Aztec-style pitcher from a Late Postclassic burial offering in Morelos

This vessel (22 cm in height) was excavated in 1976 by the Xochicalco Mapping Project, directed by Kenneth G. Hirth (2000). It is one of seven vessels found as offerings associated with a burial of three individuals on Terrace 85 (Burial 3), one of the lower residential terraces at Xochicalco. The ceramics and the context indicate that Burial 3 dates to the Early Cuauhnahuac phase (A.D. 1350-1440, the first part of the Late Postclassic period), prior to the conquest of Morelos by the Triple Alliance Empire. Hirth excavated several other Late Postclassic burials on Terrace 85, suggesting that Xochicalco may have served as a cemetery for Postclassic peoples long after its abandonment as an Epiclastic urban centre. Excavations at the Epiclastic urban settlements of Teotenango and San Miguel Ixtapan in the State of Mexico have also located intrusive Postclassic cemeteries (Pina Chán 1975; Rodríguez G. and García S. 1996). Unlike Terrace 85 at Xochicalco, the Postclassic burials at the latter sites were placed in the centres of the Epiclastic cities, amidst the monumental public architecture.

Fig. 1. Polished redware pitchers from Late Postclassic burials in Morelos. A: From Burial 3, Terrace 85, Xochicalco (see front cover); B: from a burial at Coatepec (Arana Alvareza 1984b); C: from Temimilco; D: from an unknown Morelos site; E: from a burial at Olintepec (Canto Aguilar 1993). Vessels C and D are part of the Dubermann Collection in the Museo Cuauhnahuac in Cuernavaca, Morelos. (Drawings by Michael E. Smith, from Smith 2003a).

Fig. 2. Illustration from the Florentine Codex of a drunken noble with his pitcher of an unspecified drink, most likely pulque (Sahagún 1950-82: Bk. 10, Fig. 26a). (Drawing by Jennifer Wharton).

Pitchers, along with other ceramic vessels such as jars, bowls, plates, and long-handled censers, are regularly depicted in the Central Mexican codices. Most often, such vessels appear in feasting scenes, either in public ritual or domestic contexts (Fig. 2). Pitchers in the codices are also shown in more mundane activities such as bathing and irrigating fields, as well as in toponyms and personal names. In all such depictions, pitchers are plainly finished without any of the decorations that occasionally occur on other vessels; there

Fig. 3. Pitchers from Central Mexican codices and pictorial sources. C, F, G, and H have signs for water; I has dots that represent pulque; and E contains a captured water mammal. B is a pitcher paid in tribute, and G is a sign for tribute in domestic labor. H is part of a toponym (for Tlaahuilipan). A: Codex Azcatitlan, lám. 4 (Barlow 1995); B: Codex Kingsborough, f. 219r (Valle, 1995); C: Durán (1967): Vol. 1, Plate 6); D: Codex Telleriano Remensis, f. 46r (Quiriones Keber 1995); E: Florentine Codex, Bk. 11, Fig. 234 (Sahagún 1950-82); F: Florentine Codex Bk. 4, Fig. 11; G: Códice Osuna, f. 479-17v (Códice Osuna 1947); H: Codex Mendoza (1992: f. 27r); I: Primero Memoriales, f. 252v (Sahagún 1993).
are no illustrations of elaborately decorated pitchers like the vessel on the cover.

The pitchers illustrated in the codices appear in a variety of forms. They can be spouted or unspouted, flat or round-bottomed, tall and narrow or short and globular (Fig. 3). Most often, pitchers—regardless of their form—are depicted containing water. They are also shown, less frequently, as serving vessels for pulque (most pulque vessels in the codices are plain jars and bowls identified with the yecamiztli symbol). Central Mexican codices are a rich source of information on the uses of ceramic vessels and other material objects excavated by archaeologists. It is likely that the polished redware pitcher on the cover was used to serve water and/or pulque, perhaps at feasts (Smith, Wharton and Olsen 2003).

