And so they named it Teotihuacan: 
because it was the burial place of rulers. 
For it is said: When we die, 
we do not truly die, 
because we are alive, 
because we are brought back to life, 
because we still live, 
because we awaken.... 
Thus, the elders said: 
"He who died became a god."  

In the year 1502, on the day 9 Deer, Motecuhzoma Xocoyotzin ascended the throne of Mexico-Tenochtitlan in an unprecedented ceremony, and with it he inherited what would be the most powerful empire in Mesoamerica at the time of the arrival of the Europeans. The tumultuous island-city had been decked out as never before for the occasion. Lodged in its palaces were the most distinguished leaders from the allied domains, provinces, and enemy city-states. When the moment arrived and after sumptuous banquets, endless dances, and flowery speeches, Motecuhzoma “the younger” was publicly anointed and crowned. In the following act, at the sacrificial block of the Templo Mayor, the images of the gods were fed, as was customary, with the blood of captives recently caught on the battlefield.

Meanwhile, some forty kilometers (twenty-four miles) to the northeast of Tenochtitlan, at the site known by native peoples of the sixteenth century as Teotihuacan, something very different was happening. Amid silence and desolation rose the majestic ruins of the hegemonic capital of the classical world, which was the first city on the American continent. No fewer than eight hundred years had elapsed since its decline and the disintegration of its age-old tradition that had endured hundreds of years. With the irremissible passage of time, Teotihuacan had been transformed into a true archaeological metropolis stripped of all historical significance. Its ceremonial center was completely abandoned and the silhouettes of many of its buildings could only be vaguely surmised beneath the vegetation.

The Mexicas, now masters of the political scene, never even came to know what language was spoken by its original inhabitants. Knowledge lost of its prior existence, the history of Teotihuacan soon shifted from the real to the mythical. Postclassic peoples did not take long to offer all kinds of explanations about its origins. They believed, for
Fig. 1
Teotihuacan-style mask with shell and stone inlaid eyes and teeth. Offering 82, Templo Mayor, Tenochtitlan.
example, that huge, disproportionate giants had built the pyramids, an idea that undoubtedly arose from Mexica astonishment over the majesty of the ruins.

And so [the first men] built very large mounds to the Sun and the Moon, as if they were just like mountains. It is unbelievable when they say that these were made by hand; but at that time giants still lived there.\(^2\)

In other accounts, the incomparable undertaking is attributed to people as renowned as the Toltecs and the Totonacs.\(^3\) Nevertheless, according to the most well-known account, what was unquestionably the work of humans was attributed to the gods. Teotihuacan appears from this point of view as the place of origin of the Fifth Sun, the cosmic era in which the Mexicas lived; it was the last era, that of the center, the color green, and of earthquakes or movement. It occurs in no less than the place where the dramatic sacrifice of the gods was consummated so that the new sun would undertake its definitive march. This is the account given by the informants of friar Bernardino de Sahagún:

It is said that even when it was night, even when there was no light, when dawn had not yet come, they say that they gathered, they called the gods together there at Teotihuacan.\(^4\)

Among the gods who gathered there, Tecuciztecatl and Nanahuatzin were the ones selected; with their penance and death they would restore the sun and life itself. Four days and four nights they fasted and offered their own blood in sacrifice:

A mountain was made for each one of them, where they stayed doing penance for four nights. Now it is said that these mountains are the pyramids: the Pyramid of the Sun and the Pyramid of the Moon.\(^5\)

At midnight on the appointed day, Nanahuatzin in a surge of bravery leaped into a huge bonfire, and not to be outdone Tecuciztecatl had to do the same. The myth tells us that both reappeared in the east at dawn, transformed into the Sun and the Moon, respectively. This idea, in which Teotihuacan is considered to be the place of rebirth for these deities, is perhaps the origin of the Nahuatl designation for the city — “Teotihuacan” or “place where one may become a god.”

