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A Typology for Fremont Figurines

Chapter 1 Introduction

Many scholars and observers have noted the similarities between Fremont-attributed rock art and Fremont anthropomorphic clay figurines. An established Fremont rock art typology has been recognized yet no typology has been created to categorize and describe Fremont figurines. Although some of the characteristics utilized to describe Fremont rock art apply to Fremont anthropomorphic clay figurines, the limits of unfired clay as a medium to represent the human figure, give the figurines unique characteristics distinct from the rock art types. This study will compare stylistic representations of humans in these two media, rock art and unfired clay, by analyzing head, torso, and terminus shapes, and decorative elements to aid in creating a new typology for the study of Fremont figurines. Many archaeologists would like to understand the function and purpose of Fremont figurines, but without a style study and analysis of the techniques used to create the figurines, discovering their true function is a goal that is as yet out of reach. By comparing the anthropomorphic clay figurines to the established rock art types, I will establish a typology for Fremont figurines.

The data compared in this study comprise figurines from the following sites: Nephi Mound One; Woodard Mound; Hinckley Mounds One, Two, and Three; Seamons Mound; Wolf Village; and the Sevier County Survey. The figurines from the above sites are held in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures (MPC) collection. Figurines recovered from the Pilling site and Old Woman Site will also be discussed. The figurines will be compared to rock art panels from Clear Creek Canyon, Nine-Mile-Canyon, McConkie Ranch, and Barrier Canyon. Due to the limited time available to conduct this study, I have restricted attention to these sites but I recognize that there are other Fremont sites with figurines and rock art panels that can be incorporated into a broader study.

To understand the similarities between clay figurines and anthropomorphic rock art, I first analyzed the figurines and figurine fragments from the Brigham Young University (BYU) MPC
collection to determine where each fragment came from on a figurine. The decoration, or lack thereof, on the figurines was also recorded. The stylistic differences in facial feature representation on the figurines were compared and are needed if comparisons are to be made to the rock art.

Established Fremont rock art genres will be used to categorize and describe the anthropomorphic rock art panels as outlined in Polly Schaafsma's book, *The Rock Art of Utah*, and Joel Janetski's *Life on the Edge: Archaeology in Capitol Reef National Park*. These rock art typologies are the Classic Vernal Style, Northern San Rafael Style, Utah Painted Style, Sevier Style A, and the Barrier Canyon Style.

There are no established Fremont figurine types to date, so I devised the categories in this paper to suite this need. Fremont figurines do not have an established chronology; at multiple sites figurines of different styles appear in the same stratigraphic levels. For this reason I chose to distinguish figurines based on stylistic characteristics rather than unsupported chronological or regional variations.
Chapter 2

Excavation and Lab Analysis Methods

Chapter two covers the excavation and laboratory methods used in recovering and analyzing the figurines for this study. The figurines used in this study were recovered over a period of 90 years by multiple excavation crews, some professional some amateur, and using a variety of recovery methods. Differences in excavation techniques and record keeping by the various crews made it impossible to retrieve all the site information needed for my analysis. Not all the necessary data has been preserved for all of the figurines in the MPC collection. For this reason, only excavation techniques for 42UT273, Wolf Village, are mentioned as this was the only excavation in which I participated. Where appropriate, I indicate the excavation reports for those interested in learning more about the excavation procedures at previously excavated sites.

Excavation Techniques

The excavation procedures at Wolf Village were carried out by the BYU archaeological field school excavation class which was divided into four teams, comprised of four to five undergraduate students lead by graduate students, who worked at different structures within the site. F4 was led by Katie Richards. Her crew included Jana Hooker, Christine Edmunds, Sara Shiley, and Erica Ryder. No figurines were recovered at F4. This site was a semi-subterranean adobe-walled structure that was partially excavated in the 2009 field season and reopened to finish excavation in 2010.

The excavation at F5 was led by Janis Calleja. Aaron Barns, Rosemary Leik, and Sara Adams were on Janis's crew. This was an above ground pithouse. One figurine fragment, 2010.3.1943, was recovered at F5.

Lindsey Johansson led the crew at F100. On her crew were Kari Schrade, Andrew Haight, Abby Jones, and Sara Smilinich. F100 was an above ground pithouse structure and no figurines or figurine fragments were recovered at F100.
The crew at F3 was led by Sara Stauffer with Adreanne Potts, Lara Pagan, Lauren Johnson, and Emily Crain. Wendy Dahle, the field school lab assistant, helped with the excavation at F3. F3 was a semi-subterranean adobe-walled structure on the ridge overlooking the south side of the valley facing Currant Creek. Carbonized beams were found outside the north wall that may have provided support for the walls or could have been roof fall from when the structure burned. The majority of the figurines from Wolf Village were found in F3.

The 2009 and 2010 field school excavation crews followed all excavation procedures outlined in the *Archaeology Field School Student Handbook* (MPC BYU 2010).

When a figurine or figurine fragment was discovered, it was left in situ to be recorded. The excess dirt was removed from around the figurine using soft brushes, and Dr. James R. Allison came and photographed the figurines. The figurine was then drawn and mapped within the square in which it was found. The figurine was placed in a brown paper bag with the depth, grid square coordinates, date, and excavator information written on the outside. The figurine was transferred to the anthropology laboratory in this bag and held by a crew member during the drive back to the laboratory to keep it from being smashed by other artifacts which were transferred in similar bags placed in large plastic buckets.

**Laboratory Analysis Methods**

Each day during excavation season, the field crew came back to the BYU anthropology lab to assign Field Specimen (FS) numbers to artifacts and to wash and dry the artifacts for labeling and repackaging. Figurines were treated differently and were carefully cleaned of any residual dirt and debris by Dr. Allison. The figurines were never moistened during the cleaning process because the unfired clay would disintegrate and the figurine or figurine fragment would be lost. Dr. Allison used a soft dry toothbrush to clear the extra dirt off the figurines before photographing them in the laboratory.

During this cleaning process, the appliqué eye on the left side of figurine 2010.3.1943 fell off.
The eye was loose and the excavators had been worried it would fall off at the time of excavation (Figure 8B). The eye was saved and placed in the labeled plastic FS bag with the rest of the figurine.

Unlike the other artifacts, figurines from the 2009 and 2010 seasons did not have the labels and FS numbers written in black pen on a coat of clear nail polish. This would have damaged the figurines if the labels were ever to be removed. Other figurine fragments from other sites in the BYU MPC collection were labeled, and corresponding fragments refitted and glued back together, but none of the Wolf Village figurines have been altered or glued back together.

After cleaning, the Wolf Village figurines were placed in plastic, acid-free bags with a completed MPC acquisition slip. The original information was cut from the brown excavation bag and also included. Due to the fragile nature of the figurines, the Wolf Village pieces were placed into two small museum boxes to give them additional stability. None of the Wolf Village fragments were placed in individual boxes with packaging foam although it is possible that they will be in the future.

When I began my analysis, Wendy Dahle helped me locate all of the known figurines at the MPC. She gathered the figurines and placed them in one box so that I could access them in the anthropology laboratory. Wendy located additional figurine fragments for me to work with in the museum storage facilities in B-67. Some of the fragments had been mislabeled as ceramic sherds. The MPC staff were assigned to correct the status of these fragments from ceramic sherds to figurine fragments in the museum database.
Chapter 3

Figurine Analysis

The prehistoric Fremont who lived in Utah Valley are an enigmatic people who left many clues but more mysteries about their lifestyle. Their unfired anthropomorphic clay figurines are no less enigmatic and come in a variety of shapes, sizes, and styles. This chapter examines figurines and figurine fragments from eight different sites held in Brigham Young University’s (BYU) collections, and analyzes the various artistic conventions employed, and possible construction techniques used, to create these pieces. Artistic conventions addressed include eye type, facial features, length, width, thickness, nose construction, head construction, terminus construction, paint, appliqué, decorative jewelry, and clothing. Construction techniques analyzed include hand or palm construction, basket construction, and phragmites reed drying or construction methods. Possible body shaping and construction techniques, such as the coil and flattening and shaping methods are also discussed.

Figurines from BYU’s collection were measured, photographed, and compared to prepare a comprehensive analysis of the artistic styles and construction techniques used to create these figurines. Where necessary, these figurines were compared to others found at similar sites held in other collections such as the Pilling figurines and the figurines from the Old Woman Site. It was not possible to view the Pilling and the Old Woman Site figurines in person, so I have had to work from photographs.

The presence of decorative clay additions to figurines as well as figurine shapes and impressions have been analyzed to explore the possible ways these figurines were created. Further analysis of all Fremont figurines is needed before definitive answers about their original intended purpose can be reached, but this chapter functions as a preliminary study to encourage further research.

This chapter presents data in the following order for figurines from the following sites: 42UTJB2, 42UT102, 42UT110, 42UT111, 42UT112, 42UT271, 42UT273, and 42SV374.
The analysis of artistic and construction techniques involved in creating Fremont figurines will aid researchers in understanding the types and styles typical of Fremont figurines. Due to the incomplete nature of the archaeological record and the large span of time between excavations at these sites, more figurines and figurine fragments have been recovered at some sites than others. The figurines in this study are referred to by their Museum of Peoples and Cultures (MPC) accession number.

