Invited Review

Ernst Florens Friedrich Chladni (1756–1827) and the origins of modern meteorite research

URSULA B. MARVIN

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA Author's e-mail address: umarvin@cfa.harvard.edu

(Received 1996 April 16; accepted in revised form 1996 July 3)

Abstract-In 1794, Ernst F. F. Chladni published a 63-page book Über den Ursprung der von Pallas gefundenen und anderer ihr änlicher Eisenmassen und über einige damit in Verbindung stehende Naturerscheinungen in which he proposed that meteor-stones and iron masses enter the atmosphere from cosmic space and form fireballs as they plunge to Earth. These ideas violated two strongly held contemporary beliefs: (1) fragments of rock and metal do not fall from the sky, and (2) no small bodies exist in space beyond the Moon. From the beginning, Chladni was severely criticised for basing his hypotheses on historical evewitness reports of falls which others regarded as folk tales and for taking gross liberties with the laws of physics. Eight years later, the study of fallen stones and irons was established as a valid field of investigation. Today, some scholars credit Chladni with founding meteoritics as a science; others regard his contributions as scarcely worthy of mention. Writings by his contemporaries suggest that Chladni's book alone would not have led to changes of prevailing theories; thus, he narrowly escaped the fate of those scientists who propose valid hypotheses prematurely. However between 1794 and 1798, four falls of stones were witnessed and widely publicized. There followed a series of epoch-making analyses of fallen stones and "native irons" by the chemist Edward C. Howard and the mineralogist Jacques-Louis de Bournon. They showed that all the stones were much alike in texture and composition but significantly different from the Earth's known crustal rocks. Of primary importance was Howard's discovery of nickel in the irons and the metal grains of the stones. This linked the two as belonging to the same natural phenomenon. The chemical results, published in 1802 February, persuaded leading scientists in England, France, and Germany that bodies fall from the sky. Within a few months, chemists in France reported similar results and a new field of study was inaugurated internationally-although opposition lingered on until 1803 April, when nearly 3,000 stones fell at L'Aigle in Normandy and transformed the last skeptics into believers. Chladni immediately received full credit for his hypothesis of falls, but decades passed before his linking of falling bodies with fireballs received general acceptance. His hypothesis of their origin met with strong resistance from those who argued that stones formed within the Earth's atmosphere or were ejected by lunar volcanoes. After 1860, when both of these hypotheses were abandoned, there followed a century of debate between proponents of an interstellar vs. a planetary origin. Not until the 1950s did conclusive evidence of their elliptical orbits establish meteorite parent bodies as members of the solar system. Thus, nearly 200 years passed before the questions of origin that Chladni raised finally were resolved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ironmasses, 1794 April	
Meteoritics in the Late-Eighteenth and	
Late-Twentieth Centuries	
Chladni's Hypotheses	
Firehalls	
Stones and Irons from the Sky	551
Cosmic Origin	551
Atmospheric Origin	552
Chladni's Compilation of Witnessed Falls	552
Fichstädt Bayaria 1785	552
Tabor Bohemia 1753	552
Hraschina (Agram) Croatia 1751	552
Pre-eighteenth-Century Falls	554
Additional Fighteenth-Century Falls	554
Native Irons	556
The Pallas Iron Siberia 1772	556
The Mesón De Fierro Campo del Cielo Argentina	557
The Aken (Aachen) Mass	557
German Desponses to Chladni 1704	558
Two Witnessed Falls 1794 1795	
Siena Italy 1704	
Wold Cottage England 1705 December	560
Edward King On Fallen Stange, 1706	
Edward King On Failen Stones, 1/90	
News Deleting to Motocrites Coleconogon Europe	
News Relating to Meteorites Crisscrosses Europe	
Stones Kept Failing	

Portugal, 1796	
Mulletiwu, 1795; Bielava Tserkov, 1796; Salles, 1798	
Benares India 1798	564
Chemistry and Controversy: 1800–1803	564
Previous Chemical Analyses of Meteorites	
Edward C. Howard Assembles Samples For Analysis	
A New Planet: Between Mars and Juniter	565
The Great Debates	565
Analyses By Edward Howard and	
Jacques-Louis de Bournon: 1802	
A Second Small Planet: Between Mars and Jupiter	568
Lunar Volcanic Origin: Laplace's Hypothesis?	
The Debates Intensify	
New Falls: Fresh Evidence	
The Fall at Salles, France, 1789: A Belated Report, 1803	
De Drée, 1803: The First Meteorite Classification	571
The Fall at L'Aigle, France, 1803	
Joséf Izarn: Lithologie Atmospherique, 1803	
Metallography Of Irons: Thomson, 1804;	
Von Widmanstätten, 1808	574
Two More Small Planets Discovered	
between Mars and Jupiter	576
Pierre M. S. Bigot de Morogues: The First History	
of Meteoritics, 1812	577
Meteorite Origins: From Chladni's Time to the Present	577
Origins Within the Earth-Moon System	577
Asteroidal versus Interstellar Origin, circa 1854-1959	579
Meteorites from Asteroids and Other Planets	581



FIG. 1. Ernst Florenz Friedrich Chladni. (Reproduced by courtesy of Deutschen Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.)

Dremature Ideas in Meteoritics	
Two Treatises by Franz Güssmann, 1785 and 1803	
The "Firsts" of William Thomson, 1794 and 1804	
Ironmasses by Ernst Chladni, 1794	
Catastrophic Impacts	
Conclusions: The Founding Of Meteoritics	
Chladni's Views on the New Science: 1809	

IRONMASSES, 1794 APRIL

At Eastertime in 1794 April, a book by Ernst F. F. Chladni (Fig. 1) was published simultaneously in two cities: Leipzig, to reach physicists and astronomers in Germany, and Riga, to reach a German-reading public in northern Europe. The book, On the Origin of the Mass of Iron found by Pallas and of other similar Ironmasses, and on a Few Natural Phenomena Connected Therewith, commonly is called Ironmasses (Fig. 2). By featuring in his title a large mass of iron described by Pallas, Chladni sought to capture some of the widespread interest aroused by the book of travels in Siberia published in 1776 by the celebrated German natural historian Peter Simon Pallas (1741–1811). The Few Natural Phenomena of the title were fireballs and fallen stones and irons.

From boyhood, Chladni, born in Wittenberg in 1756 November 30, held strong interests in mathematics, physics, music, and natural history. However, at the insistence of his father, a professor and Dean of Jurisprudence at the University in Wittenberg, he studied law and philosophy at Leipzig and Wittenberg. In 1782, he earned his doctorate of philosophy and law at Leipzig. Soon afterward his father died, leaving him no fortune other than the freedom to pursue his interests. In 1787, Chladni earned his first measure of fame with *Entdeckungen über die Theorie des Klanges*, a book on the theory of sound waves. His continuing studies on that subject and his inventions of musical instruments led to Chladni being called "the father of acoustics."

Chladni's interest in fireballs and falling bodies was aroused during a conversation at Göttingen with Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1744-1799). Aged and crippled by that time, Lichtenberg ranked among the foremost physicists and natural philosophers in Europe. Lichtenberg's own interest sprang in part from having witnessed a bright, spindle-shaped fireball at Göttingen at 6:30 in the evening of 1791 November 12. As a result of their discussions, Chladni spent the next three weeks at the library in Göttingen where he compiled historical reports of 24 well-documented fireballs and 18 witnessed falls of masses of stone and iron. Chladni found that the descriptions were so astonishingly similar from place to place and century to century that, to his lawyer's ear, the eyewitnesses were telling the truth: falling masses of iron and stone are genuine natural phenomena and not the fantasies of unlettered observers. He then linked the masses with fireballs, arguing that the falling bodies become incandescent as they plunge through the Earth's atmosphere. Finally, in order to explain the exceedingly high apparent velocities of fireballs, and the fact that fireballs and shooting stars appear from every direction in the sky, he proposed the radical hypothesis that the masses originate in cosmic space.

With the physicists and astronomers of his time, Chladni shared mistaken ideas about the huge sizes of fireballs. He erred in supposing that high-altitude shooting stars, which light up only briefly, trace the passage of very small bodies through the upper atmosphere and out again into space, and he also erred in postulating that certain low-altitude meteors consist of spongy materials that rise from the Earth and catch fire. Nevertheless, every pioneer of a new field is allowed a few errors, and ultimately Chladni proved to have been so right so early about his principal hypotheses that today many meteoriticists share the view expressed by Wolfgang Czegka (1993:376): "Chladni founded meteoritics as a science by this paper."

Others, more cautious, credit Chladni with laying the groundwork for meteoritics¹ but question whether any one person founds a new science. A warning against such claims was issued in 1982 by Reijer Hooykaas (1906–1994), the distinguished historian of science in The Netherlands. He argued that too many authors develop a tendency to hero-worship and then exaggerate the intellectual virtues of their heroes and overlook the merits of earlier and contemporary scholars. Hooykaas (1981–1982:22) wrote,

Like most saints, those of the Church Scientific seem to perform miracles and, in some cases, they give birth to a new science, which before they appeared on the scene, existed at best in an embryonic state.

As one example, Hooykaas cited the following statement by R. Marcard in his 1938 history of chemistry and alchemy:

Chemistry, like Minerva of old, sprang fully grown from the head of a most eminent French savant named Lavoisier.

We know better about chemistry. The roots of modern chemistry were established well before 1789 when Antoine-Laurent de Lavoisier (1743–1794) issued his *Traité élémentaire de Chimie* in which he enunciated the principle of conservation of mass and provided a wealth of new insights on chemical reactions and combinations. Earlier contributions of importance included the works of Torbern Bergman (1735–1784) in Sweden who had described the apparatus and techniques for performing wet chemical analyses of minerals, including the alkali fusion method of bringing silicates into solution.

With respect to meteoritics, Chladni gave full credit to Lichtenberg for providing him not only with information and ideas but with suggestions on how he could most profitably carry out an investigation of fireballs and fallen masses. Chladni (1803:323) wrote:

The initial idea for my book on such masses I had from Lichtenberg, whose outstanding talent truly was to throw out a few thoughts that gave new insights and could lead to further investigations...In our conversation in Göttingen in February, 1793² he told me that if all circumstances about fireballs were considered they could best be thought of not as atmospheric but as cosmic phenomena, that is to say that they are something foreign that arrive as bodies which came from outside of our atmosphere...he suggested that I search the "Philosophical Transactions" and other sources for reports of fireballs for which good trajectories had been recorded, and, for comparison, to search for reports of fallen masses.

Clearly, then, meteoritics did not spring either exclusively or full grown from the brow of Chladni. Nor did it spring solely from that of Lichtenberg, who spoke of reports in the literature and discussions with other physicists. Nevertheless, to borrow Hooykaas' phrase, meteoritics was in an embryonic state before Chladni published his book, and eight years later it was established as a new branch of scholarly inquiry. The recent 200th anniversary of the publication of Chladni's Ironmasses makes this an appropriate time to ask how much of the new science was founded upon his book? How did Chladni's contemporaries regard his ideas? Who else, or what other factors contributed to the origins of meteoritics? Would meteoritics have arisen when it did if Chladni had not written his book? How long did it take for meteoritics to gain recognition as an important branch of science? In seeking answers to these questions, this paper will review the beginnings of meteoritics over the turn of the nineteenth century and briefly trace ideas of meteorite origins up to the present time³.

Ueber ben

Urfprung

ber von Pallas gefundenen

und anderer ihr ähnlicher

Eisenmassen,

und über einige bamit in Berbindung ftebende

Naturerscheinungen.

von

Ernst Florens Friedrich Chladni,

in Blicenberg, der Phil. und Nechte Doctor, der Berliner Sciellichaft Naturf. Freunde Mitgliche, und der tonigl. Societät der Wiffenschaften zu Gottiugen Correspondenten.

> Riga, bey Johann Friedrich Hartfnoch. 1794.

FIG. 2. The title page of Chladni's book, Ironmasses..., 1794. (From reprint edition, 1974, University of Arizona Press.)

Meteoritics in the Late Eighteenth and Late Twentieth Centuries

One answer to the final question listed above is provided in the article on Chladni in *The Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, which aimed to summarize the lives and contributions of leading scientists around the world from the fifth century B.C. to 1990. The opening sentences on Chladni deliver a profound shock (Dostrovsky, 1971, 3:258):

Except for a few publications on meteorites, in which he proposed their extraterrestrial origin, Chladni devoted his research to the study of acoustics and vibration. His most important work was in providing demonstrations of the vibrations of surfaces, using the sand pattern technique which he devised.

So much for the "Founder of Meteoritics"! Indeed, so much for meteoritics! The science itself is given the back of the hand by this physicist, and, in effect, by the *Dictionary*'s editorial board headed by Charles C. Gillespie, the distinguished scholar who introduced history of science into the curriculum at Princeton University in 1956.

To a meteoriticist, Dostrovsky's statement reveals a breathtaking ignorance of Chladni's greatest accomplishments. But we scarcely could find a better illustration of how very inconsequential meteoritics appeared to some of our leading historians of science as recently as 25 years ago. This tells us that nearly two centuries were to pass before the Space Age would establish meteoritics as more than a narrow specialty.

