

THE ADAPTATION
OF FOREIGN RELIGIOUS
INFLUENCES IN PRE-SPANISH MEXICO

Just a very few years ago no one would have thought of introducing an article with this title, because only more or less isolated religious traits and complexes of traits were known to be common to Mexico and China on the one hand, like the series of animal etc. names used in the calendar, and to Mexico, India and Indianized Southeast Asia on the other, like the belief in four or five destructions and re-creations of the world, the *pachisi-patolli* game connected with the four directions, the tearing out of the heart of a still-living victim of human sacrifice, the piercing of the tongue by priests and the pulling through of thin objects, and a considerable number of motives in religious art, including the representation of specific gods with their characteristic paraphernalia.

Though every one of the several items connecting Mexico with India and Southeast Asia—especially the style common to certain Mexican and Indian Southeast Asian objects of art—but

Foreign Religious Influences in Pre-Spanish Mexico

still more the whole group taken together, was clearly indicative of something bigger and more basic in the way of religious diffusion from that part of Asia to Mexico, to many students convincing proof was still missing that these were not simply stray items, surely striking in themselves but still capable of "being explained away." What likewise stood in the way of realizing that a whole religious system was involved was the fact that no connection could be seen between the Chinese calendar list and the Indian religious ideas and customs mentioned above.

This situation was changed radically when we had the good fortune of discovering precisely what we had been looking for, a system—a system of classifying gods common to Mesopotamia, China, India, Java and Mexico. This system consists of grouping all gods, and also their animals and plants, in three types expressing three great themes.

We have tabulated the correspondences between the Chinese, Indian, Javanese and Mexican classifications of gods and animals in a paper read at the International Congress of Americanists¹ and added dates from Mesopotamia in a subsequent publication.² Here we are not dealing with these correspondences as such, but only with the changes which this system of Asiatic, ultimately Mesopotamian origin, seems to have undergone in Mexico.

The basic feature common to all these lists is that gods and animals follow each other in the order type I, type II, type III, type I, type II, type III, etc...

The first type consists of the fathers of the gods, the gods who have created or ordered the universe or different parts of it, like the several "worlds" and their inhabitants, dead or alive, also fire, water, wealth, human institutions, and who now are the guardians of the cosmic order inherent in all creation. With the single exception of one goddess found only in one of the five countries, all the deities of this type are male. They stand

¹ Paul Kirchhoff, "The Diffusion of a Great Religious System from India to Mexico," *Actas y Memorias del 35º Congreso Internacional de Americanistas*, pp. 73-100, Vol. I.

² Paul Kirchhoff, *Die Mexikanistik von neuen Perspektiven: Mexiko und die alte Welt*, Paideuma, 1963-64.

so to speak above mankind and are somewhat remote from it. Animals and plants belonging to this type of god are, e.g., the dog, everywhere connected with the world of the dead, cow, buffalo cow and, in Mexico, maize or cane, all three belonging to the gods of wealth; in China also two imaginary animals, the dragon and the unicorn, the former corresponding to the only female deity in this group, the Mexican goddess Itzpapalotl, who is likewise drawn with wings and claws, that is, as a dragon.

The second type of gods represents the great forces of the universe, both nature and human society, be they constructive or destructive. Frequently these two opposite characteristics are combined in one single deity. Some of the forces these gods represent are: the earth, vegetation and plant growth, sexual potency, the winds, water, lightning, fire, time, disease, destruction and death in general; in human society kinship, marriage, cultivation of the soil, husbandry, hunting, war and death in war and sacrifice. Characteristically ambivalent deities of this type are the warlike gods of the earth, vegetation and agriculture. In this type goddesses are relatively frequent in Asia, but absent in Mexico. Seen as a whole, the gods of this type are more directly concerned with man's life than those of the first type. Since many of them are terrifying and dangerous, their veneration and cult aim at pacifying them. Bloody sacrifice appears as specifically important in this group of gods seen as a whole, but there are exceptions to this rule. In Asia animals are sacrificed; in Mexico both animals and human beings. To the gods of this type belong animals living in the earth or close to it, such as the hare, badger, fox, rat or mouse, mole, rabbit, and birds living close to the earth, such as the cock, pheasant and quail, but also the bat, crow and eagle. The latter belongs rather to another group, that representing kingdom, power, male potency and war, as lions, bulls, horses and deer.

