

CHAPTER V.

Were the Ancient Central Americans and Mexicans the Jaredites and Nephites?—The Color of the Ancient Central Americans and Mexicans—The Culture of the First Inhabitants of Central America—The Direction of Migration of the Ancient Peoples—The Contact of the Ancient Central Americans and Mexicans—The First Civilized People Not Exterminated—The Extent of the Ancient Empires—Traditional History of the Toltecs.

The ancient civilization of Central America and Mexico is to be ascribed to two distinct peoples, the Mayas and Nahuas. That there were other tribes which possessed considerable advancement is not to be doubted, but, as these exerted the widest influence and played the leading parts in those regions, antiquarians are wont to divide primitive culture into two branches, the Mayan and Nahuan.

Bancroft says: "Notwithstanding evident marks of similarity in nearly all the manifestations of the progressional spirit in aboriginal America, in art, thought and religion, there is much reason for and convenience in referring all the native civilization to two branches, the Maya and the Nahua, the former the more ancient, the latter the more recent and widespread."—*Native Races*, Vol. II., pp. 90, 91.

And Short says of these peoples: "The venerable civilization of the Mayas, whose forest-grown cities and crumbling temples hold entombed a history of vanished glory, no doubt belongs to the remotest period of North American antiquity. It was old when the Nahuas, then a comparatively rude people, first came in contact with

it, adopted many of its features, and grafted upon it new life."—*North Americans of Antiquity*, p. 519.

Whether or not these peoples were related is not known. They differed widely from one another in language, monuments and hieroglyphics, and their points of resemblance were only such as could be due to contact; hence ethnologists are led to the conclusion that, if these stocks are related, their separation from one another must have occurred at a very late date, after which they developed their culture in different channels.

The Mayas are supposed to have come originally from the north. They are known to some writers as the Colhuas, and these apply the name Maya only to that branch of their descendants who inhabit Yucatan. Tradition and archæology agree in affirming that they were the builders of the cities of Yucatan not only, but also of the more ancient cities of Palenque, Copan and Quirigua in Chiapas, Honduras and Guatemala.

The Nahuas were an enterprising branch of the great Uto-Aztecan family. Their traditions say that they entered Mexico and Central America after the Mayas, coming from the north. Their history is usually divided into four periods or epochs: the pre-Toltecan, previous to the sixth century; the Toltecan, from the sixth to the eleventh century; the Chichimecan, from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, and the Aztecan, from the fifteenth century to the Spanish Conquest.¹ The Toltecs, according to tradition, were their most cultured and progressive tribe, and the Aztec bards never tired of singing of their golden age. Dr. Brinton denies that the Toltecs, as they are commonly described, ever existed, and claims that they were only an unimportant gens of the Azteca.²

¹ "Native Races," Vol. V., pp. 157, 158.

² "Essays of an Americanist," pp. 83-100.

Most ethnologists, however, do not share in this conclusion, and consider them a *bona-fide* tribe.

Mormon writers declare that the ancient civilized peoples of Central America and Mexico, those who erected the prehistoric cities of those regions, were the Jaredites and Nephites.

Elder Stebbins says: "And when they come forward and tell us that the more ancient ruins were built upon by a people later, whose manners of construction and of architecture were different from those of the former people, showing that there were two civilizations and two periods in the history of the country, what can I say but that they were the Jaredites and the Nephites, just as the Book of Mormon tells us they were?"—*Book of Mormon Lectures*, p. 45.

Elder Etzenhouser, another Mormon archæologist, writes: "We have now presented Short, Pidgeon and Bancroft, three eminent authorities, on there having been two distinct peoples, and who preceded the aborigines of America, in the possession of this land, which supports the claim of the Book of Mormon for the Jaredite and Nephite colonizations."—*The Book Unsealed*, p. 10.

And Miss Louise Palfrey says: "The only theory that will agree with all the facts and circumstances of archæological source, and that is compelled to invent no excuses, overlook or discard no prominent feature of tradition, relic or ruin, is that there were two distinct civilizations before the time of the Aztecs and the Incas, one preceding the other and confining its limits to North America, while the seat of its highest development, hence its greatest age, was in Central America."—*Divinity of the Book of Mormon Proven by Archæology*, p. 178.

But the fact that research has shown that two distinct

peoples controlled, in ancient times, the regions where the principal ruins are found, in numerical agreement with the Book of Mormon, is not in itself sufficient to prove that they were the Jaredites and Nephites, the point these writers so gratuitously assume. There are several forceful objections that must be removed before Jared can be identified with Votan, or the land of Moron be proved to have been the empire of Xibalba, or the Nephites be identified with the Toltecs.

But I am ready to grant that, if the Jaredites and Nephites are to be identified with any New World nations at all, they must be with the Mayas and Nahuas, for these peoples, judging by the monuments, came the nearest to reaching the stage of culture described in the Book of Mormon of any nation in America, with the exception possibly of the Peruvians, and their history covers at least a portion of the time in which the Book of Mormon claims that those regions in which they were located were inhabited by its peoples.

If the identification which Mormon writers make of the builders of the ancient cities of Central America and Mexico with the Jaredites and Nephites be well founded, the ethnologist is confronted with a number of facts which will materially affect many of the conclusions at which he has arrived. If these authors are correct, the following conclusions are true: the distant ancestors of the Aztecs, Mayas, Quiches and Cakchiquels were of the Caucasian race; the Colhuas, or Mayas, were the first inhabitants of the American continent, and came bringing with them the civilization of the Old World; they were totally exterminated, after sixteen centuries, in a long and disastrous war, the last battle of which was fought in western New York; they were succeeded, after a few centuries, by the Toltecs, or Nahuas, who came

from South America; the governments of the two peoples were not confined in their jurisdiction to Mexico and Central America alone, but the northern boundary line of both was extended northward as far as the Great Lakes, while the southern boundary line of the second lay as far south, at least, as the southern limits of Colombia; the two nations were here consecutively and not at the same time; and the empire of the first came to an end in 600 B. C., while that of the second ended about 400 A. D. These are some of the conclusions that must be reached if the "two distinct peoples" of Bancroft and Short were the Jaredites and Nephites.

But, on these conclusions, archæologists will not agree with Mormon writers; every one of them is contradicted by the facts derived from the traditions of the people and from archæological research.

THERE IS PROOF THAT THE ANCIENT RACES OF CENTRAL AMERICA AND MEXICO WERE IDENTICAL WITH THE PRESENT AMERICAN.

The Mayas and Aztecs, at the time of the Spanish Conquest, were described as well-formed races of a tawny color. As they were erecting the same kinds of edifices, using the same kinds of hieroglyphics, worshipping the same gods, practicing the same arts and computing time by means of the same calendar system as their predecessors, we set out with the presumption that they were like them in color and physical features—the same race. And this presumption can only be set aside by well-founded, not inferential, evidence.

