
NOTE TO READER:

This chapter is taken from a monograph concerned with Neolithic figurines from Iran – a very different time-period and place of origin than the Jackier Zebu figurine – but the author provides a theoretical framework for the functional interpretation of figurines that can be applied to any time or place. Read pages 186-193, with especial attention to the tables on page 190 and 192.

University Museum Monograph 50

HASANLU EXCAVATION REPORTS
Robert H. Dyson, Jr., General Editor
VOLUME I

HAJJI FIRUZ TEPE, IRAN: THE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT

Mary M. Voigt

Faunal Remains by Richard H. Meadow

Contributions by:

Jean Turnquist, John Winter, and Eric Parkinson



Published by

The University Museum
University of Pennsylvania
1983

MUSEUM
GN
776.32
E7
V641
1983

Design, editing, production
Publications Division, The University Museum

Typesetting, Printing
The Sheridan Press
Hanover, Pennsylvania

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Voigt, Mary M., 1939—
Hajji Firuz Tepe, Iran: the Neolithic settlement.

(Hasanlu excavation reports; v. 1) (University
Museum monograph; 50)
“The material in this report originally formed part
of my doctoral dissertation . . . University of
Pennsylvania”—Acknowledgments.

Bibliography: p. 325

Includes index.

I. Hajji Firuz Tepe (Iran) 2. Neolithic period—
Iran. 3. Iran—Antiquities. I. Meadow, Richard H.
II. Title. III. Series. IV. Series: University
Museum monograph; 50.

GN776.32.I7V64 1983 935 83-12469
ISBN 0-934718-49-0

Copyright © 1983
THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

PARALLELS:

A "terra cotta burnisher" was found in Tepe Sialk II₁. It is sub-rectangular and appears to have

smoothed surfaces (Ghirshman 1938:Pl. LIII:19). It is, however, larger and thinner than the Hajji Firuz rubbing tool.

Functional Interpretation

FIGURINES

The function of human and animal figurines (types 3 and 4) has rarely been systematically investigated; however, three studies of figurines from Near Eastern sites have set up classifications and attempted functional interpretations of the resultant types. The first is an unpublished M.A. thesis in anthropology by Broman (1958) which deals solely with the large collection of clay figurines from Jarmo. The second, by Ucko (1962), focuses on predynastic Egyptian and Cretan Neolithic figurines, but also includes analyses of figurines from other Near Eastern sites, among them Jarmo and Tell Hassuna. The third is an undergraduate thesis in Near Eastern art and archaeology by Nickerson (1979;1980), which considers the figurines from the Elamite city of Malyan, Iran. The authors differ significantly in their approach, as might be expected given their respective corpora and academic training. Although Broman presents some original and stimulating ideas, they are based on intuition and her own experiments with figurine modelling. Ucko's study on the other hand relies on the application of generalizations derived from a study of the ethnographic literature on figurines (1962). He initially divides the ethnographically documented artifacts into a series of functional categories based on both ideology and associated patterns of behavior and lists a series of attributes associated with each category. The characteristics of archaeological figurines are then matched with the attribute lists and used to suggest functional interpretations. Nickerson summarizes documentary sources from ancient Mesopotamia which bear on figurine function and disposition, and considers the evidence of damage and/or wear on the Malyan figurines as well as their form and archaeological context. The discussion here draws on the analyses of Ucko and Nickerson, and on recent or particularly rich ethnographic accounts.

Most of the ethnographically documented figurines fall within one (or more) of the following functional categories: 1) cult figures, or representations of supernatural beings used primarily as symbols or objects of worship (prayer, musical performances, offerings, sacrifice); 2) vehicles of magic,¹ or figurines which are manipulated and in many cases disposed of as a key element (simulation) in rituals intended to produce, prevent or reverse a specific situation or state (for example, to insure fertility or healthy children, to cause harm to other persons, to protect one's

own health or property, to prevent natural disasters, to cure illness); 3) didactic or teaching figures, for example, figures used to teach values, sexual facts and sexual mores during initiation ceremonies; 4) toys, or figures used for entertainment; and 5) representations of deceased persons (as well as of people or animals associated with the deceased) used as mortuary furniture (Ucko 1962:45-47; 1968:420-426; see also Wallace 1966:53-67). Since all the Hajji Firuz (and Hassuna) figurines have been recovered from nonmortuary contexts, the last category will not be considered here.

