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ABSTRACT

This thesis considers ritual as it was used by the Classic Maya at Baking Pot, Belize, during the site’s abandonment circa 800-900 CE. Ritual was deeply woven into the daily life of the Classic Maya. This study reviews Classic Maya rituals and problematic deposits in order to address peri-abandonment deposits made by the community of Baking Pot during its abandonment. To understand aspects of the role ritual took at the time of site abandonment at Baking Pot, 207 ceramic “special finds” artifacts were analyzed, all having been excavated and recovered by the Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance Project. A vast majority of the ceramic artifacts were recovered from peri-abandonment deposit excavations located primarily in the ceremonial architecture of Group B, with a smaller sample recovered from nearby domestic housemounds. The peri-abandonment deposits at Baking Pot and at sites in the greater Belize River Valley are complex and include a variety of material remains, but this thesis considers the special finds artifacts that compose the Baking Pot figurine collection in order to address rituals involved during site abandonment, their similarity to known Maya rituals, and their variability across contexts including ritual expression in different spaces of the site. This research finds evidence for activities related to termination rituals that lead to the buildup of peri-abandonment deposits during site abandonment. The figurines and other ceramic special finds artifacts analyzed here were consistently included in both terminal and peri-abandonment deposits. The artifacts that make up the Baking Pot figurine collection were deposited by the Ancient Maya in
different locations throughout the site. By depositing items used in termination rituals, the
Classic Maya were calling upon rituals they had enacted for centuries prior to abandonment,
indicating that ritual held important roles for the residents of Baking Pot during a time of stress
and uncertainty.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Introduction

Ritual studies have occupied the minds of Archaeologists as long as our field has existed. We work toward understanding the cultural, social, and psychological spaces rituals occupy for humans. We understand that each culture may express ritual acts for similar reasons but do so in different ways, each of which offer value to the human experience. Our work with ritual leads toward a better understanding and synthesis of what it means to be human, and how humans navigate their lives both singularly and as part of a community. This thesis explores ritual during the Classic Maya collapse and asks what role does ritual play during the abandonment of a community? To investigate this broader issue, the following specific questions are examined:

1) How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned?

2) What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot?

3) How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?

The Classic Period Maya (c. 250 – 900 CE) occupied parts of the Yucatán peninsula of Mexico, Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras. The societies living in this region built monumental architecture, used carved and written glyphic writing systems, and fashioned and maintained reservoirs and extensive agricultural canals and fields to support their vast populations. The final years of the Classic Maya epoch are known as the Terminal Classic period, characterized by the abandonment of many city centers. These processes are thought to have occurred at differing
rates throughout the region between 750 and 900 CE (McKillop 2004:8-12). These events have been popularly referred to as the Classic Maya Collapse, but involves a complex variety of processes still under investigation (Demarest et al. 2003).

In recent years, the Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance (BVAR) Project has been working to better understand the detailed chronology of this process as well as the political and social climates of the Terminal Classic that led to the decline and abandonment of city centers and their peripheries in the Belize River Valley of western Belize. This research includes excavations formally beginning in 2013 and continuing through 2018 to uncover, catalog, and analyze the items included within late contexts at the sites of Cahal Pech, Xunantunich, Lower Dover, and Baking Pot (Alvarado et al. 2017; Awe et al. 2020a; Davis 2018; Hoggarth and Awe 2015; Romih 2019a). Baking Pot is a uniquely situated site for this study. A major focus of research at Baking Pot for the past seven years has been producing a finely detailed chronology of the abandonment of the site. As an extension of that research, this study analyzes specific artifacts recovered from the ritual deposits left in the site core during abandonment: namely the ceramic special finds artifacts, including figurines and musical instruments. These deposits were left in both the Group B site core as well as in domestic household contexts in lesser numbers. Whereas other sites in the Belize River Valley have yielded large Preclassic (1000 BCE – 300 CE) figurine collections (McKillop 2004:7-8), Baking Pot is thus far unusual in that there is a low quantity of Preclassic figurines but a large quantity of Classic Period figurines that have been found there, which differs from other sites in the region.

Research Questions

Ritual is an essential practice for communities during their foundation, and in this, ritual brings people together and creates group identities and social cohesion (Turner 1969). Ritual
practices create and solidify aspects of social, political, cosmologic, and spiritual worldviews for individuals and throughout the life of communities as well. As such and in this role, ritual becomes a part of a community’s practice and social memory (Megged and Wood 2012; Turner 1969). Evocations of social memories by ritual acts at times of upheaval and collapse can act as a way for populations to call upon those feelings of cohesion and assuage their shared anxiety around turmoil and uncertainty (Bell 1992:71).

Deposits of ritual offerings are well documented both archaeologically and ethnographically for the ancient Maya (Alvarado et al. 2017; Aimers et al. 2020; Awe et al. 2020a, b; Chase and Chase 1998, 2004; Romih 2019b; Sagebill and Haines 2017). The practice of providing offerings occurred both at the foundation or “opening” of buildings and monumental architecture, as well as at the deconsecration or “closing” of buildings, as well as at the time of site abandonment. Deposits created during site abandonment are termed peri-abandonment deposits, and were left in specific locations, including plazas and alleyways between buildings (Beardall 2017). Since the vast majority of the Baking Pot figurine collection was excavated from peri-abandonment deposits, this collection can provide insight into the role that ritual played during the abandonment and collapse of the mid-size polity of Baking Pot. A series of questions are addressed throughout this thesis that pertain specifically to both ritual acts and the figurine collection as artifactual remnants of ritual acts in order to explore this expression of ritual in more detail. The foremost question this project looks to explore is: What role does ritual play during the abandonment of a community? To investigate this inquiry, the following questions are examined: How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya of Baking Pot as the site was being abandoned? What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot? How did
ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct? The following section, Chapter Summaries, previews in additional detail the steps this project follows to explore and define the answers to these research questions.

**Chapter Summaries**

This thesis is presented in six chapters. This first chapter provides a brief introduction to ritual and peri-abandonment deposits, which is expanded upon in detail in Chapters Two and Three. I also introduce the research questions that guide this study of ritual, artifacts, and ritual spaces at the time of site abandonment among the Classic Maya of Baking Pot. To best answer these specific questions, they are developed further in the following chapters.

Chapter Two presents a selective discussion of Anthropological and Archaeological ritual theory. This discussion presents the theoretical approach of this project. This chapter is strongly grounded by the work of Victor Turner and others, addressing how ritual plays an important role in the foundation and maintenance of group identities and community. Additionally, ritual can be utilized by these societies during times of upheaval, crisis, or stress to help groups cope and maneuver stressful social, personal, and political situations (Bell 1992). Ritual acts are deeply entrenched in the social memory of a community and were (and are) highly revered and valued parts of Maya life (Katz 2018). Social memory here acts as a guide in the rituals participants used to assuage fears or rifts in communities, such as were seen during the Terminal Classic Period. Finally, Chapter Two begins to tie together the research questions with the theories presented.

Chapter Three outlines the history of and previous archaeological research at the site of Baking Pot, Cayo District, Belize. Previous excavations and reports from the 1920s, 1950s, and
1960s are briefly summarized before turning to details on the excavation and research conducted in the last few decades by BVAR. I include a brief discussion of household archaeology at Baking Pot and how the population adapted to political changes during the Terminal Classic Period (Hoggarth 2012). Following Dr. Hoggarth’s household dissertation research, BVAR undertook further excavations at the site core to understand the chronology of architectural sequences in Group B (Sullivan and Hoggarth 2015). These excavations revealed peri-abandonment deposits and led to the targeted excavation of these deposits over the following five years (Hoggarth 2016; Hoggarth et al. 2020). Following this history of excavations at Baking Pot, I discuss different types of archaeological problematic deposits, created as the result of different activities, including ritual. I continue on offering a review the major types of ritual among the Classic Maya. Finally, a summary of previous figurine and musical instrument research is presented (Awe 1992; DeLance 2016; Peniche May et al. 2019; Zweig 2010). The chapter concludes with evidence showing how figurines were used as ritual items and placed deliberately into peri-abandonment deposits.

Chapter Four presents the research design and methodology that has guided this thesis project. Each research question is reintroduced, followed by an explanation of how data I gathered addresses the project questions. Then, a background of excavation history that led to the Baking Pot figurine collection is discussed before the research design is laid out in detail. Each artifact in the collection is sorted into artifact categories. This is done using a classification flowchart and the details and features of each artifact in the figurine collection. Finally, Chapter Four closes with a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the Baking Pot figurine collection as a data set for this project directly. Overall, this chapter justifies the methods of data collection, and why specific lines of data were utilized over others which were considered but
not included for this project. The methodology guiding this project is expressed throughout this chapter.

Chapter Five presents the results and analysis of these data. Here again, each individual research question is addressed and answered with results from the project. Descriptive statistics characterize the Baking Pot figurine collection, and information including counts, categories of artifacts, morphological aspects, and location of excavation units they were recovered from are shared. This provides data on what items were included in which deposits in Baking Pot. Information about figurines and musical instruments being included in either problematic deposits or as part of different ritual acts is presented. Additionally, the figurines recovered from domestic household excavations are analyzed and compared to figurines recovered from ceremonial spaces in Group B. To understand rituals spatially during abandonment in areas with different types of access in of Group B, chi-square tests are employed to test associations between expressions of ritual in these open or restricted spaces. A final discussion provides a synthesis of all these data that provides understanding how the Baking Pot figurine collection answers the research questions of this project, and what the results say about the site, abandonment, and ritual during the end of the Classic Period at Baking Pot.

Finally, Chapter Six concludes the thesis, starting with a discussion of each of the research questions. In revisiting the research questions, I summarize and synthesize how the findings of this study answer the project questions. In reflecting upon the research, I find that this project provides contributions toward present and future figurine research in the Belize River Valley. I reflect on how the study went overall, what I could have approached differently, and offer thoughts on future research opportunities and goals for this collection, as well as for peri-abandonment studies, and for the role ritual plays at the collapse of a state level community.
Appendix A provides photographs of each of the figurines and other ceramic artifacts used for this study. This appendix includes the catalog number, special finds number, excavation unit, classification of artifact, morphology information, and a description to supplement the photographs of the artifacts in the collection. Raw data is provided in Appendix B, including Excel spreadsheets used to gather data and tables of data not presented within the thesis itself. Appendix C provides the SPSS output and raw data from the chi-square tests used and discussed in Chapter Five for consideration. These appendices provide complete documentation of the figurine data for this project and reflects the entirety of the Baking Pot figurine and special finds collection as of the close of the 2018 field season.
CHAPTER II
THE ROLE OF RITUAL IN COMMUNITY INTEGRATION AND DECLINE

The Importance of Ritual

Ritual has been a topic of study in social sciences for centuries (Andresen 2001; Bell 1992; Knottnerus 2012; McCauley and Lawson 2002; Summers-Effler 2006; Turner 1969). Psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists work to gain insights and understanding of the importance of ritual for humans, its nuances, its purpose, and why people conduct and partake in rituals day in and day out. In this chapter, we will look at the role that ritual has played in the foundation and reproduction of communities, its importance during turbulent times, and ways in which it is utilized to maintain cohesion, especially when differences between groups would arise. This thesis explores the question: if ritual plays an important role at the foundation and maintenance of a community, what role does ritual play during the abandonment of a community? First, I discuss relevant theories of ritual, specifically the importance of ritual in founding of communities. This lays a foundation to understand the importance of ritual for these groups and sets an understanding that ritual is used and used again throughout a community’s existence, including during times of stress and site abandonment. In following chapters, types of Maya ritual are explored and focus on the Classic Period Maya (250-900 CE) of the Belize River Valley, with an explanation of how ritual is understood through Classic Period Maya art, written records, and archaeological material remains.

Ritual Theory: Communitas and Ritualization

Timothy Darvill (2002) describes ritual as:

...a favourite but deplorable term commonly used by archaeologists looking to explain unfamiliar patterns in material culture that seem to have no functional explanation. Ritual strictly refers to practices connected with magical, supernatural, or religious experiences and beliefs, ritual deposits being the result
of material culture deployed as part of such practices. It is now widely recognized, however, that in non-capitalist, non-westernized societies there is no formal boundary between what is ritual and secular, between the sacred and the profane (Darvill 2002).

While the first half of this definition expresses that ritual has become a sort of joke in classifying poorly understood material remains and behavioral patterns, much ink has been spilled and centuries of research have gone towards a better understanding of ritual that is more nuanced and recognizes that ritual is a practice and not just a series of events or religious movements. A key to a better understanding of ritual as a practice and action lies in the last statement of this definition: “...in non-capitalist, non-westernized societies there is no formal boundary between what is ritual and secular, between the sacred and the profane.” Sociologist A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Anthropologists Victor Turner and Catherine Bell are some who have spent their careers helping us to understand this important aspect of human life and behavior.

As early as 1908, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, influenced by multiple scholars including Chinese philosophers (including Sun Tzu), Emile Durkheim, and Bronislaw Malinowski, put forth the theory that religious rites create “an orderly social life amongst humans” (Radcliffe-Brown 1952). In giving a lecture to The Royal Anthropological Institute in 1945, Radcliffe-Brown proposed that rites and rituals are important to humans specifically because they bring humans together. He first addressed the topic in the vein of that time, in the thought that ritual most often was understood as equal to a series of religious rites. He argued that while every society around the world and through time differ, they all used ritual, even as rituals varied in appearance and practice from culture to culture. Ritual is a human universal, and while ritual can be used to control large groups of people, it can also bind societies together. His point was that ritual does not exclusively refer to religious beliefs and should be studied for its social impacts. He closed with a call for scholars to observe rites in action, and to understand that while rites...
differ from society to society, ritual occurs among all humans (Radcliffe-Brown 1952). This work marked a change toward understanding that the roles rites and rituals play are universal and complex, and that they bind people together socially.

A few decades later, Victor Turner expanded on these thoughts in his 1969 book *The Ritual Process*. Turner shared his experience in doing just what Radcliffe-Brown had called for: observing ritual in action as he experienced it in his early field work as an anthropologist among the Ndembu of Zambia, Southern Africa. Turner’s book opened by walking the reader through intricate details and nuance of a Ndembu fertility ritual, just one of the rituals he observed and wrote about in his early ethnographic work. Then, he turned to his theory of “liminality and *communitas*.” Liminality, according to Turner, are the moments in life in which a person experiences a state of change culturally, socially, and ritually. Liminality speaks to individuals going through changes in role and status. Some examples of this includes persons undergoing a move to a new home, those who are about to be married, parents preparing for their children to be born, and those moving into positions of status, such as political leaders. It is the space a person occupies prior to their reincorporation into society in their new position. *Communitas*, then, refers to people in the state of liminality, and the space in which they come together as part of a group, society, or community. People that experience communitas come together with strong bonds and are of equal social standing. Turner explored three different types: spontaneous, normative, and ideological communitas. Spontaneous communitas occurs as a moment in history, a new social movement, and Turner used the Hippie countercultural movement of the 1960s as an example of people in the state of spontaneous communitas. Normative communitas occurs after a passage of time and speaks to those individuals that have come through liminality and are part of a structured (and thus ritualized) community. Taking the concept of normative
communitas a step further, Turner defines ideological communitas, which refers to utopian ideals that normative communitas reveres and works toward achieving (Turner 1969).

Turner stressed that the important aspect of communitas is the role it plays in people’s lives as part of the ebb and flow of living in a society. While in liminality and communitas, people look to those around them, their community, to navigate the changes they are experiencing. He stated that people utilize communitas to help move beyond it and into structure (as Levi-Strauss described structure). There are times that one must move from structure to communitas and back again in order to maintain order or to navigate conflict when it arises socially, politically, and religiously. In Turner’s work, what is important most of all for a community is balance, with people working to create equilibrium even when there is none, and he indicated that ritual leaders are vital to helping keep societal balance. Persons are “...released from structure into communitas only to return to structure revitalized by their experience of communitas” (Turner 1969:129). The constant upkeep of this balance is important because when a community leans toward having too little communitas, structure loosens and the community can break apart, with differences between community members driving the breakage. Yet also, with too much communitas, the structure of a community becomes too rigid and can also expose and cause strife which can lead to the community breaking apart (Turner 1969). Turner explained that ritual leaders and experts guide the community toward a balance in which life is ordered and social, political, and religious tensions are met and dealt with via this state of communitas. And while there have been critiques of this theory, it has helped us to further understand the complex and vital role that ritual plays in people’s lives and in founding a community.
Catherine Bell took ritual studies further in her book *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (1992). She explained that ritual cannot be understood simply by observing it, as Radcliffe-Brown championed, stating ritual will be misunderstood if it stands alone as just “ritual.” Instead, Bell explained, one must have knowledge and understanding of all other aspects of a society or culture, including history and social cues and nuance, in order to gain insight into their rituals. Interestingly, this is something that Turner in practice worked into his analyses of ritual among the Ndembu. Bell stated that ritual must be thought of in a completely different way, which she called *ritualization*. In ritualization, the ritual itself is not what is important, not the words spoken, nor the items used, and not the order in which events occur, but instead importance lies in the knowledge of the community member of how to conduct a ritual, be it planned or spontaneous (Bell 1992:69-70). There is a need for ritual to be structured and follow specific rules, yet it must also capture the interest of those conducting and/or observing the ritual, and while these certain scripts, rules, or worldviews can guide the ritual act, they are not and cannot all be identical each time a ritual act takes place. Whether restricted or open, political or social, spiritual or secular, ritual is fluid and can and will change either minutely or drastically from ritual act to ritual act. Bell’s work helps anthropologists think beyond the static nature in which ritual can easily be viewed, and to understand that what is most important are the reasons behind *why* ritual occurs. Many of these nuances shift how ritual is conducted and thus appears, both during its inception and action as well as in the material record, and we as archaeologists must continue to be aware of this.

Both Bell and Turner reiterated that there are specific life or crisis events for which rituals occur, including navigation of fertility, birthing, coming-of-age, political ascension, illnesses, and death (Turner 1969). Bell also highlighted rituals categorically, alluding to the
dichotomies of religious and secular ritual, political and civic ritual, rebellion and solidarity rituals, and restricted and open ritual (Bell 1992). What both scholars agreed upon is that these events were created and then drawn upon for specific reasons, with Turner focusing on the cohesion of communities and society, and Bell focusing on how the knowledge and nuance is expressed by people who live within and best navigate their society from day to day. Turner spoke of ritual producing “considerable psychological benefit” (Turner 1969:43) and expressed that the enactment of rituals oftentimes was connected to “crises in the social life of villages” (Turner 1969:10). Bell similarly expressed that the role of ritual can be “cathartic performances that are responses to situations of anxiety and fear” (Bell 1992:71). This will be important here when looking at the role ritual plays for communities at the time of site abandonment. But first, let us look at our understanding of the importance of ritual in the founding of communities.

**The Importance of Ritual in Founding Communities**

Ritual events brought diverse peoples together as a tool to navigate social dynamics necessary in order to found a community and gain the advantages that the balance of communitas provides: the possibility of safety, allies, and greater access to resources. These founding populations may not have shared similar world views, spirituality, or customs, and likely dealt with conflict between groups. Ritual acts these peoples utilized were intended to build communitas in order to smooth interactions during integration into permanent settlements on the landscape. These newly founded communities could build up the space around them in reflection of this newfound communitas.

Archaeologists have worked to understand why people form a community since the dawn of the discipline. A main line of evidence archaeologists use to study this topic is architecture. Leaving an unmistakable footprint behind, buildings and built spaces tend to be the largest and
most visibly dominant feature of a location that was once occupied and has since been abandoned. Archaeologists find that populations living in many early communities built structures for community ritual (Dietrich et al. 2012; Gilman and Stone 2013; Inomata et al. 2015; Kornienko 2009; Mithen et al. 2011; Wheaton 2006). These communal structures will vary from region to region but are alike overall in that they were associated with group ritual. Analyses of the remains of public buildings can identify aspects of the worldview of the population settling in the region. New community formation can be associated with new forms of architecture as spaces for ritual, and potentially with the remains of rituals in the form of artifact deposits. We see this repeatedly in the Old World in Mesopotamia (Dietrich et al. 2012; Kornienko 2009; Mithen et al. 2011), as well as in the New World, be it in the American Southwest (Gilman and Stone 2013), or in the Maya region (Aimers et al. 2020; Ashmore and Sabloff 2002; Awe et al. 2017; Chase and Chase 1998; Inomata et al. 2015).

Old World archaeological evidence from Mesopotamia suggests that community spaces were used and built up prior to a shift to agricultural economies. Structure O75 at site WF16 near Wadi Faynan, Jordan, is larger than previously found structures in the region. Radiocarbon dates from floor deposits in the structure to between 9580 and 8470 BCE. This places the large community structure in time before the expansion of a complex agricultural economy in the region. And while it is yet unknown what the structure itself was used for, it is certain that community efforts would be necessary for the construction and maintenance of such a space (Mithen et al. 2011). Structures in Northern Mesopotamia, dating to the same era, at the sites of Jerf el-Ahmar, Çayönü, Nevali Cori, and Göbekli Tepe have been termed “cult buildings,” indicating their communal and ritual importance. Evidence in calling these structures such include special, separate locations repeated at different sites, similar structural layouts,
specialized flooring (including mosaics or tiles), stone benches, the presence of stelae, evidence of ritual activities along with absence of evidence for domestic activities, and at Göbekli Tepe, the deposit of offerings in “sacrificial bowls” at the base of a pillar (Kornienko 2009). Findings such as these, along with radiocarbon dates that shows these monumental structures and pillars were constructed prior to the onset of full-time utilization of agriculture shows that community and ritual gathering spaces held high importance at the start of communities. Again, at the site of Göbekli Tepe, pillars and stelae with anthropomorphic carvings on them were erected during the Pre-Pottery Neolithic (10,000 – 8800 BCE). It is hypothesized that these pillars were a space of communal gathering, feasting, drinking, and ritual (Dietrich et al. 2012). Each of these sites provide architectural evidence that ritual brought groups of people together prior to their settling into full-time agricultural communities, which highlights the important role ritual played in community formation.

