

tracts from Fischer, finds no place in it, though here and there an isolated fact is planted side by side with some crude observation of the first quarter of this century. Thering's classification, the most pregnant and suggestive (if not the most successful) attempt in many years, is not even mentioned. There is shown no grasp of the subject; and, on contested questions of importance, the treatment recalls a man in a menagerie poking up the animals through the bars. Errors of fact and of the types could be cited in abundance; but it is not necessary to descend to small details; the real fault is with the architecture, not with the bricks.

THE PARIS METEORITES.

Guide dans la collection de météorites du Muséum d'histoire naturelle. Paris, Masson. 1882. 40 p. 8°.

THIS little work of some forty pages is valuable as giving in brief the results of the extended studies upon meteorites by Prof. A. Daubrée and his assistant Dr. Stanislas Meunier. Besides furnishing a catalogue of all the specimens to be found in the collection, three hundred and six in number, it discusses the origin, characters, classification, etc., of meteorites. These are regarded as having a common origin, and possessing types corresponding to rocks and structures of terrestrial origin, i.e., to lavas, dunite, lherzolite, serpentine, breccias, pumice, metallic veins, metamorphic rocks, etc. The classification is one which, in its simpler divisions, has been well received, but in the minor subdivisions is but little known; hence it is a matter of interest to place this classification in its latest phase before our readers.

METEORITE.

I. HOLOSIDERITE.

Octibbehite, tazewellite, nelsonite, catarinite, braunite, caillite, schwetzscheite, jewellite, campbellite, burlingtonite, tucsonite, lenartite.

II. SYSSIDERITE.

Pallasite, atacamaite, brahinite, deesite, lodranite.

III. SPORASIDERITE.

1. *Polysiderite*. — Toulite, logronite.
2. *Oligosiderite*. — Aumalite, chantonnite, aiglite, montrejite, parnallite, luceite, canellite, mesminite, belajite, butsurite, manbhoomite, banjite, limerickite, menite, bustite, richmondite, tieschite, erxlebenite, quincite, stawropolite, tadjerite, rutlamite, renazzite.
3. *Cryptosiderite*. — Howardite, ornansite, chladnité.

IV. ASIDERITE.

Igastite, rodite, eukrite, shalkite, chassignite, bokkevelite, orgueillite.

The principal divisions, as will be readily seen, are based on the presence or absence of iron, and its relations to the associated sili-

cates when they are present. The subdivisions are named from the localities at which the specimen chosen as a type happened to fall. It is unfortunate that the bibliographical index, professing to give the principal works relating to meteorites, should be so very imperfect, — giving only *eight* works and papers, omitting such as the classical publications of Chladni in 1819, Schreibers, and Partsch, and the more recent ones of G. Rose, Shepard, Clark, Harris, Rammelsberg, Kesselmeyer, Phipson, Lawrence Smith, and others.

EARLY ORIENTAL HISTORY.

Histoire des anciens peuples de l'orient; par LOUIS MÉNARD. Paris, 1882. 468 p. 8°.

THIS work contains the outlines of Egyptian, of Assyrio-Babylonian, and of Israelitish history. Parts i. and ii. are profusely illustrated from the monuments. Part ii. (Assyria and Babylonia) covers 102 pages, and discusses in five chapters the region of the Tigris and Euphrates, the primitive times, the Sargonidae, the new Chaldean empire, the monuments, religion, manners, and customs. The author tells in a pleasing way what he knows of these topics; but, unfortunately, he is not a student of Assyriology, nor has he informed himself as to the latest results of Assyrian study. His authorities are the Old Testament, Berosus, and the classic writers and the older generation of explorers and decipherers (Botta, Layard, Rawlinson, Hincks). Of the younger generation, with one or two exceptions, he knows absolutely nothing (Smith and Sayce in England; Halévy, Pognon, and Guyard in France; Schrader, Delitzsch, and others in Germany). Hence he quotes (p. 261) from Berosus the Chaldean legend of the deluge, and points out its similarity to the biblical account, without even mentioning the cuneiform deluge story discovered by the lamented George Smith. On p. 262 he tells us that the name 'Babylon' seems to mean 'gate of god.' Certainly this meaning is above possible doubt. He informs us (pp. 262, 263) that the people of Accad and Sumer are of different race; the former being Cushites, and speaking a language approaching the Semitic tongue, the latter being of the Scythic or Turanian stock. He has evidently never heard of Paul Haupt, who has shown that the peoples of Sumer and Accad spoke the same language with dialectical differences, — a language utterly unlike any Semitic tongue. He says (p. 273) that 1112 B.C. is the oldest date which can be established for the history of Assyria. He should