Categories and principal variants*	Lambityeco	Ejutla	Mitla Fortress	El Palmillo low status	El Palmillo high status	El Palmillo ballcourt
decorated garment/tunic/arms crossed/on chest	85	4	–	2	1	–
intricate headdress (head only)	113	–	4	1	3	–
female #3 (small crossed arms)	**127**	**2**	**13**	**3**	**2**	**–**
male/warrior	**370**	**417**	**138**	**62**	**110**	**16**
cotton armor	91	58	41	25	35	6
feathered cape	39	9	14	5	12	5
feathered hood (head only)	59	50	19	9	15	1
helmet/turban headgear (head only)	58	108	31	9	13	2
indeterminate head or torso	12	–	3	1	1	–
loincloth	10	128	–	1	7	–
plain jacket	14	13	7	–	5	–
priest	15	39	12	4	13	–
tiered hood (head only)	34	12	6	7	8	2
trophy head	38	–	5	1	1	–
whistle (small)	**209**	**50**	**74**	**12**	**29**	**1**
bird whistle	–	–	–	2	–	–
buccal whistle	3	1	12	3	11	–
feathered headdress	144	37	61	7	14	1
whistle base	62	12	1	–	2	–
whistle (large globular)	**2018**	**52**	**32**	**62**	**45**	**1**
bird/bat/owl headdress	83	4	3	1	4	–
fauces de serpiente	237	10	7	3	–	–
feathered headdress	299	7	7	9	14	–
jaguar headdress	279	2	1	–	4	–
serpent head	29	3	1	1	1	–
whistle base	654	4	–	13	–	–
whistle head indeterminate	437	22	13	35	22	1
indeterminate anthropomorph	**341**	**633**	**145**	**178**	**157**	**3**

* does not include all indeterminate fragments.

We treat whistles as a subset of figurines (e.g., Lopiparo and Hendon 2009; Martínez López and Winter 1994; Triadan 2007), since representational sections of whistle fragments are not always possible to distinguish from other figurines. Some molded, flatback figurines have hollow attachments on the lower back torso that can be used as a support or as a whistle (Paddock 1983, 203), whereas others do not. The representational portions of some of these pieces are basically indistinguishable. Figurines and whistles are typically broken at the neck, so it can be a puzzle to link specific imagery from heads and torsos.

Most prior interpretations of Mesoamerican fired-clay figurines have stressed their roles in household ritual. Indeed, we found that most figurines were produced and utilized in domestic contexts, but other classes of figurines, especially certain whistles, were heavily used in public rituals enacted in association with civic-ceremonial structures.

A4.1. Background to Oaxaca Figurines

Fired-clay figurines and whistles have long been recognized as part of the archaeological ceramic complex from the prehispanic Valley of Oaxaca (Boos 1966; Caso and Bernal 1952; Caso et al. 1967; Feinman 2018). Early on it was noted that there were important differences between Formative figurines (ca. 1600 BC–200 CE) and Classic/Postclassic figurines (after ca. 250 CE). Most Formative period figurines in Oaxaca are small solid forms that were modeled by hand and include both anthropomorphic and, in lower quantities, zoomorphic representations (Drennan 1976; Marcus 1998). At that time, almost all the human forms are thought to represent females, while dogs, birds, and frogs are the most common animals (Blomster 2009, 124–31; Marcus 1998, 3; Martínez López and Winter 1994, 7). The human figures usually lack clothes and have an array of elaborate hairdos, a highly distinguishing feature (Marcus 1998, 31). Contextually, the figurines are mostly

associated with females, either placed in their burials or used in household ancestor rituals conducted by women (Marcus 1998, 2009b).

By the Classic period, mold-made figurines that represent both males and females became the dominant form in Oaxaca (e.g., Feinman 2018). In contrast to Formative figurines, Classic period figurines are usually clothed; they often wear decorated cotton garments and have elaborate headdresses (e.g., Caso and Bernal 1952, 293, 295; Martínez López and Winter 1994, 6–67). Feathers are often represented in both headdresses (e.g., Caso and Bernal 1952, 179, 309) and garments (e.g., Scott 1993, 20).