Great kivas are another example of built spaces where emerging communities would gather that became important ritual spaces through time and through their use and manipulation (Gilman and Stone 2013; Wheaton 2006:23). The locations in which great kivas were built align with important astrological aspects of the night sky. In this, ritual activities that correlate to these astrological phenomena—such as lunar eclipses—would call upon peoples to gather together to celebrate or view these phenomena. Great Kivas could have been built to celebrate the ceremonies that celebrated these moments, as is argued at the site of Aztec (Wheaton 2016). Also important in the conceptualization of ritualized spaces is the concept of “imagined communities,” and community dynamics that took place in Great Kivas. These spaces were created for community use, and while diversity is present in their details of construction, each
community had a template for ritual space that they were able to customize for each community’s needs, as is seen with Mogollon Great Kiva construction (Gilman and Stone 2013).

Community formation occurred for different peoples, at different times, and in different ways throughout the world. Groupings of people would form community identity via communitas and ritual. These new communities also looked different throughout the world, and were not necessarily sedentary, as sedentism is not a prerequisite for communitas. For instance, there is evidence that the Maya who created the earliest monumental architecture at Ceibal came together first as diverse, mobile groups who used and reused the space for ritual acts that built their community. Burials at Ceibal from the Preclassic Period, ranging between 850 – 350 BCE, act as evidence for ritualized space considering these ancestors were interred prior to residences being constructed. Included with these burials were grave goods, including caches of ceramics. These caching behaviors are discussed further in Chapter Three, but are evidence for ancestor rituals. These multiple groups of Maya practiced communitas and ritual while continuing differing levels of mobility. And these early rituals simultaneously served social and political needs while developing among the people an attachment to place. They later collaborated on building up physical buildings and spaces specifically for rituals (Inomata et al. 2015). Evidence for ritual in these built spaces is found at the neighboring community of Caobal, where two types of ritual evidence were recovered among residential spaces. A burial dated to 450-350 BCE is interred below the house, an act of ancestor ritual. Additionally, there is a dedicatory cache located in front of this building that included ceramics, lithics, and faunal materials. This evidence found at Caobal, a close neighbor to Ceibal, shows the ritual acts present at Ceibal continued for hundreds of years. These findings indicate that humans were ritually interred
during the founding of built spaces at Ceibal, along with ceramics, a practice that is mirrored ritually throughout the Maya region, including in the Belize River Valley (Aimers et al. 2000).

These buildings and spaces offered a place for communities to gather together, meet socially, spiritually, and politically, and conduct ritual. While these gathering spaces were utilized in times of peace, the stresses of warfare or external threats also brought communities together for protection, leading to the creation and moments of reification of such spaces. Here, if we look again at ideological communitas, we would see the community working to use and maintain these built spaces during times of stress, while the ritual heads and/or leaders helped to guide the community into balance.

In addition to built spaces, ethnography and ethnohistory can be used to help understand ritual. Scholars propose that ritual is not only a belief system or religion, but an action to help navigate political, personal, and spiritual aspects of social life (Bell 1992; Lucero 2006, Turner 1969). In this way, then, ritual is created and acted upon by cultures as a part of that culture’s belief and understanding of the world around them. Scholars are able to draw upon ethnographic analogy and make educated links between ethnography, worldview, and material remains. During this process, archaeologists are careful not to define the meaning of the ritual, but instead work to understand ritual actions, as well as their intended purpose. It is important to note that archaeologists are examining what ritual does for people and communities, but not what ritual means directly. An example of this is the Maya interring human remains under the floors of houses; we understand that this is a ritual act of ancestor veneration by linking ethnographic accounts of Maya ritual with the archaeological evidence. What we state then as archaeologists is the ritual and purpose: interring ancestors below homes is an act of ancestor veneration. What is not stated is the meaning behind the ritual for the people who conducted it (Lucero 2006).
are able to hypothesize on the meaning of ancestor veneration by using ethnographic and ethnohistoric analogies with care. Each time ethnographic and ethnohistoric analogy is used, it must be done so with care (Fox 1987; Maca 2009; Mock 1998; Robin 2002).

Material items utilized in these rituals and ritual spaces were sometimes perishable and did not survive in the material record. Here it is most important to bring understanding of ritual built space and ethnographic/ethnohistoric accounts together to understand the surviving artifacts. The artifacts that do survive in the material record can both be analyzed in themselves as an item, yet also can be studied with further understanding of how a community might have conducted ritual. In addition to the discussion about Ceibal above, it is understood that the Maya oftentimes would include multiple items in a founding ritual during construction of permanent or monumental architecture, such as ceramic wares including bowls or censers, figurines, “special” stones like obsidian or jade, botanical items, beverages, animals or parts of animals, and sometimes human remains. These items also were sometimes burned in ritual acts (Awe 2013; Duncan et al. 2015). These ritual deposits offer insights to rituals and activities the communities used.

In summation, ritual and its importance at the founding of communities and sites can be approached archaeologically through studying architecture and features, by utilizing ethnographic and ethnohistoric accounts responsibly, and through artifact analyses. What role does ritual play, then, during the decline and abandonment of archaeological sites? We have discussed deposits from founding communities already; what does ritual look like in the material record at site abandonment? It has been argued that a community experiencing stress is unable to know that the events they are experiencing would end in the total abandonment of their home (Schachner 2001). Therefore, evidence for ritual might look the same prior to site abandonment.
Or, we might see changes in ritual action via the material record as populations in times of stress and change recognize dwindling populations or decide to abandon the site they inhabited.

Chapter Three examines Classic Maya ritual and our archaeological understanding of it before moving on to discuss ritual deposits left at sites throughout the Belize River Valley during site abandonment by looking at these deposits at one site, that of Baking Pot.

**Summary**

I have described how ritual is important to humans in that it provides a sense of community, provides space to navigate changes in communitas, and that humans enact and call upon rituals both formally and informally to help navigate a variety of situations including social, political, and spiritual events. Specific information about rituals that the Classic Maya utilized is examined in Chapter Three.

Humans come together and connect through social, familial, and political actions. We have seen here that humans used ritual to create community during site foundation. These rituals helped to tie people to place through practice and created group identity. These identities and important places were vital for the successful settling down into these permanent communities. Having come together as diverse groups, people were able to navigate each of the changes they experienced through life and in communitas by using these ritual acts to build community. With ritual having been so important to the establishment of these early communities around the world, what role did ritual play for communities at a time of community decline? Specifically, how was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned? What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot? How did ritual activities differ
between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?

The next chapter introduces the Classic Maya site of Baking Pot, Belize, discusses types of Maya ritual, and introduces ritual peri-abandonment deposits that included the ceramic figurines, musical instruments, and special finds artifacts offered up in these ritual acts that occurred during the abandonment of the site during the Terminal Classic period (c. 850 CE).
CHAPTER III

PRIOR RESEARCH AT BAKING POT AND ON RITUAL AND FIGURINES

A Brief History of Archaeological Research at Baking Pot

Baking Pot is a Classic Maya site located in the Cayo District of Belize, Central America. It sits approximately 10 kilometers northeast of the modern neighboring towns of San Ignacio and Santa Elena on the banks of the Belize River (Figure 3.1). The site is easily accessible today from the Western Highway, and the land it sits on is currently managed by the government farm (Central Farm), the Tilapia Hatchery, and the Cayo Deaf Institute. Baking Pot was a mid-sized political capital in the Belize River Valley region and was occupied continuously from at least the Late Preclassic period (300 BCE – 300 CE) to the Terminal Classic period (c. 900 CE).

Whereas archaeological research—relying heavily on ceramic analyses—originally found that Baking Pot was occupied continuously through the Postclassic Period (900 – 1500 CE) (Gifford 1976; Willey et al. 1965), research conducted and presented in the past decade indicates that Baking Pot was depopulated by the Early Postclassic with no evidence for occupation again until the Late Postclassic (1280-1420 CE) (Hoggarth et al. 2014).

Baking Pot Excavations from the 1920s through the 1950s

In the early 20th century, the Western Highway was being constructed in the Cayo District of Belize (known previously as British Honduras until the name was changed in 1973). It was quickly discovered that construction fill for portions of the highway was coming from an abandoned Maya site nearby. The Archaeological Commissioner at that time, A.H. Anderson, stepped in to stop this repurposing (Hoggarth, personal communication). In response to this, academics at the Carnegie Institute of Washington launched an archaeological expedition to the
Figure 3.1: Map showing location of Baking Pot, Belize.
(Davis 2018; after Hoggarth 2014)
site of Baking Pot (Ricketson, Jr. 1931). This investigation stepped in to stop any further destruction of the site, and under this pretext scientific archaeological excavations began at Baking Pot in 1924. Directed by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, this first scientific excavation was led by Oliver Garrison Ricketson, Jr., with work taking place from March 23 to May 31, 1924. During these twelve weeks a total of 15 burials and other various artifacts were unearthed in Group 1 (Morley 1924). Group 1 is the area of monumental architecture now known as Group A (Figure 3.2). “Excavations at Baking Pot, British Honduras,” was published in Contributions to American Archaeology in 1931, and detailed the work done at the site with photographs—including those of human remains—for public and academic consumption.

Mary Bullard, daughter of Oliver Ricketson Jr., and her spouse William Bullard, travelled through British Honduras in the late 1950s. This included a trip to archaeological sites along the Belize River, and the time they spent at Baking Pot prompted a second set of archaeological excavations there. The Bullards ran an excavation for the Royal Ontario Museum in 1961 in an effort to revisit and better understand other areas at Baking Pot. Their excavations were the first time that Group 2 (now known as Group B) had been the subject of scientific investigation (Figure 3.2). Stone from Group B, like those in Group A, had been used over the previous decades routinely for construction projects. Yet even with prior damage done at Group 2, the work the Bullards conducted in 1961 included excavation of a “throne room,” so-called for their finding a bench in Structure B1, as well as work completed at Structures B3 and B4, and at the southern ballcourt in Group B. Their project excavated seven burials and uncovered extensive artifacts which were detailed and illustrated in their publication on this research (Bullard and Bullard 1965). Each of these two early excavations provided the archaeological community with an understanding of the site that would cement its place as a mid-sized Classic Maya political
center, and contributed to seminal work on household archaeology among the Maya and in the Belize River Valley.

Gordon Willey, during his own research, worked alongside the Bullards during their late 1950s excavations. Together, Willey and the Bullards published a seminal article in 1965 titled “Prehistoric Maya Settlements in the Belize Valley.” This research looked at settlement patterns at the site of Barton Ramie and its periphery sites, which included Baking Pot as Barton Ramie’s immediate neighbor. Projects focusing on settlement and household archaeology were not unheard of at the time but were rare in the Maya region where most previous work had focused on elite courts and on monumental architecture. The excavations and survey conducted by Willey and his colleagues between 1953 and 1956 contributed to this paper, which primarily focused on housemounds at Baking Pot (Willey et al. 1965). Yet even with this important publication,
research and excavation at Baking Pot subsided for some years after this, and archaeological focus in the Cayo District shifted to sites such as Lamanai (from 1980 to present), Caracol (from 1985 to present), Cahal Pech (from 1988 to present), and Xunantunich (from 1992 to present) (Pendergast 1993:11-12). New excavations at Baking Pot were not conducted for four decades, when The Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance Project was formed and began working there (Bednar et al. 2016:241).

**The Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance Project at Baking Pot**

The Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance (BVAR) Project was established by Project Director Dr. Jaime Awe as a project for Belizean and Maya Archaeology at the site of Cahal Pech in 1988. Looking to expand research into the greater Belize River Valley, the BVAR project began work at the site of Baking Pot in 1992 under the direction of Dr. Jaime Awe and Dr. Jim Conlon (Conlon 1993; Iannone and Healy 2012:36). These early years of work conducted by BVAR at Baking Pot focused primarily on survey of the site, and in understanding political structure, settlement patterns, adaptations during the Late Classic Period, and the timeframe of site abandonment (Aimers 1997; Audet 2006; Conlon 1993 and 1996; Helmke 2008; Hoggarth 2012; Hoggarth et al. 2014). The legacy of Baking Pot as synonymous with Maya household archaeology sparked by Willey and colleagues was expanded upon by BVAR Project Director Dr. Julie Hoggarth as she focused her 2012 dissertation research at the site, defining household adaptations to stress and political reorganization at the time leading up to site abandonment (Hoggarth 2012).

BVAR’s recent research at Baking Pot over the past decade has included work on refining the timeline of site abandonment, questioning continuous occupation through the Postclassic period, understanding the phases and chronology of monumental architecture
building events, gaining an understanding of the ditched field system supporting the site, and identifying and researching “problematic deposits” (Bednar et al. 2016; Davis 2018; Helmke et al. 2018; Hoggarth et al. 2014; Hoggarth et al. 2016; Hoggarth 2018; Sullivan 2015). These projects have contributed to an even more refined understanding of what life at Baking Pot would have been like during the Late Classic period, and how elite and common populations interacted, conducted ritual, and coexisted together.

**BVAR’s Peri-Abandonment Deposit Research**

In the years immediately following Dr. Hoggarth’s dissertation work, she continued excavating at Baking Pot, turning part of her focus toward understanding the architectural building sequences and terminal occupation at Group B. As these BVAR project excavations progressed, a large deposit was found in the corner between structures in Courtyard 3, and research focus shifted toward understanding these artifact deposits (Figure 3.3) (Hoggarth Personal Communication 2017; Hoggarth and Sullivan 2015; Sullivan and Hoggarth 2015). In the next few years, similar excavations began at the other BVAR sites, including Lower Dover, Xunantunich, and Cahal Pech, in an effort to understand if this deposit behavior was repeated at multiple sites throughout the Belize River Valley (Alvarado et al. 2018; Beardall 2017; Hoggarth et al. 2016; Lonaker et al. 2017; Romih et al. 2018). It quickly became apparent that the deposits were present at each site and dated to the time of site abandonment. The BVAR project moved forward in terming these deposits peri-abandonment deposits after analyzing and presenting multiple lines of evidence showing these ritual artifact accumulations were left upon site abandonment at different sites in the Belize River Valley. This is explored in the following section.
So why are these large deposits of artifact at multiple sites being considered peri-abandonment deposits? It is due specifically to the artifacts present and the time and manner of deposition. The artifacts included in the peri-abandonment deposits at Baking Pot include polychrome jars and pottery, faunal remains associated with rituals, lithics (including chert and obsidian), ceramic figurines, musical instruments, censers, freshwater shell, jade, and the human remains of at minimum three individuals (Davis 2018). The artifacts included in a housemound deposit at Structure M410 are similar, and include ceramic, chert, quartzite, obsidian, jade, faunal remains, shell, and ceramic figurines (du Menil 2014). Other sites in the Belize River Valley have yielded the same artifacts in their peri-abandonment deposits, including the sites of
Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, and Lower Dover (Alvarado 2019; Awe et al. 2019; Romih 2019b; Tappan 2020).

Peri-abandonment deposits are found consistently and repetitively in plaza corners (including northeast, southeast, and southwest plaza corners at Baking Pot Group B, as seen in Figure 3.5), against the walls of monumental architecture, and in alleyways between buildings (Awe et al. 2020b; Beardall 2017; Hoggarth et al. 2020). The deposits at Baking Pot are quite large in size, especially when compared to peri-abandonment deposits from other sites in the region, measuring from one-half meter by one meter up to three meters by five meters in length and width. They can measure as deep as a meter of consistent artifacts from top to bottom.

A specific feature of peri-abandonment deposits over other deposit types is a thin layer of dirt or soil accumulation atop the floor and under the deposits, suggesting that time had elapsed prior to the start of their deposition. This, coupled with the artifact types present in each deposit, indicates that these deposits were formed at site abandonment after the site core of Baking Pot was already depopulated (Davis, 2018; Hoggarth et al. 2020). In order to best understand these deposits, I first present a brief discussion of other explanations for problematic deposits posited by scholars working at various Maya sites before outlining the differences found in peri-abandonment deposits and what their contents include.

**Problematic Deposits in the Maya Region**

A variety of hypotheses and theories have been posited regarding large artifact deposits that have been excavated at many Maya sites. These deposits have been placed under the umbrella classification of “problematic deposits” for the fact that they can be difficult to decipher and understand (Aimers et al. 2020:67 [citing Moholy-Nagy and Coe 2008]). Physically, these deposits are often a large accumulation of artifacts from various classes, sometimes including
pottery, faunal remains, lithics, bloodletting instruments, figurines, and other artifacts. Artifacts included in these deposits are varied, so the artifact assemblage of each deposit is important to understanding it. Throughout this section, the artifacts included in each deposit are discussed to better understand the interpretations presented and to showcase the differences between the deposit types. Additionally, the size of deposit can vary as well, ranging from a small pile of artifacts to accumulations several meters in extent (Figure 3.4). We are able to work toward understanding problematic deposits and form these hypotheses on their use and purpose based on multiple lines of evidence including their contents, their locations, additional contextual data, and our ethno graphic and ethnohistoric understanding of ritual among the Ancient Maya.

Artifacts and ritual items that were placed into these problematic deposits have been excavated at sites throughout the Maya region, having been recovered most often in the alleyways of temple structures or acropolises, against the walls of temples and pyramids, and in

Figure 3.4: Artifact deposit from Baking Pot Plaza B, unit B2-4. (Photograph by Niyo Moraza-Keeswood [Figure 13, Lonaker et al. 2017:19])
the corners of both open or public plazas and restricted or private courtyards. The accumulation of these artifact deposits has been categorized in different ways. Scholars have argued that such deposits of artifacts could be middens or refuse, the result of rapid abandonment due to warfare, the material remains of feasting events, or ritual termination deposits. Emerging research identifies a different type of deposit, like the ones that yield the Baking Pot figurine collection, that does not correspond to any of these previous deposit types, but are instead ritual deposits placed at the time of abandonment of a site. These deposits are aptly named peri-abandonment deposits (Aimers et al. 2020; Alvarado 2019; Awe et al. 2020; Davis 2018; Helmke et al. 2018; Romih 2019b; Tappan 2020). A brief explanation of these different classifications will help to understand why the figurines discussed later in this thesis are understood as ritual items uncovered from peri-abandonment deposits, and not items discarded during another event or situation.

**Middens or refuse.** Problematic deposits have been interpreted as refuse or as middens for many years in the Maya region, particularly due to ethnoarchaeological correlates that can be a valid reason for the buildup of these artifacts (Deal 1985; Hayden and Cannon 1983). Midden deposits and refuse piles are made up of diverse and sometimes unpatterned collections of artifacts (Aimers et al. 2020; Stanton et al. 2008). They include an accumulation of items and artifacts specific to refuse, oftentimes including a large number of used foodstuffs, lithic debitage, broken or worn-out tools, and broken or worn cooking vessels (McKillop 2004; Moholy-Nagy 1997). Taphonomic and ceramic analyses from this type of deposit show different results than feasting or ritual events. Distributions of ceramic objects vary widely with a strong propensity for rearticulation (Aimers et al. 2020; Sagebiel and Haines 2018). These types of deposits are found in locations away from major activity areas. They were not left in alleyways
or areas of high traffic. They can be in primary contexts, but are often found in secondary or tertiary contexts, having been removed from open spaces, patios, and homes (Hayden and Cannon 1983). Middens, as problematic deposits, are not the direct result of ritual acts conducted by the Classic Maya, but are instead the result of everyday activities.

**Rapid abandonment.** Another proposed explanation for problematic deposits in the Maya region is that these deposits are the result of rapid abandonment of a site, sometimes during warfare events. Material and archaeological evidence associated with these war events include daily items left in primary locations, smashed pottery that can be fully reassembled, and specialty items in activity area locations of a site core. For example, artifact accumulations associated with scribal tools have been excavated in one space, domestic artifacts in another, workshop items were left in primary locations, and so on. The argument that problematic deposits are a result of rapid and immediate abandonment due to warfare has been made at the site of Aguateca in Guatemala, and Colha in Belize, as the artifacts there include deposits of items left in place and evidence of mass burning throughout all areas (Barrett and Scherer 2005; Inomata 1997). This type of problematic deposit is not the direct result of any specific or immediate ritual, but instead is the biproduct of the speed of abandonment.