Today, meteoritics serves as a crucial link between astrophysics, planetary science, and earth science. Unfortunately, if meteoritics is gaining more notice from the broader scientific community and the public than it received in the biosketch of Chladni in the *Dictionary* of Scientific Biography, this may result not so much from discoveries of amino acids or extra-solar grains in meteorites as from the dramatic impact scenario for the extinction of the dinosaurs.

In Chladni's time, acoustics and meteoritics, the two new realms of inquiry to which he devoted his energies, were both very marginal to physics. Thus, although he was awarded a number of honors during his lifetime, Chladni never received a university appointment. To the day of his death at age 71, he earned his living by traveling over Europe with horse and carriage giving lectures and demonstrations. A letter dated 1824 June 22, from the physicianastronomer Wilhelm Olbers (1758–1840) in Bremen to Carl F. Gauss (1777–1855) describes the situation (Schilling, 1900, 2:321):

Dr. Chladni is here again to give lectures on acoustics and meteorites...I have gladly given him his fee; only with the understanding that he will not require me to attend every one of his 12 or 14 lectures. It is truly sad that this, in many ways, deserving man has found no institution to award him a position with a salary, and at age 67 he must seek, in this way, to escape the miseries of poverty.

CHLADNI'S HYPOTHESES

Moving from Chladini's own fate to that of his ideas, let us examine his three hypotheses of 1794 that are accepted, wholly or in part, today. They are: (1) masses of stone and iron do, in fact, fall from the sky; (2) they form fireballs as they plunge through the atmosphere; (3) the bodies originate in cosmic space as either: (a) primordial masses that never aggregated into planets or (b) fragments of planets disrupted by explosions from within or collisions from without.

Fireballs

Chladni devoted the first part of his book to a discussion of fireballs (Feuerkugeln) and meteors (Sternschnuppen—"shooting stars"), which he argued were similar phenomena except that the latter are small bodies that streak through the upper atmosphere and out again into space. Fireballs are spectacular phenomena that first appear as small points or streaks of light at very high altitudes and then expand in size as they plunge obliquely toward the Earth. Some were reported to surpass the diameter of the full Moon and the brilliance of the Sun. Typically, fireballs lost their luminosity several kilometers above the Earth and left behind long smoky trails. Many fireballs were accompanied by thundering detonations and "horrid hissing sounds." Chladni listed the 20 best-described fireballs that were observed between 1676 and 1783, giving their estimated beginning and end points, apparent sizes, velocities, and the number and force of their explosions. Eighteen of the fireballs were observed in Europe and two in North America.

One particularly famous fireball discussed by Chladni (1794:13) streaked down the night sky at 10:30 P.M. on 1771 July 17. It first appeared over Sussex, England, passed over Paris, and ended with a huge explosion over Melun, France, 30 miles farther southwest. It caused such a sensation that the Académie Royale des Sciences commissioned Jean-Baptiste Le Roy (1720-1800) to conduct the first formal inquiry into the passage of a fireball. Observers told Le Roy that the fireball looked larger than the full Moon and changed its appearance before it exploded (Fig. 3). Some of them estimated that it traveled the entire 180 miles in four seconds. Faced with such an unimaginable velocity, Le Roy stretched the time to 10 seconds to yield the more credible velocity of 18 miles/second, which is equal to the orbital velocity of the Earth itself (Le Roy, 1771:665). Some observers near Melun reported that a few glowing pieces seemed close to the ground after the fireball exploded, but Le Roy suggested that the explosion might have ignited some components of the lower atmosphere.

The apparent sizes of fireballs were as problematic as their velocities. Astronomers had determined the Moon's mean distance from the Earth as nearly 240,000 miles and its diameter at about 2,200 miles (Burke, 1986:19). From this, they calculated that a fireball looking as large as the full Moon at an altitude of 55 miles must be half a mile in diameter. Le Roy estimated that the fireball of 1771 was 0.6 miles in diameter. Larger fireballs at lower altitudes were thought to be up to two miles in diameter. The obvious consequences if a fireball were to plunge into a city were not lost on anyone, but Le Roy assured his readers that no fireball could strike the Earth as a flaming mass because it would self-destruct on entering the dense lower atmosphere. Le Roy suggested that fireballs might be some kind of electrical phenomena but also said that the subject needed more study.

Chladni systematically reviewed and rejected all the common explanations of fireballs—that they were related to the zodiacal light or the aurora, were clouds or streaks of inflammable gases in the upper atmosphere, or were manifestations of lightning or other electrical phenomena. He noted that several astronomers had surmised that fireballs were comet-like bodies orbiting the Sun. This idea granted a cosmic origin to fireballs but did not endow them with solid nuclei that could reach the ground.

Chladni declared that fireballs form when solid bodies traveling at cosmic velocities undergo frictional heating in the atmosphere. To account for their prodigious sizes, Chladni hypothesized (incorrectly) that, during flight, the solid masses heat to incandescence, melt completely, expand to enormous sizes, and explode from the build up of gas pressures. As did all physicists of his time, Chladni thought in terms of ordinary combustion and assumed that the matter burning must be about the size of the fire. Not until the mid-nineteenth century would scientists begin to understand that fireballs are incandescent auras of ionized atmosphere surrounding much smaller solid bodies, and that these bodies dwindle in size as thin layers of melt on their forward surfaces fly off in a trail of glassy droplets. Incandescence ceases when the bodies decelerate to the velocity of free fall. This commonly occurs at altitudes of 5-20 km above the Earth's surface; heights of the same order as those calculated for the end points of fireballs by Chladni and his contemporaries.

In our own time scientists have learned that the detonations are sonic booms generated by shock waves set up by the body's supersonic flight in the atmosphere. Observers on the ground hear the



FIG. 3. Le Roy's illustration of the great fireball of 1771 July 17. His caption reads: "The different appearances in which it was seen. In the first, Figure A, it has assumed the shape of a drop before the explosion. In the second, B, it is pear-shaped just before the instant of explosion. The third, D, represents the meteor as it was seen by M. Landsman (Professor of Fortifications at the École Militaire), from Boulevard 9, sometime before the explosion." (There is no view C.) (From Le Roy, 1771:716.)

terminal explosions first, sometimes followed by a great rumbling as a succession of shock waves arrives from higher in the trajectory. The hissing sounds often reported during the passage of fireballs are believed to be genuine, but they remain poorly understood (Buchwald, 1975, 1:31)

Stones and Irons from the Sky

Fireballs are rare but they may be seen by thousands of witnesses. No one in Chladni's time disputed their existence. Falls of meteorites always are local events with few, if any, witnesses. They are easy to deny. In his book, Chladni recounted eyewitness reports of 18 falls of "meteorische Stein-und Eisenmasses" (the word "meteorite" was coined later) beginning with the fall of an iron in Lucania about A.D. 56 and ending with the fall of a stone at Eichstädt, Bavaria, in 1785. He also discussed masses of so-called "native iron" that had been discovered far from any volcanic activity or sites of prehistoric smelting operations, and he argued that they, too, must have fallen from the sky. Several years later, Chladni (1797:29) wrote that when he finished his book he hesitated to publish it because of the hostile reactions to be expected. Why did he expect hostile reactions?

Toward the close of the eighteenth century, when Enlightenment ideas dominated thought throughout Europe, Chladni was reviving the ancient concept of things falling from the sky that had been dismissed a century earlier as a vulgar superstition. He also was gainsaying 2000 years of wisdom, inherited from Aristotle and confirmed by Isaac Newton, that no small bodies exist in space beyond the Moon. It is hard to imagine a more radical departure than Chladni's from a generally accepted body of knowledge.

Eighteenth-century physicists and astronomers were well aware that from time immemorial many peoples had believed in the fall of stones and fragments of iron from the sky—as well as in rains of blood, milk, wool, flesh, and gore—and that in both the old and the new worlds fallen irons had been venerated as signs from heaven and placed in shrines or burial mounds. In addition, certain earthy materials of odd shapes were believed to have fallen as "thunderstones" or "lightning stones." Chief among these were objects we now recognize as belemnite fossils, globular concretions of pyrite or marcasite, fossil shark's teeth, and prehistoric hammers and axeheads. Depictions of such "falling stones" wreaking destruction on Earth are found in numerous old works (*e.g.*, Fig. 4, upper), but close-up sketches of them (Figs. 4, middle and lower) were first published in 1565 by the Swiss natural historian, Conrad Gesner (1516–1565).

By the mid-eighteenth century, savants understood that minerals form within the Earth and fossils are petrified remains of living things. Contrary to expectations, observations in the Americas had shown that primitive men possessed both the skill and motivation to fashion stone implements without the aid of metal tools.⁴ Consequently, they could not point to any objects in their natural history collections that necessarily had "fallen from the sky." Furthermore, most eighteenth-century scholars rejected an old belief that solid bodies can aggregate from dust within the atmosphere through the action of lightning or the combustion of flammable gases. That left no sources of supposedly fallen stones and irons except volcanoes and hurricanes. Westrum (1978:467) pointed out that the naturalists of the time had shed the Renaissance fascination with ancient authors and popular lore, on which Chladni had relied almost exclusively, and had come to distrust any phenomenon that they could not subject to observation or experiment. They had no possible way

of verifying eyewitness reports of falls, and so most savants of the Age of Enlightenment came to regard the very idea of objects from the sky as flouting both common sense and the laws of physics. An origin outside the atmosphere was not even to be considered.

Cosmic Origin

When he spoke of cosmic space, Chladni's vision extended from the outer fringes of the Earth's atmosphere to the reaches of interstellar space. Noting that fireballs and shooting stars enter the atmosphere from every direction at velocities much higher than those



FIG. 4. Sixteenth-century sketches of fallen stones. (upper) A spherical ceraunia splits open a tree while a small, triangular glossopetra is about to dispatch a man already prone from the blast (Reich, 1517; courtesy of Prof. Owen Gingerich, Harvard University). (middle) "Fallen belemnites" (Gesner, 1565:91). (lower) One "Donneraxt" (Thunder-axe) and three "Donnerkeil" (Thunder hammers). Stone "A" was said to have plunged through a wind-mill at Torgaw, Saxony, on 1561 May 17. Stone "D" split an oak tree with great force at Siptitz; the farmers dug it out and took it to the tax collector at Torgaw (Gesner, 1565:64; courtesy of Smithsonian Institution Libraries). People marveled that these thunderstones looked so much like useful tools.

attributable to the force of gravity, Chladni (1794:22) concluded that they are unrelated to the Earth or the Sun. He pictured them as small masses of primordial material that formed in deep space and never accumulated into planets, or as debris from the formation, destruction, and reaccumulation of planets—or of whole planetary systems.⁵ Chladni (1794:85) postulated that the individual masses move through space in whatever direction they originally were propelled until they are captured by a large body.

With his hypothesis of cosmic origin, Chladni was challenging the almost universally accepted principle that aside from the great bodies—the fixed stars, comets, and planets—all space beyond the Moon is empty except for an ineffable æther. Aristotle had said so in the fourth century B.C., and Isaac Newton (1642–1727) had declared it again in 1704. By Newton's time, observations by Tycho Brahe (1546–1601) had removed comets from the Earth's atmosphere and placed them among the bodies beyond the Moon. Thus, Newton wrote (1704:367):

...therefore, to make way for the regular and lasting Motions of the Planets and Comets, it's necessary to empty the Heavens of all Matter, except perhaps some very thin Vapours, Steams, or Effluvia arising from the Atmospheres of the Earth, Planets, and Comets, and from such an exceedingly rare aethereal medium as we describe above.

Newton felt that the æther was needed to transmit light and the force of gravity across the reaches of the cosmos. Like Aristotle, Newton viewed each of the great bodies as a self-contained entity to which nothing may be added or lost. Only in the mundane realm between the Earth and Moon did these two philosophers allow all the messy disturbances the Greeks called watery, airy and fiery meteors—clouds, rain, snow, hail, tempests, whirlwinds, lightning, aurorae, shooting stars, fireballs.

Chladni saw no physical basis for the claim that outer space is empty. Having presented his evidence for the existence of small bodies in space, he declared (1794:56) that to deny their presence is as arbitrary as to assert it; unless we assume that the universe has remained completely unchanged from the beginning, we must admit that changes have taken place in planets—or in whole planetary systems. The evidence, he said, favors the latter conclusion and observations, not unproved hypotheses, should decide the matter. But who would listen to Chladni challenging the elegant, mechanistic universe of the great Isaac Newton?

Other critics charged that Chladni's idea of bodies falling from heaven, and particularly his vision of planets being formed, destroyed, and formed again, violated the most sacred laws of the Creator. We shall hear from them below.

Atmospheric Origin

The concept that solid bodies may accrete in the atmosphere had been favored by Avicenna (980–1037), whose works reached Europe about 1300, and by René Descartes (1596–1650) and his followers. Largely abandoned by the early eighteenth century, the idea was revived in 1789 by Lavoisier, who described gases and dust containing earthy and metallic elements rising daily from the Earth and forming inflammable strata above the ordinary air. Such strata, he said, could be ignited by electricity with consequent consolidation of metals and stony matter that produce fiery metcors (Burke, 1986: 58). Chladni totally rejected this mode of origin as being inadequate to create, instantaneously, solid stones and huge masses of iron.

