



INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES  
ESTÉTICAS  
ARCHIVO HISTÓRICO



FONDO	<b>BEATRIZ DE LA FUENTE</b>
SERIE	007: ESCRITOS ACADÉMICOS
CAJA	023
EXP.	128
DOC.	002
FOJAS	28-47
FECHA (S)	5/F

I wish to thank Esther Payton for her invitation to participate in this conference. My dedication goes to my friend and colleague Doris Heyden. I have changed the title of my paper, it is now

3

BENEATH THE SIGN OF "OTHERNESS"

BF7C23E128D2F28

Final para presentar en Colombia

Beatriz DE LA FUENTE  
INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES ESTÉTICAS  
UNAM

1. *Universal Points of View: Philosophy and Culture*

Part of the approach of this paper was conceived, perhaps, under the light of Octavio Paz's *Privileges of sight* (1978). An artist himself, he distinguished three "constituent characteristics of Mesoamerican civilization", namely: originality, isolation, and "otherness". Moreover, he applied the concept of "expression" to Mesoamerican art:

*Quote*

what it says is said with such a concentrated energy that that saying is always expressive... A Maya deity covered by attributes and signs is not a sculpture that we can read as a text, but as a sculpture/text. Fusion of reading and contemplation, two acts dissociated in Occident (Paz, 1978: 50).

~~Artists perpetuate and transmit cultural values throughout the work of art, and create something original and revealing. Art tells the way in which societies perceive, understand, and explain their world. Through art, humankind translates the Universe into a language harmonically constructed of materials, spaces, forms, lines, colors, textures, proportions, images plentiful of symbols and meanings.~~

Thus, works of art are extraordinary media to know cultural developments, whether of an epoch or a region. They allow a deeper approach to humankind, of its restlessness dealing with origin and destiny, with nature and deities.

Comprehension of artistic expressions is the principal vehicle to interpret a culture, its origins, evolution, influences, decay and collapse. This is also true, and most important, when we lack written sources to approach human past, as it happens with pre-Columbian art.

Besides, we face here a crucial difference: Pre Hispanic art falls apart from Western canons. My intention is to offer a summary of some opinions about Mexican conception of Mesoamerican art, aiming to find out the differences between West and Non West. If to date we consider it art, the path of understanding has been long and troubled. I think one reason deals with several predominant ideologies born at the main centers of political power or of artistic production: Spain, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and recently the United States. This assertion includes approximately the time span between XVIth and XXth centuries.

## 2. *Initial and Long Steps*

The origins of such comprehension go back to the XVIth century, when soldiers and friars expressed their opinions about Indian societies and their cultural achievements. At the same time, two main routes for the proper understanding of pre-Columbian art born: one of acceptance and one of rejection. Similarities, obviously, were accepted, namely artistic forms close to naturalism, to "beauty", but those that differ did not have the same luck; I mean unintelligible, confusing or "monstrous" forms.

~~Let us remember that Renaissance postulated a new address to conceive the world, grounded on the legacy of Classic Greece and Rome. One aim was to suppress differences that seemed to deny the unity of humankind. In the field of arts, definitions took base upon *Scienza Nuova* and "noble arts": architecture, sculpture, painting, and music.~~ Naturalism in Renaissance art was one of the most pursued purposes. So, the New World puzzled refined Europe. News arrived of almost naked inhabitants but of complex social and urban life —almost as Europe herself—. They worshipped "Satan and his cohorts" with assassin, bloody rituals, and under any circumstance they cut their flesh to pour blood. Nevertheless they

were capable of creating magnificent works and crafts, as well as poetry, and theatrical plays.

European conquerors thought contradictorily about Indian works of art. Architecture, metal and feather works received laudatory commentaries. Sculpture and painting were condemned to silence and repudiation; for they were "things of Satan". Through chronicles of conquerors and friars, we appreciate the first amazement about the *rei publicæ* and harmony in which Indians lived, expressed in several levels of emotion and appreciation; but these qualifications completely oppose to the values assigned to the artistic works, and consequently reject them.