Cover photo by Michael E. Smith
Text by Michael E. Smith and Jennifer Wharton
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Decorated serving vessels from Postclassic burial offerings in Morelos

These painted ceramic vessels were associated with Postclassic burial offerings excavated at sites in the western part of the state of Morelos. The tall jar (30.5 cm in height) was excavated in 1976 by the Xochicalco Mapping Project, directed by Kenneth G. Hirsh (2000). It is one of twenty vessels found as offerings associated with a burial of seven individuals (Burial 1) on Terrace 85, one of the lower residential terraces at Xochicalco. The ceramics indicate that Burial 1 dates to the Temazcalli phase (A.D. 1200–1350), the local western Morelos manifestation of the Middle Postclassic or Early Aztec period. This jar (piece no. XV-40 in the catalog in Smith 2003) is an example of the “Tlahuica polychrome jar” type. The Tlahuica polychrome style is a distinctive white-based polychrome ceramic style common in western and central Morelos during the Middle and Late Postclassic periods (Smith 2003a; Smith n.d.). Burial 1 also contained miniature jars, Tlahuica polychrome bowls, a polished redware bowl, and various plain bowls, jars and basins. Other grave goods included manos and metates, spindle whorls, obsidian blades, three copper/bronze bells and one tiny copper/bronze dog.

The red vase (mouth diameter of 13 cm) was excavated in the early 1970s by Raúl Arana Alvarez at Coatepec. Arana uncovered a number of burials and offerings associated with a ballcourt at Coatepec, one of the few well preserved Aztec ballcourts (Arana Alvarez 1984a). These offerings, like most of the architecture at Coatepec, date to the Cuauhnahua (Late Postclassic) period, A.D. 1350–1520+. The vase (piece no. CV-14 in the catalog in Smith 2003a) is an example of the polished redware (guinda) type. Polished redware serving vessels are common throughout central Mexico in Middle and Late Postclassic times. Approximately half of the more than 200 ceramic vessels in the ballcourt offerings were miniature plain vessels, and approximately one-quarter of the vessels were polished red incurved cups. The remaining vessels include plain and decorated bowls, spinning bowls and spindle whorls, long-handled cesars, and several polished redware pitchers and vases, including this one. These offerings may represent the material remains of some kind of feasting event associated with a funeral and/or a ballgame (Smith, et al. 2003a). Polychrome jars and redware vases are low-frequency ceramic types at the many commoner and elite Aztec houses I have excavated at various sites in Morelos.

Polychrome jars like vessel XV-40 were probably used for carrying and storing water. Although jars are commonly depicted in the Aztec codices (with a variety of uses), polychrome jars are rarely shown. This may be due to the fact that painted jars, although regular parts of Postclassic ceramic assemblages in Morelos and the Toluca Valley, were rare in the Basin of Mexico. The polished redware vase was probably used to serve cacao, a common use for these vessels in the codices. At the beginning of the Códice Tudela (1980:2r), for example, a woman pours cacao from one vase into another to produce froth (fig. 4A). The form and decoration on the lower vase (fig. 4B) are very close to vessel CV-14. The main difference is the motif inside the circle: the Tudela figure shows a bird with a flower, whereas the vessel has a butterfly element.

These excavated ceramic vessels provide information on a variety of economic, social, and iconographic topics. They support the contention of Dorie Reents-Budet (1994) that the scholarly value of properly excavated and documented archaeological objects is far higher than unprovenienced objects, many of which may have been looted.
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From the editor’s desk

The year 2003 is a hallowed period for mexicon. With this issue we begin the celebration of our 25th anniversary and we have been thinking about ways in which we could mark the event appropriately. One rather visible sign of the momentous occasion will not have escaped your attention—the colourful cover with its rich display of Aztec ceramics. Coincidentally this is also to a large degree the Year of the Aztec, marked in Great Britain and Germany by the important exhibition titled succinctly ‘Aztecs’. And equally coincidentally, we are inaugurating a new series of essays on the current state of Mesoamerican studies, each written by a leading scholar in a special area of interest. These invited
essays, known as Perspectives on Mesoamerica, will appear at irregular intervals from now on. Our first invited author is the archaeologist Michael E. Smith (State University of New York at Albany), who is also the kind donor of the photos adorning our front and back covers. One of the foremost scholars working on Aztec civilization today, Michael Smith has added great breadth to Aztec studies by the emphasis he has placed on the imperial provinces, rather than focusing narrowly on Tenochtitlan. His review of the field through the eyes of an archaeologist will provide us with a much-needed perspective on the state of the art in an area traditionally dominated by text-based studies. We at mexicon sincerely thank him for this valuable contribution.