**Feasting events.** An additional hypothesis for accumulations of artifacts is that they are the debris of feasting events, both private or public, at the household or at the community-wide level. As with each type of problematic deposits, those resulting from feasting events leave particular traces of evidence behind (Hayden 2001), especially regarding ceramic and faunal remains. Zooarchaeological studies can clarify whether bones from a deposit were commonplace or hard to obtain food items, if and how they were served for consumption, and the size of the animal, with larger animals having been utilized for feasts (Aimers et al. 2020). Taphonomic
analyses help to understand how or even if the animal was processed or if cut marks are present from food preparations, whereas faunal remains from ritual offerings do not show evidence of the animal being prepared for consumption (Burke et al. 2017). Additionally, ceramic artifacts found in deposits resulting from feasts may be serving dishes, cooking dishes, or specialized decorative serving platters. Analyzing all of the different types of vessels present in a deposit can provide evidence for feasting events, especially if there is a large quantity of standardized serving dishes present in the deposit as this indicates a large number of people were served (Davis 2018; Sagebiel and Haines 2018). Residue analyses can also be conducted to determine what items were served or held in the containers and dishes (LeCount 2001). Residues of items understood to be used in rituals and feasts, such as cacao or tobacco, along with these other lines of evidence, help us to understand feasting deposits. And not all feasting events ended with deposits of artifacts. LeCount has argued at Xunantunich, that specified dishes, plates, and vases were used for feasting and are recovered from primary contexts, that being either elite or commoner households (LeCount 2001). Yet some feasting events led to deposits found in areas away from activity or traffic, located just outside the home near refuse piles for household feasts. Public feasts can also be partially transported, oftentimes being accumulated near or in midden deposits outside of the site cores. If the resulting deposits from feasting events are in these secondary or tertiary contexts, ceramic vessels might not be able to be refit, or are able to be refit with items scattered across deposits (Aimers et al. 2020). Feasts are ritual acts, and can be connected with Classic Maya royal, continuity, or cosmological rituals. As with the other types of deposits discussed here, the archaeological evidence for feasting rituals is distinct, as expressed above.
Termination deposits. The final form of problematic deposit explored here relates to the accumulation of artifacts as a direct result of termination rituals. Termination or terminal rituals include the smashing of items to release the spirit included in the item or from the space being “terminated.” Maya archaeologists understand the ritual of termination through ethnographic analogy, translation of hieroglyphic texts, and detailed archaeological analyses (Chase and Chase 1998; Coe 1959; Davis 2018; Freidel and Schele 1989; Kunen et al. 2002; Mock 1998). There are two main types of termination ritual deposits: reverential and desecratory. Archaeologically, both types of terminal deposits feature smashed ceramic vessels (often able to be refit), scattered artifacts, and can include burials (oftentimes looted), and items attributed to ritual use (including bloodletting instruments or specific items like musical instruments or figurines) (Aimers et al. 2020; Davis 2018). Reverential terminal deposits can feature items with killholes present in them, and sometimes have a new phase of construction placed over them. On the other hand, desecratory terminal deposits differ by sometimes showing signs of looting, cut marks (including damaged floors or steps), and all-over burning. These deposits are found both in domestic and ceremonial contexts, usually at locations of importance, including ceremonial plazas, in alleys between large structures, on the stairs of households or monumental architecture, or in corners of plaza or buildings. Terminal deposits are the direct result of ritual themselves, and include the items listed above that are oftentimes counted as ritual items, including bloodletting instruments, figurines, musical instruments, and the like.

Peri-Abandonment Deposits

Peri-abandonment deposits, having at times been previously classified as problematic deposits, refer to a specific accumulation of artifacts that were ritually deposited at the time of a site’s depopulation. The ritual events creating peri-abandonment deposits can occur over hours,
days, weeks, months, or years, and further analysis of microstratigraphy and artifacts within these deposits will help refine their sequence (Hoggarth et al. 2020). These deposits are comprised of a multitude of artifact types, including pottery, faunal remains, chert and obsidian, freshwater shell, marine shell, jade, ceramic figurines, musical instruments, and censers. Human remains are sometimes interred below the peri-abandonment deposit, but not always. The location in which peri-abandonment deposits are built-up is important, as well as the fact that these deposits, unlike the other types of problematic deposits discussed above, feature a thin layer or matrix of soil or dust built-up between the terminal floor below them and the earliest artifacts left in the deposit, indicating that some period of abandonment had passed (Davis 2018).

Figure 3.5: Group B at Baking Pot showing locations of peri-abandonment deposits and tested courtyard corners. (Hoggarth et al. 2020)
Peri-abandonment deposits include the artifacts listed above. This type of deposit consistently includes these artifacts; at the same time artifactual evidence present in other types of problematic deposits discussed above are not present. In other words, artifacts present in middens or feasting deposits would show evidence of specifically modified faunal remains, namely as food items. This differs from the analysis of faunal remains found in peri-abandonment deposits, as their preparation and cut marks differ as they were used as ritual items. Also, evidence of rapid abandonment or midden deposits would include cleaned areas, artifacts found in their original context, artifacts removed to secondary or tertiary spaces with scatter common in this movement, and butchered or prepared faunal remains meant for consumption, and this is also not the case with peri-abandonment deposits (Davis 2018; Tappan 2020).

Extensive analyses are now being completed across the BVAR project on the peri-abandonment deposits that have been excavated at each of the sites the project oversees. These analyses include “big-picture” studies and distributions of all the artifact classes included in the deposits, as well as specialized analyses of each artifact class recovered from these deposits. J. Britt Davis’s Master’s Thesis research presents each data class from the Baking Pot deposits, including an extensive ceramic study looking at polychrome vessels. Katie K. Tappan’s Master’s Thesis focuses on the zooarchaeological analyses of the items from the Baking Pot deposits. This thesis uses the figurine and ceramic special finds artifacts. This thesis work is being completed with the understanding that broad analyses such as Davis’s Thesis are imperative to understanding the behavior and ritual that led to peri-abandonment deposit build-up. In addition, this next step in understanding the decline of sites in the Belize River Valley will be to study and analyze artifact classes from the deposits one by one so they can be better understood as individual data or compared and contrasted by site to determine if different ritual occurred in
different locations or at different times, as is exhibited with the faunal analysis presented in Tappan’s Thesis. Is it possible that peri-abandonment deposits include different types of artifacts and ritual items at different sites outside of the BVAR project? Was peri-abandonment ritual behavior influenced by different situations in different regions, and is this reflected in their artifact accumulations? This thesis contributes to this stage of detailed analysis and research, by looking directly at the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines and ceramic musical instruments (leading to their inclusion in this figurine collection) in more detail to further understand the ritual behavior of the residents of Baking Pot during the Terminal Classic period.

**Previous Figurine Research**

Figurines as artifacts have captured the attention of archaeologists for centuries. Figurines are found in excavations throughout the world, and early discussions and publications too numerous to review in detail here, often revolved around simply describing the items and/or interpreting them as representations of goddesses or used in fertility rites (Frothingham 1911; Murray 1934; Richardson 1898). Even early discussions of zoomorphic figurines can be tied to fertility rites (Glueck 1939). As archaeological paradigms and practices shifted in the second half of the 20th century, publications called for a revisitation of “classic” figurines, stating they should be analyzed in new ways. Theoretical approaches should and would take the place of assumptions, and figurines began to be understood, viewed, and discussed as more than representations of deities or fertility relics. They were also considered in a more nuanced manner than being dismissed as simple children’s toys (Bailey 2005; Hamilton et al. 1996; Ucko 1962).

An important early study on Maya figurines was published by Mary Butler in 1935. In her article, Butler discussed the differences between handmade and mold-made figurines, types of clays and tempers used, and similarities and differences between figurine representations
across various regions of the Maya lowlands across Guatemala, Mexico, and modern-day Belize (still named British Honduras at the time of her publication). She mentioned that while some figurines might represent deities or cult members, figurines also clearly depicted artistically “scenes from daily” Maya life (Butler 1935:640). She also noted that many Maya figurines are also “whistles” of some type, having mouthpieces and vents present on them, although in all other ways they are considered figurines. And while she organized the figurines in her study regionally and paid close attention to the details of the figurines, Butler noted that not enough is known to discern and make statements about what figurines meant for the Maya based on their physical attributes alone (Butler 1935). This work stands apart from other figurine studies occurring in other parts of the world in its approach and language.

Building from a strong foundation, recent studies have examined even more varied topics, including the role of figurines in state and household interactions and in political economies, the ritual aspects of figurines, what their existence says about societal roles and social cohesion, representations and aspects of gender, and their use as portable media and storytelling or educational devices, and as items ancestral spirits could inhabit so they would be able to participate in rituals (DeLance 2016; Gillaspie 2019; Halperin 2007 and 2014; Marcus 2019; Pinche May et al. 2019; Rice 2019; Zweig 2010). Let us look now at Maya figurine studies that have been conducted at BVAR.

**BVAR Figurine Studies**

There has been a consistent research interest in the figurine collections excavated by BVAR. Dr. Jaime Awe, director of the project, catalogued and discussed figurines from the site of Cahal Pech in his Ph.D. dissertation. The Cahal Pech figurine collection numbered 187 items at the time of his analysis (Awe 1992). In 2010 Christina Zweig revisited the Cahal Pech figurine
collection for her Master’s thesis, the collection having doubled to 387 items due to continued research and excavation year after year at the site. Zweig looked primarily at expressions of gender and sex in the Preclassic (Zweig 2010). This same collection has recently been reanalyzed by Dr. Lisa DeLance, BVAR Archivist, for her Ph.D. dissertation. The collection had amazingly tripled in the 6 years between Zweig’s thesis and DeLance’s dissertation. Dr. DeLance analyzed and cataloged a total of 1,001 figurines and expressed, using enchainment theory, possible transitions from familial power in Late Preclassic politics to the Early Classic period transition of political power to divine kings and queens (DeLance 2016). Additional research on this collection focused on temporal aspects of the collection, looking at the deposition of figurines throughout the Cahal Pech site core at different times (Pinche May et al. 2019).

It is important to note that the Cahal Pech figurine collection is unique to the Belize River Valley in the sheer number of items, and it is still growing through excavation efforts and research projects today. This figurine collection of 1,001 items is dated mostly to the Middle to Late Preclassic (with “Formative” used in place of Preclassic in DeLance 2016) period (850 BCE – CE 250). The figurines in the Cahal Pech collection are primarily handmade items, with the oldest figurines emphasizing full-bodies with a later shift toward heads focusing instead on individual facial features. The earliest figurines of bodies have been beheaded, limbs broken away, both intentionally and through weathering and time. The figurine heads are approximately palm sized, and have a template they follow in artistic form, but each face is somewhat different, leading to the argument that the figurines from Cahal Pech were made to represent and revere an ancestor (DeLance, personal communication).
The only prior analysis of the Baking Pot figurine collection is an iconographic investigation (Gillaspie 2019). For that project, I initially considered a comparison between the Baking Pot figurine collection and the Cahal Pech figurine collection. It rapidly became clear that the Baking Pot figurine collection was different from the Cahal Pech figurine collection, in context, temporality, and manufacture. While the Cahal Pech collection dates from the Middle Preclassic to the Early Classic period, the Baking Pot figurine collection dates primarily to the Classic and Late Classic period. Additionally, whereas the Cahal Pech figurines are primarily handmade and likely represent specific individuals, the Baking Pot figurine collection is primarily made up of mold-made items that showcase broader features, indicating not individuals, but categories of people. Chapter Six expands briefly on this.

**Classic Maya Ritual and Figurines as Ritual Items**

In order to further understand the information presented above, let us now focus on the ritual during the Classic Period both broadly in the Maya region and regionally in the Belize River Valley. We look at some of the major types of ritual among the Maya, and how those rituals are manifested through art, writing, and material remains.

**Types of Ritual**

Chapter Two of this thesis included mention of specific life or crisis events in which rituals are enacted, such as birth, death, political ascension, and more. What do we know of the Classic Maya and their ritual, as it pertains to these events or others? First, we must acknowledge that we know about Maya rituals through archaeological evidence (including architecture, caches, offerings, and deposits), native written records (including glyphic inscriptions on pottery, sculpture, and codices), ethnographic accounts and ethnohistoric accounts (including the *Popol Vuh*, documents from Spanish contact), and art (including murals, polychrome pottery, codices,
and figurines). Second, let us review some of the major types of Classic Maya ritual: 1) royal rituals; 2) ancestral rituals; 3) feasting rituals; 4) world continuity rituals; 5) cosmologic rituals; and 6) dedicatory and termination rituals (Awe 2013; Chase and Chase 1998; Helmke et al. 2018; Hoggarth 2012; Martin and Grube 2000; McAnany 1995; McKillop 2004; Mock 1998; Tedlock 1996). An understanding of each of these ritual types helps show how important and interwoven ritual was for the Classic Maya and can provide clues toward the rituals potentially called upon by people at settlement abandonment. It is important to note that these classifications are not absolute; at times ritual acts can overlap with one another.

**Royal rituals.** Royal rituals were highly structured in use and practice and were called upon for a variety of reasons. For one, they were used to mark life events in the royal family. These rituals took place during times of royal accession, marriage, war, and death, and are understood in part due to their being recorded on stone stelae and on murals. A few of the royal ritual acts included the act of bloodletting (sometimes with participants beginning as young as 5 or 6 years old), fasting, and warfare campaigns. Bloodletting and fasting rituals helped the royal members of society access trance-like states, allowing them to communicate with various gods (McKillop 2004:241). During warfare campaigns, royal family members, including those waiting to ascend the throne, would take war captives and these events would be boastfully recounted on stelae. Other important royal life events including marriages, alliances, and victorious battles were also recorded in this way. Additionally, when the stelae were erected, a ceremony would be held and rituals would be enacted. These events included burning of incense along with scattering blood at the base of the stelae, mimicking ritually the events that occurred at the dawn of creation (Martin and Grube 2000:14). Interestingly, it has been argued that royal rituals were birthed from domestic rituals, but are larger in scale. In this, royal rituals occurred at the same
time and for similar reasons as domestic rituals, yet were conducted in different settings, and archaeologically the material remains of these rituals show increased quality, quantity, and diversity of items (Lucero 2003). Archaeologically, these ritual events would leave behind bloodletting implements like obsidian bladelets or stingray spines, burned botanical remains in ceramic vessels or censers usually deposited in front of the stelae or buried in a cache directly under or in front of the stelae, as well as the stelae recounting ritual events themselves. Additionally, we have evidence of these events in surviving artworks on murals and polychrome pottery, and in codices.

Ancestral rituals. Additionally, ancestral rituals were an important aspect of Maya life. After family members died, the Maya sometimes interred their ancestors either within the house platform or in an area just outside of it. The ritual act of interring ancestors not only served to honor family members through ritual acts in keeping them close, as the Maya believed their spirits did not die with the body, but it also supported family members’ claims and ties to specific locations on the land through time (McAnany 1995). This practice began in the Preclassic period as a local and domestic ritual at first, and was adopted by leaders and elites and scaled up to the interment of royal members in monumental architectural locations by the Middle Preclassic and on through the Late Classic period (from ~1000 BCE – 750 CE) (McAnany 1995; McKillop 2004). When this ancestral ritual became an aspect of royal life, the multifaceted face of ritual was exposed, as it simultaneously was an ancestral ritual and royal ritual. The archaeological signature of ancestral ritual includes human remains under housemound floors, or placed intrusively into preexisting buildings, benches, or floors. It is also evidenced in royal tombs and burials within monumental architecture. Additionally, royal ancestors were buried
Feasting rituals. Feasting events also had become quite ritualized by the Classic Period. Small scale feasts occurred at the familial and household level to mark life events and health, and large feasts often occurred at a community-wide level, being hosted or sponsored by the elites or royal members of the city (LeCount 2001; Lucero 2003). While small family feasts were ritual events that marked births, marriages, and deaths, the grand community events served political purposes directly and indirectly, creating cohesion and ties in communities and between polities. These large-scale rituals in part helped to assure the public that the divine rulers were in communication with and kept balance in spiritual world. Another aspect of ritual feasting at the community level included the exchange of gifts between elite members of society, with the purpose of cementing political ties. The Komkom Vase, made in Naranjo but recovered from a ritual deposit at Baking Pot, is a likely example of one of these types of political, ritual gifts (Helmke et al. 2018). Ritual feasting events were depicted on polychrome vessels. These ceramic items have shown feasting scenes with foods being presented to elites in procession, sometimes alongside war captives or slaves, expressing how deeply intertwined ritual events were in Classic Maya life (McKillop 2004). Archaeologically, feasting signatures can include complete serving dishes and vases, a large quantity of unusually sized or decorated vessels or bowls, celebratory or ritual foods like cacao or tobacco, faunal remains of large animals with butchering marks, and high frequency of food items (Aimers et al. 2020). These deposits are found most often in typical midden locations outside of domestic structures.

World continuity rituals. World continuity rituals were an important aspect of Classic Maya life as a part of keeping the world in balance and in continuation. Ritual events that
occurred either during natural phenomena like solstices or during specific calendrical dates of the Long Count calendar were attended by both elites and the general public. During the Classic Period, rulers performed these public rituals to mark the ending and restarting of a tun (360 days or approximately one solar year), k’atun (7,200 days or approximately 20 solar years), or bak’tun (144,000 days or approximately 400 solar years) to assure their community that the world would continue. These rituals also created a space for rulers to assert their divine connection to the gods. Acts in these rituals included bloodletting, burning of incense, and reenactments of the creation of the world (Pharo 2014). The Maya ballgame is argued to be one example of a world continuity event that became increasingly ritualized. Ballgame events ritually mimicked events in the Popol Vuh creation story in which the Hero Twins played the ballgame in the underworld during the creation of the world (Tedlock 1996). Additionally, the ballgame as played during the Classic Period became increasingly politicized with either allies playing to strengthen community ties, or warring polities playing for captives. Members of the royal family may have dressed in ballgame attire when attending or hosting ballgames as they were depicted in ballgame regalia on pottery or in murals (McKillop 2004). Seeing the emphasis placed on elite members of society as part of the ballgame showcased the political manipulation that could occur via ritual acts. These ritualized games among either allies or opposing communities were intended to show the public that rulers could help placate and balance spiritual forces and the gods to keep the world continuously moving. Through centuries of practice, we see that world continuity rituals served first to do just that, bring balance and continuity to the world, but the rituals served other purposes as well, including political aims. Archaeologically, these ritual acts would leave less of a direct signature in the way of material remains or deposits, but we understand continuity rituals through stelae and codices, as well as ethnohistoric accounts and
ethnographic analogy. At times, small deposits or caches are recovered from the base or just below stelae.

**Cosmologic rituals.** Cosmological ritual among the Ancient Maya was expressed in city planning and the layout of both households and monumental architecture. Expression of cosmological ritual included specific offerings or caches that representative of physical world and spirit realms that would be placed in distinct locations during building or expansion of monumental architecture (Awe 2013; Pierce 2016; Taschek and Ball 1999). Besides these types of symbolic offerings, building and built spaces themselves were representations of the cosmological worldview in order to create sacred locations linked to ritual (Ashmore and Sabloff 2002; Awe, personal communication 2017). Pyramids served as representations of mountains which signal the heavens, where the gods dwelled, and served as spaces where divine kings and queens communed with those gods, as well as were they were sometimes interred after death.

For the Classic Maya there were thirteen layers to heaven, oftentimes represented by the inclusion of thirteen doors on the face of monumental architecture, as is seen in the architecture at the sites of Xunantunich, Cahal Pech, and Caracol in Belize to name a few (Awe et al. 2017). On the other hand, the underworld, *Xibalba*, was associated with caves, cenotes, and ballcourts. Ritual acts were conducted specifically in these locations in order to connect the rituals to the spiritual underworld and the gods that lived there (Halperin et al. 2003; Stemp et al. 2019). Cosmological rituals have an archaeological signature of caches of artifacts. These are caches with two vessels placed lip-to-lip, presented as dedicatory offerings, as a physical representation of the Maya cosmos, with the upper bowl or stone acting as a representative of the heavens, the items within the cache as offerings from the human world, and the bottom bowl or stone representing the underworld, and are found under ballcourts, at doorways and in corners of
monumental architecture, or at the base of stelae (Awe 2013; Chase and Chase 1998; Pierce 2016:122).

**Dedictory and termination rituals.** Closely related to these cosmological rituals are dedicatory and termination rituals. The Maya understood the world around them to be imbued with spirits. This includes natural features such as mountains and trees, but also material constructions such as architecture and items like ceramic vessels. When certain buildings were erected, including public buildings, homes, ballcourts, and monumental architecture, offerings were placed during ritual acts at entry doors, the foot of the stairs, in corners or along the axis of the building, or buried just below the surface to consecrate, honor, or “activate” the spirit of that building and location. These dedicatory offerings could include botanic or faunal items, shell, bones, lithics, eccentric lithics, and at times lip-to-lip bowls (as discussed above) with offerings inside the bowls. Importantly, dedicatory offerings were often buried or enclosed into the building being erected (Aimers et al. 2020; Davis 2018; Lucero 2003:531). A similar type of ritual offering activity occurred in reverse. When a building was expanded, modified, or no longer used, it would be “terminated” ritually to release the spirit(s) of that space (Mock 1998). The deposits that result from this ritual activity are aptly named terminal deposits. These deposits have been discussed previously in this chapter as having been categorized as problematic deposits before a deeper understanding of them was reached. Termination deposits include a vast quantity of smashed ceramics, so as to release the spirit of the items and buildings from use (Davis 2018). If a site was terminated with reverence or was desecrated in an act of war or political strife, the archaeological signatures will look slightly different. In addition to smashed ceramics, we see human burials, both primary and secondary, without evidence for violence in reverential terminal deposits. In desecratory terminal deposits, we can still see human remains
interred, yet with evidence of violence, or evidence of looted primary burials. Surfaces and floors can be cut through, scratched, or burned. Monuments, as well as figurines if present, are likely to have been defaced. Lastly, the smashed ceramics in desecratory terminal deposits can be scattered at some distance (Aimers et al. 2020; Davis 2018). Archaeologically, the caching and buildup of these offerings are seen throughout the vast regions the Maya inhabited during the Classic Period. These offering caches or termination deposits were sometimes also placed in homes or in alleys and ballcourts for the same ritual purposes. In this, settlements are conceptualized in the same way throughout the Maya region, both in their foundation and abandonment.