Yet let us bring to mind the enthusiastic description by Albrecht Dürer, written in 1520 at Brussels: he welcomed American works of art. However other factors intervened, particularly the dreadful question about the "humankind of Indians". After long debates, they "obtained" humankind, but their æsthetic production was doomed during almost three centuries. 4

During XVIIth century there were few efforts to understand American art and its authors. Nevertheless, I must point out that the general feeling about Indians moved from the "diabolical wild man" to the "tamed, idyllic wild man". So, Indians became worthy of inclusion into the History of Christianity, and Mesoamerican past evolved to one of the foundations of nationalism. Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora exemplified this change of view in New Spain, when he described the "triumphal arch" to welcome Viceroy Earl De Paredes in 1628 (Fernández, 1972: 37). 5

A series of linked events occurred in XVIIIth century. Discussion and study on Pre-Columbian past and art get renewed intensity into the spirit of Enlightenment, dealing with the discovery of Pre Hispanic monuments.

Among 1750 and 1770 the ruins of Palenque were discovered. In order to know who inhabited the city, Ramón de Ordóñez y Aguiar, ecclesiastic of Ciudad 6

Real de Chiapa, wrote the *History of the creation of Heaven and Earth according to the system of American gentility* (De la Fuente, 1965: 69-72; De la Fuente and Schávelzon, 1976: 149). ~~To Ordóñez, Carthage founded Palenque, and most of the peoples of Ancient Near East left evidence of visiting the city. Hence, Ordóñez denied the Maya roots of Palenque;~~ <sup>where he assigned them to Ancient Near East</sup> idea followed by several explorers.

In 1790 the vicerojal government ordered to repair the paved-stone streets of the Plaza Mayor at Mexico City. Workmen found the colossal statues of Coatlicue, the Stone of the Sun or Aztec Calendar, and the Stone of Tízoc. One year later José Antonio de Alzate published the *Description of the antiquities of Xochicalco* —recently discovered—; and the following one Antonio de León y Gama published the *Historical and chronological description of the two stones* (1792), that is to say Coatlicue and the Stone of the Sun. Both texts glorified the artistic skill of ancient Mexicans. 7

Some years earlier, in 1767, Jesuit Order was banished from Spanish domains. Jesuits in exile spoke of ancient Mexican past as an element of identity. <sup>This is what happened with</sup> ~~For example,~~ <sup>who</sup> friar Pedro José Márquez published in Rome in 1804 *Due antichi monumenti di architettura messicana* (Gutiérrez, 1988: 178). He <sup>placed</sup> ~~elevated~~ Pre Hispanic art at the same heights that Greece's. 8

These events made clear the increasingly deep feeling of difference between "~~Gachupines~~" or Spain-born people, and Americans or New Spain-born people. Archaeological discoveries and ancient works of art proved a close past in which to find the roots of a new spirit of identity.

~~I must remark the enterprise of both priests, who made a hit in the appreciation of Mesoamerican art. Their assertions founded a new comprehension far beyond rejection, for they willingly compared such art with the Old World civilizations. As a result, in the first decades of XIXth century the new~~

~~Mexican Republic attested the arrival of many personages coming from Europe. Among their interests, one was to know the then famous ruins of the ancient civilizations; another was to provide *Wunderkammern*, *Naturalia* and *Artificialia* at European courts; and least but not last, to investigate American past.~~

In XIXth century pre-Columbian art was considered "exotic", "primitive", and even "barbarian". Of course its meanings remained hidden to Western eyes; there were neither explanations nor awareness of who, when, how and why developed such cultures and their artistic manifestations. For they broke the European canons, and understanding became useless.

To change this idea, it was necessary the visit of Alexander von Humboldt. Through several years he collected many data for his grand task book *Kosmos*. Part of his data appeared at Paris as the *Relation historique du voyage aux régions équinoxiales du Nouveau Continent* (1814-1825), and *Vue des cordillères et monuments des peuples indigènes de l'Amérique* (1816). Thus Europe knew of Palenque, Teotihuacán and Xochicalco (cf. Zea and Magallón, 1999: *passim*). Von Humboldt was also the first one to differentiate Mayas and Mexicas, based upon the style of painted codexes. Furthermore, he declared that Coatlicue could compare to Greek statuary. <sup>but Humboldt was a desial european</sup> Few years later, in 1831 Lord Edward King, Viscount of Kingsborough, published in London nine elegant volumes called *Antiquities of Mexico* (De la Fuente and Schávelzon, 1976: 149).

