

## CHAPTER V

## STYLISTIC TRAITS

## Hand Modelled Figurines

There is little ceremonial or elite art in Early Classic times at Teotihuacan with which to compare the hand modelled figurines. If the Pyramid of the Sun or the Pyramid of the Moon were painted with designs, no traces are left. Other evidence for public ceremonies during the earlier phases at Teotihuacan is the large stone sculpture referred to as the water goddess, and the carvings on the Temple of Quetzalcoatl (Kubler 1962: 33, 35), as well as the murals.

The water goddess was probably part of an architectural structure, and apart from being a representation of a person, bears no likeness to hand modelled figurines in this collection. Nor do any of the animal figurines from 9:N1E7 compare stylistically with the carved heads on the Temple of Quetzalcoatl, a structure dated to the Miccaotli phase (R. Millon 1973: 55). Rubín de la Borbolla excavated an offering at the foot of the stairway of the Temple of Quetzalcoatl (1947: Fig. 13). The offering contained terracotta figurines as well as other artifacts, but the figurines do not look like the heads on the facade of the temple. The figurines in the offering include bald heads and bald cleft heads, and the offering is dated to the Early Tlamimilolpa sub-phase (R. Millon 1966: 5).

The developed art of mural painting appears in the Tlamimilolpa phase (C. Millon 1972: 5). Some of the earliest mural designs were geometric; however, some figures are shown--a bird, a scene on the Temple of Agriculture of people making offerings (Miller 1973: 63-65, 71-72), and the Mythological Animals (R. Millon 1966: 11). Apart from these examples, there are no graphic representations of human figures or religious practices in ceremonial art, either in murals (C. Millon 1972: 5) or on decorated pottery (Rattray 1979: 296).

#### The Offering Scene Mural

Figs. 4, 5, and 6 and some human figures in the offering scene wear similar headgear, especially if the side strips on the figurine heads are meant to represent hair. This mural was excavated by Batres and is now lost (Villagra Caletí 1965: 137-138, Fig. 5). The details of the painting may have been distorted when restored (Villagra Caletí 1965: 135), but the symbolic elements may be accurately shown. The mural portrays a group of people in attitudes of supplication, facing what appear to be statues. The figures wear feather headdresses with animal motifs, turbans, and some have long hair. Some of the profiles look slightly prognathous. One male and one female, those to the near side of each statue, wear headgear similar to the turban headdresses of Figs. 4, 5, and 6 (and perhaps Fig. 2, but this headdress is broken and almost no detail remains). The males in the mural wear loincloths like those of the hand modelled torsos with bits of appliqué around the hip area. The figure near the left statue

and the figure just above wear loose hanging garments. The shape of these garments is similar to that of figurine torsos of the so-called half conical type which appear in the Late Xolalpan subphase. Almost all the figures wear necklaces of round bead-like objects and ear-spools. Some are barefoot, others wear sandals. Headdresses and coiffures are arranged to cover most of the forehead, much like the figurines' head decorations.

#### Wide Band Headdress

It is impossible to restrict consideration of Teotihuacan figurine styles entirely to either hand modelled or moulded groups. The wide band headdress motif begins early at Teotihuacan and continues on figurines made in moulds, and does not appear on Coyotlatelco or Aztec figurines. The wide band headdresses from site 9:N1E7 (Fig. 9, hand modelled, and Figs. 80-81, moulded) have no associated torsos. The motif is found in several stylistic contexts. It is seen on figurines wearing long skirts and quechquemitls, usual female garb in Mesoamerica (Seler 1915: 476, Fig. 86; Covarrubias 1957: Fig. 54, middle of first and second rows; Séjourné 1966a: Lam. 52, Fig. 154), on a female holding a child (Séjourné 1959: Fig. 58g-i), and on the child being held (Séjourné 1966a: Lam. 54, Fig. 15). Seler (1915: 475, Fig. 85) illustrates what appears to be a hand modelled figure devoid of sexual attributes and costume except the wide band headdress,

earspools, and a two-strand coil necklace. Von Winning notes wide band headdresses on moulded bound figurines (1972: 31, Fig. 2, third row) which he equates with "bed figures," infants, and cradles probably made of perishable material. Two figurines with this headdress were recovered from a Yayahuala burial (Séjourné 1966a: 240, Fig. 160). The tradition of the wide band headdress has a long history at Teotihuacan because it occurs in both hand modelled and moulded form. One hand modelled head with a wide band headdress and coffee bean eye was found in the fill of the tunnel of the Pyramid of the Sun excavated by Millon, Drewitt, and Bennyhoff (1965: Fig. 105c). Paddock (1978: 46) writes that Caso suggested the Monte Alban "lamp-shade" headdress, "if flattened from front to back, would result in the sort of broad-band headdress. . . typical of many Teotihuacan II figurines."