Turning specifically to the evidence from Greater Mesopotamia, figurines which can be assigned to the first two functional classes are attested in cuneiform texts. The use of cult figures, or anthropomorphic representations of deities, is well known in Iraq and Iran. Although the most important images of the gods (that is, those kept in the temples) were made of wood decorated with gold and other precious materials, "cheap replicas" for use in private worship were clay (Oppenheim 1964:184; Saggs 1962:357, 478;

¹ The name used for this category should not be taken to imply that a fundamental distinction is being drawn between "magic" and "religion." Such a distinction, based on the nature of the supernatural power(s) invoked in rituals (impersonal or personal), is difficult to maintain in studies of living groups (Wallace 1966:107, with references), and can serve no purpose in studies of prehistoric groups.

Although the present discussion of figurines is not focused on a discrimination between religious and nonreligious behavior (that is, between "the sacred" and "the profane"), the importance of this dichotomy in other works (for example, Oates 1978) necessitates some explicit statements concerning assumptions and definitions. The analytical framework for the examination of religion which has been adopted here is that proposed by Wallace (1966). Religion can be described as a set of beliefs about supernatural beings and forces ("myths") and a set of behavioral sequences associated with such beliefs ("rituals"); ritual is considered as primary, since it is the means by which a religion accomplishes its goals (Wallace 1966:52, 102-107). From this perspective, religion can be defined as "a set of rituals, rationalized by myth, which mobilizes supernatural powers for the purpose of achieving or preventing transformations of state in man and nature" (Wallace 1966:107). Wallace's approach to religion is particularly useful for the archaeologist interested in the reconstruction of behavioral systems because it provides typologies of religious activities, and explicit definitions for minimal elements of behavior as well as complex ritual sequences. The terminology employed here is in conformity with his typological systems.

Spycket 1968). The use of figurines in rituals intended to protect against or to counteract evil caused by spirits, witches or events (actions of animals, unusual natural phenomena, the victim's own acts) is documented in numerous texts (Nickerson 1979:18–27 and Saggs 1962:305–328 with references; see also Caplice 1974; Gurney 1935; Meier 1967). Made of clay or organic materials, these figurines might take the form of humans or of animals such as dogs, frogs, lizards and asses. During the rituals the figurines were disposed of in a variety of ways: they were buried under house floors, under gates or in open areas; they were destroyed by breaking or burning; they were thrown into rivers; and they were placed in graves. As part of these rituals, “incantations” or formulae were recited. The texts, which provide detailed instructions for rituals employing figurines and simulation, date to the first millennium B.C. There are, however, related texts consisting solely of incantations from earlier periods, providing documentary evidence of a ritual tradition which extends back to Sumerian times, or the third millennium B.C. (Erle Leichty and Robert Biggs, personal communications).¹

The manufacture and use of small clay toys are not known from historical evidence, but through modern observations in Iran and Iraq. In conjunction with excavations at the site of al-Hiba (ancient Lagash), Ochsenschlager made a study of the techniques of manufacture and morphology of all types of sun-dried mud objects used in contemporary villages near al-Hiba. He found that children of both sexes make small clay toys for their own use; moreover, “the range of such items is truly impressive and seems limited only by the breadth of a child's worldly experience or imagination” (Ochsenschlager 1974:171). Included among these toys are representations of men, women, vehicles (boats, wagons, tractors), houses and animals (lions, dogs, wild pigs, sheep, goats, fennecs, equids, camels). In some cases the figurines are composites showing people engaged in ordinary activities, such as riding a donkey(?) or poling a boat; the use of groups of figurines is also documented (Ochsenschlager 1974:170–171). A similar pattern of manufacture and use has been observed in western Iran by Watson:

... I saw two little girls playing near the *jub* [irrigation ditch] just south of the auto-road. They had made two “automobiles” . . . and several human figurines of mud. The autos were oval basins with stubby wing-like appendages and a perforation in each side to represent doors standing open. The figurines were simply blobs 10–12 cm long with pinched out arms, legs, and head; only a few had punched eyes and mouth. One held a baby, a small edition of itself. (1979:202)

Watson also watched little girls playing house with larger dolls made of plastic or of wood with cloth and mud(?) heads; the “houses” were demarcated by small stones arranged in circles (1979:201–202, Fig. 5.64).