**Site 42JB2 Nephi Mound One**

Excavations at Nephi Mound from the early 1900s to the late 1960s have unearthed many different Fremont figurines. The Nephi Mound One figurines in BYU's MPC collection come from site 42JB2 and are part of the Earnest Foote Collection. Between 1934 and 1935, Albert Regan received two figurines and other artifacts provenienced to Nephi Mound One, from Earnest Foote. Foote had many figurines, and he donated some to Brigham Young University. The excavations done at 42JB2 were carried out at an unknown date, and were not professional excavations; records are not attached to most of the artifacts. The two figurines in BYU's collection from Nephi Mound One do not share many similarities to the figurine found there during the 1965-1966 field season which had “a drilled hole, 1.5 cm. From the top, [which] does not completely pierce the body. No eyes nose, mouth, or other features are indicated. The figurine is tempered with a small amount of finely crushed basalt” (Sharrock 1967:29).

**89.039.001.1** (Figure 1A) Figurine one was broken in three pieces and glued back together. The figurine is divided by painted lines into five sections of roughly equal widths. Two sections are distinguished by paint; the other three are unpainted. There are remnants of black paint on the second fifth of the figurine, in a band 20.3 mm wide starting 11.9 mm from the bottom end of the figurine. Another band of paint on the fourth fifth of the figurine is present as well, 15 mm wide, starting 22.1 mm below the top of the figurine. This paint appears to wrap around the figurine, but damage to the
back of the figurine makes it impossible to tell.

This figurine has the tri-hole facial feature\(^1\), but the holes are not perfect circles and are slit-like. This figurine also has coffee-bean appliqué eyes with indentations inside the eyes. There are small peck marks at regular intervals over the left front side of the figurine. Peck marks such as these are not found on the second figurine, but do appear on other figurines in decorative patterns. This figurine also has little nubs that could indicate arms, and no definitive feet. The torso, head, and leg measurements taken roughly follow along the breakages of the three pieces.

89.039.001.2 (Figure 1B) This figurine is smaller than Figurine One. It was broken into three pieces and then refitted. It has the coffee-bean appliqué eyes, but they are rounder than the eyes on 89.039.001.1, and lack indentations inside the holes. The facial features are the tri-hole features, but these are larger than usual and are not perfect circles. The nostril holes are located between the eyes, and the mouth hole goes all the way through the figurine. The figurine appears to have had small feet at the bottom, but there are no leg designations. The right foot has been reattached, but the left foot is missing. Feet are not usually this distinct on Fremont figurines, making 89.039.001.2 unique among the figurines analyzed here. There is an additional clay piece attached to what looks like a clay nub arm; it is pinched in the back and flat at the front. The left side of the figurine looks as if it were scraped after construction, with something that had ridges. This scraping is why part of the figurine on the left side is missing.

The back side of the figurine, under the glue and residue from improper displaying, appears to have parallel lines down it going from the top to the bottom of the figurine. This may or may not be diagnostic because part of the back has been chipped off and parts with glue still on it have paper attached, and can't be seen through. These lines may have been caused during the construction process.

This figurine has paint like the other figurine, but only in one band. The paint looks like the

---

\(^1\) A list of terms and conventions can be found in Appendix A.
same burnished slip present on the first figurine and is 19.1 mm wide, and 13.3 mm above the bottom of the figurine. Some paint fragments are still present on the left side of the figurine between the scraped areas, indicating that it was painted before the left side of the figurine was scraped away.

Both figurines resemble others from Nephi, Utah, illustrated by Noel Morss (1954, Figure 22). The body shapes and facial features are also similar. The eyes are treated the same as on 89.039.001.1, being the coffee-bean appliqué style. The three figurines Morss illustrated also have arm nubs, but they are broken at the torso, and no evidence of feet nubs is present.

**42UT102 Woodard Mound**

**72.29.065.1** (Figure 2B) This fragment is incredibly small and could be the bottom of a figurine if it had a cylinder-type bottom, or the top/head of a figurine. It appears to be the top, or head of a figurine because there are two round appliqué circles that could be eyes on this piece, with a bit of clay between them that could be a nose. The appliqué circles have holes in the middle of them, making them appear to be eyes. The appliqué circles are not uniform, and the one on the left side is slightly wider than the other. Figurine **72.29.065.1** resembles four other figurine fragments from Woodard Mound from the 1980-1981 field season that were determined to be heads “with round, punched appliqué eyes” (Richens 1983:66).

**73.480.1275.7** (Figure 3D) This fragment appears to be the bottom piece of a figurine. This fragment is interesting because it has indentations on the back like it was molded around a rounded edge, maybe a finger if held in the hand, or on the edge of a basket. The bottom is rounded, and there is a strip of thin clay that is shaped like a band, 5.2 mm wide, around the piece about 7.7 mm above the bottom. Strips of clay like this are common decorative elements as seen on some of the Pilling and Old Woman site figurines. Some Old Woman site figurines have clay strips around the waists of the figurines, and this fragment may be something similar (Taylor 1957:41). Interestingly, the top of this fragment is not broken. There is a small section that is missing on the front, but this fragment could be
a decorative piece that was placed on a figurine, not actually part of the figurine body. The side edges of the fragment are broken and must have extended further around a figurine, perhaps as decorative clothing.

**84.11.379.N** (Figure 3B) This fragment appears to be the bottom of a figurine. The bottom end is rounded with a small nub on the right side that may indicate a foot, or a leg and a foot similar to **89.039.001.2.** (Richens 1983:66). There is evidence that another small nub, like that on the right side of the figurine, may have been included during the construction of the figurine on the left side also. The fragment is conical and gets wider toward the top toward the break. It is charred on the back and on the broken edge. Fragment 89.65.1.4 from 42UT111 Hinckley Mound Two also looks like this, but the top is still present, and may give an example of what **84.11.379.N** looked like before it broke.

**84.11.349.O** (Figure 3E) This is a broken torso piece. It is broken on the top and on the bottom, but it is like the flattened cylinder body type. It is noticeably narrower on one end, but not by much. The break at the wider area is slightly charred. There are no decorative elements on this piece to indicate whether this fragment was positioned closer to the head or to the bottom of the figurine.

**84.11.379.P** (Figure 3C) This fragment is a small piece of broken torso or bottom. It is broken on top and bottom. The sides are mostly intact and do not appear to have been broken off. There is some red, possibly hematite or ocher, on the right side and back of the fragment. Two other known fragments from the Woodard Mound 1980-1981 excavations are also “stained with red ochre” (Richens 1983:66). The red on the back of the fragment is in four parallel lines from broken edge to broken edge, with evidence of a fifth line of red on the left corner. The fragment is, unfortunately, not diagnostic as it cannot be determined where on the figurine this it came from.

**84.11.349.Q** (Figure 3A) There is no charring on this fragment, and the clay does not appear to have any kind of temper added to it. This fragment could be the left hand side of a figurine. There is one small impression, near the thickest part, where the fragment was broken off that looks like it could
be a fingernail impression for a slit eye. This fragment, like the two preceding, is not distinct enough to be assigned to a specific part of a figurine.

89.38.2.1 (Figure 2D) This is the torso of a figurine that is missing its head and bottom. There is some appliqué on the left side of the figurine, around the waist, indicating that it had been decorated with strips of clay similar to other figurines. The left shoulder is intact, but the right shoulder is partially broken. The bottom begins to flair out but is broken after this point. The shoulder area is thinner than the cylinder-like torso area. This fragment is partially charred on the front and on the top of the back. There is a slight impression on the chest where there may have been a clay decoration necklace that is now gone. This figurine, as well as 89.38.2.2, is from the early Woodard Mound excavations, and not many records were kept of this excavation.

89.38.2.2 (Figure 2A) This figurine is charred, and the lines are less defined than the lines on fragment 89.38.2.1. This figurine has one rounded appliqué eye on the left side, but the other eye is missing. There is an indentation on the right side where the other appliqué eye was. The humanoid features of this figurine are sparse, but this figurine does have a dent to delineate the chin. No other recognizable facial features are present. There are two nubs for arms, but the bottom is broken off 13.2 mm below the arm nubs. The break appears to be old because the edges are worn, but the bottom half of the figurine was never found. This figurine has a cylinder-like body, and the broken section indicates that the figurine may have been constructed from a thick coil.

89.38.2.3 (Figure 2C) This fragment is not charred, but it is broken on the top and the bottom. There is a row of circular holes along the wider edge that look like they were made with the same instrument. The edge of this break has grooves that indicate that there were more holes in other rows after the row of holes that is still visible. The sides, where they are not broken, are smooth and rounded, and appear to be the same thickness. This fragment is a broken torso piece that appears to be part of a trapezoidal body-shaped figurine. None of the other Woodard Mound fragments in this collection fit the
breakages of this figurine.

42UT110 Hinckley Mound Three or Christensen's Mound

67.25.6.1 (Figure 4B) This fragment is most likely the bottom end of a figurine. The strange fin-like additions to the fragment make it appear that this could be the top of a figurine and that these fin-like additions are arms, but this is not consistent with breakage patterns as there are none at the smaller end of the fragment near the fins to suggest that the figurine head had been here. Construction indicators on the designated back of the figurine show that the fin-like additions were added to the large cylinder-like clay piece.

The designated back of the figurine is slightly charred. The back also has odd black lines that look like vegetal black paint. The paint appears to have been splashed on the back, between the fins, and allowed to drip down the sides of both fins. The paint is not as burnished as that found on figurines 89.039.001.1 and 89.039.001.2, but it is shinier than the rest of the fragment.

