



The PARI Journal

A quarterly publication of the Pre-Columbian Art Research Institute
Volume IX, No. 1, Summer 2008

Special Chalcatzingo Issue

containing:

Chalcatzingo: A Brief Introduction

by
David Grove

PAGES 1-7

•

Chalcatzingo Monument 34: A Formative Period "Southern Style" Stela in the Central Mexican Highlands

by
Susan D. Gillespie

PAGES 8-16

Joel Skidmore
Editor
joel@mesoweb.com

The PARI Journal
202 Edgewood Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94117
415-664-8889
journal@mesoweb.com

Electronic version
available at:
www.mesoweb.com/
pari/journal/0901

The PARI Journal is made
possible by a grant from
Precolumbia Mesoweb
Press

ISSN 1531-5398

Chalcatzingo: A Brief Introduction

DAVID C. GROVE

University of Florida

In 1934 archaeologist Eulalia Guzmán traveled to the remote hamlet of Chalcatzingo near Jonacatepec in the Amatzinac valley of eastern Morelos state to investigate reports of "stones with reliefs." The village sits near two conjoined granodiorite hills or *cerros*—the Cerro Delgado and the larger Cerro Chalcatzingo (also known as the Cerro de la Cantera)—that jut out starkly against the relatively flat landscape of the valley (Figure 1). The archaeological site that Guzmán viewed is situated just at the base of those *cerros* where they meet to form a V-shaped cleft. The ancient occupation extended across a series of terraces below the twin *cerros*. From there, in the distance, the magnificent Popocatepetl volcano can be seen.

On the rock face of the Cerro Chalcatzingo Guzmán recorded four

bas-relief carvings. The largest of them (Monument 1), nicknamed "El Rey" by the villagers, depicts a personage seated in a cave-like niche above which are rain clouds and falling raindrops (Guzmán 1934:Fig. 3) (Figure 2). In addition, in a small *barranca* that cuts through the site Guzmán was shown a unique three dimensional sculpture—a "mutilated statue" of a seated personage, minus its head. Guzmán also found pot sherds dating to both the "Archaic" (Preclassic or Formative) and "Teotihuacan" (Classic) periods, leaving her uncertain as to the date of the carvings (Grove 1987c:1).

At the time of Guzmán's explorations the Formative period Olmec of the Gulf coast were very little known. Thus it was nearly another decade before the rock carvings at Chalcatzingo were recognized




Figure 1. The twin *cerros* of Chalcatzingo, Cerro Delgado (left) and Cerro Chalcatzingo (right). From an infrared aerial photograph by David Grove.



Figure 2. Chalcatzingo Monument 1, "El Rey." This photograph was taken in 1978. The condition of the monument is now threatened by exposure to acid rain. Photo: David Grove.

by artist Miguel Covarrubias as having iconographic similarities to some stone monuments at the Olmec site of La Venta, Tabasco (Covarrubias 1946). Archaeologist Román Piña Chan excavated test pits at Chalcatzingo in 1953 (Piña Chan 1955) and recovered sherds similar to those found at Zacatenco and Tlatilco in the Valley of Mexico, confirming that there had been a Formative settlement at Chalcatzingo.

However, nearly four decades after Guzmán's explorations, a significant question remained unanswered: What type of settlement was Formative period Chalcatzingo? To answer that question, in 1972 archaeologists Jorge Angulo, Raúl Arana, and I began the Chalcatzingo Archaeological Project (CAP). We carried out extensive excavations at the site from 1972 through 1974, and again briefly in 1976 (Grove 1984; Grove, ed. 1987; Grove and Angulo 1973; Grove et al. 1976). That research determined three significant phases of occupation at Chalcatzingo during the Formative Period: the late Early Formative Amate phase (1500-1100 bc, uncalibrated radiocarbon years), the early Middle Formative Barranca phase (1100-700 bc), and the late Middle Formative Cantera Phase (700-500 bc) (Cyphers and Grove 1987). Evidence of minor Late Formative, Classic, and Postclassic occupations was also found (Arana 1987).

Most of the information recovered by the CAP excavations pertains to the Cantera phase and indicates that the Cantera phase village was a dispersed settlement with one large domestic structure on each terrace (Grove 1987b:421; Prindiville and Grove 1987:79-80). The primary project goal was "household archaeology," that is, to locate and excavate houses to help understand the lifeways of the people who had lived at Chalcatzingo. This goal was enabled by the fact that the modern land surface is very much the same as that during the Formative period, such that artifacts and even some structural foundations were visible on the surface. The unfortunate corollary of this fact is that many Formative period house floors had been destroyed by plowing and similar disturbances over the centuries. Nevertheless, our large-scale excavations revealed the remains of ten partial or complete Cantera phase domestic structures whose walls had been of adobe or wattle and daub (Prindiville and Grove 1987). Virtually all of them had subfloor burials, and 143 Formative burials were recovered at the site (Merry de Morales 1987). One of the burials, in what we believe to have been the village's elite residence, included a stone head (Monument 17) severed from a sculpture, providing one of the first clues that some Olmec-style "monument mutilation" may have taken place at a leader's death (Grove 1981) (Figure 3).

Despite its relatively small population, Chalcatzingo was a major regional center. This is shown by the presence of monumental architecture, the many stone carvings, and evidence for elite status held by a minority of residents (Grove and Gillespie 1992). Even in the Early



Figure 3. Monument 17, a decapitated statue head recovered from Burial 3. Photo: David Grove.