These tribes had well-preserved traditions of the important events in their history, which reached back to, at least, their advents into the central region. While, so far as their chronology is concerned, these traditions

can not be depended upon, many of the events they record are known to have transpired by the corroboratory evidences of the monuments. The traditions tell us of the founding of the Maya and Toltec empires, of the erection of their capital cities, of the introduction of new religious ideas, of the progress and prosperity of the people and of the subsequent breaking up of nations and scattering of tribes, all of which accounts have been fully corroborated from monumental and linguistic sources. Yet not a hint is thrown out in any tradition that the ancestors of the Mexican and Central American races were white and that they were transformed in color to coppery by a miracle. Such a miracle, widely known of in 420 A. D., could hardly have failed of being transmitted in the traditions of the country to the time of the Conquest.

The crania of the country present no diversities by which the ancient may be distinguished from the modern races. The same conformations and deformations of skull observed among the tribes at the time of the Conquest are to be seen in the crania from the ancient burial-places. On certain remains taken from the ancient sepulchres at Ticul, Yucatan, Bancroft remarks: "The skeletons and skulls dug up at Ticul were pronounced by Dr. Morton to belong to the universal American type."—*Native Races*, Vol. IV., p. 282.

One of the peculiar customs of the inhabitants of this part of the continent was that of flattening the forehead by pressure. This practice was in vogue when the Spaniards first came, and the deformation of the skull was looked upon as a mark of beauty and refinement. But this same custom was practiced by the ancient races, and this would imply a continuity of race from the earliest times to the present. "That it was practiced to a

considerable extent," says Bancroft, "in remote times by people inhabiting the country, seems to be shown by the deformed skulls found in their graves, and by the sculptured figures upon the ruins."—*Native Races*, Vol. II., p. 281.

Another evidence of the ethnical identity of the ancient and modern inhabitants is in the faces sculptured in profile upon the monuments of the country. That these are the faces of the native population is not to be doubted, while their dress, ornamentation and attitude indicate that they are representations of priests, warriors and statesmen.

Galindo says of the carved faces on the monuments of Palenque: "The physiognomies of the human figure in alto relieve indicate that they represent a race not differing from the modern Indians; they were, perhaps, taller than the latter, who are of a middle or rather small stature, compared with Europeans."—*Travels in Mexico*, p. 163.

The bas-reliefs of Yucatan are also declared by Nadaillac to show features plainly Indian. "The bas-reliefs are remarkable; all the faces are of the present Yucatan type, and contrast strongly with the pointed heads and retreating foreheads represented at Palenque, and which are said to be still met with amongst the inferior mountain races."—*Prehistoric America*, p. 341.

Reclus, in speaking of these same bas-reliefs, remarks: "The type of such figures is the same as that of the present natives, especially the Eastern Lancandons, except that it is highly exaggerated, especially in the temples of Palenque."—*The Earth and Its Inhabitants*, Vol. II., p. 160.

Again, the figures that these ancient peoples moulded of themselves out of clay possess Indian physiognomies.

Certain of these images from the mounds of Zachila, Oajaca and Cuilapa are said by Bancroft to agree in features with the Zapotecs, the present inhabitants of those localities. "Those figures which are moulded in human form agree in features with the Zapotec features of modern times."—*Native Races*, Vol. IV., p. 376.

And, lastly, as indicative of the direct relationship of the ancient and modern races, we have their paintings in which the human figure is painted reddish brown. Says Short: "Blue, red, yellow and green are the colors employed, though the human figures are painted reddish brown."

With these facts before him, the reader will observe that archæological evidence is opposed to the theory that the ancient peoples, those who built the cities of Central America and Mexico, were of the Caucasian race.

THE FIRST PEOPLE OF CENTRAL AMERICA WERE SAVAGES
OF THE LOWEST TYPE.

This is directly contrary to the teachings of the Book of Mormon and to the theory of its defenders, according to which the first Americans were highly-civilized immigrants from the Tower of Babel. Apostle Kelley says of them: "They brought with them the civilization, the arts, sciences, habits, customs, traditions and language of their day and time."—*Presidency and Priesthood*, p. 258.

They are said to have landed upon the east coast of Central America, "near the mouth of the river Motagua," and to have "finally fixed their capital (Moron) at what is now known as the ruins of Copan on the Copan River, Honduras; possibly it was at Quirigua, on the Motagua River, Guatemala."—*Report of the Committee on American Archaeology*, p. 70. As the two old Mayan cities,

Copan and Quirigua, stand about an equal show with the Committee of being Moron, it is evident that they look upon the ancient Mayas as being identical with the Jaredites.

But the theory that the first inhabitants of Honduras and Guatemala were civilized peoples is opposed by the traditions of the natives. Votan, the white and bearded civilizer, who is said to have come from over the sea, is declared to have found that country inhabited by a race of people known under the general name of Chichimecs, "dogs," who were savages of the lowest type, building no cities, having no agriculture, eating their meat raw, and, for refuge from the storms, fleeing to the recesses of the forests and to the caves of the mountains. And, whether we consider Votan a real person or a mythological character, the fact remains the same, that the civilized Mayas had savage predecessors who preceded them in the valley of the Usumacinta.

Nadaillac says: "The most ancient traditions made him come from a land of shadow, beyond the seas; on his arrival, the inhabitants of the vast territories stretching between the Isthmus of Panama and California lived in a state which may be compared with that of the people of the stone age of Europe. A few natural caves, huts made of branches of trees, served them as shelter; their only garments were skins obtained in the chase; they lived upon wild fruits, roots torn out of the ground and raw flesh of animals which they devoured while still bloody."—*Prehistoric America*, p. 264.

With this Baldwin agrees: "According to these writings, the country where the ruins are found was occupied in successive periods by three distinct peoples, the Chichimecs, the Colhuas and the Toltecs, or Nahuas."—*Ancient America*, p. 198.

Of the first people he says: "The most ancient people, those found in the country by the Colhuas, are called Chichimecs. They are described as a barbarous people who lived by hunting and fishing, and had neither towns nor agriculture."—*Ibid.*

The Committee on American Archæology tell us that the Colhuas were the Jaredites and the Toltecs the Nephites. Who, then, were the Chichimecs, the people who were here before the Colhuas came?

THE CIVILIZED NATIONS OF CENTRAL AMERICA AND
MEXICO CAME FROM THE NORTH.

With the Book of Mormon the direction of aboriginal migration was from south to north in both Americas; but, if we follow traditional, linguistic and archæological indications, we must conclude that the ancient nations of Central America and Mexico came from the opposite direction.

1. *The traditions of the Mayas and Nahuas declare that they came originally from a more northern latitude.*

Brinton says of the Maya tradition: "The uniform assertion of these legends is that the ancestors of the stock came from a more northern latitude, following down the shore of the Gulf of Mexico. This is also supported by the position of the Huastecs, who may be regarded as one of their tribes left behind in the general migration, and by the tradition of the Nahuas which assigned them a northern origin."—*The American Race*, p. 154.