Gordon Whittaker
Editor

**Perspectives on Mesoamerica**

**A Quarter-Century of Aztec Studies**

Michael E. Smith

mexicon was founded in 1979, the year after the Coyolxauhqui stone was uncovered in Mexico City. That discovery initiated the Templo Mayor project, one of the most important research projects in the history of Aztec studies. The twenty-five years since 1979 have witnessed tremendous progress not only in the archaeology of Tenochtitlan, but in all of the disciplines and scholarly approaches included under the rubric ‘Aztec studies.’ In this article I review some of the important discoveries and advances during this interval. The overarching trend has been an expansion in the domain of what scholars call ‘Aztec.’ The scope of our understanding of Aztec civilization has expanded geographically – outward from Tenochtitlan – as well as socially – throughout the social hierarchy.¹

What people (if any) should be called ‘Aztecs’?

The term ‘Aztec’ has too many meanings. It refers minimally to a time period, an empire, several pottery types, and an art style. These meanings are all clearly defined by specialists and useful within specific domains of scholarship, but they often cause confusion. The term is most widely used, however, as an ethnic label: ‘the Aztecs.’ But just who should be included here? While not a neologism, Aztec was not used as an ethnic or political label at the time of the Spanish conquest. Barlow (1945) points out that its widespread usage began in the eighteenth century with Clavigero, and was widely promoted in the nineteenth century by Prescott’s popular book on the Spanish conquest.

Some scholars view Aztec as synonymous with Mexica and believe the label Aztecs is best confined to the inhabitants of the imperial capital Tenochtitlan. Alfredo López Austin (2001), for example, devotes an encyclopedia entry under the term Aztec to a description of the Mexica of Tenochtitlan, a usage also followed by Clendinnen (1991) and others. In contrast, I have argued that Aztec should include all of the Nahua-speaking peoples of highland central Mexico between the twelfth century A.D. and the Spanish conquest (Smith 2003b: 3–5). To justify this usage I cite James Lockhart’s (1992: 1) use of the term ‘Nahuas’ for their direct descendants after the conquest. But this wider definition also has its problems, most notably in the elimination of Central Mexican peoples who did not speak Nahua. There were many speakers of Otomi and other Otopamean languages in Postclassic highland Central Mexico, and these peoples were important players in the Aztec social and political landscape (Nava L. 2002). Few scholars call these peoples ‘Aztecs,’ but there is little theoretical or empirical justification for eliminating them from consideration in scholarship on Postclassic Central Mexico.

Perhaps it is time to move beyond ‘ethnic’ interpretations of the past, which can lead to sterile debates about which people were ‘Aztecs’ and which people were not. Our time is better spent focusing more on historical and cultural processes (of which ethnicity is certainly one type).² For the purposes of this article I define ‘Aztec studies’ as scholarship on the post-Toltec societies and cultures of highland Central Mexico, regardless of whether the people spoke Nahua or not. The past quarter-century of Aztec studies makes it abundantly clear that the relevant geographical scope for scholarship must be far wider than the shores of the island of Tenochtitlan.

The geographical scope of Aztec society

The year 1979 marked the publication of The Basin of Mexico: Ecological Processes in the Evolution of a Civilization (Sanders, et al. 1979), a synthesis of several decades of innovative archaeological survey fieldwork directed by William Sanders and Jeffrey Parsons. Among the many seminal contributions of this research—such as documenting Aztec settlement patterns for the first time, identifying a major population explosion during Aztec times, and reconstructing the agricultural landscape—one finding for the Aztec period stands out. The surveys reveal a uniform material culture at Aztec-period sites throughout the entire Basin of Mexico. From the heart of Tenochtitlan to the rural edges of the Basin, people used the same kinds of pottery vessels,

---

¹ Smith 2001.
² The traditional ‘Aztec’ was defined as the Mexica who lived in Tenochtitlan and associated territories. However, as Michael Smith (2001) points out, the term Aztec was not used as an ethnic or political label at the time of the Spanish conquest. Instead, it has been used to refer to the inhabitants of the Basin of Mexico, who speak Nahua and its various dialects. The term has been further extended to include the peoples of the highland Central Mexico, who also speak Nahua and its various dialects. This broader definition has been challenged by some scholars, who argue that the term should be confined to the inhabitants of Tenochtitlan and associated territories. However, this narrower definition is not widely accepted, and the term Aztec is still commonly used to refer to the inhabitants of the Basin of Mexico and related areas.

