

**Arizona State University**

---

**From the Selected Works of Michael E Smith**

---

2006

## Foreward: Aztec Figurine Studies

Michael E Smith, *Arizona State University*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/michael\\_e\\_smith/21/](https://works.bepress.com/michael_e_smith/21/)

## Foreword: Aztec Figurine Studies

Michael E. Smith

Arizona State University

Ceramic figurines are one of the mystery artifact categories of ancient Mesoamerica. Although figurines are abundant at archaeological sites from the Early Formative period through Early Colonial Spanish times, we know very little about them. How were figurines used? Who used them? What was their symbolic meaning? Did these human-like objects portray deities or people? Most scholars believe that ceramic figurines were used in some way in rites or ceremonies, but it has been difficult to find convincing evidence for their specific uses or meanings.

The lack of knowledge about the use and significance of ceramic figurines is particularly striking for the Aztec culture of central Mexico.<sup>1</sup> Early Spanish chroniclers devoted literally thousands of pages to descriptions of Aztec religion, yet they rarely mentioned figurines. Ritual codices depict numerous gods, ceremonies, and mythological scenes, yet figurines are not included. Today we have a richly detailed understanding of many aspects of Aztec religion, but figurines play only a minor role in this body of knowledge. An important reason for the omission of figurines from the early colonial textual accounts is that these objects were almost certainly used primarily by women—in the home—for rites of curing, fertility, and divination (Cyphers Guillén 1993; Heyden 1996; Smith 2002), and the Spanish friars who wrote the major accounts of Aztec culture had little knowledge of Aztec women or domestic life (Burkhart 1997; Rodríguez-Shadow 1997).

Ceramic figurines can provide crucial information on Aztec domestic ritual and life. They offer a window on these worlds that are very poorly described in written sources. Given the great importance of these objects, the small number of scholarly studies devoted to them is puzzling and alarming. There is no comprehensive analysis of Aztec ceramic figurines; in fact there is not even an agreed-upon classification or typology of the objects. Only two published studies have illustrations of large numbers of examples (Baer 1996; Parsons 1972).

Given the small number of publications on the topic, Flora Kaplan's MA thesis on Aztec figurines remains, after nearly 50 years, an important work. Kaplan studied a collection of figurines in the American Museum of Natural History that were excavated—but not published—by George Vaillant at the sites of Nonoalco and Chiconauhtla. She analyzed the attributes of the objects in terms of Aztec iconography and described a typology based upon the identification of deities. Her photographs of the objects were superb. A brief historical review of research on Aztec figurines can place this work in its intellectual context, and also help explain why this 50-year-old thesis remains valuable today.

---

<sup>1</sup> Important studies of pre-Aztec Mesoamerican figurines include Cyphers Guillén (1993), Hammond (1989), Lesure (1999), Marcus (1998), Miller (1975), Sánchez de la Barquera Arroyo (1996), Scott (2001), Stocker (1991), and Stocker and Charlton (2001). Lesure (2002) reviews theories and approaches to ancient figurine studies in general.

## Research on Aztec Figurines

The relatively few publications on Aztec figurine research can be divided into studies that focus primarily on whole figurines in museum collections and those that analyze fragmentary examples from archaeological fieldwork. Studies pursuing the first of these approaches have concentrated on the iconography of Aztec figurines, particularly the identification of deities based upon clothing and other attributes. Eduard Seler (1990-98:vol. 2, 166-170), the great Mesoamericanist of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, initiated the first approach. He illustrated a number of whole Aztec figurines from the Uhde Collection in Berlin and proposed deity identifications. This tradition of emphasizing the iconography of figurines and the identification of deities continued in the 1950s in papers by Cook de Leonard (1950) and Barlow and Lehmann (1956); the latter paper was later reprinted, in Spanish, in a more accessible source (Barlow and Lehmann 1990). Flora Kaplan's MA thesis was written within this intellectual tradition.