The break, which is located on the wider part of the fragment, is even. There is some glue on the back of the fragment, and part of the figurine was broken off the back when the glue was peeled off. This damage is consistent with that found on the back of 89.039.001.2 and is most likely from being improperly displayed. This damage also removed some of the paint on the back of the figurine.

67.25.14.1 (Figure 4A) Looks like it could be the figurine of an animal. The back side of the figurine is burned. There are short stubs for arms and legs or feet. There is some part broken off at the observed head, but the breakage isn't enough to make it look like it had a humanoid head attached. It looks as if it could be a figurine of a prairie dog, otter, or other small rodent-like mammal. This figurine is rounder at the lower end at what appears to be a stomach region. If the small nubs above this are arms, there is no indication of breasts on this figurine.

42UT111 Hinckley Mound Two

“Between 1956 and 1960, 20 ceramic figurines were discovered in Mound 42UT111 at the
Hinckley site west of Utah Lake in northern Utah” (Green 1964:74). Dee Green and others from BYU excavated at 42UT111. Some of the figurines from their studies are housed in the MPC collection. Many of the figurine fragments could not be located for this study.

67.25.6.4 (Figure 5A) This figurine is very charred. The clay is black and not very strong. The back of the head appears to have some scrape marks, maybe from construction or from modern handling. This scrape mark appears below the MPC accession number painted on the back, and above a section where some of the clay is missing. This figurine also has a small bit of glue on the back and a small clean break where part of the clay and most of the glue was broken off from improper displaying similar to other figurines. The bottom of the figurine has been broken off, but the edge is worn and it appears that this was done a long time ago.

This figurine has the tri-hole facial features, but also has indentations above the holes that indicate eyes. The eyes are right up at the top of the head and do not have any appliqué, but only consist of small indentations in the clay. Between these indentations, there is a rise in the clay that usually indicates a nose on other figurines. The presence of both the rise of clay between the eyes and the tri-hole facial feature is interesting and may indicate a blending of two ordinarily separate artistic traits. There are two small nubs that appear to be arms, but the rest of the figurine is missing below the nubs. Dee Green believes that these nubs constitute breasts, and cites this figurine as female, but given that the figurine is incomplete and that other figurines with similar nubs are taken to indicate shoulders or arms, it is indeterminable whether the nubs actually indicate breasts (Green 1964:75).

89.65.1.1 (Figure 5D) This figurine has the bottom and top right broken off. The breaks aren't new, and both are rounded. This figurine was burned, and there is some evidence of scraping on the top of the figurine. The scrape marks look similar to those on figurine 67.25.6.4, also from 42UT111. Figurine 89.65.1.1 also has the tri-hole facial feature like 67.25.6.4, but 89.65.1.1 has a more recognizable indentation indicating the left eye, above the tri-hole feature. This figurine has no
indication of arm nubs like the other, but is slightly in shape, and may have had the cylinder-type bottom. This figurine also has some darker markings of black paint. Figurine fragment 67.25.6.1 had similar black paint markings, and is from 42UT110, another Hinckley Mound site.

89.65.1.3 (Figure 5C) This fragment is the head of a figurine. It is incredibly detailed in comparison to the other figurine heads. The appliquéd slit eyes are present with indentations inside the eyes like all the others with coffee bean shaped appliqué eyes. “The slits were formed by impressing with the lateral edge or end of a thin implement, leaving a series of small ridges within the eye” (Green 1964:75). Other figurines with similar incisions in the eyes have been found at multiple sites. The top of the head of figurine 89.64.1.3 is flat, and there is a nose depicted, with nostrils, between the eyes. There are three holes, similar to the tri-hole facial feature, but here, the nostril holes are further from the mouth hole, and are directly under the formed nose. The chin is detailed here unlike most of the other figurine faces. Figurine 89.038.002, from 42UT102 Woodard Mound, also has a distinct chin, but is not as detailed as 89.65.1.3. The face protrudes from the neck, unlike most others in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures' collection. On the left side, the figurine has an attached ear and earring. This is missing on the right side but it appears as if there had been one there.

The back of this fragment also has the glue damage from displaying like others in this collection. The glue is still present and makes it impossible to determine if there is any evidence of form construction techniques on this piece.

89.65.1.4 (Figure 5B) This figurine has had a small piece on the bottom left side glued back onto it. It has been charred and the bottom part is broken and missing. There is no indication of arms, but there is an indentation below the head, indicating the neck. There is a similar indentation on the lower portion of the figurine which could indicate legs or feet, but there is no way to know because after this second indentation, the figurine is broken. This figurine also has the tri-hole facial features as well as the slit and indented eyes near the top of the head. The break at the bottom of the figurine
appears to be old because the edges are worn and not sharp like a new break would be.

**42UT112 Hinckley Mound**

42 UT 112 Sq.10 (Figure 6) No other information is available for this fragment except that it came from one of the Hinckley Mounds and was in “Sq.10.” This information is written on the back of the fragment in marker and there are no other records associated with this fragment. There are no distinguishable facial or body formations on this fragment and the thinness of the clay could indicate that this is actually a fragment from a ceramic vessel. This piece has appliqué like other figurines that isn't normally found on Fremont ceramic wear. The decorations of the bands of clay decorating this piece are different from most figurines. The back side of the piece is concave, and could indicate that this piece was formed on the outside of a vessel. All four edges are broken, but this fragment, due to the clay decorations, could be from the torso of a figurine. The clay is much coarser and is a different color than that used to construct the other figurines, but this difference could indicate that it is from a different clay source instead of the fragment being from a ceramic ware piece.

**42UT271 Seamons Mound**

72.38.15 (Figure 7) This appears to be the cylindrical-shaped bottom of a figurine. Like figurine 2010.3.3272 (Figure 8A) the intact figurine found at 42UT273, the bottom is shaped like a clay coil. The fragment tapers from 21 mm down to 13.8 mm at the bottom until it is broken off. The narrower part of the fragment has an indentation on one side. It is not uniform and it is not apparent whether this was intentional at the time of construction or due to modern handling and excavation. There is an unclean break at the wider end of the fragment. This area might have been attached to the top of the figurine if it was like other trapezoidal shaped figurines with the cylinder-type bottom.

**42UT273 Wolf Village**

Ten figurine fragments, one full figurine, and one animal figurine fragment were discovered at Wolf Village during the field seasons of 2009-2010. Of these, three of the six figurines that have
diagnostic shoulders have the upside down body shape. The other three have rectangle-like bodies.

2010.3.3444 (Figure 8D) This figurine, when it was intact, would have been larger than all of the other figurines in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures' collection. It has some black marks on the right side that could be paint or blackening from charring. This figurine has the coffee-bean appliqué eyes with the slits inside as well as the tri-hole facial features. The three holes are more to the left side of the figurine than centered between the eyes on the face. There also appears to be two impressions of holes for the mouth. One hole is further to the left, directly under the left nostril hole, and the other is slightly overlapping the first, but shallower and to the right. There are little nubs indicating arms, but about 11.9 mm below that, the rest is broken off. The area where the figurine is broken is wider than the top of the figurine and could indicate that this figurine had a thicker bottom, possibly cylindrical in shape. This figurine resembles the Nephi Mounds figurine 89.039.001.1 at the top, which is rectangular, with the exception of the extreme thickness under the arm nubs. The back side of this figurine has been smoothed over so there is no indication of it being formed on a basket or being scraped. Because of the close similarities between 2010.3.3444 and 89.039.001.1, it is most likely that 2010.3.3444 was rectangular in shape.

2010.3.1566 (Figure 8C) This figurine was excavated at F3. It was found lying outside the north wall of feature 145. The front of the figurine is charred gray, but the back is a reddish color. This figurine has the tri-hole facial features, and indentations for eyes, but is lacking appliqué. There is a section of clay, 10.2 mm wide, left above the eye incisions, which is unlike all other figurines in this collection. The head of this figurine is slightly in shape, being wide at the top and narrowing slightly at the arm nubs. This figurine, like the one above, is broken below the arm nubs.

A figurine fragment found at Evans Mound also has a head similar to 2010.3.1566, but it has distinct facial features unlike the Wolf Village figurine (Dodd 1982:53). The shaped head seems to be less common, and 2010.3.1566 has a unique combination of traits.
2010.3.3446.1-5: (Figure 9A-E) All of the 2010.3.3446.1-5 fragments were found in a vent shaft on the east side of structure F3. 2010.3.3446.1 (A) is the bottom end of a figurine. It could possibly be a re-fit with 2010.3.3446.4 (D). This piece is a rounded flattened cylinder-like bottom. 2010.3.3446.2 (B) is a fragment that appears to have been the top section of a figurine that if it were intact, may be similar in size and style to 2010.3.3444. The top left side has a rounded nob that could have been a shoulder. There is a diagonal break from this nob down the figurine to the bottom right side. The front is smooth while the back is rough, chipped, and charred. This could have been part of a figurine with 2010.3.3446.3 and 2010.3.3446.5. 2010.3.3446.3 (C) is the bottom fragment of a figurine. It is a flatter cylinder-like bottom that has been widened and rounded at the end. It is charred on the right front side and back side. 2010.3.3446.4 (D) is the top of a figurine. The tri-hole facial feature is visible as well as the right incised eye. The three holes are fairly close together and small. There is no appliqué on the eye. There is one right nub arm. The back of this figurine is slightly concave and may indicate that it was formed on the outside of a round surface or in the hand with the top part over the inside of the fingers. 2010.3.3446.5 (E) is a very small fragment. It is charred like .2 and .3 and appears to be a decorative end, perhaps like the over-the-shoulder bits of clay found on other figurines (see figurine 2010.3.3272). On the left side of this fragment, there are small indentations that indicate that other small strips of clay may have been overlaid on this piece for additional decoration.

