mustached face of the central figure on the Kaminaljuyu stone is strikingly similar to those of the two heads held by the Chocóla figure. Might the Chocóla stone, the only carved monument yet found at the site, be commemorating the victorious display of enemy heads after a successful raid or battle against the much larger community of Kaminaljuyu to the east?

Comparisons and Dating

The standing figure of the Chocóla monument is undoubtly the ruler of the community, portrayed in triumph. Although no hieroglyphic inscription survives on the stone to tell us this clearly, the pose, costume, and trophy heads are similar to those on other Maya monuments where the glyphic text names the figure as
A new drawing of Kaminaljuyu Stela 10 by James B. Porter of the Archaeological Research Facility, University of California, Berkeley. The pose of the main figure, costumes, and incised line details of this carving are strikingly similar to those of Chocolla Monument 1. (Stela is in the Museo Nacional, Guatemala)

**12**

*Tikal Stela 31, A.D. 446. An Early Classic Maya stela from northern Guatemala showing the triumphal ruler Stormy Sky.*

**13**

*Tikal Stela 36, probably 4th century A.D. It shows a seated ruler displaying two trophy heads.*

Ruler. In many ways the closest parallel is to Tikal Stela 31 (Fig. 12), which is dated to A.D. 446 and is linked specifically to the Tikal ruler Stormy Sky by a long inscription on the stela back. Similarity to the Chocolla monument is particularly marked in such traits as the standing pose of the figure, with one arm outstretched in front and the other holding a masked head in the crook of the arm. Other comparable elements include the cross-hatched and parallel-line incision to give texture to the bas-relief carving, and the use of U-shaped elements. Tikal Stela 36 (Fig. 13), of probable 4th-century date, shows a Tikal ruler also displaying two heads. The early Tikal stelae, starting at A.D. 292, are the first in the long Classic Maya tradition of ruler portrayal, which lasts until the 9th century.

The carved stone monuments of Preclassic southern Guatemala and Chiapas, including Chocolla Monument 1, have been thought of as forerunners of the Classic Maya monument carving style. This view, that the Maya of Tikal and Uaxactun and the other Early Classic communities of northern Guatemala derived their tradition from earlier precedents to the south, has been
challenged by Schele (1985), on the grounds that the Maya of northern Guatemala had apparently also developed a monument carving tradition during the Late Preclassic. Unfortunately, the most striking example of early carving from the northern area cited by Schele, the Hausberg Stela, is still of unknown provenience and uncertain date.

I would like to further Schele's challenge by pointing out that although there is no doubt that much southern sculpture postdates the Late Preclassic, it is earlier than the dated Tikal stelae (those from El Baul and Abaj Takalik having calendric dates in the last two centuries A.D.; Table 1). Chocolin Monument 1 and Kaminjlujuyu Stela 10 are not necessarily dated to the Late Preclassic. The Chocolin monument was apparently placed secondarily (see Box). The stratigraphic position of the Kaminjlujuyu stela has recently been reviewed by Parsons (1986:65-69, 68).

Three fragments of Kaminjlujuyu Stela 10 were excavated by Gustavo Espinosa in 1953. Two years later, the same sounds was continued by Edwin Shook, whose records of the stratigraphy and related pottery provide the most reliable information for the dating of this monument. The Stela 10 fragments were apparently included in a deposit consisting of thin adobe and sand floors, and pottery dating to the Late Preclassic period. Although Parsons concludes that the stela was associated with the floors, and is therefore Late Preclassic, his notes on an interview with Shook provide the basis for a somewhat different interpretation. The thick Stela 10 fragment could not have been "sealed" within the Preclassic floors, but clearly protruded above them; it is therefore likely that they were dug down into this context in later times. The stela, therefore, can be either Late Preclassic or Early Classic in date, and might even be contemporary with the Tikal stelae of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D.

In the posture of the figures and in details of carving such as the use of fine cross-hatching and parallel lines, the Chocolin and Kaminjlujuyu monuments of southern Guatemala show a stronger link to early Tikal in the north than they do to any other

**Expedition**

**The Morris Coin**

A Masterpiece by Euatenus

**DONALD WHITE**

One day, longer ago than I care to recall, when I was a graduate student assistant at Princeton University’s excavations at Morgantina in central Sicily (Fig. 1), a rumor swept our site like fire across a parched hay field that something spectacular (“prodigiosa, stupenda”) had just been found. The prodigy turned out to be a blackened coin of exceptional weight, thickness, and diameter. After cleaning it was identified as a silver decadrachm issued some time after 406 B.C. by Syracuse, the greatest of all the Classical Greek cities in the west, and signed by Euatenus. Euatenus was arguably the most famous celtor or die engraver ever to design a coin. This recollection is worth mentioning only to the extent that it bears witness to the excitement and wonderment which the playing of the coin-engraver’s craft always seems to stir in anyone lucky enough to see it or, better yet, to hold it in their hand, even when blackened and encrusted after nearly sixteen

---

*Footnotes and references are not provided in the image.*