The use of figurines as teaching devices cannot be documented during historic periods in Greater Mesopotamia; nevertheless, there seems to be no good reason for excluding this function as a possibility during prehistoric times. The ethnographic examples of didactic figurines are all drawn from Africa, where they are associated primarily with ceremonies held at puberty for girls and boys (“initiation rites”); they are, however, also used at other rites of passage, including marriage ceremonies, ceremonies after the birth of a first child, and ceremonies marking the entry into secret societies (Cory 1951:10, 172; Ucko 1962:46; 1968:425). During these rituals the figures serve as symbols of the “secrets” or knowledge communicated to persons taking on a new role (A. Richards, in Cory 1951:10–11). Given the importance of rites of passage in many cultures, and the particular emphasis on rituals marking the change from the role of child to that of adult (see Wallace 1966:126–130), it seems likely that such activities also took place in early village societies. The possible use of didactic figurines in the ancient Near East has already been considered by Ucko, who suggested that some of the figurines from Jarmo (as well as from Neolithic sites in Egypt, Crete and Greece) were used during initiation rites (1968:429–430, 436, 443).

The best documented series of figures used in initiation rites comes from east Africa (Cory 1951). Made of organic materials as well as of clay, these representations of people, animals and imaginary beings (rarely spirits) are schematic and often crudely modelled. They are used to illustrate lessons communicated in the form of traditional songs or proverbs. The topics dealt with range from forbidden behavior during the initiation ceremonies to general values or social rules, for example, the proper relationships between parents and children, and attitudes toward orphans or people with physical deformities. As might be expected, many of the lessons deal with sex, providing basic biological information as well as rules and advice on marriage, adultery and sexual etiquette. Although some of the figurines illustrated by Cory have ele-

¹ A third function of figurines found in the texts is apparently rare cross-culturally and falls outside of the classification system outlined here. Clay figurines could serve as symbols of agreements such as treaties or transfers of property, including cases of inheritance (Nickerson 1979:11–16 with references). Descriptions of the clay figurines recovered from historic sites in Mesopotamia can be found in Barrelet (1968), van Buren (1930) and Dales (1960). A study of the archaeological evidence for “apotropaic” or protective figurines has recently been completed by Richard S. Ellis of Bryn Mawr College.

ments of realism and could be identified as to subject, few if any could be properly interpreted without the accompanying oral traditions.

The rich symbolism of the initiation figures and the difficulties inherent in any attempt to reconstruct the content of prehistoric symbol systems raise an issue which must be dealt with explicitly before we can proceed to the identification of functional classes within sixth millennium figurine industries. Studies of early Near Eastern figurines have sometimes focused on their symbolic content, and attempted to confirm or deny the existence of "representations of deities," or more specifically the existence of a "mother" or "fertility" goddess. In some cases the argument consists solely of assertions based on the author's own interpretations of certain aspects of figurine morphology and the meanings which such morphological traits might convey. The most systematic treatment, that of Ucko (1968), makes inferences based on links between morphological and functional classes. There are, however, weaknesses in his analysis which stem from a failure to distinguish between the symbolic content of figurines and the specific function(s) which they serve.

At the heart of Ucko's argument is an implicit distinction between religion and magic. Religion is apparently identified with the worship of deities, and can be documented archaeologically by the presence of artifacts classified as "cult figures"; both deities and the activities associated with them are sharply differentiated from the use of "vehicles of sympathetic magic" (Ucko 1962:48; 1968:437-441). Two corollaries follow: 1) if a figurine can be identified (on the basis of morphology or in some cases, archaeological context) as a representation of a deity (as opposed to some other kind of supernatural being?), then it is a member of the functional class "cult figure"; and 2) if a figurine can be identified as a member of any other functional class, for example, "vehicle of sympathetic magic" or "toy," then it is not a representation of a deity.¹ A distinction between magic and religion is not accepted here (see p. 186, n.1), but the problem of definitions aside, both of the corollaries—which are fundamental to many of Ucko's conclusions—are false.