2010.3.3272 (Figure 8A) This figurine was found intact on the outside of the northern wall between two possible wooden buttresses at Wolf Village structure F3. There were many other figurine fragments found in F3. This figurine has a distinct head with a designated chin. The nose is pronounced and comes directly down from the top of the head. It has wide shoulders and a cylinder-like bottom that protrudes slightly toward the back. There are two protruding narrow nubs that come out of the shoulders that appear to be arms. There is a three slit variation on the tri-hole facial features, and the two top slits are directly under the protruding nose. The eyes are appliqué with slits inside. Attached to
the head, there are two pieces of clay that come from the top of the head down on the sides of the face and onto the chest. They have a pinched fin-like part around the cheeks which flatten out and widen on the chest. There are light incisions made on the clay parts that rest on the chest. The left side has one incision 5.5 mm from the bottom, running perpendicular to the clay piece. The right side has a few light incisions running parallel to the play piece, but only reaching 7.3 mm in height from the bottom of the clay piece. There are two main lines and two lighter lines that don't appear to have been included on purpose.

This figurine combines the body shape with the cylinder bottom and has no leg or feet designations. The back of this figurine has scratches and indentations that don't indicate specific construction techniques. From the back, the figurine head is distinctly square shaped. This figurine is unique among Fremont figurines. The bottom part of the figurine has a bit of blackening that could be either paint or charring, but the rest is an orange adobe color. This figurine was excavated by Sara Stauffer.

2010.3.1943 (Figure 8B) Only the head, shoulders and partial chest of this figurine survived. The eyes are small and round appliqué with holes in the middle. One eye has fallen off, but the right eye is still attached. The nose is less pronounced than some, but it is raised. The tri-hole facial feature holes are close together and small. The two top holes are directly under the raised nose. There is a neck decoration on this figurine; a thick band of clay that is incised with small holes that angle toward the center of the chest. Unfortunately, this band of clay is so worn that it is difficult to tell if it is meant to indicate many strings of beads, or cloth. There also appear to be earrings dangling up around the neck that have small holes incised into them.

2010.3.3358 (Figure 10) This fragment is a torso section with the top head and bottom broken off. The right shoulder is intact and charred and the left is broken off. This fragment is typical of the Fremont figurine body shape with wide shoulders and a narrow waist. Similar to 89.38.2.1 (Figure 2D),
this fragment has been smoothed on the front, and the back has some incised lines running parallel between both breaks.

2009.35.630 (Figure 11) This fragment could be a coyote head, or it could be a tripod base. There are holes for eyes, but the facial features are not well defined. It is more likely that it is a coyote head because the tripod-like bottoms for figurines or any ceramic decoration in Fremont ware is uncommon. This fragment was excavated by Sara Stauffer during the field season 2009.

2010.3.2916 (Figure 12) This fragment is of yellowish clay and has no evidence of charring. It has a shallow hole that could be an eye. This hole looks similar to the missing eye of figurine 2010.3.1943. The most interesting feature of this fragment is the small lines running down the back side.

42SV374 Sevier County

There are three fragments that were discovered during the Huntington to Sigurd survey, in Sevier County. The MPC records do not show any additional information about these fragments. The similarities in artistic and construction techniques of these fragments with those found in Utah County sites indicates that ideas or trade circulated these figurines or styles.

84.370.008.001 (Figure 13) This is a figurine torso but the top and bottom have been broken off. There are five lines of incised small holes. It was originally two separate fragments. The top, wider section has had the back portion sheared off. The bottom piece is cylinder-like. Both pieces have been pieced together and glued in place.

84.380.166.001 (Figure 14) This fragment is the head of a figurine. It is broken off after the chin, and part of the left side of the face is missing. It has the tri-hole facial feature, but it is clear the top two holes are the nostrils. The eyes are up near the top of the head with oval coffee-bean appliqué eyes with indentations inside. This fragment is burned. There appears to be an ear hole on the left side of the face, but the ear and earring have been mostly removed. This fragment is similar to 89.65.1.3
Fig. 5C).  

84.380.176.001 (Figure 15) The functionality of this fragment is difficult to determine because only a small piece of rounded conical area is left. This piece may have been fired. The back side is flat.

84.380.177.001 (Figure 16) This fragment looks like it could be the bottom portion of a figurine. The bottom end has two small nubs that could be legs or feet. It is charred and has “10” written in ink on one side. It is similar to a figurine fragment found at Pharo Village that also has an indentation indicating feet at the bottom (Marwitt 1968:36).

Construction techniques

Occasionally impressions dried in the clay of figurines can lend some information about construction techniques. Some figurines appear to have basket impressions where figurines were constructed or laid to dry on or inside woven baskets. Others seem to have been constructed on either the fingers or the palm of the hand. Some figurines from the BYU collection have thin impressions similar to the grain on phragmites reed leaves. Others have no indication of construction or drying techniques that can as yet be determined. Below is an analysis of some of the possible types of construction techniques used in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures Fremont figurine collection.

Hand or Palm Construction

Some figurines have concave impressions on the back that indicate that the figurine may have been held with the bottom portion of the figurine resting in the palm of the hand while the torso and head of the figurine were held over the fingers allowing the other hand to form the clay. Figurine fragment 2010.3.3446.4 (Figure 9D) has a rounded concave back and may have been decorated or constructed by being held in one hand, with the head over the outstretched fingers. The rounded inside of the fingers could have created the curvature on the back of this fragment.

Fragment 73.480.1275.7, (Figure 3D and 17) has distinct curves on the inside of the fragment where it would have been attached to the figurine. These curves indicate that the clay was held and
modeled on the inside of the fingers. The curves may have helped the fragment adhere to the figurine.

Between the arm nubs of figurine 2010.3.1566, (Figure 8C) there is a slight impression, the size of a thumb print on the front of the figurine. This figurine may have been shaped and then held between the arm nubs to make the eye incisions and tri-hole facial features.

The hand or palm construction technique is the least represented and studied in other collections. After analysis of other figurines has been completed, this technique may be more easily recognized.

**Basket Construction**

Figurines from many collections have impressions on the back side that are attributed to the circular coils on the inside of baskets. The famous Pilling figurines are known for the basket impressions on the backs of many figurines. “The figurines were laid while still soft on the bottoms of coiled baskets or trays, flat or slightly convex in the center, the imprints of which are visible on the backs of several of the specimens. The prints are not sufficiently clear and continuous to enable us to state definitely that the prints were made by the same basket in any two or more cases” (Morss 1954:4). Pilling figurines numbers one through five, seven, and nine through eleven, as numbered by Morss, all show distinct basket impressions.

One figurine from the Museum of Peoples and Cultures collections shows basket-like impressions on the back side. Figurine 2010.3.1943, (Figure 8B and 18) from the 2010 BYU field school at Wolf Village has basket impressions on the back of the head similar to some of the Pilling figurines. The back of this figurine has round coil impressions which indicates that it could have been constructed on the inside or bottom of a basket. It is unknown if the figurines were constructed on the basket-like surface, or if they were placed there to dry. The Frequency of this type of impression on the back of figurines makes this type of construction more easily recognizable.

**Mat or Reed Construction/Drying**
Evidence of woven reed and grass mats has been discovered at some Fremont sites. Mats made from the phragmites reed, an indigenous reed common in Utah Valley, could have been used in the construction or drying of figurines. Figurine 2010.3.2916 (Figure 12B) has small parallel lines running across the back of the figurine that could indicate a construction or drying technique using the leaves or a woven mats made of the phragmites reed. The phragmites reed is indigenous to Wolf Village, being located along Currant Creek near the site, and is common in marshy areas in central Utah. Charred reed was recovered from Wolf Village and was identified as paragmites reed.

Other figurines, such as 67.025.6.4 (Figure 5A), also have the small parallel lines on the back that match the lines that could be made by drying a figurine, or pressing and constructing a figurine, on a leaf or the woven leaves of the phragmites reed. Figurine 89.039.001.2 (Figure 1B) exhibits parallel impressions running down the back that are consistent with the lines on phragmites reed leaves. However, due to the damage on the back of the figurine, it is indeterminable whether these lines were part of the construction process.

**Body Types**

Some figurines have round cylinder-like bodies or bottoms, while others are rectangular, or trapezoidal. These distinct body types and artistic styles are sometimes merged, or found at the same site, indicating that these styles could have been circulating at the same time, and were passed or traded between groups at different sites. The figurines from the MPC collection show a wide variety of these body types and shapes.

**Cylinder Body Type Construction**

The bottoms of many figurines are cylinder or coil shaped and do not have any indication of legs or feet. Some figurines combine the flattened trapezoidal torso with the cylinder-like bottom. The cylinder bottoms may have been constructed using a coil method, similar to that used to create coils for pots.
The shape of figurine 67.25.14.1 (Figure 4A) suggests that it was constructed using a fat coil that was then molded and formed to create the head and nubbin arms and legs. This figurine does not have very distinct anthropomorphic characteristics, but looks like it could be an animal figurine.