Please note, the ritual categories described above are not completely distinct or separate from one another in theory or practice, nor do they encompass all of Classic Maya ritual. Many of these rituals and events discussed here had multiple meanings and occurred in various locations for purposes we are unable to understand through just the archaeological record. Rituals were conducted in caves, in the household, on ballcourts, and on pyramids and in temples, and likely in other locations we are unable to understand through the material record as well. They happened throughout all aspects of Maya life: during birth, life events, death, and beyond. Rituals were practiced for a multitude of reasons. Yes, they were used in *communitas*, to bring community together, especially while founding new sites to live in permanently. Through time, rituals were also used to gain or control political, economic, and spiritual aspects of life, and again, these categories are not exclusive. As is true for Maya today, Classic Maya lives were intertwined with rituals that were part of their culture and worldview and helped members of society to navigate their lives, communicate with one another in various manners, and gain favor with the gods, or political favor with other humans or communities (Bell 1992).
Figurines as Ritual Items

Figurines have been found at archaeological sites around the world. Almost as pervasive in scholarship and publications about figurines are statements repeated often that while archaeologists agree that figurines are likely ritual items, exactly what use(s) figurines had in rituals is contingent upon the context in which they were recovered. Therefore, figurines are seen in a variety of ritual aspects. Mesoamerican and Maya figurines are also understood and classified as ritual items with a variety of explanations proffered for their existence. Figurines are seen in some Maya studies as part of a standard and expected collection of household items (Gonlin 2007:99-100). Some scholars still conclude that Mesoamerican figurines were children’s toys (McCafferty 2007:234) while at the same time pointing toward an interpretation that they represent deities (McCafferty 2007). For Prudence Rice, figurines serve as educational cosmological tools and as societal signals, after Victor Turner’s “celebratory objects;” objects which included figurines as ritual items in his work among the Ndembu (Rice 2019:24-25; [Turner 1969:19] cited in Rice 2019:18). Some believe that figurines could represent items used for curing or medicinal or birthing rituals (Olson 2007:272). Still another interpretation is that figurines are physical and unique representations of ancestors (Awe 1992; DeLance, personal communication). Recently, work has been published suggesting that figurines “became individuals” during ritual, as an item or space to host ancestors and spirits so that they may be present for and participate in rituals (Marcus 2019). Most of the scholars cited here are careful to mention their interpretations could be incorrect, and point out that with figurines there are ranges of artistic expression exhibited, differences between regions, local or regional expressions, differences in meaning and use over time, and socioeconomic variations in the materials used to create figurines (Awe 1992; Gonlin 2007; Marcus 2019; McCafferty 2007; Olson 2007; Rice
2019). All of these concepts show that while figurines are classified under the single banner of ritual items archaeologically, the ritual aspect of figurines, like ritual itself, is multifaceted and complex, and a multitude of supporting evidence needs to be considered when analyzing figurines as ritual items. The majority of the research discussed above revolves around figurines recovered from domestic or household contexts. There is less information on figurines as ritual items in the context of elite households or ceremonial spaces. This is an additional problem to consider for the work here.

When considering the different interpretations of figurines, we look to where they were recovered. Figurines can oftentimes be found in domestic settings. When it comes to recovering figurines from problematic deposits, it is important to know the context of where they are found as much as when and where figurines are absent. Figurines are usually absent from middens and refuse. They are also usually absent from the evidence for feasting rituals. Figurines may be present in primary contexts during rapid abandonment, as they would be left in workshops or specialized areas. Figurines can be recovered from both dedicatory and termination deposits in certain contexts. They are seldom included in dedicatory caches or in lip-to-lip offerings, but have been found included in some instances (Marcus 2019). Additionally, dedicatory offerings are buried, and not left as deposits on floors or surfaces. In contrast, termination deposits are composed of accumulations of multiple artifacts (including figurines) on floors and surfaces. Figurines are also found in ancestor veneration and reverential terminal deposits (DeLance, personal communication). When recovered from desecratory terminal deposits, they have been broken, beheaded, or defaced.
Why the Baking Pot Collection is an Ideal Case Study

Considering the information presented in Chapter Two and here in Chapter Three about problematic deposits and different rituals among the Classic Maya, the Baking Pot figurine collection is an excellent collection of artifacts to answer the second research question. All of the ceramic items included in the collection were recovered from peri-abandonment deposits, both in the Group B site core and from domestic contexts at house mound excavation units. Exploring aspects of these figurines can help us to understand figurines as ritual items at the time of site abandonment. They were included in ritual acts of deposition during a time of change, and likely stress. Were they included in different locations for different rituals or purposes? The remainder of this thesis works to understand this role that ritual took during site abandonment.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter reintroduces the research questions of this thesis, provides information on the excavation and collection of the Baking Pot figurine collection, provides details of the research design of this project, and examines strengths and weaknesses of the figurine collection in regards to these research questions and project. The aim of this chapter is to clearly elucidate how each of the research questions is addressed. Brief discussions considering expectations and/or possible outcomes from the analysis and results are mentioned here and further addressed in Chapter Five.

The overarching goal of the research design of this project is to answer the question, “What role did ritual play during the abandonment of the community?” To further explore this question, a series of additional questions are asked and answered. These questions include: 1) How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned?; 2) What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot?; and 3) How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?

To address research question 1, I summarize the information provided in greater detail on artifacts included in peri-abandonment deposits from Chapter Three. I then define the content of the ritual offerings that make up the Baking Pot figurine collection by assigning the artifacts to distinct categories. I create an inventory of each of these deposit locations and include their contents.
To address research question 2, I compare how and when figurines and musical instruments—being ritual items that are part of the Baking Pot figurine collection—are used in Classic Maya ritual. I ascertain if figurines and musical instruments are found in royal rituals, ancestral rituals, feasting events, and the other ritual types I expressed and described in Chapter Three. Additionally, I compare how and when figurines and musical instruments are found in different types of problematic deposits.

Finally, to address the research questions listed under research question 3, I outline and identify the context for each deposit by outlining what locations are part of the domestic, ceremonial public and ceremonial restricted spaces around Baking Pot. I employ statistical testing to determine if different signals for rituals are present in these different spaces within Baking Pot itself.

**Excavation History of the Baking Pot Figurine Collection**

Chapter Three detailed the long excavation history at Baking Pot, as well as the work that led up to the peri-abandonment research that yielded the majority of the Baking Pot figurine collection. To recount briefly, BVAR Director Dr. Julie Hoggarth excavated housemounds at the site for her dissertation work, which yielded the artifacts from housemounds in the collection. These excavations took place during the summer field seasons between 2009 and 2015 at housemounds M-90, M-99, M-101, M-184, M-195, and M-410 (Figures 4.1 and 4.2). From these housemound excavations, the following counts of artifacts were recovered that are part of the Baking Pot figurine collection: one was recovered in 2009 (from M-99), two in 2010 (from M-90 and M-99), three in 2012 (from M-410), and one in 2015 (from M-101). Thirteen artifacts recovered from housemound excavations did not have a date listed on their artifact card (from M-184, M-195, and M-410), yet it is safe to assume that these thirteen artifacts were excavated
Figure 4.1: Locations of housemounds mentioned in this text.
(Modified from Hoggarth et al. 2016, Figure 1)
within these dates from 2009 to 2015, as other projects, including Dr. Hoggarth’s dissertation research, were conducted at and around these mounds during these field seasons.

Following her dissertation, Dr. Hoggarth began a project in the 2013 and 2014 field seasons to excavate monumental architecture in Group B to gain new insights into construction sequences and terminal occupation at Baking Pot. During these exploratory excavations, a large deposit was found in the southwest corner of Courtyard 3 (Figure 3.3) (Hoggarth and Sullivan 2015; Sullivan and Hoggarth 2015). Meanwhile, these large deposits were being uncovered at other BVAR project sites, and attention turned over the next few field seasons toward finding these locations via test pit excavations and recovering them at the sites of Baking Pot, Cahal Pech, Xunantunich, and Lower Dover (Alvarado et al. 2018; Beardall 2017; Hoggarth et al. 2016; Lonaker et al. 2017; Romih et al. 2018). The targeted peri-abandonment excavations in Group B at Baking Pot took place during the summer field seasons between 2012 and 2016 in Plaza B and Courtyards 1, 3, 4, and 5 across the site. Peri-abandonment deposits were found in
the northeast and southeast corners of Plaza B, and in the southwest corner of Courtyard 3. Seven additional test pits were placed throughout Courtyards 1, 3, 4, and 5 at Group B, but peri-abandonment deposits were not located there (Figure 3.5). These test pits were chosen specifically based on information gathered about peri-abandonment deposits found throughout the Belize River Valley. From these Group B excavations, the following counts of artifacts were recovered that are part of the Baking Pot figurine collection: one was recovered in 2012 (excavation unit location not recorded), one hundred twenty-two in 2013 (from Courtyard 3 excavation units B14 and B15), thirty-four in 2015 (from Plaza B excavation units B2, B6, and B7, as well as from Courtyard 3 excavation unit B15), and twenty-eight in 2016 (from Plaza B excavation units B2, B6, and B7). Two artifacts recovered from Group B excavations did not have a date listed on their artifact card (from Plaza B excavation unit B2 and from Courtyard 3 excavation unit B15), yet again, it is safe to assume that these two artifacts were excavated within these dates from 2012 to 2016, as these were the years in which targeted excavations on peri-abandonment deposits took place in Group B.

**Project Research Design**

Having outlined the background information on the excavation of the Baking Pot figurine collection, I now turn to outlining each research question included in this thesis project and the research design I use to address them in detail. Each question includes justifications and predictions. Again, each of these questions are designed to answer the overall question of this thesis, which asks, “What role did ritual play during the abandonment of a community?”

**Question 1**

Research question 1 asks: “How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned?” In order to answer this question, and to
further understand the artifacts in the Baking Pot figurine collection, I categorize the artifacts included in this collection to develop an artifact profile of items placed into ritual peri-abandonment deposits during the time of site abandonment by the Classic Maya. I divide the artifacts into five distinct classes, that I define below. Once I have categorized the artifacts in the collection, I calculate and present an inventory of the items, describing what artifacts were recovered from which locations. By understanding what categories of artifacts were included in peri-abandonment deposits in domestic or ceremonial open or ceremonial restricted contexts we can begin to understand what rituals were being expressed by the Ancient Maya at Baking Pot during site abandonment. Each of the three research questions compare my results to the different types of ritual and problematic deposits as expressed in Chapter Three. Question 1 looks at the types of artifacts present in the Baking Pot figurine collection. Question 2 looks specifically at figurines and musical instruments. Question 3 looks at the locations they were deposited in. In this, my null hypothesis is that I expect to find that ritual expression was similar throughout Baking Pot, both in domestic and in ceremonial open and ceremonial restricted spaces.

The Baking Pot Figurine Collection is comprised of ceramic artifacts categorized as “Special Finds” during excavation due to their unique and outstanding diagnostic traits. This collection includes mostly figurines and figurine fragments, but also features anthropomorphic and zoomorphic ceramic musical instruments, censers with anthropomorphic traits, as well as ceramic beads and undefined fragments. These artifacts are analyzed together under the designation of a figurine collection due to their similar qualities, as well as for ease and clarity in discussion.
All of the ceramic special finds in this collection have been classified into 5 distinct categories based on their diagnostic features and stylistic traits. These categories are: 1) figurines, 2) musical instruments, 3) censers, 4) ceramic beads, and 5) undefined fragments. Figure 4.1 presents the procedure for classifying each artifact into a category. Additionally, Appendix A of this thesis features the entire inventory of this collection to date that includes the item’s catalog or special finds number, photographs, location it was excavated from, the artifact category assigned (described immediately below), what—if any—morphological features are present (either anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, or unknown), and a description. My 2017 field season was spent documenting and photographing 163 ceramic special find artifacts, which account for 78.7% of the total collection. Forty-four additional items were documented, photographed, and added to the collection during the 2018 analysis. Here I present an introductory description of each category and their defining features.

![Artifact classification flowchart](image_url)
**Figurines.** Figurines in this collection are ceramic anthropomorphic or zoomorphic figures, whether complete or fragmentary. Figurine fragments in this collection include (but are not limited to) items such as hair or headdress fragments, appendages such as hands or feet, face fragments, torso, animal ears, or animal tails. The ceramic artifact may be lacking additional diagnostic features but must have at least one trait present that clearly shows it was part of a figurine before being classified as such. If no diagnostic trait is present or clear enough to classify an artifact as a figurine, it is considered for the other four categories. If it does not fit into any other category, it is classified as an undefined fragment. Figure 4.4 is one example of this category.

![Figurine fragment showing human head with natural degradation, but clearly still showing hair and a traveler's or merchant hat.](image)
**Musical instruments.** Musical instruments in this collection are ceramic artifacts that are either whole or a part of a musical instrument, sometimes with an anthropomorphic or zoomorphic design or applique. Musical instrument fragments include (but are not limited to) ocarina mouthpieces, flute mouthpieces, bases of flutes, ocarina body fragments with finger stops, flute body fragments with finger stops, and appliques no longer attached to a flute. The ceramic artifact may be lacking additional diagnostic features but must have one of these traits present that clearly shows it was part of a musical instrument before being classified as such. If no diagnostic trait is present or clear enough to classify an artifact as a musical instrument, it is re-examined first to determine if it is a figurine or figurine fragment, and if not, it is then examined for the other three categories. It if does not fit into any other category, it is classified as an undefined fragment. Figure 4.5 is one example of a musical instrument from this collection.

Figure 4.5: BKP-00054. A musical instrument from this collection. Flute fragment with mold-made applique face and hand-made earspools and design around face. Maya Blue paint present.
Censers. Censers in this collection are ceramic artifacts that are an *incensario* (incense burner) fragment, oftentimes with an anthropomorphic or zoomorphic design. Censer fragments include (but are not limited to) bases, arms, and body fragments featuring anthropomorphic noses and mouths as exit points for smoke and incense. It is important to note that holes in ceramic items could be present on items to prevent explosion during the firing process. The censers in this collection were considered for this and truthed against other known censers in the Belize River Valley for comparison and categorization. The ceramic artifacts may be lacking additional diagnostic features but must have one of these traits present that clearly shows it was part of a censer before being classified as such. If no diagnostic traits are present or clear enough to classify an artifact as a censer, it is examined to determine if it is part of the other four categories. If it does not fit into any other category, it is classified as an undefined fragment. Figure 4.6 is one example of a ceramic censer from this collection.

![Figure 4.6: BKP-00022. A censer from this collection. Note that it is anthropomorphic, and shows a nose and mouth, both with holes in them to release smoke from the interior of the vessel.](image-url)
**Ceramic beads.** Ceramic beads in this collection are small objects with a very small longitudinal or transverse hole (measuring 1 to 2 mm in width) drilled through the center of the item. These artifacts in this collection never have anthropomorphic or zoomorphic features associated with them and are undecorated. There are two types of beads in this collection, unslipped, thick, and long, oval-shaped beads with a very small hole compared to the bead, and slipped, thin, and fragile tube-shaped beads whose hole is as thick as the wall of the bead. These artifacts were included as part of the collection as they are ceramic special find artifacts from peri-abandonment deposits. They are not figurine appendages, as these do not have holes through their centers. They are not considered for other categorical classifications as they are standalone artifacts. Figure 4.7 is an example of the unslipped, thick and long oval-shaped bead from this collection.

![Figure 4.7: SF B17-49. A ceramic bead from this collection. Item includes a longitudinal hole throughout. This item was broken in three pieces and rearticulated in the field using B72.](image)

**Undefined fragments.** Undefined fragments in this collection lack diagnostic features or clear delineations to classify them as any of the four categories listed directly above. Undefined fragments sometimes feature an unusual shape (like a conical protrusion) or design (like incised
lines) but lack other diagnostic traits. Oftentimes, undefined fragments were recorded together under one special find or catalog number and include multiple small fragments that were excavated together but do not articulate. Figure 4.8 is one example of undefined fragments from this collection.

Figure 4.8: SF B17-14L. Undefined fragments from this collection. While these fragments exhibit design and shape, there is not enough diagnostic material present to classify them confidently.
Question 2

The second research question asks, “What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot?” In order to answer this question, I turn again to the categories outlined above under Question 1. I examine each of the five artifact categories (figurines, musical instruments, censers, ceramic beads, and undefined fragments), and compare their occurrence to royal rituals, ancestral rituals, feasting rituals, world continuity rituals, cosmologic rituals, or dedicatory and termination rituals. These types of Classic Maya ritual were discussed at length already in Chapter 3, and the answer to this question draws on that previously presented research and evidence. Presenting these findings is important to understanding what possible rituals were taking place during site abandonment, or what items were repurposed from different rituals for the ritual act of peri-abandonment behavior during site decline.

Question 3

Question 3 asks two questions to understand spatial aspects of ritual during site decline. These questions are, “How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?” To answer these questions, I first review the Baking Pot deposits and categorize them by their location within different sectors of the site, assigning them to either domestic, ceremonial open, or ceremonial restricted spaces. I then compare the context of peri-abandonment deposits to the different types of ritual discussed previously. I continue by comparing the assemblages in the domestic settings to those from Group B. The Baking Pot figurine collection is biased toward ceremonial contexts, not domestic, and the discussion in Chapter Five provides further understanding of that bias. Lastly, I statistically evaluate assemblage differences between open versus restricted spaces.
within the ceremonial architecture of Group B. I employ chi-square tests specifically to
determine if there is an association with artifact category (figurine or musical instrument) and
location of deposit it was recovered from. I chose chi-square tests for their ability to express the
strength of associations between artifact categories and location (ceremonial open or ceremonial
restricted spaces) at the site. In order to determine if the artifacts of this collection were signaling
different expressions of peri-abandonment ritual that were occurring in open or restricted
ceremonial locations in Group B due to artifact density differentiation I run these statistical
evaluations comparing the major artifact categories in the collection by location. These tests
reveal if different artifact types are being used at different locations for possibly different ritual
purposes before being placed or offered into the peri-abandonment deposits. A null hypothesis
would be that deposits in the domestic area of Baking Pot are the same as those found in the
ceremonial open and ceremonial restricted Group B deposit locations.

Data Collection

To start gathering data for this research project, I spent two field seasons in Belize
examining the Baking Pot figurine collection. At this time, I followed the flowchart for artifact
classification (Figure 4.3) to start my data collection. Additional reference information about the
excavation was taken from the object’s artifact card. I created two pages in one Excel
spreadsheet (Appendix B), one for the Group B findings and one for the household excavation
findings. I created columns that included the catalog number and special finds number of the
artifact to keep an inventory and for reference, with an additional space for artifact category and
morphological representation; did the artifact exhibit anthropomorphic or zoomorphic features,
or none at all? In order to understand breakage patterns or distributions of fragmented items, I
next listed total item counts, ranging from one to 32 fragments for each individual catalogued
Next, to aid in understanding spatial aspects of the collection for the chi-square tests, I recorded the building adjacent to each deposit. Additionally, I recorded the lot and lot composition, both so that I would have fine details about stratigraphic level. For understanding the items once I left Belize (as special finds artifacts cannot be exported for research purposes), I also recorded verbatim the description from each artifact card as it was recorded in the field during excavation. To expand upon that, I created a personal description column describing each item in detail for reference while looking at photos and analyzing the collection at home. Lastly, in order to have a reference and point of contact for any questions that might arise, I recorded the excavation date, the site supervisor’s name, and any additional comments they made. And in this, I considered including other categories at the start, including specific dimensions and weights, and materials used (paste, temper, slipped or unslipped, etc.), but I am not addressing issues of production or trade, and this information would not distinguish between different types of ritual.

After recording these data, I photographed every item in the collection. I used a 1’x1’ piece of black felt as a backdrop and a centimeter scale. All photos were taken on my personal 12 megapixels with f/2.4 telephoto lens Samsung Galaxy Note 8 smartphone camera. I captured a minimum of three photographs of every item in the collection, including photos both with and without flash. The photos without flash provided me with different shadows, coloring, and angles from the photographs taken with flash. I did this to reference different minute details in the artifacts when I returned home. All of the artifact photos are presented in Appendix A in this thesis.

To process these photographs, I uploaded them to the cloud, and renamed the photograph after the catalog number or special finds number (if the item had not had a catalog number assigned to it yet). Different angles of the same artifact were numbered. For example, the three
photographs taken for catalog number BKP-00015 would be titled BKP-00015_1, BKP-00015_2, and BKP-00015_3. I cropped each photo, including the entire 10-centimeter scale at the base of each photo. The top and right and left edges of the photograph were cropped closely to the artifact but did not so close as to touch it or obscure the item in anyway. This cropping was done to organize all the photographs in the same manner for consistency and clarity when reviewing them. No color correction or filters were placed on the photographs.