Just as the native sages told Sahagún, once the Sun God was created with the body of Nanahuatzin, the problem arose of the sun’s immobility. So the gods met again to discuss this and take extreme measures:

“How will we live? The sun does not move. Will we perhaps give a new life without order to the macehuales, to human beings? May the sun become strong through us! We shall all die!”\(^6\)

It is curious that in addition to this myth Sahagún transmits another native version, very different from the earliest one, about the founders of Teotihuacan. Referring to the migration of a complex of groups originally from the mythical Tamoanchan, the Franciscan notes the following:

They moved at once; all following the path; the child, the venerable sage, the young woman, the venerable woman elder. Calmly, quietly they advanced toward the place where they went to settle together at Teotihuacan. There they established the government. They were elected rulers — the sage, the nahuales, the masters of spells.\(^7\)
And the whole world made mounds there to the Sun and to the Moon; then they made many small mounds. There they said prayers. And rulers were installed there. And when lords died, they buried them there. Then on top of them they built a mound.

In this pair of quotations it is evident that the Mexicas assumed that the two Teotihuacan pyramids of greatest dimensions had been dedicated by its builders to the solar (Tonatiuh itzacual) and lunar cults (Metztli itzacual). This was probably not the case, because several specialists believe that the colossal constructions, comparable only to the pyramid at Cholula, were raised in honor of aquatic deities. Another totally erroneous idea recorded in these passages has to do with the principal street of the City of the Gods; the Mexicas christened this avenue with the Nahauatl name of Miccaotli (Street of the Dead) based on the false belief that the structures flanking its entire length functioned as funerary mounds of ancient Teotihuacan lords.

By the end of the fifteenth century, Classic Period Teotihuacan (A.D. 250-700) had been converted into a renowned cult and pilgrimage center. Thanks to the sixteenth-century document the “Relación de Tequizistlán y su partido,” we know that the towns of the Basin of Mexico attributed the city with a strong sacred character and that they continued venerating the old images (fig. 2):

There were other lesser idols [worshipped by the Mexicas] in the town of San Juan, which was the [location of the] temple and oracle attended by nearby towns. In this town they had a very tall temple where there were three landings to ascend to the top; at the summit of it was a stone idol called by the name Tonacateuctli, which was made of a single very rough, very hard stone. It was three brazas [1 braza = 1.7 meters or 5.6 feet] long and another wide, and another in depth. It faced the west and on a plain that stretched in front of this temple, there was another smaller temple, of three estados [1 estado = about 2.1 meters or 7 feet] in height on which was another idol a little smaller than the first one, called Miclanateuctli, which means "Lord of Hell." This faced the first, set on a large, square boulder, one square braza on all sides. A little further, toward the north, was another temple slightly smaller than the first, which was called "the hill of the Moon," on top of which was another idol, almost three brazas tall, which was called The Moon. All around it were many temples, in one of which [the largest of them] there were six other idols, who were called Brothers of The Moon, [and] the priests of Montezuma, lord of Mexico, came with this Montezuma, every twenty days to [offer] sacrifices to all of them.

Based on the assiduous visits mentioned in this account, it is logical that the Mexicas as well as nearby peoples would have been interested in knowing what was hidden in the ruined mounds of Teotihuacan. With all certainty, curiosity led them to excavate some of its buildings on more than a few occasions. The imitation of Teotihuacan architecture, mural painting, and sculpture that occurred during the Late Postclassic Period (A.D. 1350-1520), as well as the presence of actual materials from the City of the Gods in offerings from the Templo Mayor of Tenochtitlan (in present-day Mexico City) can only be explained by this type of "archaeological" activity. This should not strike
us as unusual, for other Mesoamerican civilizations were accustomed to removing “antiquities” from sepulchers and offerings belonging to noncontemporary societies. In fact, the Mexicas also carried out premeditated explorations at Olmec and Toltec sites.10

Clearly the vestiges of the City of the Gods served as an archetype for Postclassic generations. It is not accidental, for example, that there is a grid plan at Teotihuacan analogous to that of Tenochtitlan, made up of a sacred precinct from which extended two orthogonal axes that divided the city into four parts. In effect, different scholars have noted how the center of Teotihuacan is located at the Ciudadela, at the intersection of the principal avenues — the Street of the Dead, from north to south, and the East-West Avenue.11 This would have divided Teotihuacan into four sections or quadrants. Similarly, the Tenochca ceremonial precinct, surrounded by alternating walls and stairways delimiting the sacred space, recalls the Ciudadela compound.

