

rescent ("Toltec") in Yucatán. This was equally true at Xcaret. And at other sites on the coast where Highland Mexican traits occur (such carved serpent columns, battered basal zones), they appear in the degenerate form inherited by the later architects on the Mayapán level of time, when we know there was an intimate cultural contact between the two areas. Sanders was mistaken in stating that the Modified Florescent tradition was "almost entirely limited to the site of Chichen Itza." It is widely spread over Yucatán, forming for example, an important horizon at Dzibilchaltún.

A type of unstriated bowl or jar which Sanders variously refers to as Alegre Vista ware, the Alegre Vista complex, and the Alegre Vista-San Miguel complex is described as having spanned this otherwise long hiatus of the Pure and Modified phases of the Florescent Period in Yucatán. Although this may well have been the case, one is inclined to suspect either that there are as yet undiscovered developmental horizons in East Coast culture, or that Early Period traditions survived much longer in this area, and that those characterizing the Decadent Period in Yucatán might have been of greater antiquity here.

The earliest component of Sanders' final Tulum complex, which he calls Mayapán Black-on-Cream, although it was indeed found at the base of the late stratigraphy at Mayapán, has been defined as a separate period at Dzibilchaltún, where it occurs in pure deposits associated with distinctive architecture clearly transitional between the mosaic-decorated, veneered concrete of the Modified Florescent, and the crude stucco-decorated, block-wall, and slab-vault construction of the Decadent (Mayapán) Period. Occurring at both Tulum and Tancah, this serves to narrow the gap at Tancah between the earlier occupation and that contemporaneous with Tulum.

The complete absence of anything pre-dating the Black-on-Cream pottery at Tulum in Sanders' very large collection establishes the Decadent Period date of the mass of well-preserved architecture at the site. I confirmed this by an examination of the broken wall surfaces of Tulum buildings, most of which show abundant fragments of Tulum redware re-used in primary construction mortar (although this was the case in only a few of the later structures at Xcaret).

Regrettably scant attention was paid to the important architectural remains at the many sites visited — much of it newly discovered. Although thorough recording of these finds would have been of greatest value, only rudimentary plans and simple elevations were made, and these only of some of the buildings examined. Little structural data are given, and no masonry sections. In publication, both drawings and photographs are reproduced in such minute scale as to be difficult and sometimes impossible to use (in the earlier report 45 line cuts including eight site maps were reduced to three 6-by-9 inch pages; in the present contribution, the 30 architectural photos are reduced to two figures). The future worker interested in architecture and art as well as ceramics will have a long and very difficult trail to retrace to fill in essential detail which would have consumed

relatively little time on the survey — and already much of the material has been demolished.

Sanders is to be congratulated on the results he accomplished towards his set goal. He has published a clear account of the basic pottery wares in an area previously unknown to the ceramist, and assembled the resultant material into a convincing series of complexes which he was able through stratigraphy and seriation to set in chronological order. Finally, I am in accord with the pattern of relationship set up by Sanders to equate his material with that of neighboring archaeological areas. With a short time in the field, and a limited time to prepare his material for publication, Sanders has made a permanently valuable contribution to the Maya field. His information was profitably applied to series of gridded test pits to determine ancient settlement patterns at Tulum and Tancah, that is, what segments of the population lived at what parts of the sites, and at what times.

An interesting sidelight to Sanders' reconstruction of Quintana Roo prehistory is the increasing evidence of uninterrupted and relatively little influenced cultural development, particularly in architecture (much of which he has more firmly set in the time scale) during the profound cultural changes which took place in the western half of the peninsula during the two phases of the Florescent Period. In relative isolation in this area, art and architecture seem to have developed and then degenerated within narrow patterns into forms strikingly similar to those that appeared relatively suddenly after the disappearance of Florescent traditions in the west. I suggested in the Xcaret study (1957) that a survival of Early Period traditions on the East Coast might be responsible for the apparent return of these earlier techniques in architecture, art, and ceramics in the final stages in Yucatán.

E. WYLLYS ANDREWS  
Tulane University  
New Orleans, La.

*The Carved Human Femurs from Tomb 1, Chiapa de Corzo, Chiapas, Mexico.* PIERRE AGRINIER. Papers of the New World Archaeological Foundation, No. 6, Publication 5, Orinda, 1960. vi+26 pp., 17 figs., \$2.00.

The two elaborately carved bones found at Chiapa de Corzo, in Tomb 1, Mound 1, are of very considerable importance in Middle American art and history. They have been treated previously in two papers by Keith A. Dixon (1958, *American Antiquity*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 53-62; 1959, *Archaeology*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 106-10). Agrinier's publication offers additional description and discussion of these carvings. With the aid of detailed analytical drawings prepared by Ramiro Jiménez Pozo, whose name does not appear, he is able to present features not easily seen in his photographs of Dixon's rolled-out casts. Unfortunately, he causes confusion by changing the designations of the different bones. Dixon's Bone 2 has become Bone 3, and the plain ones with the carvings, Bones 2 and 4.

