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Abstract

The present article summarizes several aspects of recent research in the Classic Maya site of Tamarindito, including its archaeology and epigraphy. The archaeological section focuses on results of the 2010 field season of the Tamarindito Archaeological Project, directed by the junior author. An unusual walled group excavated during that season is discussed in greater detail along with the implications it raises for the reconstruction of the borders of Classic Maya centres. In the epigraphy section, the senior author provides new insights into the written history of the site and its hieroglyphic corpus.

Resumen

El articulo presente recapitula varios aspectos de investigaciones recientes en el sitio clásico maya de Tamarindito, incluyendo su arqueología y epigrafía. La parte arqueológica se enfoque en las excavaciones de la temporada 2010 del Proyecto Arqueológico Tamarindito bajo la dirección del segundo autor. Un grupo excepcional y cercado fue excavado durante ese temporada y se trata en más detalle, junto con las implicaciones que este contribuye a la reconstrucción de los límites de los centros mayas del periodo Clásico. En la sección epigráfica el autor mayor proporciona nuevas informaciones acerca de la historia escrita del sitio y su corpus jeroglífico.

INTRODUCTION

The Maya site of Tamarindito is located in the Petexbatun area of the Department of Peten in south-western Guatemala (Figure 1). The geographic position according to the WGS 84 datum is 16° 27’ 04” N, 90° 14’ 05” W, at an altitude of 203 m above mean sea level (Gall 1999: 32), as referenced in Plaza A, within the eastern group (Figure 2) of the site centre.

The archaeological zone lies within the municipality of Sayaxche that is situated approximately 10.0 km northeast on the southern bank of the Río Pasión. From Tamarindito, it is only 17 km in a fairly straight line to the Río Usumacinta and the border of Mexico, to the west. The archaeological site can be accessed by a dirt road and later a trail from the modern hamlet of Las Maravillas, which is located some 1.5 km to the north, and also by boat on the navigable waters and a trail from the river bank across cultivated land. In both instances, the visitor arrives first at Plaza B.

The closest bodies of water are the Laguna Tamarindito, 1.3 km northeast, and the Laguna Petexbatun, the northernmost bay, which lies 3.0 km to the east. From there, the Laguna drains into

¹ The present article is based in parts on a manuscript prepared for an epigraphic study of the inscriptions of Tamarindito and a catalogue of its monuments (Gronemeyer in prep.).
the Río Petexbatun and ultimately the Río Pasión. To the north and east of the site, the terrain is rather level, with seasonal wetlands occurring closer to the rivers and the Laguna Petexbatun.

A number of important Maya sites are located within a short distance of Tamarindito. Arroyo de Piedra is connected to Tamarindito by a network of trails and is approximately 3.5 km to the west. The important Late Classic centre of Dos Pilas lies about 7.0 km in the same direction. Aguateca is located 7.3 km southeast.

The site of Tamarindito is part of the Reserva Nacional de Dos Pilas, essentially a rectangular area with some prolongations to the north and south (Eberl et al. 2009: 9). Nevertheless, the area around Tamarindito still suffers heavily from illegal deforestation and slash-and-burn agriculture that produces mainly maize and squash (Eberl et al. 2009: 9-10, 2010: 77). However, judging from early descriptions in Vanderbilt’s Proyecto Regional Petexbatun (Houston et al. 1992: 155), there were already clearings

Fig. 1. Map of the central Petexbatun region. Map by Markus Eberl (2007: Fig. 1.2).
for milpa agriculture in the early 1990s. The destruction of the rainforest has increased (Eberl et al. 2010: 77), leaving now only small isolated allotments of about 100 to 200 m² of rainforest. The areas north of the site centre are the most affected. Already by 2009, the logging had approached to within about 350 m of Group B, leaving only a small belt of original rainforest around the site centre. It is likely due only to the fact that Tamarindito is constantly supervised by two IDAEH guards that the cutting has not overtaken the entirety of the site centre. The deforestation has not just involved slash-and-burn agriculture, but also the logging of timber used for house construction, furniture, and firewood.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE**

The centre of Tamarindito consists of two major groups (Figure 2), built across natural hilltops. Group A crowns a hill, facing northeast, also known as the Cerro de Cartografía (Houston et al. 1992: 154). The plain to the east with the Laguna Tamarindito extends out about 85 m below the elevation of the Cerro de Cartografía (Vinson 1960a: 6). Group A is atop the highest elevation of the many ridges that run along a fairly north-south direction and form an escarpment to the plains in the north and the

---

**Fig. 2.** Map of the centre of Tamarindito. Group A is to the northeast, Group B to the southwest. The position of monuments known in 1984 at the time of the mapping is included. Survey by Boyd Dixon, Stephen Houston and Alejandro Córdoba (Houston 1993: Fig. 2-13).
Laguna in the east. To the west, Group A also faces a considerable gully in the terrain, before it rises again and Group B is reached to the south-west.

Four larger structures\(^2\) and architectural compounds are located around a large plaza of Group A. To the south is Str. A1, a large pyramidal structure that had at least three stelae (TAM St. 3, 4, 5, likely also St. 2) erected at its base. A compound to the north (Str. A5 through A16) is accessible via stairs from the plaza. By its layout, it can be considered a palace with individual structures and interspersed courts (Valdés 1997: 322) on an elevated platform. A few other structures and patio groups are located adjacent to the main plaza.

Excavation work has shown that the construction of Group A began during the Early Classic period (Valdés et al. 1995: 417-419; Valdés 1997: 324-325), and that larger scale remodelling took place in the Late Classic. Most notable in this respect are Structures A7 (Valdés et al. 1995: 418) and A13 (Valdés et al. 1994: 370, Fig. 3; Valdés 1997: 323-324). Test pitting revealed at least two construction phases in Str. A5, which also may be the oldest building in this group (Valdés et al. 1995: 418). The structures of this compound with their corbelled vaults and stone benches further testify to its elite use. There is also evidence that Str. A1 served as an important ceremonial pivot in the Early Classic, as all Tamarindito monuments dating to the 6th century AD have been found in front of it.