The final piece of data collection I conducted involved attempting to refit any of the figurines and artifacts. I laid out the artifacts from each excavation unit until all 207 cataloged items were available for these refits. Any item that was complete and unfragmented was placed back in its specimen bag and put away. I then spent about one week going through the items to attempt refits, and none were present. This completed data collection for this research project.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Data Set**

Based on the preliminary descriptive data above, the Baking Pot figurine collection is robust for a Classic Maya site of this size. 207 catalogued items in one collection attests to the density of peri-abandonment deposits. This sample size is well suited to answer the research questions for this project. It is a strength of this collection that this many artifacts come from multiple excavation units that include ritual activity occurring over a specific and short period of time during the site’s depopulation and abandonment. These figurines and ceramic items offer an interesting way in which to answer the research questions of this project.

It is important to note here that it can be problematic to analyze these ceramic items in the absence of the other offering components. This concern has been addressed in Chapters Three and Six. Here again I state that this project moves forward with the understanding that this analysis, along with other detailed analyses of artifact classes from the Baking Pot peri-
abandonment deposits, can offer insights into individual deposits within the site, as well as regional variation between peri-abandonment deposits between sites in the Belize River Valley.

A weakness of this dataset for answering the research questions is the difference in sample size between the Group B excavations that targeted peri-abandonment deposits and the housemound excavations that did not. Some of the artifacts from the housemound sample were excavated during Dr. Julie Hoggarth’s dissertation research exploring social and political reorganization at commoner households just prior to and during the Classic Maya collapse (Hoggarth 2012). Therefore, excavations at the housemounds were carried out with different research questions in mind than those that took place in Group B. Other figurines from the housemound excavations do indeed come from a problematic deposit, discussed previously as a termination deposit (du Menil 2014). These previous findings can be reanalyzed in future work to consider if indeed this was in fact a peri-abandonment deposit.

Additionally, the sample size of figurines for varies greatly by context. The Baking Pot figurine collection is biased toward ceremonial contexts, not domestic. To better understand ritual behavior at the domestic level, excavation would need to be carried out that specifically target peri-abandonment deposits in order to assemble a larger sample size of artifacts from domestic contexts. This targeted excavation work at the domestic level would allow a more robust assessment of whether different ritual behaviors are happening in ceremonial and domestic spaces during site abandonment. This issue of small domestic sample size is addressed in the statistical tests, in which I have made the choice to run tests exclusively on artifacts recovered from Group B.
CHAPTER V
FIGURINE COLLECTION ANALYSES AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of this study with details on data analysis and tests conducted on the Baking Pot figurine collection to answer the research questions of this thesis. Each question is be repeated and the findings will be shared and addressed. Immediately following the results for each question is a discussion of these findings. Each of these questions work toward answering the overall research question of this thesis: “What role does ritual play during the abandonment of a community?”

Question 1

Question 1 of this project asks: “How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned?”

Question 1 Results

We now understand that the Ancient Maya of Baking Pot created peri-abandonment deposits during the time they were depopulating and moving away from their site. These deposits include a multitude of artifacts, including Terminal Classic polychrome jars and pottery, faunal remains, lithics (including chert and obsidian), freshwater shell, marine shell, jade, human remains, ceramic figurines, musical instruments, and censers. Analyses of each of these artifact classes and types are or have been recently undertaken (Davis 2018; Hoggarth et al. 2020; Tappan 2020). As mentioned previously, we look specifically at the inclusion of figurines and other ceramic special find artifacts as evidence for items that were used to express ritual in their placement and inclusion in peri-abandonment deposits at Baking Pot.

The Baking Pot figurine collection is made up of 207 catalogued items and 444 individual ceramic pieces. Of these 207 catalogued items, 87% (n=180) are single artifacts listed
under one catalog or special find number, 7.8% (n=16) include two or more fragmented artifacts in direct association with each other, and 5.2% (n=11) include two or more fragmented artifacts that were not originally the same item but were found in association with one another during excavations.

To further understand the composition of artifact categories in this collection, I present the total counts of each artifact by classification. These artifacts were categorized using the flowchart presented in Chapter 4 (Figure 4.3). Table 5.1 first breaks down the 207 catalogued items by these classification types and presents totals for both the Group B and the housemound excavation findings. This collection includes a total of 95 figurines, 72 musical instruments, 7 censers, 13 ceramic beads, and 20 undefined fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT CLASS</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>HOUSEMOUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGURINE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95 artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.9% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72 artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.8% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERAMIC BEAD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDEFINED FRAGMENTS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>207 artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because the Baking Pot figurine collection came from domestic and ceremonial open and ceremonial restricted locations at Baking Pot, I also detail the total counts and distributions of the artifact categories from these different locations by separating the housemound excavations artifacts and Group B artifacts. Table 5.2 expresses the total percentages and counts of artifacts found during the housemound excavation units, and Table 5.3 presents the percentages and counts of artifacts from the Group B excavation units.

### TABLE 5.2 Total counts and percentages of ceramic special finds artifacts by category from domestic excavations at Baking Pot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT HOUSEMOUND ARTIFACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGURINE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERAMIC BEAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDEFINED FRAGMENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5.3 Total counts and percentages of ceramic special finds artifacts by category from Group B excavations at Baking Pot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT GROUP B ARTIFACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGURINE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERAMIC BEAD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDEFINED FRAGMENTS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 1 Discussion**

With the data presented above, we see that ritual was expressed by the inclusion of various items into peri-abandonment deposits by the Classic Maya during site abandonment. These items include a high count of figurines as well as musical instruments which are both extensively documented as ritual items. A total of 80.7% of the collection is in fact just those two categories, with 13% of the collection accounting for censers (ritual items) and undefined fragments that were likely figurines based on their size and inclusion. Only 9.6% of the collection are classified as undefined (n=20), and it is important to note that this classification errs on the side of caution. Many of the undefined fragments could be pigeonholed into one category or another, but it is important to be conservative with these classifications to create a strong dataset for additional testing to answer the research questions. This means 90.4% of the collection is preserved well enough to identify diagnostic features and to clearly classify the items. Additionally, 6.3% of the collection is comprised of ceramic beads, separated out here specifically as these are likely items of adornment as jewelry or part of clothing. This means 93.7% of the total ceramic special finds collection are ritual items, and the 6.3% ceramic beads are non-ritual, or adornment.

**Question 2**

Question 2 of this project asks, “What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot?”

**Question 2 Results**

In an effort to further understand the artifact categories present in the Baking Pot figurine collection, it is important to examine what problematic deposits these sorts of artifacts are found in. Table 5.4 expresses when figurines or musical instruments are found in the five different
types of problematic deposits discussed in detail in Chapter Three. This table includes peri-
abandonment deposits as problematic deposits to consider these results.

Table 5.4: Instances when figurines or musical instruments are found in problematic deposits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Figurines</th>
<th>Musical Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middens or refuse</td>
<td>Rare evidence</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid abandonment</td>
<td>Rare evidence</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasting debris</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Rare evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination deposits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-abandonment deposits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the course of this research, I found that figurines are considered ritual items, with different theories and explanations presented for how they were used as ritual items. Figurine research within the BVAR project has argued that figurines serve as ancestral representations, and are a key piece of ancestral ritual (DeLance, personal communication). Additionally, figurines have been suggested to be used in the Maya world as items that a spirit or ancestor could inhabit to participate in rituals (Marcus 2019). Table 5.5 presents a synthesis of the previous discussion about ritual and showcases when figurines are considered a part of the rituals listed.

Table 5.5: Instances when figurines or musical instruments are included in different rituals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Figurines</th>
<th>Musical Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal ritual</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancestral ritual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasting ritual</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World continuity ritual</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmologic ritual</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination ritual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-abandonment ritual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2 Discussion

Table 5.4 compares these two artifact categories (figurines and musical instruments) with different problematic deposits discussed in detail in Chapter Three. Figurines could be found in middens and during rapid abandonment events, yet the other artifacts and context of these problematic deposits clarifies the nature of those contexts. Musical instruments are also recovered from termination deposits and peri-abandonment deposits. Instruments could be found in association with feasting debris, but again, the other artifacts and evidence of instruments being found in this context indicates a specific ritual situation that has clear lines of evidence supporting it. Musical instruments are not found in association with middens or rapid abandonment problematic deposits.

Table 5.5 then compares two of the artifact categories of the Baking Pot figurine collection and different rituals that were detailed in Chapter Three. Figurines have been directly associated with ancestral, dedicatory, and termination rituals. There is, at times, evidence for figurines being included in royal rituals, world continuity rituals, and feasting rituals, while there is little to no evidence that ceramic figurines were used cosmologic rituals. When considering musical instruments as ritual items, most of our evidence for their inclusion in ritual acts involves artistic representations of music. An example of this includes the famous Bonampak murals (Miller 1988). Based on the artistic dataset, we know that musical instruments are part of royal rituals, as well as part of termination rituals, based on the inclusion of musical instruments in termination deposits. There is some evidence that musical instruments were included in ancestral, feasting, and cosmologic rituals. There is no evidence that musical instruments were a part of world continuity rituals. That does not mean they were not used in these rituals. It simply means we must gather and utilize sufficient archaeological, ethnographic, or ethnohistoric
evidence for it, such as is done through the utilization of the direct historic approach to understand figurines standing in as ancestors and spirits during a variety of rituals as proposed by Joyce Marcus (2019). Importantly, the only overlapping evidence we have of both figurines and musical instruments being included in rituals is in the instance of termination rituals and peri-abandonment rituals (as termination rituals that occur during site abandonment).

**Question 3**

Question 3 of this project asks: “How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?”

**Question 3 Results**

The final question(s) of this project are multi-faceted in order to best understand the spatial distribution of ritual activities occurring inside Baking Pot during the time of site abandonment. Here I break each of the questions apart to address them. Additionally, I address each of the spaces in Baking Pot specifically as domestic (any housemound located outside of Groups A or B at Baking Pot), ceremonial open (Group B Plaza B), and ceremonial restricted (Group B Courtyard 3). Following these definitions, artifacts recovered from housemounds M-90, M-99, M-101, M-184, M-195, and M-410 are considered domestic findings, artifacts recovered from excavation units B2, B6, and B7 are considered ceremonial open findings, and artifacts recovered from excavation units B14 and B15 are considered ceremonial restricted findings.

**How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core?** Before exploring the data present for different ritual activities occurring in different spaces within the Baking Pot site core, I present the data outlining the stratigraphic
locations each of the collection items were recovered from. This aligns with the data that all of these artifacts were recovered from peri-abandonment deposits and their associated and immediately adjacent strata. Figure 5.1 details the total distribution of the Baking Pot figurine collection artifacts as found in during the peri-abandonment deposit excavation (by stratigraphic level). Items recovered from the bulk of the peri-abandonment deposits (titled “P-A Deposits” in Figure 5.1) directly account for nearly two-thirds of this collection, at 65.3% (n=122). Directly above the peri-abandonment deposits were stratigraphic layers of humus and collapse. The humic layer accounted for 5.3% of artifacts from this collection (n=10), and the collapse layer accounted for 28.3% of artifacts from this collection (n=53). These artifacts are still understood to be part of the peri-abandonment deposit in their direct connection to the deposit as stratigraphically directly above the bulk of the deposit. Two artifacts did not have the stratigraphic level recorded, which accounts for 1.1% of the entire collection.

![Artifacts Recovered by Stratigraphic Level at Peri-Abandonment Deposits](image)

**Figure 5.1: Distribution of artifacts by excavation level in Group B excavations**

Having confirmed that each of the artifacts from Group B in this collection are directly from and associated with peri-abandonment deposits, I turn to analyzing the excavation unit and location they were excavated from. To address contextual variability, I compiled data deposit
Figure 5.2 outlines these distributions for Group B artifacts. 58.3% of the artifacts from the Group B came from excavation units located adjacent to structure B15 (n=109), the southernmost structure in Courtyard 3. An additional 9.1% of this figurine collection was recovered from excavations adjacent to structure B14 (n=17), the westernmost structure in Courtyard 3. This courtyard is toward the remote, restricted access area of Group B in contrast to the easily accessible and open area in Plaza B. Courtyard 3 would have, during Baking Pot’s height, served as a private, elite space. As such, the peri-abandonment deposit that was placed and accumulated here was located in an elite, less-accessible location (Figure 3.5). 67.4% of the Baking Pot figurine collection was recovered from the ceremonial restricted space. Thus, the remaining 32.1% of the Group B artifacts were recovered from the ceremonial open space (Figure 5.3). The deposit with the next highest frequency of figurines from a peri-abandonment deposit is adjacent to Structure B6, located on the north side of the central, open Plaza B. Yet even this artifact density only accounts for 19.3% of the total count of Group B artifacts (n=36). It is understood that this is not a result of sampling error or oversight. As mentioned previously, test pits and other excavation units were placed throughout Group B
plazas in multiple corners to ensure that each of the targeted excavations was meant to address the issue of peri-abandonment deposits (Hoggarth 2019, personal communication). Adjacent to Structure B6 on the east is Structure B7, and excavation units in front of this structure accounted for 6.9% of the collection (n=13). The final Plaza B deposit was located adjacent to Structure B2, on the south side of the plaza, with 5.9% of the figurine collection from this location (n=11). 0.5% of the Group B artifacts are listed as unknown location (n=1), as it was not recorded on the artifact card. Figure 3.5 detailed the locations of where these deposits were located, in addition to the test units that returned no deposit results from Courtyards 1, 3, 4, and 5 in Group B. These results indicate that different ritual activities could be occurring in different spaces within the Group B site core restricted and open spaces.

![Artifact Totals by Ceremonial Location in Group B](image)

**Figure 5.3: Distribution of artifacts by ceremonial location in Group B**

**Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?** My first step in answering this question brought me back to Tables 5.2 and 5.3. A total of 90.3% of the artifacts in this collection were recovered from Group B excavations with 9.7% of the total collection having come from housemound excavations. The first step in understanding this question was to gather data on the stratigraphic layers and artifact category comparison, presented here.
To elucidate the stratigraphic layers in which the domestic artifacts were recovered, I found that distributions of artifacts at the housemound excavations include 15% from the bulk of the peri-abandonment deposit (n=3). Additionally, 65% of the domestic ceramic special finds were recovered from humus (n=13), 10% from collapse (n=2), and 10% unlabeled (n=2). Each of these levels were recorded in association with a peri-abandonment deposit. It has been noted previously that items found in collapse can possibly be associated with termination deposit behavior, as ethnographic accounts record Maya pulling down part of their home structure when terminating the building to place on top of the deposit (Lucero 2003:531, citing Stross 1998).

Regarding the artifact categories, 75% of the housemound artifacts (from the ceramic special finds artifacts recovered there) are categorized as figurines. Additionally, 15% of the artifacts from the housemounds are censers, with 10% categorized as musical instruments. Domestic contexts yielded no ceramic beads or undefined fragments.

Next, I examined the excavation history of both the Group B and housemound excavations to analyze what activities were occurring in what spaces of the site. I found that 70% of the artifacts in this collection were recovered from M-410 (n=14), a large housemound structure located approximately 870 meters to the west of Group B (Figure 4.2). No other mound comes close to this density of artifacts recovered, with a report that the artifacts recovered from locations M-410A and M-410B (classifying two structures at M-410) were in fact from a terminal deposit (du Menil 2014). It is unclear at this time if this terminal deposit is instead a peri-abandonment deposit. M-99 accounts for 10% of the collection items from housemound excavations (n=2), with M-90, M-101, M-184, and M-195 all accounting for 5% of the collection each (n=1 from each location). Interestingly, four of the housemounds that yielded figurines for this collection have been classified socioeconomically through various research projects. M-410,
or Lubul Huh, is classified as a non-royal, noble housemound, along with M-99. M-90 is classified as a “high status commoner housemound” with M-184 classified as a “low status commoner housemound.” No socioeconomic classifications for M-101 and M-195 have been listed to date (du Menil 2014; Hoggarth 2012). Table 5.6 streamlines these findings. This distribution suggests that socioeconomic status of the household affects the use of figurines in peri-abandonment ritual.

To further understand the data collected to answer these research questions, I decided to conduct chi-square tests to see if there is an association between the artifact categories and the locations in which they were found. First, I considered the importance of testing artifact categories themselves. There is a large enough sample size of figurines and musical instruments that can be tested against ceremonial open and ceremonial restricted spaces. The artifact category counts from domestic excavations are too small to be included in these tests, and their inclusion in termination deposits can be reconsidered in the future if sample size increases.

Table 5.6: Domestic artifacts found by housemound socioeconomic status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
<th>Lubul Huh M-410</th>
<th>M-99</th>
<th>M-90</th>
<th>M-184</th>
<th>M-101</th>
<th>M-195</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artifact Count</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total % Domestic Ceramic Special Finds Artifacts</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to this, I considered it important to consider the morphologic features of the items included in this collection. Figurines inherently are anthropomorphic or zoomorphic artistic representations, and they make up a total of 42.8% of the ceremonial Group B ceramic special find artifacts (n=80). Of these 80 figurines, 70% show clear morphological features (n=56). Musical instruments make up an additional 37.4% of the ceremonial Group B items (n=70), with some of these instruments featuring anthropomorphic or zoomorphic morphological traits. Of the 70 musical instruments from these ceremonial spaces, 30%, or nearly a third, have clear morphological features present (n=21). Either the entire instrument can have an anthropomorphic or zoomorphic form (as is the case with many of the collection’s ocarinas), or decorative appliques can represent anthropomorphic features (as is seen in the collection’s flutes and flute fragments). Combined, figurines and musical instruments with morphological features account for a total of 41.2% of the ceremonial ceramic special find collection (n=77). Censers also tend to have decorative features. Fifty percent of censer fragments clearly express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic features (n=2). Therefore, a total of 42.2% of the items from Group B shows clearly distinguishable figurine-like features, be it representations of humans or animals (n=79).

Chi-square test results. I chose chi-square tests to further examine categorical relationships between the artifacts in the Baking Pot figurine collection and different ceremonial locations in Group B, both open and restricted spaces, that the peri-abandonment deposits were located in. These tests are meant to answer the research questions about differences in ritual activity occurring at Baking Pot, as well as to understand and answer questions about differences in the figurine collection itself.
Two chi-square tests were utilized to examine spatial locations and artifact type. Considering the relatively large number of Group B figurines (n=80) and musical instruments (n=70), a chi-square test was used to see if there was a significant difference between placement of the artifact by location in Group B and artifact category as either a figurine or musical instrument. Secondly, 42.2% of the Group B ceramic special find artifacts has clear anthropomorphic or zoomorphic traits associated with the artifacts (n=79), therefore the second chi-square test looked for significance between placement of the artifact by location and figurine collection category. These tests assume that physical traits of the artifacts signal different uses or ritual meanings, as well as the belief that different types of rituals occurred in open or restricted locations in Group B. Table 5.7 presents the results of both chi-square tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artifact Category by Ceremonial Location</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology by Ceremonial Location</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3 Discussion**

Question 3 includes multiple questions; each is addressed in this discussion. First, there is some indication that different nuances in ritual are taking place in the ritual activity in the ceremonial open and ceremonial restricted spaces in Group B at Baking Pot. The figurine collection shows that figurines, musical instruments, censers, ceramic beads, and additional undefined ceramic fragments are being placed in deposits in ceremonial restricted space twice as often as they are the ceremonial open space. This trend continues into the domestic areas, where no ceramic beads or undefined fragments were recovered at all.
Additionally, the items recovered from the ceremonial spaces are all from peri-abandonment deposits, in contrast to those recovered from domestic settings. Ten percent of the ceramic special find artifacts were recovered directly from the deposit excavated at M-410 (n=2), while 46.5% of the ceremonial open and restricted space artifacts were recovered directly from the peri-abandonment deposits themselves (n=87). The other artifacts included in this collection come from strata that are either directly above or directly below the main deposits themselves. That being said, it is important to note that 70% of the ceramic special find domestic artifacts were recovered from strata associated with or inside of a peri-abandonment deposit (n=14). The terminal deposit at M-410 deserves a review to determine its classification as a terminal or peri-abandonment deposit. Overall, it can be said that ritual activity is similar but not identical between domestic and ceremonial spaces within Baking Pot as viewed through this study.

Lastly, it was noted that ritual items are being placed into the peri-abandonment deposits in the ceremonial restricted space twice as often as they are ceremonial open spaces. The chi-square tests looked at artifact category and morphological expressions to determine if either of these aspects of the figurine collection could offer clues to this deposit discrepancy. The chi-square test results are discussed below.

**Discussion of Chi-square test results.** Results of these chi-square tests show that there is likely no association between the location of the deposit (open or restricted) and the category of artifact found in them (p = .444). Objects are more common in ceremonial restricted spaces but they are the same or very similar distributions of the same categories of artifacts as in ceremonial open locations. Note, Appendix C includes these test results, and in early tests, ceremonial restricted spaces are listed there as “private,” and ceremonial open spaces are listed as “public.” Additionally, there seems to be no significant association between the morphological features
(anthropomorphic or zoomorphic) present on the collection artifacts and the location in which they were deposited in (p=.938). Future research will need to consider other manners in which to analyze these data, as there is likely some reason why deposits in the restricted courtyard location had more artifacts in their deposits than were recovered in the open plaza deposits. While it can be stated that there is a higher density of these ritual artifacts at structures B14 and B15 then at any other location in Group B to date, there is no distinction between the artifacts in different locations as studied here. Future research can examine other considerations, including different iconographic distinctions not studied here, or possibly source the ceramic material present in the artifacts themselves using XRF or other tests. This is discussed further in Chapter Six.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Discussion

This thesis has examined ritual and the role it takes, both in the foundation of communities theoretically, as well as in the decline and depopulation of sites. Looking directly at the site of Baking Pot, a Classic Maya mid-level political site near modern day San Ignacio, Belize, I have examined the excavation history and the Belize Valley Archaeological Reconnaissance Project’s focus on ritual peri-abandonment deposit behavior at the site to better understand ritual at site decline and abandonment. Ceramic figurines and musical instruments received specific attention to answer the research questions guiding this thesis: How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned? What kinds of deposits do we find ritual artifacts—such as figurines and musical instruments—in during the abandonment of Baking Pot? How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core?