#### Bald Cleft Head

Another motif seen only on figurines, the bald cleft head, was also made by both hand modelling and moulding. The word "cleft," like several others in Teotihuacan figurine terminology, does not accurately describe this head shape. The head may be either heart-shaped (Fig. 11), or have a notch in the middle (Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 25). It appears as early as the Late Tzacualli phase (von Winning 1976: 154). Heads of this shape have been recovered in the interior fill of the Pyramid of the Sun (Noguera 1935a: Lam. XVII,

no. 4; Barbour 1975: Plate 12a). In some cases the top of the bald head is wide, giving the face a triangular shape, with no cleft or indentation (Fig. 20). The bald cleft head is associated with puppet figurines (von Winning 1958: 4), but is also seen on other torso forms (Séjourné 1966a: Lam. 56). Figs. 11 and 20 are the only hand modelled heads of this shape in this group. Figs. 57-60 are of the same general shape, and were made in moulds. They are discussed with moulded figurines, but are mentioned here to demonstrate continuity of style.

#### Bald Head

Figs. 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 19 are hand modelled bald heads. However, only Figs. 18 and 19 may be stylistically ancestral to portrait heads (Figs. 50-56) because they lack ear spoils or any head decoration.

None of the figures in the offering scene mural have bald heads, bald cleft heads, or wear wide band headdresses. Apparently these are motifs found only on figurines. (Portrait heads and the figures in the bottom registers of the Tlalocan mural are discussed on page 61.)

#### Human Head in Animal Head

The human head encased in an animal head (Fig. 21) is another style which is seen in both hand modelled and moulded form, but this

type is also seen in ceremonial art. Fig. 21 is a simple design compared to the more elaborate moulded forms. There is no moulded example in the 9:NE7 group.

### Animals

Hand modelled animal heads (Figs. 24-28) provide only the information that animals were somehow significant in the early phases at Teotihuacan, both in elite and folk art. They certainly do not resemble any of the animals in the mural of the Mythological Animals, the bird on the Temple of Agriculture, or the heads on the facade of the Temple of Quetzalcoatl. It should be noted that early mural art is richer in animal than human iconography. These heads are all rather simply, or even crudely, fashioned, and lack any decoration. They do not appear to be unusual in style as many similar hand modelled animal heads have been found at Teotihuacan (Séjourné 1966a: Figs. 173-179).

### Classic Moulded Figurines

There is a wealth of representational art in the Xolalpan and Metepec phases, both murals and decorated vases; but few direct stylistic counterparts are seen in the 9:NE7 figurines. Pasztory sees cross references of iconographic elements in murals (1974: 11, footnote 2), and some examples in this group suggest the same is true of figurine design.

### Dancer Figurines

Dancer bald heads, torsos, and limbs resemble the figures in the bottom registers of the Tlalocan mural at Tepantitla (Caso 1942); and Wicke (1954: 120) particularly pointed up the similarity. However, the moulded faces of portrait figurines (Figs. 50-56) were carefully fashioned (Covarrubias 1957: 140), and are not at all similar to the cartoon-like paintings. The different artistic executions of mural painting and mould making could explain this incongruity. It has been suggested (Heyden 1976: 1) that these figurines were decorated or dressed in paper or some other perishable material. This seems likely because most Teotihuacan figures have earspools or headgear which covers the ear area. The complete lack of ears on portrait heads contrasts with attention to detail of the facial features, and might indicate that the heads wore headdresses of other material. Some Tlalocan mural figures, but not all, have ears.

### Puppet Figurines

Apparently puppet figurines, or associated forms (bald cleft head, wavy ridge headdress) do not appear in elite art. Puppets seem to be a figurine genre apart. The isolated four-symbol-pattern (von Winning 1958: 6) occurs on puppet figurine headdresses and on vases, but personages wearing this symbol were not pictured on vases or in murals. The motif is not found on 9:N1E7 figurines. Von Winning

(1976: 153-154) says the bald cleft head seems to be symbolic rather than decorative, and does not represent deities.