Formative Amate phase, Chalcatzingo had at least two stone-faced platform mounds, apparently unique for the central Mexican highlands at that time. Furthermore, at the start of the Barranca phase the inhabitants of Chalcatzingo modified the natural hillside into a series of long terraces, the landform that still exists today (unfortunately destroying most of the Amate phase occupation in the process). This type of monumentality—land reshaping at a massive scale, providing evidence of well organized communal labor—more often goes unremarked compared to the presence of sculptures and platform architecture. One of the earthen platform mounds, on the largest and highest terrace, was enlarged during the Barranca and subsequent Cantera phases and measures 70 meters long. In fact, until the CAP excavations, the mound had been thought to be a natural promontory. Several smaller stone-faced platform mounds were situated on some of the nearby terraces downslope (Grove 1984:57-65, 1989:128-129; Prindiville and Grove 1987:63-66).

Although the 1970s excavations emphasized household archaeology, the CAP added greatly to the number of known monumental stone carvings at the site, all of which appear to date to the Cantera phase. During that two-century period the settlement grew to its largest extent and experienced contacts with the Gulf coast Olmec as well as with peoples of Guerrero, the Valley of Mexico, Puebla, and Oaxaca (Grove 1987a; Prindiville




Figure 4. Project co-director Jorge Angulo cleaning Monument 12 at the time of its discovery in 1972. Photo: David Grove.

and Grove 1987:78-80). At the start of the CAP in 1972, eleven bas-relief carvings and one statue had been recorded at Chalcatzingo (Gay 1972:37-71; Grove 1968). An additional eighteen monuments were discovered during the CAP (Grove and Angulo 1987) (Figures 4 and 5). Several more carvings came to light in our research there in 1995 and 1998 (Grove 2005), one of which is discussed by Susan Gillespie in an article in this issue. The quantity of Middle Formative monuments at Chalcatzingo is surpassed in Mexico only by the Olmec centers of San Lorenzo and La Venta. It may also surprise Maya scholars to learn that Chalcatzingo's monuments include the earliest known pairing of a carved stela with a round altar in Mesoamerica (Grove 2005) (Figure 6).

The placement of the major sculptures in relation to their natural and cultural surroundings and relative to



Figure 5. Monument 12, "The Flying Olmec," in 1972. The condition of this carving is substantially worse today. Photo: David Grove.



Figure 6. Monuments 25 (round altar) and 26 (associated stela base) after being moved to a prepared platform for their protection. Photo: David Grove.

one another is a critical factor in understanding their function and meaning. Carvings were located in two general areas: six are carved on the rock face of the Cerro Chalcatzingo and another six on large boulders on the talus slopes of the cerro, while stelae were found on several site terraces in association with monumental architecture (Grove 1999; Grove and Angulo 1987). Almost all of the stelae depict individual human personages (Figure 7). CAP co-director Jorge Angulo (1987:133) noted the linear arrangement of the bas-reliefs on the Cerro Chalcatzingo and suggested that they formed purposeful pictorial sequences. Because they are spaced several meters apart, they cannot be viewed simultaneously as a group. To see them, a viewer must walk from carving to carving. The same kind of “processional arrangement” applies to at least some of the stelae as well.

The ideological and technological roots of Chalcatzingo’s monuments seem to derive from the Gulf coast Olmec—most likely La Venta, Tabasco. The Chalcatzingo sculptures even suffered the same fate of defacement, mutilation, and decapitation common at Olmec centers (Grove 1981). Nevertheless, Chalcatzingo was not an Olmec site. It was already an important regional center by 1100 bc, long before the arrival of various Gulf coast traits in the Cantera phase. The CAP excavations demonstrated that most of the Formative period pottery, figurines, and other artifacts at Chalcatzingo are similar to those at other highland central Mexican Formative sites such as Zacatenco or El Arbolillo in the Valley of Mexico (Grove 1987a, 1989). In fact, the people of Chalcatzingo probably spoke a language related to Zapotec and Mixtec, while the Olmec may have spoken an early form of Mixe-Zoque (Grove 1994:171-172).



Figure 7. Monument 33 stela, discovered in 1998 lying horizontally next to its in-situ base (right). Photo: David Grove.

Furthermore, the carvings at Chalcatzingo are eclectic, in that they combine motifs known to occur at the Gulf coast sites as well as those that do not, such as the quatrefoil motif (Grove 2000). An excellent example of that eclecticism is seen in the site's unique table-top altar-throne, Monument 22, situated at one end of a sunken patio (Fash 1987) (Figure 8). Altar-thrones represent a major category of stone monuments at Gulf coast Olmec centers, and Chalcatzingo's is the only altar throne known outside of the Gulf coast. Although

Monument 22 duplicates the table-top form of Olmec altars-thrones, it differs in two significant ways. First, its front face lacks the symbolic cave-niche of the Gulf coast counterparts and instead bears the eyes of a serpent supernatural (Grove 2000). Secondly, Gulf coast altar-thrones were carved from single massive blocks of stone that had to be laboriously transported from distant sources to Olmec centers such as San Lorenzo and La Venta. In contrast, at Chalcatzingo stones of a size suitable for monolithic altars are abundant at the base




Figure 8. Monument 22, a table-top altar-throne: (above) as it was being uncovered in 1973—the altar-throne's face had been covered in antiquity by worked stones; (left) during excavation as the altar face is revealed; (right) drawing of the altar face. Photos and drawing by David Grove.

of the two cerros, yet Monument 22 was created from multiple large rectangular blocks of stone. That fact suggests that although the people at Chalcatzingo may have experienced an ideological motivation to construct a tabletop altar-throne, it was unimportant for them to make it monolithic.

