The New Tenochtitlan Templo Mayor Coyolxauhqui-Chantico Monument

El nuevo monumento de Coyolxauhqui-Chantico del Templo Mayor de Tenochtitlan constituye — según apreciación general y amplio reconocimiento — uno de los más bellos relieves prehispánicos encontrados hasta hoy en la capital. Sus medidas de 3.26 × 2.98 × 0.35 metros exceden en tamaño las de cualquier otro monumento azteca con excepción del “Calendario”.

Esta figura representa a Coyolxauhqui, la maligna media hermana de Huitzilopochtli, asesinada por este último en uno de los episodios de su nacimiento.

February 21, 1978, Mexico City Compañía de Luz workmen excavating a pit discovered a large carved monument about two meters beneath the street surface near the corner of Argentina and Guatemala streets, in a position fronting one stage of the southern stairway of the Templo Mayor of Huitzilopochtli and Tlaloc, the southwestern portion of whose foundations, in at least four major superpositions, was exposed in 1913 (Gamio 1917: 129; 1920–21). It is a massive oval stone (apparently andesite), 3.26 × 2.98 × 0.35 meters, surrounded by a stucco pavement. The very high relief, on which traces of red, yellow, and white pigments are visible, is virtually in mint condition. The only significant damage is a narrow crack running diagonally across the left central portion of the monument. The archaeological context of the discovery was thoroughly treated in a monograph by Angel García Cook and Raúl M. Arana A. (1978) of the Departamento
de Salvamento Arqueológico, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, who headed the salvage team that excavated the monument. In this paper, dedicated to the memory of my old friend and colleague, Gerdt Kutscher, I will be concerned only with the iconography of the carved upper surface of the stone (Fig. 1).  

A female is depicted, facing right. She is shown decapitated and dismembered. The torn edges of her headless trunk and severed limbs are indicated, as is usual (cf. Fig. 2 and severed human members on the "Stone of Itzpapalotl"; Nicholson 1971: fig. 62), by scalloping, with protruding ends of the humerus and femur bones clearly represented. Adjacent to the proximal ends of the left arm and the legs are pairs of bloodstreams tipped by droplets, three of them decorated with jewel (chalchihuitl) motifs to indicate the preciousness of this fluid. She wears what appears to be a kind of striated wig or perhaps a headcloth (cf. Figs. 7 - 12) decorated with numerous circular elements that represent downballs. Draped over it is a snake with sectioned body. Probably a coral snake was intended, the type usually associated with the terrestrial-fertility goddesses and which often seems to have symbolized blood (Seler 1902 - 03: 143 f.). Its tail is hidden while its head hangs down over the figure's forehead (cf. Fig. 6, where only two portions of the snake's body are visible). An elaborate feather device crowns the head, composed of three concentric rows of stylized feathers with a wide panache rising above and behind this central element. A prominent striped band runs across the bridge of the nose and the upper cheek, from which depends a metal bell, coyolli. Identical ornaments, composed of circular, trapezoidal, and angular elements, are worn as ear and noseplugs. The large, pendulous breasts are boldly displayed on the bare upper body, as well as two (post-partem?) creases in the belly area just above the belt. The latter is composed of a doubled, sectioned body of a two-headed serpent. It sup-

1 The explorations of this salvage team also resulted in the discovery of five caches (one of which contained a large oblong green serpentine stone with an engraved image of a female deity; López Austin 1979), and, on a stucco pavement 125 cm below the pavement surrounding the monument, another apparent decapitated and dismembered representation of Coyolxauhqui, only partially preserved, molded in stucco mixed with stones. On the basis of this report, I was able to make some minor factual corrections and additions to the original version of the article, copies of which, in manuscript, were circulated to some of my colleagues. Since this article was written, in April, 1978, various studies of the monument have been published, the most important of which is Aguilera García (1978).