Findings of this Research

This thesis has identified answers to each of the three separate research questions. These questions have been explored and answered throughout the previous chapters (Chapters Two through Five). A discussion of each of the questions and the findings of this thesis follows.

Question 1. The first question of this thesis asked, “How was ritual expressed through offerings by the Classic Maya as the site of Baking Pot was being abandoned?” Ritual was likely expressed in multiple ways by the inhabitants of Baking Pot at site decline, yet in this thesis I have studied material evidence for ritual expression through the deposition and build-up of the Baking Pot figurine collection from peri-abandonment. With termination and peri-abandonment
deposits found in both housemound and site core contexts, this ritual behavior was enacted by a broad sample of Baking Pot’s population. The ceramic objects from peri-abandonment deposits, as a temporal type of termination deposits, were used to ritually close and terminate structures that were falling into disuse during abandonment. The spirit of the structures and spaces they inhabited were released through these rituals. Additionally, the figurines and other artifacts included in these deposits themselves were likely being included in ritual acts of expression of both ancestor veneration and termination. This proposal is explored further in the exploration of the findings for question two.

**Question 2.** Question two asked, “How did specific artifacts—including figurines and musical instruments—act as ritual items?” The answer here is somewhat ambiguous, as this thesis argues that ritual is not just a series of actions or items, but is instead a fluid and changing social dynamic that communities use to navigate issues of group cohesion, political strife, and stress at the time of site abandonment, to name a few ways it is utilized. Additionally, ritual was used among the Classic Maya in order to mark royal life events, venerate ancestors, to host both familial and public feasts, to aid in world continuity, to mark cosmological or calendrical events, and to dedicate or terminate buildings and built spaces. Even more specifically though, it was found that figurines as ritual items themselves are also quite ambiguous and have multiple meanings ascribed to them. These meanings range from standard items in a household assemblage, to children’s toys, to representations of deities or ancestors, to educational tools in cosmological storytelling and education, or as items in medicinal or birthing rituals. The figurines from the Baking Pot figurine collection were specifically used as items in termination rituals by their inclusion in peri-abandonment deposits, and could have acted as items in ancestor veneration rituals and/or as items intended for termination.
Directly, figurines are included in ancestral and termination rituals. Musical instruments are found in royal ritual and in termination rituals. Together, figurines and musical instruments are both included as part of termination rituals. Chapter Five explores the concept that peri-abandonment deposits are an extension of termination rituals and refer to these rituals occurring at the time of site abandonment. Both figurines and musical instruments are physically found in terminal deposits and by extension peri-abandonment deposits.

**Question 3.** The final research questions of this thesis asked, “How did ritual activities differ between open or restricted spaces within the Baking Pot site core? Was ritual activity in the residential area distinct?” The results for this question are of course twofold. First, there is evidence for some sort of difference in ritual activity at the site core. With 58.3% of the ceramic special find artifacts in this collection coming from just one peri-abandonment deposit adjacent to structure B15, and an additional 9.1% coming from the deposit adjacent to structure B14, a total of 67.4%, or just over two-thirds of the ceramic special finds artifacts come from Courtyard 3. Considering the test pit locations around Group B and the fact that each peri-abandonment deposit located was excavated in full, this reflects an accurate picture that two-thirds of the figurines and musical instruments used for these rituals were deposited in the harder to access and more private location of Courtyard 3. This, in itself, is not evidence that the rituals were different but does present interesting information that warrants further examination. The figurines do not offer additional insights to this density difference at the Group B site core. The figurine collection was assessed using chi-square analyses to determine if there is an association between the type of artifacts in the different locations described just above. Additionally, the chi-square tests employed show no association between the iconographic or physical features of the items and the location they were recovered from. There is one difference in the content of the
domestic deposits and the ceremonial open and restricted deposits in that the ceremonial spaces
did have ceramic beads and undefined fragments present, and the domestic spaces did not.

**Contribution to Ritual and Figurine Studies**

The Baking Pot figurine collection includes a variety of figurines, musical instruments,
censers, ceramic beads, and as yet undefined fragments that are dated to the Classic Period. This
collection totals 207 distinctly catalogued items recovered by BVAR excavations, and a total of
444 individual items included in those catalog numbers. This collection can be added to the
plethora of figurines available for research in the Belize River Valley, in the Lowland Maya
region, and in greater Mesoamerica. This thesis represents an initial in-depth analysis of the
collection, and in such provides data and understanding about the artifacts as well as the peri-
abandonment deposits they were recovered from. It indicates figurines, musical instruments,
censers, and beads were important in peri-abandonment ritual, and that those rituals using
figurines and musical instruments do not appear to have differed considerably for different
locations within the site. Considering the value the Maya place and placed on ritual, studies like
these can further scholarship on understanding ritual both for termination and reverence, as well
as how ritual can assist communities and people during times of intense stress that would likely
be experienced during site depopulation and abandonment. This thesis research can join the
growing research on peri-abandonment deposits being published today (Aimers et al. 2020;
Alvarado 2019; Awe et al. 2020a; Awe et al. 2020b; Beardall 2017; Davis 2018; Hogggarth et al.
2020; Romih 2019b; Tappan 2020), and will contribute toward a better understanding in the
future of the deposits and those who created them.
Reflection

This project analyzed the current Baking Pot figurine collection. It also provided general and categorical iconographic information. These categories were used to analyze the distribution of artifacts as found throughout the site. In this, the project was successful in presenting descriptive data about the collection. This research project was the first time that the ceramic special finds artifacts from peri-abandonment deposits at Baking Pot were gathered together and presented as one collection. The artifacts in the collection span from excavations and field seasons ranging from 2009 to 2016 and present a more cohesive picture of these ritual items from across Baking Pot. Additionally, the chi-square tests presented results that help future researchers to rule out specific understandings of ritual and distributions of this collection’s artifacts.

If presented with this research project again, I would pursue a few different or additional avenues for analysis. First, I would focus my literature review more directly toward Maya figurines and the research published about them. Additionally, I would consider different approaches toward the physical features of the artifacts themselves. Specifically, I would undertake detailed research and analysis on Maya hairstyles and representations of hair and faces in art, murals, codices, and on ceramic polychrome vessels. Toward the end of gathering data under the categories I chose for this project, I began to think about the variety of hairstyles, hats, and headdresses present on the anthropomorphic figurines and musical instruments in the collection. An example of this came to me toward the end of my data collection in finding out about so-called duende hats, and that they represent travelers or merchants (DeLance, personal communication). Item SF B6-6-1-1 (Figure 6.1) shows a representation of this hat on one of the collection’s figurines. Examples of complex headdresses are also part of the Baking Pot
collection. Item SF B6-6-1-64 (Figure 6.2) shows an example of a complex headdress with hair (striations) and blue and red paint residue present on it. Another avenue of research I would pursue would include an iconographic analysis of the animals or beings represented on the zoomorphic items. I would be able to cross reference these items with understandings of ritual and different animals or beings associated with rituals directly in the Maya region. This being said, it is important to note that this research avenue might not be possible until the sample size of the collection has increased. Subdividing the Baking Pot figurine collection by these suggested categories could result in not being able to draw conclusions.

Figure 6.1: SF B6-6-1-1. Figurine fragment of an anthropomorphic figure with duende hat atop their head. This would represent a traveler or merchant.
Figure 6.2: SF B6-6-1-64. Figurine fragment of an elaborate headdress, with hair and paint residue shown.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

There are some considerations for how to expand or build upon this research for future projects. First, the figurines and musical instruments could be held up in comparison to similar categorizations or testing of other artifact classes. Perhaps there is more than one artifact type with a difference in density of distribution between the peri-abandonment deposits found in the different plazas and courtyards of Group B. In addition, integrated analyses of the different artifact classes present in the peri-abandonment deposits can lead to a finely detailed resolution of the deposit’s contents and these findings might shed additional light on events or rituals occurring at the different locations in the site core of Group B. There is also the distinct possibility that results could show no distinct differences between the peri-abandonment deposits, and that they were in fact just located in different spaces but indicate the same rituals were occurring in both places due to their contents. Either outcome is advantageous to research
of peri-abandonment deposits and helps us to further understand the rituals occurring at the decline and abandonment of Baking Pot.

Another avenue for future research includes conducting the same classifications and tests as presented in this thesis on figurine collections from peri-abandonment deposits at other sites in the Belize River Valley or Maya Lowlands for comparison. In these comparisons, if Baking Pot were to be atypical in the volume of figurines recovered from peri-abandonment deposits, this would be telling about ritual activity that occurred at this location specifically during site abandonment. Examinations like these could lead toward understanding either regional or site-specific behaviors or styles. It could help us to understand larger patterns, if present, in artifact deposits and ritual behavior. Or conversely, no patterns may emerge, again, providing us with details to further explore about peri-abandonment deposit rituals at site abandonment.

As is important with all research, future work could reconsider the approach, classifications used, and biases brought into this research project as it stands today. This reconsideration could elucidate if this figurine collection is best suited for different analyses unapproached here. Reexamination of the categorical classes, or addition of new categories could further this study in the future. A constant consideration for biases, while present in the project as it stands today, in the future could lend to this. For example, did the Classic Maya divide the spaces in Plaza B and Courtyard 3 as ceremonial open and ceremonial restricted spaces as they were assumed to be here? What additional understandings and nuances could lend toward a greater understanding of this work in the future?

Lastly, a phenomenological approach in the future could benefit this research. Dr. Jared Katz has worked with musical instruments throughout the Precolumbian Americas, especially in Mesoamerica (Katz 2018). In our discussions during this research, he suggested that we could
partner up and return to different sites in the Belize River Valley, setting up recording equipment at various distances from the site core. We would then play (and record) 3D printed instruments found at the sites to gain understanding of the distance, volume, and intensity of the sounds as they travel throughout the site. A project such as this would involve understanding the heard environment and an understanding of how far sounds elite rituals performed in the site core could travel into the surrounding lived areas. This work could be done with the understanding that the built environment and landscape are of course quite different today, and that we lack the additional sounds that would have been present in the site’s history when the instruments were used. This possible future research is still under consideration.
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APPENDIX A

BAKING POT FIGURINE COLLECTION PHOTOGRAPHS

The following Appendix includes all of the photographs taken of the 207 items in the Baking Pot figurine collection. This inventory comprises a minimum of two photographs of the artifact (most often the front and back, but at times one side and the other), the catalog or special finds number assigned to the artifact in the field by BVAR Staff, location artifact was excavated from site core or household excavations), the category that the artifact was sorted into for this research (figurine, musical instrument, bead, censer, or unknown fragment), and a description of attributes present on the artifact.

Note: some photographs have handwritten notes included with the artifact. Between the start of this project in 2017 and its completion in 2020, some Group B courtyard and building designations were updated by BVAR. Specifically, artifacts recorded in the field as part of B1 units are now classified as B14 units, and artifacts recorded in the field as part of B17 units are now classified as B15 units. This will account for any inconsistency noted in the following photographs that include handwritten notes in them.
Catalog Number: BKP-00003
Special Finds Number: none assigned

Front: Back:

Excavated from: unknown, not recorded
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Human hair in either headdress or up-do

---

Catalog Number: BKP-00004
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-29

Right Side: Top: Left Side:

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Bird head figurine with hole through neck and applique eyes on either side of artifact
Catalog Number: BKP-00005
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-33

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Human hair in either headdress, “bangs” present

Catalog Number: BKP-00006
Special Finds Number: SF 27

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)
Classification: Censer
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Human face represented on a spout, base, leg, or stand for a censer, depicting a nose with nostrils incised, mouth with opening, and eyes that are closed. Likely part of a tripod jar censer (after Russell 2000).
Catalog Number: BKP-00007
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-13

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Mold-made figurine fragment showing a human face, including one eye, part of the nose and mouth, and large ear-spool applique.

Catalog Number: BKP-00008
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-44

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Mold-made figurine, solid human head and hollow body broken at shoulders. Puffy cheeks represent a musician playing a wind instrument. Clothing on left arm shows jaguar pelt in patterning (DeLance 2018, personal communication).
Catalog Number: BKP-00009  
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-23  

Front:  
Top:  

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (in ceramic deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Anthropomorphic figurine head fragment, badly weathered but with a drooping hat present above two prominent eyes and large nose.

Catalog Number: BKP-00010  
Special Finds Number: SF 410B-5  

Front:  
Back:  

Excavated from: Household mound 410B (humic layer)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Possible animal mask with two eyes represented as holes, and a nose.
Catalog Number: BKP-00011  
Special Finds Number: SF 410B-9  
Exterior: 
Interior:  
Excavated from: Household mound 410B (humic layer)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic with zoomorphic mask (fragment)  
Description: Decorative mold-made face fragment that was part of a flute. This artifact is unique to this collection in its representation of a human face wearing a zoomorphic mask with large disc present on headdress or wrap.

Catalog Number: BKP-00012  
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-30  
Front: 
Back:  
Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Defaced anthropomorphic figurine head fragment. PLEASE NOTE: photographs taken in 2017 and figurine represented here is upside down. Bangs or hair present.
Excavated from: Household mound 410A (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Anthropomorphic figurine head fragment broken at neck/shoulders, appears to have a mask over eyes, nose, and cheekbones.

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (listed in “level 1”)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Decorative mold-made face applique upper flute fragment. While the face is mold-made, the appliques to the face include a pinched headdress, ear spools, and possible pendant or clothing clasp at neck.
Catalog Number: BKP-00015
Special Finds Number: SF B15-36

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (unbroken, whole ocarina)
Description: Whole ocarina of an adult person holding a child on their hip. Mouthpiece and finger stops are all intact. Stands on its own on tripod structure between feet and mouthpiece at the back.

Catalog Number: BKP-00016
Special Finds Number: SF B15-13

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Fragmented mold-made ocarina depicting a puffy cheeked musician, representative of playing a wind instrument. This instrument is identical to item #BKP-00024, recovered from the same unit and deposit.
Catalog Number: BKP-00017
Special Finds Number: SF B15-7

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (humic/collapse layer)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (nearly complete)
Description: Whistle instrument without any finger stops, representing a dog. It appears that there was an organic decoration or applique along the nose/snout that did not survive into modern times.

Catalog Number: BKP-00018
Special Finds Number: SF B15-40

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (missing applique with full wind chamber present)
Description: Ocarina with two finger stops. Two round appliques detached from top of whistle making a better typological classification impossible. Possibly zoomorphic due to legs and round belly shape instrument stands upon.
Catalog Number: BKP-00019
Special Finds Number: SF B15-44

Front:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Anthropomorphic figurine fragment with a head and face present, as well as two arms and hands meeting on chest above an oval decoration. Figurine is very weathered.

Back:

Catalog Number: BKP-00020
Special Finds Number: SF B15-41 (Items BKP-00020 through BKP-00023 bagged together but do not articulate)

Front:

Interior (rotated 90 degrees to the left):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment of a mold-made face showing eyebrow ridge, eyes, nose, and lips.
Catalog Number: BKP-00021
Special Finds Number: SF B15-41 (Items BKP-00020 through BKP-00023 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid, conical pointed figurine fragment. Lacking other diagnostic traits so morphology is unknown. Familiar shape compared to other artifacts in collection; similar to bases/feet as seen in items BKP-00015 (anthropomorphic) and BKP-00017 (zoomorphic).

Catalog Number: BKP-00022
Special Finds Number: SF B15-41 (Items BKP-00020 through BKP-00023 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Censer (effigy censer)
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Effigy censer fragment showing an anthropomorphic nose, mouth, and chin (Russell 2000). Holes are present in the corners of the mouth and in both nostrils to allow smoke to escape from inside of the censer.
Catalog Number: BKP-00023
Special Finds Number: SF B15-41 (Items BKP-00020 through BKP-00023 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Instrument fragment with two finger stops present. Unknown if anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, or neither due to fragmented piece lacking additional diagnostic traits beyond finger stops.

Catalog Number: BKP-00024
Special Finds Number: SF B15-9
Left:  Front:  Right:  Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (nearly complete)
Description: Fragmented mold-made ocarina depicting a puffy cheeked musician, representative of playing a wind instrument. This instrument is identical to item #BKP-00016, recovered from the same unit and deposit.
Catalog Number: BKP-00025
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-38 (Items BKP-00025 and BKP-00026 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic figurine fragment broken at neck. One ear broken off. Hole drilled through neck for either firing or repurposing of item in antiquity. Blue paint seen on exterior of fragment.

Catalog Number: BKP-00026
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-38 (Items BKP-00025 and BKP-00026 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Mouthpiece of either a whistle or ocarina. Unknown if the instrument was plain in style or exhibited anthropomorphic or zoomorphic features.

Catalog Number: BKP-00027
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-37 (Items BKP-00027 and BKP-00028 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Fragmented musical instrument, most likely a flute due to the shape and thickness of the fragment. No indications of applique or design on this fragment.
Catalog Number: BKP-00028
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-37 (Items BKP-00027 and BKP-00028 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior: __________
Interior: __________

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Slipped fragment with no diagnostic features. Unknown if it was part of a figurine, instrument, or other ceramic item.

Catalog Number: BKP-00029
Special Finds Number: SF B15-31
Front: __________
Back: __________

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Mold-made figurine head with headdress and face present, broken at mouth. One earspool applique present, as well as blue paint on headdress and red paint on face.
Catalog Number: BKP-00030
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-27

Exterior: [Image of exterior fragment]
Interior: [Image of interior fragment]

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small fragment of an instrument. Classified as such due to partial presence of finger stop. No other diagnostic traits.

Catalog Number: BKP-00031
Special Finds Number: SF B14-10/misc (Items BKP-00031 through BKP-00033 bagged together but do not articulate)

Front: [Image of front fragment]
Back: [Image of back fragment]

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: 11 ceramic items excavated and bagged together. None articulate with the other. Largest item (right above) likely an anthropomorphic if compared to other artifacts in collection but no specifically diagnostic traits to determine exactly.
Additional fragments excavated with SF B14-10/misc, but do not articulate with BKP-00031:

Catalog Number: BKP-00032
Special Finds Number: SF B14-10/misc (Items BKP-00031 through BKP-00033 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Instrument fragment of an ocarina mouthpiece only without the instrument body present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00033  
Special Finds Number: SF B14-10/misc (Items BKP-00031 through BKP-00033 bagged together but do not articulate)

**Top:**

**Side:**

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Instrument fragment of just an ocarina mouthpiece without the instrument body present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00034  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-25

**Front:**

**Back:**

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Anthropomorphic figurine headdress fragment with blue paint present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00035
Special Finds Number: SF B15-32

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (unknown lot or level, not recorded)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic ocarina fragment, possibly of a dog. Hole drilled through neck for either firing or repurposing of item in antiquity. Finger stop present on fragmented body. No mouthpiece present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00036
Special Finds Number: SF B14-14 (Items BKP-00036 and BKP-00037 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Anthropomorphic fragment with eye applique and finger stop hole present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00037
Special Finds Number: SF B14-14 (Items BKP-00036 and BKP-00037 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic figurine fragment with applique oval-shaped eyes and hand-formed ears. Snout broken off and figurine broken just below neck. Hole drilled through base of the head for either firing or repurposing of item in antiquity. Very little blue paint visible on left side of head below eye.

Catalog Number: BKP-00038
Special Finds Number: LSF B14-3

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic figurine fragment with multiple curved striations possibly showing fur or hair and extended ear. Eye may be present. Mold-made.
Catalog Number: BKP-00039
Special Finds Number: SF B15-38 (Items BKP-00039 through BKP-00042 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:  
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic artifact, likely was part of a figurine—very likely was not part of a vessel of any sort due to shape and thickness. Weathered, does not show additional diagnostic features beyond shape and thickness.

Catalog Number: BKP-00040
Special Finds Number: SF B15-38 (Items BKP-00039 through BKP-00042 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:  
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic artifact, likely was part of a figurine—very likely was not part of a vessel of any sort due to shape and thickness. Does not show additional diagnostic features beyond shape and thickness.
Catalog Number: BKP-00041
Special Finds Number: SF B15-38 (Items BKP-00039 through BKP-00042 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic artifact, likely was part of a figurine—very likely was not part of a vessel of any sort due to shape and thickness. Does not show additional diagnostic features beyond shape and thickness.

Catalog Number: BKP-00042
Special Finds Number: SF B15-38 (Items BKP-00039 through BKP-00042 bagged together but do not articulate)

Front:

Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment with earspool present. Blue paint visible as well. No other diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00043
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-32 (Items BKP-00043 through BKP-00046 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Interior:
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic artifact, likely was part of a figurine—very likely was not part of a vessel of any sort due to shape and thickness. Does not show additional diagnostic features beyond shape and thickness.

Catalog Number: BKP-00044
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-32 (Items BKP-00043 through BKP-00046 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Side view/Interior:
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid, conical pointed figurine fragment. Lacking other diagnostic traits so morphology is unknown. Familiar shape compared to other artifacts in collection; similar to bases/feet as seen in items BKP-00015 (anthropomorphic) and BKP-00017 (zoomorphic).
Catalog Number: BKP-00045
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-32 (Items BKP-00043 through BKP-00046 bagged together but do not articulate)

Unknown side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic artifact, likely was part of a figurine—very likely was not part of a vessel of any sort due to shape and thickness. Does not show additional diagnostic features beyond shape and thickness.

