

The Stage-Driver.

There is a magic in the calling of a stage-driver. Everybody knows and aspires to know the stage-driver; everybody is known by, and is proud to be known by, the stage-driver. The little boys remember it a month; if the stage-driver speaks to them, there is a particular satisfaction to be able to distinguish among drivers, and say it was Winkle, or it was Nason, or it was Mitchell. The stage-driver is prince of a peculiar realm; and that realm consists of the yellow coach he drives, and the high seat he occupies, and his four mettlesome horses, and forty miles of country road, and the heart of several principal roads, not to speak of ten thousand little matters of interest and pleasure, business and profit, news and gossip, with which he is connected. Hence he, like a prince, is held in reverence of the populace. Of all the people on the earth, he is the one who rolls by in a gilded coach; he is the one who rides through his immense estate with the most lordly and consequential air, and all the rest of us seem to be but poor tenants and gaping bores. It is something to speak to a stage-driver; it is a great thing to be perchance known by one who knows nobody, is nothing. To be known, to be pointed out, to have your name whispered in a bystander's ear, by one who knows everybody, affects you as if Omnipotence were speaking about you. The stage-driver differs from a steamboat captain, in that the latter is not so to be so immediately connected with his craft as the former. We meet the captain at the breakfast-table; he is nobody; he is no more than we; we can eat as well as he can. But who dare touch the stage-driver's ribbons? Who dare swing his whip?

How rapidly and securely he drives down one hill and up the next—and that with fifteen passengers and half a ton of baggage! Then how majestically he rounds to, at the door of the tavern! What delicate pomp in the movement of the four handsome horses! In what style the clond of dust, that has served as an outrider all the way, passes off when the coach stops! How the villagers—the blacksmith, the shoemaker, the thoughtful politician, and the boozey loafer that fill the stoop—grin and stare, and make their criticism!

How he flings the reins and the horses to the stable-boy, who presently returns with a splendid Congress water, and presents these from the boy with that set of air with which a king might be supposed to take his armor from the hands of a valet! There are his gloves, withal; he always wears gloves, as a Saratoga fine lady, and would no sooner touch anything without gloves than such a lady would a glass of champagne. There is, moreover, a mystery attaching to the stage-driver—a mystery deeper than the question why the carcasses of elephants are found imbedded in the ice-mountains of the Arctic—even this: Why the stage-driver is not frozen to death in our winters? His punctuality has something preternatural in it. How, in the coldest weather, in the severest storm, in fogs, in sleet, in hail, in lightning, in mud, when nobody else is abroad, the stage-driver appears, rounding the corner, just as regular and just as quiet as the old clock in the kitchen!

Four Men to be Hanged.

Four men, all of them whites, are now being held in the County Jail of Burnet County, Texas, under sentence of death—all to be executed at the same place on January 15. Their names are Benjamin Shelby, Arthur Shelby, Ball Woods, and William Smith. They were all sentenced for the murder of Benjamin McKeever. Their case, taken in its details, is one of the most interesting in the annals of criminal trials. The evidence against them, though conclusive, was entirely circumstantial. McKeever was shot from his horse at night near the residence of the Shelys, his throat then cut, and his body carried on horseback three miles and thrown into a cave. A large rock was placed on the body, and where his throat was cut, but this precaution, instead of concealing the crime, led to the arrest of the criminals. The keen eyes of a frontiersman saw that the rock had been recently placed there; so it was removed, and indications of blood found. A closer search resulted in the further finding of a paper-wadding that had been fired from a shot-gun. On examining a gun of Benjamin Shelby paper-wadding was likewise found in it, and yet another wadding that had been fired from a shot-gun like the first, was found under Shelby's doorstep. In his house was found a copy of the *Chimney Corner*, and by comparisons it was ascertained that the paper-wadding was identical with that obtained from that paper. Placed together the following enigmas could be easily read: With piece of paper or a slate, Sit around the fire both large and small; A letter make, almost an sight, And now you see what covers all. There were several other circumstances pointing strongly to the accused men as the murderers; therefore the jury that tried them did not hesitate to find them guilty of murder in the first degree. The verdict is generally approved by the citizens of Burnet County, and the latest advice from there indicate that there will probably be no interferences by Superior Courts or the Governor to prevent the decreed quadruple execution.

An Affectionate "Pop."