Western world, therefore, disposed to accept ancient America, and to look inquisitively at Mesoamerican art. Attempts of explanation and comprehension turned once again to the disjunction West-Non West, Art-Non Art, no matter Renaissance precedents. Discussions favored one conception or another. One of numerous examples is that of John Lloyd Stephens and Frederick Catherwood. Both in ~~*Incidents of travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatán*~~ (1841), and

~~Incidents of travel in Yucatan (1843)~~ they argue that pre-Columbian civilizations were autochthonous, original, and not savage, as demonstrated by the Mayas. Furthermore, Maya art redeemed the whole Pre Hispanic civilizations and art, and gave guide lines of approximation to the present.

Meanwhile, in 1825 President Guadalupe Victoria ordered the creation of the National Museum at the University; yet it had to wait until 1831 to exist. ~~Political circumstances prevent the settling of the new acceptance of pre-Columbian art.~~ The years 1846-1848 and 1862-1867 saw Mexico involved in two wars, respectively against the United States and France. It is also pertinent to note that Emperor Maximilian tried to revive the National Museum: he provided the apartments of the <sup>old</sup> Casa de Moneda. 11

### 3. *The Astonishment of "Otherness" among Mexicans.*

Later, during the government of President Benito Juárez, the political and cultural goals were to create a sense of ~~national~~ unity against the invaders and their own cultures, to look for emblems that unified the whole country, rather as an emotional defensive project than as a clear identification of national feeling. The logical path was at hand throughout Mesoamerican past and art, mainly Mexica. 12

Under the government of President Porfirio Díaz, the revaluation of pre-Columbian past ~~also~~ became an important task. For example, Mexico's Pavilion at the Universal Exposition of Paris in 1889 showed architectural features of Indian monuments (Xochicalco and Mitla). The ~~exterior~~ walls displayed modern bronze reliefs of Mexica deities as well as historical heroes. The whole conception replied 13 the nationalist and centralist zeal of Antonio Peñafiel and Alfredo Chavero, as represented by Aztec culture (Ramírez, 1988: *passim*), to which we now refer to as Mexica. Chavero, according to the State ideology, looked at pre-Columbian art for revealing the whole panorama of ancient civilizations.

I sustain here that Aztec culture became a model. Ruins and monuments found at Mitla, Tajín, Tula, Teotihuacán, Xochicalco, Tenochtitlán and many sites were considered "Mexicans"; better said "Toltecs or Teotihuacanos", the noble precedents of Aztec culture. All formed a cultural group, far from bloody rituals, that were one of the chief obstacles to understand Mexica aesthetics. Mayas were a clearly different and little known civilization. Anyway, ancient art became solidly accepted. It received a new impulse during the first decades of XXth century. 14

As part of the celebrations of the first centennial of Independence War (1910), President Díaz wanted to inaugurate a new National Theater —actually the Fine Arts Palace—. According to the eclectic *Art Nouveau*, <sup>the architect</sup> Adamo Boari included several ornaments <sup>inspired</sup> motivated on Mesoamerican <sup>designs</sup> cultures; among them serpents, masks, and a modern interpretation of the head of the Eagle Warrior. 15

~~Appropriation and transformation of Pre Hispanic legends and symbols, together with those of Colonial past were clear signs of nationalism.~~ As part of a personal aesthetic language, and also as a research, Saturnino Herrán painted several "decorative panels". One of the greatest is "Our gods" (1915), in which central section Herrán masterly and insightfully merged the images of Crucified Christ and of Old Mother Coatlicue. This is, to my knowledge, the most eloquent portrait of the birth of our nationalism. 16

After the battles of Revolution calmed down, the Mexican State searched for elements that recalled a feeling of ~~national~~ unity. Music, literature, architecture, painting, and sculpture developed different ways to denote it. <sup>Let us name as an</sup> ~~In the music,~~ <sup>example the</sup> ~~Julian Carrillo, Manuel María Ponce, Carlos Chávez ("Indian Symphony"), and Silvestre Revueltas ("The Night of the Mayas") direct their attention to pursuit all that could be the roots for Mexican identity. Each one reached his own purpose, and nowadays they typify musical nationalism, whether in Mexico or in other countries.~~ 17



*And recall, for the purpose of this paper the ones who played a significant part in the visual arts for the mid Century*

Diego Rivera and José Clemente Orozco choose to depict Mesoamerican past from two utterly different points of view. David Alfaro Siqueiros joined them.