Teotihuacan architecture also served as a source of inspiration for Mexica craftsmen, who integrated isolated elements into their work without respecting the internal coherence of old styles, or their proportions and symbolism. In this way, imitations acted more as evocations of the past than as parts of an integral context. What is certain, in several buildings in Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco (also in present-day Mexico City), is that Teotihuacan architectonic and decorative traits were harmoniously fused with those that were in vogue at the time of their construction.

Up to now, four buildings in marked archaic style have been exhumed from the lands that occupied the Sacred Precinct of Tenochtitlan. The first was discovered next to the intersection of the present-day streets of Justo Sierra and República de Argentina; the second behind the apse of the Metropolitan Cathedral; and the two remaining (Shrine C and the Red Temple) to the northeast and southeast of the Templo Mayor, respectively.

These buildings share a longitudinal orientation from east to west. Three of them have almost identical dimensions and forms, while the fourth in general resembles them. It is very probable that this similarity indicates the rigorous planning that took place prior to construction of the compound and that their construction was contemporaneous.

Each building is made up of two parts, a massive platform with stairway and a small open space toward the front, like an atrium. Both elements grow out of the same base, which contributes to the harmony and unity of the compound. The massive platform is distinguished by its exterior profile, in which a short, sloped talud rests under a projecting tablero of vertical panels. The form and proportion of this profile is highly reminiscent of the architectural style disseminated by Teotihuacan between the third and eighth centuries. We should mention that wholly Mexica elements are added to these archaizing ones; for example, balustrades that are inclined at the base of the structure and that end in a small platform at the top are the Mexica version of the continuously sloped balustrade characteristic of Teotihuacan.

It is interesting that construction techniques of Tenochca buildings are quite unlike those regularly used in the City of the Gods (fig. 3). It seems that the Mexicas were solely interested in formal appearances. Although at Teotihuacan the tablero rests directly on the talud, at Tenochtitlan the latter do not have a structural function; the talud
only serves as a facade for an interior stone wall that bears the stress of the building nucleus while it sustains the upper tablero.

These Mexica buildings have rich polychrome decoration, largely sharing the same characteristics as Teotihuacan mural painting as defined by Arthur Miller — two-dimensionality, visual juxtaposition, technique of manufacture, and utilization of repetitive patterns. Just as red predominates in the mural paintings of Teotihuacan, the major themes relate to frontally represented deities flanked by profile figures in processions, geometric and rectilinear designs, representations of ritual paraphernalia, and zoomorphic images. Also abundant are motifs related to the water cult (Tlaloc mask, cut shells, currents of water, and trilobe motifs that represent water droplets), as well as pairs of bows (fig. 4).

Another building very similar to the ones described above was discovered in the ruins of Mexico-Tlatelolco, twin city to Mexico-Tenochtitlan. The competition between these two Mexica cities had repercussions in the architectural development of their respective sacred precincts; the construction, remodeling, and destruction of these architectural compounds were practically parallel. Both were built on the same plan and consequently their general characteristics are very similar: these quadrangles have similar dimensions; they are confined by a platform with alternating stairways and balustrades; and the main temples are dedicated to Tlaloc and Huitzilopochtli, exhibiting the same number of rebuildings. In this context it is not surprising to find a small Teotihuacanoid-style building at Tlatelolco similar in form, dimensions, and relative position to the so-called Red Temple. Building L was located on the southeast side of the Tlatelolcan Templo Mayor. It is characterized by a low platform that serves as base for a Teotihuacanoid profile body and an “atrium.” Just like the Red Temple, it has a repeated decoration of pairs of bows, although these are worked in low relief in stone.