The *Terre Haute Express* tells the following dog story: "There were two dogs living in the same neighborhood, up town, that were attached friends, often visiting each other and making excursions together. The other day one of them sickened and died. His canine friend called to see him, and found him dead. He watched beside the body until night, and then attempted to drag it to his home. But the burden was too great for his strength. After dragging it several hundred yards, he was compelled to desist. But even then he would not leave. He stood, for a time, gazing sorrowfully on the dead, then laid down in the street, beside him, with his head on the neck of his old companion, and thus he passed the night, and thus he remained until the body was removed. Such is dog friendship."

The Champion Numismatist.

It may not be generally known that Dr. Charles Spier of this place is the oldest living and most successful numismatist in the world. He has been engaged in the collection of coins for over fifty-seven years, and has now over 4,000 pieces, representing ever species of coin ever produced in any year, or under the dominion of any sovereign or government, from the days of Semiramis and the Pharaohs down to the present time. His collection is worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. He has over 10,000 of his pieces in the vaults of the Bank of California, and 4,000, or over, less, at the Bank of California his collection is pronounced the best and most valuable in existence, not excepting those of Queen Victoria and the sultan of Turkey, which are particularly extensive and valuable. A few days ago we examined the 4,000 of his pieces which he keeps here. They proved a most interesting study. Coins of the most interesting kind, of the various kings, emperors and emperors of Rome, of Tyre, Sidon, Carthage, Nineveh, Babylon, China, Palmyra, Egypt, Japan, etc., with specimens of every year's coinage in all Christian lands from the time of Constantine till now, were exhibited in prodigal profusion. The doctor has many coins which would sell for many thousands of dollars each. His collection has been the work of a very extended lifetime. He has travelled nearly all over the world, and is constantly receiving new additions to his pieces from Europe and the East. He has gold and silver coins from the size of a very large tenpenny down to that of a pea. We wish we had the space to particularly describe some of them. The doctor, who is in easy circumstances and greatly advanced in years, though still robust for one of his age, remains in Visalia on account of the excellence of the climate. His collection is very interesting to any one appreciating the memorials of antiquity.—*Visalia (Cal.) Delta.*

Chinese Gambling.

Little by little we are arriving at an understanding of the Mongolian habits of life. The introduction of the race into Pennsylvania has given us a new insight into their "ways that are dark," and the *Pittsburgh Post*, which has never ceased to wonder at them since their pioneers reached Beaver Falls, thus describes one of their peculiar amusements:

Among the many little diversions employed by the Mongolians at Beaver Falls, none are more popular than the game called "Chapin." It is played by the pigtail with "tsen," a copper coin the value of one-tenth of a cent. The gamster is driven into reckless profligacy by the necessity of throwing a whole penny into the pool at one time. The game causes the utmost excitement, and the most intense ardor among the players. On the table is a kind of dais with holes all around it. Into this each player puts as many ten or pennies as he wishes, the number being restricted within a certain limit, and then a spring makes the pennies put in to revolve in a circle. The player who guesses the number of pennies in the pool, and the one who guesses the nearest obtains the pool. At first sight the game looks exceedingly simple, and one would imagine that each player would put in the smallest number of pennies possible. But this is not so; for each one tries to outguess the others by cunning. A player will put in sometimes a great many more pennies himself than the other, and then guess in proportion. The main amusement of the game to an outsider is the manner of playing it—the many ways which the players employ to make believe that they are putting in many pennies by enlarging their fingers or that they are putting in little by making them smaller, when they may be doing the very opposite. It is exceedingly comical and interesting, and all the time the jabbering and clattering goes on at a pace that would astonish Confucius himself.

Love at Sight.

A servant girl of no strong intellect, who lived with a lady in the neighborhood of Paisley, one day surprised her mistress by giving up her place. The lady inquired the cause, and found it was that fertile source of discussion between mistress and maid—servant—a lad. "And who is that lad?" inquired the mistress. "Oh, he's a nice lad; a lad that sits in the kirk, just for me!" "And when does he intend that he and you should be married?" "I dunna ken." "Are you sure that he intends to marry you at all?" "I dare say he does, mem." "How you had much of each other's company?" "Not yet." "When did you last converse with him?" "Deed, we hae nae conversed ava yet." "Then how should you suppose that he is going to marry you?" "Oh," replied the simple girl, "he's been lang lookin' at me, and I think he'll soon be speakin'."

The Volcanic Rocks of the Pacific Coast.