~~Rivera focused in agriculture, arts, religion and war, but conspicuously avoided the topic of human sacrifices. He idealized Pre Hispanic civilizations, and interpreted them with disregard of bloody aspects: he saw an original, organized and creative world. Rivera displayed the most amazing images of that past as he wanted it to be, not as it actually was. On the other hand, he considered Cortés a monster (thus, New Spain was unworthy).~~

~~Orozco thought of Mesoamerican past as a closed entity, and perceived it under a dramatic sign of existence: violence, reflected in the extreme cruelty of human sacrifices. In a certain manner, Orozco's conception of pre-Columbian civilization was close to an apocalyptic vision, somber, brutal. To him, Cortés and La Malinche were the origins of modern Mexico, even if its birth was also violent.~~

~~Siqueiros preferred to glorify the heroic gesta of the Conquest, as we perceive it in "The torture of Cuauhtémoc" and "Cuauhtémoc revived".~~

As can be noticed, nearby the end of XIXth century and the beginning of XXth century, Mexican intellectual milieu did not concern with defining the separation between West and Non West. The main affair was to delineate the elements of national feeling and identity through Mesoamerican past.

#### 4. *Towards a Philosophical Comprehension and views from Mexican Scholars*

Philosophy rendered another tendency of study. Alfonso Caso published in 1917 his "Essay on a Classification of Arts". Caso arose his ideas from Kant's philosophy, and applied it to the analysis of Mexica art compared with written Colonial sources. He assembled artistic manifestations in three groups: visual (architecture, decorative, sculpture, painting), hearing (music and poetry) and

visual-hearing (drama and dance). As a result he opened a new way to classify most of pre-Columbian works, as well as new focuses and possibilities in its study.

During the 1920-1940 decades, analysis of art moved to descriptions of specific examples. One reason was that Archaeology and Ethnology acquired great advances in their own fields.

Under such circumstances, José Juan Tablada wrote his *History of Art in Mexico* (1927). He contributed to the affirmation of Mexican art by its own right, for it was the time of improvement of art criterion and nationalism after the Mexican Revolution. His study is devoted to all Mexican art, but when dealing with Pre-Hispanic art, Tablada classified it as a totality. He described it in descending order: painting (murals, codexes, and also feather works), sculpture, architecture, and "minor arts" (textiles, feather works, metal works, and ceramics). Tablada also denoted some characteristics of indigenous art: religiosity, ornamentalism, ritual, sophistication, and expressive purpose. ~~In short,~~ <sup>He</sup> Tablada was the very first modern Art Historian to grant real importance to Mesoamerican art, and his view deals in some way with actual aesthetics.

Eulalia Guzmán followed the steps of her predecessors. She joined their ideas with her own and with the modern criterion of national renewal. In 1933 she published an extraordinary and crucial essay, "Essential Traits of Ancient Mexican Art. Its Fundamental Way". Among her many statements, she considered the cultural unity of Mesoamerica and argued of "beauty" in terms of "significant expression" or "meaningful forms". In doing so, Guzmán revived the analysis of expressive forms, ignored since long ago. She also pointed out the main features of pre-Columbian art: accentuated rhythm, repetition of motives, sophistication, ornamentalism, symbolism, religious and magical means.

In 1940 Edmundo O'Gorman set up a quite new path of comprehension. He wrote a brief but thoughtful article: "The Art or on the Monstruosity". There he expressed the transforming necessity of art taken as "the clearest manifestation of actuality and strength of our mythical conscience". O'Gorman discussed topics as "the proper nature of what is called Ancient Mexican *art*", and settle its links with Occident. To achieve his purposes, O'Gorman records the difference between "simple meditation" and "critical-historical meditation". Consequently he suggests scholars to dismiss "one's selfhood" (Occident) to understand "strangeness" (pre-Columbian America). Only in this way, scholars can dialogue with ancient American cultures and their artistic manifestations.