Scholarship on figurines in museum collections continued after 1958 in two types of publication. First, books on Aztec art devote some space to ceramic figurines and their iconography (e.g., Basler and Brummer 1927; Bonifaz Nuño and Robles 1981; Matos Moctezuma 1989; Pasztory 1983). Second, catalogs of museum exhibits of Aztec art typically include several ceramic figurines (e.g., Eggebrecht 1987; Matos Moctezuma and Solís Olguín 2002; Solís Olguín 1991, 2004b). Works of both types feature only a very few of the finest surviving ceramic figurines, ignoring the great majority of the examples in museums. This narrow focus makes it difficult to assess the range of variation in form, style, attributes, or iconography in Aztec figurines (Smith 2004).

There are two major exceptions to this pattern of focusing narrowly on only a few fine figurines: First, Alva Millian's MA thesis, also at Columbia University (Millian 1981), examined a large number of figurines from museums, particularly those in New York and Philadelphia. This is an important work, and photocopies have circulated among Aztec specialists for many years. Unfortunately, the numerous photographs of figurines do not reproduce well in photocopies, limiting the usefulness of the thesis for scholars. Second, the catalog of Aztec ceramics in the Lukas Vischer collection at the Ethnographic Museum in Basel (Baer 1996) contains illustrations and brief descriptions of a large number of Aztec figurines. This is one of the largest museum collections of Aztec figurines, and the catalog includes high-quality photographs and line drawings of the entire corpus. Other studies have used museum collections to address specific kinds of figurines, such as temple models (Schávelzon 1982; Wardle 1912) and early colonial Spanish figurines (Barlow 1946; Von Winning 1988).

These studies of figurines in museum collections take advantage of the complete nature of the objects. A variety of figurine attributes—from the headdress and hairstyle to the types of objects being held (infants, drums, etc.), to specific religious symbols on the figurines—can be analyzed as a complex whole, allowing rich iconographic interpretation. Studies of fragmentary figurines from archaeological excavations, on the other hand, must rely upon a much more limited repertoire of attributes. Only a few of the nearly 2,000 figurine fragments I excavated at Yauhtepec, for example, were sufficiently complete to propose confident identification of specific deities (Smith 2005). Most of the objects are so fragmentary that they can only be identified as a figurine fragment; it is often impossible to determine such basic facts as whether or not they are

anthropomorphic, whether they are male or female, or other features. A further problem characterizes most studies of figurines from archaeological excavations and surface collections: archaeologists have tended to publish and describe only a small proportion of the figurines from individual Aztec sites.

Some archaeological studies provide extensive discussions and illustrations of small sets of complete or nearly-complete figurines from a site, ignoring a larger corpus of fragmentary examples from the same site (e.g., Brumfiel 1996; Cook de Leonard 1950; Guilliem Arroyo 1997; Otis Charlton 2001). Other studies summarize the range of figurines recovered, but with a limited level of illustration and documentation of the corpus from a site or region (Otis Charlton 1994; Smith 2002, 2005). The best publication of a collection of archaeological figurines from Aztec sites remains Mary Parsons' study from the Teotihuacan Valley (Parsons 1972). This work stands out for its comprehensive approach to the corpus of figurines recovered in the region, and for its extensive illustrations.

## The Present Work

Flora Kaplan analyzed the nearly 1,000 figurines excavated by George Vaillant at Nonoalco and Chicouauhtla.<sup>2</sup> Hers was the first comprehensive study of a collection of excavated figurines with provenience information. It established the method—followed later by most other archaeologists—of applying insights from research on whole figurines to collections of fragmentary figurines from excavations. Vaillant's collections differ somewhat from other archaeological collections I am familiar with, in that there are many whole objects and very large pieces; this is a great contrast to the collection of figurines I excavated at Yautepec, for example, which consists mostly of small fragments (Smith 2005). The large size of the fragments from Nonoalco and Chiconauhtla allowed Kaplan to carry out a much more detailed iconographic analysis than is possible with most excavated collections.

This MA thesis is important not just because of the small number of other works on Aztec figurines; it is a significant work of scholarship in its own right. In discussing Flora Kaplan's MA thesis, Alva Millian (1981) states, "The enduring value of her work is the order she imposed on a large body of excavated figurines from the Postclassic period. It is evident that Kaplan's study served as groundwork for Mary Parsons, who has provided the only other comprehensive study on a controlled group to date." Mary Parsons (1972:82) notes that "Her thesis is a very good synthesis of a vast amount of material." These scholars recognize the important place of Flora Kaplan's MA thesis within the history of research on Aztec figurines.