In the third type we find gods presiding over acts of fertilization like rain and copulation, as well as over pleasing and beneficial activities like dancing and singing, other arts and crafts, healing, etc. In Mesopotamia and Mexico we find in this group many goddesses, in fact most of them, but not so in India and Java. All the deities of this type are the friends of man. Animals belonging here are the tiger—in Mexico both among

the Maya and in Teotihuacan connected with rain and water—, two other rain-bringing animals, the snake and the elephant, and two water-loving animals, the buffalo and the pig; the latter may also be considered part of another group of animals thought of as sexually especially excitable, potent or fertile, as the monkey, the he-goat, the stallion, the rabbit. Some of the latter symbolize other qualities as well, e.g., in Mexico the monkey playfulness, and the rabbit, agricultural work.

Long before us Georges Dumézil discovered the same threefold grouping of gods among the Indoeuropeans, including the Aryans of India. Our findings constitute a full confirmation of Dumézil's "*trois fonctions*," so far as India is concerned, but differ in that he denies their existence in Egypt, Mesopotamia and China, and therefore thinks of them as typically Indo-european, whereas we found this system in five countries, Mesopotamia, China, India, Java and Mexico. The Indoeuropeans, therefore, must have derived their "*trois fonctions*" directly or indirectly from Mesopotamia, the country where they are first found.

This extraordinary system, which betrays a very high degree of religious development, is known to us primarily through lists of gods, and secondarily through lists of animals or, as in Mexico, of animals, plants, objects and other phenomena. These lists consist everywhere basically of 12 gods and animals or 12 groups of gods and animals. In these lists gods and animals, whether singly or in groups, follow each other four times in the order in which we have enumerated the three types, that is I-II-III, I-II-III, I-II-III, I-II-III. Most Mesopotamian lists know more than four repetitions. In Mexico four gods and animals have been added at each end of the basic list. The four repetitions of each type are variants of the same basic theme. The Indian material, which Dumézil handled, did not give him this fourfold repetition, but only a single series I-II-III. In our lists from five countries not only do the three great types agree, so that e.g. all creator gods and gods of world order are found in the positions within the list of 12 that are assigned to this type, that is, positions 1, 4, 7 and 10, but many of the variants agree as well, e.g. in position number 4 we find gods of wealth, or in position number 11 rulers over the waters. In other cases the variants occupy

different positions in different countries, demonstrating that the variants are to a certain extent interchangeable, but always only within the four positions assigned to type. What holds for the gods likewise goes for the animals.

From Mesopotamia we know only lists of gods, from China only lists of animals, from India both a list of gods and of animals, from Java again only one of gods, and from Mexico both a list of gods and of animals, the latter also including some plants and other objects and phenomena.

In Mesopotamia and Mexico the lists consist of basically 12 single gods or animals etc., in India and Java of 12 groups of gods and animals, and from China we know both a list of 12 single animals and of 12 groups of them.

The lists of gods from Mesopotamia do not seem to have been used directly for calendar or astrological purposes. China and India have in common a system of 28 or 27 so-called lunar mansions: the corresponding lists of 28 or 27 gods and animals are clearly divided into 12 groups, that is, they follow the usual pattern, although in a different form. The Javanese list of 30 gods can be shown to be based on an original list of only 28 gods, likewise divided into 12 groups, to which two gods were added when these gods were made to preside over the so-called *wuku*-period of thirty solar days, instead of a period of 28 lunar mansions. Just as China and India have in common the system of lunar mansions, China and Mexico share a calendar system which for the naming of days and years makes use of two series of names or numbers that are different in length. In China our list of 12 is combined with another of 10. In Mexico 8 gods and animals were added to the original lists of 12, four at one extreme and four at the other, making a total of 20. These two lists of 20 were then combined with a list of 13 numbers. Two important facts emerge in relation to this Mexican addition: the gods that were added follow the same order Type I - Type II - Type III that is found in the original block of 12 gods; in the animal list no animals were added, but, with one exception, only plants and objects.