CHLADNI'S COMPILATION OF WITNESSED FALLS

As noted above, Chladni (1794:37ff) listed 18 observed falls in all of history. He began his account with descriptions of two eighteenth-century occurrences, one at Eichstädt, Bavaria, the other at Agram, Croatia, that he felt presented the most persuasive evidence favoring his hypothesis that stones and irons actually do fall from the sky. For his information on these falls, Chladni quoted extensively from a paper *On Some Stones Allegedly Fallen from Heaven* published in 1790 by the Abbé Andreas Xavier Stütz (1747–1806), then serving as Assistant Director of the Imperial Natural History Cabinet at Vienna.

Eichstädt, Bavaria, 1785

Stütz wrote that in 1785 he received a small piece of stone from his friend the Baron Homspech, Canon of Eichstädt and Bruchsal in Bavaria. Stütz described the sample as ash-gray sandstone with tiny grains of malleable iron and iron ochre scattered through it. He said it had a thin, sulfurous crust of malleable native iron, resembling a blackish glaze streaked with traces of fiery melt. A notarized document he received with the stone stated that at 12:00 P.M. on 1785, February 19, a day when the countryside was covered with a foot of snow, a worker at a brick kiln saw it fall from the clouds after a violent thunderclap. The man rushed to the spot but found the black stone too hot to pick up until it cooled in the snow. The document stated that the country rock of that area consisted chiefly of fossiliferous marble that was entirely different from the stone.

Tabor, Bohemia, 1753

Stütz remarked, in passing, that the Baron Ignaz von Born (1742–1791), a previous director of the Imperial Cabinet, had described a specimen in his private collection consisting of refractory iron ore mixed with greenish stone and covered with a slaggy crust that had been found near Tabor in Bohemia. Chladni (1794:31) quoted Von Born's notation in his catalog: "...some credulous people claimed that the stone had fallen from heaven in a thunderstorm on July 3, 1753." Chladni accepted the claims of the credulous people.

Hraschina (Agram), Croatia, 1751

The reports from Eichstädt and Tabor reminded Stütz of a 71 pound mass of iron in the Imperial Cabinet that likewise was said to have fallen from heaven many years earlier near Hraschina, in the Bishopric of Agram, Croatia. With respect to that mode of origin, Stütz wrote (1790:399) "...many a mouth already has been distorted with derisive smiles." He added that if fairly distinct effects of fire were visible on the Eichstädt specimen, they were unmistakable on this one, much as they are on the mass of iron found in Siberia by the celebrated Pallas, except that here the impressions are larger and shallower. Stütz observed that the Agram iron lacks the yellow glass of the Siberian mass and the stone of the one from Eichstädt. (Clearly, no sharp distinctions were drawn at that early date between masses of metallic iron, stony irons, and stones with iron grains).

With his interest aroused, Stütz retrieved from the archives a Latin document that had been sent to the Imperial Cabinet in 1751 along with the large iron. It quoted the sworn testimony of seven witnesses, from widely separated localities, of a spectacular event that occurred about 6:00 P.M. on 1751 May 26. Indeed, immense detonations had caused such alarm over so wide an area that the Imperial couple, Emperor Franz I and Empress Maria Theresa, had ordered the investigation. Stütz translated the document into German and published it along with the description of the Eichstädt stone. He would leave it to his readers, he remarked, to draw their own conclusions as to the facts presented.

In the testimonials, collected for the Bishop of Agram, the witnesses were unanimous in saying they had heard an enormous explosion and seen a brilliant ball of fire burst into two balls linked by fiery chains (Fig. 5). A great rumbling followed as of many carriages rolling along. Some of the witnesses saw a large mass of iron fall into a newly plowed field where it split a large cleft in the ground, scorched the soil, and made the ground shake like an earthquake. Others saw a smaller mass fall into a meadow. Stütz (1790: 407) wrote:

The artless manner in which the whole thing is described, the agreement of the witnesses who had absolutely no reason to agree on a falsehood, and the similarity of the story with that of Eichstädt makes it seem at least probable that something real lay behind the accounts.

By "something real," Stütz was not referring to falls, however. He continued:

Of course, in both cases it was said that the iron fell from heaven. It may have been possible for even the most enlightened minds in Germany to have believed such things in 1751 due to the terrible ignorance then prevailing of natural history and practical physics; but in our time it would be unpardonable to regard such fairy tales as likely. However, it is a large step from disbelief of tales to the discovery of the true cause of a phenomenon that seems to us miraculous. And probably I should have committed the error, into which we so naturally fall concerning things we cannot explain, of denying the whole history rather than being prepared to believe anything so incredible, if various new writings on electricity and thunder had not, fortunately, come into my hands at that time. Particularly the remarkable experiment of Komus that reduced iron oxide to metal ...Lightning is an electrical stroke on a large scale: if the reduction of iron oxide can be obtained by the discharge of an electrical machine, why should not this be accomplished with much greater effect by the very powerful discharge of lightning from the clouds?

Stütz preserved the large specimen of the Hraschina iron (Fig. 6) (a class IID medium octahedrite), and the Eichstädt stone (an H5 chondrite), both of which may be seen today in the Natural History Museum at Vienna. Chladni wrote (1794:33):

I am not astonished at the aversion this competent doctor (Stütz) shows to relating these phenomena to circumstances that seem contrary to accepted ideas, and by his effort to explain them by the ordinary principles of physics. I do not wish to reveal a lack of the knowledge prevailing in this century when I defend the exactitude of the circumstances reported and argue that these masses are truly



FIG. 5. "Two painted plates depicting the phenomena of Agram (1751)," a handwritten no-tation by Paul Maria von Partsch, Director of the Imperial Natural History Cabinet in Vienna, on a folder in the archives containing these two pictures. They show the fireballs and smoke trail as seen from near Szigetvár, 15 miles southeast of Hraschina, about 6:00 P.M. on 1751 May 26. (Upper) A high cloud expells flashes like lightning (A), and a fireball (B) bursts into two balls linked by intertwined fiery chains. (Lower) As seen from Szigetvár, the fireball appeared to fall straight down from the cloud (1). straight, smoky trail shortly after the fireball burned out (2). As the evening star appeared beside the cloud, the trail grew fainter and assumed a zig-zag shape (3). As night came on, the cloud disappeared and the trail grew dimmer, longer, and its angles more rounded (3 and 4). These depictions were duly attested to by five witnesses. (Chromolithograph from Haidinger, 1859:389).



FIG. 6. The larger of the two Hraschina irons listed by von Schreibers as weighing 71 Vienna commercial pounds; cataloged today (Graham *et al.*, 1985:170) as weighing 40 kg (88 English pounds). Note Widmanstätten figures in the small, etched space at top where a small piece was sliced off. The iron is on display in the Natural History Museum in Vienna. (Plate 1 from von Schreibers, 1820).

fallen from the atmosphere, or might be part of a bolide, and by no means are the product of lightning.

Pre-eighteenth-Century Falls

Chladni found records of ten falls reported in the first through the seventeenth centuries. Most of them were cursorily described and remained unsubstantiated, but he said they merited citation because their accounts shared one or more similarities with those of the Agram and Eichstädt falls: a violent thunderclap in a serene sky, a sky with one small cloud, a great fire in the sky, hard or metallic stones with black crusts, sulfurous smells, and stones too hot to touch.

Ensisheim, Alsace, 1492–The 280 pound stone that fell at Ensisheim on 1492 November 7 is the only one in Chladni's preeighteenth-century list of which specimens are preserved today. Chladni (1794:35) remarked that the great triangular stone still was attached by an iron chain in the parish church of that place. However, in 1793, as he was writing his book, French revolutionaries liberated the stone from religious authority and placed it on public display in nearby Colmar. Chladni did not mention the enormous explosion, which was heard over much of the upper Rhineland, or the fireball that heralded the Ensisheim fall. However, he took pains to correct his source materials, one of which dated the fall in 1493, another in 1630. Chladni said we could deduce the actual date of fall from the following chronogram, mounted near the stone, which declares that a stone weighing twice onehundred pounds fell from the sky at Ensisheim. Excluding the E in Ensisheim, the capitalized letters—taken individually with no pairing and no subtractions—sum to 1492:

Centenas bIs habens a Vpes en saXea LIbras EnsheMII eX CoeLI VertICe Lapsa rVIt.

Today, the main mass of the stone of Ensisheim (an LL6 chondrite) is on display in the historic Palais de Régence in Ensisheim where the museum was refurbished in time for the celebration of the 500th anniversary year of its fall (Marvin, 1992). The stone of Ensisheim was the first witnessed fall in the West from which pieces are preserved. Indeed, it was believed to be the first in the world until scientists learned in 1979 of a stone preserved in a Shinto Shrine at Nogata-shi, Japan, that was described in old records as having been seen to fall on May 19, A.D. 861 (Shima *et al.*, 1983).

Additional Eighteenth-Century Falls

By the eighteenth century, records were much improved of the events Chladni took to have been falls. In addition to those reported by Stütz at Agram, Tabor, and Eichstädt, Chladni listed the following five, all of which now are cataloged as genuine meteorites.

Pleskowitz, Bohemia, 1723–In 1723 June 22, at about 2 o'clock on an afternoon of serene weather, with only one small cloud in the sky, a loud peal of thunder heralded the fall of stones at Pleskowitz in Bohemia. No flash of light was reported. Twenty-five stones of different sizes were collected at one site and seven or eight at another. All of them were black on the outside, metallic on the inside, and exhaled a strong odor of sulfur. Today, some 35 g of Pleskowitz (or Ploschkovitz), an L5 chondrite, are distributed among various museums.

Albareto, Italy, 1766-In 1766 July, a 12 kg stone fell at Albareto in the Duchy of Modena. Chladni (1794:37) listed it but provided no details of the event. Neither did he refer to the report issued in 1766 by the Abbé Domenico Troili (1722-1792), who investigated the circumstances of the fall and examined the stone. Troili detected in it a brassy mineral he called "marchesita," which was long thought to be pyrite. A century later that mineral would be identified as FeS and named troilite in his honor. Troili believed that the stone had fallen from the sky after having risen from a vent in the Earth. However, Giambatista Beccaria (1716-1781) wrote to Benjamin Franklin in 1767 that a bolt of lightning must have struck through the stone as it lay on the sodden ground that typified the Albareto region, causing water and the stone to rise in a mighty splash and fall back again. Such a mechanism would be entirely ineffective, wrote Chladni. Today, the main mass of Albareto (an L5 chondrite) is in the University Museum at Modena.

References to "the electric fluid" as a component of the atmosphere proliferated in the literature on meteors and meteorites after 1752 when Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790) conducted his spectacular kite experiment demonstrating the identity of lightning with electricity.

Lucé 1768, Nicorps 1750, Aire-sur-la-Lys 1769, France-Chladni ended his list with three falls that he listed under the names of the provinces of France where they fell: Maine, Cotentin, and Artois. In the autumn of 1768, the Royal Academy of Sciences received a fragment of a stone from a corresponding member, the Abbé Charles Bacheley, who stated that it fell from the sky at Lucé in Maine about 4:30 P.M. on September 13th. He reported that several harvesters, startled by sudden thunderclaps and a loud hissing noise, looked up and saw the stone plunge into a field where they found it half-buried and too hot to pick up. The sky was clear. No high cloud, fireball, or lightning flash were reported. The Academy requested an examination of the Lucé stone by a committee of three members: the chemists August-Denis Fougeroux de Bonderoy (1732-1789), Louis-Claude Cadet de Gassicourt (1731-1799), and Antoine-Laurent de Lavoisier (1743–1794). Two years later, the Academy commissioned Le Roy's investigation of the great fireball of 1771 (see above). Westrum (1978:463) observed that the Academy saw no connection between the "fallen stone" and the fireball-at the time they had no basis for making one.

The First Chemical Analysis of a "Fallen Stone," 1769– Although the analysts did not think of it as such, the Lucé stone was the first "fallen stone" to be analyzed by essentially modern chemical methods. The chemists described the stone as partially covered with a thin black crust over an interior of gray cindery material scattered with an infinite number of shiny metallic points of a pale yellowish color. They performed bulk analyses first by wet and then by dry techniques that yielded three constituents: vitrifiable earth 55.5 wt%, iron 36%, and sulfur 8.5%.

While they worked, the chemists received a second stone from M. Morand-le-fils, who said it had fallen near Coutances in the Cotentin, lower Normandy. According to Joseph-Jêrome de Lalande (1802:452), this probably was the stone that fell with a loud explosion near Nicorps, in Cotentin, on 1750 October 11.

Lavoisier was a newcomer to the Academy and the junior member of the committee. Nevertheless, he read the report to the Academy on 1769 April 15. The full report, dated 1772 July and authored by Fourgeroux, Cadet, and Lavoisier, was not published until 1777 in volume 2 of the Journal de Physique, which was founded that year. In it, the authors concluded that the stone from Lucé was not a thunder stone and had not fallen from the sky; it was a fragment of pyrite-rich sandstone that had been struck by a bolt of lightning. They suggested that the bolt had blown away a thin covering of soil and melted the surface of the stone, but the heat was too transitory to penetrate the interior. Today, this can be read as the first statement that interiors of stony meteorites are not melted. The chemists reported that the black-encrusted stone from the Cotentin emitted a less sulphurous odor but was similar in other respects to that from Lucé. This coincidence led Fourgeroux et al., (1777:255) to conclude: "We do not believe that one can conclude anything else from this resemblance except that the thunder struck preferentially on pyritiferous rocks."