All figurines have an associated ideology. Given a primary concern with artifact function, the general function of the artifact class "figurine" is to serve as

a representation or symbol; the functional categories defined above constitute a second level of classification, based on an analysis of the behavior patterns which employ these symbols. Although the kind of behavior associated with a figurine/symbol is related to its information content, this relationship does not in most cases take the form of a one-to-one correspondence between symbols and functional classes. For example, we can group figurines into three major classes based on one aspect of their symbolic content, the kind of being represented: 1) representations of animals; 2) representations of humans; and 3) representations of supernatural beings, including those referred to as deities, spirits, demons and ghosts.

Using the ethnographic data previously cited, we can now make some general statements about the relationship between representational and functional classes. Figures representing humans and animals, or beings in the natural realm, occur in three of the four functional categories under consideration; they may be used as vehicles of magic (symbolizing either agents responsible for evil, or the victims of evil), as didactic figures and as toys. Representations of supernatural beings can be found in all four categories. All figures used as cult objects are by definition representations of supernatural beings. Vehicles of magic frequently represent a supernatural being thought to have caused evil, or one which is invoked against evil. There is too little information on initiation or didactic figures to generalize, but in the African collections documented by Cory representations of supernatural beings are present, although rare. Perhaps most surprising, given the tenor of some previous discussions (for example, Oates 1979:121-122), is the case of toys. Children's play is clearly a "profane" or nonritual activity; this does not mean, however, that toys cannot represent supernatural beings.

When in use as toys, figurines represent characters or roles in some kind of narrative. The content of this narrative may be related to the ordinary activities of adult men and women in the child's society. For example, in our own culture "dolls" (usually representations of children or of older females) are most frequently used by little girls to act out roles such as mother, bride, doctor, nurse or teacher; these figures vary considerably in size (ranging from several centimeters to nearly a meter in height), material (plastic, organic materials, ceramics) and degree of realism.

¹ In her synthesis of the evidence for "religion and ritual" in Mesopotamia during the sixth millennium, Oates initially eschews a distinction between magic and religion (1979:117, 118). When she discusses clay figurines, however, she appears to follow the interpretive framework outlined by Ucko. Her conclusions are as follows:

It is possible that Samarran site-specific [figurine] types may symbolize particular deities associated with particular towns or villages—the pattern of historic times. But the general diversity of even these figures makes such an assumption

highly speculative. It must not be forgotten, however, that we are undoubtedly classifying together objects of different purpose, simply because they are made of clay. The almost certain presence of toys and 'gaming pieces' should not be allowed to obscure the possibility that some figurines may reflect a genuine religious iconography, or serve some apotropaic purpose, an undoubted function of *some* later Babylonian and Assyrian figurines. Whether the associated rituals represent 'religion' or sympathetic magic is another question. (1979:121)

Smaller "action figures" (representing animals as well as human males and females) are used by both boys and girls to enact battles or to simulate vocational activities such as running a farm, a garage, a store or a school. Similar kinds of play can be documented in other cultures. Little Cashinahua girls have dolls called "play children" which they carry about, baby dolls are used to "play house" in Hasanabad, and Nuer children of both sexes use small mud cows and oxen to "play at herding and marriage" (Evans-Pritchard 1940:38; see also Béart 1955; Klepzig 1972; Reynolds 1968:221).

A second type of narrative is more imaginative, and involves characters which can range from the merely exotic to the mythological. In Hasanabad, this type of play is documented by the clay figures of people in large cars who drive through the village (usually at the highest possible speed). In our culture such narratives are very common; the figures employed may be the dolls used in playing house, but perhaps more diagnostic are legions of character dolls and action figures which carry distinctive physical traits and costumes. Among the more familiar are astronauts, cowboys and Indians, knights, beach bums and models, celebrities, "superheroes" and characters from popular movies and books. At least some of the characters can be classified as supernatural beings. The latter include personae from traditional children's stories (for example, "fairy godmothers") and from a modern epic, *Star Wars*.¹ In other less secular cultures, where the most common tales and myths deal with the activities of a pantheon, toys representing supernatural beings might also be expected. Ethnographic data on play which would support this proposition are not plentiful, but at least one and perhaps two examples were found in a cursory search of the literature. In her description of Hopi toys, Watkins (1946:6-7) states that girls are given cottonwood dolls painted to represent *kachinas* or spirits as a means of religious instruction; moreover, although the dolls are distributed as part of a ritual performance, they are later used in ordinary play and "are really toys and not gods." A similar pattern seems to be documented in India, where figures representing specific gods are made during religious festivals and presented to children as toys (Chattopadhyay 1975:112-121). I would emphasize, however, that the argument presented here does not hinge on the existence of toys that rep-