This great variety of forms and functions through which this system of grouping gods according to three basic concepts or themes expresses itself in different countries clearly shows

Foreign Religious Influences in Pre-Spanish Mexico

that the primary thing is not these forms but the classification that manifests itself in them.

In view of the combination of both a common structure and a very large number of details that are common to all of these lists, there can be no doubt in our minds as to the possibility of their having independent origins. That seems to be ruled out. Their similarities must be explained as being due to a common history.

To unravel this history of a great world system will be a complex and difficult task that can be undertaken only by a team of orientalists and mexicanists working together. Since the Sumerian civilization is the earliest in which this system is found, all other countries that have it must have derived it from there, directly or indirectly. The first country which it seems to have reached in its spread over the world would be, to judge by dates on the oracle bones that must be based on it, China, and it must be through China that this system came to Mexico, for several reasons; one, in all Asia only China and the countries within its direct sphere of influence knew the specific calendar system which the Spaniards found in vogue in Mexico and which makes use of our series of 12 gods and animals; two, Fritz Graebner has shown that in these lists, both Chinese and Mexican, several animals follow each other in the same order and with equal intervals, while domestic animals named in the Chinese list were systematically replaced in Mexico by wild animals or plants or inanimate objects and phenomena; three, calendar dates based on this system appear in Mexico in the first millennium B.C., that is at a time when, so far as we know today, the only Asiatic influences known were Chinese.

This situation forces us to postulate for China, from where we now know only lists of animals, the former existence of a list of gods as well. Actually the Chinese animal lists, both the shorter one of 12 animals and the larger one of 12 groups of animals, read like lists that originally accompanied a list or lists of gods, because types of animals that in India and Mexico belong to a specific type of god or even to a specific god within that type, in China occupy the very same positions in which we find them in the lists that accompany lists of gods. For instance, in the same position where in Mexico we find

the god Mictlantecutli who rules over the world of dead, and in the accompanying list the dog, there we also encounter the dog in the Chinese list; in the place where in Mexico stands the earth-god Xipe, with his bird the quail, and in India and Java Rudra, protector of husbandry and agriculture, with his animal the mole, there we find in China a group of three animals living likewise in or near the earth, namely the hare, badger and fox; where in Mexico we find the water goddess Chalchiuhtlicue accompanied by the rainbringing snake, there the Chinese list likewise shows the snake. In other words, the Chinese list of animals expresses the same religious, or more concretely, polytheistic ideas and classifications, as in other countries the lists of gods; and just as the latter are accompanied by a list of animals, so the Chinese lists of animals must once have accompanied a list of gods.

But the fact remains that we do not know this list and that, therefore, we are unable to study directly what must have happened along this early route of diffusion from Mesopotamia through China to Mexico. As it is, we know of this diffusion, so far as the gods themselves are concerned, only the starting and the end point.

There must, however, have existed another route of diffusion from Mesopotamia to Mexico which went through India and Southeast Asia. Since for this route we know the intermediate points through the lists from India and Java, we can study a complete series Mesopotamia-India-Java-Mexico. Without, of course, pretending to have investigated the problem thoroughly, we may even at this stage distinguish a number of contrasting situations along this route. First there are traits that seem to be unknown in Mesopotamia, but are common to India, Java and Mexico, as for instance the fact that the gods of type II either are at the same time one and many—such as Rudra in India and Java—or have with them large hosts of companions—such as Indra and Shiva in the Javanese list and Patecatl in the Mexican one. Of traits like this we are probably justified in assuming that they first arose among the Aryans, possibly before their separation from the other Indoeuropeans, and that with the rise of Hinduism and the Hinduization of Southeast Asia they were brought to Java and finally to Mexico. In other cases,