The volcanic rocks of the Pacific coast in the Sierra Nevada and Coast range consist of a cooled lava flow extending from middle California through Oregon—where it is two thousand feet thick—northward into British Columbia. In this lava region, occupying an area of not less than fifty-six thousand square miles, are about a dozen volcanoes, every one extinct, being, as Prof. Joseph Le Conte of the University of California calls them, mere mounds upon its surface. That geologist maintains that these volcanoes could not have formed forth so immense a quantity of lava, and ascribes its occurrence to fissure eruptions, instead of to the action of craters.

A Company of New York and Pennsylvania Capitalists.

A company of New York and Pennsylvania capitalists have purchased ten acres of land at McKinney's Station, on the Erie road, Pittsburg, Penn., for the purpose of establishing works for the manufacture of steel by the Bessemer process. The company has a capital of \$1,000,000.

The Emotional Nature of Dogs.

A little reflection shows that a dog approaches a man much more nearly in the matter of feeling than either of physical or mental characteristics. It is a startling fact, well brought out by Jesse in a synopsis of the dog's attributes ("Researches," chap. v.), that there are very few human passions which a dog does not share. A dog feels anger precisely as we do, and after provocation is sometimes vindictive and sometimes placable, according to his individual character. He is susceptible of hatred of the bitterest kind. He is so excruciatingly jealous that his life becomes a burden in the presence of a favored rival. His envy continually leads him to eat what he does not want lest another animal should take it, and to illustrate the fable of "The Dog in the Manger." Gluttony holds out to him temptations under which even his honesty sometimes succumbs; but, on the other hand, a dog drinks no wine, he is not emancipated. A dog mentioned by the Rev. Thomas Jackson ("Our Dog Companions," p. 48), having once been made so drunk with malt liquor that he was unable to walk up stairs, ever after declined to taste the pernicious beverage, and growled and snarled at the sight of a pewter pot. Again, as to love, Don Juan was a cold and unenterprising character compared to a dog; and as to maternal affection, the mother-dog feels it with heroic passion, starving herself to death rather than forsake her offspring. Gratitude may be almost said to be a dog's leading principle, supplanting the spirit of allegiance to his master, and ever after remembering him with true magnanimity to take evil from the hand from which he has accepted good. Regret and grief he feels so deeply that they often break his heart. Fear is a passion which dogs exhibit with singular variation, some breeds and individuals being very timorous, and others perfect models of courage; the latter characteristics and fortitude seeming to be more characteristically canine. A greyhound has been known, after breaking his thigh, to run on till the course was concluded; and in the excellent new volume "On the Dog," by Keston (p. 39), is a delightful story of a foxhound whose ferocious master flogged so savagely for "balking" (as to be out of his eye with his whip). The animal continued to hunt with the pack till the end of the chase, where, upon the human brute, a certain Colonel Thornton, "took out his scissors and severed the skin of the dog's neck, and had hung pendant during the entire run." As to hope, no one can observe the dog watching for his master's steps in Landseer's picture of "Expectation," without admitting that he knows the sentiment as well as we. Pride in a successful chase may be witnessed in every dog, and even felt in the quivering heartbeats of a greyhound who crossed and praised. That dogs have personal vanity appears from the fact that they are so manifestly dejected and demoralized when dirty and ragged by long exposure, and recover their self-respect immediately upon being washed and combed. Chivalry and magnanimity may nearly always be calculated upon in dogs, and wife-beating is an offence to which the four-footed beast never descends. The stories are endless of big dogs generously overlooking the insults of small curs, or taking them into their arms, and giving them a good licking and a punishment for their impudence, and then helping them mercifully back to land (see Jesse's "Anecdotes," p. 147). Sense of property, bifurcating into both covetousness and avarice, is common to all dogs. The kennel, rug, collar, water-basin, or bone once devoted to his use no dog ever transfers to another without indignation. Frequently he "covets his neighbor's house," and attempts to enclose himself in it, and covets his neighbor's bone, and purloins it if he dare. Even from avarice he cannot be wholly exonerated, observing his propensity to bury his treasures. Shame, humor, gratitude, and all the other emotional attributes not above enumerated, are also to be noticed in dogs.

Animal Ingenuity.