¹ A well read and relatively sophisticated ten-year-old informant clearly distinguished between the "supernatural" powers of Ben Kenobi and Darth Vader, embodying the Force and its dark side, and the abilities of superheroes. Characters such as the Hulk, Spiderman and Superman have abnormal physical attributes, but in each case, these attributes are explained in terms of a "scientific" cause, for example, exposure to radiation, an insect bite or migration to a planet with different physical laws (Seth Ellis, personal communication).

resent supernatural beings, but rather on the fact that such representations occur within more than one functional class.

To summarize, sufficient evidence has been provided to show that representational or symbolic aspect of figures and the function of figures are analytically separable and to some extent independent characteristics. Thus even if it is possible to unequivocally identify the persona or being represented and its status as part of the natural or supernatural realm, these data do not in themselves provide evidence about the kinds of activities in which the figure was employed. In this study, therefore, emphasis will be placed on evidence which permits a direct reconstruction of behavior patterns associated with the Hajji Firuz figurines.

Using ethnographic and ethnohistorical sources, it is possible to list a series of attributes associated with each of the four functional classes considered most likely to have been present in early village settlements. These data are summarized in Table 28. It is clear that the attribute lists do not provide a simple method for the grouping of figurines from archaeological contexts into functionally meaningful units: the lists are obviously elliptical, and depend heavily on comparisons between functional types which may not co-occur in a given assemblage, or in the specific contexts sampled through excavation; there is also a great deal of overlap in the attributes characteristic of each class. Nevertheless, careful use of the attribute lists can lead to information on figurine function. At a minimum, they facilitate the rejection of interpretations which are incompatible with the ethnographic record. For example, the presence of exaggerated or realistically portrayed sexual characteristics cannot be used as the basis for the interpretation of figures as "fertility deities" or as vehicles for rituals intended to insure fertility; such figurines might also have been used in initiation rites (Cory 1951: Figs. 24, 51, 70; Ucko 1968:425) or as children's toys (Kensing 1975: Fig. 43; Ucko 1968:422-423). At a maximum, the lists may be used to formulate a classification system which will lead to valid inferences about function.

As stated above, discrimination among functional types is most likely to occur if artifacts are classified on the basis of attributes which reflect behavior (as opposed to ideology). In the case of figurines, the key attributes are those which reflect their use and disposal. This statement is based on the following assumptions:

- 1) Most figurine industries are diverse, with more than one functional class represented (see Ucko 1968:426, 443).
- 2) There is a relationship between figurine form and function; however, the specific function of

TABLE 28
 Figures and Figurines: Attributes of Functional Classes Based on Ethnographic and Ethnohistorical Sources*