Catalog Number: BKP-00046
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-32 (Items BKP-00043 through BKP-00046 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic artifact, likely was part of a figurine—very likely was not part of a vessel of any sort due to shape and thickness. Does not show additional diagnostic features beyond shape and thickness.
Catalog Number: BKP-00047
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-37

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (listed in “feature 3”)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Hollow, mold-made zoomorphic figurine fragment with two ears and top of head present. Catalog item BKP-00047 excavated with additional 12 ceramic fragments that do not articulate. This item and additional 12 fragments are all part of the same special finds number, LSF B15-37.

Catalog Number: BKP-00048
Special Finds Number: SF B14-15

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Possible hat or headdress figurine fragment, well eroded.
Catalog Number: BKP-00049  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-18  
Unknown Side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (unknown lot or level, not recorded)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Instrument fragment of an ocarina mouthpiece without the instrument body present.

---

Catalog Number: BKP-00050  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-52  
Top:  
Unknown Side:  
Unknown Side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Spherical hollow fragment with two holes drilled in it with possible leopard print strip on side. A circular applique broken off.
Catalog Number: BKP-00051
Special Finds Number: SF B15-42 (Items BKP-00051 through BKP-00054 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Interior (rotated just past 90°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid, conical pointed figurine fragment. Lacking other diagnostic traits so morphology is unknown. Familiar shape compared to other artifacts in collection; similar to bases/feet as seen in items BKP-00015 (anthropomorphic) and BKP-00017 (zoomorphic).

Catalog Number: BKP-00052
Special Finds Number: SF B15-42 (Items BKP-00051 through BKP-00054 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:
Interior (rotated just past 90°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Solid, pointed figurine fragment. Incised marks at end of foot are diagnostic of an anthropomorphic foot representation. This fragment would have acted as a base of the figurine. Band of blue paint present across artifact.
Catalog Number: BKP-00053
Special Finds Number: SF B15-42 (Items BKP-00051 through BKP-00054 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small fragment of a hollow item with the edge of a finger stop present, lending to classification of a musical instrument.

Catalog Number: BKP-00054
Special Finds Number: SF B15-42 (Items BKP-00051 through BKP-00054 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Flute fragment with mold-made face, earspools, and headband appliques. Blue paint present on one earspool and as a band below the chin.
Additional fragments excavated with SF B15-42, but do not articulate with BKP-00051 through BKP-00054:

Catalog Number: BKP-00055
Special Finds Number: SF B15-37 (Items BKP-00055 and BKP-00056 bagged together but do not articulate)

Left:
Right:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Bird figurine head fragment, broken at neck. Likely mold-made, hollow interior starting at neck. Applique eyes.
Catalog Number: BKP-00056
Special Finds Number: SF B15-37 (Items BKP-00055 and BKP-00056 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior:

Interior (rotated 90°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Hollow figurine fragment, worn enough to lack additional diagnostic features.

---

Catalog Number: BKP-00057
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-44

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small musical instrument fragment with partial finger stop. No other diagnostic features.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid, curved figurine fragment. Lacking other diagnostic traits so morphology is unknown. Familiar shape compared to other artifacts in collection; similar to bases/feet as seen in item SF B6-6-39 (anthropomorphic).

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece. No other diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: BKP-00060
Special Finds Number: SF B15-4

Exterior: | Interior:
---|---

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (humic layer)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Hollow, possibly mold-made figurine fragment showing two faces side by side, but very worn or weathered. Comparable to artifact BKP-00015 of a human adult holding a child.

Catalog Number: BKP-00061
Special Finds Number: SF B15-53

Unknown Side: | Unknown Side:
---|---

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment possibly of an appendage, but no additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00062
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-17

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Flute fragment with mold-made face broken at forehead. One eye, nose, mouth, earring, and arm present. Small amounts of blue paint present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00063
Special Finds Number: LSF B14-2

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Censer
Morphology: Unknown morphology (“arm” or base fragment)
Description: Censer arm or base fragment, likely from a tripod censer (Russell 2000). If used as an arm, this artifact would have held up an additional ceramic platform, plate, or bowl to hold burning incense or other botanical items. Similar to item BKP-00082. Found in the same unit level 4 days apart, July 2013. No additional diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: BKP-00064
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-18

Front: Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Figurine arm fragment with bangle or bracelet around wrist. Fingers depicted via small incised lines.

Catalog Number: BKP-00065
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-5 (Items BKP-00065 through BKP-00068 bagged together but do not articulate)

Unknown Side: Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid cylinder fragment, possibly an anthropomorphic appendage, yet lacking additional diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: BKP-00066  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-5 (Items BKP-00065 through BKP-00068 bagged together but do not articulate)  
Unknown Side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Solid, curved cylinder fragment, possibly an appendage. Decorative striations present, as well as fragmentary blue paint.

Catalog Number: BKP-00067  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-5 (Items BKP-00065 through BKP-00068 bagged together but do not articulate)  
Known Side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Solid cylinder fragment, possibly an anthropomorphic appendage, yet lacking additional diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: BKP-00068
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-5 (Items BKP-00065 through BKP-00068 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:  
Interior:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid cylinder fragment, possibly an anthropomorphic appendage, yet lacking additional diagnostic features.

Catalog Number: BKP-00069
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-43 (Items BKP-00069 through BKP-00073 bagged together but do not articulate)
Exterior:  
Interior (rotated 180°):  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment likely depicting an ear and earspool. Earspool shown as round applique, as is the standard for this collection.
Catalog Number: BKP-00070
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-43 (Items BKP-00069 through BKP-00073 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small, round figurine fragment with blue paint residue, lacking additional diagnostic features.

Catalog Number: BKP-00071
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-43 (Items BKP-00069 through BKP-00073 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical Instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small instrument fragment, classified as such due to round finger stop edge and hollow interior. Exterior slipped. Likely a fragment from the same artifact that BKP-00072 and BKP-00073 were made of, but the three fragments do not articulate.
Catalog Number: BKP-00072
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-43 (Items BKP-00069 through BKP-00073 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small instrument fragment, classified as such due to round finger stop edge and hollow interior. Exterior slipped. Likely a fragment from the same artifact that BKP-00071 and BKP-00073 were made of, but the three fragments do not articulate.

Catalog Number: BKP-00073
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-43 (Items BKP-00069 through BKP-00073 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small instrument fragment, classified as such due to round finger stop edge and hollow interior. Exterior slipped. Likely a fragment from the same artifact that BKP-00071 and BKP-00072 were made of, but the three fragments do not articulate.
Catalog Number: BKP-00074  
Special Finds Number: SF B14-3

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (near complete ocarina)  
Description: Mold-made ocarina depicting a human with hands meeting in front of the chest or stomach. One finger stop present with mouthpiece removed or broken off. Hat or headdress visible with bangs and hair shown. Earspools present on both sides of the face. Face and instrument are well weathered and worn.

Catalog Number: BKP-00075  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-31

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Appendage fragment, likely a foot if anthropomorphic or ear if zoomorphic. The appendage has a circular impression in it, looking more like an ear, but no additional diagnostic information available to be certain.
Catalog Number: BKP-00076
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-20

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Fragment of figurine, greatly worn exterior and broken, crumbled interior. No diagnostic traits to help distinguish morphology.

Catalog Number: BKP-00077
Special Finds Number: SF B15-19 (Items BKP-00077 through BKP-00079 bagged together but do not articulate)

Front:

Back (rotated 45°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Solid, pointed figurine fragment. Incised marks at end of foot are diagnostic of an anthropomorphic foot representation. This fragment would have acted as a base of the figurine. No additional diagnostic traits present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00078
Special Finds Number: SF B15-20 (Items BKP-00077 through BKP-00079 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown figurine fragment, weathered with no particular diagnostic traits present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00079
Special Finds Number: SF B15-21 (Items BKP-00077 through BKP-00079 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment with incised lines on exterior, including incised lines on side running opposite direction (similar in shape and design to BKP-00096). Bits of blue paint remain. Possibly zoomorphic due to wing or fin look, but no additional diagnostic information to be sure it is not part of a headdress or clothing adornment for an anthropomorphic figurine.
Catalog Number: BKP-00080  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-19

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Figurine fragment of a human head with headdress. Unique to this collection, Figurine BKP-00080 has been defaced and broken at the neck in antiquity. Large hat or headdress with two circular appliques present. Hair and bangs left intact.

Catalog Number: BKP-00081  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-39

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit 15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece with a small broken applique design at the base of the mouthpiece. No additional diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: BKP-00082
Special Finds Number: SF B14-8

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit 14 (collapse)
Classification: Censer
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Censer arm or base fragment, likely from a tripod censer (Russell 2000). If used as an arm, this artifact would have held up an additional ceramic platform, plate, or bowl to hold burning incense or other botanical items. Similar to item BKP-00063. Found in the same unit level 4 days apart, July 2013. No additional diagnostic features.

Catalog Number: BKP-00083
Special Finds Number: SF B15-26

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Fragment of a musical instrument, possibly an ocarina mouthpiece.

Additional fragments excavated with SF B15-26, but do not articulate with BKP-00083:
Catalog Number: BKP-00084  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-48 (Items BKP-00084 through BKP-00086 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Flute fragment, likely the end of the flute, no mouthpiece present at this end.

Additional fragments excavated with SF B15-48, but do not articulate with BKP-00084:

Catalog Number: BKP-00085  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-48 (Items BKP-00084 through BKP-00086 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Flute fragment with no additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00086
Special Finds Number: SF B15-48 (Items BKP-00084 through BKP-00086 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic fragment. Excavated in association with other musical instrument fragments, thus its inclusion as a Special Find artifact.

Catalog Number: BKP-00087
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-15

Exterior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (nearly whole ocarina)
Description: Ocarina of unknown design and shape. Rounded and angular with some appendages broken away. Possible zoomorphic item but no diagnostic traits to categorize it specifically as such.
Catalog Number: BKP-00088
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-28

Exterior:  | Interior:
--- | ---

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Worn and weathered headdress fragment.

Catalog Number: BKP-00089
Special Finds Number: SF B14-19

Front:  | Back:
--- | ---

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Figurine head fragment, very worn and weathered. Headdress and hair present with circular applique at the peak of the headdress. Face missing; unknown if either defaced or worn.
Catalog Number: BKP-00090  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-15

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic head fragment, broken at the neck with two additional unarticulated fragments. Circular applique eyes on both sides of figurine head. Possible bird based on other fragments in the Baking Pot Collection.

Catalog Number: BKP-00091  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-29

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic fragment.
Catalog Number: BKP-00092
Special Finds Number: LSF B-15-3

Front: Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Top of human head fragment. Very worn, headdress or hair shown in striations but all facial features worn or missing.

Catalog Number: BKP-00093
Special Finds Number: SF B15-51

Exterior: Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Possible foot or appendage fragment. Figurine was hollow and likely mold-made. Small bit of blue paint present on the exterior.
Catalog Number: BKP-00094
Special Finds Number: SF B15-34

Unknown side:  
Unknown side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece with no additional diagnostic features present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00095
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-35

Exterior:  
Interior:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid, conical pointed figurine fragment. Lacking other diagnostic traits so morphology is unknown. Familiar shape compared to other artifacts in collection; similar to bases/feet as seen in items BKP-00015 (anthropomorphic) and BKP-00017 (zoomorphic).
Catalog Number: BKP-00096
Special Finds Number: LSF B15 - (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior: Side (rotated 45°): Interior (rotated 90°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment with incised lines on exterior, including incised lines on side running opposite direction (similar in shape and design to BKP-00079). Possibly zoomorphic due to wing or fin look, but no additional diagnostic information to be sure it is not part of a headdress or clothing adornment for an anthropomorphic figurine.

Catalog Number: BKP-00097
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-25

Front: Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Flute fragment with mold-made face and ceramic applique on headdress and as earspools. Broken at neck. Mouthpiece present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00098
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Mold-made figurine head fragment with hat and 4 earspool appliques. Three locations in hat for possible biodegradable decorations. One of the four earspools is painted blue. Hat is repeated in other figurines per Lisa DeLance, and is termed a “smurf hat.” Unknown what purpose this type of hat served or signaled.

Catalog Number: BKP-00099
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Possible appendage. Lacking interior hole that ceramic beads have. No additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00100
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior: 
Interior: 

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Possible flute fragment due to interior curve. Could also be a flute applique fragment. Unknown design present on exterior.

Catalog Number: BKP-00101
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Exterior: 
Interior: 

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Possible flute fragment due to edge of finger stop on fragment, as well as the thickness and curvature of the artifact. Exterior painted blue with some residue still showing.
Catalog Number: BKP-00102
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Unknown side:                                                                 Unknown side:                                                                                     

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Possible appendage fragment, classified as such due to thickness and size or other appendages in the collection.

Catalog Number: BKP-00103
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Unknown side (possible front):                                                                 Unknown side (possible back, rotated 90°):                                                                                     

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Possible anthropomorphic headdress fragment with three deep impressions. Broken at possible forehead of figurine.
Catalog Number: BKP-00104
Special Finds Number: LSF B15- (No specific additional number provided on artifact card; items BKP-00096 and BKP-00098 through BKP-00104 bagged together but do not articulate)

Top:  
Front:  
Back:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece, broken away from the remainder of the ocarina.

Additional fragments excavated with LSF B15- (no specific additional number provided on artifact card), but do not articulate with BKP-00096; BKP-00098-BKP-00104:
Catalog Number: BKP-00105  
Special Finds Number: SF B14-17  
Front (rotated 90°):  
Back:  
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Headdress fragment with blue paint present. One circular applique, possibly at the top or side of the headdress. Incised pattern present either as part of the headdress or representative of hair.

Catalog Number: BKP-00106  
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100extB:65  
Unknown side:  
Unknown side (rotated 180°):  
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)  
Description: Flute fragment with “trowel trauma” on front from excavation. No other diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00107
Special Finds Number: SF 101-101-05
Right side: 

Excavated from: Household mound 101 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Ceramic bird head with hole drilled through the face. Possible that biodegradable artifacts were part of the beak of the figurine in antiquity. Broken at neck.

Catalog Number: BKP-00108
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100extB-40
Unknown side: 

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece, broken from the remainder of the ocarina.
Catalog Number: BKP-00109  
Special Finds Number: SF B7-101-06

Front:  
Back:  
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (collapse)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)  
Description: Flute fragment, base of flute. No mouthpiece present but showing two finger stops. Molded or applique band at the base of the flute.

Catalog Number: BKP-00110  
Special Finds Number: SF B15-2-4

Top:  
Right side:  
Interior:  
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)  
Classification: Musical instrument  
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Ocarina fragment of a zoomorphic creature’s head. Appears bovine but unknown what creature is actually depicted. It appears that eye appliques have been removed or broken off. Broken at neck from additional hollow body of instrument.
Catalog Number: BKP-00111
Special Finds Number: SF B6-5-5

Unknown Side: Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic “tinkler.” Has a small hole at the top used to hang the item to bump against other tinklers to create a light musical note. For comparison only, it is similar to some times of modern windchimes. Identical to BKP-00112.

Catalog Number: BKP-00112
Special Finds Number: SF B6-2-4

Unknown Side: Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic “tinkler.” Has a small hole at the top used to hang the item to bump against other tinklers to create a light musical sound. For comparison only, it is similar to some times of modern windchimes. Identical to BKP-00111.
Catalog Number: BKP-00113
Special Finds Number: SF B6-5-6
Unknown Exterior Side:
Interior:
Unknown Exterior Side (rotated 90°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece with no additional diagnostic features present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00114
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-9

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (below Feature 1)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Flute fragment with no mouthpiece present. One finger stop present and base of flute as well. Striations designed into the flute, with slightly flared base. No additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: BKP-00115
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100-1

Unknown side:                                      Interior:                                      Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Cylinder shaped item listed as “drum” on artifact card. Exterior slipped, interior exposed ash-tempered ceramic. Broken from additional ceramic and both ends of cylinder open. No other additional diagnostic features are present.

Catalog Number: BKP-00116
Special Finds Number: SF L-B2-3-4-1

Exterior View (from top looking down):                                      Front:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Solid, curved figurine fragment. Lacking other diagnostic traits so morphology is unknown. Familiar shape compared to other artifacts in collection; similar to bases/feet as seen in item SF B6-6-39 (anthropomorphic).
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B14-1

Front:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small ceramic fragment, rounded on the front and interior curved like it had a hole running through it. Could have been an applique on another item previously.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B14-4

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (humus)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology
Description: Disc shaped ceramic artifact with an indent protruding out one end conically. Possibly an applique or hat that broke off a figurine but unsure. No additional diagnostic features present.

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B14-7

Unknown Side:  
Unknown Side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B14 (collapse)  
Classification: Ceramic bead  
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)  
Description: Fragment of a ceramic bead with slipped exterior. No additional diagnostic features present. Similar is shape and size as SF B15-29.  

Catalog Number: Unassigned  
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-6  

Fronts:  
Backs:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorph (fragments)  
Description: Three figurine fragments all bagged together. Left item unknown with no diagnostic features present. Middle item likely zoomorphic top of unknown animal head with ears present, broken at forehead. Right item anthropomorphic fragment of the corner of a head with either headdress or hair showing. Circular pattern possibly representing earspool. Cataloging this item as anthropomorphic overall as that item provides the most information.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-7

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (below Feature)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragments)
Description: Three fragments, likely all figurine fragments. Left item does not articulate with middle item, but is the same paste and temper, as well as thickness. They were likely part of the same item in antiquity. Middle item is cylinder shaped but does not have finger stops other diagnostic traits indicating it was an instrument. Right item is a figurine fragment with two small, circular appliques, as well as one small band applique. No additional diagnostic features are present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-8

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (below Feature 1)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unidentifiable ceramic artifact. One side has deep, circular impression, with evidence of what appears to be a thumb-print and fingernail indentations. Other side is blocky and angular.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-10

Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (below Feature 1)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment with thin, small hole through center.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-11

Top: Front: Right Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (below Feature 1)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: “Smurf” style figurine at with incised markings around the front of the brim. Similar in appearance as the hat on figurine BKP-00098. Also has a hole in the top of the hat that could have held organic material as decoration or for functionality in antiquity.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-2-extA

Front: Back:

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-4-12

Right Side: Back: Left Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Headdress or hair up-do fragment, broken before head. Front of fragment shows vertical striations. Figurine was hollow. No additional diagnostic features present. Item looks similar to center artifact LSF B17-14B.

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (humus)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (mostly intact)
Description: Very round ocarina of animal with small head and applique eyes that are no longer part of the item. Has two small front protrusions or feet to help item stand up. Mouthpiece broken from artifact as well. Possibly amphibious representation.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B2-4-17

Right Side:                      Top:                      Left Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (collapse above floor)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (mostly intact)
Description: Whole ocarina with small fragments missing from item’s left side. Looks like a fish, yet has four small protrusions or feet to help item stand (could simply be for appearance and not for physical representation of animal). Mouthpiece is placed at the top of the item with two small finger stops on each side of instrument.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: None recorded; from Lot B2-4-3 (excavated June 23, 2016, Supervisor N. Moraza)

Front:                                        Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B2 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Figurine headdress fragment. Very weathered or worn. One circular applique present. No other diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-1-1 (duplicate Special Finds Number given in field, excavated June 8, 2015)

Front: Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Human figurine head and shoulder fragment with wide brimmed hat and shoulder bag present. Interpretations of this representation include female merchants or travelers from the Late Classic period (Halperin 2014:84-91; Stone 2014). Hair is present below the hat. The knot of a travelling bag is seen on the right shoulder of the figurine.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-1-1 (duplicate Special Finds Number given in field, excavated June 5, 2015)

Exterior: Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (humus)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Very worm face fragment with nose protruding. Hair present as well as one shoulder and either necklace or shirt collar showing. No other diagnostic features present.
**Catalog Number:** Unassigned  
**Special Finds Number:** SF B6-2-1

**Exterior:**

---

**Catalog Number:** Unassigned  
**Special Finds Number:** SF B6-3-2

**Front:**

---

**Back:**

---

**Description:** Bug eye face fragment with nose present. Very pronounced eyebrow ridge and prognathic face, possibly representing a monkey.

---

**Excavated from:** Group B site core, unit B6 (humus)  
**Classification:** Figurine  
**Morphology:** Zoomorphic (fragment)  
**Description:** Small instrument fragment. Classified as such due to the partial figure hole present. No other diagnostic features available.
Catalog Number: Unassigned  
Special Finds Number: SF B6-3-5  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)  
Classification: Ceramic bead  
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)  
Description: Decorated ceramic bead with incised lines on one side running from one corner to the other. Small hole throughout interior.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned  
Special Finds Number: SF B6-4-2  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)  
Classification: Censer  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)  
Description: Censer base or leg fragment decorated with anthropomorphic face showing two applique eyes and one nose. No mouth present. Not classified as a spout due to the flat base standing on its own and the breakage angle of the ceramic above the face, while late in this study Dr. Hoggarth suggests she believes it looks more like a spout than censer fragment (Hoggarth, personal communication).
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-4-3

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Likely anthropomorphic fragment with vertical striations either representing headdress or hair, similar to other anthropomorphic figurines in this collection. No face or other diagnostic features present.