Mrs. Susan Hale sums up the accounts of the migrations of the various pre-Chichimecan tribes from the north in the following: "We can not stop to be very much interested in this rudimentary people, called Quinames, who have left us scarcely more than a name and

little even of legend to charm us. . . . Whence they came, therefore, it is vain to speculate: how long they were there, what manner of men they were. A wave of life more civilized swept down upon them from the north and exterminated the whole race, so that we have nothing more to tell about them. The tribes which have the credit of destroying the giants bear the names of Xicalancas and Olmecs. . . . Next came the Mayas, still always from the north. Although they left some traces upon Anahuac, they, too, moved farther on, to establish in Yucatan and the territory between Chiapas and Central America their greatly advanced civilization. The Otomies, still with the same northern origin, spread themselves very early over the territory which is now occupied by the states of San Luis, Potosi, Guanajuato and Queretaro, reaching Michoacan, and spreading still farther. . . . Mixtecas and Zapotecas are names of other people who came to occupy Anahuac, but the Toltecs are the first of these ancient tribes distinguished for the advancement of their arts and civilization, of which their monuments and the results of excavation give abundant proof. The legends of those tribes who came to Mexico over the broad path leading down from the north refer to an ancient home, of which they retained a sad, vague longing, as the Moor still dreams of the glories of Grenada."—*The Story of Mexico*, pp. 18, 19.

And Nadaillac says: "All these men, whether Toltecs, Chichimecs or Aztecs, believed that their people came from the north, and migrated southward, seeking more fertile lands, more genial climates, or, perhaps, driven before a more warlike race; one wave of emigration succeeding another."—*Prehistoric America*, p. 13.

So prevalent was this tradition among the Nahuatl tribes of the sixteenth century that even Bancroft, who

denies their northern origin, is forced to admit it. "It is not probable," he says, "that this idea of a northern origin was a pure invention of the Spaniards; they doubtless found among the Aztecs with whom they came in contact what seemed to them a prevalent popular notion that the ancestors of the race came from the north."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 217.

And yet Elder Walker, in the face of this widely stated tradition, has the boldness to say: "By the ruins and traditions, it appears that the Olmecs, Toltecs, Aztecs, *et al.*, can be traced through Central America to Peru."—*Ruins Revisited*, p. 150. A statement that no man can truthfully make who is familiar with the traditions.

2. *The languages of the Mayas and Nahuas prove that they came originally from the north.*

It is an indisputable fact that both the Maya and Nahuatl tongues are related to the tongues of tribes who dwell to the northward and whose traditions declare that they came from regions still farther north. The Mayas are connected with the Huastecs who reside on the Rio Panuco, and the Nahuas with the Sonorans and Shoshonians whose tribes are scattered as far to the north as the Columbia River.

On the relationship of the Nahuas to northern stocks, and what this fact proves as to their southerly movement, Thomas writes: "If Buschmann be correct in uniting the Ute or Shoshone group of dialects with and making them a part of the Nahuatl or Mexican stock, named by Dr. Brinton the 'Uto-Aztec Stock,' we have, in the spread of this extensive family, what would seem to be incontrovertible evidence of the tendency in this western section to southern movements. Members of this family are scattered from the vicinity of the Colum-

bia River to the Isthmus of Panama; and so far as any evidence has been found in regard to the movements of the tribes, it indicates they were southward."—*American Archaeology*, p. 316.

The indications are that the Uto-Aztecan family, of which the Nahuan, Sonoran and Shoshonian are the branches, had its origin at some point between the Rocky Mountains and the Great Lakes. This is the conclusion of Dr. Gibbs, arrived at after an exhaustive study, and has also been reached by both Dr. Brinton and Professor Thomas, after independent research.

Brinton says: "That very careful student, Mr. George Gibbs, from a review of all the indications, reached the conclusion that the whole group came originally from the east of the Rocky Mountain chain, and that the home of its ancestral horde was somewhere between these mountains and the Great Lakes. This is the opinion I have also reached from an independent study of the subject, and I believe it is as near as we can get to the birthplace of this important stock."—*The American Race*, p. 121.

Of the branches of this stock, the Nahuas were the first to move southward, stopping for some time in the region of the Gila, where they created the germ of that culture which afterwards reached its highest point of development in central and southern Mexico, and then poured down upon Anahuac in successive waves, the Olmecs and Xicalancas leading, then the Toltecs, then the Chichimecs, and, lastly, the Aztecs and kindred tribes. The great Nahuan branch was followed by the Sonoran, which dwelt, at the time of the Discovery, in the States of Sonora, Sinaloa, Chihuahua and Durango; while the Shoshonians came last and took up their residence on the Columbia River and in adjacent territory.

3. *The architecture of the Mayas and Nahuas proves that they must have originally come from the north.*

It was long a favorite opinion with archæologists that the civilization of Central America was indigenous to that section, and it was assumed that that region had been a sort of radiating center from which the various nations went out to people the New World.¹ But this assumption will have to be relinquished, for it is now known that Central America not only did not germinate the culture of the other regions of America, where men had reached a considerable degree of advancement, but that she derived her own civilization from without. This is proved by the fact that the successive steps, the rude beginnings and the intermediate stages of a developing architectural art, found in Egypt and other countries where civilizations have been begun and carried to a high degree, are wholly wanting in Chiapas and Yucatan. The Mayas, when they entered the central region, were artisans and mechanics with advanced ideas of architecture. "How are we to account for this absence of earlier forms," asks Thomas, "except upon the theory that when the tribes entered their historic seats they had already become proficient in the builder's art?"—*American Archaeology*, p. 341.

When the works of Mexico and Central America are carefully studied, it is observed that there is a general architectural improvement from the Gila on the north to the Usumacinta on the south, as though there had been a constant but slow trend of population southward. A line of continually developing architectural forms may be traced from the region of the Gila, in Arizona, through Casas Grandes, in the State of Chihuahua, and

¹ "Prehistoric Races," pp. 339, 340.

Zape, in Zacatecas, to Mexico, and from thence to Chiapas and Yucatan. This route, evidently, was the ancient thoroughfare over which the Mayas and Nahuas traveled on their way to Anahuac and Central America. The initial efforts at pyramid and terrace building, carried to so high a grade in Central America, were made on the Gila, as is evidenced in the mounds and artificial platforms there to be found. At Casas Grandes, while in general type the architecture is unquestionably like that of Arizona, transitional forms appear, and, by the time Quemada is reached, the impress of a northern influence becomes fainter with more of a tendency toward Central American forms. These facts prove that the monuments from the Gila to Honduras were erected by the same people, or related peoples, who moved by slow stages, and frequent stops, southward, increasing in power and civilization on the way. This is the easiest and best explanation of the transitional architectural forms of northern and southern Mexico.¹

To fortify this argument, I here introduce the testimony of three as competent archæologists as have ever written on the subject of antiquities, at least two of whom have made careful personal investigations on the field.

Thomas says: "In fact, the evidence of gradual advance toward a higher grade in the architectural art is seen beyond question as we advance southward from Arizona to Quemada, be our opinion in regard to the authors of these works what it may. We must confess that, so far as we are able to judge from all that has been written in regard to the ruins of the southwest, there seems to be no other reason for denying this advance in type than a

¹"American Archæology," Chapter XXIII.

fixed purpose to maintain a theory."—*American Archæology*, p. 349.