Class	Attributes	
<i>Cult Figure</i>	Material:	May be made of precious materials, or of common materials such as clay or wood
	Morphology:	May be technologically superior to other types of figures Size is highly variable, ranging from large, stationary figures to small portable ones Usually anthropomorphic in form May be accompanied by iconic elements such as plants, animals or objects (head-dresses, objects held in the hands)
	Use:	May be used singly or in groups Generally used over an extended period of time May be handled (dressed, carried about), but with care May be stored/used in a special purpose (ritual) context or in a domestic context
	Disposal:	Little data, but treatment probably different from that of ordinary or nonritual artifacts
<i>Vehicle of Magic</i>	Material:	Made of ordinary materials, including clay, wax, other organic substances; rarely, made of precious materials
	Morphology:	Are small, portable May take the form of humans or animals; may be male, female or "sexless"
	Use:	Used singly or (rarely?) in groups May be used over an extended period (for example, when worn as an amulet) but usually made and disposed of as part of a single behavioral sequence
	Disposal:	Frequently destroyed by breaking, burning Whole figures or fragments may be deposited within the fabric of domestic structures (within walls or floors, beneath floors, especially at thresholds), in pits in open areas or in bodies of water (streams, pools, wells) Fragments (and whole figures?) disposed of in habitation debris
<i>Initiation Figure</i>	Material:	Made of rare or costly materials as well as of clay or common organic substances
	Morphology:	Vary widely in style, technical competence Size is variable, ranging from large stationary figures to small portable ones May take the form of humans or animals Form highly variable, including "strikingly nonconformist" figures
	Use:	Used in groups, with each figure having a distinctive form and meaning Most used only for a short period, the duration of an initiation ritual, but some stored and used in several successive rites Handled during use, but with care Stored during use in a special structure (initiation hut); those used in several rites stored in secret place
	Disposal:	Often destroyed by burning Thrown into bodies of water, habitation debris, rarely in houses
<i>Toy</i>	Material:	Made of common materials, including clay, wood or other organic materials
	Morphology:	May be crudely or well made Portable, may be very small Include animals, humans, imaginary beings; may be sexless or show sexual characteristics in elaborate detail Often have arm stubs rather than arms, or are simple cylinders
	Use:	May be used singly or in groups, with a tendency for larger figures to be used alone Less durable figures (of unbaked clay or organic materials) used for a relatively brief period; more durable figures may be used for years Careless or rough handling not uncommon Used in domestic contexts, both inside houses and in open areas
	Disposal:	Treated in similar fashion to any other kind of domestic trash; found in habitation debris, but never in ritual contexts

* The sources used to compile this table are those cited within the text. Although the structure of this table was derived from Ucko (1962:47-48), its content represents emendations as well as additions to his attribute lists.

a figurine is rarely evident from its form, and functional classes may cross-cut classes based on technological and morphological attributes (see below).

- 3) Differences in function will be reflected in different patterns of behavior, at least some of which can be discerned archaeologically.
- 4) Among the most significant behavioral variables are those related to use and disposal. These include: a) the number and variety of figurines used in a single activity; b) the length of time that a figurine is in use; c) the frequency and duration of handling or manipulation during use; d) the locations in which figurines are used and/or stored; e) the kinds of damage ordinarily sustained during use and/or disposal; f) the locations used for figurine disposal; and g) the presence or absence of other kinds of activities in the locales in which figurines are used or deposited.
- 5) Behavior related to figurine function can be inferred from attributes such as: a) kind and degree of wear (abrasion, polish, scratches, minor chips); b) location of wear; c) breakage patterns; d) evidence of burning; e) patterns of disposal; and f) contextual data (associations between figures as well as associations of figures with structures, features, open areas, other artifact types, food and manufacturing debris).¹ A set of use, damage and depositional attributes is suggested for each class in Table 29.

The relationship between morphology and function requires further discussion. Because of the rarity of morphological traits which are diagnostic, or limited in occurrence to the members of a single functional class, a primary or exclusive dependence on morphology as a guide to function necessarily results in vague or highly qualified conclusions (see, for example, Ucko 1968:427–443). Even if attribute clusters (rather than isolated traits) are used in analysis, the number of cases in which morphology will permit the assignment of a figure to a specific functional class with some degree of confidence is small. The exceptions are usually (if not always) elaborate and well preserved figures. A pertinent example is the unique representation of a fat, seated female from Çatal Hüyük Level II (Mellaart 1963:45–46, 93–95, Pl. XXIV, Figs. 31–32; 1967a: 183, Pls. IX, 67–68, Fig. 52). The form of this figure suggests that it was stationary during use and relatively fragile; it is

¹ Flannery (1976) also emphasizes the importance of contextual data, but for a very different purpose. He *assumes* that clay figurines found in Formative deposits in Mexico (c. 1500–1000 B.C.) were used in ritual activities. He then uses context to infer the kinds of social units (households and sodalities) which participated in these rituals.