Today Chalcatzingo faces threats to the integrity of the site and its carvings. For several decades now, smog from Mexico City has penetrated into the Amatzinac valley. Together with the rapid development of Morelos and increased vehicle traffic, this pollution is contributing to acid rains that are slowly but surely destroying the magnificent bas-reliefs. The modern village of Chalcatzingo is not immune to forces stimulating development, and its growth is beginning to encroach onto the lower limits of the site. Nevertheless, the two cerros are as beautiful as ever, and Chalcatzingo has a magical quality that never fails to impress even hardened archaeologists. Visitors to Chalcatzingo will find that the community has built a very nice, small, archaeological museum at the site entrance. Archaeologists from the National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH), which maintains the site, have recently reconstructed a late Classic period platform mound near the site's center, providing a glimpse of Chalcatzingo's continuing importance after its Middle Formative florescence. There are also efforts underway to enhance the visibility, accessibility, and preservation of the Cerro Chalcatzingo and talus slope reliefs.

References Cited

- Angulo V., Jorge
1987 The Chalcatzingo Reliefs: An Iconographic Analysis. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 132-158. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Arana, Raúl Martín
1987 Classic and Postclassic Chalcatzingo. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 387-399. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Covarrubias, Miguel
1946 El arte "olmeca" o de La Venta. *Cuadernos Americanos* 28 (4):153-179. Mexico City.
- Cyphers Guillén, Ann, and David C. Grove
1987 Chronology and Cultural Phases at Chalcatzingo. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 56-62. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Fash, William, Jr.
1987 The Altar and Associated Features. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 82-94. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gay, Carlo T.
1972 *Chalcatzingo*. Portland: International Scholarly Book Services.
- Grove, David C.
1968 Chalcatzingo, Morelos, Mexico: A Reappraisal of the Olmec Rock Carvings. *American Antiquity* 33:486-491.
1981 Olmec Monuments: Mutilation as a Clue to Meaning. In *The Olmec and Their Neighbors: Essays in Honor of Matthew W. Stirling*, edited by Elizabeth P. Benson, pp. 49-68. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
1984 *Chalcatzingo: Excavations on the Olmec Frontier*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- 1987a Chalcatzingo in a Broader Perspective. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 434-442. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1987b Comments on the Site and Its Organization. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 420-433. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1987c Introduction. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 1-5. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1987d Miscellaneous Bedrock and Boulder Carvings. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 159-170. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1989 Chalcatzingo and Its Olmec Connection. In *Regional Perspectives on the Olmec*, edited by Robert J. Sharer and David C. Grove, pp. 122-147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1994 Chalcatzingo. In *Los olmecas en Mesoamérica*, edited by John E. Clark, pp. 164-173. Mexico City: Citibank.
- 1999 Public Monuments and Sacred Mountains: Observations on Three Formative Period Sacred Landscapes. In *Social Patterns in Pre-Classic Mesoamerica*, edited by David C. Grove and Rosemary Joyce, pp. 255-299. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
- 2000 Faces of the Earth at Chalcatzingo, Mexico: Serpents, Caves, and Mountains in Middle Formative Period Iconography. In *Olmec Art and Archaeology in Mesoamerica*, edited by John E. Clark and Mary E. Pye, pp. 277-295. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art.
- 2005 Los monumentos de la Terraza 6 de Chalcatzingo, Morelos. *Arqueología*, 2nd epoch, 35:23-32. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Grove, David C., ed.
1987 *Ancient Chalcatzingo*. Austin: University of Texas Press. (Electronic version available online at www.famsi.org/research/grove/chalcatzingo/index.html)
- Grove, David C., and Jorge Angulo V.
1973 Chalcatzingo, un sitio excepcional en el Estado de Morelos. *INAH Boletín*, 2nd epoch, 4:21-26. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Grove, David C., Kenneth G. Hirth, David E. Bugé, and Ann M. Cyphers
1976 Formative Period Settlement and Cultural Development at Chalcatzingo, Morelos, Mexico. *Science* 192:1203-1210.
- Grove, David C., and Ann Cyphers Guillén
1987 The Excavations. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 21-55. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Grove, David C., and Susan D. Gillespie
1992 Archaeological Indicators of Formative Period Elites: A Perspective from Central Mexico. In *Mesoamerican Elites: An Archaeological Assessment*, edited by Diane Z. Chase and Arlen F. Chase, pp. 191-205. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Guzmán, Eulalia
1934 Los relieves de las rocas del Cerro de la Cantera, Jonacatepec, Morelos. *Anales del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia y Etnografía*, 5th epoch, 1(2):237-251. Mexico City.
- Merry de Morales, Marcia
1987 Chalcatzingo Burials as Indicators of Social Ranking. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 95-113. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Piña Chan, Román
1955 *Chalcatzingo, Morelos*. Informes, 4. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Prindiville, Mary, and David C. Grove
1987 The Settlement and Its Architecture. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 63-81. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Chalcatzingo Monument 34: A Formative Period “Southern Style” Stela in the Central Mexican Highlands