### Unrealistic Shaped Heads

Several motifs overlap on the four head types described here as "unrealistic," and possibly associated with the supernatural--the rain deity, old god, pyramidal-shaped head, and protuberance on the forehead. Of these four, the rain deity and the pyramidal-shaped head are seen in murals.

The goggle-eyed rain deity is seen in murals and also in figurine form, but Fig. 72 has bulbous eyes; this apparently is another way the Teotihuacanos expressed the symbolic importance of large, round eyes. A similar head is illustrated in Séjourné (1966a: Fig. 185, middle row on right), and is shown with goggle-eyed figurines.

Three examples of the pyramidal head shape are seen in murals at Tetitla (Miller 1973: Figs. 302, 325, 326). All are heads without torsos falling upside down in water panels, as if they were objects of offering. One is shown in profile, and each one has arches over the eyes, although on the profile head the arches dip toward the eyebrows rather than away from them as seen on Figs. 75 and 76. The heads in the water panels lack the topknots and side locks of the figurines (Figs. 76-77). On all the pyramidal-shaped heads in this group, details of decoration vary and suggest that the head shape was of more symbolic importance to the Teotihuacanos than adornment. The same may be true for the protuberance on the forehead (Figs. 78-79),



which appears to be the shape of the head rather than adornment. However, this shape is not seen in any art form other than figurines.

The old god (Fig. 74) has both wrinkles and bulging closed eyes; this may be an overlap of symbols. The wrinkled face is most diagnostic of the old god figurines, whereas the bulging closed eyes are associated with the fat god (Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 188). In two of Séjourné's examples (Fig. 188, middle row left and right), the fat god has a wrinkled brow, but all heads have fat cheeks. The cheeks of Fig. 74 are sunken.

Overlapping symbols are also seen on Fig. 78. Sunken cheeks and a heavy brow ridge (or sunken eyes) may have been intended to make the face look old, but the protuberance on the forehead is not associated with the old god.

#### Goggle Motif

A pair of double concentric circles, or goggles, are seen on figurines in two contexts: over the eyes (Figs. 73, 82, 83), and on the forehead (Figs. 77, 88). The goggle over the eye motif is usually associated with the rain deity (Pasztory 1974), and appears in several stylistic contexts. She refers to elite art forms when she writes "The explanation for the significance of the rings over the eyes has to be general enough to account for such a wide variety of contexts" (Pasztory 1974: 15). Some examples of goggles over the eyes seen in murals are illustrated in Miller (1973: Fig. 163, Tepantitla; Fig. 201,

Zacuala; Fig. 248, Tetitla; Fig. 341, Atetelco). The motif is also found on decorated pottery (Linné 1934: Fig. 26; 1942: Fig. 128; Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 91).

Association of goggles on the forehead with the rain deity is obscure, if indeed one was intended. The zoomorphic creature on the facade of the Temple of Quetzalcoatl wears the motif, and presumably this has led some people to identify the figure as Tlaloc, but Caso (1966: 254) preferred the term "el dios con el moño en el tocado." The head (actually a series of identical heads) has ringed eyes and fang-like teeth, but otherwise shows no similarity to the rain deity. The curled element on the ear area is reminiscent of the feline in the Mythological Animals mural (Miller 1973: Fig. 96), and the serpent on the miniature temple at Atetelco (Miller 1973: Figs. 346, 349). The rain deity is usually seen in anthropomorphic rather than zoomorphic form, although it has animal associations (Paszatory 1974).

Small heads bordering the basal rims of cylindrical tripod vases wear the forehead goggle motif (Rattray 1981: Fig. 9a, Lam. III). The vase illustrated in Lam. III is painted with a large frontal jaguar head. Another cylindrical tripod vase with this basal rim decoration is from Linné's Xolalpan Grave 3 (1934: Fig. 35).<sup>1</sup>

Goggles on the forehead are found on Fig. 77, a pyramid-shaped head (another example of overlapping motifs), and on the close fitting helmet of Fig. 88. Fig. 77 has only an indirect stylistic connection with ceremonial art, and the simplicity of Fig. 88 makes interpretation obscure.