---

Fig. 5. Toponyms in Aztec codices from different towns in the Basin of Mexico. A, B, and C: Codex Boturini (Tenochtitlan); D: Tira de Tepechpan (Tepechpan); E: Codex Xolotl (Tetzoco); F: Codex Mendoza (Tenochtitlan); after Boone (2000: fig. 25). For principles of Aztec writing and glyphs, see Prem (1992) and Léon-Parro (1982).
stone tools, and other domestic implements, and people lived in the same basic kinds of houses (nobles in palaces built on raised platforms and commoners in small ground-level adobe-wall structures).

Further scholarship on codices, sculptures, and monumental architecture (e.g. Pasztory 1983) also finds a general uniformity of expression within the Basin of Mexico (Fig. 5). These results are hardly surprising; in 1964 Charles Gibson identified a basic regularity in local social and political patterns throughout the Basin from his analyses of Spanish-language administrative documents. Archaeological fieldwork at Aztec sites outside of Tenochtitlan expanded greatly after 1979, revealing a pattern of economic variation within the Basin. For example, craft production was quite intensive at Otumba but minimal at Huexotla, and intensive agricultural methods varied according to environmental setting (see citations in Hodge 1998). This economic diversity flourished within a setting of relative cultural and linguistic uniformity. In fact, there is little basis for distinguishing the residents of Tenochtitlan (the Mexica) from the other peoples of the Basin of Mexico on the basis of material culture or forms of social organization.

The publication of Richard Andrews’s *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl* (Andrews 1975) initiated a significant expansion in linguistic scholarship, and there are now a number of excellent analytical dictionaries and grammatical works on the Aztec language (e.g. Campbell 1985; Lockhart 2001). The Copenhagen Nahuatl Dictionary Project, directed by Una Canger, is producing a computerized database that will facilitate a wide range of scholarship. Training in Classical Nahuatl is now offered at a number of universities; of particular note is Jonathan Amith’s Yale Nahuatl Summer School. Paralleling the findings of Aztec archaeology, ethnohistory, and art history, research on Nahuatl linguistics shows that the relevant spatial scale is the central Mexican highlands, not just Tenochtitlan. Although spatial variation in Classical Nahuatl is a current topic of study, studies comparing regional variants to social and cultural patterns identified in other types of data (e.g. Whittaker 1988) are still in their infancy. A related area with great promise is the analysis of Nahua toponyms in the codices (Dyckerrhoff and Prem 1990; León-Portilla 1982). Research in Central Mexican Ototamean languages has also accelerated recently (Lastra de Suárez 1992; Muntzel 1990; Nava L. 2002; Valiñas 2000), illustrating the nature of linguistic and cultural variation in Aztec Central Mexico.

The past quarter-century also has seen an expansion in documentary and archaeological research outside of the Basin of Mexico. The publication and analysis of Nahual-language administrative documents has revolutionized our understanding of the *altepetl*, the *calpolli*, and other aspects of local social organization. Research by James Lockhart (1992), his students, and colleagues shows that many of the social and cultural patterns first identified in the Basin of Mexico also characterize Conquest-period societies in the Toluca, Cuernavaca, and Puebla regions. Furthermore, Lockhart identifies a contrast between ‘western Nahua’ (in the Basin of Mexico, Toluca, and Morelos) and ‘eastern Nahua’ (in Puebla and Tlaxcala) patterns of social organization, a distinction whose contours are only starting to be explored (e.g. Chance 2000). Archaeological fieldwork at Aztec-period sites in these areas has lagged behind documentary research, but my own excavations in Morelos have turned up a mixture of distinctive local patterns — such as decorated ceramic styles and commoner house construction methods — and traits shared with sites in the Basin of Mexico. The latter category includes basic food-preparation technology, items for domestic ritual — such as ceramic figurines (Fig. 6) — and the ground plans of palaces (see Smith 2003b). Polished redware ceramics, one of the finest and most elaborate Aztec wares, were widely manufactured and extensively traded so that it is often difficult to distinguish Morelos vessels — such as the pitcher illustrated on the cover of this issue — from those excavated in the Basin of Mexico.