Susan D. Gillespie
University of Florida

It is a little known fact that the Mesoamerican Middle Formative site with the most carved stone stelae is not the major Olmec center of La Venta, but Chalcatzingo in the highland state of Morelos, Mexico (Grove n.d.) (Figure 1). Chalcatzingo (Grove 1984; Grove, ed. 1987) is justly famous for its stone carvings dating to the Cantera phase, c. 700-500 bc (uncalibrated radiocarbon years). These mostly bas-relief sculptures—carved on the face of the Cerro Chalcatzingo, on nearby hillside boulders, and on free-standing stones—have long been recognized as having affinities with Olmec sculptures on the Gulf coast. Their closest stylistic affiliations are with La Venta, and a few motifs are known only at these two sites (Grove 1987b:426-430, 1989:132-142, n.d.). How-

ever, Chalcatzingo’s sculptors also produced motifs, forms, and spatial patterns that have no known Gulf coast Olmec connections, such as the quatrefoil (Grove 2000), and some designs show ties to west Mexico and to the Pacific slopes and highlands of Chiapas and Guatemala (Grove 1989, 1999, 2000).

This paper describes a recently discovered Chalcatzingo stela, Monument 34, carved with motifs strikingly reminiscent of later (Late Formative) artworks in southern Mesoamerica, including those in the lowland Maya region. This stela manifests yet another historical tie between Chalcatzingo and other areas of Mesoamerica, and it may possibly signal the site’s status as an innovator of important motifs.



Figure 1. Chalcatzingo and other sites mentioned in the text.
Cartography by Precolumbia Mesoweb Maps with source data by Planetary Visions.




Figure 2. Drawing of Chalcatzingo's terraces showing some of the monument locations (in boldface), based on a drawing by David C. Grove, provided courtesy of David C. Grove.

The Archaeological Context of Monument 34

Chalcatzingo Monument 34 was discovered in 1998 in situ in front of a Cantera phase stepped platform mound (Structure 1) on Terrace 6, in the eastern portion of the site near the foot of the Cerro Delgado (Figure 2). Terrace 6 Str. 1, excavated in 1974 by the Chalcatzingo Archaeological Project (Grove 1984, n.d.; Grove, ed. 1987), is the largest of four known Cantera phase stone-faced platforms at the site, three of which have directly associated stelae. This platform was erected just a few meters east of a precocious Early Formative (Amate phase, c. 1500-1100 bc) stone-faced mound, Terrace 6 Str. 3 (Prindiville and Grove 1987:65), indicating a long period of use of this man-made terrace for public, if not strictly elite, activities. It is therefore useful to consider the relationship of Monument 34 with other carvings previously discovered on Terrace 6.

Terrace 6 Str. 1 is 15.7 meters long oriented north-south and was built directly onto the sloping hillside of the Cerro Delgado to the east, so that its front side is on the west (Prindiville and Grove 1987:65). Immediately in front of the platform's west side is Monument 27, a mutilated stela (Figure 3). It is approximately 2.8 m tall and was positioned just north of the platform's centerline, its carved side facing west. Monument 27 had been broken in antiquity into at least three pieces. Its basal portion

was still in situ, and the right upper half, though severed from the base, was left lying against the platform wall behind it. However, the left upper half had been removed in antiquity. The carving depicts a single standing personage, legs apart as if in a striding pose, in left profile, the left arm bent at the elbow. The person either wears or carries what looks like a large deer or deer skin on his back. The missing section of the stela included the figure's face and headdress (Angulo 1987:151, Fig. 10.24; Grove 1984:Fig. 10; Grove and Angulo 1987:129, Fig. 9.25). Such personal or identifying criteria were often removed from sculptures in antiquity, both at Chalcatzingo and at Olmec centers, as an act of ritual termination (Grove 1981).

Other monuments found on Terrace 6 in the 1970s include another stela, Monument 28, which also depicts the modified profile left view of a single striding figure holding an object in the crook of his left arm (Angulo 1987:152, Figs. 10.23, 10.24; Grove 1984:62, Fig. 13; Grove and Angulo 1987:130). This massive stone, over four meters long, was not broken like Monument 27, but it was heavily eroded, and the person's face was likely purposely effaced. The excavators believe it probable that the stela had once been erected on Terrace 6, possibly in association with an earlier building phase of the Str. 1 platform, and that it was later removed and bur-




Figure 3. Drawing of Monument 27 by Barbara Fash (in Grove 1984:Fig. 10). Provided courtesy of David C. Grove.

ied face-down 30 meters to the west (Grove n.d.). Grove (1984:62) further suggested from the postural similarities but costume dissimilarities of Monuments 27 and 28 that they may represent a sequence of high-ranked personages associated with the Terrace 6 Cantera phase platform.

Monument 26, a third stela, was found 16 meters north of Terrace 6 Str. 1. Only the basal portion remained, still in situ, with a few engraved lines on it to indicate that its upper section, never recovered by the archaeologists, was once carved (Grove and Angulo 1987:129, Fig. 9.24). More significant was its association with the sculpture next to it, Monument 25, a flat-topped circular

stone (1.3 meters in diameter, 47 centimeters high). It has low relief carving completely around its circumference displaying motifs unknown elsewhere in Formative period iconography (Grove and Angulo 1987:128-129, Fig. 9.23). Monuments 25 and 26 constitute the earliest known pairing of a carved stela and round altar in Mesoamerica (Grove 1984:62-64, 1987a:436, 1989:141, n.d.).

