various lines of investigation to one another becoming known, these lines would aid in solving many of the problems which have hitherto been shrouded in obscurity. is a noticeable fact that in all the mound explorations yet made not a single stone with anything like letters or hieroglyphics inscribed thereon, or by which the language of the mound builders might be judged, has been discovered. Neither has anything been found to justify the theory that they belonged to a highly-civilized race, or that they had attained a higher status than the Indian. mounds furnish promiscuous heaps of bones, which have evidently been cast into a heap with a mound built over them; and the skeleton burials alluded to by the old Jesuit Fathers have been described in a former issue of this journal. A common error assigns these bones as those of warriors slain in some great battle; but the condition and position of these bones show evidence of burial long after the flesh had been removed, and sometimes after long exposure to the air. Again, although many of these mounds belong to pre-historic times, and some of them to the far distant past, yet the evidence of contact with European civilization is found in many, where it cannot be attributed to intrusive burial, thus showing they were built subsequent to the European discovery of this continent. In the older records of this country very little mention is made of mounds. They are only once alluded to in Relations des Jesuites, and no mention is made in the writings of the Recollects of such. In Colden's history of the Five Nations, 1755, it is stated, "a round hill was sometimes raised over a grave." Dupratz, in 1758, noticed ancient earthworks on the Mississippi, but knew nothing of their origin. A Philadelphia periodical, 1789, gives an account of works near Detroit, observed by Heckewelder, which, he says, he was informed had been built by Indians. Apart from these, no other early writings mention mounds nor earthworks. But many of the early writers mention