It is difficult to establish a pattern of goggle use on figurines, whether worn on the forehead or over the eyes. Apparently goggles were not used on portrait or puppet heads, the figurine types most usual in the Xolalpan phase, and are not associated with the wide band headdress. Generally, they are not seen on hand modelled heads.<sup>2</sup>

#### Segmented Headdress

Figs. 82 and 84 wear helmets made of small segments. Figurines recovered from other parts of Teotihuacan wear the same kind of helmet (Séjourné 1966a: Lam. 11, Fig. 39, bottom row, Lam. 14). It is also found on a figurine with a half-conical torso (Linné 1942: Fig. 257), or wearing goggles like Fig. 82 (Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 95, third row on right; Fig. 98, middle of bottom row). At Azcapotzalco as well as at Teotihuacan this segmented headdress had a chin strap, apparently made of the same material (Seler 1915: Fig. 48; Séjourné 1966a: Lam. 27-28, Figs. 87-89). The face in the latter illustration has animal-like ears and fangs, as well as goggles over the eyes, and sits on a throne.

The goggled figure on the Calpulalpan bowl (Linné 1942: 170-174) wears a tri-tassel headdress, but the three accompanying figures wear helmets made of small segments, with feathers sticking up from the top. Clara Millon points out the similarity of dress with the profile figures on Tikal Stela 31 (1973: 304, Fig. 3a). The stela figures

also wear helmets made of overlapping small segments. The figure on the left side of Stela 31 wears a helmet with feathers and a chin strap. These same elements are seen on figurine heads at Teotihuacan (Séjourné 1966a: Figs. 87-88). The helmet of the figure on the right side of the stela is decorated with an animal head motif and feathers. Both figures carry shields, but the decoration, a Tlaloc face, is shown only on the left side.

Possibly the segments on the helmets of Figs. 82 and 84 were supposed to be overlapping also, but the crudely made moulds did not allow for such detail. The segments on the helmet of Fig. 85 are clearly shown to overlap like fish scales. However, the shape of the helmets, the segments themselves, and the variety of adornment on the helmets, considered together, are a strong argument for linking the profile personages on Stela 31 with the Teotihuacan figurines. Ball (1974: 8) illustrates two figurines from a cache in Becán. Both wear helmets with chin straps, and the segments are shown. They are in profile, and appear to be moulded. Ball sees a close resemblance between these figures and the profile figures of Stela 31 in "helmet design, posture and profile view" (1974: 8-9). The Becán figurines are not like Teotihuacan models because they have black body paint, and do not carry the Tlaloc shield. They were among ten small figurines which were originally placed inside a large hollow figurine with a bald heart-shaped head. The cache is dated to approximately A.D. 600 (Ball 1974: 2-3).

### The Coil Headdress and Female Attire

Figurines wearing headdresses of two or three coils (Figs. 92-96) may be female. The coiled headdress with a central round ornament (Fig. 94) is found on unbroken figurines wearing quechquemitls and long skirts (Artes de México 1965: 90, bottom row; Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 32, bottom right). These figures are similar in posture, hair style, and dress, but as has been noted with other types of figurines, details of decoration vary from simple to ornate. The most richly decorated figure illustrated in Artes de México (p. 90) wears, among other elements, a three-coil headdress with a bird in profile on the left side, fringed quechquemitl, and a long skirt. A scarf is knotted at the throat. Two torsos in this collection (Figs. 125-126) wear similar garments, but have capes as well. The heads (Figs. 94-95) which are most similar to those in Artes de México are broken on both sides of each headdress, and it is impossible to know if there were birds or other ornaments on the headdresses. The kind of headdress seen on Figs. 94 and 95, and the clothing on the torsos of Figs. 125 and 126 is the same attire worn by a female form on a painted cylindrical tripod vase (Artes de México 1965: 171).

The heads (Figs. 94-95) and torsos (Figs. 125-126) could not have been attached. The heads are proportionately larger than the torsos, and the heads, although made by the shallow mould process, are thicker than the gingerbread torsos.

One of the shreds of evidence that gingerbread figurines began

at Teotihuacan earlier than the Metepec phase is Fig. 126. It was recovered from stratigraphic pit 1, layer 8, with ceramics dated no later than Late Xolalpan.

### Male Attire

Two torso figurines (Figs. 123-124) may be compared with figures in the mural at Teopancaxco. These figures are shown in profile, and their capes are painted as hanging behind them, indicating movement. The figurines, on the other hand, are shown in front view and no motion is indicated. However, the garments worn by the mural figures and the figurines are similar. It may be assumed that Figs. 123-124 are male figures if the ones in the Teopancaxco mural are male. Seler (1915: 415) says they are clearly gods or priests. Figures such as Figs. 117-122 are usually assumed to be male simply because they wear clothing other than the traditional female quechquemitl.