2 I would like to thank José Luis Franco, Doris Heyden, Constanza Vega Sosa, and Augusto Molina Montes for supplying relevant information concerning this discovery -- and Sally Bond, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, for information concerning their jadeite mask.
ports a large skull back device (cf. Figs. 8, 10) and is knotted in front with a prominent upper loop in the fashion of the knots of the male loincloth, maxtlatl (cf. Fig. 8, who wears both a skirt and a loincloth). Similar knotted two-headed snakes adorn the upper portions of the arms and the lower portions of the legs. Intertwined or arched coral snakes are occasionally encountered in the native tradition pictorials (e.g., Figs. 3, 4), but knotted examples in the positions depicted on our monument are quite unusual. “Demon faces”, with round eyes, supraorbital ridges, and prominent tusks are represented on the knees, elbows, and heels. These devices are standard on the knees and elbows of the Tlatelcuhtli, Earth Monster, figures (Nicholson 1967: Fig. 5), but their presence here at the heel positions is unusual. Elaborate wristlets are also worn, composed of loop devices and bands with circular elements from which depend metal bells, four on the right wrist and three on the left. Lastly, our figure wears banded anklets and fancy sandals, secured by large loops at the insteps, whose heelcaps are decorated with elongated triangular motifs, connoting them as itzcaactli, “obsidian sandals”. These were specified as a diagnostic of the insignia of a goddess, Chiconahui Itzcuintli (9. Dog), the calendric name of Chantico, by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún’s Tlaltetolco informants (Sahagún 1950—82, Pt. X: 79) and is clearly shown in the “Tonalamatl Aubin” representation of this goddess (Fig. 10).

As was immediately recognized by the Mexican government archaeologists who supervised the initial exposure of the stone and who were quoted in media accounts of the discovery; this figure represents Coyolxauhqui, the malevolent half-sister of Huitzilopochtli slaughtered by the latter as an episode in the myth of his birth. The head closely resembles in its essential features one of the most famous pre-Hispanic sculptures found in Mexico City, the colossal green porphritic head discovered in the foundations of a colonial building only about a block to the southeast in March, 1830. Two years later, Carlos María de Bustamante, in his enlarged re-edition of Antonio de León y Gama’s classic 1792 study of the “Calendar Stone” and other monuments discovered in the subsoil of Mexico City (León y Gama 1832, Part II: 89 f.), in a lengthy footnote described the circumstances of the discovery of this head in a yard behind the church of Santa Teresa la Antigua in connection with the construction of new buildings by the convent of La Concepción on property formerly constituting the mayorazgo of the Mota family. This area probably comprised the southeast sector of the walled Templo Mayor precinct (e.g., Alcocer 1935; Marquina 1960), although some students (e.g., Maudslay 1912; Caso 1956) would place this zone just to the east. According to Bustamante, with the authorization of Lucas Alamán, Minister of Foreign Relations, he offered to purchase the head for Mexico’s recent-
ly established national museum; however, the Abbess freely ceded it, and it has been ever since one of the museum’s most prized possessions (presently exhibited in the Sala Mexica; catalogue number: 11–3338).

Principally because he believed the head displayed on its cheeks “como un parche redondo de ulli o goma negra” and wore “una gorra de manta revuelta y añudada,” Bustamante identified it with a goddess described in Chapter 8 of Book I of Sahagún’s “Historia General de las Cosas de Nueva España”, Temazcalteci, “la abuela de los baños”, an aspect of Teteoinnan, “Mother of the Gods”. In 1840 he published a short article concerning this monument, providing further details on its discovery and now adding “Centeotl” (erroneously equating this deity with Temazcalteci) as a label for it. The article was accompanied by three lithographs: frontal and back views of the head and the complex relief on the under-surface. Although not entirely accurate, they provided the first basically adequate illustrations of this remarkable monument.