also large, with a preserved height of 13 cm and an estimated complete height of c. 20 cm. These attributes rule out use as a vehicle of magic or toy. The seated position of the figure and the presence of a human head between its ankles provide unambiguous evidence that the figure was intended to portray the act of childbirth, which might suggest use as an initiation figure; however, the fact that the woman rests each hand on the head of a standing feline can be used to argue that this artifact is instead a cult figure, a representation of a deity flanked by iconic animals.²

Accepting the premise that attributes reflecting use and disposal are critical for the assignment of most archaeological figures to functional classes does not diminish the importance of description and classification systems based on form. Ideally, the definition of classes based on technology and morphology forms an initial step in any functional analysis of figures or figurines. This may, however, be impossible, particularly if the sample is small: for example, the two “styles” of human figurine from Hajji Firuz Tepe are not true classes; the realistic style is known only from a single fragment, and if it does in fact belong to a distinctive morphological group, the characteristics of this group cannot be stated. The first step in analysis may, therefore, consist of a grouping of figures into units which can be used in description and comparison, but are not formally defined. (A list of attributes of anthropomorphic figures is presented in Table 30.)

The second step is to ascertain the relationship between techno-morphological units and functional classes. In general, it is reasonable to assume that within a given assemblage, those artifacts which look alike served a similar function. This would seem particularly likely in the case of figures and figurines, where morphological similarity presumably indicates a similarity in information content or symbolism. Nevertheless, ethnographic evidence shows that some societies use identical figures for quite different purposes. For example, groups in North America (the Pomo), Africa and India use the same kind of figure as a vehicle of magic and as a toy (Ucko 1968:422, with references; Bussabarger and Robins 1968:34; Chattopadhyay 1975:112–121). The use of the same object as both toy and cult figure has been documented in Africa (Béart 1955:81–85), and also occurs in contemporary western households, where baby dolls are temporarily used as representations of the infant Jesus in nativity scenes during the Christmas season (Rodrigues 1974:14; personal observations). On the other hand, people commonly use different kinds of figures (that is, outside the range of variation nor-

² My conclusions regarding this figure should not be taken as support for Mellaart's reconstruction of the belief system represented by the structures, wall paintings and sculptures from Çatal Hüyük (see Mellaart 1967a:180–202).

TABLE 29
 Figures and Figurines: Predicted Patterns of Wear, Ruinous Damage and Disposition
 Associated with Functional Classes

Class		Attributes
<i>Cult Figure</i>	Wear and damage:	Intact surface, or minor damage incurred during relatively careful handling Localized areas of abrasion or polish may occur on surface from ritual touching (for example, at head or feet) Figure may exhibit burning, ruinous fresh breaks due to "killing" at the time of disposal
	Disposition:	May be deposited in special purpose (ritual) structure May be deposited in inaccessible places (for example, caves, bodies of water) Groups of figures which are similar or which differ in morphological characteristics may be associated because of the repeated deposition of figures used sequentially, or to the deposition of a number of cult figures at a single time Unlikely to be associated with ordinary refuse
<i>Vehicle of Magic</i>	Wear and damage:	Either no wear, or abrasion/polish of a type resulting from contact with a person wearing figure as an amulet Frequently exhibits burning, ruinous damage which occurred as part of the deposition process
	Disposition:	Characterized by fresh breaks in a consistent location (for example, at neck, waist) May be placed in the walls or beneath the floors of houses May be deposited in burnt features, pits in open areas, bodies of water Parts of broken figures are frequently separated at time of deposition, do not occur in same part of settlement Groups of figures may be associated by repetition of a ritual in a single locale, or by the use of several figures in a single ritual May be associated with ordinary domestic refuse
<i>Initiation Figure</i>	Wear and damage:	Surface may exhibit minor wear from handling, especially at base May be burnt, or intact and unburnt
	Disposition:	Frequently disposed of in inaccessible areas such as caves, bodies of water Rarely associated with domestic structures, houses Groups of morphologically different figures usually associated because of deposition of entire teaching group as a unit Occasionally associated with ordinary domestic refuse
<i>Toy</i>	Wear and damage:	Surface chipped and abraded, especially at base of standing figures Appendages frequently broken away Broken areas are worn, abraded due to continued use
	Disposition:	No systematic pattern of ruinous damage, except at points of structural weakness Deposited in ordinary domestic contexts, both interior and exterior Figures randomly distributed in debris, not clustered Associated with ordinary refuse, including bones, sherds, other kinds of broken artifacts