In 1998 two additional stelae were discovered on Terrace 6 by the Proyecto la Arqueología del Preclásico Temprano en Chalcatzingo (PAPTC), conceived and directed by Maria R. Aviles¹ (Grove 2005, n.d.). Designated Monuments 33 and 34, these stelae had been placed in front of the stone-faced platform, Str. 1, approximately four meters out from its northwest and southwest corners, respectively (Figure 4). Monument 33, discovered first, had been broken in half in antiquity. The basal portion was still in situ, while the upper section (1.4 meters long) had been laid horizontally, carved-side up, beside its base. That section had been incorporated into a north-south alignment of large well-faced, rectangular stone blocks laid end-to-end, paralleling the west side of the structure.

Monument 33, like Monuments 27 and 28, depicts a person in striding posture, in a three-quarter view of the left side of the body (Figure 5, also see page 7, Figure 7). The profile face has been effaced, and all of the carving is eroded. The headdress is also erased, although its chin-strap and what may be the ends of a cloth tie are seen in outline. Both arms are shown bent, and the figure holds with his two hands five or more large staves or a sheaf of long objects that extend over the left shoulder. An X-motif is still clearly evident on the left wristband, as are a banded hip cloth and a knotted tie on the left knee. The figure may wear a cape that billows out behind the left side of the body. If Grove is correct that these figural stelae were used in succession and reference a chain of political leaders, then the toppled but re-utilized Monument 33 may originally have been erected prior to the positioning of Monument 27 closer to the platform. However, the stratigraphic data are insufficient to indicate the chronological ordering of stela placements, and they may be contemporaneous (David C. Grove, personal communication 2006).

¹ In 1995 and 1998 PAPTC focused on the excavation of the Early Formative Amate phase structure (Str. 3) on Terrace 6. Discovering the Middle Formative Cantera phase stelae was a byproduct of those investigations. The 1995 project was funded by the Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies, Inc., and it laid the groundwork for the 1998 project funded by the National Science Foundation and the Wenner-Gren Foundation. The project was ably directed by Ms. Aviles, who deserves full credit for the discoveries. Circumstances later delegated responsibility for reporting on the sculptures to David C. Grove (2005, n.d.), who had been issued the permit by the INAH Consejo de Arqueología to carry out the excavations. Monument 33 and 34 were carefully reburied in place to protect them. Monument 32, another figural stela found ex situ in 1995, has been moved to the Chalcatzingo site museum.




Figure 4. Excavation photograph showing the location of Monument 34 with respect to Monuments 33 and 27 and to Terrace 6 Str. 1 in 1998. The earlier Chalcatzingo Archaeological Project had built a stone wall to protect the platform and a roof over Monument 27. In the center background is a roofed structure built to protect Monuments 25 and 26, the stela butt and round altar, which were moved to that location from their original positions nearby. Photograph by David C. Grove, provided courtesy of David C. Grove.

Based on the location of Monument 33 just off the northwest corner of the platform, the 1998 project opened an excavation pit an equivalent four meters out from the southwest corner to ascertain whether a stela was situated in a symmetrical position. Monument 34 was thereby revealed, badly damaged but still in situ (Figure 6). The basal portion is approximately 1.5 meters high, and based on the heights of other Chalcatzingo stelae, it is probable that some fifty percent of the upper section had been removed (David C. Grove, personal communication 2005). Although its position with reference to the platform is symmetrical with that of Monument 33, Monument 34 exhibited very different designs compared to the other intact stelae on Terrace 6, and it is worthy of more extended discussion.²

Description of Monument 34

Unlike the other Terrace 6 stelae, non-figural bas-relief designs were placed on all four sides of Monument 34. The stela is approximately one meter wide and 0.75 meter in maximum breadth. It is more ovoid than strictly rectangular in cross-section, and the motifs wrap around the rounded corners. The portion of intact decoration ex-

tends about one meter in height up to the broken edge. This lower portion of the stela had been battered, parts of the design seem to have been erased, and it had become eroded. The two broad sides (east and west) were especially damaged, with the designs on the east side—facing the platform—almost completely removed.

The north, west, and south sides had the same set of motifs: spiral scrolls, a large J- or L-shaped volute above a stack of slightly curved parallel lines, and interlocking bands (Figure 7). All of these motifs were arranged in vertically oriented zones or columns, and together



Figure 5. Monument 33, photograph with overlain line drawing based on field sketch by Susan D. Gillespie, May 1998. Photograph by David C. Grove, provided courtesy of David C. Grove.

² More stelae may still be found on Terrace 6 as well as elsewhere at Chalcatzingo if modern development on the site can be kept at bay.



Figure 6. Excavation photograph of the north side of Monument 34. Photograph by David C. Grove, provided courtesy of David C. Grove.