Although Barbour says the half-conical torso may begin in Early Xolalpan (1975: 91-92), he illustrates six of these figurines, all of which were recovered with Metepec ceramics (1975: Plates 34a, 47c, 48c, 51d, 66b, 67a).

### Animals

The animal heads are difficult to put into stylistic context because the pieces in this group do not look like animals in elite art. Of the nine moulded animal heads, only Figs. 110, 113, and 114 have

unrealistic features, whereas the others appear to be realistic and represent the animal itself, rather than a combination of symbols.

For Kubler (1970: 19) the jaguar at Teotihuacan was a cult image which "always mingles with other life forms." Fig. 112 is similar to a head illustrated in Tozzer (1912: 43, Plate XIIIa) which he says is an ocelotl, painted red. Unlike Fig. 112, Tozzer's example had a point of attachment to an olla at the back of the head. Von Winning's examples (1958: Fig. 18a-e) with faces much like Fig. 112 are described as not literally animals, but humans wearing jaguar masks (1958: 44).

Fig. 110 is a canine head with tiny human hands covering the eyes. Eyes were emphasized in Teotihuacan art, both on humans and animals. Goggles, of course, were used. In murals jaguar eyes have feathered surrounds (Kubler 1970:20), and isolated eyes are not uncommon on vessels (Séjourné 1966b: Fig. 167). The eyes of some of the animals in this group are large and bulbous (Figs. 112, 113, 115, 116), and some have striations to indicate the feather surround (Figs. 111, 116). Seler (1915: Fig. 218) illustrates a human head with a tiny human hand over the eye. The piece is shown in profile. The eye of the face is shown on top of the back of the hand, so in a sense the eye is not really covered. The head is from the Oaxaca museum.

The disembodied tiny human hand motif is seen on a human head, apparently moulded (Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 36, second from left on bottom row). It extends vertically from the top of a peaked cap (or pyramidal head shape) with the hand in center forehead just above the eyes.

The type of flowers in the hair of the monkey-like head (Fig. 114) may be the morning glory. In the discussion following Kubler's paper at the Dumbarton Oaks conference, Peter Furst mentioned that although there is an abundance of flowers at Teotihuacan, they are almost always the same kind--the morning glory (Kubler 1970: 48). Furst (1974: 200-202) suggests that the flowering vine in the Tlalocan mural is a morning glory, a powerful hallucinogen, and further points up the association of the flower seen en face as well as in profile with the quatrefoil rosettes seen in other Teotihuacan artistic contexts. The flowers on the head of Fig. 114 are eroded and the outlines dim, but two appear to have four petals (Fig. 114, profile). The association of the morning glory and the monkey is unclear except that both are native to warm climates; morning glories are not limited to them, however.

There is no doubt that animals were of great importance in Teotihuacan iconography. Some particular examples of animals have been studied (for instance, von Winning 1948, 1949; Kubler 1970). Although their significance is fairly well understood when placed in pictorial context with other figures, it is not at all clear when the animal figurine is considered alone.

### Whistles

The term whistle is used here only in a general way. It is unknown whether these fragments of rounded stems were whistles, some



other kind of wind instrument, or perhaps pipes. The pieces in this group (Figs. 131-135) are included because the faces or torsos in some way form part of whistles, or the entire stem (Fig. 134) fits into the category.

The face of Fig. 132 is possibly of foreign manufacture. The paste is more compact than usual for Teotihuacan pieces. The Roman nose and small earspool are not in the Teotihuacan style.

Tozzer illustrates a head similar to Fig. 135, and says it is probably a deer (1921: 43, Plate 13b). His example was recovered at Azcapotzalco.

#### Coyotlatelco Figurines

No remains with designs other than geometric ones have been recovered with which to compare Coyotlatelco figurines. In the Coyotlatelco phase there are no murals or vases with pictures of humans.<sup>3</sup> Comparisons within the Coyotlatelco phase may be made only with other figurines.

Illustrations of figurines from Azcapotzalco are published in Tozzer (1921) and Vaillant (1938), and from Tenayuca in Noguera (1935b). Rattray's study of Coyotlatelco material recovered at Cerro Tenayo includes the figurine illustrations on the other three authors.