however, the innovations seem to have set in rather as part of the transition from Brahmanism to Hinduism, as, e.g., the gods with skull necklaces whom we encounter only in the Javanese list—Shiva and Ganesha—and in the Mexican one where Patecatl occupies the same position as his Hindu counterparts. In the corresponding place in the animal and plant list we find the *malinalli*-plant which may be represented pictorially either through a combination of plant and the mandibulae of a skull or through the latter alone. There is still another trait through which these three Hinduist and Mexican gods are tied together and contrasted with their Brahmanistic and Mesopotamian counterparts: this is their lunar character, for in the list from Mesopotamia and India we find in this position two solar gods, Shamash and Savitr.

These examples show that along this route our comparative material is rich enough to permit of a detailed study of what became of the original gods and their characteristics, what developments they underwent, and what new interpretations, traits and gods were added, and when and where this happened. We are still very far from tackling this tremendous undertaking systematically, but one fact seems to stand out clearly even now, that is that the Mexican list is in many respects especially close to the last link in the Asiatic part of the chain, that is, the list from Java. A beautiful example refers to the already mentioned gods Ganesha and Patecatl. Ganesha, as is well known, is always shown with an elephant's head with one tusk. In the same place that he occupies in the Javanese list, the Mexican list of animals and plants has either the *malinalli*-plant or the name "his tooth," which, without the light the Indian data shed on it, would remain well nigh unintelligible. The great Mexicanist Eric Thompson, in fact, thought the name must have been recorded wrongly, although it was recorded in two widely separated places, amongst the Quiché of Guatemala and in Metztitlan in Central Mexico.

There would, of course, seem to be nothing surprising in the fact that the Mexican lists are especially close to the list from Java. If the arrival of those lists really is, so to speak, geographically and chronologically the last step in the Hinduization of Southeast Asia, this is as it ought to be. But this

wave of Hinduism cannot possibly have reached Mexico before the third century A.D. and probably even somewhat later, and at that moment the system must have been known in Mexico for a long time, as we explained above. The diffusion through India and Java then is a second diffusion of the system, this time of the specific form which it had taken in the meantime in Brahmanistic and later Hinduistic India and Southeast Asia. It will be a fascinating task to reconstruct one day what happened in Mexico when the newly arrived Indian-Southeast Asian variant of the system clashed with the older Chinese-derived variant, which by then had very likely developed into a new Mexican variant. The difficulty, of course, is that of the Chinese variant we know only the animal list, not the list of gods. But should it not be possible one day to hypothetically reconstruct this Chinese list of gods which must have lain somewhere midway between the Mesopotamian and the Mexican lists, and on whose details a closer study of Chinese animal symbolism may shed much light? What encourages us in this hope is the fact that, side by side with the above-mentioned specific similarities with Java, the Mexican list of gods shows equally specific similarities with Mesopotamia. For instance, in both Mesopotamia and Mexico we found a heavy concentration of female deities in type III. In India and Java, on the contrary, this type, so far as our lists are concerned, is exclusively represented by male gods. It is true, however, that in the shorter Indian lists (invocations and the like) which Dumézil studied, here too the mother goddesses belong to type III. If, therefore, the contrast may not be as clear cut as it appears from our lists, there is one case where the similarity between Mesopotamia and Mexico is almost unbelievably close. In the same type III, position number 3, we find in the list of gods from Shuruppak Inanna or Ishtar, goddess both of love and of war, and in the Mexican list Tlazolteotl, equally a warlike goddess of love and birth. The latter, but apparently not the former, is also secondarily connected with water. A specially Mexican touch is that this deity not only is represented with a warrior's loin-cloth, but that giving birth is considered an act of war, and that women who die in childbed are honoured like warriors who die on the battle field. But the similarity between these two goddesses,