The Royal Academy received a third stone that fell at Aire-surla-Lys in Artois too late for it to be included in the paper. However, Fourgeroux and Cadet analyzed it and reported that the stone from Aire was essentially identical to those from Lucé and Cotentin. They remarked that perhaps one day studies of such stones will throw new light on the nature of electricity, lightning, and thunder itself. Fourgeroux and Cadet presented their results to the Academy on 1769 August 2 (Smeaton, 1957:228).⁶ The report remains unpublished, but a copy obtained from the archives of the Academy was made available for this study by D. W. G. Sears (1996, pers. comm.).

Although the Academy did not issue a Memoir on this subject, a brief note titled *Three Curious Events of the Same Kind*, presumably written by the secretary of the Academy, G. de Fouchy, appeared in the history of the Academy for 1769 (published in 1772). After summarizing the observations and chemical results, the note stated that the Academy was far from concluding that the three stones were produced by thunder. But the similarity of events in widely separated places and the perfect resemblance between the stones and their differences from other stones appeared to be sufficient grounds for publishing this note and inviting physicists to submit anything new on this subject. Perhaps they could shed new light on the electric fluid and its action on thunderstones (Burke, 1986:34).

Today, samples of the Lucé stone, an L6 chondrite, are found in several museums. Those from Nicorps and Aire-sur-la-Lys are long lost but are believed to have been genuine meteorites.

Barbotan (Agen), France, 1790–Chladni did not include this fall in his list, presumably because the news did not reach him in time. It is important to our history, however, because of the widespread publicity it received and the diverse responses to it.

At about 9:30 P.M. on 1790 July 24, a brilliant fireball with a long, luminous trail was seen for nearly 50 seconds over a large area of southern France. An enormous explosion heralded the fall of stones over several villages in the vicinity of Barbotan and Agen. Excited stories circulated widely and Pierre Berthelon (1741–1799), editor of the *Journal des Sciences utiles* in Montpellier, published reports of the event. Word of his accounts reached his friend, Jean F. B. Saint-Amans (1748–1831), who said later that he sought to match this absurdity with an authentic act by demanding an official testimonial to the event. Much to his surprise, Saint-Amans received a notarized deposition in short order, signed by a mayor and his deputy, stating that at least 300 citizens had witnessed the fall. Seeing the deposition as nothing but new proof of the credulity of country people, Saint-Amans induced Berthelon (1791:228) to write:

How sad, is it not, to see a whole municipality attempt to certify the truth of folk tales...the philosophical reader will draw his own conclusions regarding this document, which attests to an apparently false fact, a physically impossible phenomenon.

Five years later, certain editors still felt the same way. In 1796, Nicolas Baudin, Professor of Physics at Pau, published a detailed description in *La Décade* of the fall at Barbotan, which he had observed while strolling with a friend in the grounds of the Chateau de Mormês. Baudin (1796:388) wrote that just after the great fireball exploded, sending echoes rumbling along the Pyrenees, a quantity of stones had fallen near Juliac and Barbotan. To this statement, the editors appended a footnote:

The author of the memoir appears persuaded that, in effect, a fall of stones occurred immediately following the explosion of the meteor, and he goes to great pains to explain their formation; he would have been more philosophical to doubt the fact in the first place. As for us, in spite of so many well-affirmed certificates; in spite of so many pretended examples of showers of stones, we do not place any faith in them. The noise that these meteors make in bursting, the dazzling light that they spread, the surprising shock they cause stuns the majority of those that see them: they do not doubt that the burst had fallen all around them; they run, they look, and if they find by chance some stone that is a little bit black, they say that surely this stone just fell. If the fable spreads, all the country will look for such stones, and will find thousands....A meteor quite like that which makes the object of this memoir appeared about 24 years ago above Paris...and many very reliable persons in Paris certified that the flaming material had been thrown out by the explosion almost into their bedrooms. (Note des Auteurs de la Décade.)

It was into this intellectual climate that Chladni introduced his book.



FIG. 7. Sketch by Pallas of the mass of iron he saw in the village of Ubeisk in Siberia. No hint is visible of the striking porosity of the mass. The figure has no relationship with the meteorite: it is one of three Pallas drew to depict local costumes. (From Pallas, 1776, Vol. III, Plate 3, p. 68; courtesy of the Houghton Library, Harvard University.)



FIG. 8. A fragment of the Pallas iron (Krasnojarsk), about 8 cm across, showing the rough, cellular nickel-iron metal enclosing crystals of olivine. (Courtesy of the Department of Mineral Sciences, Smithsonian Institution.)

NATIVE IRONS

The Pallas Iron, Siberia, 1772

As noted above, Chladni 's book title referred to a 1600 pound mass of iron seen in 1772 in a remote region of Siberia by Peter Simon Pallas, a German professor of natural history at St. Petersburg. In 1749, the mass had been found lying on a high ridge of

Mt. Emir by a blacksmith, Jacob Medvedev. Thinking that it might be something better than iron, Medvedev expended enormous energy transporting the mass over 32 km of rough territory to his home in the village of Ubeisk (Krinov, 1960: 10). The local people told Pallas the mass was a sacred gift from heaven. Pallas did not share that belief but he saw it as worthy of study. He sampled and sketched the mass (Fig. 7) and described it as rough as a sea sponge-riddled with cavities many of which were filled with amber-yellow glassy-looking material (Fig. 8). He regarded the mass as a remarkable instance of the work of nature, which was most likely formed in a pocket of a vein long since eroded away. Pallas described the bedrock of Mt. Emir as gray schist banded with blue-black magnetic ore assaying 70% of iron. He noted signs of forest fires near the find site but searched in vain for evidence of volcanic activity or of primitive smelting operations. In 1777, Pallas arranged for the mass to be carried 233 km northward to Krasnojarsk. From there, it was shipped to the Imperial Academy at St. Petersburg where it was named the Pallas Iron and displayed in the Kunst Kammerer (hall containing a collection of curiosities begun by Peter the Great) (Krinov, 1960:11). Pallas sent samples to leading natural historians of Europe. In later years, the meteorite was (rather surprisingly) renamed "Krasnojarsk" and classified as a stony-iron, which is the type specimen of pallasites.

The Pallas Iron was a striking example of those enigmatic bodies that then were called "native irons," which had long puzzled natural philosophers. Were they the work of nature or of artifice? Consisting largely or wholly of malleable metal, these unrusted masses always occurred as exotics; they were entirely unlike the country rocks of the region where they lay. Clearly, they once had been molten, but similar metal masses were not found at the vents of active volcanoes. Their huge sizes and frequently remote locations made production by ancient smelting operations appear extremely unlikely, and, in any case, metallic iron produced artificially is not malleable but brittle. Nevertheless, in seeking explanations for native irons, savants of the late eighteenth century often spoke of extraordinarily powerful ancient volcanoes, vanished artisans with advanced technologies, or bolts of lightning on iron ore or pyrite.

From Pallas' description of the mass, Chladni argued that the local people were correct: the iron mass must have fallen from the sky. He pointed out that it showed evidence of fusion, so it could not have been deposited from an aqueous solution. It lay among schistose mountains and was too distant from volcanoes or inflammable coal seams to have been created by natural modes of combustion. Forest fires or bolts of lightning would be entirely inadequate to melt and reduce bedrock to metallic iron under any circumstances. And the Pallas Iron was by far too heavy and in too remote a location to have been created by ancient smelting operations, which, in any case, should have separated out the yellow mineral and robbed the metal of its maileability. Chladni (1794:40) called the yellow component "olivine" before he ever saw a sample of the Pallas Iron. The fusion of the metal, Chladni said, must have taken place in a fire more intense than any known on Earth—a fire that, somehow, left it malleable. Chladni concluded that this "native iron" was cosmic matter that had heated to incandescence and melted while plunging through the atmosphere in a fireball.

Did Chladni See the Pallas Iron?-Chladni visited St. Petersburg in 1794 May, the month after the publication of Ironmasses. The purpose of his trip was to demonstrate his newly-invented glass musical instrument, the euphonium, which he played to enthusiastic listeners including the Empress Catherine the Great. Did Chladni, who was a corresponding member of the Academy, examine the Pallas Iron during his visit? Of course he did, we respond; indeed, we envision him rushing to see the mass as soon as he arrived. However in 1958, Friedrich Adolf Paneth (1887-1958) raised this question, in all seriousness (see Dingle et al., 1964:207). Paneth noted that Chladni, who faithfully reported his trips to examine meteorites and described his own sample of the Pallas Iron, never wrote that he had seen the main mass. Instead, Chladni relied on Pallas' descriptions, using some of his words and phrases, not only in his Ironmasses of 1794, before he went to St. Petersburg, but also in his Feuer-Meteore of 1819. In response, Hoppe (1979:95) argued that in 1815 May, Chladni described a sample of the Pallas Iron in the Berlin Museum as a very rare piece taken from the outer surface of the the mass where it was more scoriacious. Hoppe thought that Chladni could not have known about its surface characteristics unless he had seen the main mass. The question remains open.

The Mesón de Fierro, Campo del Cielo, Argentina

Chladni reasoned that the huge mass of iron that lay in the flat, powdery soils of the northern Argentine chaco also must have fallen from the sky. Well known to the nomadic peoples of the region, the mass was first seen by Europeans in 1576 when Capitán Hernán de

Miraval led a small contingent of Spanish soldiers on a long, dangerous march to the site. He reported finding the surface exposure of an iron mine. Two-hundred years passed before the next adventurer saw the "great bar or plate" of metal in 1774. Soon, rumors of silver in the metal prompted additional treks to search out the fabulous "Mesón de Fierro." Finally, in 1783, the Viceroy at Buenos Aires sent Lieutenant don Miguel Rubín de Celis, of the Royal Spanish Navy, to measure the extent of the ore body and, if it proved promising, to found a colony at the site. De Celis dug around the mass, tilted it up, and exploded gunpowder in the hole. Failing to find any extension at depth, he estimated its weight at 15 metric tons and made sketches of it (Fig. 9). No one ever has seen the Mesón de Fierro again. Perhaps de Celis pushed it back into its deepened hole where it gradually was covered by mud from seasonal flooding and overgrown with the thorny bushes of the chaco. Fortunately, de Celis took samples, but he reported wearing out 70 chisels to obtain 12 kg of the metal (de Celis, 1788:40). From Spain, he sent specimens to the Royal Society in London that were deposited in the British Museum of Natural History.

From the first, the indigenous peoples had said that the iron had fallen from the sky. The Spanish rejected that idea out of hand, but they did call the area Campo del Cielo (Field of the Sky), which is a translation of the Indian name for it. De Celis scouted the unpromising region for a volcano. Presently, two leagues to the east, he found a brackish spring at a gentle rise of about five feet above the plain. This, he concluded, must be the worn down remnant of the ancient volcano that erupted the gigantic mass of native iron (de Celis, 1788:371). Chladni (1794:40) argued that the iron mass fell from the sky in a fireball.

Today, Chladni's opinion has been fully vindicated. More than 60 metric tons of fragments of an octahedrite (Class IA) and 20 shallow meteorite craters have been found at Campo del Cielo in a strewn field 75 km long (Cassidy *et al.*, 1965). Carbon-14 measurements on three fragments of charred wood from within a rim and beneath a crater floor indicate that the fall occurred about 4,000 years ago (Cassidy, 1993, pers. comm.). Thus, it is possible that ancestors of the indigenous people actually witnessed the spectacular fall at Campo del Cielo (Marvin, 1994).

The Aken (Aachen) Mass

Chladni discussed a third large mass of iron, weighing 15,000 to 17,000 pounds, that reportedly was dug up in 1762 from under the pavement at the city of Aken in the Duchy of Magdeburg. He examined a small sample of this metal in a mineral collection at the University of Wittenberg. Subsequently, Chladni (1819:346) wrote that the identity of the sample was mistaken, the weight of the mass was much smaller than reported, and the actual site of its discovery was in Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle). Ultimately, this iron mass was dismissed as an artifact. Chaldni spoke of other "native irons," mostly with attached scoria, that were not meteorites.

Toward the end of his book, Chladni (1794:59) observed that fallen bodies are principally composed of iron, an element that is abundant in the Earth's crustal rocks, a key component in all living things, and one that we must suppose makes up a considerable portion of the Earth's interior, as indicated by the presence of the magnetic field. He then suggested that elements such as sulfur, silica, and magnesia may not be limited to our Earth but very likely also occur in the materials that make up the celestial bodies. His insights mark an early beginning to planetary science.



FIG. 9. A sketch of the Mesón de Fierro made by don Rubin de Celis who excavated it in 1783. He reported its maximum width as 3.54 meters and estimated its weight as about 15,000 kg. This was the first iron to be discovered at Campo del Cielo, Argentina. (From Alvarez, 1926.)