Classic period figurines are mostly known from the prehispanic capital city, Monte Albán (Caso et al. 1967; see also Bernal 1965; Caso and Bernal 1952; Kuttruff 1978; Martínez López and Winter 1994; Paddock 1966). In these earlier publications, figurines were mostly discussed through a culture historical lens as chronological or cultural markers (see also Sánchez Santiago and López Zárate 2017), with figurines from Monte Albán seen as typical for the entire valley. They also were thought to be representations of the supernatural, with specific figurine varieties identified as different goddesses (e.g., Caso and Bernal 1952; see also Boos 1966). These early discussions gave little consideration to spatial variation or to the significance of different contexts in which specific figurines were found.

Although intact deposits of complete figurines arranged in scenes naturally have received the greatest attention as a vantage to past ritual activities (Marcus 2009b, 2019), we believe that the large corpus of broken figurines recovered from other contexts can also provide useful information on how and where different broad categories of figurines and whistles were used and how variations in representations and use patterned across contexts and sites. For the Valley of Oaxaca, no prior study has analyzed a large corpus of figurines in conjunction with a consideration of distributional variation from a suite of contexts. Sue Scott (1993) defined a set of warrior figurines from several excavated palaces at Lambityeco, but the warriors in her study represent only one class of figurines that were analytically culled from a much larger assemblage.

A4.2. Classic Period Figurines in the Valley of Oaxaca

In developing our classification, we reviewed roughly contemporaneous assemblages of figurines that had been reported or published from other sites in the Valley of Oaxaca (see Figure 1.1). We excavated only in the civic-ceremonial core of Lambityeco, but other sources have reported on figurines from excavations in domestic areas (López Zárate 2016) and from the palaces north of the civic-ceremonial core of Lambityeco that were excavated by Paddock (Scott 1993). There also is a large assemblage of Classic period figurines from Macuilxochitl (Faulseit 2013; Faulseit et al. 2016; López Zárate 2016), located approximately 5 km northwest of Lambityeco. At that site,

there is evidence of figurine production on one excavated terrace (Faulseit et al. 2016), which includes figurine representations also present at Lambityeco. For Yagul, another archaeological settlement near Lambityeco, Bernal and Gamio's (1974) report on excavations in a palatial residence illustrates many figurines. Several publications report on figurines from Miahuatlán in the southern part of the Central Valleys of Oaxaca, just south of Ejutla (Brockington 1973; Markman 1981). A small assemblage of figurines from Jalieza, in the Valle Grande, are included in a report on excavations in domestic contexts at the site (Elson et al. 2010). A small subset of figurines from the region's primary center of Monte Albán (Blanton 1978) are published in several books (Boos 1966; Caso and Bernal 1952; Caso et al. 1967; Kuttruff 1978; López Martínez and Winter 1994), but the selective reporting and the somewhat spare accompanying information on context limit direct comparisons with samples from that key site. As relevant, we drew on these other works as we coded the figurines at each of these sites in line with the schema that we employed for the assemblages we excavated. In certain cases, the figurines that are reported in the available literature include more complete figurines that permit us to match the broken mold-made heads and torsos in our collections and visualize a more complete representation.

The molded figurines that dominate the Classic period assemblage in the Valley of Oaxaca were made using technology not previously employed before the Classic period; yet figurines modeled by hand continued to be made and used at that time, and they are not rare finds. In our analysis, we tried to expand our perspective on Classic period figurines and to start to understand if and how the use of the new molded forms differed from the modeled figurines of the Formative period.

Our approach is broadly similar to that of Lesure (1999), who considers figurines both as products and as ritual implements. We classify figurines in broad categories without making assumptions about the specific personages that are represented. Because we have a large assemblage with context, we can provide insight into spatial variation in figurine use. Why do some contexts have many more figurines than others? Is there site-specific or context-specific variation in figurine assemblages? Can we define communal (public ritual) instead of domestic use for some classes of figurines? Prehispanic Mesoamericans used music to communicate with the supernatural world (Houston 2006, 143; Sánchez Santiago 2005; Taube 2004, 78), and it was an integral part of ballgame ritual (Wyllie 2010, 216; Zender 2004). Are different sets of whistles used for making music in domestic rituals as opposed to the more public rituals associated with the Mesoamerican ballgame?

A4.3. Categories of Classic Period Figurines in the Valley of Oaxaca

Classic period figurines in the Valley of Oaxaca are diverse in form, size, representation, and production technique,