separated as they are by thousands of years and thousands of miles, goes even farther. If we accept Eduard Seler's very convincing demonstration that Tlazolteotl was identical with Teteoinnan, "Mother of Gods," we encounter in Mexico a custom that is clearly related to and can only be explained by the famous Mesopotamian *Hieros Gamos*, the Holy Marriage of this goddess with the king of the city state. Just as here the priestess of Inanna-Ishtar is led to the top of the ziggurat where the king receives her, thus on the festival of Tlazolteotl-Teteoinnan a girl is led to the top of the pyramid with the words: "Do not cry. Today the king will sleep with you," words that are not spoken on any other occasion. When she arrives at the top, and here is the profound transformation of this rite in Mexico, her head is being cut off. The similarity underlying this difference would be striking even if we only knew that in both cases the goddesses involved presided over the otherwise unknown combination of love and war. As it is, in addition to this, the two goddesses occupy identical positions in the lists from the two countries. In India and Java, where the lists contain not single deities but groups of them, we find in this position instead of the goddesses that combine the two aspects of war and love, separately the rain-bringing goddesses called *Sarpab*, "serpents," the equally rain-bringing wind god Vayu and the young warrior god Bhishma. Only in another variant of this type we find in Java the god Kumara or Skanda, whose domain is both war and sex. The idea of a female deity of this type is unknown, and there is, therefore, no room for an institution like the Holy Marriage of Mesopotamia. This complex Mexico must have received through a different channel, that is, via China, even though we do not know of its existence there. India and Java, on the other hand, have added something that is not visible in the Mesopotamian goddess, but in the Mexican Tlazolteotl, which is the connection with water.

Up till now we have dwelled only on what Mexico received from Asia through one or other of the two routes, and what it retained. When we have mentioned change, loss or additions, it has been only incidental to our main argument. One of the changes mentioned by us may, however, be indicative of a major trend. We are referring to the difference between the festival of

Inanna-Ishtar in Mesopotamia and that of Tlazelteotl-Teteoinnan in Mexico. In the former the woman led to the top of the stepped pyramid actually or symbolically cohabits with the king; in the latter the woman is only told that the king expects her there, but actually upon her arrival at the top she is being sacrificed.

Every student of ancient Mexican religion is aware of the central place human sacrifice holds in it. Human sacrifice was, of course, practised in the Old World too, and some jungle tribes of India even knew the Mexican technique of tearing out the heart of a still living victim. But amongst nations of a cultural development similar to that of the ancient Mexicans human sacrifice was rare and atypical—certainly not characteristic of the cult of any of the gods mentioned in our lists from Mesopotamia, India and Java. In Mexico, on the contrary, most if not possibly all gods of our list received the blood of human victims. In a specific way, however, the Mexican gods of type II seem to have been connected with this rite. The first of them, the warlike god of earth, plant growth and agriculture Xipe was even honoured with a whole sequence of different kinds of human sacrifice, and spilling of the blood of the victims on the earth as an essential part of his cult. It is true that similarly, as Eduard Seler points out, some tribes of the Indian Dekkan bury a piece of the flesh of a sacrificed girl in the field, and other similar rites are known in the later popular Hinduism, but these again are not typical of Indian religion as a whole, as human sacrifice and the offering of blood are typical of ancient Mexican religion.

If we want to study this phenomenon in its most intensive development, we must turn to the Mexican gods of type II. Let us remember that while the Indian and Javanese lists are especially rich in that they enumerate 12 *groups* of gods, in Mexico a total of 8 gods has been added to the two extremes of the original list of 12. If we now look at the 4 plus 2, that is the 6 Mexican gods of type II, and at the accompanying list of likewise 6 animals, plants, etc., we are struck by a characteristic common to practically all of them, that is, a connection not only with war—that we found in Mesopotamia—and death and destruction—as in India and especially Java—but specifically

with human sacrifice and blood, both the blood of the victims killed as well as the blood drawn from one's own body, ears, tongue, legs and genitals, blood that had to be offered to the gods so that they might continue to live and do their work.