After completing her MA thesis at Columbia University, Flora Kaplan went on to receive her Ph.D. in Anthropology from The Graduate Center, City University of New York. She had a distinguished career at New York University in the Department of Anthropology and in museum studies pursuing research on a variety of topics in the areas of art, crafts, and cognition, in Mesoamerica and Africa. She retired in 2004 as professor *emerita*, Faculty of Arts and Science. Among her many contributions to anthropology I want to mention just one. For her dissertation, Kaplan conducted research on Mexican folk ceramics in Puebla (F.S. Kaplan 1980). A later book

---

<sup>2</sup> Vaillant never published these important excavations. Christina Elson has been analyzing his data and the artifacts collections, all housed at the American Museum of Natural History in New York (e.g., Elson 1999; Elson and Smith 2001).

on this topic, *A Mexican Folk Pottery Tradition*, is one of the finest ethnographic studies of traditional Mesoamerican ceramics (F.S. Kaplan 1994a). Particularly noteworthy is her investigation of the cognitive dimensions of ceramic vessels as perceived by their makers and users (F. Kaplan 1981; F.S. Kaplan 1985; F.S. Kaplan and Levine 1981). This research has important implications for archaeologists that have yet to be explored.

Flora Kaplan's MA thesis contained the germs of several of her later research interests. Her use of iconographic data from the codices and chronicles to interpret the forms and meanings of figurines was later replaced by ethnographic interviews and formal analysis to approach the cognitive meanings of contemporary ceramic vessels. Her use of a museum collection may have presaged her later work in museum studies, which included research and publication (e.g., F. Kaplan 1991, 1993; F.S. Kaplan 1994b) as well as teaching and founding the museum studies program in the Graduate School of Arts and Science at New York University.

Given the recent expansion of fieldwork in Aztec archaeology (Hodge 1998; Matos Moctezuma 2003; Smith 2003) and an increased interest in Aztec art as witnessed by major museum exhibits (Alcina Franch, et al. 1992; Matos Moctezuma and Solís Olguín 2002; Solís Olguín 2004a), it is only natural that the present thesis should take its rightful place in the body of scholarship on Aztec ceramic figurines and on Aztec material culture and society generally.

Flora Kaplan and I want to thank the Department of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History for permission to reproduce the figurines in this thesis. We are grateful for the help provided by Christina Elson (of the American Museum of Natural History). We also thank Marilyn Masson, Director of the Institute for Mesoamerican Studies (University at Albany, State University of New York), for her help in reproducing and distributing this work.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Alcina Franch, José, Miguel León-Portilla, and Eduardo Matos Moctezuma (editors)  
1992 *Azteca mexicana*. Lunwerg Editores, Barcelona.
- Baer, Gerhard (editor)  
1996 *Ancient Mexican Ceramics from the Lukas Vischer Collection, Ethnographic Museum Basel*. Corpus Americanensium Antiquatatum, Union Académique Internationale. Friedrich Reinhardt Publishers, Basel.
- Barlow, Robert H.  
1946 Some Mexican Figurines of the Colonial Period. *Carnegie Institution of Washington, Notes on Middle American Archaeology* 3(70):59-61.
- Barlow, Robert H., and Henri Lehmann  
1956 Statuettes-grelots aztèques de la vallée de Mexico. *Tribus* 4/5:157-176.
- 1990 Figurillas-sonaja aztecas del valle de México. In *Obras de Robert H. Barlow, vol. 3*, edited by Jesús Monjarás-Ruiz, Elena Limón, and María de la Cruz Pailles, pp. 257-298,

vol. 3. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia and Universidad de las Américas, Puebla, Mexico City.

Basler, Adolphe, and Ernest Brummer

1927 *L'art précolombien*. Librairie de France, Paris.

Bonifaz Nuño, Rubén, and Fernando Robles

1981 *El arte en el templo mayor: México-Tenochtitlan*. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico City.

Brumfiel, Elizabeth M.

1996 Figurines and the Aztec State: Testing the Effectiveness of Ideological Domination. In *Gender and Archaeology*, edited by Rita P. Wright, pp. 143-166. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Burkhart, Louise M.