89.38.2.2 (Figure 2A) the break under the arm nubs of this figurine indicates that the bottom was thick and circular. This figurine may have had a cylinder-like bottom.

Fragments 72.38.15 (Figure 7), 2010.3.3446.1 (Figure 9A), 84.370.008.001 (Figure 13), 84.11.349.O (Figure 3E), and 67.25.6.1 (Figure 4B), are all semi cylinder-like. Some are rounder, while others have been slightly flattened. All of these fragments resemble 12010.3.3272 (Figure 8A), where a round coil of clay was used to create the bottom of the figurine. A figurine fragment from the Knoll Site has a cylinder-like terminus shape that is flattened similar to 2010.3.3446.1 (Fry 1979:80).

Flattening and Shaping Construction

Figurines 89.039.001.1 and 89.039.001.2, (Figure 1A-B) from Nephi Mound, are examples of the more rectangular shaped body construction. They are not perfect rectangles, but their heads and bottoms resemble squares. Figurine 2010.3.3444 is similar, and has a distinctly flat, squarish head. These figurines, and others that are flatter, appear to have been constructed by flattening and shaping the clay instead of using a coil of clay.

Fragment 89.38.2.3 (Figure 2C), resembling a flattened trapezoid, is broken on top and bottom, but this fragment is flat and has an even thickness throughout. This fragment is another example of flattening and shaping construction.

Some fragments and figurines combine the cylinder and flattening method to create a sort of hybrid figurine. Number 67.25.6.1, (Figure 4B) has a cylinder-like bottom that has fin-like clay pieces attached. The cylinder bottom widens and flattens as it goes up, indicating that the top of the figurine may have looked like the trapezoidal torso shape. Figurine 2010.3.3272 (Figure 8A) is an intact example of the cylinder and flattening methods merging. The bottom cylinder of this figurine is thick.
and round, but it thins out as it widens to the shoulders and arm nubs. There is no visible seam between the thick bottom and thinner torso sections, and it is probable that this figurine was started as a cylinder and then flattened and widened at the top.

Decoration

The purpose of the decoration and ornamentation of Fremont figurines is still unknown. It has been hypothesized that the appliqué jewelry and dress of some figurines is representational of ceremony and status, and is similar to anthropomorphic depictions in Fremont rock art. The figurines in the MPC collection contain different examples of various decoration types from jewelry, paint, appliqué, and incised holes, to remnants of appliqué clothing.

The intact figurine, 2010.3.3272 (Figure 8A) from Wolf Village, has additions of clay that come down from the top of the head and over the chest. The decorations are similar to over-the-shoulder, or “bow-tie” clay additions from figurines from Old Woman Site and the Pilling figurines (Jennings 1978: 187-205). Figurines from both sites with clay additions like these were meant to be viewed from the front, and like 2010.3.3272, attach at the back, but do not extend to the back side of the figurine. Figurine 89.039.001.2, (Figure 1B) also has a clay decoration similar to the “bow-tie” type, but it is pinched at the top similar to 2010.3.3272.

Fragment 89.65.1.3 (Figure 5C, 19) is a detailed head piece that has the left ear and earring intact. This piece is similar to 84.380.166.001 (Figure 14), another head piece that also has the left ear and earring mostly intact. Both pieces display the same facial characteristics as well as the same type of round dangling earring. Figurine 2010.3.1943 (Figure 8B) has a partial earring piece, but no ear, and a thick necklace, or piece of clothing that comes over the shoulders and meets across the chest at approximately a 45 degree angle. The necklace and earring have small holes that could indicate strings of beads. These three fragments are the only overt examples of jewelry in the MPC collection.

42UT112 Sq.10 (Figure 6) has an appliquéd row of clay along the bottom broken edge, and a
small fragment of appliqué near the top broken edge. The appliqué near the top is interesting because it is different than what is usually found on Fremont figurines. The thin band of clay was placed on the figurine and then a small instrument, possibly a straw-like reed with a small diameter, was used to incise the small circles along the clay strip. This appliqué design does not appear on any other figurine or fragment in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures collection. The appliqué along the bottom edge has faint circles, but is in poor condition. These bands of clay could indicate jewelry or decorative pieces of clothing, but without additional pieces of the figurine, it is difficult to determine the purposes of these appliqué bands.

Two appliqué bands of clay found on an Old Woman figurine are similar to the appliqué found on 42UT112 Sq.10. The bands are located around the figurine’s neck, under the chin and have small incised holes (Taylor 1956 fig.19). Unlike 42UT112 Sq.10, the holes on the Old Woman figurine have removed the clay or pushed it in. The holes in fragment 42UT112 Sq.10 still have the clay inside which is unique to Fremont decoration.

Fragments 2010.3.3446.5 (Figure 9E) and 89.38.2.1 (Figure 2D) both have indentations where clay strips might have been. The clay strips could be similar to those found on the Pilling figurines, and the indentations could have been caused when the clay bands were pressed into the figurine. Fragment 2010.3.3446.5 could be one of the “bow-tie” decorations that commonly adorn the Pilling and Old Woman figurines (Jennings 1978:187).

The trapezoidal fragment, 89.38.2.3, (Figure 2C) is broken on top along two rows of small incised holes. The top broken edge shows divots where another line of incised holes had been. These holes are similar to those on fragment 84.370.008.001 (Figure 13), where the torso of the figurine has small even holes in five lines that create a pattern; three lines close together at the wider top, one near the middle, or waist, and one line close to the bottom break.

89.039.001.1 (Figure 1A) The small peck marks, or holes, on the front of this figurine are only
on the left side and are not in a particular pattern or order. The holes start at the top of the figurine, under the first break, and are in wider rows at the top, and then narrow after the first band of paint and stay on the left side to the bottom of the figurine. Figurine \textit{89.039.001.2}, which was found with \textit{89.039.001.1}, does not have any incised or hole marks on the front or the back.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Fremont figurines come in a wide variety of construction shapes and artistic styles. The figurines from the Museum of Peoples and Cultures’ collection show artistic conventions and construction techniques that are both unique and typical of the Fremont tradition. Decorative additions to figurines, including paint, appliqué, incised holes, facial features, and clothing possibilities, are all present in the MPC collection. Body shapes ranging from trapezoidal, rectangular, and cylindrical, mark various figurines, with some using multiple construction techniques. Evidence of construction practices, such as hand/palm construction, flattening and shaping methods, the coil method, phragmites reed and basket construction, all appear on figurines in this collection. Some figurines and fragments combine traits that are as yet, considered unique in the Fremont construction repertoire. Further studies analyzing figurines from the entire Fremont area are needed to create a comprehensive view of Fremont figurines. Until this study can be done, it will be difficult to come to a definite conclusion about the purpose and function of Fremont figurines.
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Chapter 4

Classic Vernal Style Rock Art

McConkie Ranch Petroglyphs and Pictographs

The rock art panels used to illustrate the Classic Vernal Style petroglyphs come from McConkie Ranch. McConkie Ranch is located on private land in Dry Fork Canyon near Vernal Utah and contains some of the best examples of Classic Vernal Style rock art. McConkie Ranch Vernal style petroglyphs have been described as having:

precise, ornamented detail and decorative effects. They show facial features, jewelry, and highly variable headgear. Other details include items of apparel such as fringed aprons, breechcloths, belts and sashes, armbands, and torso decorations. Figures are often shown holding decorated shields, as well as objects that have been interpreted as masks, scalps, or human heads. Some anthropomorphic figures have tear streaks on their faces, a device known as the 'weeping eye' motif. (Silfer 2000:177)

Classic Vernal Style petroglyphs are also characterized by their trapezoidal body shapes. The shoulders are broad and the body shapes are geometrically executed. The anthropomorphic figures range in size with many which are life-size. Classic Vernal Style heads have been described as large and bucket-shaped, with the occasional round head also shown. In some instances only facial features and some jewelry are shown and the rest of the head and body either was not pecked, was painted and has been weathered away, or was not ever indicated. Polly Schaafsma considers the Classic Vernal Style to be “the climax of Fremont rock art development” (1971:109. Figure 20).

The details and decoration on the Pilling, Old Woman site, and some Wolf Village figurines most closely resemble the Classic Vernal Style rock art in the following ways: body shape, jewelry,
some facial features, head shape, indications of clothing, and possible indication of hair (see figure 21). The trapezoidal body shape on the Classic Vernal Style petroglyphs in Figure 20 is mirrored in the Pilling, and Old Woman Site figurines as well as the Wolf Village 2010.3.3272 figurine (Figure 8A). As noted in chapter three, figurine body shapes differ between figurines found at the same site in the same stratigraphic level. This trapezoidal body shape is a defining characteristic of a particular figurine type.

The jewelry indicated on the McConkie Ranch petroglyphs shares some similarities with the scant anthropomorphic unfired clay figurine jewelry that has survived. The jewelry and individual bead or pendant pieces of clay shown on the Pilling figurines are highly elaborate (figure 21). Some of the necklaces included on the Pilling figurines are more detailed and are made up of more individual clay pieces than the necklaces shown on the rock art. This differentiation may be due to the ease with which small clay pieces could be attached to the moist clay torso of a figurine, while making multiple peck marks for each bead and part of the necklace on a panel would have taken considerable time to show.