Figure 7. Drawing of the carved designs on Monument 34's north, west, and south faces, based on a scaled field drawing made in May 1998 by Susan D. Gillespie; final drawing by Gillespie.

they compose a larger symmetrical design across at least these three stela faces. On the north side, which is the least damaged, the columns are delineated by vertical lines, each taking about one-third of the space. In the center, a large fat J- or backwards-L-shape descends from the broken upper portion of the stela. Below the J is a narrow column filled by slightly concave parallel horizontal lines or bands. A possible design in the center portion of that column is missing, apparently pecked out. To the left is a column composed of two sets of two- or three-part bands forming an interlocking X-shape, as if woven—recognizable as the Mesoamerican “mat” motif. On the right, forming a less well defined column, is a stack of four circular scrolls originating from the right edge of the central column and curving clockwise about two-and-one-half rotations.

The south face of the stela appears to be a mirror image of the north, with an L-shaped motif in the upper middle zone, the mat motif in the right column, and counterclockwise scrolls in the left. Only three scrolls

were carved on the south face, but they take up about as much room as the four scrolls on the north face.

The wider west face is damaged in its central and lower portion, but its design is similar to the other two. In the top center is a much larger L-scroll with an embellished upward projection on the tip of the L. Scrolls appear on either side of this face of the stela, although they are not completely symmetrically aligned. On the left side they curl counter-clockwise, and at least four may be present, while on the right they curl clockwise. With all three faces shown together in the drawing (a view otherwise obtainable only by walking around the stela), the scrolls on the west face are seen to be directly juxtaposed against their counterparts on the north and south faces, and they curl in opposite directions. Below the large L-scroll on the west face most of the carving has disappeared, but there is enough to see the likelihood of two columns of motifs in the center, one on the left composed of the horizontal curved lines, while just a hint of the mat motif can be seen on the right.




Figure 8. Drawing of Chalcatzingo Monument 1, "El Rey," by David C. Grove (in Grove 1984:Fig. 5). Provided courtesy of David C. Grove.

On the badly damaged east face (not drawn), only the lowermost portion of the design escaped destruction, exhibiting traces of two scrolls. There are also small remnants in the lower central area of vertical lines delineating a column and possibly the parallel shallow curved lines. By looking at this side one can see the mat motif coming around the two corners from the north and south faces, framing the missing main portion. Because this side, which faced the structure, was so greatly damaged by battering and erasing, it may have depicted more personal information, possibly a figure. Thus, the same motif set appeared on at least part of this fourth stela face, but it is impossible to say whether a figure or different motifs were carved here or higher up on the stela and were more vigorously removed for that reason.

Significance of Monument 34's Designs

Spiral scrolls of the same type as those stacked vertically on Monument 34 occur on only one other known Chalcatzingo carving, Monument 1, nicknamed "El Rey," "The King" (Angulo 1987:135-141; Grove 1968:486-487, 1984:Pl. IV; Grove and Angulo 1987:115-117, Fig. 9.3). This bas-relief, carved directly on the stone of the hillside of the Cerro Chalcatzingo overlooking the site's

terraces, depicts an elaborately dressed, modified right-profile human figure seated within a concavity formed as the mouth of a great supernatural entity (Figure 8). The shape of the mouth, shown in profile, is the quatrefoil, and the entity has been identified as the deified earth, its mouth becoming a cave or earth entrance (Grove 1968:486, 2000:279). Grove (2000:280) further observed that in the Formative canon of zoomorphic representation, this being was a serpent. Its "fangs," the tight scrolls on the upper and lower extremities of the mouth, curve outward, making it a sky-serpent (*ibid.*:281). This is a reference to a vertical register or zoned location in space, and the carving is positioned rather high on the hillside.

The serpent's fangs each make two-and-one-half rotations, just as on Monument 34; the top one is counterclockwise and the bottom is clockwise. In the space between them, other spirals appear as if emanating from the great mouth at the termini of elongated lines. These longer scrolls have typically been interpreted as thunder, clouds, or mist (Grove 1968:486), and the entire scene, which includes clouds, raindrops, and plants, is believed to represent agricultural or fertility themes (*ibid.*:487). I have suggested that Olmec personages shown seated in niches, for example on Gulf coast monolithic altars, are ancestral figures whose spirits were believed to reside in the earth, mountains, or general otherworldly locations (Gillespie 1999:241). The same interpretation would apply to El Rey, the personage in Monument 1, as a revered ancestor.

Interestingly, Monument 1 also has designs that link it directly to the contemporaneous center of La Venta, especially the triple-raindrop motifs in the headdress of the seated figure (Grove 1989:133-134). However, Middle Formative Gulf coast Olmec carvings lack both the quatrefoil (Grove 2000:283) and spiral scrolls of this particular type. The significance of the scroll motif is better realized when Monument 34 is compared to Late Formative carving traditions. J-scrolls and simple spiral scrolls were used on Izapa stelae on the Pacific coast (Norman 1973) and also occur on the Gulf coast, for example, epi-Olmec Tres Zapotes Monument 3 (Porter 1989:Fig. 14). On those carvings the motifs set off a vertical register of space (upperworld or underworld). The J- and L-shapes on Monument 34 may similarly reference a spatial setting (see Grove 2000). Spiral scrolls more similar to those on Chalcatzingo's Monument 1 and Monument 34 also appear in the Guatemalan Maya highlands in the Late Formative, for example, above the standing figure on El Baul Stela 1 dated AD 37 (Schele and Miller 1986:Fig. 8), where they form an upper registral setting for an ancestral head peering down at a standing figure. The El Baul stela directly associates scrolls with an ancestor, the same association that I suggest applies to the Monument 1 carving at Chalcatzingo, which predates that stela by a half-millennium.