TABLE 30
Attributes of Anthropomorphic Figures
(after Ucko 1968:67)

-
- A. Material
 - B. Techniques of Manufacture
 - C. Dimensions:
 - 1. Maximum height
 - 2. Maximum width at shoulders
 - 3. Maximum width at waist (narrowest point in mid-body region)
 - 4. Maximum width at hips (widest point of lower body)
 - 5. Maximum thickness of upper body, excluding breasts
 - 6. Maximum thickness of lower body, including buttocks
 - D. Head Form
 - 1. Form of cranium
 - 2. Facial features depicted
 - 3. Hairstyle
 - 4. Position of head
 - E. Form and Position of Torso, Arms and Legs (including hands and feet)*
 - F. Anatomical Details Depicted (breasts, penis, pubic triangle, navel, buttocks, lumbar dimples, fat folds, knees, digits)
 - G. Depiction of Clothing and Ornaments (including tattoos, body painting, scarification)
 - H. Associated Objects (animals, secondary human figures, artifacts other than ornaments, including furniture, tools, "wands")
-

* For a more detailed list of attributes of body form, see Ucko 1968:355.

mally defined for a single techno-morphological class) for the same purpose. In some cases, such diversity is characteristic of the members of a functional class: although there may be common stylistic elements, the artifacts which comprise a set of initiation figures differ significantly in form (Cory 1951); religions frequently incorporate a belief in a pantheon, and some of these supernatural beings may be represented by distinctive cult figures. In other cases, variation within a functional class is related to the kinds of social context in which the members are used; for example, both ancient Mesopotamian and modern Catholic groups use relatively elaborate cult figures in ritual structures serving the community, and simpler, smaller, cheaper figures within domestic structures or household units. Factors of production may also lead to techno-morphological differences. Little Cashinahua girls carry cylindrical wooden dolls made for them

by their fathers, and also use more realistic clay dolls made by female relatives (Rabineau 1975:231–233, Figs. 43, 89, 231–232, Pl. facing p. 81; see also Reynolds 1968: 221, 223–224, Pl. XIV, Fig. 85a–c). Given these ethnographic data, the second step in a functional analysis of figures must consist of an examination of the sample for distinctive patterns of wear, destruction and distribution, followed by a splitting and/or lumping of techno-morphological units into use-disposal units which can be assigned to functional classes.

There is one significant source of error inherent in this classification system. Figures which had multiple functions will be difficult or impossible to interpret; they will be assigned that function which resulted in the greatest amount of wear or damage, or which governed their disposal. Problems will also arise if the sample of figures is small and does not exhibit consistent patterns of wear and/or disposal.

Having set forth a series of general rules, we can now proceed to an analysis of the Hajji Firuz clay figurines in order to infer their function. As stated above, the figures from this site can be grouped into two, and perhaps three, techno-morphological units: abstract human figures; animal figures; and (on slim evidence) realistic human figurines. Data related to the use and disposal of these figures is presented in Table 31. Although there is some variation, all the Hajji Firuz figurines can be placed in a single use-disposal group. This group has the following characteristics:

- 1) A majority of the figurines have no significant wear on their surface (73%, or 8 of the 11 figures specifically examined for wear).
- 2) All the figures were broken in antiquity, and the breaks occur at a consistent location (the torso) on most figures. In all cases, the head was broken from the body.
- 3) In all but one case, the pieces of the figurines were separated, so that only one half of each was recovered.
- 4) All the stratified figurines were recovered from trash deposits, most of which were located in exterior areas (77%, or 10 out of 13).
- 5) There is a tendency for figurines to be associated with burnt features (burnt pits, hearths, an oven), but the degree of association may be exaggerated because of the occurrence of a large group of figurines around a single feature (Feature 9; Figs. 103–105).
- 6) There is only one case in which figurines are clustered. This cluster, in the area around Feature 9, includes examples from all three techno-morphological units, as well as a large number of pieces of fired clay (sealings, type 7; Fig. 104).