In support of his belief, he gives us a quotation from the well-known archæologist, Bandelier, part of which is as follows: "It seems, therefore, that between the thirty-fourth and the twenty-ninth parallels of latitude the aboriginal architecture of the southwest had begun to change in a manner that brought some of its elements that were of northern origin into disuse, and substituted others derived from southern influences; in other words, that there was a gradual transformation going on in ancient aboriginal architecture in the direction from north to south."—*Ibid*, p. 350.

He also gives us the following from Charnay: "Las Casas Grandes, the settlements in the Sierra Madre, the ruins of Zape, of Quemada, recalling the monuments at Mitla, others in Queretaro, together with certain features in the building of temples and altars which remind one of the Mexican manuscripts, from which the Toltec, Aztec and Yucatec temple was built, make it clear that the civilized races came from the northwest."—*Ibid*, p. 349.

The name of the ancient country from which the Maya and Nahua tribes are said to have come is given differently in the traditions. The Toltecs called it Hue Hue Tlapallan, "Old Old Red Land;" the Chichimecs, Amequemecan, and the Aztecs, Aztlan, "White Land," or Chicomoztoc, "Seven Caves," while the Mayas spoke of it as Tulan Zuiva, or "Seven Ravines." It was vaguely located in the north somewhere and was to the tribes of Mexico and Central America what Palestine is to the Jew and Grenada to the Moor. Archæologists have been puzzled to know just where in the north to locate it and varied have been their conjectures. Bald-

win, Foster and Short have looked for it in the Mississippi Valley and have identified the Mexican and Central American tribes with those who built the mounds, but recent discoveries, by which the tribes resident in the valleys at the time of the Discovery are identified with the Mound Builders, have effectually refuted this theory. Briart claims a location for it near Lake Tulare in California, Becker on the Rio Colorado, and Humboldt on the Gila.

Of all these theories, and many others that might be mentioned, the last two are the most probable. The constant mention of caves and ravines in the old accounts may refer to the manner of life followed by the tribes, when they resided in the north, of living in cliffs and caves, while the colors red and white, by which the ancient country was designated by the Toltecs and Aztecs, may refer to the color of the cliffs or mountains. On this point Professor Thomas writes: "Why there has been such persistent refusal on the part of scholars to accept, as at least possible, the theory that the tradition of the 'Seven Caves' or 'Seven Ravines' (Chicomoztoc and Tulan Zuiva) refers to the cliff dwellings or cave dwellings of northwestern Mexico and Arizona, is difficult to account for. There is nothing in this supposition contrary to the traditions, nor to the generally accepted theory of the course of migrations. The number seven does not necessarily play any particular role in the solution of this problem. Numbers were determined from some incident or circumstance which may or may not be known. Seven may have been selected because of some superstition, or because it was understood that seven was the number of tribes belonging to a certain group or stock, or it may have arisen in many other ways. It is, therefore, immaterial in this relation. The

reference, therefore, in the Nahuatl and Maya traditions to seven caves, although largely mixed with myth, may be interpreted as possibly referring to the cliff or cave dwellings, or to this mode of living while in the north. This would be appropriate as explaining the frequent reference in these traditions to darkness, gloom and a sunless condition. It is well known that caves were often resorted to in the southern regions as places for holding religious ceremonies and other purposes."—*American Archaeology*, p. 355.

It is also a fact of history that many of the towns on the southern Gila were deserted in 1540 when Coronado visited them; these and others, which have not yet been discovered, may have been among the works of the old Mayan and Nahuatl tribes. Besides, it is now known that tribes of the Uto-Aztecan family, notably the Mokis of the Shoshonian and the Pimas of the Sonoran branch, have built cliff houses within historic times. Putting these facts all together, we have pretty strong proof that the Mayas and the Nahuas came from the north not only, but also that the ancient country in which they began to lead a life of civilization was somewhere in the northwestern part of Mexico, or in the southwestern part of the United States.

The most prominent opponent of the northern origin of the Nahuatl tribes is Bancroft. For several reasons he opposed the theory and tried to find Hue Hue Tlapalan in the Usumacinta region and to connect the Toltecs with Xibalba. He did not, however, bring them from south of the Isthmus, and so his theory can not be made to do service in the interest of the Book of Mormon. He argued that no ruins had been discovered in the north which could have been the initial steps in Maya and Nahuatl architecture, and that no Aztec or Maya dia-

lects had been found in that direction; both of which conclusions, since his day, have positively been proved untrue, as we have seen.¹ Many more of his opinions in nowise conflict with the theory of a northern derivation.

The consensus of opinion among scientific men upon the origin of the Maya and Nahua tribes is, however, that they came from the north to those countries which they inhabited in historic times.

"The Toltecs directed their course toward the south."
—*Briart's Aztecs*, p. 38.

"It results from the evidences in our possession that there has existed a continuous and general tendency of migration from north to south in the two Americas."
—*Preadamites*, p. 395.

"Here, again, enters speculation upon the location of that country of the Toltecs. No one knows certainly where it was, but everything points to its having been in the north."
—*Ober's History of Mexico*, p. 26.

"When the Toltecs, who led the van of the great Aztec migration from the north, settled in Mexico, they are said to have found it inhabited by the Olmecas or

¹ Since writing this I have come across a statement from Bancroft in which he concedes that there is no good reason why the foundations of the Nahua and Maya civilizations may not have been laid in the Northwest. In opposing the theory of Buckle, that the development of civilization is dependent upon the heat and moisture of the tropics, he says (Vol. II., p. 53): "Indeed, there is no reason why the foundations of the Aztec and Maya-Quiche civilizations may not have been laid north of the thirty-fifth parallel, although no architectural remains have been discovered there, nor any other proof of such an origin; but upon the banks of the Gila, the Colorado, and the Rio Grande, in Chihuahua, and on the dry, hot plains of Arizona and New Mexico, far beyond the limits of Mr. Buckle's territory where 'there never has been found, and we may confidently assert, never will be found,' any evidence of progress, are to-day walled towns inhabited by an industrial and agricultural people, whose existence we can trace back for more than three centuries, besides ruins of massive buildings of whose history nothing is known."

Olmecs, a nation to which the learned Siguenza ascribed the construction of the pyramids of Teotihuacan."
—*American Antiquities*, p. 200.

"The Toltecs arrived in Anahuac, or the country now called Mexico, migrating from the north."
—*Types of Mankind*, p. 286.

"Before the Christian era the Nahoas immigration from the north made its appearance."
—*The Mound Builders*, p. 147.

"No reasonable doubt exists but that the Athapascas, Algonkins, Iroquois, Chahta-Muskokis and Nahuas all migrated from the north or west to the regions they occupied."
—*Myths of the New World*, p. 47.

"The prevailing opinion among scholars of the present day, so far as published, appears to be that the Nahuatl group originated in, or at least came from some place north of, the known localities of the tribes composing the family."
—*American Archaeology*, p. 316.