In addition, vertical stacks of scrolls occur on Late

Formative building façades in the Guatemalan Maya lowlands, allowing for further interpretative linkages to the Chalcatzingo motifs. At Tikal's North Acropolis, Late Formative Str. 5D-Sub-10-1st had painted murals of human figures on its front façade (Sharer 1994:Fig. 3.22). They were executed in a style similar to Late Formative depictions in highland Guatemala, such as Miraflores phase Kaminaljuyu (ibid.:109). These murals depict individual (non-interacting) standing humans, each one arrayed against two stacks of spiral scrolls that emerge behind them on their right and left sides. On each side of the figure the scrolls form pairs of opposite-oriented spirals. Given the association of this building with the North Acropolis, which became a necropolis for Late Formative (and later Classic) chiefs and kings, it is likely that these figures represent ancestors. The scrolls may be read as mist or clouds, or more generally, as symbols of an otherworld dimension or state of being.³

Even more intriguing than the Tikal mural in its similarities to Chalcatzingo Monument 34 is the stucco façade on a small Late Formative building at nearby Uaxactun, Guatemala. Str. H-Sub-10 served as the western entryway onto a large platform that had a great pyramid on its eastern edge (Sharer 1994:183). Modeled in stucco on the corners of the building and its doorway were individual standing human figures, their bodies wrapping around the corners. As in the Tikal mural, the figures were individually arrayed against two stacks of scrolls on either side of the body, the scrolls forming pairs spiraling in alternate directions (Freidel et al. 1993:Fig. 3:13). These scrolls are interpreted as smoke (Sharer 1994:183) or clouds (Freidel et al. 1993:142) and as a reference to the otherworld. Although the human figures are considered to be kings (Freidel et al. 1993:142; Sharer 1994:183), they may be ancestral rather than living, like the seated person in Chalcatzingo Monument 1, whose otherworldly location is more explicitly indicated by his positioning within the sky-mountain cave.

The reading of "king" for the Uaxactun figures was based on a second motif that alternates with the personages in the scrolls. A large zone of interlocking bands—the mat motif—dominates the front façade on either side of Str. H-Sub-10's doorway (Figure 9). Read as *pop*, the Maya word for mat, this motif became a widely distributed and long-lived icon symbolizing the throne and hence kingship among the Maya and other Mesoamerican cultures (Robicsek 1975). It is therefore significant that Chalcatzingo Monument 34, erected centuries earlier in the Mexican highlands, juxtaposes exactly these same two motifs—the spiral scrolls and the mat symbol. Like the Tikal and Uaxactun building façades, this stela—placed in front of the large Cantera phase platform




Figure 9. Detail of façade of Str. H-Sub-10, Uaxactun Group H, based on a reconstruction drawing by Linda Schele (in Freidel et al. 1993:Fig. 3:13).

mound at Chalcatzingo—probably refers to ancestors as the source of legitimate authority (symbolized by the mat motif) within the Chalcatzingo polity (see Gillespie 1999).

Conclusion: Chalcatzingo's Southern Connections

Grove (1987a:436-437, 1989:141-142) has previously emphasized features at Chalcatzingo that show certain ties to southern Mesoamerica, in part to counteract the conventional tendency to treat the settlement as a highland community that fell under Olmec influence. These features remain under-appreciated in attempts to reconstruct Middle Formative intra-Mesoamerican historical connections. They include the earliest known round altar and stela combination, Monuments 25 and 26 on Chalcatzingo's Terrace 6, a pairing that became common at Late Formative Izapa on the Pacific slope and at many Classic lowland Maya sites. Another important connection is the early use of the incurving-mouth "earth monster" basal register, which appears on Chalcatzingo Monument 21 (a stela associated with another Cantera phase platform near Terrace 6) and on a looted ceramic vessel probably from Chalcatzingo (Grove 1987c:64). This motif also occurs on Los Mangos, Veracruz, Monument 1 (Grove 1987b:437), but it was more widely used on Late to Terminal Formative sculptures on the Pacific coast, including Izapa (Norman 1973) and Miraflores phase Kaminaljuyu Stela 11 (Parsons 1986:66-67).

Beyond artworks, Grove also noted certain ceramic attributes and forms at Chalcatzingo that can be linked to southern Mesoamerica all the way to its southern frontier, including precocious polychrome pottery, *comal*-like plates, three-pronged braziers, and Peralta Orange ceramics; these last two characteristics are also

³ "Smoke and mist" was a much later Aztec metaphor for the fame and honor of an illustrious person, said of a someone recently dead or who had gone away but whose honor and glory were still evident (Sahagún 1969:Ch. 43:244).

found on the Gulf coast. Significantly, Cyphers Guillén (1987:234) observed that Chalcatzingo's Peralta Orange ceramics are not similar to other highland pottery types but "exhibit strong correspondences to Middle Formative orange wares from the Maya area, including Mars Orange from Uaxactun," among other sites.