![Fig. 6. Ceramic figurines from commoner houses at Yautepec, Morelos. These objects were produced in Morelos, but they are nearly identical in form and style to ceramic figurines from the Basin of Mexico; drawings by Ben Katis.](image)

The relevant spatial scale for Aztec studies, however, is even wider. The Triple Alliance (or ‘Aztec’) empire extended far beyond Central Mexico and incorporated many non-Nahua peoples. The empire has been the subject of extensive documentary analysis (Berdan, et al. 1996; Carrasco 1996; Hassig 1988) and limited archaeological fieldwork (Smith 2003b). This research shows that developments at Tenochtitlan cannot be understood without consideration of events and processes in the outer provinces of the empire. Capital and provinces were integrated not just through the administrative and economic channels of empire, but also through shared stylistic expression and intellectual culture (Boone 2003). For example, Aztec-style codices were produced in all parts of the empire (Table 1). Beyond the borders of the empire, it is difficult to justify the label ‘Aztec studies.’ Nevertheless, the dramatic Late Postclassic increases in commercial, stylistic, and intellectual exchange bind the entire area of Mesoamerica into a single interaction zone or world system, and scholarship on Aztec society needs to take this wider context into account (Smith and Berdan 2003).

**The Social Hierarchy**

Just as the past twenty-five years have seen an expansion in our knowledge of the geographical scope of Aztec society, so too has this period witnessed a parallel expansion in knowledge on the social scope of Aztec society, from the highest noble to the lowest provincial peasant. The Templo
Table 1. Recent facsimile editions of Aztec codices (published since 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tenochtitlan:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Codex Azcatitlán</em></td>
<td>(Barlow and Graulich 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Codex Telleriano-Remensis</em></td>
<td>(Quiñones Keber 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice Tributos de Coyocacón</em></td>
<td>(Batalla Rosado 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Historia mexicana desde 1221</em></td>
<td>(Medina González 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ordenanza del Señor Cuauhtémoc</em></td>
<td>(Valle 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basin of Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice de Santa María Asunción</em></td>
<td>(Williams and Harvey 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice de Tepetlahoc</em></td>
<td>(Valle 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tira de Tepechpan</em></td>
<td>(Noguéz 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Highland Central Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice de Huezoltzinco</em></td>
<td>(Hébert, et al. 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice de Tepoztlan</em></td>
<td>(Brotherston 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice Techialoyan de San Pedro Tototepoc</em></td>
<td>(Noguéz 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice Xiquipilco-Temoaya</em></td>
<td>(García Castro 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lienzos de Tepeciac</em></td>
<td>(Aguílera 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outer Imperial Provinces:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Códice de Xicoxtpec</em></td>
<td>(Stresser-Péan 1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By expanding the spatial scope of Aztec documentary research beyond the Basin of Mexico, the work of Lockhart (1992) and others has greatly clarified many aspects of social hierarchy and relations among nobles and commoners. Many Náhuatl-language documents provide direct windows into the lives of provincial commoners with a level of detail unknown twenty-five years ago (see Box). A different window into these same lives is provided by many excavations of commoner houses at a number of sites in Morelos. The Yautepetl house shown in Figure 8 was probably inhabited by a family not unlike that of Elotl and Tiaco (see Box). The excavation of trash deposits behind this and other houses provides additional details on commoner activities and conditions. Their inhabitants were not isolated peasants, but rather active participants in regional marketing systems: they had access to many diverse imported goods, including obsidian, salt, and decorated ceramics from the Basin of Mexico, bronze tools from the Tarascan empire, and obsidian and ceramics from many other parts of highland Central Mexico. These people also participated in wider stylistic networks, as shown by their clay figurines (Fig. 6), serving vessels (see cover photo), censers, and other objects. Most of these commoner houses in Morelos were arranged into patio groups quite similar to the patio groups of the Classic period lowland Maya area (Johnston and Gonlin 1998).