Group B lies approximately 260 m to the west of the Cerro de Cartografía, separated from it by a drop in the landscape. It comprises several plazas and various architectural groups fulfilling ritual and residential functions (Valdés 1997: 325). A sacbé originally ran in a north-south direction (Valdés 1997: 325), west of the palace compound (Str. B55) in the south-eastern sector of the group.

The highest elevation in this group is Str. B31, the main pyramidal structure at the northernmost end of the group. Its summit is 11.2 m above the plaza level (Vinson 1960a: 6). The lower part of its stair once contained four carved steps with depictions of captives and accompanying hieroglyphic captions (TAM HS. 1). Of great importance is Str. B44 at the west side of the south-western plaza. With an elevation of 10.0 m (Valdés et al. 1995: 420), it has a considerable height. Furthermore, the first four steps of its staircase comprised TAM HS. 2 (Valdés et al. 1995: 420). In the construction core of Str. B44, Burial 6 was discovered (Valdés 1994, 1997: 329; Valdés et al. 1995: 421) in a termination rite also seen with other materials or contexts (Wagner 2006a).

Notable is the palace compound to the east of the plaza, facing Str. B44. It consists of several individual structures aligned around a huge courtyard. This compound can almost be called an acropolis by its size, but has thus far not been archaeologically investigated (Valdés et al. 1995: 419). Previous researchers assumed that it may have served residential purposes. The entrance to the inner court consists of a small passage between Str. B64 and Str. B55. The largest building in this compound is Str. 61 to the east of the court. Structure B64, north of the entrance, once contained TAM HS. 3 (Houston et al. 1992: 157), which was flanked by two carved panels (TAM P. 3, 4) still in situ in the collapse debris.

Previous research at palace-like structures in the northern area of Group B (Str. B32 and B33) concluded that these were not used for residential purposes (Valdés et al. 1994: 373, Fig. 4; Valdés et al. 1995: 419), but rather served as administrative buildings (Valdés 1997: 325). Without further excavation in the acropolis of Group B, it cannot be ascertained whether the royal household continued to live in Group A or resettled to Group B in Late Classic times.

\(^2\) All structures of Tamarindito have been numbered consecutively, beginning with 1 in Group A and continuing with 31 in Group B. We will nevertheless prefix either ‘A’ or ‘B’ to make it easier to locate any structure in the site.
Residential groups were mainly explored in two areas outside the site centre: Twelve groups were investigated by the Proyecto Regional Petexbatun in an area east and north-east of Group A (Valdés et al. 1994: 377; Valdés et al. 1995: 415-417) along the hill slopes as far as the Lagunita Tamarindito. Forty-one groups were investigated between 2009 and 2011 by the ongoing Tamarindito Archaeological Project, mainly to the west and southwest of Group B (Eberl et al. 2009, 2010, 2011a, 2011b). Most of these groups feature four buildings or platforms encircling a patio, and they are fairly consistent in layout and configuration, conforming in large measure to plazuela groups so common in the Maya area.

One of the major results of the mapping and excavations in the residential complexes east of Group A was the detection of agricultural ‘box terraces’ (Houston et al. 1992: 159-162; Valdés et al. 1994: 376; Valdés et al. 1995: 329-333; Dunning et al. 1997: 258-259, Fig. 4; see also Chase and Chase 1983; Healy et al. 1983). The terraces are made of low stone murals to enclose rectangular plots, guided by the natural incline. Their construction prevented soil erosion and took care of drainage. Dikes were also erected to control the water flow and create reservoirs (Valdés 1997: 333). These terraces date to the Late and Terminal Classic periods (Houston et al. 1992: 162).

**HISTORY OF EXPLORATION**

Tamarindito was discovered in 1958 during a helicopter reconnaissance by George Vinson, an American geologist who was working for Esso Standard Inc. (Vinson 1960a: 4, 1960b: 119). He spotted the ruins on his return journey to Sayaxche. The ruins were first entered in September 1958 by George Vinson and Esso geologist R. Talbert; it was then that TAM HS. 1 was discovered (Vinson 1960b: 119). Tamarindito was re-visited in June and August 1960 by Vinson and Terence Grieder, then from Connecticut College, New London (Vinson 1960a: 6; Grieder 1960: 10, 14). In their reports, Vinson and Grieder describe a number of structures and monuments. It is also very likely that some photos of the monuments were taken (Grieder 1960: 10). This is further implied by an exchange of letters between Vinson and Heinrich Berlin (Sebastian Matteo, pers. comm., 2010). Vinson requested readings of the glyphs, but the photos were not considered suitable by Berlin. Grieder’s brief report on Tamarindito contained no illustrations (Grieder 1960).

Over the following decades, the site was visited by a number of scholars, among them Ian Graham (2010: 323-324) and Merle Greene Robertson (2006: 68-69). Graham’s photos are now stored in the archive of the Corpus of Maya Hieroglyphic Inscriptions project (Cambridge), and Merle Greene Robertson’s rubbings are in the Latin American Library at Tulane University (New Orleans).

The first thorough mapping of the site centre was conducted in 1984, as part of a Yale University project (Houston 1993: 17) by Boyd Dixon, Stephen Houston and Alejandro Córdoba, who also recorded the position of visible monuments and established an initial nomenclature (Figure 2). This expedition also recovered TAM HS. 3 (Houston et al. 1992: 155).