Traits reminiscent of Teotihuacan are also present in Mexica sculptural art. One of the most striking examples is a basalt monolith measuring about seventy-seven centimeters in height (two-and-one-half feet) that dates to the end of the fifteenth century or the beginning of the sixteenth (fig. 5). This sculpture was found in the area of Shrine C, which leads us to believe that it occupied the upper part of this building. It represents an anthropomorphic image seated with crossed legs. It is hunched forward and sustains on its head a great cylindrical vessel decorated on the sides with alternating motifs of pairs of bars and “eyes.” The hands rest directly on the knees in different positions: the right hand is extended with the palm up, while the left is completely clenched. These attributes are characteristic of representations of the God of Fire. Although this type of representation goes back to the Formative Period, it is during the Classic — and especially at Teotihuacan — when it acquires its orthodox form and is frequently reproduced. What is really interesting is that in the following period, the Postclassic, its production ceases and the Mexica sculpture found in the Templo Mayor bears attributes atypical of the Teotihuacan style itself — rectangular plaques that cover the eyes and mouth, fangs that emerge from the latter, massive brazier, and lack of facial traits indicating age.

The Mexicas did not only copy Teotihuacan art, they also ex-
tracted numerous manufactured objects from the ruins of the ancient archaeological city. Although it is feasible that some of these pieces might have been the result of fortuitous finds in the City of the Gods, the vast majority were obtained from specific searches, as mentioned by several colonial texts. We are unaware of the circumstances under which these undertakings were carried out and the type of individuals who ventured to pillage antiquities. Perhaps they were priests or people guided by them who unearthed this type of object.

Surely the high quality of manufacture of Teotihuacan artifacts influenced their overvaluation in the decades prior to the Conquest. But above all, the supposedly magical nature of objects, the creation of which was attributed to giants or gods, made the Mexicas decide to offer them in their sacred precinct. This magical character was not possessed solely by complete pieces, but even by fragments. If this were not the case, it is difficult to imagine why broken objects and simple fragments were included among the rich gifts interred in the Templo Mayor.

The archaeological discovery of Teotihuacan pieces in Mexica contexts in Mexico City may be credited to Leopoldo Batres in 1900, Jordi Gussinyer in 1969, and Eduardo Matos between 1978 and 1982. During the latter excavations, forty-one Teotihuacan-style and twenty-three Teotihuacanoid-style pieces were found, which date to the lapse between A.D. 200 and A.D. 800. Rich primary materials were used and many hours of work were invested in their creation. Carved, polished pieces made of semiprecious stones in green tones constitute the vast majority. Ceramic artifacts, usually fine-paste wares, were destined for religious uses. In accord with their functional characteristics based on the form, the Teotihuacan-style pieces offered in the Templo Mayor may be grouped into three categories — masks and small anthropomorphic heads, anthropomorphic figurine bodies, and stone and ceramic recipients.
Masks and small anthropomorphic heads were sculpted in dense stones (fig. 1). Stylistically speaking, they present a symmetrical distribution of facial features articulated through a succession of planes and horizontal lines, framed by a contour curved into a U-shape, a manner that was in vogue throughout the time of Teotihuacan splendor. Features are well defined. Two slanted, rectangular plaques simulate ears. The forehead is a flat, smooth, narrow band. Eyebrows are marked by a fine, slightly curved ridge, while eye cavities are elliptical and sometimes have obsidian or shell incrustations that simulate the iris and the white of the eye. The nose has a wide base with perforations for nostrils and a narrow ridge that indicates the space between the eyebrows. The mouth has well-delineated, half-opened lips, and the cheeks and chin are represented by shallow planes.

Full-body, anthropomorphic figures were also made of greenstone. On the one hand, some are small, flat, and geometric in form. Their stylized traits were created by means of a technique of grooves and planes. They display headdresses or bands on the forehead and feminine images wear huipiles (unstitched, blouselike garments). On the other hand, there were also pieces of greater dimensions with less schematic facial features that approximate the quality of the masks. They represent individuals wearing a headdress or headband.