No wonder that in those years Manuel Gamio founded the National School of Anthropology and History. This School displayed the awareness about fulfilling, in the academic fields, the quest for national identity.

I must add a peculiarity of Mexico's history since Independence. Our country struggled between two paths: to bind to, or to free from the image presented by Europe as a cultural canon. In other words, challenges were "not being Occidental" or "being Occidental". Thinking of artistry of æsthetic expressions implies to accept or to reject a diverse artistic reality (*cf.* Manrique, 1977; O'Gorman, 1940). Mexico looks for and supports its own being through artistic manifestations. Acceptance of Mesoamerican art shows that the difference between West and Non West is old-fashioned.

The fields of philosophy and literature were once again step on by Miguel León-Portilla and Justino Fernández. León-Portilla used Colonial sources to investigate wisely the náhuatl concept of *toltecáyotl*, its importance to artistic creation and historical progress. His findings appeared in *Náhuatl Philosophy Studied in its Sources* (1956) and the now revised *Fifteen Poets of Náhuatl World*

(1997). Fernández analyzed the *Mexican Art Aesthetics* (1958) from three models: ~~the pre-Columbian, the colonial and the modern~~ Coatlicue, the Retablo de los Reyes at Mexico City's Cathedral, and Orozco's "El Hombre". His perspective undertook history and historiography, history of art and philosophy. He retrieved not only the aesthetic meanings derived from the artistic prototypes he chose, but equally their merit as <sup>important</sup> emblems of Mexican nationalism.

In recent years Miguel León-Portilla has been worried about the preservation of náhuatl literature as one kind of culture expression. At the UNAM, he leads a group of *nahuatlitos*, whose efforts surpass the recovering of ancient literary traditions. I think that his attempts coincide with those of Manuel Gamio, related to the incorporation of indigenous people to the modern State but keeping alive their civilization. This path has been followed by several scholars in Mexico.

5. *A Theory on National Identity.*

Since long ago, Mexico accepted Mesoamerican art without further debate. Pre Hispanic cultures and history are fairly included into our national legacy as an intrinsic element. However their subordination to State requirements still invites to deeper analysis.

As an example I want to recall a remark of Francisco de la Maza — a <sup>my professor</sup> prominent Colonial Art scholar— referred to the National Museum of Anthropology. He said that the building and its space arrangement resemble a three-aisles-Cathedral, which main altar is the Mexica room. This one appears as the last branch of a trunk — right aisle — whose origins are Preclassic Central Plateau, evolving without interferences to Teotihuacán and Toltec cultures. Oaxaca and Gulf Coast, Maya, and after a gap, Occidente and Northwest — left aisle — look like a triadic mosaic with no evident correlation between each group.

The Museum echoes the importance and understanding given by the government to pre-Columbian past, and offered to the world as reinforcement to

*We ought to remember that Mexican people are profound Catholics. Does this explain the plan resemblance of a secular but national construction?*

political unity. May two examples serve. In 1825, Aztec Calendar was removed from Mexico City's Cathedral to the above mentioned Museum established by President Victoria. In April 16, 1906, 75 years old President Porfirio Díaz —of Zapotec ascendant— accompanied by Justo Sierra, Ministry of Education and Rector of the University, and also by archaeologist Leopoldo Batres, then in charge of excavations and reconstructions at Teotihuacán, went up the Pyramid of the Sun as a remembrance to Díaz's ancestors, as he did in boyhood at native Monte Albán and Mitla. 23

In my opinion, the Museum portrays the most painstaking State conception of Mesoamerican past, for it reveals the idea of a system of national culture, provides a theoretical shelter to guard "Mexican Selfhood", and mirrors, a hundred years later, the "emotional defense" pursued by Juárez and his successors. Despite Mesoamerica turns metaphysical, godlike, prevailing essence is to honor that past as principal root of identity. Moreover, this was, and actually is, the axis of the official feeling and discourse of national identity.