GERMAN RESPONSES TO CHLADNI, 1794

As noted above, Chladni remarked in 1797 that after writing his book he hesitated to publish it because of the hostile reactions to be expected. However on careful consideration, he concluded that the phenomena he described could not properly be explained in any other manner without either contradicting observations already made or well-known laws of nature. He retracted nothing. However, without having personally observed a meteorite fall, or even examined a meteorite, he had only hearsay evidence with which to document his case at a time when his learned contemporaries had long since dismissed all reports of fallen stones, ancient and modern, as figments of superstitious imaginations.

In Germany, the first review of Chladni's book appeared in the 1794 August 11 issue of the *Göttingen Notices on Learned Subjects*. After a brief summary of Chladni's main arguments linking fireballs with fallen bodies of cosmic origin, it concluded in a negative tone (p. 1286):

One must admit that his hypothesis and his application of it are sharp-witted. To assume materials whose existence is by no means proved but are essential to the hypothesis, and to add forces and motions according to the needs of the hypothesis, leads easily into the pitfall of the Cartesian philosophy that is out of style. However, its use has become so common to explain chemical, electrical, magnetic etc. phenomena, that one cannot deny these liberties with physics to Mr. Chladni's hypothesis.

Two months later on October 10, Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859) wrote to his friend Carl Freiesleben in Freiberg (Hoppe, 1979:26): "By all means, read Chladni's infamous book on iron masses."

Throughout that year, Chladni's book received only negative reviews in Germany. German scientists felt that Chladni's use of historic eyewitness reports, which they equated with folk tales, and his flouting of the rules of the Aristotelian-Newtonian view of the cosmos made his new theory totally unacceptable (Hoppe, 1979:27). Meanwhile, before any of the above responses to Chladni's book had appeared in print, a spectacular shower of stones had occurred at Siena in Tuscany.

TWO WITNESSED FALLS, 1794–1795

Siena, Italy, 1794

About 7:00 P.M. on 1794 June 16, a high cloud approached Siena from the north emitting smoke, sparks like rockets, and bolts of unusually slow-moving red lightning. Suddenly, a series of tremendous explosions rent the air, the cloud flamed red, and stones fell at the feet of men, women, and children about 14 km southeast of Siena. One stone reportedly pierced the rim of a boy's hat and scorched the felt while others singed leaves on trees. Two astonished English ladies saw stones fall into a pond and splash out water that appeared to boil. Subsequently, the government drained the pond and recovered the stones, which were sold to English tourists at such high prices that a lively trade sprung up in simulated fallen stones.

A Dissertation by Ambrogio Soldani, September, 1794–In Siena, the Abbé Ambrogio Soldani (1736–1808), Professor of Mathematics at the University, compiled reports from numerous witnesses, examined 19 of the stones, and in 1794 September, he issued a 288 page book, On a Shower of Stones that Fell on the 16th of June at Siena. In it, he detailed the circumstances of the fall and the sizes, shapes, and distribution of the stones, which ranged from a few ounces to seven pounds. Soldani included one large fold-out plate (Fig. 10) with engravings of the high cloud and five fallen stones. To him, their forms suggested imperfect crystals, pyramids and parallelpipeds. Soldani concluded that the stones had aggregated from metallic and earthy dust within the fiery cloud to a pasty material with a strong impetus toward crystallization.

William Thomson on Mineralogy and Possible Lunar Origin, 1794–Soldani inserted into his text seven letters from William (Guiglielmo) Thomson (1761–1806), the English expatriate physician-chemist-mineralogist in Naples to whom he had sent a stone. Thomson (1794a:273, 245) described its black crust and gritty, "quartzose" interior scattered with pyrites. He crushed a sample, drew a magnet through the powder, and made the first mineralogical separation in a fallen stone of grains that he identified as iron in a state of perfect malleability. Thomson's observation proved conclusively that the stone differed from all known rocks.

In a postscript to his letter of August 26th, Thomson (1794a) wrote (Soldani, 1794:264) that a friend, who did not wish to be named, had suggested that the Sienese stones had been projected beyond the lunar sphere of attraction by the process described by the celebrated Herschel. Furthermore, at the time of the eruption, the Moon must have been at its zenith directly over Italy so that the stones were attracted to that spot on our globe. The celebrated Herschel to whom Thomson referred was the German-born astronomermusician, William Herschel (1738–1822), residing in England, who built the most powerful telescope of his time and had discovered the planet Uranus in 1781. Herschel (1787:230) reported observing four volcanic eruptions on the Moon between 1783 and 1787. Although Thomson presented it as a suggestion by an anonymous friend, his letter carried the earliest speculation in modern times that fallen stones might have come from a lunar volcano.

A Report on the Siena Fall by Sir William Hamilton, 1795-Soldani dedicated his book to a distinguished resident in Siena, Frederick Augustus Hervey (1730-1803), the 4th Earl of Bristol and Bishop of Derry, to whom he had sent a detailed account and a stone. On July 12th, Hervey sent the stone and a description of the fall (which he said took place amidst a most violent thunder storm) to Sir William Hamilton (1730-1803), the English Ambassador to the Court of Naples, who is remembered chiefly today as the husband of the renowned beauty, Emma Hamilton, who later became mistress to Lord Horatio Nelson. Hamilton did not receive the letter immediately because Hervey sent it via Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820), the President of the Royal Society in London. Banks forwarded the letter and stone to Hamilton with remarks to the effect that the old Bishop must be telling tall tales (Pillinger and Pillinger, 1996). Meanwhile, Hamilton, who was instrumental in turning volcanology into a modern science, was diligently observing the dayby-day activity of Mt. Vesuvius that had sprung into full eruption 18 hours before the fall of stones at Siena. This circumstance, wrote Hervey (in Hamilton, 1795:103):

...leaves a choice of difficulties in the solution of this extraordinary phenomenon...either these stones have been generated in this igneous mass of clouds...or, which is equally incredible, they were thrown from Vesuvius at a distance of at least 250 miles; judge then of its parabola⁷...My first objection was to the fact itself, but of this there are so many eye-witnesses, it seems impossible to withstand their evidence, and now I am reduced to a perfect scepticism.

Introducing the subject as "..a very extraordinary circumstance indeed...although it might have no relation to the eruption," Hamilton inserted a single paragraph concerning the fall at Siena into his 43-page report on the eruption of Mount Vesuvius that appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* of 1795 Feb-



FIG. 10. "Stones fallen from the stormy cloud on the 16th of June 1794": Soldani's title to the plate in his book. The individual engravings are: (a) Sketch of the high dark cloud as it first appeared approaching Siena from the north. (b) The cloud a little later, after it had spread horizontally. Of the stones in the Siena shower, A, weighing five pounds, was the largest one seen by Soldani. He described it as tending toward a pyramid with a flat, quadrangular base. Stone B was much smaller, tending toward a triangular pyramid with a base Soldani called a quasi-hexagon approaching a parallelpiped. Stone C was a broken fragment with a quadrilateral shape that was something like the base of B. Stones D and E are stones that, in Soldani's view, approach a pyramid and parallelpiped. (Endplate from Soldani, 1794, courtesy of the Smithsonian Institution Libraries.)

ruary. After quoting from Hervey's letter, Hamilton (1795:104) gave his own impressions of the stones:

The outside of every stone...ascertained to have fallen from the cloud near Siena, is evidently freshly vitrified and black, having every sign of having passed through an extreme heat; when broken, the inside is of a light-gray color mixed with black spots and some shining particles, which the learned here have decided to be pyrites, and therefore it cannot be a lava, or they would have decomposed...stones of the same nature, at least as far as the eye can judge of them, are frequently found on Mount Vesuvius; however, when I was lately on the mountain, I searched for such stones near the new mouths but found none because of thick beds of new ash...if similar stones with vitrified coats were to be found on Vesuvius, the matter of origin would be decided in favor of Vesuvius-unless it could be shown that another vent had opened closer to Siena, such as that of Mount Radicofani [a long-dormant volcano] which lay within 50 miles of that city.

As he wrote these observations, Hamilton (1795:105) was struck with another idea: inasmuch as quantities of ash were known to have been carried to greater distances than that between Mt. Vesuvius and Siena:

...might not the same ashes have been carried over the Sanese (sic) territory, and mixing with a stormy cloud, have been collected together just as hailstones are sometimes...and might not the exterior vitrification of those lumps of accumulated and hardened

volcanic matter have been occasioned by the action of the electric fluid on them?

Hamilton remarked that Father Ambrogio Soldani, who was currently printing his dissertation on this event, believed that the stones were generated, independently of volcanic assistance, in the igneous mass of clouds from which the stones fell.

After the fall at Siena, no one in Italy disputed the authenticity of fallen stones. Arguments focused on whether they were ejected by volcanoes or had coagulated within the atmosphere, with or without the presence of volcanic ash. One scholar, Lazarro Spallanzani (1729–1799), the distinguished Professor of Natural History at Pavia, rejected both volcanoes and dusty clouds as meteorite sources. He declared that the stones that fell over Siena had been swept up from the ground by a local hurricane and singed on the outside by atmospheric electricity.

A scientist who positively favored a volcanic origin was Georgio Santi (1746–1822), Professor of Botany at Pisa, who had witnessed the event and argued, at first, that the stones were ejecta from Vesuvius; later he postulated that they came from a submarine eruption near Siena. Santi compiled reports from Siena, Florence, Pisa, and other localities, and sent information and more samples of stone to William Thomson. It all began, wrote Santi (Tata, 1794:11) with

the appearance of a little cloud, dark and menacing, while the rest of the sky was serene (no sign here of Lord Hervey's "most violent thunder-storm").

A Memoir by Domenico Tata, December, 1794–Thomson supplied information on the fall to the Abbé Domenico Tata (1723– 1800), Professor of Physics and Mathematics at Naples. In 1794 December, when it was still too early for Chladni's book to be known abroad, Tata published the 74 page *Memoir on the Rain of Stones Fallen in the Countryside of Siena, the 16th of June, 1794*. Tata (1794:14) wrote:

Mr. Thomson came to me and asked if I had heard details of the curious phenomenon seen at Siena. I answered that I had not. Thomson said: 'A rain of stones.' 'Is it true?' I asked, 'How do you know?' 'It is beyond doubt. I have one of the stones with me.' 'Well then,' I said, 'permit me to describe that stone to you without having seen it.'

This occurrence is nothing new, declared Tata. Back in 1755 December, his friend, the Prince of Tarsia, had told him of the fall of a stone after a thunderous detonation on the previous July at his estate at Terranova di Sibari in Calabria. Five shepherds saw the fall and brought the stone to him. On hearing the tale from the naive young cavalier, Tata said he scarcely could contain his laughter; he only asked if the Prince would send him the stone and an eyewitness report. One month later, he had the stone in his hand along with a notarized document supplied by the highly respected agent of the house of Tarsia. The stone was nearly spherical and covered with a dark crust except where a piece had broken off when it struck the ground. It weighed about seven and one-half pounds. After examining it in detail, Tata placed the stone in an elegant glass case in which it could be seen on all sides without being touched. Subsequently, he deposited it in the public library where it would be well cared for. Nine years later, in 1764, he returned with two visitors and found the stone partly covered with an efflorescence and beginning to crumble. Ultimately it disappeared, probably, he said, because one of the custodians found the disintegrating stone to be useless and wanted the case for something better. Tata (1794:23) was con-

vinced of the authenticity of this fall, and he said he had intended to publish a full description of it but was dissuaded by friends who warned him that he would be ridiculed by "Savants" and, worse yet, by "Half-Savants" who are the more to be feared.

Tata (1794:28) also mentioned the report by Abbé Andreas Stütz in 1790 of the alleged falls at Hraschina in 1751 and Eichstädt in 1785. He said he had learned of these events from a letter written to Thomson by Captain François Tihausky, the director of His Majesty's Cannon Foundaries in Naples. Stütz himself had denied that these events were actual falls from the sky, but four years later the situation looked different to the scholars in Italy; they took the reports from eastern Europe as confirmation of falls as valid natural phenomena.

Tata's treatise included a more complete mineralogical description by Thomson than the early one he had sent to Soldani. Thomson (1794b) (Tata, 1794: 52ff) said the stones had dark, slaggy surfaces and granulated interiors with light and dark portions separated along curving surfaces, typical of semi-liquid or pasty material. The light portions, the color of ashes, resembled quartose sand cemented with clay and scattered with grains of iron, pyrite with a dark-purplish luster,

and red-ochre spots, probably of decomposed pyrite. Using a loupe, he could see also tiny fragments of greenish glass. He said the dark portions, which made up four-fifths of the mass, were semi-vitrified and rich in reddish, lamellar pyrite, some of which contained globules of metallic iron. Thomson again described his magnetic separation of malleable iron grains. Both Tata and Thomson discussed Soldani's work with much admiration and agreed with his conclusion that the stones originated within the atmosphere and had no link with volcanism. Thomson (1804:144) named the material of the stones "soldanite," in recognition of the great zeal and perseverance of Pére Soldani in seeking detailed information through sworn testimony of witnesses to the rain of stones and his indefatigable research since then to clarify all aspects of the subject. Appropriate as it may seem to name this rock for the first scholar to fully document a meteorite fall, "soldanite" did not survive for long in the annals of meteoritics.