Other types of necklace decoration, such as bands of pecked lines, also show up on the McConkie Ranch petroglyphs (Figure 22). The band, or collar, necklace is common at McConkie Ranch. The band-style necklace type shows up on one figurine fragment from Wolf Village (Figure 8B).

The earrings depicted on the McConkie Ranch petroglyphs are different than the earring types found on Fremont figurines and may be due to the nature of working in clay (see Figure 22). The majority of McConkie Ranch Classic Vernal Style earrings dangle from the anthropomorph's head but due to the limitations of recreating dangle earrings in unfired clay, the earrings on figurines are attached to the ear of the figurine (Figure 19).

Some of the Classic Vernal Style petroglyphs also share similar facial features with the Fremont anthropomorphic clay figurines. The tri-hole and tri-slit facial features, composed of three holes or slits or a combination of both, used to indicate the nose and mouth on figurines are altered slightly in rock art panels. The tri-hole and tri-slit facial features in the Classic Vernal Style show the eyes and mouth
instead of nostrils and mouth like on figurines (Figure 24). Additionally, some figurines have raised, or pinched noses in addition to the tri-hole features (Figures FC, 8A, 14, 21). Few rock art examples indicate the nose but one example, Figure 22, has a line going down the middle of the face between the eyes that ends above the mouth that could indicate a nose.

When eyes are clearly present on figurines, they show up as slits, punched appliqué circles, or incised coffee-bean appliqué as illustrated in Figures 1-2, 5, 8, 14, and 21. Eyes are treated with greater detail on figurines than on rock art in the Classic Vernal Style.

Heads on figurines aren't shown as clearly as they are on rock art. The heads and faces of some of the more elaborate figurines, such as the Pilling figurines appear to be made from a separate piece of clay and attached to the figurine (Figure 21). Most other figurine heads are extensions of the figurine body such as Figures 1, 5, and 8. There are additional differences in the way the head is depicted on rock art and on figurines when head shapes are compared. Classic Vernal Style rock art heads vary in shape from the upside-down-bucket shape, to square, or rounded, and usually have distinct necks (Figures 20, 22, 23). The figurine heads by contrast, do not show evidence of a neck but are either elongated and formed from the figurine body, or no distinction is made between the head and body at all (Figures 1, 5, 8). Some of the more elaborate figurines have delineated chins, which could have been the first step toward depicting the head as separate from the body (Figures 5C, 19, 8A, 14). Figurine 89.65.1.3 shares the flat topped, rounded chin, head shape of some Classic Vernal Style rock art anthropomorphs.

Headdresses are common on Fremont rock art, and are elaborate in the Classic Vernal Style. Hair may be depicted on rock art Figure 25, and the long over the shoulder lines look similar to the over the shoulder clay pieces on the Wolf Village figurine 2010.3.3272, and the Pilling figurines (Figures 8A, 21). The clay pieces on the rock art all go over the shoulder, while the identifiable headdresses on rock art stick up off the head. Since there are so few examples of possible headdresses
or hair that survive on figurines compared to the abundance of headdress examples in Fremont rock art, it is difficult to say what the over the shoulder clay pieces represent.

Clothing, which is rarely preserved on figurines, occurs frequently in the Classic Vernal Style. The Pilling and 2 Old Woman Site figurines are the most notable examples of clay appliqué used to show clothing (figure 21). The strips of clay that hang from the waist of the figurines resemble the lines depicted on rock art Figure 25. Some of the Pilling figurines have lines of clay pieces that look like beads across their waists that are similar to the rows of dots on the waists of rock art Figures 20, 22, and 25). Some figurines have punched and incised holes on the body that may indicate clothing (Figures 1, 2C, 2D, 3D, 6, and 13).

Sometimes feet, hands, and occasionally fingers and toes are depicted on the McConkie Ranch panels but there are no intact figurines with delineated legs and feet. Examples of arms and legs in rock art panels could show how the Fremont may have artistically viewed arms and legs, but not added them to clay figurines because of the fragile nature of unfired clay (Figure 20). The small nubs near the shoulders of some figurines have been interpreted as arms or breasts by researchers. Interestingly, none of the McConkie Ranch panels indicate breasts while some of the Pilling figurines have very clear breasts. Shields, bows and arrows, and other objects held by rock art anthropomorphs do not survive or were not depicted on figurines.

Although there are different ways of showing Classic Vernal Style rock art legs and feet, there is no evidence of figurines having had feet depicted. The figurines have a variety of terminus shapes ranging from tapering rectangular, coil, and in the Pilling figurines, a half-moon rounded terminus. Despite these differences, both Classic Vernal Style rock art and Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurines generally emphasize the torsos of the anthropomorphs over the legs and feet. The similarities and differences between the Classic Vernal Style rock art typology and Fremont figurines indicates that

2 For information and photographs about the Old Woman Site figurines, see The Fremont Cultures: Their Position In Southwestern Prehistory by Dee Calderwood Tayler.
the figurines need their own typology and should not be defined by the Classic Vernal Style topology.
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Figure 20. McConkie Ranch Classic Vernal Style


Figure 22. McConkie Ranch Petroglyph. Jewelry and possible nose example.
Figure 23. McConkie Ranch Petroglyph. Tri-slit facial feature example.

Figure 24. McConkie Ranch Petroglyph. Tri-hole facial feature example.

Figure 25. McConkie Ranch Petroglyph. Hair and clothing example.
Chapter 5 Nine Mile Canyon

Northern San Rafael Style

Utah Painted Style

Nine Mile Canyon, which has been called the longest art gallery in the world at 40 miles long, is located northeast of Price Utah. Although Nine Mile Canyon is the type-site for the Fremont rock art Northern San Rafael Style, examples of the Utah Painted Style Fremont pictographs are also located there. The Southern San Rafael Style anthropomorphs:

are not only smaller and less ornate but occur with less frequency. Instead, representations of animals and abstract elements predominate. Fremont anthropomorphs in this style are typically horned, and sometimes carry shields and weapons. ...Northern San Rafael style rock art is generally of poorer craftsmanship; the figures are more crudely pecked, are usually solidly pecked instead of outlined, [and] show less detail. (Silfer 2000:178)

The Northern San Rafael Style occurs geographically between the Classic Vernal Style and the Southern San Rafael Style. Anthropomorphic representations are less common in the Northern San Rafael Style than the Classic Vernal Style and are often shown on panels crowded with deer, mountain sheep, and other animal petroglyphs. Schaafsma has characterized this style as “careless,” but the location of so many Northern San Rafael style petroglyphs in Nine Mile Canyon, which was used as an animal migration route where the Fremont and later Indian groups traveled and hunted, could account for the difference in style due to area use (Schaafsma 1971:31).

Survey of the anthropomorphic Northern San Rafael Style petroglyphs in Nine Mile Canyon revealed that there are multiple body shapes and styles of the torso, head, arms, legs, hands and feet, occurring within this typology (See Figures 26-27). For example, Figure 26 resembles the Barrier Style...
rock art in Barrier Canyon more than it does the Northern San Rafael Style of Figure 27. Because of the many prehistoric groups traveling through Nine Mile Canyon, the Northern San Rafael Style could illustrate a confluence of different rock art styles.

Despite the variety of styles and body shapes seen in the Nine Mile Canyon petroglyphs, Schaafsma has compared the smaller and larger anthropomorphs and found correlations between size and style.

Some figures maintain echoes of the larger Fremont types in their broad-shouldered trapezoidal or more rarely triangular forms and in their horned headdresses. They sometimes appear as hunters and may be shown in an attempted profile or three-quarter view with bent legs and angled body....others are reduced to crude stick-figure representations.

All of these figures may carry bows with which they are shown hunting.

(Schaafsma 1971:31)

Examples of this variation can be seen in the Hunter Panel, Figure 28. As mentioned in chapter 4, none of the Fremont figurines recovered have bows, arrows, shields, or any other clay tools attached to them. One unique example, from the Pectol Collection, is a painted unfired clay figurine that was found in a small cradle board3 (Simms 2010:101). The lack of additional unfired clay, or other objects found with figurines makes the presence of the cradle board a secondary diagnostic feature in creating figurine typologies because of its rare occurrence. It is worth noting that figurine 89.039.001.2 has a small piece of added clay on the right shoulder that could be hair, a headdress, or other decoration, but the piece is undiagnostic.

The possible headdress on figurine 2010.3.3272 could be related to the headdresses on many of the Northern San Rafael petroglyphs. The anthropomorphs in Figure 29 have headdresses that curve

---

3 See Traces of Fremont Society and Rock Art in Ancient Utah by Steven R. Simms.
down toward their shoulders instead of up like most of the other headdresses depicted in the Northern San Rafael Style. Headdresses seem to be the most prevalent form of decoration on Northern San Rafael anthropomorphs.

Facial features are not usually shown on anthropomorphic petroglyphs that conform strictly to the Northern San Rafael style. Due to the multiple body shapes that are part of the Northern San Rafael Style, the lack of facial features, presence of arms and legs, headdresses, and tools, the many differences between the typology and Fremont figurines indicates that the Northern San Rafael Style typology is neither suited to define a portion or all Fremont figurines.

**Utah Painted Style**

The Utah Painted Style pictographs occur in the “Great Salt Lake region and the northern part of the Sevier drainage” (Janetski 2005:326). Characterized by “the simple painted representation, usually in red, of a Fremont-like triangular-bodied horned anthropomorph” the Utah Painted Style rarely has facial features but occasionally has painted decorative lines across the torso (Schaafsma 1971:85). Many of the smaller Utah Painted anthropomorphs do not have painted horns or headdresses.