So, of course, the new Museum —inaugurated in 1964 by President Adolfo López Mateos, and now being remodeled— opens its doors to speak the truth about the heritage of Mexican people. ~~Scientific and most accurate vision of Pre Hispanic universe expresses through the masterpieces of art kept in its huge and solemn spaces, as if to house and perpetuate the icons of the only and unequal origin: the one coming from pre-Columbian world.~~

Many events symbolizing such recreation of the past have had scenarios all over the world sponsored by Mexican governments. Among examples, let us remember the exhibits at the United States *Mexico: Splendors of 30 Centuries*, and *Olmec Art of Ancient Mexico*, as well as something rather amazing: the incredible pavilion at the British Museum, that keeps the major treasures of 24

Mesoamerican art taken out in late XIXth century. <sup>President Zedillo</sup> has witnessed at least 24 events <sup>so far to August this year</sup> related to Mesoamerican past. In brief, all presidents of Mexico have paid tribute to native past, and they have been present at archaeological discoveries and pre-Columbian exhibits.

What does this mean? I think that there is a deep belief that we have the privilege of inherit one of the primary civilizations in the world. It is certainly a universal cultural patrimony; ~~perhaps the image of a global new perception of the world.~~ Nevertheless, in this Western world of globalization, Asia, Africa and pre-Columbian America have their sign of "otherness". Mexico's indigenous past is not West to study and comprehension, because we are not truly Occidentals; we entered late into Western tradition. Maybe we might be included as Non West, which is partially true, considering that our origins go back beyond the centuries and mixed to create a new identity: that of Mexicans.

I also perceive an essential peculiarity. I have said that in Mexico the break between West and Non West is old-fashioned. ~~We do not look for ties with remote past; for it is ever apparent in several ways since the Conquest itself.~~ Pre-Columbian past is an intrinsic part of our life; so there is no need to establish links between past and present, between West and Non West. Indeed, countries like Mexico (and others in Latin America, Asia and Africa) does not mark such a distinction. Our concern <sup>seems</sup> ~~is~~ to pursuit a proper and actual emblem of identity.

Furthermore there have been changes, new viewpoints that sustain such idea but with a slight shift in the conception. Recent studies are focused on multidisciplinary approaches; historical and specialized subjects that converge in various disciplines. We are assembling a new kind of comprehension rooted in our common historical memory, trying to conceive pre-Columbian civilizations as a coherent unity, but distinguishing differences among elements.

Study of Pre-Columbian art supplies one of the means, as I have tried to demonstrate. History shows it in the writings in Spanish aimed to one of the largest languages in the world (over 400 million speakers). To Mexicans Pre Hispanic past is one of the strongest basis of identity. As José Moreno Villa —a refugee Spanish scholar, and Mexican by adoption— wrote sixty years ago, "the history of Mexico is on feet. Here no one is dead, despite assassinations and executions ... This is Mexico's originality. All her past is palpitating actuality. Past is not dead" (1992: 223).

Rescue and expansion of Mesoamerican history have a powerful ideological motivation. Both delineate new focuses on self knowledge and new efforts to constantly define self identity and aspirations: thinking of culture expressions involves to embrace or to refuse "otherness". So pre-Columbian art appears upsetting, and moves hither and thither, from "being" to "not being" Western to outsiders. ~~Relatively and historically new or rich countries are looking for such bonds to successfully face globalization, since it comprises national identity. To me, it is like finding one's selfhood in the mirror of "otherness", and such condition pervades thoughts of pre-Columbian civilizations and art.~~

I also find here one of the ineluctable traits that permeate our comprehension of Mesoamerican art. I do emphasize it is a history of fighting midway admitting or excluding "the other one", pre-Columbian America, but to European and North American scholars. To them, recognition is a recent topic, an affair of mind-opening to different cultural systems. It is an effect of knowing "others", inasmuch as it happened with African and Islamic arts through XIXth century. To Mexican scholars such antagonism is fruitless. It is rather a result of epochs of crisis, of overthrow of traditional values, besides our political,

economical, and social development, as implied by Independence, Reform, and Revolution wars.