The characteristic features of the cult of Xipe, the first of the four original gods representing this type, the "frightening lord," as he was called, have already been mentioned: several different kinds of human sacrifice in a row, together with the killing of many quail the blood of all of which had to spill on the earth over which this god ruled. In the pictorial codices he is frequently represented as sitting on the paraphernalia of human sacrifice, specially the little flags given to the victims. His special connection with war as the main source of human victims is shown by customs like the one of the city of Texcoco where the bravest captured enemies were reserved for him, and by the corresponding animal in the accompanying list which is the eagle, symbol of the warrior. "Eagle cactus fruit," was the ritual name of the heart that was offered, and "Eagle vessel," that of the receptacle for the blood.

The following god, Patecatl, is likewise characterized as warlike, and next to his figure we find again the paraphernalia of both human sacrifice and self-sacrifice, in the form of the blood covered thorn-like tips of agave leaves. The *malinalli* plant in the accompanying list may, as we have already said, be presented either by the combination of the plant and the mandibulae of a skull, or by the latter alone. The plant itself symbolized the transitory nature of things.

The third god, Xiuhtecutli, god of fire and lord of war, is accompanied in the animal etc. list by the sign "water." This combination reminds us strongly of the Mesopotamian belief that Gibil, god of fire, was the son of Enki-Ea, god of water, and of the Indian belief that Agni, god of fire, was born of the waters called Apah. But whereas in both Mesopotamia and India reference is clearly made to real water—even though they may be heavenly waters—in Mexico, as Eduard Seler has shown convincingly, *atl*, "water," *teoatl*, "divine water," or as we might say "divine liquid," and *chalchiuhatl*, "precious liquid," stood for blood. Thus the Aztec term for war, *atllachinolli*, literally "water and burning," or, translated more freely, "water and fire," that

is, "blood and fire," is a combination of the two things this god ruled over, fire and war, the victory over the enemy being represented in the codices by the burning of their temple. Thus the Asiatic concept of an intimate connection between fire and water as the two primeval elements out of which the universe was formed has been reinterpreted in Mexico in an equally profound but totally different sense, as the "elements," if we may say so, out of which the nourishment for the gods comes, war and blood, in this case the blood of immolated prisoners of war, in other cases the devotee's own blood.

The fourth god is Tecciztecatl whom Seler has interpreted as the Moon, Thompson as the Earth. The moon's image, as a matter of fact, is formed of bones, and the sign for blood is added to the figure of this god. Among the Maya Indians we find instead the God of Death, and in the Aztec list of animals etc. the sign "death."

The first god, that is the first of the two that in Mexico were added to the original group of four, is called Chalchihuatotolin, "precious turkey." While he seems specifically connected with the sacrifice of one's own blood—the symbol of blood is added to the figure of the god—, the sacrificial knife which we find in the corresponding place in the accompanying list indicates that he presided over sacrificial death as well.

Only for the sixth god Tepeyollotl, "Heart of the mountain or mountains," and his sign "house" have we been unable to establish any special relationship to war, warriors' death and human sacrifice or blood.

For this importance of blood there are certain antecedents in the Asiatic lists, but they are slim enough indeed. Bloody sacrifice—that is, bloody sacrifice of animals—was especially characteristic of the god Enlil who in the Mesopotamian list stands in the same place as Xipe in the Mexican one, that is, at the head of the gods of type II. He even had a special animal park for this purpose. Of the three others, Utu-Shamash and Zababa-Ningursu were simply warrior gods, and the fourth was a mother goddess. In India and Java we find in the same position Rudra who seems to be the only one of the whole list of 28 gods to whom blood was offered on leaves. So the Mexican figure of the "terrible lord" Xipe—Enlil was also called "lord,"