No further work was conducted in the site until 1990, when further mapping and the first test excavations took place as part of Vanderbilt University’s Proyecto Regional Petexbatun (Houston et al. 1992) under the direction of Stephen Houston and Oswaldo Chinchilla. Field seasons continued between 1991 and 1994 under co-director Juan Antonio Valdés (cf. Valdés et al. 1994, 1995; Valdés 1997; Demarest 2006: 121) and mainly focused on excavations in the site centre, namely Groups A and B, and further mapping of residential groups adjacent to the centre (Valdés et al. 1994: 377; Valdés et al. 1995: 415-417; Demarest 2006: 82, 121). Within the Vanderbilt project (Demarest 1997, 2006), which aimed at a large scale and interdisciplinary investigation of the Petexbatun region at specific sites as well as by large transects, Tamarindito formed its own sub-project.
Operations in the site were resumed in 2009 (Eberl et al. 2009) with the Proyecto Arqueológico Tamarindito (PAT), again carried out by Vanderbilt University, and continued in 2010 (Eberl et al. 2010; Eberl et al. 2011b) and 2011 (Eberl et al. 2011a). The current project concentrates on the exploration of residential groups dating to the Late and Terminal Classic periods (Eberl et al. 2009: 7). Its investigations consist of a systematic survey between Tamarindito and the Río Petexbatun, the mapping of the site and the excavation of residential groups to investigate their occupational history and socio-economic utilization (Eberl et al. 2010: 12). A special focus is placed on the question of persisting occupation and settlement patterns during and after the time of the collapse when the Petexbatun was reduced to political turmoil and warfare (cf. Demarest et al. 1997; Martin and Grube 2000: 64-67).

From a spatial perspective, the relationship between residential groups and the topography is one focus, always under comparison to known patterns from the Petexbatun area. The typology of residential groups is also investigated in the site’s internal context, for example, in order to identify neighbourhoods, or barrios, in Tamarindito. Knowing where the residential groups during the Late Classic were located and how far they extended around the site centre has chronological significance. Without a doubt, these perspectives must be pursued in combined analysis to determine the expansion of the site at a certain point of time and reconstruct its limits.

**THE PROYECTO ARQUEOLÓGICO TAMARINDITO**
In the 2009 PAT field season, operations took place at twelve groups (operations TM1-TM12) to the west and southwest of the site centre. They are mainly distributed north and south of the current trail to Arroyo de Piedra. In the 2010 field season, a total of sixteen operations (operations TM12-TM27) were conducted at fifteen new groups, with one (TM12) being completed from the preceding year. Again, the excavations were concentrated in the sector west of the centre (Figure 3). One particular group (5QR-c) will be discussed in greater detail, below.

Generally, we can observe that all the excavated groups date to the end of the Late Classic period. Tamarindito’s centre was occupied from Pre-Classic times onwards (Eberl et al. 2010: 12) and the earliest hieroglyphic accounts date back to AD 472 (TAM St. 5). Commoner residential groups, however, have provided little evidence of earlier materials in form of ceramic sherds and none for earlier construction phases pre-dating the verge of the Classic Maya collapse in the Petexbatun region (Eberl et al. 2009: 33).

As the project focuses on the common people and their living conditions, it is not surprising to find that most of the platforms were of simple and low-quality construction. Most of them supported structures of perishable materials and sometimes a stone wall of varying height. However, there are several examples of extremely well built structures with benches (5RQ-4, 5QR-5, 5QR-8, 5QR-9, 5SQ-1, 5SQ-7, 5SQ-10). Such terminal Late Classic examples demonstrate that the political collapse in the region did not affect the common people evenly across the board, and it might even be argued that in certain cases it rather improved their living circumstances (Eberl et al. 2010: 78). Furthermore, the varying quality of the architecture shows that these people were not a homogenous group, and this demonstrates the need to further investigate the socio-economic differences among the inhabitants of Tamarindito and their activity patterns across the settlement in a diachronic fashion.

**2010 FIELD SEASON RESULTS**

The 2010 PAT field crew consisted of four archaeologists (Markus Eberl, Claudia Vela González, Sven Gronemeyer, and Sarah Levithol) and twelve workers from neighbouring Las Maravillas. The archaeological fieldwork took place between May 24 and June 11, 2010. The laboratory work in Flores took place between June 21 and August 6, 2010, conducted by Markus Eberl and supported by three students from the Centro Universitario de Petén of the Universidad de San Carlos in Santa Elena. The sixteen operations had 67 sub-operations in total, resulting in a total excavation area of 107.3 m² (Table 1).

Nearly 15,500 ceramic sherds have been unearthed, and nearly 28 % were suitable for ceramic analyses (Table 2). The analyses follow the second phase of the Aguateca (Inomata et al. 2007) and Dos Ceibas projects (Eberl 2007; Eberl et al. 2008). The prevalent ceramic groups are Tinaja, Cambio and Saxche-Palmar, which amount to 97.3 % in total. Six vessels could be reconstructed. Sherds of plates, bowls and cups were the most abundant. Almost all ceramic material dates from the Late Classic. Among the 56 fragments of ceramics found that are not the remains of vessels, 10 were parts of flutes and 18 were parts of figurines or musical instruments.