Agrinier identifies a "dragon," Figure A on Bone 1, with the head, Figure F, on Bone 3, and he differs with Dixon's conclusion that Figure F is not fleshless. Since the jaw treatment of the Figure F head is identical to that of "Dragon" A, Bone 1, and the latter is not interpreted as a fleshless death symbol, Agrinier's interpretation is difficult to accept.

Both Dixon and Agrinier assign Tomb 1 to Proto-classic, but Agrinier rejects the radiocarbon dating of the pottery complex and places it more than 200 years earlier. As additions to the discussion, Agrinier suggests for the figures Mexican and Maya hieroglyphic associations that rather stretch the imagination, and he provides a brief, naïve discussion of aesthetics (pp. 21-2).

In examining the areal associations of the style of the portable Chiapa carvings, Agrinier follows Dixon's argument quite closely, although with greater emphasis on "Olmec" affiliation. Actually, the motifs of bearded "jaguar"-faced figures and "dragons" and the manner of their carving conform closely to a recently recognized Middle to Late Preclassic monumental tradition in the Guatemala Highlands and Pacific Slopes, the definition and full documentation of which is still unpublished.

There are some additional oversights of documentation in this publication. The fact that Agrinier's identification and discussion of the "dragon" and its Maya descendants was preceded by a discussion of the matter by Covarrubias (1957, *Indian Art of Mexico and Central America*, pp. 60, 81, Fig. 36) is not mentioned, although Covarrubias's book is referred to in other connections. The stela fragment from Kaminaljuyú, Guatemala, shown in Figure 8, is given a phase attribution without naming a source of information, although there is a published statement by Heath-Jones (1959, *Abstracts of Papers*, p. 37, 24th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology).

Detailed analytic studies of carving and sculpture are extremely important to the growing understanding of art and history in Middle America. Perhaps future studies of the Chiapa de Corzo carvings will be less repetitious and more comprehensive. It would have been useful to expand the comparative section by utilizing the data on human femurs from Uaxactún (A. V. Kidder, 1947, *Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication* 576, pp. 57-9) and from Kaminaljuyú (Kidder, Jennings, and Shook, 1946, *Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication* 561, pp. 153-5).

Chimalpahin had used to test the reliability of his chronicle and to present an account of the early history of the Mexica-Tenochca and the Chalca, particularly those parts which can be checked against other chronicles. These translations were not available when the author completed his manuscript (doctoral dissertation) in 1957.

In 1958 the greater part of Chimalpahin's writings, mainly those of significance to the Americanist, were published in German (*Das Memorial Breve . . .* translated and edited by Walter Lehmann and Gerdt Kutscher; reviewed by von Winning, *American Antiquity*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 1960, pp. 437-8).

Chimalpahin, who has been acknowledged as a foremost source for the ancient history of Mexico, wrote a century after the Spanish Conquest, but even at that time (between 1620-31) he still had at his disposal documentary evidence in Nahautl, as well as pictorial codices, many of which since have been lost. He is noted as the only chronicler of events in the southeastern part of the Valley of Mexico. A descendant of the former lords of Chalco, which was subjugated by the Aztecs in 1465, he had in his possession family documents which were used to attempt the restoration of the Chalco dynasty before and after the Conquest. For his concise evaluation of the sources employed by Chimalpahin, Zimmermann translated the 8th *Relación* (not included in the Lehmann-Kutscher edition), in which the chronicler commented at length on the material available to him, a feature not equalled by any other chronicler. This translation is of particular importance in judging the accuracy of the chronicle because it was written a long time after the Conquest. Proof of the reliability of Chimalpahin is derived from comparisons of passages taken from the geographical description of the world given by Enrico Martinez, who wrote in Spanish, and whom Chimalpahin translated accurately into Nahuatl. Versions of the 2nd and 3d *Relaciones*, furthermore, show that Chimalpahin followed Cristóbal de Castillo (who completed his *Fragmentos* in 1599), Tezozomoc (who wrote in 1609), and the Codex Aubin of 1576. Considerable passages were copied literally. For the history of the Mexica-Tenochca, during the period they remained in Chapultepec, Chimalpahin recounts events analogous to those in the *Anales de Tlaltelolco* (1528), although he did not copy them literally. Even though no comparisons with other sources can be made for the history of Chalco — except for certain toponymics and tribal names — Zimmermann, who translated extensive passages concerning these events (3d *Relacion* and *Memorial*), makes a clear case for the