

how much the assertion is still a matter of doubt. (1) It is the same with articles of human manufacture. The fragments of iron found at Montmartre, are points of the tools which the workmen employ in blasting, and which sometimes break in the stone. (2)

Yet human bones preserve equally well with those of animals under similar circumstances. There is no difference between the human mummies found in Egypt, and those of quadrupeds. I collected, in the excavations made some years since in the old church of St. Genevieve, some human bones interred beneath the first race, which may have belonged to some prince of the family of Clovis, which have still preserved their forms very accurately. (3) We do not find in ancient fields of battle that the skeletons of men are more altered than those of horses, if we allow for the difference of size; and we find among the fossils, animals as small as rats still very perfectly preserved.

All these tend to confirm the assertion, that the human race did not exist in the countries where

ded shells of the neighbouring sea, and land shells still to be found alive in the island, and which are known as the *bulimus Guadaloupenensis* of Ferrusac.

(1) See *Le Traité des Petrifications* of M. de Schlotheim. Gotha, 1820, page 27; and his letter in the *Isis*, of 1820; 8th No. Suppl. No. 6.

(2) It is perhaps necessary to make some mention of the fragments of sand-stone, of which some talk was made last year (1824,) in which a man and horse were said to have been found petrified. The very fact of its being a man and horse, with the flesh and skin, which must have been visible, was sufficient to inform the whole world that it was a *lusus naturæ*, and not a real petrification.

(3) Fourcroy has given an analysis. *Ann. du Museum*, tome x. p. 1.