---

3 Contexts are designated according to the following scheme in the nomenclature of the Tamarindito project (Eberl et al. 2009: 8, 9, Figs. 3, 4): TM24A-1-2-3 (TM = Tamarindito, 24 = operation (a residential group), A = sub-operation (structure or midden in a residential group), 1 = unit, 2 = level, 3 = lot). Group designations are oriented after the UTM grid as follows: 5QR-c (5 = cipher of 5 x 5 km segment, QR = longitude/latitude cipher of a 250 x 250m grid within, c = third group within grid). Much like group identifiers increment within each 250 x 250 grid, so do the numbers for individual structures.
Table 1. Summary of all operations and artefacts excavated (after Eberl et al. 2010: 16-17, 62-63, 66-72).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Suboperation</th>
<th>Area excavated</th>
<th>no. of ceramics</th>
<th>no. of lithics (obsidian, flint, quartz, manos)</th>
<th>no. of figurines and molded ceramics</th>
<th>no. of bones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B-C</td>
<td>1.0 m²</td>
<td>239 (1.5%)</td>
<td>O: 3 (2.7%), F: 7 (0.6%), Q: 2 (10.5%), M: 1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A-F</td>
<td>19.0 m²</td>
<td>1,262 (8.1%)</td>
<td>O: 5 (4.5%), F: 148 (13.1%), Q: 11 (57.9%), M: 1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>8 (17.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A-E</td>
<td>4.0 m²</td>
<td>1,478 (9.5%)</td>
<td>O: 14 (12.6%), F: 18 (1.6%), Q: - M: 14 (60.9%)</td>
<td>6 (13.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A-E</td>
<td>5.0 m²</td>
<td>1,894 (12.2%)</td>
<td>O: 4 (3.6%), F: 8 (0.7%), Q: - M: 1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A-D</td>
<td>4.0 m²</td>
<td>580 (3.7%)</td>
<td>O: 2 (1.8%), F: 21 (1.9%), Q: - M: -</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A-E</td>
<td>4.0 m²</td>
<td>2,566 (16.6%)</td>
<td>O: 2 (1.8%), F: 63 (%), Q: - M: -</td>
<td>10 (21.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A-D</td>
<td>3.0 m²</td>
<td>526 (3.4%)</td>
<td>O: 1 (0.9%), F: 11 (1.0%), Q: - M: -</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A-D</td>
<td>4.0 m²</td>
<td>426 (2.8%)</td>
<td>O: 6 (5.4%), F: 14 (1.2%), Q: - M: 1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>7 (15.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-D</td>
<td>6.0 m²</td>
<td>351 (2.3%)</td>
<td>O: 2 (1.8%), F: 71 (6.3%), Q: 4 (21.1%), M: 2 (8.7%)</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A-E</td>
<td>24.0 m²</td>
<td>596 (3.8%)</td>
<td>O: 4 (3.6%), F: 27 (2.4%), Q: - M: 1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>3 (6.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic groups</td>
<td>Vessel types</td>
<td>Dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambio</td>
<td>1,490 (34.4%)</td>
<td>Plates</td>
<td>199 (31.8%)</td>
<td>Pre-Classic</td>
<td>26 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Caballo Waxy</td>
<td>16 (0.6%)</td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>190 (30.4%)</td>
<td>Early Classic</td>
<td>7 (0.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanza</td>
<td>3 (0.1%)</td>
<td>Cups</td>
<td>158 (25.3%)</td>
<td>Late Classic</td>
<td>4,252 (98.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dos Arroyos</td>
<td>4 (0.1%)</td>
<td>Jars</td>
<td>72 (11.5%)</td>
<td>Terminal Classic</td>
<td>41 (0.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saxche-Palmar</td>
<td>1,137 (26.3%)</td>
<td>Drums</td>
<td>4 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tinaja</td>
<td>1,581 (36.6%)</td>
<td>Comales</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Gray</td>
<td>5 (0.1%)</td>
<td>Lids</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Orange</td>
<td>36 (0.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>44 (1.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625 (27.9% of analysable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Results of the ceramic analyses (after Eberl et al. 2010: 62-64).
Only very little bone material has been found (Eberl et al. 2010: 72-73), and 15 fragments and parts of a turtle carapace were recovered from middens (Table 1). The human remains from Burial 1 from Str. 5SQ-6 (Figure 4) are heavily deteriorated and intruding sediments and rodents had disturbed the burial. Most of the fragments belong to parts of the long bones of arms, femora and lower leg bones, and there is one fragment of the cranium, nine teeth and four hand phalanges. Most notably, vertebrae are missing as well as other diagnostic bones such as the pelvis or the mandible. Since the bones appeared in their approximate anatomical positions in the burial it would seem that the interment is a primary burial; nevertheless, the excavator expressed some doubts as to this assessment and suggested that this may represent a secondary interment. The head portion was covered by a Saxche-Palmar Orange-polychrome tripod plate (complete vessel 310515).

One of the most extensively excavated residential groups of the 2010 field season was 5SQ-a (TM13), with Str. 5SQ-1 standing out as the residential group featuring the highest quality of architecture, among the groups excavated to date (Figure 5). Its excavation (TM13C) revealed that the corners of the platform are made of finely worked stones, supporting a single room structure of
a stone mural of an original height of about two metres. The room contained a single rectangular bench, later transformed into a ‘C’ shape (Eberl et al. 2010: 20; see also Tourtellot 1988; Harrison 1970). A Pabellon Molded-carved bowl (complete vessel number 310520) from the entrance of the structure (TM13C-6-2-2) clearly dates the usage of this building into the Terminal Classic period (Eberl et al. 2010: 65, 78; Smith and Gifford 1966: 160; Adams 1971: 49-51; Sabloff 1975: 195-196, 198).

