

with hydrofluoric acid until the triclinic pyroxene was almost entirely dissolved. The rhombic pyroxene was then analyzed and found to possess the composition of hypersthene. The isolation and chemical analysis of the rhombic pyroxene was performed by Mr. W. F. Hillebrand of the U. S. Geological Survey.

The conclusion drawn is, that a large proportion of the supposed augite is hypersthene in the andesites. The paper is an important contribution to the micro-mineralogy of andesite, and its publication in a completed form is awaited with interest. The following chemical analysis of the andesite was made by Hillebrand:

Sp. Gr.	SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃	Fe ₂ O ₃	FeO	CaO	MgO	Na ₂ O
2.742	56.19	16.117	4.919	4.433	6.996	4.601	2.961
K ₂ O	MnO	P ₂ O ₅	Cl	H ₂ O	Total.		
2.368	trace	0.266	0.022	1.028	99.901.		

—M. E. W.

YEAR BOOK OF THE GERMAN MALACOLOGICAL SOCIETY¹—This excellent periodical has now concluded its ninth year of publication, a fact upon which malacologists may well congratulate themselves. Those only who have been personally engaged in upholding a periodical devoted to a speciality, addressed to a small audience of naturalists whose interest in their favorite study is too often counterbalanced by deficiencies of income,—they alone can realize what a successful nine years' struggle implies. The society whose organ it is, is partly an outgrowth from the Senckenbergian Museum of Frankfurt, its curators, students and friends. They began by publishing a "Nachrichtsblatt" which still flourishes in its fifteenth year, and which furnishes by its monthly or bimonthly numbers a convenient means for circulating conchological news, preliminary descriptions, obituary and business notices, proffers of exchanges, *et id omne genus*. The decay in interest and value of the much older "Malacozoologische Blätter" originated by Dr. L. Pfeiffer, probably suggested a publication more worthy to be the organ of German Malacology. The last mentioned journal after an honorable and apparently successful career of many years, became, from causes unknown to us, irregular in its appearance (numbers being sometimes a year later in publication than their ostensible date), and degenerate in quality. It also contained little matter on any group except Pulmonates and few papers of serious importance. It continued to exist however, and recently has shown signs, under the editorial management of Clessin, of a new energy and greater usefulness. We trust that the time may not be far distant when it shall regain a position worthy of its long life and its distinguished founder. It is very possible that pecuniary troubles were at the bottom of the difficulties we have referred to.

¹ *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Malakozoologischen Gesellschaft, 1882.* Frankfurt am Main. Edited by Dr. W. KOBELT: M. Diesterweg.

Whatever the source of the plan of the Frankfurt journal, its inspiration and success are due more to its editor, Dr. Kobelt, than to all other co-operating causes whatsoever. His scientific qualifications for the task are well known, apart from which he possesses an artistic pencil of rare facility which has been employed freely for the illustration of the "Jahrbuch" from the beginning; while it is an open secret that to Madame Kobelt's brush we are indebted for the tinting of the beautifully colored plates which have graced the work from time to time. This lady is an enthusiastic collector and excellent conchologist, and her labors as well as those of her husband have been carried on in the midst of household duties and the busy life of a physician in a country village. These personal details may be pardoned, since devotion, under difficulties, to the promotion of science is the highest stimulus to those in similar circumstances.

It will be rightly inferred from the above that the journal has been well edited and illustrated from the first, and that it has contained in preceding volumes some of the best malacological papers of the time. The present volume is well up to the standard of its predecessors, and contains, beside notices of current literature and items of news, a continuation of Dr. Kobelt's useful catalogues of species, the most important of which in this volume are *Fusus* and *Pisania*; contributions to the conchology of South America by Dohrn and Dunker; of the Tyrol by Vincent Gredler; of China by Mollendorff; of Central Asia and Madagascar by Dohrn; E. von Martens contributes to our knowledge of the Pulmonates of Angola and Loango; P. Hesse discourses on the conchological aspects of Greece; Jickeli and Löbbecke describe various novelties; while Schepman contributes a thorough, well illustrated and important paper on the dentition of *Hyalina*. Herr T. A. Verkruzen, who is only too well known to American students from the Rafinesquean manner in which he has lately increased the molluscan fauna of our eastern coast, has two articles on the genus *Buccinum*, treated from his own standpoint. Kobelt more soberly gives us, apropos of part of the same material, data on the *Buccinums* of the St. Petersburg Museum, many of which are valuable as Middendorf's type, while in regard to others which served as texts for Verkruzen's observations we may be thankful to get any comprehensible information. We are informed that all of these will be figured for the monograph of *Buccinum* preparing for the new edition of the "Conchylien Cabinet" by Kobelt, when those who are interested in this subject will have opportunity of judging of the value of these criticisms.

By no means the least important of the articles in this volume is the editor's account of a conchological journey to Spain, under the auspices of the Museum, with a view of investigating various points in geographical distribution, but exigencies of space compel us to cut our remarks short, with the recommendation to con-

chologists and libraries to number the "Jahrbuch" among their possessions. One suggestion may be permitted: that the future numbers should contain an exact statement of the date of publication, which could be relied on in matters of priority, a matter of some importance in these days of rivalry in research.—*Wm. H. Dall.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MINERALOGICAL AND GEOLOGICAL SECTION OF THE ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCES 1880-1881. No. 2.—This is a neatly printed little pamphlet of thirty-eight pages, containing the notes on subjects germane to the objects of the section, according to the title, during the years 1880-1881, and (to judge from Mr. Rand's last contribution on the volume C₆ of the 2d Geological Survey's publication, which did not appear till late in 1882), for this latter year also.

There are in reality but thirty-three pages devoted to science, the remaining five being filled with catalogues of members, names of authors, &c., and of these thirty-three, fourteen are of that short desultory character which make up what might be called a memorandum book of apparent facts which may one day be sifted of errors and usefully embodied into some systematic work. It is rather curious that with such a large array of amateur and professional workers in the line of these allied sciences, nineteen pages of octavo should cover the more or less completed work for three years.

There are thirty-six papers and short observations in all, of which fourteen are by Professor H. C. Lewis (secretary), and five by Mr. Theo. D. Rand (director), the latter including the only two moderately long papers in the pamphlet. These are, in reality, the only parts of the volume which can be reviewed, and it is proposed to devote a few words to them. The first of these papers is called, "Notes on the Geology of Radnor and vicinity," and is mainly a criticism of Mr. Chas. E. Hall's paper on the "Relations of the crystalline rocks in Eastern Pennsylvania" (Proc. Am. Phil. Soc., Jan. 2, 1880). Speaking of the serpentine, Mr. Rand says, that between the outcrops of the rock north-west of Radnor station and that near the Paoli, no outcrops of serpentine have been noted.

Mr. Rand doubtless refers to the description of serpentine areas in Rogers' final report, Vol. 1, p. 168, when he skips from his second belt of this rock (south of the narrow limestone trough of the upper part of Gulf creek) to his third belt near the Paoli. Mr. Hall had no occasion to mention the occurrences outside of Delaware and Montgomery counties in C₆, nevertheless in the as yet unpublished but stereotyped C₄, he does describe the outcrops in Easttown township, Chester county. These outcrops could not possibly have escaped the *observation* of any geologist who has been in the township at all. Mining operations were conducted there anterior to the publication of Rogers' report, and it seems