A more stylized frontview engraving was published four years later by Brantz Mayer (1844: 85). After giving the erroneous date of 1837 for its discovery, he cites the opinion of Bustamante that it represented “the god of Baths”. He then mentioned a diverse opinion, that of Isidro Gondra, director of the Mexican National Museum, that it represented rather “the god of Night — the half shut eyes, and sealed mouth, bearing him out in his hypothesis”. Some years later, in 1882, a leading Mexican scholar of the Porfirian period, Alfredo Chavero, preferred to label the mysterious head “Totec, que es una de las manifestaciones mas esplendidas del sol” (Chavero 1882: 483; cf. Chavero 1882 — 1903: 426 f.; 1887: 319, 391 — 393), and it was so classified in the first reasonably comprehensive catalogue, in Spanish, of the major monuments of the Museo Nacional (Galindo y Villa 1895: 31 f.). Also, as illustrations to Chavero’s 1882 — 1903 “Piedra del Sol” series of articles, cited above, the first really accurate illustrations of the head were published, three excellent pencil drawings by the distinguished Mexican artist, José María Velasco (front, side, and angle views; the first two are illustrated in Fig. 6).

Finally, in 1900, the correct identification of the head was first made by the leading European Mexicanist of the day, Eduard Seler, in his commentary to the “Tonalamatl Aubin” (English edition, 1900—01: 117). He identified the motifs on both cheeks as bells, with the upper circular elements bearing the well-recognized cruciform symbols for gold — thus, Coyolxauhqui, “Painted with Bells”. He was also the first clearly to recognize that the head displays various features iconographically diagnostic of the goddess Chantico as she is represented in the Codices “Borbonicus” (Fig. 7), “Telleriano-Remensis” (Fig. 8) / “Vaticanus A”, “Borgia” (Fig. 11), “Vaticanus B” (Fig. 12), “Tonalamatl Aubin” (Fig.
10), and Sahagún’s “Primeros Memoriales” (Fig. 9), particularly the distinctive headcloth, and, on some, the ear and nose ornaments and the associated *atl tlachinolli*, “sacred war”, symbols.

The following year, in his article on the major archaeological discoveries in and adjacent to the Tenochtitlan Templo Mayor, Seler (1901: 129 f.) identified the head more definitely as Coyolxauhqui — not mentioning Chantico in this context — and suggested that it had originally stood on the summit of the Huitzilopochtli-Tlaloc temple, in conformity with the myth wherein, after her slaughter and dismemberment by Huitzilopochtli, her head remained on the Coatepetl, the “Serpent Mountain”, precisely the name applied to this structure. Surprisingly, although he cited Alvarado Tezozomoc for the latter fact, he failed to note that both this Indian chronicler (Alvarado Tezozomoc 1944: 300) and the Dominican missionary Durán (1967, II: 333) — drawing from a common source, the “Crónica X” — explicitly state that a representation of Coyolxauhqui was set up on the Huitzilopochtli-Tlaloc temple in connection with the dedication of its final, 1487, renovation by Ahuitzotl. In the enlarged version of this article published three years later (Seler 1902–23, II: 767 — 904), Seler added a drawing of the central portion of the carving on the underside of the head (the remainder was obscured by the museum’s mountings) and correctly identified it as the *atl tlachinolli* symbol intertwined with an *aztamecatl*, the downball-adorned sacrificial cord, and a two-headed coral snake. The complete drawing of this surface published by Bustamante, which revealed two additional motifs not visible in the Seler drawing, the date 1. Tochtli in a square cartouche and a spider (to be discussed below), was apparently not available to him.

Although Chavero (1903: 432 — 436) rejected Seler’s interpretation, countering with a new identification of his own, Tlahuizcalpantecuhtli, the Venus deity, nearly all scholars subsequently have accepted the Seler interpretation (e.g., Beyer 1921 [1965]; Caso 1938: 93 — 95; Bernal 1969: n. p.). A generally adequate photograph of the piece was published in Galindo y Villa 1902 (Pl. 14), and it has since become one of the most frequently illustrated Aztec sculptures. A good color photograph was featured on the cover of a recent catalogue of the Museo Nacional de Antropología (Cervantes 1976). A photograph of the complete underside has been published by Fernández (1963: fig. 4; our Fig. 13).