We have three lines of evidence, then, which refute the Book of Mormon claim that the ancient inhabitants of Central America and Mexico came from over the sea and from South America. First, the traditions; second, the languages, and, third, the architectural features. These evidences strongly declare that the ancient Mayas and Nahuas came from the north.

THE ANCIENT MAYAS AND NAHUAS WERE NEAR NEIGHBORS, CAME CONSTANTLY IN CONTACT, AND WERE LONG IN INTIMATE ASSOCIATION WITH EACH OTHER.

The Jaredites are declared to have landed upon American soil in the year 2224 B. C., and to have been here until the year 600 B. C., when they were exterminated at Hill Ramah in western New York. The Nephites, we are told, immediately followed them and con-

tinued until 385 A. D., when they suffered defeat at the hands of the Lamanites. The Jaredites and Nephites are said to have been distinct peoples and never to have come in contact, except in the case of the Jaredite Coriantumr, who survived the destruction of his people and who dwelt with the Zarahemlaites "nine moons."

But the American traditions show that the two ancient civilized peoples of Central America and Mexico were here at the same time, were near neighbors, were often at war with each other, and exerted a mutual influence in the development of their respective civilizations.

Says Short: "The pyramidal structure we have found employed by both Mayas and Nahuas, with certain modifications and with such resemblances as would seem to indicate that both peoples had been originally, or at an early day, near neighbors, and that the younger people, at least the more recent in their occupancy of Mexico and Central America, the Nahuas, may have copied the pyramid in its perfected form from the Mayas."—*North Americans on Antiquity*, p. 224.

Says Bancroft: "First, as already stated, the Maya and Nahua nations have been within traditionally historic times practically distinct, although coming constantly in contact."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 166.

And Thomas declares: "It is also generally conceded, or at least intimated, and apparently in accordance with the most reliable data, that the Mayas and Zapotecs, if not derived in the far distant past from the same original stem as the Nahuatl tribes, had long been in intimate association with the latter."—*American Archaeology*, p. 354.

This is a most forceful argument against the Mormon theory that the "two distinct people" of Central

America and Mexico were the Jaredites and Nephites, for, if the Mayas and Nahuas were "near neighbors," came "constantly in contact" and were in "intimate association" with each other, they could not have been identical with the Book of Mormon nations, who are said to have been here consecutively.

Tradition further tells us that the Nahuas were the force that overthrew the old, effete empire of Xibalba. Bancroft sums up the historical facts, as given in the Quiche manuscript, the Popol Vuh, in the following: "The Quiche traditions, then, point clearly to, first, the existence in ancient times of a great empire somewhere in Central America, called Xibalba by its enemies; second, the growth of a rival neighboring power; third, a long struggle extending through several generations at least, and resulting in the downfall of the Xibalban kings; fourth, a subsequent scattering—the cause of which is not stated, but was evidently war, civil or foreign—of the formerly victorious nations from Tulan, their chief city or province; fifth, the identification of a portion of the migrating chiefs with the founders of the Quiche-Cakchiquel nations in possession of Guatemala at the Conquest."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 185.

The facts, as gleaned from the fields of traditional history and archæology, are as follows: Some hundreds of years ago, probably not earlier than the beginning of the Christian era, there appeared in Central America from the north a civilized people known to us as the Mayas, or Colhuas. These subjugated the barbarous tribes, taught them the arts of civilized life and established an empire, which, at the height of its glory, included under its sway the valley of the Usumacinta and adjacent territory. When this people had become settled in their new home there appeared to the north of them a new people,

speaking a new language, who settled in central and southern Mexico. The indications are that the two peoples lived peaceably side by side for some time, until the Nahuas had developed sufficient strength to overthrow the Votanic sovereigns. This was accomplished, however, only after a long and bloody struggle. Bancroft speaks of this conflict as "a long struggle extending through several generations at least, and resulting in the downfall of the Xibalban kings."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 186. And Short says: "While we do not attach much certainty to the Abbe's"—DeBourbourg's—"date, still we think that the fall of Xibalba was due to Nahua influences brought to bear upon the ancestors of the Quiches."—*North Americans of Antiquity*, p. 227.

The overthrow of this empire did not consist in the extermination of a people, but in the destruction of a government and the scattering of its subjects or their absorption among the victorious Nahuas. "The old civilization was merged in the new, and practically lost its identity; so much so that all the many nationalities that in later times traced their origin to this central region were proud, whatever their language, to claim relationship with the successful Nahuas, whose institutions they had adopted and whose power they had shared."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 234.

These facts are against the Book of Mormon. The Jaredites and Nephites never came in contact; the latter had nothing to do with the downfall of the former; and the first people, after their overthrow, were not merged with the second. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that the Mayas and Nahuas were not the Jaredites and Nephites.

THE BUILDERS OF THE ANCIENT CITIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA ARE NOT AN EXTERMINATED RACE.

Apostle Kelley asserts: "Further, it is known that the oldest nation that inhabited America has long since been exterminated. So says the 'Book of Mormon.' So says tradition. So says modern research."—*Presidency and Priesthood*, p. 264.

But we are compelled to dissent from this opinion of Apostle Kelley. That the Book of Mormon says that the oldest nation which inhabited America has long since been exterminated we allow, but when it comes to tradition and modern research we are not prepared to concede that they agree with the Book of Mormon. It can be shown that tribes and nations have been broken up by war, famine and pestilence; that they have been scattered in different directions and merged with other tribes and nations, and that they have lost their former glory; but it can not be proved that an ancient and widespread race, like the Jaredite, ever lost its existence in the way in which the Book of Mormon declares this people lost theirs.

Everywhere throughout the New World the evidences proclaim loudly and emphatically against the theory of "vanished," "lost" and "extinct" races, using these terms in the sense in which they are applied to the Book of Mormon peoples. The Mound Builders, about whom so much mystery hung for a number of years, are now positively proved to have been only tribes of American Indians, and so critically have their remains been studied that in many instances the very tribes who built the works of certain localities are known. The same is also true of the Cliff Dwellers. While, according to Brinton, the people who erected Copan and Quirigua, said by the

Josephite Committee on American Archæology to be Jaredite cities, are represented to-day by no less than nineteen distinct tribes, as follows: Aguatecas, Cakchiquels, Chaneabals, Chinantecos, Choles, Chortis, Huastecas, Ixils, Lacandons, Mams, Mayas, Mopans, Quekchis, Quiches, Pokomams, Pokonchis, Tzendals, Tzutuhils and Uspantecas.¹

That Mormon writers identify the Jaredite cities with those of the Mayas in Yucatan, Honduras, etc., is made evident by a statement in "Book of Mormon Lectures," p. 64. Mr. Stebbins says in this place: "The chief Jaredite cities were not in Mexico, but south in Yucatan, Honduras, etc." If this is true, Uxmal, Chichen Itza, Peten, Palenque, Quirigua, Copan and Utatlan are all the work of an exterminated race who met their final defeat in a battle in western New York six centuries before Christ. This, I do not hesitate to say, is putting the overthrow of their builders before the erection of the cities themselves, for but very few, if any, of our best-informed writers of to-day would feel justified in giving any of them an antiquity of more than nineteen hundred years.