Two of the Teotihuacan-style vessels recovered are made of greenstone. One of them has a flat base with walls that flare outward and supports in the form of truncated cones. A fragment of a cylindrical bowl was also found with a narrow band around the edge and a rectangular support. It has a bas-relief decoration on its outer wall that represents a kneeling warrior holding a feathered shield and a macana (a club edged with obsidian blades). He faces a beast who wears a feather collar, located on top of a pyramid with talud-tablero profile. Also found were two ceramic vessels made of medium-fired brown clay polished with

Fig. 6
Olmec-style mask from Guerrero. Offering 20, Templo Mayor, Tenochtitlan.
sticks. Their decoration consists of appliqué, forming highly stylized Tlaloc faces.

Also found were twenty-three Guerrero-Teotihuacanoid-style pieces. All these greenstone sculptures incorporate hybrid traits of Teotihuacan and local figural styles. They try to imitate Teotihuacan, without really succeeding. A technique of carving grooves and planes was used to give form to these figures. They possess well-defined facial features similar to the above-mentioned Teotihuacan mask traits, while the rest of the body is totally flat and schematic. Generally, arms extend beside the body. In the case of female images, slight protuberances indicating breasts and the representation of a huipil serve to distinguish gender.

Not all Teotihuacan and Teotihuacanoid objects were offered just as they were found: an important percentage were decorated by the Mexicas prior to their final burial. Thin coats of paint or chapapote (a tarlike substance), drawings of human or divine attributes, and glyphs delineated on mask interiors were added by Mexica craftsmen to accentuate old religious meanings of the pieces, or else to confer them with new meanings.

The number of Teotihuacan pieces and Guerrero imitations of this style seem very small if the total number of elements recovered by the Templo Mayor Project (around seven thousand) is considered. Nevertheless, this group of sixty-four pieces is quite impressive when compared with the sole Olmec relic found to date in the Templo Mayor (fig. 6). Furthermore, each Teotihuacan and Teotihuacanoid piece unfailingly occupied a place of preeminence within its corresponding offering. Regarding the location of the ten offerings that contained these materials, the following of a more or less homogeneous spatial pattern is provocative; eight offerings were buried in the principal temple dedicated to Tlaloc and Huitzilopochtli, while the other two offerings were found in adjoining shrines.

Of even greater importance is the fact that all this material was concentrated in deposits belonging to or postdating Stage IV of the Templo Mayor. In fact, the contrast with preceding stages is striking: not a single one of the twenty-two offerings buried prior to this stage included a single Teotihuacan or Olmec artifact. If the tentative chronology proposed by Matos is correct, perhaps the custom of depositing antiquities in the sacred precinct of Tenochtitlan begins or at least escalates during the reign of Motecuhzoma Ilhuicamina (A.D. 1440-1469), when the Mexicas begin to dominate the Central Highlands.

Because of this burial of goods produced by past societies and the building of architectural copies based on old civilizations coincides with the period in which the Mexica state was undergoing a process of integration, consolidation, and expansion. The recuperation of an extinct tradition should perhaps be understood in this historical context as one of many strategies adopted to maintain their new dominant position in the eyes of their own subjects as well as others. It may be supposed that with the passing of centuries, almost all Olmec and Teotihuacan objects, as well as Teotihuacanoid and Toltecoid architecture, had lost its original significance and function. Perhaps, void of specific connotations, they acquired the aura of sacred symbols par excellence, as direct allusions to a life of grandeur.

In this way, the Mexicas were rescuing a past that was never their own. These recent arrivals to the Basin of Mexico thus made their pres-
ence seem less accidental and their place in the cosmos appeared less arbitrary to their neighbors. All in all, the mythical affiliation with the builders of Teotihuacan forever removed them from anonymity, while their indirect descent from Toltec people made them feel that they belonged to a world in which they had become masters. Both in written documents, as well as in archaeological remains, this desire to establish the “historical thread” of legitimacy appears, from the mythical origin of human beings at Tamoanchan, to the great power of Tenochtitlan, passing through Teotihuacan (the place of grandeur) and through Tula (the political foundation). Thus, the Mexicas could instill fear in their enemies and legitimate their hegemony, thanks, among other things, to their authority emanating from the Templo Mayor, the precinct that concentrated the power of deities of war and of water, as well as of the ancestors.