The three torso styles recovered at site 9:N1E7 have counterparts at both Cerro Tenayo and Azcapotzalco. Torsos are not illustrated in

Noguera (1935b) or Vaillant (1938). A few examples of full figures in studies of Tozzer (1921) and Rattray (1966), as well as the one intact figurine from site 9:N1E7, show headdresses associated with torsos.

### Female Attire

Two full figures from Cerro Tenayo (Rattray 1966: Plate VI) have triangular quechquemits and skirts, turban headdresses with rosettes, and side locks. These headdresses are similar to Figs. 139 and 140. Side locks are also seen on Fig. 154, an almost identical headdress to one illustrated by Vaillant (1938: Fig. 2q, left). However, the full figures illustrated in Tozzer (1921: Plate 11b-c) wearing the triangular quechquemitl and skirt combination do not seem to have side locks, nor does the full figure in draped quechquemitl and skirt (Rattray 1966: Plate VIIc). In these examples the headdresses with side locks are different from the headdresses without them. The protuberance from the head of the triangular quechquemitl full figure (Tozzer 1921: Plate 11b) resembles those found on the head of Fig. 144; however, this face has jowled cheeks.

### Male Attire

The enthroned torso in the 9:N1E7 group (Fig. 136) may be intended to represent a male because the figure apparently does not wear a quechquemitl. This figure wears a three-sided headdress with

four round objects (not rosettes) on the front. One enthroned figurine from Cerro Tenayo has a bird headdress (Rattray 1966: Plate IXe); the others (Plate VIIIa-b, d-e) lack either heads or headdresses, and cannot be identified.

#### Comparison with Classic Teotihuacan Figurines

Most Coyotlatelco figurines may be distinguished from those of the preceding phase at Teotihuacan by general differences of form. Figurines continue to be made in moulds. Apparently there is less diversity in style of dress of Coyotlatelco figurines than of the Metepec ones.

Some elements which continue are the four-petal flower (Figs. 141, 142, 158; Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 42), the three-sided headdress (Fig. 136; Séjourné 1966a: Figs. 97, bottom left, 98, top row right, bottom row left), and the enthroned figure (Fig. 136; Séjourné 1966a: Figs. 73, bottom right, 87, 88, 96, 97, middle row left). With the exception of Fig. 144 (and possibly 145) Coyotlatelco figurine head decorations seem to represent realistic forms rather than the abstract Classic period head shapes such as the pyramid-shaped head, the protuberance from the forehead, and the bald cleft head. The lateral protuberances from the head of Fig. 144 do not seem to be the head shape, but neither do they appear to be part of a headdress.

The T-shaped dental mutilation motif seen on Coyotlatelco Figs. 155 and 156 may have begun in the Metepec phase. Barbour illustrates

a moulded head with the wide band headdress and teeth "which possibly show the T-shaped dental mutilation" (1975:100, Plate 47r). According to Barbour, the figurine was found "below earth floor 1" (Tepantitla Excavation 23, presumably a layer associated with Metepec ceramics), and is an "example of what can be considered a late or possibly terminal Metepec phase figurine" (1975: 99). He calls attention to the teeth of the figurine head and states, "this representational feature may be related to what Dumond and Müller call the 'T-shaped dental mutilation' which they place as post-Metepec in a transitional period to the Post-Classic or early Second Intermediate Period outside Teotihuacan" (1975: 100).<sup>4</sup> Dumond and Müller consider T-shaped dental mutilation, with other "Teotihuacanoid traits," a marker of the transition phase (1972: 1211). There are no examples of T-shaped teeth in the site 9:N1E7 figurines earlier than the Coyotlatelco phase. The motif is clearly defined on both Figs. 155 and 156, although the mouth of Fig. 156 is eroded.

The use of a stand to prop up figurines continues into the Coyotlatelco phase. The enthroned figure has a stand (Fig. 136), but the two quechquemitl-style torsos do not. Fig. 157 has a scar on the back which appears to have been the place where a posterior support was broken off. None of the other heads have scars on the backs, as do some of the Classic moulded heads where they may have been attached to vessels. The other Coyotlatelco figurines from site 9:N1E7 have no indication of stands, nor do they appear to have been part of the decoration of other objects.