~~I have no reticence to assert that modern progression toward intellectual and emotional understanding of pre-Columbian art had led to coexistence of different canons: those of Occident and those of the native New World. The aim is to multiply studies helping to spread the acceptance of different ways of being. One direction is the study of art.~~ Pre-Columbian art mirrors our psyche with universal meanings, and shapes a fairest image of the world we live in, beneath West.



*Selected readings*

BARTRA, Roger,

1997 *El salvaje artificial*, Mexico, Ediciones Era-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

CASO, Alfonso,

1917 "Ensayo de una clasificación de las artes", in: *El Universal*, daily newspaper, Mexico: October 20.

ESPINOSA, Elia,

1988 "Lo «cursi» y los elementos que lo transforman en la pintura de Jesús Helguera", in: *Historia, leyendas y mitos de México: su expresión en el arte (XI Coloquio Internacional)*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM (Estudios de Arte y Estética, 30): 345-363.

FERNÁNDEZ, Justino,

1972 *Estética del arte mexicano. Coatlicue. El retablo de los Reyes. El Hombre*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM (Estudios de Arte y Estética).

FONCERRADA DE MOLINA, Marta,

1965 *La arquitectura escultórica de Uxmal*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM (Estudios y Fuentes del Arte en México).

1993 *Cacaxtla. La iconografía de los olmeca-xicalanca*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM.

FONCERRADA DE MOLINA, Marta and Sonia LOMBARDO DE RUIZ,

1979 *Vasijas pintadas mayas en contexto arqueológico (catálogo)*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM.

FUENTE, Beatriz de la,

1965 *La escultura de Palenque*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM (Estudios y Fuentes del Arte en México).

1978 *Los hombres de piedra. Escultura olmeca*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM.

FUENTE, Beatriz de la and Daniel SCHÁVELZON,

1976 "Algunas noticias poco conocidas que sobre Palenque se publicaron en el siglo XIX", in: ROBERTSON, Merle G., ed., *The art, iconography and dynastic history of Palenque. Part III*, Pebble Beach, The Robert Louis Stevenson School: 149-153.

GUTIÉRREZ HACES, Juana,

1988 "Los antiguos mexicanos, Vitruvio y el padre Márquez", in: *Historia, leyendas y mitos de México: su expresión en el arte (XI Coloquio Internacional)*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM (Estudios de Arte y Estética, 30): 177-200.

KUBLER, George,

1962 *The Art and Architecture of Ancient America. The Mexican, Maya, and Andean peoples*, London, Penguin Books (The Pelican History of Art).

1969 *Studies in Classic Maya iconography*, New Haven, The Connecticut Academy of Art and Sciences (Memoirs, XVIII).

1991 *Esthetic recognition of ancient Amerinidan art*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

LEÓN-PORTILLA, Miguel,

1956 *La filosofía náhuatl estudiada en sus fuentes*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, UNAM.

1995 "Xochicalco en la historia", in: FUENTE, Beatriz de la, et al., *La acrópolis de Xochicalco*, Mexico, Instituto de Cultura de Morelos: 35-86.

1997 *Quince poetas del mundo azteca*, Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

LEWIS, Bernard,

1979 *La historia recordada, rescatada, inventada*, Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica (Breviarios, 282).

LOMBARDO DE RUIZ, Sonia,

1974 "Análisis formal de las pinturas de Bonampak", in: *Actas del XLI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas*: 365-379.

1994 *El pasado prehispánico en la memoria nacional (Memoria hemerográfica, 1877-1911)*, 2 vols., Mexico, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (Antologías, Serie Arqueología).

LÓPEZ AUSTIN, Alfredo and Leonardo LÓPEZ LUJÁN,

1996 *El pasado indígena*, Mexico, El Colegio de México-Fondo de Cultura Económica (Sección de Obras de Historia).

LÓPEZ LUJÁN, Leonardo,

1989 *La recuperación mexicana del pasado teotihuacano*, Mexico, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia-GVE Editores.

MANRIQUE, Jorge Alberto,

1977 "Ambigüedad histórica del arte mexicano", in: *Del arte. Homenaje a Justino Fernández*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM: 163-173.

MATOS MOCTEZUMA, Eduardo,

1997 "Tlaltecuhli. Señor de la Tierra", in: *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl*, México, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, UNAM: no. 27, 15-40.

