

The engineer in charge of their operation was
none other than Captain Diaz Sr. Son of the
Presiding ^{senior work} Mexico.

These ~~excavations~~ ^{excavations} which were being
carried out in Guatemala Street (then called
Calle de Escaleras) and at the corner of
present day ^{present day} Justo Sierra and Argentina Streets,
were ^{excavating} ~~excavating~~ ^{many} ~~many~~ ^{many} artifacts that Professor
Frodozo Bales, minority of monuments, was called
in for consultation. He was naturally alarmed
and soon ~~called~~ ^{called} the government to allow him
to supervise the excavation, declaring that
precious objects were being destroyed through
careless digging, and that important pieces
were also being looted.

That the two "Huastec" figures may have
been part of this loot would not be apparent
for nearly 80 years - until Eduardo Matos
Mordeneque carried out his famous excavation of
the Templo Mayor. At the time the Huastec
figures entered the collection of INAH no one
seemed to know what to make of them.

There were no comparable ^{known} ~~known~~ ^{known} clay pieces
which related to compare them. This style
was some what East Coast looking, perhaps
even Tlalteca, some thought. Others believed
that they were so anomalous that they
might be ^{Mayan} ~~Mayan~~ ^{Mayan} ~~Mayan~~. For whatever reason,
the two figures were placed in storage
in the back rooms of the museum and all
but forgotten.

It was not until Eduardo Matos
excavated ^{the} two life-sized figures of what he
thought to be Eagle Knights in the
Northern part of the Templo Mayor ~~that~~ ^{that}
the earlier figures were re-~~examined~~ ^{considered}. Clearly
the Huastec and the Eagle Knights were ^{undeniably}
so closely related that they must have
been made in the same workshop. Unfortunately
the earlier figures had been neglected for so

near the great
attribution

Sahagun
Vol 2, p 120

Remondy
p. 127

Here Sahagun describes her ~~distinct~~ Ceremonial
Race and running ^{many} battles with the young
warriors of the city. Most importantly he
notes that the goddess (Here impersonated
by a man wearing the skin of a sacrificed
penned ~~victim goddess~~ ^{warrior} ~~impersonate~~) is
grievous at the beginning of "her" year by the
great lords (who alone are addressed
to gather at the Sacred Coatlán). But closest
to her are her two guardians called "Hueytlahqueh."
These guardians are quite possibly the Warrior-
priests called Tlazolteotl ~~the~~ Cuauacuatlan and
may ~~also~~ be represented by the two Cronos
figures of which one head is a part. crown

It is tantalizing to think that these two
figures were indeed unearthed near the corner
of just Sierra at Argentine streets ~~in 1900~~ by
Porfirio Diaz's men for such and I
believe that this area later unearthed by
Meyer is indeed the southern compound of the
Coatlán but closer where the Ochpaniztli
Race would have begun.

The ~~Complete~~ ^{Cronos} figure at The Mexico Hall also
wears a pleated paper shield and cone
shaped object over her genital. It is called
a Cuexotl Chimalli and is often seen
worn by Death Gods. It is important to keep
in mind that there is always a very close
unbreakable link between fertility and
death. ~~Tlazolteotl~~ The God of Tlazolteotl
perfectly illustrates this. She is called
the "eater of filth" a power she manifests
in both the physical and moral sphere.

In the world of nature she devours all
animal and vegetable matter thus regenerating
the earth ~~in perpetua~~ to insure new life. In
the moral sphere she devours the sins of
men who confess to her ^{through} her priests. Thus
both earth and man are renewed through her
sacred agency. That she is frequently depicted

on the forefinger can be seen in many
mutilated Remojada examples - and
perhaps in some early Aztec pieces as well.
But the outstanding difference between
this piece and mutilated Remojada wares is
the pose of the figure with its feet tucked
behind in pure Aztec fashion. I have
been looking for years and have never
seen an East Coast ceramic figure of a
female depicted in this traditional Aztec
feminine pose. ~~The face of the figure~~
~~most of the East Coast~~

The woman's face has many Aztec
qualities as well as some ^{late} Remojada. Stylistic
traits ^{of the} figures with similar facial features
are generally thought to be early post Classic
and to date around 950-1200 A.D. If such
is true with this piece then it and
similar figures may have served as a
prototype for later Aztec seated female
figures. But why are there not more
examples of similar ^{feminine} figures with the feet displayed
in this Aztec way? We know that Aztec
power and influence penetrated to the East
Coast of Mexico, causing substantial changes
in the areas art and iconography. The
sculptures of Coste de Teco and Cempoaltepec
are good examples of this introduced influence.
It might, then, be very possible that
this figure is a late post Classic (1460-1511)
example of Aztec artistic influence on East
Coast Culture. This figure is a good candidate
for the explanation for a more accurate
dating. Until then the mystery remains. The figure
is genuine, I'm quite sure - But genuine what?
If the figure is Aztec, what does it
represent? George Cardant in his remarkable
book, "The Aztecs", has included a beautiful
stone sculpture of a seated woman, dressed

Sculpture with and any
diagnostic paraphernalia is in dispute
their identity.

Only in a skirt with her hair wrapped
in ribbon in the manner of a Mexican
woman. Both Vaillant's example and
ours apparently lack the "Horns" or
twin tufts of hair worn by Aztec matrons
of Tenochtitlan.

What we have here, I believe, is the
feminine counterpart of the so-called ^{male} Macchualli
Sculptures of Central Mexico - which are
thought to depict the Common man. This
figure may ^{then} be an archetypal example
by the Common woman. But it is not strictly
a secular sculpture for there is no such
thing as secular art among pre-Columbian
peoples.

As an archetype, however, our figure
may represent the feminine principle itself.
~~Our figure is a mature woman who has given birth.~~
Our figure is a mature woman who has given birth. Being
a ~~mother~~ ^{mature} mother she
almost certainly represents the quatercentennial
mother goddess called Tonantzin (Our
mother) among the Aztecs. (As was her
shrine north of the city at Tepicayac that
later became the shrine of the Virgin of
Guadalupe ^{after the conquest}). As the
embodiment of the mother she in all
probability is also mother of the Gods,
known as Tlaloque.

In the Aztec mind ~~was~~ the body of
every human being is potential flesh
for the Gods - that through Circumstances it can
be occupied by divine power. Common people
were not worthless as some have thought. They
belonged to the Gods who could not flourish
without human intervention from all levels
of society. In a very real sense human beings
could be seen as models for the Gods. This
Macchualli woman then is a model for
Tonantzin the Aztec "Great Mother" and Mother of the Gods.