The architectural ingenuity, or rather genius, of the tarantula is a fact long familiar to naturalists, a San Diego, California, paper tells us. This insect has an exceptional development of the instinct which instructs all creatures which are not protected by nature with a warmly engendering hairy hide to warn themselves. The details of the tarantula's dwelling, down even to the matchless mechanism of the doors of its edifice, have excited the wonder of the alertest eye in natural history. The most elaborate inventions in locks and hinges of vaulted human skill are distanced by this venomous insect in the construction of the door which secures its privacy. But the tarantula, a deadly enemy exists, its master, as an incident which we are about to relate will show.

Prof. Agassiz, during his recent visit here, exhibited a special desire to be supplied with as many specimens as possible of the road-runner, of the tarantula, and of the tarantula-killer. We are not advised as to whether he was supplied with five specimens of the road-runner. This is a very timorous and incredibly swift bird. It is about the size of a pheasant; its plumage is not unlike that of the pheasant family. It has longer legs, and a slender neck and body than the pheasant. It trusts for locomotion almost altogether to its long, sinuous wings, and its flight would shame a rabbit or a hare. It is susceptible of domestication, and in time learns to come at the call of those who have petted it. But it is a hopeless thing for a stranger to try to approach this fowl.

It is as sagacious as a swift. We were put in possession of facts about the creature by Mr. Jose G. Estudillo, which excited our wonder and admiration. As we have said, there is enmity between the road-runner and tarantula. The road-runner is as noiseless as rapid. It lies in wait for the tarantula, and when it approaches it, it is awakened by the prickly cactus. Deftly and stealthily it goes on piling the prickly prickle around the devoted insect, until at last a rampart of the desired height is piled up. It then selects a specially jagged and heavy piece of cactus, and drops it on the tarantula. The last, and most successful, endeavor to rise and make its exit. It is instantly impaled upon the thorns, and the triumph of the road-runner is complete.

The Story of Stephen Girard.

The man lives in Philadelphia who when young and poor, entered a bank, and says he, "Please, sir, don't you want a little boy?" And the stately personage said, "No, little boy, I don't want a little boy." The little boy, whose heart was too full for utterance, chewing a piece of licorice stick he had bought with a cent stolen from his good mother, and with sobs plainly audible, and with great globules of water rolling down his cheeks, glided silently down the marble steps of the bank. Bending his noble form, the bank man dodged behind a door, for he thought the little was going to sly a stone at him. But the boy picked up something and stuck it in his pocket, and he said, "Come here, little boy, and the little boy did come here; and the bank man said, 'Lo, what pickest thou up?' And he answered and replied, 'A pin.' And the bank man said, 'Little boy are you good?' and he said he was. And the bank man said, 'How do you vote?' 'Excuse me, do you go Sunday to school?' and he said he did. Then the bank man took down a pen made of pure gold and flogging with pure ink, and he wrote on a piece of paper, 'St. Peter,' and he asked the little boy what it stood for, and he said 'St. Peter.' Then the bank man said it meant 'Saint Peter.' The little boy said 'Oh!' Then the bank man took the little boy by his bosom, and the little boy said 'Oh!' again, for he squeezed him. Then the bank man took the little boy into partnership, and gave him half the profits and all the capital, and he married the bank man's daughter, and now he has all his, and all his own, too.

The value iron acquires under the hammer is something wonderful. It is said that a bar of iron worth \$5 is worth \$10.50 when made into horse-shoes, \$55 when made into needles, \$29,480 in shirt buttons, and \$250,000 in balance springs of watches. Boys may, from this, see what labor is worth, and learn to value and respect it, for it is the labor the mind puts into the iron that so increases its value. Consider what would be the result if there were no iron.

All the prisoners confined in the Frankfort (Ky.) jail escaped one dark night through the roof.

A Burying Ground of Giants.

On the farm of Mr. Harrison Whaley, near Moorfield, in Carlisle Co., Ky., is a skirt of woods which possesses characteristics of deep interest. About three inches beneath the surface of the entire tract may be found innumerable bones, evidently the remains of an extinct species of the human race. Several mounds are also in the woods, and in one which has been partially explored were found skulls and bones which from their size must have belonged to a race of beings far more gigantic than the race which now inhabits the earth. In this mound were also found many clay utensils; also arrow heads cut out of the solid rock, and pipes of the same material. Such a memorial of the past states many inquiries. Was the place once a battle-ground, where the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial ground? The first seems to be the most plausible theory, inasmuch as the whole tract, covering at least fifteen acres, has multitudes of human bones but a few inches beneath the surface. It is evident that the aborigines fought to maintain the glory of their respective tribes? Or was it a common burial