

and we are shut up to the conclusion that their progenitors were either created on the north-west coast of America, or were the off-spring of some warlike Pacific lobster (which they resemble in color), or were landed on the coast ready made, from some other country.

Nor do we lose all traces of their origin when we reach the shores of the Pacific.

Sir Alexander McKenzie, in his voyages among the Arctic tribes, assures us that some of them have a tradition that they had come from another country and had traversed a great lake which was full of islands, and of having suffered great hardships on the voyage.

The Showanoes, an Algonquin tribe, have a tradition of a foreign origin, or landing from a sea voyage; and nearly as late as 1819, kept up yearly sacrifices for their safe arrival in this country.*

Montezuma told Cortes of a connection between the Aztec race and the nations of the Old World. His erroneous claim that they were of *Spanish* origin, does not vitiate the tradition of a *foreign* origin, since the latter fact would be much more likely to be preserved, than a knowledge of the particular stock from which they sprung; and yet, as we shall see, by and by, this error of the Aztec monarch was not wholly without foundation in truth. The general facts of their foreign origin, their migration by water and subsequent journeyings southward along the shores of the Pacific are well established by their pictorial writings and charts, which, by the aid of Aztec instructors, the Spanish conquerors learned to decipher. The Aztecs also kept chronological records by tying sticks in bundles, by cycles, and by these it has been ascertained, with a reasonable degree of certainty, that they landed on the continent between the years 1038 and 1064. But the Aztecs were by no means the original inhabitants, and hence have been denied the title of *Aborigines*. They were preceded by the Toltecs and they by the Olmecs, the

* Schoolcraft's Natural and Tribal History, p. 19.