Another very relevant piece is a jadeite mask in the collection of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University (acquired apparently in 1928 but of unknown provenience; catalogue number: 28–40–20/C10108), which also represents Coyolxauhqui-Chantico. It was first illustrated by Cahill (1933: Pl. 59; our Fig. 14) and variously since (e. g., Pijoán 1958: fig. 213; Thomson 1971: Pl. 88).
Basically, it is quite similar to the colossal head, but the nose ornament is absent, the bells are simpler and more stylized and lack the upper circular elements with the gold symbols, and they depend from a narrow band which bridges the nose. In these latter features the new carving obviously more closely resembles the mask than the famous head.3

The fullest version of the myth of the birth of Huitzilopochtli, featuring Coyolxauhqui as his hostile half-sibling, was recorded by Sahagún, in Nahuatl, in Tlatelolco probably in 1561 – 1565. It survives in two versions, virtually identical, in the “Códice Matritense del Real Palacio” (fols. 132r – 134v) and the “Florentine Codex” (Book III: fols. 1 – 7). Paso y Troncoso (1906: 205 f.) published the first in a photographic reproduction; paleographies of the second have been published by Seler (1927: 253 – 258) and Dibble and Anderson (Sahagún 1950–82, Pt. IV: 1 – 5) with direct translations into German and English, respectively. Sahagún himself made a paraphrastic Spanish translation, which constitutes the left-hand column of the “Florentine Codex” version – and which is also preserved in the Tolosa manuscript (Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid: fols. 174 – 177) version of the “Historia General” (Book III, Chapter I, Paragraph 1), from which all published versions (e.g., Sahagún 1975: 191 f.) are derived.

In concise summary, Coatlicue, “Serpents-her-Skirt”, while performing penitential exercises at Coatepec, is impregnated by a floating feather ball which she places in her bosom. Her eldest child, Coyolxauhqui, and her 400 (“innumerable”) sons, the Centzon Huitznahua, resolve to kill her for her shameful sexual transgression, but her unborn child, Huitzilopochtli, consoles his mother from the womb. Warned by a renegade among the approaching host with matricide their aim, he bursts forth, fully armed, and with the xiuhcoatl, the “turquoise snake”, decapitates and dismembers his half-sister and destroys most of his half-brothers, the survivors fleeing to the South.4

3 Chavero (1900: Plate facing p. 457) illustrated a small silver head obviously based closely on the colossal Coyolxauhqui-Chantico head, plus a silver ring with a head seemingly based more loosely on it. He published them in the belief that they were authentic pre-Hispanic artifacts, but they appear, from his illustrations, to be almost certain falsifications. Chavero (1900: 457) also stated that he knew of another head similar to the colossal one; he described it as being of red porphyry, 15 cm in diameter. However, he did not illustrate this piece, which is apparently otherwise unreported, so it is impossible to judge whether this was an authentic pre-Hispanic object.

4 This climactic scene is illustrated in the “Florentine Codex” (Sahagún 1950–82, Pt. IV: fig. 2; our Fig. 15), including the decapitation and dismemberment of Coyolxauhqui, but in such a sketchy fashion that it is not iconographically of much significance.
A significant variant of this narrative is contained in Alvarado Tezozomoc (1944: 9 – 11) and Durán (1967, II: 30 – 32), derived from the “Crónica X”. In this version Huitzilopochtli decapitates and extracts the heart of “Coyolxauh”, not explicitly identified as his sister, and does likewise to the Centzon Huitznahua in the sacred ballcourt, the Teotlachco, at Coatepec, which is specified as a stopping place on the Azteca-Mexica migration route from Aztlan to the Basin of Mexico – where they had angered their patron deity by their intention of remaining in the artificial lake-surrounded community they had created there. Alvarado Tezozomoc’s version is somewhat more detailed than the rather sketchy account in Durán but is garbled and at times almost unintelligible (see discussion and analysis in Seler 1902–23, III: 325 – 331). Both chroniclers earlier described Huitzilopochtli’s sister under another name, Malinalxoch(itl), a malevolent sorceress, who is abandoned, on her brother’s orders, at or just after leaving Patzcuaro, in Michoacan. With a faithful band of followers, she settles at Texcaltepec-Malinalco (named after her), giving birth to an equally hostile son, Copil, who later plays a significant role in events surrounding the foundation of Mexico Tenochtitlan.