Group 5QR-a (TM14) may provide hints as to its socio-economic use (Eberl et al. 2010: 38-40). Str. 5QR-1 is a two-tiered platform with a small stair leading to a single room structure with a bench.
surrounded by enormous walls. The structure was well built, and large stone slabs covered the surface of the platform and obviously served to transfer the mass of the supporting mural. The structure can be tentatively identified as a scribal residence or workshop on account of a stone bark beater found on the surface of the platform (TM19A-1-1-1), along with the head of a figurine (TM19B-1-2-1), which depicts a spider monkey wearing a wrapped and bent headdress that was not only typical for scribes (see e.g. K1522, K2220), but also for ritual specialists (Zender 2004a: 10, 2004b: 142-152). A ceramic sherd featuring the distinct iconography of the Jaguar God of the Underworld was also recovered (TM19D-1-4-2), eventually determined to have been part of a censer (Miseria Applique, also dating to the Terminal Classic period; see Sabloff 1975).
The most spectacular finding was Group 5QR-c (Eberl et al. 2011b: Fig. 4), situated some 740 m west of Plaza B (Figure 6). It consists of five platforms surrounded by a C-shaped wall (Str. 5QR-11) with a passage (Eberl et al. 2010: 52-55, 79-81; Eberl et al. 2011b: 239, 240) allowing access into the complex. The whole group is some 20 m south of the current trail towards Arroyo de Piedra. There is good reason to consider this group as an ‘entrance’ to Tamarindito by at least the Late Classic, due to its advantageous topographic setting on top of a rather flat elevation. It also likely served defensive purposes, as is implied by the wall and by its position overlooking the northern plains below the escarpment. This group specifically evokes the question of ‘urban boundaries’ of Classic Maya

**GROUP 5QR-C**

The most spectacular finding was Group 5QR-c (Eberl et al. 2011b: Fig. 4), situated some 740 m west of Plaza B (Figure 6). It consists of five platforms surrounded by a C-shaped wall (Str. 5QR-11) with a passage (Eberl et al. 2010: 52-55, 79-81; Eberl et al. 2011b: 239, 240) allowing access into the complex. The whole group is some 20 m south of the current trail towards Arroyo de Piedra. There is good reason to consider this group as an ‘entrance’ to Tamarindito by at least the Late Classic, due to its advantageous topographic setting on top of a rather flat elevation. It also likely served defensive purposes, as is implied by the wall and by its position overlooking the northern plains below the escarpment. This group specifically evokes the question of ‘urban boundaries’ of Classic Maya

Fig. 7. Top left: Plan and profile of TM24A, the south-eastern corner of the northern wall. Bottom: Profile of TM24B, a trench through the northern mural. Plan and profiles by Omar Schwendener based on field drawings by Sven Gronemeyer (after Eberl et al. 2010: figs. 79-81). Right: Photo of TM24A showing the wall fill and pavement. Photo by Sven Gronemeyer.
settlements (Eberl et al. 2011b: 241-242) and the architectonic imprints of such boundaries, especially when considering that the wall faces towards Tamarindito’s twin capital of Arroyo de Piedra (Mathews and Willey 1991: 43; Escobedo 2006: ix, 28).

Four sub-operations (Figure 7) have been conducted during the 2010 PAT field season in this group (Eberl et al. 2010: 52-55; Eberl et al. 2011b: 239-240). As there has only been limited test pitting and trenching thus far, all results and conclusions remain tentative and subject to change.

The first of these is TM24A, a 3 x 3 m pit in the south-eastern corner of Str. 5QR-11, which also served to investigate parts of the passageway and the area behind the wall. The limestone bedrock in this area is very uneven. Throughout the entire sub-operation, a thin layer of compacted earth with small cobbles was found above the bedrock. Apparently it was deposited to level the area before the construction of the passage and the wall. Large and rather flat stones were set in the area of the passageway, while the area behind the wall only consists of dense soil. The core of the wall and the stones in the passage grade seamlessly, and we can thereby assume that they represent a single phase of construction. TM24B is a 4.1 x 0.5 m trench six meters north to TM24A. In this section, the wall was built directly on the bedrock which is much more even here. It was built in one construction phase. The wall deteriorated into a loose pile of rocks covered by sediments. It is surmised to have originally supported a wooden palisade.

TM24C is a 1 x 1 m test pit in Str. 5QR-13 that serves to clarify the dating of one of the northern platforms and investigate whether they were contemporaneous with the wall. The target of TM24D was Str. 5QR-14, into which a looters trench had already been driven (Eberl et al. 2011b: Fig. 5). The profile was cleared to a width of 1.3 m and excavated down to bedrock. The stratigraphy exposed by the looting provided a clear view of a single construction phase. The collapse of a bench or wall covered the surface. Beneath was a thin layer of deteriorated stucco, indicating that the entire structure had once been plastered. It is the only evidence of stucco thus far from a residential group outside Tamarindito’s centre. The underlying layers represent construction core on the remnants of a palaeosol.

THE QUESTION OF CLASSIC MAYA SITE BOUNDARIES

The discovery of Group 5QR-c raises some important questions as to the boundaries of Classic Maya cities and access to them (Eberl et al. 2010: 79-81; Eberl et al. 2011b: 240-242). The ceramics found in all sub-operations date to the Late Classic period. The wall measures around three metres at its base and reaches around one metre in height. As the northern arm of the wall is rather short, Strs. 5QR-12, 13 and 16 likely blocked this side. We assume that we have the original layout of the entire group that was planned and constructed in one phase and was left open to the east, towards Tamarindito. The presence of various residential groups of the same time period in the vicinity implies that this group was not built as an advanced ‘control post’ on a green field. The closest group is just 70 m to the west, and residential groups have thus far been found up to 1.6 km to the west of Tamarindito’s centre (thus about 900 m further from this group).

Str. 5QR-14 and 15 align on an axis with the passageway and were likely to the side of a route or roadway that cut the group in a west-east direction, which is to say between Arroyo de Piedra and Tamarindito. We assume this route to be more than a trail. Its development into something like a roadway is suggested by the construction in the passageway, but further investigations are needed to clarify whether some hard-surfaced paving was laid down and whether this putative material is to be found exclusive in the wall group, or if it even extended all the way between the site centres of

---

Sub-operations TM24A and TM24B yielded only very few artefacts. Interestingly, the lowest densities were found in the area of the passageway and behind the wall, among them one broken flint spearhead.
Arroyo de Piedra and Tamarindito. Large areas of the group were still covered by vegetation in 2010. As a result, it was not possible to more thoroughly investigate the possibility of a trench in front (to the west) of the wall, as we know to have existed at other sites, such as Tikal or Becan, for example.

