

and faith; altars imply victims and sacrificial ceremonies; sculpture, the existence of art; kingly palaces are the result of a strong government, wars, and conquest; sepulchral deposits reveal thoughts of another life; and hieroglyphic inscriptions, even if their key be lost, imply events deemed worthy of record, and a degree of progress toward letters.

What the personal souvenir is to the memory of dead friends, what the ancestral mansion with its portraits and other relics is to family memories and pride of descent, what the ancient battle-ground with the monument commemorating early struggles for liberty is to national patriotism, what the familiar hill, valley, stream, and tree to recollection and love of home,—all this and more are material relics to the study of ages gone by. Destroy such relics in the case of the individual, the family, and the nation, and imagine the effect on our interest in a past, which is, however, in nearly every instance clearly recorded. What would be the consequence of blotting from existence the ruins that stand as monuments of a past but vaguely known even in the most favorable circumstances through the medium of traditionary and written annals? Traditional archæology, fascinating as its study is and important in its results, leaves always in the mind a feeling of uncertainty, a fear that any particular tradition may be in its present form, modified willfully or involuntarily in passing through many hands, a distortion of the original, or perhaps a pure invention; or if intact in form its primary signification may be altogether misunderstood. And even in the case of written annals, more definite and reliable of course than oral traditions, we cannot forget that back beyond a certain time impossible to locate in the distant past, history founds its statements of events on no more substantial basis than popular fable.

It is true that false reports may be made respecting the discovery or nature of ruined cities and other monuments; and relics may be collected and exhibited

which
it is s
Chich
the cr
native
quaria
may h
dinavi
inscrip
time t
some
terfeit
falsity
as will
noted
said, f
describ
plorer.
or of n
well-au
not acc
erally,
the rep
has not

The
high de
value i
source o
nals oth
tinued r
by indic
peoples
arts of m
the prec
sculptur
they are
they thr
these an