Another version of the Malinalxochitl-Copil and Coyolxauhqui-Centzon Huitznahua episodes is recounted in the early part of the “Crónica Mexicayotl” (1975: 27 – 36), apparently also attributable to Alvarado Tezozomoc. The former is also very briefly mentioned in Chimalpahin’s “Tercera Relación” (Chimalpahin 1963: 10), undoubtedly derived from Alvarado Tezozomoc. Interestingly, in the “Crónica Mexicayotl” his female antagonist at Coatepec is called “Coyolxauhchiuatl” and is described as his mother. Alvarado Tezozomoc (1944: 300) also seems to merge or confuse Malinalxochitl and Coyolxauhqui, for, in referring to the image of the latter set up on the top of the Tenochtitlan Huitzilopochtli-Tlaloc temple adjacent to the sacrificial stone, he describes her as “pobladora de los de Michoacan”, which actually refers to Malinalxochitl. Another very summary account of Huitzilopochtli’s birth at Coatepec during the Mexica migration is included in the “Historia de los mexicanos por sus pinturas” (1965: 43 f.); his slaughter of the Centzon Huitznahua (not, however, named as such) is described, but Coyolxauhqui is not mentioned. It is also made explicit that the Panquetzaliztli veintena ceremony was in commemoration of Huitzilopochtli’s birth and victory over his enemies. In accordance with various other sources, the event is assigned here to the New Fire year, 2 Acatl, which, in the chronology employed in this source, would equate with 1143. The “Códice Azcatitlán” (1949: Pl. V), on the other hand, may indicate the previous year, 1 Tochtli (equated here with 1194). Perhaps significantly, this latter date, as mentioned, is carved on the underside of the colossal head (Fig. 13). Ce Tochtli, the date of the
creation of the present universe, is sometimes carved on the undersides of Aztec monuments (e.g., Seler 1902–23, II: Abb. 6), but here it might signify the date of Coyolxauhqui’s death at the hands of Huitzilopochtli — although, as indicated, the following year, Ome Acatl, is that more frequently given for this event.\(^5\)

The Huitzilopochtli birth myth, particularly the detailed Sahagúnite version, has given rise to diverse interpretations. The most popular has been the solar-lunar-astral interpretation of Eduard Seler (first adumbrated in Seler 1901–02: 112; most fully developed in Seler 1902–23, III: 327 f.; IV: 157 – 167), wherein Huitzilopochtli is the sun, who, at the moment of his birth-rising from the earth (Coatlicue), conquers and disperses the moon (Coyolxauhqui) and the host of stars of the southern firmament (Centzon Huitznahua). Hvidfeldt (1958: 133), on the other hand, characteristically interprets it as “a fantasia inspired by motifs from the ritual”, i.e., Panquetzaliztli. At the other extreme is an essentially historical-euhemeristic explanation which interprets the Huitzilopochtli-Centzon Huitznahua conflict as a political-military struggle between two factions of the migrating Mexica (González de Lesur 1966) or between the latter and the Toltecs of the Tollan-Coatepec zone (Jiménez Moreno and Fernández 1963: 116). The Seler hypothesis is seductive and “logical”, which probably explains its wide acceptance, but, with regard to Coyolxauhqui at least, there seems to be little or nothing in her iconography which is specifically lunar. On the other hand, she does share various features with other female fertility deities whose lunar associations, among others, have long been generally accepted, particularly Xochiquetzal (see Thompson 1939).