Unknown Sides (three different angles and rotations):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown fragmented ceramic item classified as a musical instrument due to one finger stop present on the top of the item. Likely a wind instrument of some sort. No morphological diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF L-B6-5-1

Exterior:  
Interior:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Split half of an ocarina mouthpiece fragment with no additional diagnostic features present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-5-3

Front:  
Back:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown applique fragment, half circle with curved back where it was attached to another item previously. Possibly attached to a flute but no other additional diagnostic features, so classifying as unknown.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: B6-6-1

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (humus)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Head fragment broken at the neck with helmet or headdress over person. Helmet or headdress is zoomorphic and has sleeked back ears behind the person wearing it. There also appears to be a covering on the forehead and cheeks, or the cheeks themselves are puffy, indicative of a musician. Hole drilled through the head behind the eyes looks to have been done to reuse or repurpose item, and not as an original part of the figurine.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-1-63

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Figurine fragment with orange slipped exterior. Possible representation of eyes or nose, but unknown.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-1-64

Front:  
Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Very detailed headdress and hair from a figurine, but face broken away. Incised designs to show headdress and hair with fragmentary blue paint or the right side still showing. Unique breakage pattern, showing that the hair was specifically removed from the face, possibly purposefully.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: B6-6-31

Front:  
Near-Back (rotated about 75°):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Flute fragment with mold-made face attached by handmade headband, earspool appliques, and circular necklace or celt present on the chest. Mouthpiece present but broken below torso representation.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-32

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Head fragment with large nose. Headdress or hat covering forehead with either circular decorations or earspools present. Hollow item, broken at the base of the nose and top of head.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-35

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Top of figurine headdress present with a headband or decoration and two circular appliques. Broken at forehead; no face present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-39

Front:

Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic
Description: Two items bagged together under the same special finds number, one base/foot and one headdress with vertical striations. Possible from the same artifact. Clothing or tunic showing next to the foot.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-42

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Top of hollow zoomorphic figurine fragment head. Ears present but lacking any other diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-49

Front:

Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Head fragment of a bat figurine (Awe 2018:Personal Communication). Broken just below the head. Some blue paint residue present on face still.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-50

Unknown Side:

Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Unknown hollow fragment lacking any diagnostic features.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-52

Unknown Side:

Top:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece with no additional diagnostic features present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-53

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Highly fragmented ceramic piece. Unknown if part of figurine, instrument, or other. Morphology unclear.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-60

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Mold-made face, possibly wearing a mask due to circular opening or decoration around the mouth and eyes. Curved back indicates it broke away from a flute. Many similar shaped and size mold-made face fragments are present in this collection to lead to this classification as part of a musical instrument.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-67

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: SF B6-6-67 consists of two fragments bagged together. Right item has slipped exterior and possible finger stop present. Left item is an ocarina mouthpiece.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-68

Front:

Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Headdress fragment with multiple vertical striations incised into item. Broken at base of headdress/top of forehead. No face present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-69

Exterior:

Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece. Unknown if the ocarina had an anthropomorphic or zoomorphic depiction, if any.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-70

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology
Description: Hollow instrument with a hole through the center and one large but broken chamber. Possibly a broken flute with bulb similar to item LSF B15-14G.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-76

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic instrument, likely with ocarina mouthpiece where animal’s mouth was but it broken off. Believed to be a coatimundi representation. Broken at neck as well. Ears and eyes are present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: B6-6-77

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Human head fragment with hat or headdress. Face very worn. Broken in an angular manner near shoulders.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-88

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Possible flute fragment with two small, rounded protrusions. Same thickness, shape, and material as SF B6-6-89, but the two items do not articulate. No additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-89

**Unknown Side:**

- **Front:**
- **Back:**

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Flute fragment with no indication of morphological decorations. Same thickness, shape, and material as SF B6-6-88, but the two items do not articulate. No additional diagnostic features present.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-93

**Front:**

- **Back:**

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Unknown ceramic fragment with residue of blue paint on one side. No additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B6-6-94

Front:

Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B6 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Anthropomorphic headdress or hair figurine fragment. Broken at base of hair/start of forehead. No other diagnostic traits present.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100-8

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100ext.A-14

Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit beneath Burial 4-1)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece fragment. No other diagnostic information present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100ext.A-15

Front:

Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit beneath Burial 4-1)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Bottom of anthropomorphic figurine, fragmented. Base shows wide hips or haunches and two small round appliques as either feet or representative of legs. Hollow interior. No additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100extB-41

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100ext.B-52

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-100extB-54

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Head fragment of a possible turtle with two circular eyes and incised mouth slit present. Slight bits of blue paint residue present on top of item. No other diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-101-02

Front: Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorph wearing Zoomorphic Mask
Description: Figurine face with feline nose and curled mouth features. Possible jaguar features or mask over human face. Headdress or hair-wrap also present. Broken just below the mouth. No other diagnostic features present.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B7-102-01

Exterior: Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Mold-made face with curved back. Would have been used to decorate a flute with applique adornments around it.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B7 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (Nearly complete)
Description: Ocarina with finger holes present on back. Nearly complete artifact but item is missing its mouthpiece. Front of artifact is a human representation and would have stood on its base between the missing mouthpiece and two front feet. A long, curved decorative piece is on the body of the individual, either as clothing or jewelry.

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Possible arm or leg/appendage. Location where other ceramic material was attached seen on one side, right picture, top right corner above. No additional diagnostic features present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-2-3

Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Ocarina mouthpiece with no additional diagnostic features present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-8

Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Possible drum, very similar to artifact BKP-00115
Catalog Number: Unassigned  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14A  
Unknown Side:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)  
Description: Two small ceramic fragments that could have been appliques or appendages. Unknown morphology due to lack of diagnostic features present.  

Catalog Number: Unassigned  
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14B  
Front:  

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)  
Classification: Figurine  
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragments)  
Description: Three small fragments excavated and catalogued together. Center item is similar to SF B2-2-extA-, yet this item has a whole drilled through the center of it. Center item also has vertical striations. Left and right items are lacking diagnostic features to help classify their morphology.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14C

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Small, mold-made face fragment with hair or headdress present. Eyes and nose showing, but broken at the mouth. No additional diagnostic features.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14D

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14D consists of thirteen ceramic fragments that do not articulate and one fragmented but rearticulated flute. Top center fragment appears to be a ceramic bead. Bottom left artifact a possible figurine appendage. Second from left bottom item has decoration but unsure what it is.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14E

Prior to Rearticulation: After Rearticulation:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: Originally 4 small and very fragile, crumbly fragments. Rearticulated and glued together using B72. The smaller piece likely was attached to the larger disc piece, but left unglued due to the fragility of the items. No additional diagnostic information available, so unknown what form of ceramic item these appliques were from.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14F

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14F consists of 6 larger figurine fragments. Item in bottom left corner shows an eye and cheek with a possible headdress or headband with blue paint residue on it. Center right item is also the fragment of a headdress or headband, but the face or head below did not survive. The other four fragments lack additional diagnostic information outside of some slight red or blue paint residues.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: Two separate musical instruments present in LSF B15-14G. The left item is the same shape and style as a flute discovered in the child burial at nearby site Cahal Pech (Awe et al. In Press). The right item includes the mouthpiece of an ocarina with no additional diagnostic traits present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14H

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14H consists of fifteen ceramic fragments that vary in size. The largest item, center bottom, shows incised vertical and horizontal striations across item, with small bits of blue paint residue. The fragments do not articulate with one another. No additional diagnostic information is present.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14I is made of 26 ceramic fragments. Bottom right item is an anthropomorphic arm fragment. Second from right on bottom is likely the torso of an anthropomorphic figurine with either clothing or jewelry decorating the chest of the individual. None of the fragments articulate.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14J consists of thirty-two ceramic fragments, excavated together. There is an ocarina mouthpiece with this artifact. None of the items articulate together.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14K

Front (bottom two fragments only):

Back (Bottom two fragments only):

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14K consists of twenty ceramic fragments, excavated together. The bottom left item is the top of a zoomorphic head with two years protruding and with small indentations to further illustrate their shape. Bottom right artifact could be the base or stand of the figurine, but no additional diagnostic features are present to help classify it further. None of these fragments articulate together.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14L

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-14L consists of twenty ceramic fragments. Multiple fragments have incised lines designed on them, but do not show any morphological features. None of the fragments articulate.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-14M

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: Three ceramic fragments make up LSF B15-14M. Left item is an ocarina mouthpiece. Center item looks like an ocarina mouthpiece was broken away from the body of the item, which shows no morphological features. The left item lacks diagnostic traits.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-16

Front: Back:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Flute fragments. Bottom half of flute with base and one finger stop present. Flutes in this collection are usually decorated near the mouthpiece. Unknown morphology due to lack of additional diagnostic features.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-17

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-23

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: LSF B15-23 consists of fifteen ceramic fragments. Some of the fragments, like bottom and center right and bottom left items are blocky in their shape. Center bottom fragment unique in its curvature. Unknown if these are figurine fragments or not.
Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (in peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown (fragment)
Description: Hollow figurine fragment. Could be either foot or tail, but no additional diagnostic features to help determine.

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Ceramic bead fragment.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-28

Exterior:  
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Half of a circular applique with a hole in the center. Blue paint residue on front of item. While it appears to be a decorative earspool, unknown for certain if it is part of a figurine, so classified as unknown.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-29

Unknown Side:  
Unknown Side:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Small ceramic bead fragment. Slipped exterior. Similar is shape and size as SF B14-7.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-33

Exterior:  
Interior:

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown (fragments)
Description: Classified as flute fragments due to size, thickness, and partial finger stop present on center fragment above. No additional diagnostic features present to classify morphology.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-34

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (collapse)
Classification: Unknown
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: LSF B15-34 consists of twenty-seven fragments. They do not articulate together. Unknown if figurine or musical instrument, and morphology unknown as well.

---

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-41 (duplicate Special Finds Number given in field, excavated July 18, 2013)

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Musical instrument
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragments)
Description: Small flute fragments with no additional diagnostic characteristics present.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: LSF B15-42

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Small figurine fragment, but unknown what it represents or its morphology.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-47

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Ceramic Beads
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: Two different ceramic bead fragments. One bead is smaller and slipped exterior; the other bead is unslipped and larger in circumference.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF B15-49

Excavated from: Group B site core, unit B15 (limestone marl)
Classification: Ceramic bead
Morphology: n/a (not designed to express anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities)
Description: SF B15-49 consisted of three ceramic bead fragments. They articulated, so I glued them together using B72. Together they form one ceramic bead.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF 90-06

Back:

Excavated from: Household mound 90 (below platform wall)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic
Description: Bent ceramic figurine leg with foot. Broken at top of leg.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF L-19

Excavated from: Household mound 99 (humus)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic figurine fragment of a bird head with two circular applique eyes on either side of head and small, triangular beak at the front of the face.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: Unassigned

Exterior:  Interior:

Excavated from: Household mound 99E (humus)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Unknown morphology (fragment)
Description: Unknown figurine fragment.

Excavated from: Household mound 195 (level 7)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Only hand-made anthropomorphic ceramic figurine in this collection. Figurine torso with shoulders. Broken at the arms and hips.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF 410A-37B

Top:

Bottom:

Excavated from: Household mound 410A (in possible peri-abandonment deposit)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Anthropomorphic figurine foot fragment. Bottom is flat and would have been the base of the item. No other diagnostic features are present.

Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF 410B-4

Front:

Right Side:

Excavated from: Household mound 410B (humus)
Classification: Figurine
Morphology: Zoomorphic (fragment)
Description: Zoomorphic figurine fragment with pronounced brow ridge, highly placed nose, and one ear protruding from the right side. Hollow on the interior. Similar to item SF B6-2-1 found in the site core/Group B excavations.
Catalog Number: Unassigned
Special Finds Number: SF 410B-7

Excavated from: Household mound 410B
Classification: Censer
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Ceramic face/nose fragment. Opening where nostrils are. Would have been a censer and nose would have allowed smoke to escape from the interior of the vessel.
Excavated from: Household mound 184b (lot 4090)
Classification: Censer
Morphology: Anthropomorphic (fragment)
Description: Nose and mouth fragment of an incensario. Mouth open to release smoke from the interior of the censer.
APPENDIX B

BAKING POT FIGURINE SPREADSHEET

The following Appendix includes part of the spreadsheet used to gather, organize, and synthesize data for the Baking Pot figurine collection. Not included here are personal notes, classifications for analysis in SPSS (anthropomorphic or zoomorphic, etc.), unit supervisor, excavation date, and artifact bag number, as these columns take up a lot of space and are not immediately necessary information for this thesis. These notes can be available upon request to the author. The spacing between spreadsheet data is arbitrary and does not signify any meaning, categorization, or lumping of data. Presented first is the Group B data, followed immediately by the housemound excavation data.
Column Heading Definitions:

- **Catalog Number**: The catalog number is the BVAR appointed number to account for each specific artifact. It does not always indicate only one artifact, but instead can include fragmented items excavated together and cataloged together under one catalog number. These catalog numbers are in the process of being updated at the time of this thesis, and will be listed as either a BKP-XXXXX number (updated), or a SF, LSF, or SFL Special Finds number (not updated yet).

- **Special Finds #**: The original catalog number provided for the item(s) in the field during excavation. Used both to signify artifacts that are not standard, everyday finds while in the field each day, as well as the old catalog number after a field season ended. If this column is left blank for an item, it is due to the fact that the new catalog number has not been assigned to it yet during the current catalog update.

- **Category**: There are five categories of artifacts as analyzed in this thesis. They include Figurines (Figurine), Musical Instruments (Instrument), Incensarios (Censer), Ceramic Beads (Bead), and Unknown Items or Fragments (Unknown). For a deeper understanding of these categories, see Chapter Four, this thesis.

- **Total Items**: This column is a total count of how many individual pieces are included for each catalog number (ranges from 1 item to 32 items included in one catalog number).

- **Lot**: Lot expresses the excavation location in the field. The lot number includes both the building number and the level of the excavation. For example, Lot B15-4 would include the excavation unit adjacent to building 15 during level 4 of excavation.

- **Building**: This column is a simplified lot expression for quick and immediate understanding of the location in Group B which the artifact(s) were excavated from. This column informed the spatial analyses of this thesis.

- **Anthro or Zoo**: Anthropomorphic or Zoomorphic item? This column is part of the original iconographic analysis of this collection, and took note in a separate column if the artifact in question exhibited clear human-like features (Anthro), animal-like features (Zoo), or neither (Unknown). This column informed the distribution of artifact types excavated from the different locations (or buildings) of Group B. For a deeper understanding of these categories, see Chapter Four, this thesis.

- **This Lot Is**: Here is a record of the original, in the field notes as written by the excavator or PI, indicating what type of natural stratigraphy the artifact was recovered from. Lots include Humic, Collapse, Feature, Ceramic Deposit, Below Feature, Marl, Limestone Marl, Terminal Deposit, and Below Platform Wall. For a deeper understanding of these lot types or stratigraphic layers, see Chapter Four, this thesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Special Finds #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Items</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Anthro or Zoo</th>
<th>This Lot Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00015</td>
<td>SF B15-36</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00016</td>
<td>SF B15-13</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00017</td>
<td>SF B15-7</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-2</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Humic Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00018</td>
<td>SF B15-40</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00019</td>
<td>SF B15-44</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00020</td>
<td>SF B15-41</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00021</td>
<td>SF B15-41</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00022</td>
<td>SF B15-41</td>
<td>Censer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00023</td>
<td>SF B15-41</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00024</td>
<td>SF B15-9</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00025</td>
<td>LSF B15-38</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Feature 1: LS Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00026</td>
<td>LSF B15-38</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: LS Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00027</td>
<td>LSF B15-37</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: LS Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00028</td>
<td>LSF B15-37</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: LS Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00029</td>
<td>SF B15-31</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ce Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00030</td>
<td>LSF B15-27</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: LS Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00031</td>
<td>SF B14-10/misc</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00032</td>
<td>SF B14-10/misc</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00033</td>
<td>SF B14-10/misc</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00034</td>
<td>SF B15-25</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00035</td>
<td>SF B15-32</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-9</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00036</td>
<td>SF B14-14</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00037</td>
<td>SF B14-14</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00038</td>
<td>LSF B14-3</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00039</td>
<td>SF B15-38</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKP-00040</td>
<td>SF B15-38</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Special Finds #</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total Items</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>This Lot Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-43</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Limestone Marl: Feature 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-43</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Limestone Marl: Feature 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-43</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Limestone Marl: Feature 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-31</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-2</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-20</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ce Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-19</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ce Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-20</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ce Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-21</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ce Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-19</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-39</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B14-8</td>
<td>Censer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-26</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-48</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-48</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-48</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-15</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-28</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: LS Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B14-19</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B14-3</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-15</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-29</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-5</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-3</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-51</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>SF B15-34</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-7</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-35</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-25</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKF-0007</td>
<td>LSF B15-</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B15-4</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Feature 1: Ceramic Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Special Finds</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Lot No.</td>
<td>Special Finds #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-2</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SF B6-6-4</td>
<td>SF B6-6-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Special Finds #</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total Items</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>This Lot Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-100extA-14</td>
<td>Instrument 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-100extA-3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Terminal Deposit Beneath Burial 4-1 (Plaza B, burial 4-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-100extA-15</td>
<td>Instrument 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-100extA-3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Terminal Deposit Beneath Burial 4-1 (Plaza B, burial 4-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-100extB-52</td>
<td>Bead 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-100extB-3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Terminal Deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-100extB-41</td>
<td>Bead 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-100extB-3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Terminal Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-100extB-54</td>
<td>Figurine 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-100extB-3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Terminal Deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-101-02</td>
<td>Figurine 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-101-02</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Anthro wearing Zoo Mask</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-102-01</td>
<td>Instrument 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-102-1</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF B7-102-02</td>
<td>Instrument 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B7-102-21</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF L-86-5-1</td>
<td>Instrument 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B6-5-1</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>collapse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figurine 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B2-4-3</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Anthro</td>
<td>Terminal Deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Excavation Unit</td>
<td>Sr./Ar.</td>
<td>Total liter</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Special Finds</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-29</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00004</td>
<td>SF 410A-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-33</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00007</td>
<td>SF 410A-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-13</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00008</td>
<td>SF 410A-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-44</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00009</td>
<td>SF 410A-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-23</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00010</td>
<td>SF 410A-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-15</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00011</td>
<td>SF 410A-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-47</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00012</td>
<td>SF 410A-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-26</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00013</td>
<td>SF 410A-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 410A-22</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00014</td>
<td>SF 410A-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410A-A-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SF 101-101-05</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>BKP-00107</td>
<td>SF 101-101-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

ALL CHI-SQUARE TEST RESULTS

The following appendix includes screenshots all of the cross tabs/chi-square test results. The results included here are from SPSS and share the results of each of the tests run and the evolution they went through to garner the results presented and discussed in Chapter Five to show transparency.
Part 1: Chi-Square Results Used in this Research:

Results of chi-square test from Table 5.7 showing both artifacts by ritual space and artifacts by in or out of deposit excavation location:

### Crosstabs

#### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category * Ritual Space</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Missing N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Category * Ritual Space Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Figurine</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Ritual Space</th>
<th>Public Space</th>
<th>Private Space</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Ritual Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Musical Instrument</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Ritual Space</th>
<th>Public Space</th>
<th>Private Space</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Ritual Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Category</th>
<th>% within Ritual Space</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.587*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>.444</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>.550</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>.444</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>.445</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.72.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

#### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N of Valid Cases | 149  |
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Results of chi-square test from Table 5.7 showing both morphological type by ritual space and morphological type by in or out of deposit excavation location:

### Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthro or Zoo * Ritual Space</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ritual Space</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Space</td>
<td>Private Space</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropomorphic</td>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ritual Space</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorphic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Ritual Space</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Ritual Space</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.006a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>.000b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.15.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Unused Chi-Square Results:

Unused results of figurine and musical instrument by building (57.1% expected count less than 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category * Building Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musical Instrument</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.089*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.730</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 150

a. 8 cells (57.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .47.

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>PHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 150
Unused results of figurine and musical instrument by excavation lot location (62.5% expected count less than 5)

### Crosstabs

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category * This Lot Is</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cases Missing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category * This Lot Is Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Musical Instrument</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Limestone Marl</th>
<th>Peri-Abandonment Deposit</th>
<th>Below Feature</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Burial Associated</th>
<th>&quot;Feature 3&quot;</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within This Lot Is</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within This Lot Is</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within This Lot Is</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.485*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>11.426</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 150

* a. 10 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 47.

### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramér’s V</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 150
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Unused results of morphological expression by building (64.3% expected count less than 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstabs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Processing Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building * Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building * Anthro or Zoo Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.406a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.601</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 9 cells (64.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

## Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unused results of morphological expression by excavation lot location (62.5% expected count less than 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstabs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Processing Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Lot is * Anthro or Zoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>This Lot Is * Anthro or Zoo Crosstabulation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Lot Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-Abandonment Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial Associated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Feature 3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>10.235</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.661</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>6.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 10 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unused results of figurine and musical instrument by morphological expression (33.3% expected count less than 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstabs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category * Anthro or Zoo</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category * Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category * Anthro or Zoo Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Figurine</th>
<th>Musical Instrument</th>
<th>Censer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>Anthropomorphic</td>
<td>Zoomorphic</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Category</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anthro or Zoo</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.725&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.089</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N of Valid Cases | 79 |

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .56.

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>