Significance of the Siena Fall-The Siena fall was of key significance in the founding of meteoritics. It was the first in modern times to occur in the vicinity of a European city and to be witnessed by so many people that its authenticity could not be denied. With a population of nearly 30,000, Siena had a university and shared leadership in arts and sciences with a constellation of other Italian cities. The two treatises on the fall published in 1794 by the Abbés Soldani and Tata raised discussion of the subject to the level of learned discourse and prompted scholarly inquiry internationally. Sojourners returning from Siena carried their tales and their specimens (Fig. 11), real and bogus, home to England. When Sir William Hamilton's paragraph on the Siena fall appeared in the 1795 February, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, it carried the news to Germany and may have persuaded some of his countrymen that stones do fall from the sky, at least within a few hundred kilometers of active volcanoes. Presently, nature intervened again, this time in Great Britain herself.

Wold Cottage, England, December 1795

At 3:30 on Sunday afternoon 1795 December 13, a 56 pound



FIG. 11. A historic stone from the fall at Siena, 1794. (Courtesy of Robert Hutchison, British Museum of Natural History, London.)

stone fell at Wold Cottage in Yorkshire. The sky was overcast. Suddenly, several persons in the area were startled by something whizzing through the air followed by a series of explosions. A laborer looked up just in time to see a black stone emerge from the clouds and plunge into the soil about 30 feet from where he stood. The ground shook and mud and sod flew up all around him. Rushing to the spot he found a large stone, warm and smoking and smelling of sulfur. It had penetrated twelve inches of soil and six inches of the underlying limestone. When Captain Edward Topham (1751-1820), the landowner and a flamboyant pamphleteer, editor, and playwright, returned from a visit to London, he obtained sworn statements from the three eyewitnesses and interviewed numerous persons who had heard sounds and felt concussions. Topham arranged to exhibit the stone in Piccadilly, London, across the street from the much-frequented Gloucester Coffee House (Pillinger and Pillinger, 1996). He prepared a handbill with an engraving of the stone and a description of the fall to be given to those who paid the entrance fee of one shilling.

There, Sir Joseph Banks saw the stone and acquired a sample, possibly from Captain Topham himself. In 1797, Topham published the text of his handbill and the engraving of the stone (Fig. 12) in *Gentlemen's Magazine* (Topham, 1797). Two years later, he erected a brick monument over the site of fall and planted trees around it. Today, with the trees long gone, the weathered inscription still tells us that on this spot, on December 13, 1795, there fell from the atmosphere an extraordinary stone; 28 inches broad, 30 inches long, and weighing 56 pounds; the column in memory of it was erected by Edward Topham, 1799.

Topham's column may have been the first monument to be erected at a meteorite site of fall, but it is not the only one. In the late nineteenth century, an obelisk was raised in the arid interior of Bahia, Brazil, at the place where the large Bendegó iron had been discovered in 1784.

In 1804, Topham sold the stone to the mineralogist James Sowerby (1752–1822) for display in Sowerby's Museum in London. To Sowerby, the stone's most remarkable component was its native iron, which made a unique addition to the minerals of Britain, espe-



FIG. 12. Engraving of the Wold Cottage stone made for Captain Topham's handbill. He said the stone was about 70 cm in longest dimension. (Item No. 4 from Figure 1, *Gentlemen's Magazine*, 1797 July.)

cially, he said, since it had fallen there like "Phaeton from heaven." Sowerby opened Volume II of his *British Mineralogy* $(1804:1^*)^8$ with a full description of the Wold Cottage stone under the heading: *Ferrum Nativum, Meteoric Iron.* In 1835, the Sowerby family put up the stone for sale, and a subscription was raised to purchase it for the British Museum of Natural History in London. In 1995, British meteoriticists held a symposium in recognition of the 200th anniversary of the fall. Wold Cottage is the largest meteorite to have fallen in the British Isles and ranks second only to the great stone of Ensisheim in all of Europe.

EDWARD KING ON FALLEN STONES, 1796

In 1796, Edward King (1735–1807), a Fellow of the Royal Society, privately published a 34-page book, *Remarks Concerning Stones Said to Have Fallen from the Clouds, Both in These Days and in Antient Times* (Fig. 13). This was the first treatise on meteorites to appear in English. In eighteenth-century fashion, King composed a long subtitle that today would serve almost as an abstract:

An Attempt to account for the Production of a Shower of Stones, that fell in Tuscany, on the 16th of June, 1794: and to shew that there areTraces of similar Events having taken place, in the highest Ages of Antiquity. In the course of which Detail is also inserted, an Account of an extraordinary Hailstone, that fell, with many others, in Cornwall, on the 20th of October, 1791.

King opened with a description of the shower of stones at Siena based on the "extraordinarily detailed account" by Professor Soldani, a

REMARKS

STONES

CONCERNING

SAID TO HAVE FALLEN FROM THE CLOUDS, BOTH

IN THESE DAYS,

AND IN ANTIENT TIMES.

BY EDWARD KING, ESQ. F.R.S. AND F.A.S.



FIG. 13. Title page of Edward King's book of 1796, the first treatise on meteorites to be published in English. (Courtesy of the Smithsonian Institution Libraries.)

translation of which he had received from Sir Charles Blagdon (1748– 1820), the Secretary of the Royal Society. He reported Soldani's view that the stones had no connection with Mt. Vesuvius but were generated in the air from mineral substances arisen "somehow or other" as exhalations from the Earth. However, King tended to favor William Hamilton's idea that the stones might have formed from vesuvian ash, which, wrote King, being rich in pyrite and iron, rose to prodigious heights, caught fire, melted, exploded, and rained down as stones. To account for the puzzling fact that Mt. Vesuvius lay more than 322 km southeast of Siena and the dark and menacing cloud from which the stones fell approached Siena from the north, King referred to Hamilton's suggestion that a high wind might have wafted the ash northward past Siena until it met an opposite draft, turned south again, and precipitated stones over the city.

Soldani's descriptions and engravings persuaded King that the stones were imperfect pyramids and parallelpipeds that had failed to completely crystallize due to the rapidity of their consolidation in the cloud. He saw their surface indentations as dents made by collisions with one another while the stones were still warm and plastic. King drew an analogy between the formation of these stones in fiery clouds with the instant consolidation of hailstones in frigid clouds (an idea touched upon by Hamilton) and compared the Siena fall with dramatic hailstorms that had occurred in England and France. The one illustration in his book is of a glass model of a halfounce hailstone with four smaller ones inside it that fell in Cornwall on 1791 October 20.

Toward the end of his book, King (1796:20) heard of the Wold Cottage fall and wrote:

...it might perhaps too justly be deemed an unwarrantable omission...not to mention the very strange fact that is affirmed to have happened the last year, near the Wold Cottage in Yorkshire.

He had read of the sounds, concussions, and the stone plunging into the soil but, said King (1796:21):

I affirm nothing.—Neither do I pretend absolutely to believe : or to disbelieve.—I have not had an opportunity to examine the whole of the evidence.

However, King had had the opportunity to examine a fragment of the stone, which was shown to him by Sir Charles Blagdon. Later, he saw the stone itself in Piccadilly and noted that it had the same sort of black crust and concave impressions as those described on the stones that fell in Italy. Its substance, he said, was a sort of grit stone, containing many particles with the appearance of gold, silver, and iron "(or rather more truly of pyrites)." He also noted rusty specks, perhaps from decomposed pyrites. A sample he tested with acid did not decompose and so he declared that, insofar as he was able to determine, no such stone ever had been found before this time in Yorkshire or anywhere in England. With respect to its origin, King (1796:22) speculated:

Whether, therefore, it might, or might not, possibly be the effect of ashes flung out from Heckla, and wafted to England: like those flung out from Vesuvius, and (as I am disposed to believe) wafted to Tuscany, I have nothing to affirm.

King then spoke of falls elsewhere, beginning with the one reported in Alsace "...in the midst of a storm of hail on November 29th, 1630, and said to be preserved in the great church of 'Anzissem.'" For this information, he cited Conrad Gesner (1565), but Gesner made no such errors in dates and places. Clearly the passage refers to the fall, unaccompanied by any hailstorm, of the stone at Ensisheim on 1492 November 7. As he was closing his book, King received from Sir Charles Blagdon a translation of the paper by the Abbé Stütz in 1790 and added descriptions of the "alleged" falls at Eichstädt and Agram. Then he wrote (1796:26): Here I intended to have concluded all my observations. But a recent publication, which I knew not of, when these sheets were written, obliges me to add a few more pages. [The new publication was]...a very singular tract, published in 1794, at Riga, by Dr. Chladni.

Thus, King brings us the news that Chladni's book reached England in the summer of 1796. King thanked Sir Charles Blagdon for bringing Soldani's book, Stütz' paper, and Chladni's book to his attention and providing him with English translations. King said he would not presume to interfere with Chladni's hypothesis of origin but that surely his facts deserve much attention. He then listed the falls in Chladni's book that he had not already described (and corrected his earlier mistakes respecting the Ensisheim fall, except that he dated it as 1493). King affirmed that he had preserved a faithful and honest record and would let the discerning weigh and judge. King himself believed that all of these events had been brought to pass on extraordinary occasions by the immediate "fiat of the Almighty."

King ended his text and then felt obliged to add a postscript. He had just received from Sir Charles Blagdon a present of one of the very small stones—an irregular quadrilateral pyramid—from Siena. The black crust was such as had been described before, but he found it to be quite remarkable for the appearance of a "sort of minute chequer work" formed by very fine white lines on the black surface. This may be the earliest description of the crazing seen on crusts of many stony meteorites. Examining the inte-rior, he found an astonishing resemblance between this stone and the one said to have fallen in Yorkshire—both were of a gritty substance with metallic and pyritical grains and spots where pyrites appeared to have been decomposed. Thus, as pointed out by Pillinger and Pillinger (1996), King published the first comparison between samples of the meteorite falls at Siena and Wold Cottage, a comparison commonly credited to Sir Joseph Banks.

His observations of the two stones reminded King of the 1772 report of Fourgeroux, Cadet, and Lavoisier on the stone from Lucé, which also was pyramidal in form. King (1796:34) ended his postscript and his book:

The academicians, indeed, thought it was a stone merely struck by lightning: but, since so many corresponding facts, in other places, so remote, and so unconnected with each other, and suggesting a more interesting idea, have now come to light; such sort of concurrent evidence...ought, surely, to be duly weighed : and may justly lead us to a different conclusion.

Responses to King's Book

Report of the Pettiswood Fall of 1779–In 1796 August 1, shortly after King's book appeared, Mr. William Bingley wrote to the editor of *Gentlemen's Magazine* (66:726) that he possessed two pieces of a stone that fell with a loud peal of thunder in 1779 at Pettiswood, County Westmeath, Ireland. He said his whole village was enveloped with sulfurous fumes as a stone struck a wooden part of a harness and broke into three pieces. The affrighted horse fell to the Earth, and two boys rushed to him in terror carrying fragments that Bingley found to be warm as milk just from the cow. The outsides were tinged a whitish brown and the insides were silver white. Wrote Bingley (1796:727):

I never related this narrative and shewed the concreted substance to any persons...who have ever treated this subject with the utmost ridicule that can be imagined, but such persons have been brought to acknowledge, that, at least, they had formed too hasty an opinion.

Bingley's fear of ridicule—the same motive that had inhibited Tata from reporting the Terra Nova di Sibari stone in 1755—had been overcome by the reports of King, Soldani, and Topham. (Although both stones are long lost, the one from Pettiswood is regarded as a genuine meteorite; but the Terra Nova di Sibari stone is considered doubtful, although its story has the ring of truth). Bingley offered his opinion, now that fallen stones had become respectable phenomena, that they consist of sands and other matter that are lifted upwards from lakes, rivers, and seashores by the powerful attraction of the clouds that rise from the waters and are compacted in the sky. He felt that his own idea and Soldani's were similar except that he believed the substances rose as solids and Soldani favored exhalations. With respect to the Wold Cottage stone, Bingley (1796:728) wrote:

I am not without hope, that, upon a farther investigation by the learned, my cake and Captain Topham's loaf will be found to have both been baked in the same stupendous oven, according to the due course of Nature.

An Anonymous Review-In short order, a five-page unsigned review of King's book (presumably by the editor, Sylvanus Urban), appeared in *Gentlemen's Magazine* ([Urban?], 1796:844). After recounting King's description of the events at Siena and Wold Cottage and remarking on fireballs, the reviewer revealed his attitude:

Much as we are disposed to give Mr. K. full credit for piety and religious zeal, we cannot agree with him in the propriety or probability of multiplying lying miracles on ordinary occasions; for we see not one extraordinary occasion among all that are here recited; nor is the evidence of a few peasants or women to be admitted on those occasions.

The rest of the review consisted of scoffing remarks about King's ideas and the alleged circumstances of historical and recent falls, each of which the reviewer regarded as critically unexamined and not a little ridiculous. Despite decidedly mixed reviews, King's paper was widely read in England and on the continent. In 1797, an extract of it appeared in *Bibliothèque Britannique*, and Chladni (1797: 20) spoke of it in Voight's magazine, where he said he was acquainted with it only through the English reviews.