Problems to Resolve

The great expansion in Aztec scholarship since 1979 has led to a diversity of research issues, themes, and approaches, a detailed discussion of which is beyond the scope of this article. Instead, I want to step back and mention two larger problems that currently hinder Aztec scholarship. First, archaeologists and art historians have failed to compile and publish basic catalogs and descriptive data on Aztec material culture. Why is there no corpus of Aztec stone sculpture, metal objects, ceramic vessels, figurines, turquoise mosaics, or any other category of object? These items are scattered among museums and storage facilities in many countries, greatly hindering research. Those of us who work with such Aztec material objects lag behind scholars of codices and documents in terms of publication of basic data. Since 1979 numerous excellent photographic facsimiles of the major Aztec codices have been published (see Table 1 for the most recent of these) and many useful transcriptions of Aztec documents have appeared (e.g., Cline 1993; Hinz, et al. 1983). Furthermore, the *Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources of the Handbook of Middle American Indians* (Cline 1975) is now being updated (Oudijk and Castañeda de la Paz n.d.-a; Oudijk and Castañeda de la Paz n.d.-b).

A second problem that plagues Aztec studies is scholarly provincialism. In one form of provincialism, practitioners of various methodological approaches fail to consult data from other approaches or else they use such data in uncritical or simplistic ways. Too many archaeologists have a poor understanding of the documentary data and art historical methods and too many ethnohistorians and linguists fail to use archaeological data well (if at all). Another kind of provincialism is even more detrimental to the advance of Aztec scholarship. Many U.S. scholars ignore relevant work by Mexicans published in Spanish, and many Mexicans seem unaware of key scholarship published in English. Furthermore, too
I would like to thank Gordon Whittaker for inviting me to write this paper, and for his editing. He also helped with citations to German-language publications and comments on NahuaT linguistics. Elizabeth H. Boone and Michel R. Oudijk provided helpful citations on recent codex research.
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News and Notes

United States trying to return artifacts from Guatemala

NEW YORK/BOSTON (The New York Times/The Boston Globe). In January 1998 26 Precolombian stone and ceramic artifacts from the Peten Lowlands and the southern Guatemalan coast were brought inside suitcases to Miami by two persons who described the artifacts on Customs forms as "30 artifacts and two books packed into 10 boxes." Because no required official permission from the Guatemalan government to take them out of the country existed, U.S. Customs agents promptly seized the artifacts as cultural patrimony of Guatemala. The collection of pottery and figurines, dated between 500 and 1200 A.D. and valued at $165,000, was then taken to a vault in the basement of Customs' headquarters inside the World Trade Center. The pieces survived the September 11, 2001, terror attacks, and were found months afterward by crews sifting through the rubble. They are now in a Miami warehouse. No information was given why the artifacts remained stored in New York for so long. With the intent of returning them to Guatemala the American Justice Department took the first steps toward legally taking ownership of the artifacts recently, but the two importers who have not been charged yet by prosecutors have hired attorneys to fight to keep the pieces in the United States. A conclusion has not yet been reached.

Xipe Totec statue found in situ in El Salvador

SAN SALVADOR/Berkley (Paul E. Amaroli/Karen Olsen Bruhns). Life- to near life-sized ceramic statues of the Mexican deity Xipe Totec appear in the early Postclassic throughout Mexico and Mexican influenced areas. Although a fair number of these statues are known, only three have had good provenience data: the Mazapan Phase (Early Postclassic) statue excavated by Sigvald Linné in 1934 in the ruins of a structure above the Xolapán Palace in Teotihuacan, an Early Postclassic statue excavated by Manuel Torres in Veracruz at Piedras Negras (also known as Madereros) near Cerro de las Mesas, and, more recently, a Postclassic statue found with another, of an anthropomorphic bat deity, in Tezoquian, in Central Mexico. However, in the early months of 2002 an additional statue of Xipe was found in central El Salvador.

The archaeological site of Carranza is located approximately 1 km south of the large urban site of Cihuatlan, of which it may have been a suburb. The site is located on the floor of the Acelhuate Valley and all but two of its structures have been destroyed by agricultural activities, mainly the