1997 Mexica Women on the Home Front: Housework and Religion in Aztec Mexico. In *Indian Women of Early Mexico*, edited by Susan Schroeder, Stephanie Wood, and Robert Haskett, pp. 25-54. University of Oklahoma Press., Norman.

Cook de Leonard, Carmen

1950 Figurillas de barro de Santiago Tlatelolco. *Memorias de la Academia de la Historia* 9:93-100.

Cyphers Guillén, Ann

1993 Women, Rituals, and Social Dynamics at Ancient Chalcatzingo. *Latin American Antiquity* 4:209-224.

Eggebrecht, Arne (editor)

1987 *Les Aztèques: Trésors du Mexique ancien*. 2 vols. Roemer-und Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim.

Elson, Christina M.

1999 An Aztec Palace at Chiconautla, Mexico. *Latin American Antiquity* 10:151-167.

Elson, Christina M., and Michael E. Smith

2001 Archaeological Deposits from the Aztec New Fire Ceremony. *Ancient Mesoamerica* 12:157-174.

Guilliem Arroyo, Salvador

1997 Figurillas de Tlatelolco. *Arqueología* 17:111-138.

Hammond, Norman

1989 The Function of Maya Middle Preclassic Pottery Figurines. *Mexicon* 11(6):111-114.

Heyden, Doris

- 1996 La posible interpretación de figurillas arqueológicas en barro y piedra según las fuentes históricas. In *Los arqueólogos frente a las fuentes*, edited by Rosa Brambila Paz, and Jesús Monjarás-Ruiz, pp. 129-146. Colección Científica, vol. 322. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico City.
- Hodge, Mary G.  
1998 Archaeological Views of Aztec Culture. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 6:197-238.
- Kaplan, Flora  
1981 The "Meaning" of Pottery. In *The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections*, edited by Anne Marie Cantwell, James B. Griffin, and Nan A. Rothschild, pp. 315-324. *Annals*, vol. 376. New York Academy of Sciences, New York.
- 1991 Fragile Legacy: Photographs as Documents in Recovering Political and Cultural History at the Royal Court of Benin. *History in Africa* 18:205-237.
- 1993 Mexican Museums in the Creating of a National Image in World Tourism. In *Crafts in the World Market: The Impact of Global Exchange on Middle American Artisans*, edited by June Nash, pp. 103-125. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Kaplan, Flora S.  
1980 *Una tradición alfarera: conocimiento y estilo*. Instituto Nacional Indigenista, Mexico City.
- 1985 The Measuring, Mapping, and Meaning of Pots. *American Anthropologist* 87:357-364.
- 1994a *A Mexican Folk Pottery Tradition: Cognition and Style in Material Culture in the Valley of Puebla*. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.
- 1994b *Museums and the Making of "Ourselves": The Role of Objects in National Identity*. Leicester University Press, London.
- Kaplan, Flora S., and David M. Levine  
1981 Cognitive Mapping of a Folk Taxonomy of Mexican Pottery. *American Anthropologist* 83:868-884.
- Lesure, Richard G.  
1999 Figurines as Representations and Products at Paso de la Amada, Mexico. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 9:209-222.
- 2002 The Goddess Diffracted: Thinking About the Figurines of Early Villages. *Current Anthropology* 43:587-610.
- Marcus, Joyce