NEWS RELATING TO METEORITES CRISSCROSSES EUROPE

Some sense of the time required for the dissemination of news at the turn of the nineteenth century is provided by King's evidence that Chladni's book first appeared in England in the summer of 1796, which was more than two years after its publication. Chladni, himself, (1797:17) wrote that the first published report of the Siena fall, by Herr Zóllner, Head of the Church Council and an observer of meteors, appeared in the Berlin Monatschrift of 1796 September. It would seem, then, that more than two years elapsed before news of these two events crossed Europe. Meanwhile, Hamilton's paragraph on the Siena fall in the 1795 February issue of the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society had reached Germany where one of its readers was Wilhelm Olbers at Bremen. Shortly thereafter, Olbers gave a lecture on the Siena fall at the Bremen Museum. In it he raised the question of whether the stones might possibly have been erupted by a volcano on the Moon. Olbers followed up on this idea by calculating the velocity required for a sizeable mass to escape from the Moon and fall to Earth. He concluded that the force was well within reason, but he published nothing on this subject until several years later.

Italian scholars led the way in publishing books and articles about meteorites in response to the Siena fall. William Hamilton and Edward King, in England, were the next in print. Then Chladni's book arrived in western Europe and the trickle of journal articles rose to a flood. In 1796, in the midst of the Revolutionary wars, Marc-Auguste Pictet (1752–1835) in Geneva co-founded the *Bibliothèque Britannique* primarily to provide readers on the continent with French translations of scientific articles in English. From the first, Pictet published articles on meteorites, often with highly favorable editorial commentary. He also published negative viewpoints; so, in short order, the pages of *Bibliothèque Britannique* hummed with controversy. The letters exchanged in its pages, along with extracts of papers in English, French and German journals, provide a running commentary on the events and debates during the formative years of meteoritics.

In France, the Journal de Physique, de Chimie, d'Histoire Naturelle et des Arts, founded in Paris in 1777 by Jean-Claude Delamétherie (1743–1817), had published the analysis of the Lucé stone by Fourgeroux, Cadet, and Lavoisier that year in its second volume, thus establishing a certain editorial bias against the idea of fallen stones. In 1796, the Journal began printing articles on falls, but Lamétherie postponed his own acceptance of fallen stones until 1803. Other French journals including Annales de Chimie et de Physique, founded in 1789, and the Journal des Mines, founded in 1792, entered the fray in 1796.

In Germany, a paper on fireballs by Friedrich Carl Fulda (1774– 1847) was the earliest article to seriously discuss Chladni's ideas. It appeared in Volume I of Gmelin's *Göttingisches Journal der Naturwissenschaften* founded in 1796 and was extracted in 1799 in the *Philosophical Magazine* in England. Without proposing any new explanation for them, Fulda agreed with Chladni that fireballs are not caused by electricity, and he supported Chladni's "grand idea" that fireballs as well as shooting stars may be of cosmic origin, which to Fulda meant in orbit around the Sun. Fulda concluded that Chladni's hypothetical linking of fireballs and fallen stones could be justified only by accurate observations in the future (Fulda, 1799).

In 1797, Johann Heinrich Voigt founded the Magazin für das Neueste aus der Naturkunde in Jena, and that year he published two articles by Chladni himself. In his first article, Chladni (1797:17) listed the events that had taken place since his book appeared: the falls at Siena, Wold Cottage and Barbotan, the belated report of the fall at Pettiswood, and the publication of King's book. He repeated descriptions of a number of falls that were in his book, saying he felt it not superfluous to do so because his somewhat paradoxical method of explaining these phenomena may have prevented some from reading that work. Here, Chladni (1797:25) acknowledged the work of Troili on the Albareto stone. Once again, he argued against the consolidation of stones and irons in the atmosphere and said it was more probable that these masses come from the expanse of the universe.

In his second article in 1797 for Voigt's *Magazin*, Chladni (see 1798) repeated Baudin's account of the spectacular shower at Barbotan in 1790 and then added observations of his own. Baudin thought that the stones aggregated in the atmosphere, but Chladni argued that it can hardly be supposed that substances dissolved in the rarified atmosphere at a height of 20 German miles (1 G.M. = 7420 m), where fireballs are observed to originate, could unite into monstrous, solid masses. Some critics, said Chladni (1798:230), have ridiculed or condemned my hypothesis of cosmic origin altogether, but no one has yet confuted my principles or given any other explanation that accords so well with the facts. Chladni added that he could name several naturalists who had told him they agreed with the essential parts of his hypothesis, but he felt it improper to name them without their express permission.

Chladni then replied to one of the strongest objections being raised to his assertion of cosmic origin: namely, that a mass striking from such a prodigious height would sink not to a depth of a few feet but toward the "very center of the Earth." Chladni (1798:230) explained that the falling masses are not solid but consist of soft and elastic fluids, which, being expanded by the heat to monstrous globular forms, are then supported by the atmosphere and lose the greater part of their gravity. Such soft, tough masses, falling obliquely, would not, in general, sink far into the Earth. Chladni ended with a suggestion, made to him by a colleague, that two or more astronomers, residing at some distance from one another, might agree to observe meteors in the same part of the sky, noting the time and apparent course of their appearance. Differences in meridians and, from these, the real heights and directions of meteors, might be calculated. This idea, which delighted Lichtenberg, was carried out in 1798 by two of his students, Heinrich Wilhelm Brandes (1777-1834) and Johann Friedrich Benzenberg (1777-1846). They obtained velocities up to 67 km/s which lent strong support to Chladni's hypothesis of interstellar origin. Later, these results were shown to be spurious because of the small base lines between observers.

According to Chladni (1819:7), Lichtenberg, at first, did not like his book. Although he, himself, had prompted Chladni to perform the research, Lichtenberg said he wished Chladni had not written it: he felt as if he had been hit on the head with one of Chladni's stones. By 1796 however, Lichtenberg thought differently, and, in one of his many aphorisms he asserted: "The Moon must be an uncivil neighbor as he is saluting the Earth with stones."⁹ Thus, within two years after the appearance of Chladni's book, Lichtenberg not only believed in fallen stones, but he knew of Olbers' speculation that they might be ejecta from lunar volcances. In addition to Lichtenberg and Olbers, Chladni (1819:10) named Franz Xaver von Zach (1754–1832) and Abraham Gottlob Werner (1749–1817) among the earliest German scholars who accepted his hypothesis of fallen bodies.

We have seen that fallen stones entered English literature with favorable articles by Hamilton in 1795 and King and Bingley in 1796, which was followed by a negative response in *Gentlemen's Magazine*. By that summer, the news of the Wold Cottage fall was spreading just as Chladni's book arrived. The lead paper in Volume II of *The Philosophical Magazine*, founded in 1798 by Alexander Tilloch (1759–1825), was a concise eight-page outline of Chladni's book. Presumably, this article ([Tilloch?], 1798), was written by editor-in-chief Tilloch himself. The 1798 December and 1799 January issues of the *Philosophical Magazine* carried translations with commentary of the two articles by Chladni that had appeared in Voight's *Magazin* in 1797.

STONES KEPT FALLING

Portugal, 1796

In 1797, the English author Robert Southey (1774–1843) published a book of 30 letters written on his recent travels in Spain and Portugal. He opened Letter No. 21 (p. 355) with the following disclaimer:

A phenomenon has occurred here within these few days, which we sometimes find mentioned in history, and always disbelieve. I shall make no comment on the account, but give you an authentic copy of the deposition of the witnesses before a magistrate.

The deposition described the fall of a 10 pound stone near Evora, in Portugal, at 2:00 P.M. on 1796 February 19. Two reports were heard, similar to those of explosions in mines, which were followed by a great rumbling that lasted about two minutes. The

sky was clear to the horizon. One man heard a heavy body fall near him and found a stone the color of lead sunk into the ground, still warm. Southey, who was unaware of the falls at Siena and Wold Cottage, felt compelled to adopt his noncommittal attitude toward the story, but his report proved to be well timed. Appearing within a year of King's book, Southey's account brought to English readers fresh evidence of fallen stones from one of the much-admired "Lake Poets."¹⁰

Mulletiwu, 1795; Bielaya Tserkov, 1796; Salles, 1798

Two additional falls took place in far off lands, Mulletiwu, Ceylon, at 8:00 a.m. on 1795 April 13 and Bielaya Tserkov in southern Russia on 1796 January 15, but they were not publicized at the time. Nor was there any account published until 1802 of a shower of stones at Salles in France's Rhone valley at 6:00 P.M. on 1798 March 12.

Benares, India, 1798

A dazzling ball of fire exploded across a serene evening sky near Benares, India, at 8:00 P.M. on 1798 December 19, heralding a large shower of stones. Early in 1799, Sir Joseph Banks in London received a letter from John Lloyd Williams (*ca.* 1765–1838) in India describing the fireball and the appearance of the stones. All of them, he said, had hard black crusts like varnish or bitumen and whitish, gritty interiors with many small spherical bodies interspersed with bright shining grains of metal or pyrite. Williams (in Howard, 1802:179) concluded:

I shall only observe, that it is well known there are no volcanos on the continent of India; and, as far as I can learn, no stones have been met with in the earth, in that part of the world, which bear the smallest resemblance to those above described.

On reading the letter, Sir Joseph was struck by the apparent similarities between the Benares stones and the samples he had obtained from the falls at Siena and Wold Cottage. Judging that it was time for serious scientific investigations, he handed his two samples to the accomplished young chemist, Edward C. Howard (1774–1816) and asked him to analyze them. In 1800 December, Banks presented the Copley Medal, the Royal Society's highest honor, to Howard for his discovery of the fulminate of mercury. In his presentation speech, Banks made it clear that he believed a new field of research was opening (Sears, 1975:218):

Mr. Howard...is now employed in the analysis of certain stones, generations in the air by fiery meteors, the component parts of which will probably open a new field of speculation and discussion to mineralogists as well as to meteorologists.

CHEMISTRY AND CONTROVERSY: 1800-1803

Previous Chemical Analyses of Meteorites

Preparing for the task that Sir Joseph Banks had proposed to him, Howard combed the literature. He read Chladni's book, King's book, and numerous journal articles, and found that only three chemical analyses had previously been performed on bodies of the type that Chladni had listed as fallen from the sky. These were the Lucé stone, the Mesón de Fierro from Argentina, and the stone of Ensisheim. In all three cases, the analysts concluded that the bodies had not fallen from the sky.

Analysis of the Stone from Lucé, France, 1769–The analytical work on the stone from Lucé, performed in the spring of 1769 by the French chemists Fourgeroux, Cadet, and Lavoisier (1777), is discussed above. We will recall that these academicians concluded that it was a pyritiferous rock struck by lightning.

Analysis of the Mesón de Fierro, Argentina, 1799–In an effort to better understand the problem of "native irons," Joséf-Louis Proust (1754–1826), a professor of chemistry in Madrid, analyzed a minute (0.5 ounce) sample of the Mesón de Fiero collected by don Rubin de Celis in 1783. Struck by its silvery luster and its malleability, Proust applied a quantitative analysis for nickel that had been described only two years earlier by Sigismund Hermb-staedt (1797:108) in Berlin. Proust (1799:149) reported 10 wt% of nickel in the iron. Never before had such an alloy been known. Proust, who was not thinking of the mass as a meteorite, remarked that his findings left undecided whether such metals are the work of nature or of artifice.

Analysis of the Stone of Ensisheim, 1800-After hanging in the parish church for 301 years, the great stone of Ensisheim was appropriated by the local revolutionary council in 1793 and exhibited in the new National Museum at Colmar, about 25 km north of Ensisheim. In 1800, Charles Barthold, professor of chemistry at the recently established Ecole Centrale de l'Haut Rhin at Colmar, chipped off a large sample of the stone and performed a bulk analysis. Barthold (1800:171) reported finding 42 wt% SiO₂, 17% Al₂O₃, 14% MgO, 2% CaO and 2% S. His were the first determinations of silica, magnesia, and lime to be made on any meteorite (Sears and Sears, 1977:29). From his results, Barthold concluded that the stone was a common type of argillo-ferrugineous rock that could have been washed down a mountainside in a torrential storm. He speculated that the glitter of pyrite had fooled the superstitious local people into claiming for it a miraculous origin. Barthold said that no notice should be taken of the old story that the stone had fallen from the sky.

Edward C. Howard Assembles Samples for Analysis

In addition to the stones from Siena and Wold Cottage, given to him by Sir Joseph Banks, Howard obtained samples of two more fallen stones, one from Benares sent to him by John Lloyd Williams, and the one said to have fallen in 1753 near Tabor, Bohemia, from Charles Greville (1749-1809), the prominent British collector (and nephew to Sir William Hamilton). Greville had acquired the Tabor stone when he purchased the collection of the Baron Ignaz von Born (1742–1791) of Vienna.¹¹ From Greville and the British Museum, Howard also obtained samples of three native irons: the Pallas Iron from Siberia, the Mesón de Fierro from Argentina, and a mass called the "Bohemian iron" (the Steinbach stony-iron) that had been presented to von Born by the Bergakademie at Freiberg. In addition, the English chemist, Charles Hatchett (1765-1847), gave him a second sample of the Pallas Iron and a specimen of iron found at Siratik in Senegal (Mali) in 1716. It had been brought to London in 1799 by General Charles O'Hara (ca. 1740-1802), former commander of the English garrison at Gorée Island offshore from Dakar.