### Comparison with Coyotlatelco Figurines

Although the receding chin is a diagnostic trait of Coyotlatelco figurines, Figs. 151, 152, and 157 each have an indentation around the jaw and chin line. Fig. 151 wears a rather tall headdress, and it is slightly thick and rounded. Some Cerro Tenayo Type F heads also have the indentation at the chin (Rattray 1966: Plate XIg, j), and four wear headdresses which are tall and rounded (Rattray 1966: Plate XIe-h). The diamond and circle design on the headdress of Fig. 151 is unlike the designs on the Cerro Tenayo Type F headdresses, which are similar to each other, and look as if feathers were meant to be represented. But the basic size and shape of these headdresses from the two areas are similar, and suggest a concurrence of artistic tradition practiced by groups of contemporaneous peoples living relatively far from each other in the Valley of Mexico. The two designs might indicate regional differences between these two groups.

The four-petal flower on the turban headdress (Figs. 141-142) is found at Cerro Tenayo (Rattray 1966: Plate Ve), and so is the turban with round objects (Figs. 139-140; Rattray 1966: Plate VIa). Differences between Coyotlatelco figurines from site 9:N1E7 and Cerro Tenayo are seen in a lack of motifs at 9:N1E7 which are present at Cerro Tenayo, notably the Tlaloc face (Rattray 1966: 134). Other headdresses in the 9:N1E7 group are unlike those illustrated in publications, and little more may be said about stylistic links with Coyotlatelco figurines from other sites.

### Aztec Figurines

The eye and mouth treatment of Fig. 171 resembles several of Parsons' Type III-A heads. "The mouth is opened and rimmed . . . the eyes are round orbs molded in low relief" (Parsons 1972: 89). The wide flare of the headgear is similar to Parsons' Type III-F1 (1972: Plate 28c), a drummer figure. The eyes of Fig. 172 are less well defined, and resemble more closely the eyes of Parsons' Type III-L than Type III-A. Diagnostic characteristics of Type III-L heads are the squarish shape of the head, and no head adornment other than hair (Parsons 1972: 101-102). The illustrations show no earspools. Fig. 172 wears earspools, but the simple head decoration is not squarish and has no counterpart in Parsons' illustrations.

The body position and plain skirt of Fig. 173 is similar to Parsons' Type III-A (1972: 93, Plate 24e-f). This torso differs in that breasts are not represented, and there are no underarm perforations.

Fig. 174, a torso in a kneeling position, is similar to Parsons' Type III-A1 (1972: Plate 22e-g). She describes, but does not illustrate, a torso more like Fig. 174: "We have nine other examples of seated female figurines with knees bent at the sides. Breasts are represented on all of these, and none wear a necklace or any sort of decoration. Five have complete puncture holes drilled under the arms . . . (one example) has the hands resting on the waist" (Parsons 1972: 92). The body position of Fig. 175 is not shown in Parsons' study. It appears to be the profile view of the kneeling position.

Fig. 176 is extremely eroded and the head is broken off, making the figurine difficult to identify. However, the vertical front ridge is similar to Parsons' Type III-F1, a standing drummer figure (1972: Plate 28a).

## NOTES

1. Rattray (1981: 63) dates these Thin Orange cylindrical tripods to Late Xolalpan (1981: Fig. 9a, Lam. III), and Xolalpan Grave 3 (Linné 1934: Fig. 35) to Late Xolalpan. She does not specifically say that the tripod vase from Grave 3 is Late Xolalpan.
2. In some cases it is difficult to see in photographs which figurines are hand modelled and which are moulded. Drawings are even less definite. A photograph of a figurine shows a hand modelled torso attached to what may be a moulded head (Séjourné 1966a: Lam. 35). The headgear, which has the goggle motif on the forehead, and the earspools were appliquéd. Drawings of three heads which have the goggle motif on the forehead (Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 102, top row on left, second row left and middle) appear to be hand modelled. Another head which looks from the drawing to be hand modelled (Séjourné 1966a: Fig. 38, middle row on right) wears a version of the wide band headdress with rings on the band. The rings are set farther apart than is usual for the goggle motif.
3. A possible bird form has been reported on pottery (Rattray 1966: 163, Fig. 32).
4. Barbour (1975: 115, footnote 5.) compares the figurine on the cover of Science in which the Dumond and Müller article is published (1972, vol. 175) with the figurine showing teeth which he illustrates (1975: Plate 47r). He says the mouths and teeth of the two are similar. The



figurine on the Science cover does not have dental mutilation. I suggest that there is a strong difference, artistically as well as culturally, between a figurine's open mouth showing teeth and a figurine's open mouth showing teeth filed in a distinctly non-realistic shape. Barbour seems to see little, if any, difference between the two.