The theory that the cities mentioned were erected by an exterminated race is not advanced, so far as I can learn, by any author of any prominence whatever who has written within the last quarter of a century, although at the time the Book of Mormon came out some of the more ignorant and visionary believed it. It belongs to that class of theories broached and defended by such fanatics as George Jones, Lord Kingsborough and Josiah Priest.

Bancroft says on the relationship of the ancient Cen-

¹ "The American Race," p. 158.

tral Americans to those of the present day: "I deem the ground sufficient, therefore, for accepting this Central American civilization of the past as a fact, referring it not to an extinct ancient race, but to the direct ancestors of the peoples still occupying the country with the Spaniards, and applying to it the name Maya as that of the language which has claims as strong as any to be considered the mother tongue of the linguistic family mentioned."—*Native Races*, Vol. II., p. 117.

Squier also attributes the cities of Central America to the ancestors of the present native population. "All of them were the work of the same people, or of nations of the same race, dating from a high antiquity, and in blood and language precisely the same race, . . . that was found in occupation of the country by the Spaniards, and who still constitute the great bulk of the population."—*Palacio, Carta*, pp. 9, 10.

Tylor, the eminent anthropologist, writes: "The sculptures and temples of Central America are the work of the ancestors of the present Indians."—*Tylor's Researches*, p. 189.

Brinton says on the identity of the builders of Palenque and Copan with the present-existing tribes: "At the time of the conquest the stately structures of Copan, Palenque, T'Ho and many other cities were deserted and covered with an apparently primitive forest; but others not inferior to them, Uxmal, Chichen Itza, Peten, etc., were the centers of dense population, proving that the builders of both were identical."—*The American Race*, p. 155.

And Short says of the builders of Palenque: "Under the shadow of the magnificent and mysterious ruins of Palenque a people grew to power who spread into Guatemala and Honduras, northward toward Anahuac and

southward into Yucatan, and for a period of probably twenty-five centuries"—from 955 B. C. to the Spanish Conquest—"exercised a sway which at one time excited the envy and fear of its neighbors."—*North Americans of Antiquity*, p. 203.

The conclusion of these authors is founded upon the most conclusive evidence. Palenque, Copan and T'Ho were uninhabited at the time of the Conquest, not because their builders had been exterminated in a fatal conflict in western New York, but because they had been broken up into fragmentary nations and had been scattered to different parts of the central region.

Yucatan is identified by the Committee with the Jaredite land of Nehor. And, as it is not identified with any Nephite country, we infer that with them its ruined cities were all the work of that extinct race. But this is not true. The cities of Yucatan were among the later works of the Maya people, and were not built by an extinct race. Uxmal, according to Thomas, was built by the Tutul Xiu, a royal family, probably not much earlier than the beginning of the twelfth century, and was inhabited at the time of the Conquest. And Chichen Itza was probably founded in the sixth century A. D., and was also inhabited when the Spaniards first visited it. While, as for Mayapan, one account says that it was one of the tributary capitals of Xibalba, while another declares that it was built by Kukulcan after leaving Chichen Itza. But, be the dates of the founding of these cities what they may, one thing is certain: they were founded by the ancestors of the present native population and not by an extinct race. "It may then be accepted," writes Bancroft, "as a fact susceptible of no doubt that the Yucatan structures were built by the Mayas, the direct ancestors of the people found in the

peninsula at the Conquest and of the present native population."—*Native Races*, Vol. IV., p. 283.

I challenge the Committee on American Archæology to prove by trustworthy and well-authenticated evidence that the first civilized people of Central America, those who built Copan and Quirigua, were exterminated in the sense in which the Jaredites are said to have been exterminated.

THE EMPIRES OF THE MAYAS AND NAHUAS WERE CONFINED TO CENTRAL AMERICA AND MEXICO.

We are informed that the empire of the Jaredites extended from Honduras on the south to the Great Lakes on the north, and east and west from ocean to ocean. The Nephites included within their domain not only all of this territory, but also in addition that part of South America now known as the United States of Colombia, and, in earlier times, also Peru. Throughout their respective empires these peoples, during their respective epochs, were of a uniform degree of civilization, practiced the same arts, possessed the same customs, worshiped the same God, were under the same laws, spoke the same language, and erected the same kinds of buildings.

Ether says of the Jaredites: "And the whole face of the land northward was covered with inhabitants; and they were exceeding industrious, and they did buy and sell, and traffic one with another, that they might get gain. And they did work in all manner of ore, and they did make gold, and silver, and iron, and brass, and all manner of metals; and they did dig it out of the earth; wherefore they did cast up mighty heaps of earth to get ore of gold, and of silver, and of iron, and of copper. And they did work all manner of fine work. And they did have silks, and fine twined linen; and they did work

all manner of cloth, that they might clothe themselves from their nakedness. And they did make all manner of tools to till the earth, both to plow and to sow, to reap and to hoe, and also to thrash. And they did make all manner of tools with which they did work their beasts. And they did make all manner of weapons of war. And they did work all manner of work of exceeding curious workmanship. And never could be a people more blest than were they, and more prospered by the hand of the Lord."—*Ether 4:7*.

The "land northward," on the Committee's maps, is the name of that country lying south of the Great Lakes and north of Mexico, the "land of Heth." Evidently, in its broader sense, it included not only this territory, but also Mexico and a part at least of Central America. Upon the "whole face" of this land the inhabitants were engaged in the same occupations and practiced the same arts, implying a uniform degree of culture from Central America northward to what is now the boundary-line between Canada and the United States.

The following is a description given of the Nephites at the period of their widest extent: "Now, the land south"—South America—"was called Lehi, and the land north"—North America—"was called Mulek, which was after the sons of Zedekiah; for the Lord did bring Mulek into the land north, and Lehi into the land south. And behold, there was all manner of gold in both these lands, and of silver, and of precious ore of every kind; and there were also curious workmen, who did work all kinds of ore, and did refine it; and thus they did become rich. They did raise grain in abundance, both in the north and in the south. And they did flourish exceedingly, both in the north and in the south. And they did multiply and wax exceeding strong in the land. And they did raise

many flocks and herds, yea, many fatlings. Behold, their women did toil and spin, and did make all manner of cloth, of fine twined linen, and cloth of every kind, to clothe their nakedness."—*Helaman 2:27*.

But, when we carefully examine the evidences, traditional, linguistic and archaeological, we find no proof of the former existence of these lost empires. The Mayan Empire, with which the Jaredite must be identified if with any, had its center in the Usumacinta Valley, and in its widest extent only comprised the territory of the present states of Chiapas, Tabasco, Yucatan, Guatemala and a part of Honduras. At the time of the Conquest its descendants were confined to this territory, with the exception of an outlying colony, the Huastecs, in the valley of the Rio Panuco, which undoubtedly was left behind in the original migration from the north. The capitals of this empire, according to tradition, were Palenque in Chiapas, Copan in Honduras and Mayapan in Yucatan.