The question of clearly defined limits of Classic Maya cities is still under debate, especially in relation with routes (especially causeways) and their boundary-maintaining function (Kurjack and Andrews 1976; Ashmore 1981; Chase and Chase 2001; Shaw 2001: 261-262, 268). Commonly, particular topographic features such as inaccessible terrain, bajos, or unfavourable soils have been taken as an indicator of limited human occupation (cf. Houk 1996). This reflects the model of Maya sites as “garden cities” (Stierlin 1964: 179; Graham 1999a, 1999b), where residential groups are interspersed among spaces used for cultivation (“infield agriculture”) as opposed to outlying fields (cf. Netting 1977; Sanders 1981: 362-363). Until the 1.6 km distance to Tamarindito’s site centre where residential groups have been investigated, differences in their layout have been noted that require more thorough investigation in the future. For example, their size is not constant. In fact, the largest group discovered so far measures some 50 x 90 m and is located almost half way between Tamarindito and Arroyo de Piedra.

The discovery of Group 5QR-c allows the development of an alternative perspective on the question of Maya city boundaries. We will concentrate on four aspects to which this group, but also others, surveyed by the PAT, may provide an answer.

One question concerns how to define a Maya polity from a spatial point of view, contrasting the traditional Thiessen polygon model first successfully applied to the Maya case by Peter Mathews (1991) against a zonal model, as it was introduced by Antonio Benavides for Coba (1981a: 24, 105-115, 1981b: 210-215).

Furthermore, can we trace formal boundary markers of a Maya site and are these congruent with a ceremonial and/or territorial boundary? In ancient Rome, the defensive walls surrounding the city were different to the pomerium, which is the legal border, or the sacral delimitation (Drogula 2007). Diego de Landa (1959: 63) describes how in Colonial times rock piles with god effigies were used to separate what the Yukatek Maya call k’aaj and k’aax (cf. Stone 1995: 15-18; Taube 2003; Le Guen 2005), that is, the ordered world of the settlement from the realm of the aluxes. Alternatively, we have identified architectural features such as the arches of Labna and Kabah that mark the entrance to a site. Highly interesting in this respect is the investigation on ranked spaces and community boundaries in Copan (Wagner 2006b), where stelae-altar complexes at the cardinal points of the site seem to both formally and ceremonially delimit the city.

The particular layout of Group 5QR-c also brings strategic considerations into play. The location of the group on the flattened escarpment and the presumed road passing by cannot be a coincidence. Finally, the type of route that ran through the group is of importance. The construction of a formal causeway (or sacbe) is not overly common between Maya cities (Shaw 2001), Coba (Benavides 1981c) and Caracol (Chase and Chase 2001) being the most prominent examples, wherein the major site connects to its subsidiaries. In the Petexbatun, no kind of inter-site road has heretofore been recognised. The currently existing networks of trails (or brechas) that connect hamlets, fields and farmsteads, are sufficient to travel between two localities in a sparsely inhabited region. Such trails were likely insufficient in Classic times, though, because today’s trails are not always cut along the most suitable terrain and because they impede the use by large groups of people, be it in the form of merchants, soldiers, or during processions. Group

---

5 Based on epigraphic evidence one could argue that a Classic Maya site and its polity formed a ‘city-state’ (Grube 2000: 553). However, the extent of a Maya site does not have to match the expansion of its polity’s territory. Although neighbouring Arroyo de Piedra was part of the same polity as Tamarindito, Group 5QR-c suggests that some demarcation between the two existed.
5QR-c attests to the existence of a simple road between Tamarindito and Arroyo de Piedra and as such provides the first evidence for a Classic period network of roads in the Petexbatun region.

There are two additional questions that are linked to the relationship of Tamarindito and Arroyo de Piedra as twin capitals (Mathews and Willey 1991: 43; Escobedo 2006: ix, 28) of the polity sharing the so-called scroll emblem glyph. Were both cities within this political entity marked off as two different communities and did Group 5QR-c serve as a boundary marker? Or did the Late Classic construction of Group 5QR-c reflect the rapid balkanisation in the Petexbatun⁶ and served as a last line of defence before reaching the royal seat? The ceramic sherds recovered from the wall core and the layout that differs from other fortifications in the region suggest that Group 5QR-c predates the Petexbatun wars but the ceramic sample is rather small to provide to precise chronological estimate.

THIESSEN POLYGONS VS. ZONAL BELTS

Peter Mathews (1991) used “Thiessen polygons” (Voronoi 1908) to define the territory of Classic Maya polities on the basis of the distribution of emblem glyphs. The boundaries are drawn exactly along the centreline between two sites with different emblem glyphs. These boundaries stretch straight across the landscape and do not take into consideration the natural features that may have served as natural boundary markers.

Figure 8 shows the result of such a tessellation around the sites of Dos Pilas, Arroyo de Piedra, Tamarindito, Punta de Chimino and Aguateca. As Arroyo de Piedra and Tamarindito were part of the same polity, the ‘border’ between them is only indicated by a dotted line, Punta de Chimino was likewise part of the political sphere. Dos Pilas and Aguateca were also twin capitals (Houston and Inomata 2009: 295), and with the accession of Tahn Te’ K’inich in AD 770, Aguateca became the sole royal seat after the fall of Dos Pilas. The figure indicates the residential groups west of Tamarindito’s centre that were excavated in 2009 and 2010 and highlights the position of Group 5QR-c with an asterisk. If Group 5QR-c was a ‘control post’ at Tamarindito’s border, it is situated well within its territory and far off the hypothetical border with Arroyo de Piedra. Neighbouring residential groups even further west would be excluded from Tamarindito’s territory if Group 5QR-c was contemporaneous with them. However, its location may just be the result of a diminished territory during the Petexbatun wars.