Foreign Religious Influences in Pre-Spanish Mexico

and Rudra was in his way as terrible as Xipe—has its Asiatic antecedents. But aside from this, of our whole Mexican complex War-Warrior's Sacrificial Death-Blood we find in Mesopotamia only war as such, and war was most certainly not conceived of as a means of securing prisoners to be used in human sacrifice. In Indian and Java even the war aspect has receded into the background in this group of gods, its place being taken more and more, that is, as development proceeded from Vedism through Brahmanism to Hinduism, by the idea of destruction by other means than warfare. In the Brahmanistic list only one accompanying god, Indra—whose main place is among the world ordering gods of type I—stands for war, the Goddess Nirrti represents destruction and death, and the "one-footed goat" possibly the destructive whirlwind. In Java destruction seems to be the main theme in this type, expressed principally through the central figure in each group of gods, first again Rudra, who sends disease and destruction to men and flocks, Shiva, the Great destroyer par excellence, characterized in this respect by his necklace of skulls, and farther on again Shiva, probably with a somewhat different emphasis. Of the principal gods only Indra represents here warfare. Most of the accompanying gods—in this type two who flank the principal one—represent the other and benevolent side of the latter, except Kala ("Time") in the sense of death, destruction, and a god with the curious name of "killer of the love god." All of this together, in spite of the blood offerings to Rudra, certainly is a far cry from the Mexican complex War-Human Sacrifice-Blood. In fact, the latter is in a way closer to the Mesopotamian prototype, and the Indian-Javanese development seems to have gone in a totally different direction.

In both cases we may say that, if what a nation does with ideas and institutions that reach it from abroad, what it adds to them and what it subtracts, reveals its innermost self, the spirit of Hinduism and the spirit of Mexican religion certainly are very different. So far as Mexico is concerned, the complex of War-Warrior's Sacrificial Death and Blood Offerings seems to represent the very core of its religion.

Xipe, also called Camaxtli, who was so to speak the leader of the group of destructive, warlike, blood-demanding gods of

the earth, plant growth and agriculture, was the principal god of a large part of Mexico which started on the western side of the two volcanoes (in Chalco) and continued on the eastern side where we have important centers in Huexotzingo, Tlaxcala and many other cities. It was from the first-mentioned region, Chalco, that according to an old native tradition human sacrifice originally came to the Aztecs and other peoples. It is this same region from which comes our earliest report of the curious type of warfare called "flower war," the purpose of which was not to conquer the enemy's territory but to obtain prisoners from him that were to be immolated to the gods. This type of warfare was always engaged by mutual consent of the two sides concerned. That first report speaks of a "flower war" between two groups within Chalco, the second of one between Chalco and the Tepanecs of Azcapotzalco in which the Aztecs participated as the latter's vassals. In the next war of this type with Chalco the Aztecs engaged alone, and from now on it became a standing institution amongst them, to be waged, however, exclusively against the followers of the god Xipe and naturally with their agreement, first Huexotzingo—Chalco had been conquered in the meantime—and then and foremost Tlaxcala.

Now, as Alfonso Caso suggested many years ago with very convincing arguments, and Karl Nowotny now accepts, from this very region comes Codex Borgia, the principal source for our reconstruction of the complex War-Human Sacrifice-Blood as the characteristic of type II, headed by Xipe. The great spiritual and political center of this great region was the city of Cholula, capital of the Olmecs first and the Toltecs later. It is true that this city's god was Quetzalcoatl, whose cult seems to have been free of human sacrifice. But Quetzalcoatl was considered to be the *son* of Xipe-Camaxtli, and the cities of Cholula and Tlaxcala celebrated jointly the festivals of both gods, so that their cults must have been considered as perfectly compatible at least in this region.

We might think that the great religious complex of War, Human Sacrifice and Blood first arose among the Olmecs, if it were not for the fact that the rise of that people or rather group of peoples seems to have coincided with the arrival in Mexico of Indian-Southeast-Asian ideas and institutions. Such

Foreign Religious Influences in Pre-Spanish Mexico

ideas, Hinduist as they must have been, would certainly not have given rise to that complex, much rather would they have opposed to it a cult like the one that characterizes Xipe's opposite, Quetzalcoatl. It would seem, then, that complex must be older and that it may go back to the time of the great culture of Teotihuacan.