MORENO Y DE LOS ARCOS, Roberto,

1978 "El criollismo. La visión de Edmundo O'Gorman de la historia colonial", in: *La obra de Edmundo O'Gorman. Discursos y conferencias de homenaje en su 70 aniversario, 1976*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, UNAM: 63-73.

MORENO VILLA, José,

1992 *Cornucopia de México y Nueva cornucopia mexicana*, 2ª reimp., Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 404 p. (Colección Popular, 296).

O'GORMAN, Edmundo,

1998 "El arte o de la monstruosidad", in: FERNÁNDEZ, Martha and Louise Noelle GRAS, eds., *Estudios sobre arte. 60 años del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM: 471-476.

OTTO, Rudolf,

1984 *Lo santo*, 2ª reimp., Madrid, Alianza Editorial (Sección Humanidades, El Libro de Bolsillo, 793).

PASZTORY, Esther,

1999 "The Imaginary West", in: *PARI Newsletter*, San Francisco, Pre-Columbian Art Research Institute: no. 27, 10-11.

PAZ, Octavio,

- 1978 *México en la obra de Octavio Paz. Los privilegios de la vista*, Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica (Letras Mexicanas, 7).

PROSKOURIAKOFF, Tatiana,

- 1946 *An album of Maya architecture*, Washington, Carnegie Institution of Washington (Publication 558).
- 1950 *A study of Classic Maya sculpture*, Washington, Carnegie Institution of Washington (Publication 593).

RAMÍREZ, Fausto,

- 1988 "Dioses, héroes y reyes mexicanos en París, 1889", in: *Historia, leyendas y mitos de México: su expresión en el arte (XI Coloquio Internacional)*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM (Estudios de Arte y Estética, 30): 201-258.

SCHELE, Linda,

- 1998 *The code of kings. The language of seven sacred Maya temples and tombs*, New York, George Brazillier Inc.

SCHELE, Linda and David FREIDEL,

- 1990 *A forest of kings. The untold story of the Ancient Maya*, New York, William Morrow and Co. Inc.

SCHELE, Linda, David FREIDEL and Joyce PARKER,

- 1993 *Maya Cosmos. Three thousand years on the shaman's path*, New York, William Morrow and Co. Inc.

SCHELE, Linda y Mary Ellen MILLER,

- 1986 *The blood of kings. Dynasty and ritual in Maya art*, New York, George Brazillier Inc.-Kimbell Art Museum.

ŠĚGOTA TOMAC, Dúrdica,

- 1998 "", unpublished paper presented at XXI Coloquio Internacional del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM.

SPINDEN, Herbert,

- 1913 *A study of Maya Art. Its subject matter and historical development*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press-The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology (Memoirs, 6).

STEPHENS, John Lloyd y Frederick CATHERWOOD,

1841 *Incidents of travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan*, 2 vols., New York, Harper and Brothers.

1843 *Incidents of travel in Yucatan*, 2 vols., New York, Harper and Brothers.

STUART, David,

1987 *Ten phonetic syllables*, Washington, Center for Maya Research (Research Reports on Ancient Maya Writing, 14).

TOSCANO, Salvador,

1944 *Arte precolombino de México y de la América Central*, Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM.

WESTHEIM, Paul,

1950 *Arte antiguo de México*, Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

1956 *La escultura del México antiguo*, Mexico, Coordinación de Humanidades, UNAM (Colección de Arte, 1).

1962 *La cerámica del México antiguo. Fenómeno artístico*, Mexico, Coordinación de Humanidades, UNAM (Colección de Arte, 11).

1977 *Obras maestras del México antiguo*, Mexico, Ediciones Era (Biblioteca Era, Serie Mayor).

WINNING, Hasso von,

1987 *La iconografía de Teotihuacán. Los dioses y los símbolos*, 2 vols., Mexico, Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, UNAM.

WORRINGER, Wilhelm,

1958 *La esencia del estilo gótico*, Buenos Aires, Editorial Nueva Visión.

ZEA, Leopoldo and Mario MAGALLÓN, comps.,

1999 *El mundo que encontró Humboldt*, Mexico, Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia-Fondo de Cultura Económica.