As Seler himself recognized, however, the colossal head he identified, undoubtedly correctly, as Coyolxauhqui, is iconographically essentially equivalent to representations of a goddess concerning whom relatively little is known, Chantico (“In the House”)–Cuaxolotl (“Xolotl-Head”); perhaps also connoting “Double-” or “Split-Head” [Seler]?). Seler (e.g., 1900–01: 114 – 118; 1902–03: 272 – 278; 1963, II: 224 – 228) ably summarized nearly all of the extant data on this deity — although I would not agree with all of his interpretations. He concluded that Chantico was basically “the fire goddess of Xochimilco”. Her igneous associations seem undeniable, but she probably also connoted various other concepts common to the highly important cluster of intimately interrelated female

\(^5\) Caso (1959: 86) read this damaged date as 2 Tochtli, which usually connoted the octl (pulque) deities. On the right side of this undersurface is the representation of a spider (cf. Fig. 16), a feared, loathsome creature related to the earth, darkness, and sorcery — and which, in Alvarado Tezozomoc’s account of Malinalxochitl, is explicitly mentioned in connection with her malevolent enchantments.
fertility deities (Nicholson 1963). In particular, in my view Seler insufficiently recognized (cf. Nicholson 1971a: 413 f.) Chantico’s apparent partial merger with Xochiquetzal and, probably, with the whole complex of youthful deities of sensuality of which she was the principal female embodiment. Her special association with Xochimilco, which Seler may have overstressed, he based on Sahagún’s (1950–82, Pt. X: 79 f.) inclusion of her calendric name (9 Itzcuintli) among the deities especially worshipped by the tlateecue, the lapidaries of Tenochtitlan-Tlatelolco, whose roots lay in Xochimilco, and his belief that Durán’s (1967, I: 125–133) account of Cihuacoatl, specified by him as the patroness of Xochimilco, really referred to Chantico — a view which I would regard as somewhat dubious, although some confusion between the two deities by Durán is certainly a possibility.

Chantico’s cult was definitely of some significance. She was included in Sahagún’s “Primeros Memoriales” deity list (e.g., Seler 1903–03, II: 501 f.). A temple and sacerdotal dormitory (Tetlanman, Tetlanman Calmecac) were dedicated to her in the Templo Mayor precinct of Tenochtitlan (Sahagún 1950–82, Pt. III: 170). Seler failed to mention that another Chantico-Cuaxolotl temple was stated by Torquemada (1975: 239) as having been built by Moquihuix, ruler of Tlatelolco, “para solo engañar a los tenochcas”, just before his disastrous attempt in 1473 to conquer Tenochtitlan. An unusual idol representing her, with a detachable leg believed to be efficacious in promoting military victory when the earth was pounded with it and which was employed by Motecuhzoma in an unsuccessful effort to hex the Cortesian advance toward Mexico, was described in an inquisitorial proceeding in Mexico City in 1539 (Archivo General de la Nación 1912: 179 f., 183). Precisely why Coyolxauhqui was equated with Chantico poses a certain problem. In the few references to the former, cited above, no mention is made of Chantico. Her igneous and, apparently, aggressive, militaristic connotations — particularly if the evidence of the idol just described be taken into account — might have seemed particularly suitable for the malevolent half-sister of their national god. Chantico’s association with the black magic arts (see Seler 1900—

6 According to Torquemada (1975: 245–246), “a los diez días del mes Tecuilihuitl (que era el postrero del año de los mexicanos) fueron muertos los cautivos que representaban la figura de los dioses Chanticon y Cohuacolotl (sic) y les ayudaron su celebración y muerte y cantaron sus funestos cantos”, a significant ritual event just preceding the Mexica “civil war”. His account of the incidents leading up to this fratricidal struggle also includes a description, to exemplify his brutality and depravity, of Moquihuix’ rape of some of the women “de las que servían de tejer los ornamentos y vestiduras de la diosa Chanticon ... con que causó grandísimo escándalo en la república.”
Ol: 116) might also have been a factor. Or there may have been deeper conceptual connections concerning which we can only speculate in the face of the limited amount of data available concerning these two deities. Whatever the precise reasons, Coyolxauhqui was apparently considered to have been a manifestation of Chantico. The hyphenated title which Beyer (1921 [1965]) first applied to the Templo Mayor colossal head (cf. Nicholson 1971a: caption to fig. 12), therefore, seems quite justified.