- 1998 *Women's Ritual in Formative Oaxaca: Figurine-Making, Divination, Death and the Ancestors*. Memoirs, vol. 33. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Matos Moctezuma, Eduardo  
 1989 *Los Aztecas*. Corpus Precolombino, Sección Las Civilizaciones Mesoamericanas. Lunwerg, Madrid.
- 2003 *Excavaciones del programa de arqueología urbana*. Colección Científica, vol. 452. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico City.
- Matos Moctezuma, Eduardo, and Felipe R. Solís Olguín (editors)  
 2002 *Aztecs*. Royal Academy of Arts, London.
- Miller, Mary Ellen  
 1975 *Jaina Figurines: A Study of Maya Iconography*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Millian, Alva Clarke  
 1981 *The Iconography of Aztec Ceramic Figurines*. MA thesis, Department of Art History, Columbia University.
- Otis Charlton, Cynthia L.  
 1994 Plebians and Patricians: Contrasting Patterns of Production and Distribution in the Aztec Figurine and Lapidary Industries. In *Economies and Politics in the Aztec Realm*, edited by Mary G. Hodge, and Michael E. Smith, pp. 195-219. Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, Albany.
- 2001 Hollow Rattle Figurines of the Otumba Area, Mexico. In *The New World Figurine Project*, edited by Terry Stocker, and Cynthia L. Otis Charlton, pp. 25-53, vol. 2. Research Press, Provo.
- Parsons, Mary H.  
 1972 Aztec Figurines From the Teotihuacán Valley, Mexico. In *Miscellaneous Studies in Mexican Prehistory*, edited by Michael W. Spence, Jeffrey R. Parsons, and Mary H. Parsons, pp. 81-164. Anthropological Papers, vol. 49. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Pasztory, Esther  
 1983 *Aztec Art*. Harry N. Abrams, New York.
- Rodríguez-Shadow, María J.  
 1997 *La mujer azteca*. 3rd ed. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Toluca.
- Sánchez de la Barquera Arroyo, Elvia Cristina  
 1996 *Figurillas prehispánicas del Valle de Atlixco, Puebla*. Colección Científica. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico City.



Schávelzon, Daniel

1982 Historiografía de las maquetas cerámicas Aztecas. In *Las representaciones de arquitectura en la arqueología de América, vol. 1 (Mesoamérica)*, edited by Daniel Schávelzon, pp. 359-371. Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City.

Scott, Sue

2001 *The Terracotta Figurines from Sigvald Linné's Excavations at Teotihuacan, Mexico*. Monograph Series, vol. 18. The National Museum of Ethnography, Stockholm.

Seler, Eduard

1990-98 *Collected Works in Mesoamerican Linguistics and Archaeology*. 6 vols. Edited by Frank E. Comarato. Labyrinthos, Culver City, CA.

Smith, Michael E.

2002 Domestic Ritual at Aztec Provincial Sites in Morelos. In *Domestic Ritual in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Patricia Plunket, pp. 93-114. Monograph, vol. 46. Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, UCLA, Los Angeles.

2003 A Quarter-Century of Aztec Studies. *Mexicon* 25:1-10.

2004 Aztec Materials in Museum Collections: Some Frustrations of a Field Archaeologist. *Nahua Newsletter* 38:21-28.

2005 Aztec-Style Ceramic Figurines from Yautepec, Morelos. *Mexicon* 27(2/3):45-55.

Solís Olguín, Felipe R.

1991 *Gloria y fama mexicana*. Smurfit Cartón y Papel de México; Museo Franz Mayer; Galería Arvil, Mexico City.

2004a *The Aztec Empire*. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

2004b *The Aztec Empire: Catalogue of the Exhibition*. Guggenheim Museum, New York.

Stocker, Terry (editor)

1991 *The New World Figurine Project*, vol. 1. Research Press, Provo.

Stocker, Terry, and Cynthia L. Otis Charlton (editors)

2001 *The New World Figurine Project*, vol. 2. Research Press, Provo.

Von Winning, Hasso

1988 Aztec Traits in Early Post-Conquest Ceramic Figurines. In *Smoke and Mist: Mesoamerican Studies in Memory of Thelma D. Sullivan*, edited by J. Kathryn Josserand, and Karen Dakin, pp. 711-745. BAR International Series, vol. 402, pt. 1. British Archaeological Reports, Oxford.

Wardle, H. Newell

1912 Miniature Clay Temples of Ancient Mexico. In *Reseña de la Segunda Sesión del XVII Congreso Internacional de Americanistas Efectuada en la Ciudad de México durante del Mes de Septiembre de 1910*, pp. 375-381. Imprenta del Museo de Arqueología, Historia y Etnología, Mexico City.

**FROM:**

## The Post-Classic Figurines of Central Mexico



**By Flora S. Kaplan**

Submitted as a M.A. Thesis,  
Faculty of Political Science,  
Columbia University  
1958

Reprinted 2006 by the Institute for Mesoamerican Studies



**Institute for Mesoamerican Studies  
Occasional Publication, no. 11  
The University at Albany  
State University of New York**