The empire of the Toltecs occupied central and southern Mexico. At the period of its greatest power it comprised only the confederated states of Culhuacan, Otompan and Tollan.

This is all that can be said for the extent of the two most advanced and prosperous empires of antiquity in that part of the New World. To move the boundary-line of the first northward as far as the Great Lakes, and the boundary-lines of the second northward to the Great Lakes, and southward at least to Ecuador, is to go directly contrary to all traditional, linguistic and archaeological indications.

There are no proofs by which to establish a national connection between the ancient inhabitants of the Mississippi Valley and those of Central America. The

peoples of the two sections were wholly different in their culture stata. Their structures were dissimilar, except that they were built upon pyramidal bases. The Mound Builders used no cut stone or mortar; they had no hieroglyphical writing; their sculpture work was confined to the carving of shells, bones and small pieces of stone; their structures were all of wood or other perishable materials; they worked the metals in a cold state and knew nothing of the arts of smelting and alloying; and they depended, in a great measure, upon the chase for food. On the other hand, the Mexicans and Central Americans built large and imposing palaces and temples of cut stone, laid in well-tempered mortar; they reached a high degree of proficiency in hieroglyphical writing; they were good sculptors and covered their buildings with ornamental and graphic designs; they had well-organized governments; and they were experts in the arts of alloying and smelting metals.

Yet, notwithstanding these well-marked differences, Mr. Stebbins asserts: "Science fully establishes that a great nation formerly lived in the United States, and all unite in saying that the evidences are that this wonderful civilization had its base and origin in Central America and Mexico, and that from those countries it spread over the United States."—*Lectures*, p. 57.

But it is hard to understand how a civilized people from Central America, practicing advanced arts and under the government of the mother country, moving up into the Mississippi Valley, should suddenly relapse into a state of savagery and give up the arts of cutting, polishing and carving stone and the use of mortar; the smelting and alloying of metals, and the art of hieroglyphical writing. And yet this is just what occurred, if the ancient inhabitants of the Mississippi Valley came

from Mexico and Central America. Mr. Stebbins' claim that a "wonderful civilization" once existed in the United States is wholly incorrect. The Mound Builders were not one whit ahead of the Chata Muskokis, Cherokees and Iroquois when these tribes were first seen by the whites. On this point Professor Thomas speaks as follows: "Nothing trustworthy has been discovered to justify the theory that the mound builders belonged to a highly civilized race, or that they were a people who had attained a higher culture status than the Indians."—*Mound Exploration*, p. 11.

Again, Mr. Stebbins' assertion that "all unite in saying that this wonderful civilization had its base and origin in Central America and Mexico" is also without foundation, for the great body of archaeologists to-day deny that the arts of the Mississippi Valley were derived from the South. "There is, it is now reasonably certain," says Nadaillac, "no good ground for connecting the builders of the earthworks of the Mississippi Valley with the Central American people who erected the remarkable monuments which will hereafter be referred to. But, until very recently, it has been a favorite and not unnatural hypothesis which served to temporarily appease an ignorance, pardonable in itself, but now no longer necessary."—*Prehistoric America*, p. 13.

There is but one similarity that might indicate a connection between the peoples of the two sections—they both erected pyramidal mounds upon which they built their edifices. But here the analogy ends, for those north of Mexico are minus the richly-sculptured and richly-ornamented temples which crown the summits of those in Central America. This leads us to conclude that, while the art gems of each people undoubtedly came from a common source, they must have diverged at a time when

the two were in a savage state, before the invention of sculpturing, hieroglyphical writing and other arts for which the Mayas were justly famous and which were not practiced by the Mound Builders.

On this point Thomas remarks: "It is true that truncated pyramidal mounds of large size and somewhat regular proportions are found in certain sections, and that some of these have ramps or roadways leading up to them. Yet when compared with the pyramids or teocalli of Mexico and Yucatan the differences in the manifestations of architectural skill are so great, and the resemblances are so faint and few, as to furnish no grounds whatever for attributing the two classes of works to the same people. The facts that the works of the one people consist chiefly of wrought and sculptured stone, and that such materials are wholly unknown to the other, forbid the idea of any relationship between the two. The difference between the two classes of monuments indicates a wide divergence—a complete step—in the culture status."—*The Problem of the Ohio Mounds*, p. 14.

There is, likewise, no evidence of a national connection between the ancient peoples of South America and those of Central America and Mexico. At the Discovery the Peruvians were wholly unlike the Mayas and Nahuas in religion, government, language, architecture and sculpturing, and their remains indicate that these differences had existed from the time the two peoples began to walk in the pathway of civilization.

The theory of the Book of Mormon is that the people who built the most ancient cities of Peru were those of the second epoch of civilization in Central America and Mexico. But this theory is untenable, for the reason that the Peruvians and Central Americans had no con-

nection after they began the erection of those cities attributed by the Mormons to Jaredite and Nephite workmanship. In other words, the separation of the two peoples dates back to a period preceding any to which we are carried by the archæological evidences. So far as the evidence goes, the civilizations of the two sections were indigenous and were developed wholly independent of each other.

Says Baldwin: "It may be that all the old American civilizations had a common origin in South America, and that all the ancient Americans whose civilization can be traced in remains found north of the Isthmus came originally from that part of the continent. This hypothesis appears to me more probable than any other I have heard suggested. But, assuming this to be true, the first migration of civilized people from South America must have taken place at a very distant period in the past, for it preceded not only the history indicated by the existing antiquities, but also an earlier history, during which the Peruvians and Central Americans grew to be as different from their ancestors as from each other. In each case the development of civilization represented by existing monuments, so far as we can study it, appears to have been original."—*Ancient America*, p. 246.

The "existing antiquities" of Peru are, many of them, identified by the Committee with the works of the Nephites. The ancient city of Cuzco is identified with the Book of Mormon city of Nephi; Huanuco, with Ishmael; Gran Chimú, or Trujillo, with Middoni; Riobamba, with Amulon, and Cuelap-Tingo, with Lehi-Nephi. But, if Baldwin is correct, these cities were built after, not before, the separation of the peoples of Peru and Central America.

Bancroft sustains Baldwin: "The Maya and Peruvian

peoples may have been one in remote antiquity; if so, the separation took place at a period long preceding any to which we are carried by the material relics of the Votanic empire"—those said to have been erected by the Jaredites—"and of the most ancient epoch of the southern civilization, or even by traditional annals and the vaguest myths."—*Native Races*, Vol. IV., p. 806.

This is putting the separation of the two peoples back of the erection of those monuments which are attributed to the Jaredites, making it wholly impossible for a people from Peru to have built any of the cities of Central America, or to have been under the same government with their builders.

The facts, therefore, seem to show that the two civilized nations of Central America and Mexico were confined, in their civilizations and governments, to the central region, and to the central region alone, and that they had no control over any people or territory south of the Isthmus of Panama or north of the northern boundary-line of Mexico. Therefore they could not have been the Jaredites and Nephites.