Antonio Benavides (1981a: 24) proposed the zonal model for Coba as an alternative to better reflect the diversity of settlement patterns and incorporate them into an urban landscape. This model differentiates a nuclear zone (or epicentre) as the ceremonial and administrative centre with monumental architecture from the ‘suburbs’. These suburban zones are mainly defined by their distance from the epicentre and causeways (Benavides 1981a: 105-115), and are subdivided into a “perinuclear” zone around the epicentre (characterized by elite patio groups; Benavides 1981b: 213) and a peripheral zone of outlying groups connected to it by causeways. The complementary zone is a collocation

⁶ A process to which Tamarindito actively contributed by ousting and capturing the last Dos Pilas king K’awiil Chan K’inich in AD 761 (Gronemeyer in prep.), leading to a downfall of the hegemonial power which Tamarindito could not fill. From the Petexbatun wars, fortifications are known from numerous sites, such as Dos Pilas (Demarest et al. 1997: 230), Aguateca (Inomata 1997: 342), and Punta de Chimino. Arroyo de Piedra was also enclosed by defensive walls (Escobedo 1997: 316), but such large-scale features have not yet been found at Tamarindito.

⁷ Assumed by an Early Classic Jordan phase bowl in Punta de Chimino Burial 8, featuring the Tamarindito emblem glyph (Eberl 2007: Fig. 3.8a), which presumably represents a royal gift (Escobedo 1996: 20).
of residential groups (combined with subsistence agriculture; Benavides 1981a: 112-114) of varying density that fades into the site’s hinterland.

Settlement patterns of course seem to differ from site to site. Concentric models (Folan et al. 2009) have been discussed and applied for other sites (e.g. Garza and Kurjack 1984) while the situation was apparently different for Tikal (cf. Arnold and Ford 1980; MacKinnon 1981). Too little data are yet available for Tamarindito and future surveys and excavations might change the picture. When applying a zonal model to Tamarindito (and for comparison also other sites in the region), it necessarily remains a simplified and idealized succession of concentric circles (Figure 8), each denoting a nuclear,
perinuclear and peripheral zone. According to the size of each site, the extension varies proportionately. The expansion of Tamarindito’s perinuclear zone has been set to coincide with Group 5QR-c.

The nuclear zone of Tamarindito consists of Groups A and B as the administrative and ritual centre. The perinuclear zone is an agglomeration of elite compounds and residential groups of varying extension around the epicentre. To the west, this zone is formally bordered by Group 5QR-c, limiting the site’s extension as viewed by their rulers (Eberl et al. 2011b: 242) and without necessarily coinciding with those of the polity. Other groups of a similar function or even a similar layout may be located at other access points in the north, east and south. Since residential groups exist to the west of Group 5QR-c, this zone can be considered as the periphery. Its settlement density fluctuates depending on the terrain and the distance from the epicentre, but decreases in general with distance. The borders of the zones were vaguely delimited and Tamarindito’s periphery presumably merged seamlessly into Arroyo de Piedra’s periphery, with the twin capitals forming a large agglomeration. A transect between Tamarindito and Dos Pilas that would go through Arroyo de Piedra could provide important insights because it would traverse the border between two friendly sites (Arroyo de Piedra and Tamarindito) and the border between two enemy sites (Dos Pilas and Arroyo de Piedra).

OUTLOOK FOR THE PROYECTO ARQUEOLÓGICO TAMARINDITO

The Tamarindito project continued its investigations with a third field season in 2011. Byron Hernández started with the creation of a total station-based map of the entire site; he and his crew took about 9,000 measurements predominantly in the western part of the site near Plaza A. Sarah Levithol began her systematic survey of the area between Tamarindito and the Petexbatun river and lake. She mapped and test-pitted two residential groups near the escarpment. Claudia Vela González and the junior author continued with the investigations of commoner residential groups at the site itself. Six residential groups to the west of Plaza A were test-pitted in addition to seven residential groups to the southeast of Plaza B. The Tamarindito project completed the investigation of 41 residential groups so far and hopes to have a comprehensive sample of Tamarindito by adding additional residential groups to the south of Plaza B and by starting limited excavations that complement earlier studies by Juan Antonio Valdés in the centre (Plaza A and B).

EPIGRAPHY OF TAMARINDITO

Tamarindito is the oldest kingdom in the Petexbatun region and after Dos Pilas and Aguateca the third largest site (Valdés et al. 1995: 415). It must have played a major socio-political role in the area (cf. Inomata 1997: 338, 341), at least until Dos Pilas was founded by an exiled Tikal noble faction (cf. Martin and Grube 2000: 56-58; Fahsen 2002; Boot 2002; Guenter 2003; Eberl 2007: 64). This is exemplified by being the first site in the Petexbatun to bear an emblem glyph (Valdés et al. 1994: 368; Escobedo 2006: 7). Otherwise, emblem glyphs in the Pasion area are only attested at the sites of Altar de Sacrificios and Tres Islas (Mathews 1991; Valdés et al. 1994: 379) by these early times.

A long dynastic line is also in evidence: by around 9.13.0.0.0 (AD 711), we have Aj Ihk’ Wolok designated the 25th in succession (although surely anchored to a fictional dynastic founder), as detailed

---

8 The peripheral zone in this model matches Benavides’s complementary zone. At Coba, causeways connected outliers but since similar causeways are missing at Tamarindito, no complementary zone is needed to ‘fill the space’.