The torso shape of the Utah Painted Style is relatively uniform. The trapezoidal shape can be seen in Figures 30, 31, and 32. The trapezoidal body shape is similar to the body shapes of the figurines in Figures 2C, 2D, 8A, 10, 13, and 21. Some pictographs are solidly painted while others are left open (Figure 30). Smaller Utah Painted pictographs don't usually have additional decoration on the head, but Figure 32, a larger pictograph, has decorative lines and bands of red and beige pigment on the head and chest which could indicate a headdress and pectoral. None of the Utah Painted Style pictographs found and analyzed for this project had arms, legs, hands or feet.

Decorative lines on many of the Utah Painted Style pictographs are similar to the clay appliqué strips on the Pilling figurines. The rows of symmetrical dots on figurine fragments 42UT112 Sq.10, and 84.370.008.001, both interpreted as trapezoidal torso fragments could be linked to the painted lines
on the Utah Painted Style pictographs.

Some Fremont figurines have painted red or black lines. The figurines from Nephi Mound One have remnants of black paint in horizontal bands across the body of the figurines (Figure 1). Some of the Pilling figurines have red paint on their faces and bodies.

Body shape of the Utah Painted Style pictographs is similar to some of the Fremont unfired clay figurines. The lack of arms, legs, hands or feet, is also similar. The presence of paint on some, but not all, figurines makes paint a secondary diagnostic characteristic of Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurines. The description of the Utah Painted Style is not a suitable typology to describe Fremont figurines.
Chapter 5 Nine Mile Canyon Figures

Figure 26. Nine Mile Canyon. Example of petroglyph very similar to Barrier Canyon Style.

Figure 27. Nine Mile Canyon.
Figure 28. The Hunter Panel in Nine Mile Canyon.

Figure 29. Nine Mile Canyon.

Figure 30. Utah Painted Style. Nine Mile Canyon.
Figure 31. Utah Painted Style. Nine Mile Canyon.

Figure 32. Utah Painted Style. Nine Mile Canyon.
Chapter 6

Clear Creek Canyon

Sevier Style A

The Fremont petroglyph Sevier Style A occurs in western Utah in the Great Basin. “The relatively plain Sevier Style A anthropomorphs display horns and hairbobs and are occasionally found holding shields” (Janetski 2005:326). Body shapes vary from trapezoidal, triangular, and rectangular, with some that are less well defined. Some of the Sevier Style A anthropomorphs resemble those from the Northern San Rafael Style. Polly Schaafsma's research on Fremont rock art shows that “roughly one-quarter of the anthropomorphs are horned, and plumes, facial features, and earbobs are rare phenomena” (1971:87).

The head shapes and styles of Sevier Style A petroglyphs varies from rounded and squarish with a delineated neck, to no separate neck with the head undefined from the torso of the anthropomorph. Figure 33 provides examples of the round separated head as well as the undefined head, both with headdresses. Figure 34 illustrates the triangular body type with both the square separate and round separate head types.

Body and terminus shapes, such as that shown in Figure 33B, resemble figurine fragment 2010.3.3446.3 and others such as Figures 7, 8A, and 9A. There may be some symbolic distinction between showing anthropomorphs with legs versus without legs, but that distinction, other than being the personal preference of the artist, is not known. The triangular terminus shape on Figure 35A does not occur on Fremont figurines while the terminus shape of Figure 35B, the cylindrical bottom, does. Figure 8A and 9A both have this cylindrical bottom.

The Sevier Style A petroglyph typology, while sharing some characteristics of Fremont figurines, does not have many of the distinct features of Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurines and is not suited to define figurines.
Chapter 6 Clear Creek Canyon
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Figure 33. Sevier Style A. Clear Creek Canyon.

Figure 34. Sevier Style A. Clear Creek Canyon.
Figure 35. Sevier Style A. Clear Creek Canyon.
Chapter 7

Barrier Canyon Style

The Barrier Canyon Style pictographs could have influenced the Fremont artistic perception of the human form (Simms 2010:86). The Barrier Canyon pictographs, which lack arms and legs, share similar body shapes with some Fremont anthropomorphic clay figurines. Barrier Canyon Pictographs have been described as “mummy-like” having tapered bodies with painted designs in dots, bands, and wavy and straight lines.

During excavations at Cowboy Cave and Walters Cave in south-central Utah, unfired anthropomorphic clay figurines were recovered and “chronologically restricted to the Early Archaic...this figurine type...called the Horseshoe Shouldered type, is important because of its resemblance to the Barrier Canyon style rock art of the Northern Colorado Plateau” (Coulam 1996:402). These unfired anthropomorphic clay figurines from strata III and IV are the earliest discovered on the Colorado Plateau (Coulam 1996:406). Coulam and Schroedl were able to group the figurines from Cowboy and Walters caves into two “types based on morphological characteristics as well as stratigraphic and chronological differentiation” (Coulam 1996:406). The terminus shapes, what Morss calls “handle terminus” of the Horseshoe Shouldered figurines is very similar to the terminus shapes of Figures 7, 8A, 9A, and 13.

Figurine 84.370.008.001 is strikingly similar in shape and punctured hole decoration to the Horseshoe Shouldered figurine and fragment illustrated in Coulam's article (1996:408, figure 3A and 3B). Unfortunately, only the torso of figurine 84.370.008.001 remains so any other possible similarities, such as the shoulder and head diagnostic features, cannot be compared. Figurines 89.039.001.1 and 89.039.001.2 (Figure 1), share some painted banding across their bodies similar to some of the Barrier Canyon Style pictographs (see Simms 2010:86). The punctured holes on these figurines also resemble the rows of dots on the early archaic Cowboy and Walters caves figurines. The
heads have been treated differently however, and the figurines from 42JB2 have facial features while the Horseshoe Shouldered figurines do not.

Recent dating has placed the Barrier Canyon pictographs at only about 3000 years old, younger than the Cowboy and Walters caves archaic figurines, although Coulam and Schroedl believe that the dating may be in error since the stylistic similarities are so strong\(^4\) (Coulam 1996:411). The Barrier Canyon Style, while it shares some decorative similarities to later Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurines, is not a sufficient typology in itself to be applied to Fremont figurines.

\(^4\) For more information about Coulam and Schroedl's ideas, see “Early Archaic Clay Figurines from Cowboy and Walters Caves in Southeastern Utah.”
Chapter 8

Figurine Typologies and Conclusions

Fremont rock art styles were in part, defined by the regions in which they are found. Because figurines bearing similar characteristics to rock art styles from multiple regions have been found together in the same stratigraphic level, and away from the rock art type sites, the figurine typologies cannot be based on geographic location to the rock art type sites. The figurines need their own typologies that do not bear the rock art typology names. Since figurines of various styles have been found in the same stratigraphic levels within the same site, chronological distinctions between figurine types is not possible. Some scholars have suggested that the figurines were heirloom pieces, but due to the fragile nature of unfired clay, it is unlikely that the figurines were passed down. Unless strong chronological data showing different figurine styles showing up in successive strata is uncovered, categorizing the figurines by chronology is not possible. Body shape, since it applies to all anthropomorphic figurines, is the primary diagnostic trait used to define Fremont figurines. Due to the variety of facial feature representation, decoration such as paint, incising, appliqué, clothing and jewelry, and head and terminus shapes, are secondary diagnostic characteristics of Fremont figurines that occur independently of body shape. The following Fremont anthropomorphic clay figurine typology names and categories fill this need.

Trapezoidal Body Shape Figurines

Figurines characterized by the trapezoidal body shape occur in multiple geographic locations within the state of Utah. The trapezoidal body shape distinguishes figurines of this shape from those listed below, and is generally of higher quality craftsmanship. The Pilling and Old Woman Site figurines, as well as one figurine from Wolf Village, 2010.3.3272, and figurine fragments 89.38.2.1, 89.38.2.3, 2010.3.3358, and possibly 84.370.008.001, have trapezoidal body shapes (Figures 21, 8A, 2D, 2C, 10). The trapezoidal body shape generally has clean symmetrical lines.
Rectangular Body Shape Figurines

Rectangular body shape figurines also show up throughout multiple geographic areas in the state of Utah. The rectangular body shape is statistically less common in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures collection, but that may be due to the relatively few figurines in the collection that are intact. Some rectangular figurines appear to have been made with a thicker coil of clay while others, such as figurine fragment 67.25.6.4, is thinner (Figure 5A). Fragment 67.25.6.4 might not be a rectangular body shape figurine, but the shape of the fragment in its current state makes the fragment appear to fit the rectangular body shape typology. Figurine fragment 2010.3.3444 also appears to be a rectangular body shape figurine (Figure 8D). However, without the terminus portion of the figurine it is impossible to tell what the figurine looked like in its entirety.

The lines of the rectangular body shape figurines are not as clean and straight as the trapezoidal body shape figurines. Some of the rectangular body shape figurines only loosely resemble a rectangle, such as figurines 89.039.001.1, and 89.039.001.2 (Figure 1). These figurines taper slightly after the torso, but their body shapes aren't as pronounced as the trapezoidal body shape figurines.