Finally, some brief remarks on the esthetic-stylistic and temporal aspects of the monument might be in order. As has been widely recognized, it constitutes one of the finest large pre-Hispanic carvings yet found in the capital. It is sculpted in unusually deep relief, which conveys an especially bold, powerful effect that is heightened by Coyolxauhqui's shattered figure being conceived somewhat simpler, less cluttered than many Aztec reliefs representing supernatural personages. Its great size is also noteworthy; in diameter it exceeds any other Aztec monument except the “Calendar Stone”. As for its chronological position within the sequence of major sculptured monuments of Tenochtitlan, Matos Moctezuma (1981: 37, 90) has assigned it to his Templo Mayor constructional stage IVb, which he tentatively assigns, on the basis of a stone plaque displaying the date 3. Cali, 1469, set into the side of the platform belonging to this stage, to the first year of the reign of Axayacatl (1469 – 1481). However, the extant ethnohistorical accounts do not mention any significant construction on the Templo Mayor during his rule, although at least two major renovations are ascribed to his grandfather, Motecuhzoma I (1440 – 1469). In any case, this magnificent monument was certainly carved and set in place some time before 1487, the date assigned by all of the ethnohistorical sources to the last major renovation of the Templo Mayor, early in the reign of Ahuitzotl (1486 – 1502). Its esthetic sophistication and expert craftsmanship indicate that Aztec monumental sculpture had definitely come of age by the middle decades of the fifteenth century.
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Fig. 1. Sculptured monument discovered in February, 1978, near the corner of Argentina and Guatemala Street, Mexico City (Photo: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, México; courtesy of Augusto Molina Montes).
Fig. 2: Severed, bleeding snake. *Codex Borbonicus*, 6 (from Seler 1963, II: fig. 217).
Fig. 3: Intertwined two-headed coral snake. *Codex Cospi*, 1 (from Seler 1963, I: fig. 71).
Fig. 4: Arched two-headed coral snake. *Codex Borbonicus*, 19 (from Seler 1963, II: fig. 260).
Fig. 5: Tlaltecuhtli, Earth Monster, representation on underside of stone box. Ex-Hackmack Collection, Hamburgisches Museum für Völkerkunde (from Seler 1902–23, II: 735, fig. 25).
Fig. 6: Frontal and rear views of Coyolxauhqui-Chantico colossal head. Pencil drawings by José María Velasco (from Chavero 1887: 391).
Fig. 7: Chantico: Regent of eighteenth tonalpohualli trecena commencing 1. Ehecatl. Codex Borbonicus, 18 (from Seler 1963, II: fig. 281).
Fig. 8: Chantico: Regent of eighteenth tonalpohualli trecena commencing 1. Ehecatl. Codex Telleriano-Remensis, 21v (from Seler 1963, II: Fig. 280).
Fig. 9: Chantico. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, Primeros Memoriales (Códice Matritense del Real Palacio, fol. 266v; from Seler 1963, II: fig. 278).

Fig. 10: Chantico: Regent of eighteenth tonalpohualli tre-cena commencing 1. Ehecatl. Tonalamatl Aubin, 18 (from Seler 1963, II: fig. 282).

Fig. 11: Chantico: Regent of eighteenth tonalpohualli tre-cena commencing 1. Ehecatl. Codex Borgia, 63 (from Seler 1902–03: fig. 533).
Fig. 12: Chantico Regent of eighteenth *tonalpohualli* trecena commencing 1. Ehecatl. *Codex Vaticanus B*, 66 (from Seler 1963, II. fig. 279).

Fig. 13: Underside of colossal Coyolxauhqui-Chantico head (Photo: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, México).
Fig. 14: Jadeite mask of Coyolxauhqui-Chantico. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University (from Cahill 1933, pl. 59).

Fig. 15: Huitzilopochtli victorious over Coyolxauhqui and the Centzon Huitznahua. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, *Florentine Codex*, Book III, fol. 3 (from Sahagún 1959–82, Pt. IV: fig. 2).

Fig. 16: Spider. *Codex Borbonicus*, 19 (from Seler 1902–23, IV: 741, fig. 955).