THE TRADITIONAL HISTORY OF THE TOLTECS PRESENTS NO
FEATURES SIMILAR TO THE HISTORY OF THE
NEPHITES.

Elder Stebbins thinks that the Toltecs were the Nephites. He says: "I believe that the people spoken of in tradition and in history as the Toltecs are those named Nephites in the Book of Mormon."—*Lectures*, p. 230.

If this is true, we may expect to find in their traditions proofs by which this identification may be confirmed. But, unfortunately for Elder Stebbins, there is nothing in the traditions to substantiate his theory, as

will be seen in the following brief historical account.

It appears that the first movement of the Nahuas into Central America occurred after the Mayas had become fully settled in the Usumacinta Valley. At the time of their immigration the Mayas were in the height of their glory, their government comprising within its jurisdiction the states of Chiapas, Tabasco, Yucatan, Guatemala and western Honduras. There are reasons for believing that the Nahuas founded their capital at Tulan in Chiapas, and that, after living peaceably side by side with the Xibalbans for a number of years, they finally developed sufficient strength to overthrow their old, effete empire. Following the fall of Xibalba the Nahua power continued to increase until about the fifth century, when it ended "in revolt, disaster and a general scattering of the tribes." With the sixth and seventh centuries Toltec supremacy was achieved in Mexico. It is probable that, with the scattering of the Nahua people, many of them moved northward into that country, and passed under the dominion of the Toltecs, who may have been originally but a small tribe or a ruling family. The Toltec confederacy was composed of three small kingdoms named from capital cities, Culhuacan, Otompan and Tollan, each of which had its turn as the ruling power. Culhuacan and Otompan corresponded very nearly with the Aztec states, Mexico and Tezcuco; Tollan joined them on the northwest. The date of the Toltec departure from Hue Hue Tlapallan is given differently by different writers. Ixtlilxochitl gives two dates, 338 and 439; Veytia gives 596; Clavigero, 544 or 596, and Muller, 439. It is wholly impossible to determine the date positively, but 544 A. D. is the one adopted by most of the later writers as being the nearest correct.

The story of the departure of the Toltecs and their

subsequent settlement in Mexico is, briefly, as follows. Chalcatzin and Tlacamihtzin, two chiefs of royal blood, undertook to depose the king of Hue Hue Tlapallan, with the result that they and their followers were driven out of their kingdom and were forced to flee for their lives. This was the beginning of the Toltec migration from the north, which lasted, according to Ixtlilxochitl, 104 years. Their first capital in the land of Mexico was Tollantzinco, where they dwelt eight years, until their removal to Tollan, where the Toltec empire proper was founded. Seven years after their establishment at Tollan the chiefs, seven in number, came together to effect a permanent union between their bands, and, by the advice of their prophet, Hueman, sent an embassy with presents to the court of the Chichimec king, Icauhtzin, who gave them his second son, Chalchiuh Tlatonac, to be their first sovereign. This young man was renowned for his fine personal appearance, wisdom and goodly character, and for the excellent service he rendered his people. Soon after ascending the throne the young king decided to take a wife, and chose as his queen the beautiful daughter of Acapichtzin, one of the Toltec chiefs. The history of the Toltecs from this on is very confused, and to obtain a correct list of their kings is impossible owing to this confusion and to the custom which they had of giving a number of names to the same ruler according to his power and prominence. Suffice it to say that for five centuries the Toltec government exercised the strongest influence in Mexico of any. Its cities were renowned for their splendor, its kings for their power, its armies for their valor, its people for their progress and skill, and its religion for its bloodlessness, human sacrifices being abandoned under the reign of one Quetzalcoatl. But, finally, the empire weakened under the repeated

attacks of the Chichimecs, and the last Toltec king, Topiltzin, was forced to flee, following which the country passed under Chichimec rule.¹

There has been much written concerning the Toltecs which undoubtedly is pure fiction, but that a people bearing that name did exist and did build some of the works attributed to them is accepted as established by most authors. The points derived from these traditions, that may be accepted as in a true sense historical, are (1) the general tendency of Nahuatl migrations from north to south; (2) the founding of the Toltec kingdom in the sixth or seventh century and its continuance for a few hundred years; (3) the confinement of its government to central and southern Mexico; and (4) the prosperity of its capital cities, Culhuacan, Otompan and Tollan.

Let the reader compare this brief outline of Toltec history with that of the Nephites, and he will find no agreement at all by which to confirm the belief of Mr. Stebbins that the Toltecs and Nephites were one and the same people.

Not only are the traditions devoid of any historical similarity to the account of the Nephites, but there is also no resemblance between the names of men and of places given in these traditions and those given in the Book of Mormon.

TOLTEC CHARACTERS.

Chalcatzin.
Tlacamihtzin.
Hueman.
Chalchiuh Tlatonac.
Totepeuh.
Huetzin.

NEPHITE CHARACTERS.

Nephi.
Ammon.
Helaman.
Alma.
Amaron.
Amulek.

¹ "Native Races," Vol. V., Chapter IV.

Quetzalcoatl.	Lachoneus.
Topiltzin.	Hagoth.
Mitl.	Mosiah.
Papantzin.	Gideon.
Chicon Tonatiuh.	Mormon.
Nauhyotl.	Moroni.

TOLTEC CITIES AND PLACES. NEPHITE CITIES AND PLACES.

Culhuacan.	Teancum.
Otompan.	Angola.
Tollan.	Boaz.
Tollantzinco.	Desolation
Cholula.	David.
Teotihuacan.	Joshua.
Quauhtitlan.	Shem.
Jalisco.	Jordan.
Tultitlan.	Shim.
Xico.	Mulek.

In this chapter seven arguments have been presented against the claim that the ancient inhabitants of Central America and Mexico were the Jaredites and Nephites. They are, briefly: (1) The ancient inhabitants of those regions, judging from various evidences, were of the present race. (2) The first people of Central America were savages instead of civilized men, as the Book of Mormon declares. (3) The ancient peoples came from the north instead of from the east or south, as the Jaredites and Nephites are said to have come. (4) These ancient peoples were here at the same time and not consecutively, as the Jaredites and Nephites are said to have been. (5) The oldest civilized people of Central America, those who built Palenque, Copan and Quirigua, are not an extinct race in the sense in which the Jaredites are said to be extinct. (6) The aboriginal governments of

these peoples were confined to Central America and Mexico and had no control over tribes north of Mexico or south of the Isthmus. And (7) the traditional history of the Toltecs presents no points of agreement, in either names or details, or even in general outline, with the history of the Nephites as given in the Book of Mormon. I think from these considerations that the identification made by Bancroft and Short with the Jaredites and Nephites may be safely dismissed as fanciful and erroneous.¹

¹ In this chapter and elsewhere in this book, I have followed DeBourbourg and have employed the terms "Colhuas" and "Xibalba" as names for the ancient Central American people and their empire. I have so employed these terms, fully aware that such an application of them is objected to by many learned scholars, in the absence of better designations. "Colhua" is the Nahuatl term for "ancestors," while "Xibalba" is the Quiche name for the underworld and literally means "the place of disappearance."