Eduardo Matos Moctezuma is Director of the Museo Templo Mayor, Mexico City, and of the Zona Arqueológica de Teotihuacan. Leonardo López Luján is an archaeologist at the Museo Templo Mayor.

5. Sahagún, Códice Matritense, folio 161v and ff.
AZTEC VENERATION OF TEOTIHUACAN

Teotihuacan had collapsed four hundred years before the Mexica Aztecs founded their capital, Tenochtitlan. They were familiar with the majestic ruins, which they attributed either to the gods or to some great ancient civilization. They made no distinction between Teotihuacan and Tula and considered both to have been “Toltec” and to have existed just prior to the Aztecs. They excavated and looted at both these sites searching for treasures and ancient monuments. Some of these objects found their way into the offerings of the Templo Mayor at Tenochtitlan.

Since the Aztecs saw themselves as barbarian latecomers in the Valley of Mexico, they were insecure in the face of the great monuments of the ancient civilizations. They were extremely conscious of the past and of history. Dates are important in their art. Teotihuacan, by contrast, had no great past to look to, was not interested in history with dates, and seemed to be concerned with an eternal present or perhaps a great future.
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MASK WITH INLAY

Class Period A.D. 300-600

Found in 1978 in Offering 20, located at the east (back) facade of the Templo Mayor of Tenochtitlan, Stage IV-B (ca. A.D. 1469-1481)

Greenstone with shell and obsidian inlay

20 x 24.2 x 9 cm (8 x 9 1/2 x 3 1/2 in.)

INAH 10-168801

CNCA-INAH-MEX, Museo del Templo Mayor, Mexico City

Several Classic Period Teotihuacan masks were found at the Templo Mayor. Sculpted from dense stone in different shades of green, these masks characteristically display symmetrical facial features framed by a U-shaped contour, while rectangular tabs represent ears. The forehead is a plain band, which displays tiny perforations that perhaps held hair or feathers. Elliptical eye cavities sometimes have inlays — obsidian simulating the iris in this case. The nose is wide at the end and the mouth is essentially realistic. However, this particular mask is unusual because its lips resemble those seen in Olmec sculpture. LLL
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**QUADRUPED VESSEL**

Classic Period A.D. 300-600

Found in 1978 in Offering 20, located at the east (back) facade of the Templo Mayor of Tenochtitlan, Stage IV-B (ca. A.D. 1469-1481)

Greenstone

5.8 x 14.3 cm (2 1/4 x 5 1/2 in.)

INAH 10-168817

CNCA-INAH-MEX, Museo del Templo Mayor, Mexico City

This bowl with flat bottom and slightly convex, diverging walls has four small supports in the form of truncated cones. Covered with a rough, disk-shaped piece of greenstone, its interior held twenty small, unworked pieces of greenstone. This bowl formed part of a lavish offering that included an Olmec mask and two Teotihuacan Storm God vessels. LLL
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**FIGURE WITH AZTEC GLYPHS**

Tlamimilolpa-Metepec A.D. 250-750 (figure); A.D. 1400-1521 (glyphs)

Acquired in 1880 from C. W. Lüders

Serpentine

34 cm (13 1/2 in.)

Hamburgisches Museum für Völkerkunde, B264

The two glyphs on the figure’s chest, 1 Flint and 13 Reed, are two very important dates for the Aztecs. The birthdate of the sun was 13 Reed and thus of the beginning of time for the Aztecs, an event they placed at Teotihuacan. The date of birth of Huitzilopochtli (the patron god of the Aztecs) was 1 Flint, the day the Aztecs set out on their migration, and the date of a decisive victory over their neighbors that made their empire a reality.

Umberger suggests that the two dates together signified the birth of the Aztec era and the Aztec political empire. The placement of these dates on a Teotihuacan heirloom figure suggests that the Aztecs understood the antiquity of it and correctly associated it with Teotihuacan. EP
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