Coil Body Shape Figurines

Coil body shaped figurines are similar to the cylinder-like terminus figurines but they differ in one significant point; the coil shape extends to the rest of the body. The coil body shape figurines are marked by being less well-crafted than the rectangular and trapezoidal body shaped figurines. There are no intact coil body shape figurines in the MPC collection. Figurine fragment 89.38.2.2 has a coil shaped torso and the break at the bottom of the figurine is round, which may indicate that the terminus of the figurine was cylindrical. Figurine 89.65.1.4 also has a cylindrical torso but the terminus shape is flattened.

Conclusion

Due to the incomplete nature of the archaeological record, many Fremont anthropomorphic
unfired clay figurines do not survive intact. Many of the figurine fragments in my data set from the MPC's collection were mistakenly labeled as ceramic sherds instead of figurine fragments. Some fragments, such as 2010.3.2916, were not able to be identified to the specific location it came from on a figurine. Some of these unidentifiable fragments may come from figurines with body shapes not discovered or mentioned in this paper. As more Fremont sites are excavated and more figurines and figurine fragments are recovered, additional information about Fremont figurines may rewrite the typologies presented in this paper. The Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurine typologies outlined above are a starting point for the study of Fremont figurines. It is my hope that this analysis will encourage further research into the study of Fremont figurines.
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Terms and Conventions

- **Appliqué**: piece of clay, such as decoration, that was attached to another piece of clay, such as the body of a figurine, to represent jewelry, facial features, or clothing.

- **Terminus**: the bottom of the figurine.

- **Coffee-bean Appliqué**: a specific type of appliqué that is shaped like a coffee-bean. Usually used to show the eyes on a figurine. A coffee-bean appliqué eye can have incised lines in the middle.

- **Tri-hole facial feature**: three incised holes, two on top and one on bottom forming an equilateral triangle that appears on figurines and in various rock art styles. On figurines the tri-hole facial feature typically indicates the nostrils and the mouth. On rock art, the tri-hole facial feature usually indicates the eyes and the mouth.

- **Tri-slit facial feature**: similar to the tri-hole facial feature but instead of three dots or holes, the nose and mouth, or eyes and mouth, are represented by incised slits or horizontal lines. The tri-slit facial feature is more common on rock art than on figurines. Occasionally figurines will have slit eyes above the tri-hole facial feature.
## Appendix B

### Figurine Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Figurine Catalog Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Torso</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Legs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42UT110</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 67.25.14.1</td>
<td>Body/animal?</td>
<td>69.1mm</td>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>28.3mm</td>
<td>23.1mm</td>
<td>25.3mm</td>
<td>4-7.5mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT110</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 67.25.6.1</td>
<td>Bottom?</td>
<td>52.9mm</td>
<td>28.5mm</td>
<td>17.5mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 67.25.6.4</td>
<td>Head/top</td>
<td>38.5mm</td>
<td>27.8mm</td>
<td>9.6mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT271</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 72.38.15</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>51.5mm</td>
<td>21mm</td>
<td>13.8mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.65.1.1</td>
<td>Head/top</td>
<td>51.9mm</td>
<td>28.2mm</td>
<td>11.1mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.65.1.3</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>25.6mm</td>
<td>27.3mm</td>
<td>15mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.65.1.4</td>
<td>Head/top?</td>
<td>37.1mm</td>
<td>18.2mm</td>
<td>11.2mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT112</td>
<td>42 UT 112 Sq.10</td>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>37.1mm</td>
<td>35.1mm</td>
<td>6.3mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td>84.370.008.001</td>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>65.7mm</td>
<td>30mm</td>
<td>20.7mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.7mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.380.176.001</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>20.8mm</td>
<td>18.2mm</td>
<td>9.6mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.380.166.001</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>22.6mm</td>
<td>23.3mm</td>
<td>11.7mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.380.177.001</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>31.4mm</td>
<td>21.8mm</td>
<td>12.3mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 73.480.1275.7</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>19.9mm</td>
<td>22.8mm</td>
<td>8.7mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 72.29.65.1</td>
<td>Head/eyes</td>
<td>13.6mm</td>
<td>15.5mm</td>
<td>10.4mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.11.349. O</td>
<td>Bottom/torso</td>
<td>19.4mm</td>
<td>16.1mm</td>
<td>10.4mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.11.349.Q</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>27.3mm</td>
<td>19.7mm</td>
<td>16.1mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.11.379. N</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>29.6mm</td>
<td>16.4mm</td>
<td>13.4mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 84.11.379.P</td>
<td>Bottom piece</td>
<td>19.7mm</td>
<td>17.7mm</td>
<td>11.8mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.38.2.1</td>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>52.2mm</td>
<td>34.7mm</td>
<td>14.5mm</td>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.38.2.2</td>
<td>Head/torso</td>
<td>45.7mm</td>
<td>27.1mm</td>
<td>16.8mm</td>
<td>13.9mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.38.2.3</td>
<td>Torso fragment?</td>
<td>24.6mm</td>
<td>33.6mm</td>
<td>10.9mm</td>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42JB2</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.039.001</td>
<td>Full figurine</td>
<td>85.4mm</td>
<td>42mm</td>
<td>14.7mm</td>
<td>32.3mm</td>
<td>23.7mm</td>
<td>29.4mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42JB2</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 89.039.002</td>
<td>Full figurine</td>
<td>69.2mm</td>
<td>38.2mm</td>
<td>14mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3444</td>
<td>Head/Top</td>
<td>66.9mm</td>
<td>49.6mm</td>
<td>26.6mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.8mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.1566</td>
<td>Head/Top</td>
<td>53.2mm</td>
<td>42.2mm</td>
<td>16mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.7mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3446.1</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>53.3mm</td>
<td>22.4mm</td>
<td>11.9mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3446.2</td>
<td>Top?</td>
<td>38.9mm</td>
<td>45.5mm</td>
<td>23.3mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3446.3</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>42.8mm</td>
<td>29.6mm</td>
<td>15.1mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3446.4</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>42.6mm</td>
<td>32.1mm</td>
<td>13.7mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3446.5</td>
<td>Decoration?</td>
<td>23.2mm</td>
<td>14mm</td>
<td>8mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3272</td>
<td>Full figurine</td>
<td>93.5mm</td>
<td>64.8mm</td>
<td>23mm</td>
<td>26.1mm</td>
<td>25.5mm</td>
<td>41.9mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.1943</td>
<td>Head/Top</td>
<td>37.8mm</td>
<td>36.9mm</td>
<td>11.4mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.3358</td>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>47.6mm</td>
<td>49.4mm</td>
<td>11.5mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.6mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2009.33.630</td>
<td>Coyote head</td>
<td>22.9mm</td>
<td>19.6mm</td>
<td>18.6mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.9mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>MPC Accession No. 2010.3.2916</td>
<td>Possible Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

#### Facial Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Coffee Bean Eyes</th>
<th>Round Appliqué Eyes</th>
<th>Slit Eyes</th>
<th>Tri-Hole Facial Feature</th>
<th>Raised Nose</th>
<th>Slit Nose</th>
<th>Hole Nose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42JB2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Construction Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Hand/Palm</th>
<th>Basket</th>
<th>Reed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42JB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Decoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Jewelry</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Paint</th>
<th>Appliqué</th>
<th>Hole/Peck Decorations</th>
<th>Head Dress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42JB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Body Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Cylinder Body</th>
<th>Cylinder Bottom</th>
<th>Flattened Triangle Body</th>
<th>Flattened Rectangle Body</th>
<th>Triangle and Cylinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42JB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42UT273</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42SV374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Typology for Fremont Figurines  
Anthropology Department  
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Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurines come in a variety of styles, yet no typology has been established for figurines. Anthropomorphic rock art panels and anthropomorphic clay figurines share stylistic traits such as decoration, body shape, and facial features. Do the figurines fit the established rock art typologies, or do the figurines need a typology of their own?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classic Vernal Style</th>
<th>Sevier Style A</th>
<th>Utah Painted Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 1:</strong> McConkie Ranch</td>
<td><strong>Figure 3:</strong> Clear Creek Canyon</td>
<td><strong>Figure 5:</strong> Nine Mile Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropomorphic rock art in the Classic Vernal Style is usually life-size and is characterized by geometric body shapes, headdresses, jewelry, and kilt-like clothing. Facial features consist of horizontal lines, or circles, for the eyes and mouth. Arms, legs, hands and feet are often shown in great detail.</td>
<td>Sevier Style A rock art is less common than other Fremont rock art styles and is characterized by large and small human figures. The trapezoidal body shapes are rounded and less rigid than the Classic Vernal Style. Curved horn headdresses, hairbobs, and shields are also common.</td>
<td>The Utah Painted Style is characterized by small, triangular or trapezoidal-bodied, anthropomorphic paintings. Arms and legs are rarely shown. Pictographs are most commonly painted red and don’t often show facial characteristics. Decorative elements such as lines or dots are sometimes included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classic Vernal Style: McConkie Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wolf Village: Goshen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sevier Style A: Clear Creek Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hinckley Mound Two: Provo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Utah Painted Style: Nine Mile Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nephi Mound One: Nephi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

The use of different mediums to depict human figures makes it impossible to show some of the details on the clay figurines that can be seen on rock art. Forming arms, legs, and elaborate decoration, are difficult due to the fragile nature of unfired clay. Fremont anthropomorphic unfired clay figurines share some characteristics with Fremont anthropomorphic rock art, but the figurines are distinct enough to need their own typology.