Despite these various material ties to the south and east in the Middle Formative, Grove (1987a:437) observed that "[n]one of the southern or Gulf Coast traits remained in the highlands following the end of Chalcatzingo as a regional center. Instead they disappeared or withdrew. None of these traits left a lasting impact on highlands culture." Nevertheless, it is possible that certain motifs and forms at Middle Formative Chalcatzingo had an impact on Isthmian and southern Mesoamerica. Current data suggest that Chalcatzingo was among the earliest, if not the earliest known, community to erect carvings with the spiral scroll and mat motifs and the earth-monster mouth design. These designs may be part of a repertory that, along with the round altar and stela pairing, developed in association with the materiality of expressions of ruling authority via references to ancestral precedence and the veneration of spirits within the earth or mountains. Specific items from this repertory also occur in the Late Formative Pacific coast and the Maya lowlands in the Late Formative into the Early Classic periods.

At present it is difficult to say what historical connections may have linked Chalcatzingo directly or indirectly to the Maya area. Clearly persons at Chalcatzingo were in communication with their counterparts in various areas of Mesoamerica, and the community's elites could have been interacting with complex societies across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec region. Until the archaeology of that area is better understood, we cannot fully evaluate Chalcatzingo's seemingly precocious deployment of certain forms and motifs. With the discovery of Monument 34, these motifs now include the juxtaposition of stacked spiral scrolls and the mat symbol in the context of political leadership and ancestral authority.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to David C. Grove for providing comments and information to improve this paper, and to Maria R. Aviles for the opportunity to participate briefly in her 1995 and 1998 projects and to make the field drawings for Monuments 32, 33, and 34.

References Cited

- Angulo V., Jorge
1987 The Chalcatzingo Reliefs: An Iconographic Analysis. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 132-158. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Cyphers Guillén, Ann
1987 Ceramics. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 200-251. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Freidel, David, Linda Schele, and Joy Parker
1993 *Maya Cosmos: Three Thousand Years on the Shaman's Path*. New York: Morrow.
- Gillespie, Susan D.
1999 Olmec Thrones as Ancestral Altars: The Two Sides of Power. In *Material Symbols: Culture and Economy in Prehistory*, edited by John E. Robb, pp. 224-253. Center for Archaeological Investigations Occasional Paper 26. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Grove, David C.
1968 Chalcatzingo, Morelos, Mexico: A Reappraisal of the Olmec Rock Carvings. *American Antiquity* 33:486-491.
1981 Olmec Monuments: Mutilation as a Clue to Meaning. In *The Olmec and Their Neighbors: Essays in Memory of Matthew W. Stirling*, edited by Elizabeth P. Benson, pp. 49-68. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
1984 *Chalcatzingo: Excavations on the Olmec Frontier*. London: Thames & Hudson.
1987a Chalcatzingo in a Broader Perspective. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 434-442. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1987b Comments on the Site and Its Organization. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 420-433. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1987c Torches, "Knuckle Dusters" and the Legitimization of Formative Period Rulership. *Mexicon* 9(3):60-65.
1989 Chalcatzingo and its Olmec Connection. In *Regional Perspectives on the Olmec*, edited by Robert J. Sharer and David C. Grove, pp. 122-147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1999 Public Monuments and Sacred Mountains: Observations on Three Formative Period Sacred Landscapes. In *Social Patterns in Pre-Classic Mesoamerica*, edited by David C. Grove and Rosemary A. Joyce, pp. 255-299. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
2000 Faces of the Earth at Chalcatzingo, Mexico: Serpents, Caves, and Mountains in Middle Formative Period Iconography. In *Olmec Art and Archaeology in Mesoamerica*, edited by John E. Clark and Mary E. Pye, pp. 277-295. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art.
2005 Los monumentos de la terraza 6 de Chalcatzingo, Morelos. *Arqueología* 2nd epoch, 35:23-32. INAH: Mexico City.
- n.d. The Middle Formative Period Stelae of Chalcatzingo. In *Olmec, Maya, Aztec: Papers in Honor of Dr. H. B. Nicholson*, edited by Marilyn Beaudry-Corbett. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles. In press.
- Grove, David C., ed.
1987 *Ancient Chalcatzingo*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Grove, David C., and Jorge Angulo V.
1987 A Catalog and Description of Chalcatzingo's Monuments. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 114-131. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Norman, V. Garth
1973 *Izapa Sculpture. Part I: Album*. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, 30. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Parsons, Lee Allen
1986 *The Origins of Maya Art: Monumental Stone Sculpture of Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala, and the Southern Pacific Coast*. Studies in Pre-Columbian Art and Archaeology, 28. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
- Porter, James Bruce
1989 The Monuments and Hieroglyphs of Tres Zapotes, Veracruz, Mexico. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.
- Prindiville, Mary, and David C. Grove
1987 The Settlement and Its Architecture. In *Ancient Chalcatzingo*, edited by David C. Grove, pp. 63-81. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Robicsek, Francis
1975 *A Study in Maya Art and History: The Mat Symbol*. New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation.
- Sahagún, Fr. Bernardino de
1969 *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain. Book 6: Rhetoric and Moral Philosophy*, translated by Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J. O. Anderson. Santa Fe: School of American Research and University of Utah.
- Schele, Linda, and Mary Ellen Miller
1986 *The Blood of Kings: Dynasty and Ritual in Maya Art*. Fort Worth, TX: Kimbell Art Museum.
- Sharer, Robert J.
1994 *The Ancient Maya*. Fifth edition. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.