9 Compare to modern metropolitan areas, such as Greater London. We have the rather small City of London itself, the boroughs of Inner London around and the ones of Outer London to border the home counties.
by TAM HS. 3, Step VI, E1 – Step VII, A1 (Houston 1993: 114). This implies that the later rulers of Tamarindito considered their royal patriline to have begun many years earlier, quite possibly in the deep mythical past (see Helmke, this volume). The earliest known epigraphic reference to Tamarindito comes from TAM St. 5, Bp5. It mentions the birth of an individual on 9.1.17.10.8 (22 Dec. AD 472) who acceded to power as Ruler 1 shortly before 9.3.19.0.0 (21 Oct. AD 513). Whereas previous research (Mathews and Willey 1991: 43-44) has identified eight rulers, new investigations (Gronemeyer in prep.) found twelve rulers in the inscriptions at Tamarindito and related sites.

A pivotal event in the polity’s history occurred in the little known time between the reigns of Aj Ihk’ Wolok (Ruler 7) and Mo’? Bahlam (Ruler 10). Dos Pilas was still involved in the fratricidal war against Tikal in the decades after its foundation (Martin and Grube 2000: 57-58; Boot 2002; Guenter 2003). The Dos Pilas king Itzamnaaj K’awiil appears on TAM HS. 3, Step I, C1 acting under the auspices of Aj Ihk’ Wolok, seemingly a subordinate to the old Petexbatun kingdom. The same Itzamnaaj K’awiil likely appears less than 10 years later as the overlord of Chak Bin Ahk (Ruler 11) on ARP St. 2, overseeing his accession on 9.14.0.3.5 (6 Feb. AD 712). Ruler 11 is the offspring of a Dos Pilas princess, likely a daughter of the founder Bajlaj Chan K’awiil (Martin and Grube 2000: 57). That Dos Pilas subjugated Tamarindito (Gronemeyer in prep.) is attested to by the many smashed and mutilated Early Classic monuments that have been found at latter site (Houston 1993: 46; Escobedo 1997: 309, 2006: 110, 124). The rivalry between Dos Pilas and Tamarindito may not only have been about regional hegemony but it may also reflect pan-Lowland pretension, because Tamarindito had close ties to Tikal during the Middle Classic. We see the ‘Lady of Tikal’ governing the 9.5.0.0.0 (3 Jul. AD 534) period ending conducted by Wakoh K’inich on TAM St. 2, C4-C6 (Gronemeyer 2011: 61 in prep., Figure 9). By destroying Tamarindito’s stelae, Dos Pilas blatantly attempted to efface history.

Tamarindito actively contributed to the collapse of the Petexbatun when Chanal Bahlam (Ruler 12) captured and removed the Dos Pilas king K’awiil Chan K’inich from the throne on 9.16.9.15.3 (17 Jan AD 761), as recorded on TAM HS. 2, Step III, F1-H2 (Martin and Grube 2000: 63) and shown as a captive on TAM HS. 1, Step II (Gronemeyer in prep., Figure 9). TAM HS. 2 provides the last known mention of this Dos Pilas King as a ruler, before the ‘petty kings’ of Aguas Calientes, Aguateca, La...
Amelia and Seibal fought for supremacy in the resulting power vacuum (Martin and Grube 2000: 64-65). In an act of reprisal, Tamarindito was attacked only seven days later on 9.16.9.15.10, as TAM HS. 2, Step III, M1-P2 reports (24 Jan. AD 761), apparently as a Dos Pilas punitive expedition to recover their captured patron gods (Gronemeyer in prep.).

Tamarindito proved stable enough to sustain rulership for at least one and a half years after it had been attacked. The latest secure date is 9.16.11.6.13 (10 Aug. AD 762) on TAM HS. 2, Step IV, I1-L1, when Chanal Bahlam visited the tomb of Aj Ihk’ Wolok, the last independent king before the Dos Pilas hegemony (Gronemeyer in prep.). The last mention of the scroll polity dates to 9.18.0.0.0 (17 Aug. AD 800) in the form of a scribal signature on AGT St. 7 (Graham 1967: 24, Fig. 17; Houston 1993: 120).

THE HIEROGLYPHIC AND MONUMENTAL CORPUS

Tamarindito’s history provides some important clues to the history of the Petexbatun. Yet, its corpus remains poorly documented. Together with the texts from Arroyo de Piedra, Héctor Escobedo (2006) has provided the most comprehensive catalogue so far, though it still lacks a thorough documentation in the form of photos and line drawings. Many monuments have been looted and disappeared after they were recorded in the 1960s by Ian Graham and Merle Greene Robertson. A preliminary report (Gronemeyer 2011) listed 17 stone monuments. More recent research (Gronemeyer in prep.) that included miscellaneous texts on portable artefacts, contributed seven additional texts. Thus far, we have identified six stelae, seven panels, one altar, three hieroglyphic stairways (Gronemeyer 2011), and in addition one unpublished stela fragment, one step of stair of Str. B64 (possibly part of TAM HS. 3; Houston et al. 1992: Fig. 2), one graffito (rubbing by Merle Greene Robertson, ID D23869), two inscribed ceramic vessels from Burial 6 inside Str. B44 (Cat-No. 260,002; [Valdés et al. 1995: 421, Fig. 17; Foias 1996: 1140-1142, Fig. C.22]; Cat-No. 206,001 [Foias 1996: 1144, Fig. C.23]), one ceramic vessel with pseudoglyphs from Burial 3 inside Str. A13 (Cat-No. 206,245 [Foias 1996: 1136]), and a sherd of an Ik’-style vessel with a badly weathered Calendar Round, recovered during the 2010 PAT field season.

TAM P. 3 and 4 have been investigated during the 2011 PAT field season. TAM St. 1 and 6, which were reported as uncarved, may just be fallen with their sculptured surface facing the ground, so further excavation of these monuments might add additional insights to the epigraphy, iconography and history of Tamarindito.
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