is clearer in the Spanish text than in the Tarascan. On August 6, 1539 (3. speaks of 1519, which is impossible, but 66, mentions 1539 and of the presence of Don Vasco, when the Title seems to have been formulated) the town notables gathered to write the Title to their landholdings.

Perhaps the most interesting item in these titles, is the catalogue of the seven lords who built yácata in the region, as a bit of unique archaeological autobiography concerning a yácata Xhamondanque built himself. These data are condensed and garbelled in the Spanish text, which is shorter than the Tarascan throughout, but with the aid of Sr. José Ramos B., a native speaker of Tarascan, I venture to translate the passage as follows:

39. Each king staked out his claim, 40. forming yácatas which he owned, 41. Lands in all the town: 42. a king called Chupitan, 43. another king called Vipichuhan, 44. another king called Harame, 45. and another, the King Guzmán (sic!) 46. and another king was called Tzitzichan (Tariacuri in the Spanish text) 47. and another king was called Phancuarequa 48. and another was called Ytzipetacua. 49. Then the son of the king (the prince?) Guzmán made a yácata in Ihuatzio, 50. then the son of the king (the prince?) Xhamondanque made his yácata in Curintayrechao ("Breadville", "Tlaxcala"). 51. Thus likewise I made the yácata on the hill called Tampúuata Hatzícurin.[11] 52. And I took possession of all the lands included in this title.

The writer has numbered the sentences in the Tarascan original and in the severely mangled Spanish translation. A modern version of the title, with its wealth of old personal and place names, can be undertaken only by a qualified Tarascan scholar; the aim of the present paper is merely to make the text available for such a translation and to point out a few other sources for Cherán history, of which the Archivo General de la Nación should afford many more. [R. H. Barlow]

[11] A hill which divides Cheranastico from Ahuiran today.

[N61 III:4] RECENT FINDS AT TLATILCO

Several artifacts of a type new to archaeology were purchased in February 1953 at the brick-making center of San Luis Tlatilco, state of Mexico. These novel pieces were unearthed by the workers of Tlatilco, about two meters below the present altered surface. The men mentioned the fact that the pieces came from a hole in the clay wall, adding that perhaps parts of the broken stone objects were

still there. Upon inspection of the hole, fragments of the Olmec head were found amongst many more bones. Also two or three other fragments were discovered at the bottom of the brick pit associated with hundreds of human bones, thus allowing us to conjecture that the pieces to be described formed part of some burial furniture.

The workers insisted that they had not broken the objects upon finding them but that they had already been shattered. It was also mentioned, as something of little importance, that pieces of them were mixed with clay and made into bricks. No clay objects were found which might definitely be associated with the same burial. Yet, on the basis of stylistic relationships we feel that the diccovery of these two pieces may prove to be of aid in establishing the long suspected relations between the Olmec area of Veracruz and Tlatilco.

The first object illustrated (see plates) seems to be of basalt. It is black and was once well polished on the upper surface. This artifact presents an anthropomorphic sculpture on a ceremonial object, reminiscent of the Yokes of Veracruz. The sculpture is made in half-relief, and the decoration is geometrical-rectilineal, consisting of criss-cross lines. These lines have been filled in with red powder which has a cinnabar base. The powder was probably sprinkled over the head and then rubbed into the crevices. Remnants of white paint appear in the mouth, as well as the red cinnabar. The eyes have a coating of black substance, which appears to be asphalt, (Chapopote).

The mouth of the figure is an inverted "U". The eyes have a slight upslant, probably due to very prominent cheek-bones. The eyebrows are heavy and beetling. The chin is round and fat. The nose is flat and wide and its upper part appears to be divided into two parts, extending between and slightly above the eyebrows. Taken all together, the face is of the classic Olmec style.

This face is sculptured on a rather peculiar type of artifact which is still classed as "problematic". It is 11 cm. tall, and measures 11 $\times$ 11.5 cm. at the widest parts of the base. The base is concave, and shows many marks of stone-pecking, left from the process of manufacture.

The second object has the same form as the first, but it has no face carved upon it, being rather plain. Its upper surface was once well polished, and its only decoration consists of a single line running around the artifact, about 2 cm. from the edge. No evidences of paint are to be seen.

The base is also concave and also shows that it was partly made

by the pecking process, as the maker did not trouble to do much smoothing on the underside. The piece is 11 cm. tall, and the base is 11.2 × 11.6 cm.

This piece also seems to have been broken in antiquity, and the fracturing seems to have been done deliberately, as much force was necessary to break this rather tough stone. The piece is of a greyish-brown and its nature is not determined. Several mineralogists that gave it a quick check stated that it seemed to be of andesite and that it had been altered or mineralized, as many particles of pyrites, hornblend, feldspar and hyperstena are to be seen. It was also their opinion that this rock was not originally from the Valley of Mexico, thus indicating that it was a trade piece.

The artifact with the sculptured head could not be definitely classified geologically. However it was an opinion that the rock might possibly have originated in the Valley of Mexico, but that it could also have come from other regions.

As previously stated, the use of these objects is problematic and are relegated to the status of "ceremonial objects". It has been suggested that they might be forerunners, or antecedents, of the yokes (Yugos). It has also been suggested that they might be reproductions in stone of some objects used in the ritual ballgame, namely leg or elbow guards. This may not be as ridiculous as it might seem if the yokes might be stone reproductions of leather belts of waist guards why then could not the present artifacts also be similar reproductions of other protective devices. If the game was a sacred ritual why could not the paraphernalia be reproduced for ceremonial use? However the authors will be pleased to receive suggestions from readers of Tlalocan as to the use and significance of the two objects here described.

[Frederick Peterson and Fernando Horcasitas]

[N62 III:4] "CHICOMOZTOC QUINEHUAYAN"

Este nombre se halla en varios documentos. En el poema de Mixcoatl, o como allí se titula, *Mimixcoa incuic,* se halla la forma *quinehuaqui* que es un adjetivo participal de *quinehua,* (vid. Himno VII, nota 2).

En Chimalpain se halla también.

La razón de los "prodigios, sortilegios, encantamientos",[1] (sentido

[1] Vid. *Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca,* páginas 88 a 90, (Robredo; México, 1947).