Working with the French mineralogist, Jacques-Louis the Comte de Bournon (1751–1825), who had fled to England from the Reign of Terror, Howard began the first series of chemical analyses designed to test the possibility that the stones and irons he investigated might well have fallen from the sky. Meanwhile, a new planet was discovered in the sky.

A New Planet: Between Mars and Jupiter

On the opening night of the nineteenth century, 1801 January 1, Giuseppe Piazzi (1746–1826), Director of the Observatory at Palermo, Sicily, discovered a small body in motion against the background of the constellation Taurus. Piazzi tracked its position for about a month. Then he fell ill and when he returned to his telescope the body had disappeared from view. Piazzi circulated his measurements to other astronomers and, from them, Carl Gauss devised a method (still used, in principle) to calculate a planet's orbit from a few observations. Gauss predicted the return of the body the following year to an accuracy of 0.5°. The body, which Piazzi named Ceres, was orbiting in the wide space between Mars and Jupiter where the Titus-Bode "Law," published in 1782, had indicated there should be a planet. Piazzi's discovery caused great excitement among astronomers everywhere.

The Great Debates

While Howard and de Bournon worked diligently to characterize their samples, a storm of controversy erupted in the literature.

Guillaume DeLuc versus Marc-Auguste Pictet-In 1801, Pictet published in Bibliothéque Britannique a French translation of the extract of Chladni's book that had appeared in the Philosophical Magazine in 1799. By way of introduction to the piece, Pictet (1801a:74) referred to a work of sublime fiction, a glory of French literature, in which the author Jacques Necker (1800,2:34) asks his readers to imagine the miraculous arrival on our Earth of some inhabitants of one of the celestial spheres; for several moments we have permission to talk with them and try to understand them: what questions shall we ask them? In thus giving wings to his brilliant imagination, remarked Pictet, the author scarcely suspects that certain facts have been brought to light that lead philosophers of our time to regard it as possible that there do arrive on our Earth not some living beings from other planets but samples of the material of which these planets are composed. We submit to the judgement of our readers, declared Pictet, the observations of natural history that have led this German professor (Chladni) to this singular conclusion. We invite them to hold off from unfavorable prejudgements and to give to the ingenious interpretations made by this wise author all the attention that they seem to merit.

There followed the extract of Chladni's book after which Pictet remarked that whatever we may think of his hypothesis, this German savant has put forward a more plausible explanation than all those offered previously of the singular facts of falling stones, which are difficult to doubt when we consider the great number of such events attested to by authorities who are, for the most part, respectable.

One reader, Guillaume-Antoine DeLuc (1729–1812) of Geneva, did not see it that way. In a letter to Pictet, dated 1801 July 5, he vigorously protested the publication of Chladni's ideas in *Bibliothèque Britannique* and the editor's favorable treatment of them. Bodies simply do not fall from the sky, wrote DeLuc, persons only imagine such things when lightning bolts strike too close to them. If bodies were to fall they certainly would not land at the surface but would penetrate deeply into the Earth and shatter into a thousand pieces. Nor, he declared, do bolts of lightning transform common rocks to those imagined to fall. "There was a time," wrote DeLuc (1801a:314), "when belemnite fossils were called lightning stones ...that idea may seem very strange today but is no more so than the current hypothesis."

DeLuc believed that geologists should seek natural causes for curiosities such as the Pallas Iron. He argued, quite reasonably, that each time one discovers that the appearance of an object cannot be reconciled with sane physics and good logic, one should suspend judgement and continue studying it until one learns to understand it. From Pallas' description of the Siberian mass as "porous as a rough sponge," DeLuc concluded that it clearly consisted of volcanic scoria, which is similar in many respects to ferruginous scorias observed in lavas of numerous active and extinct volcanoes. Its large size and isolated position did not impress him in the least. Huge blocks of granite are found lying on wide plains and rugged highlands at enormous distances from granite mountains, wrote DeLuc, as are scorias from the vents of volcanoes. But, exclaimed DeLuc (1801a:318), nobody yet has informed us that the isolated blocks of granite fell from the atmosphere!

DeLuc's explanation for the granite erratics had been put forward by his older, and more famous, brother, Jean-André DeLuc (1727-1817), who is credited by some historians (e.g., Taylor, 1979:78) with introducing the term "geology" in its modern sense in 1788. Both DeLucs held that scientific ideas must conform with the laws of the Creator. Thus, in a series of letters, completed in 1798, in which Jean DeLuc set out geologic and historical proofs of the divine mission of Moses, he wrote that in the fifth period of Creation, great subterranean caverns in the Earth collapsed, triggering violent outbursts of expansible fluids at depth. These generated enormous eruptions of basalt and projected high into the air huge blocks of granite, primordial rocks, and volcanics that came to rest on limey and sandy deposits on mountains, valleys, and plains where they are found today. In 1779, Horace-Bénédict de Saussure (1740-1799) had pointed out that the great flying blocks should have made craters where they plunged back to Earth (Saussure, 1779), a point ignored by the DeLucs.

To Guillaume DeLuc, the supreme harmony of the universe required that all globes move through space in their assigned places. Thus, Chladni's idea was unthinkable that small bodies left over from the Creation might travel through infinite space until they enter the gravitational sphere of a large body, or, worse yet, that planets, and even whole systems of planets, could have been formed, destroyed, and formed again from the debris of previous ones. Those naturalists, wrote DeLuc (1801a:313):

...who give free rein to their imagination on points of such importance, and who abandon their religious contemplation of the works of the Creator, do not reflect on all the evil that they produce in the moral world.

Shortly after DeLuc's broadside appeared, *Bibliothèque Britannique* published a letter from Pictet (1801b:415) describing a visit to Howard in his London laboratory. When Howard showed him the suite of four stones he was working on, Pictet was astonished by their similarities; all of them had black, vitreous crusts and light, grainy interiors scattered with pyrite and malleable grains of metallic iron. They were strikingly different from any familiar rocks of our globe. Pictet declared that he no longer could doubt the fact of their falls from the sky, whatever might be their mode of origin.

Opposition Mounts: Louis Bertrand and Eugène Patrin-The editors of *Bibliothèque Britannique* received two additional negative responses to their extract of Chladni's book. The first was from Louis Bertrand (1731–1812) of Geneva, the second from Eugène M. L. Patrin (1742–1815), a prominent and widely traveled French mineralogist then serving as director of the national manufacturing organization at St. Etienne.

Bertrand (1801a:433) declared that Chladni's hypothesis that fragments of other planets fall on the Earth had been well refuted in a recent issue by G.-A. DeLuc. If, however, Chladni were to abandon that idea in favor of forming the bodies in the atmosphere from terrestrial exhalations, he must show how 336 quintals of iron, rising as vapors and displacing at least 358,400 cubic feet of air, would precipitate, when set aflame, as a mass with a volume of nearly 59 cubic feet. How could the iron escape oxidation in the fire? How could it fall as pure, malleable metal?

Bertrand was no more favorable to DeLuc's explanation of the widespread distribution of huge blocks. One can scarcely understand, he wrote, how subterranean fluids capable by their expansion of breaking up rocks and projecting their fragments everywhere, have traversed so many beds without disturbing them. The fluids would have had to explode from a prodigious number of points on the Earth to scatter the debris that is found in every single country of any extent. However, most of the superficial beds of the globe are intact and in a state where the sea left them, with the exception of those disturbed by volcanoes or the works of man.

With many naturalists of his time, Bertrand pictured dramatic exchanges in the distribution of continents and oceans due to periodic displacements of the Earth's center of gravity. He argued that currents of tremendous force set up in oceans would wash huge blocks down the slopes of submarine mountains and deposit them on the shores of new seas. In his view, blocks as large and heavy as the Pallas Iron could be deposited on mountain tops in the next cycle.

Here we see that large iron meteorites, encountered far from any plausible sources, became an issue in debates over the origin of erratic boulders of granite and other rocks that were scattered over the countryside of northern Europe. Not until the late 1820s and 1830s would scientists begin to visualize erratics as debris deposited by an ice sheet of continental proportions. The concept of an Ice Age, promoted in 1837 by Louis Agassiz (1807–1873) in his own flamboyant style, sparked some of the fiercest controversy in the history of geology.

Eugène Patrin opposed both Chladni's hypothesis that bodies fall from the sky and DeLuc's claim that the Pallas Iron is volcanic. Patrin wrote (1801:205):

The two opinions are equally inadmissable. That of Mr. G. -A. DeLuc is contradicted by the facts of which I have certain knowledge...that of Mr. Chladni presents enormous difficulties.

Patrin had seen the Pallas Iron at the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg and been impressed by Pallas' report that the country rock at its find site included bands of ore assaying 70% of iron. Patrin concluded that a bolt of lightning on the iron ore had melted the mass and reduced it to metal.

On November 10, before there was time for any response to Patrin's letter, Guillaume DeLuc wrote to *Bibliothèque Britannique* referring to Pictet's "interesting article" in which he described his visit to Howard in his laboratory and expressed his certitude that the stones he saw there actually had fallen from the sky. Do Pictet's observations destroy my arguments of last July against such an origin, asked DeLuc (1801b:273). I propose to examine this question (to which his answer was "No!"). DeLuc blamed all the excitement about falling stones on the supposed fall at Wold Cottage in Yorkshire, which, he said, simply could not have taken place. In his opinion, too many savants had been willing to be taken in by the word of an ignorant laborer. The stone at Wold Cottage, DeLuc assured his readers, had reposed in tranquility for many centuries in the niche in the soil where it was found.

DeLuc then turned his attention to Bertrand's recent letter arguing that exotic rocks such as the Pallas Iron were distributed over the land by violent currents in the displaced ocean. DeLuc opposed Bertrand's hypothesis mainly because of its consequences. He said that Bertrand, and many other scientists of his time, believed with Edmond Halley that the Earth has an empty space at its center, which is partially occupied by a magnetic globe. Shifts in the position of that interior magnet would change the Earth's center of gravity and wreak vast changes in the distribution of lands and seas. Bertrand, he said, called upon close encounters of a long-period comet to nudge the magnetic core aside. DeLuc was horrified (1801b: 394):

At the moment of the displacement, which Mr. B. contemplates without embarrassment, the sea with the greatest violence and accelerating velocity will sweep away the people and all living beings from the Earth. They all will perish. How can they escape that sudden invasion of the sea? But afterward the continents will be renewed! What a sad renewal!...We rely upon the Divine Providence for the preservation of His work. His ways are more certain and more efficacious than the thoughts of men.

This attack brought forth an irate letter from Bertrand (1801b: 432) who printed the above paragraph by DeLuc next to a paragraph from his own book in which he specifically addressed the problem of how to avoid the destruction of people and other living things during the translation of the ocean. If the seas are large, he wrote, the globe is much larger, and the oceans will principally flow from one hemisphere to the other through the profoundly deep valleys between them, such as the beds of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. He pictured the waters rushing from pole to pole on either side of the Americas. And always, there would be highlands inaccessable to the waters to serve as havens for inhabitants of the land (which seems to beg the question of erratics on high mountains.)

Suddenly, in the *Journal des Mines* of 1801 November, DeLuc announced a change of mind about the origin of the Pallas Iron. He had concluded that the iron mass from Siberia most likely was a product of an ancient and long-abandoned mining and smelting operation. Although Pallas had reported that there was no local knowledge of such things near the site, DeLuc observed that certain scorias at the summit of Mont Salève near Geneva give positive indications that ancient (Gallo-Roman) foundaries existed there, although no traces have been discovered and all memory of them are lost. On completing his defense of this mode of origin, DeLuc remarked that if no sign of workings ever are found on the mountain in Siberia, he will return to his theory of a volcanic origin of the mass. DeLuc wrote (1801c:220):

I regard, at present, the question as perfectly settled. This mass that has given rise to so many hypotheses, and which has been considered to be native iron, is very simply, without any doubt, a product of abandoned exploitations of the mine near the site where it was found.

Analyses by Edward C. Howard and Jacques-Louis de Bournon: 1802

The situation in 1802 was aptly described by Louis-Nicholas Vauquelin (1763–1829), the French chemist, who wrote (Vauquelin, 1802:308):

While all Europe resounded with the reports of stones fallen from the sky, while savants, divided in opinion on this subject, were forming hypotheses to explain the origin of them, each according to his own viewpoint, Mr. Edward Howard, an able English chemist, was pursuing in silence the only route which could lead to a solution of the problems.

De Bournon noted that each of their stones had four main components: "curious globules," martial pyrites, grains of malleable iron, and fine-grained earthy matrix. Using a magnifying glass, he performed the extraordinarily difficult task of separating each of these components so that Howard could analyze them individually. For the first time on any meteorites, Howard applied the alkali fusion technique to analyze the silicates (Sears and Sears, 1977:30). The stones proved to be strikingly similar to each other in mineralogy and chemical composition but different in several respects from any known rocks of the Earth's crust.

Today, we recognize de Bournon's "curious globules" as chondrules (little grains), named as such in 1869 by Gustav Rose (1798– 1873) at the Mineralogical Museum of Humboldt University in Berlin. Howard found that the reddish-yellow iron sulfide ("martial pyrites") differed from all known sulfides. It was nonmagnetic and more iron-rich than pyrite, but Howard found it impossible to extract a pure sample. Not until the 1860s was this mineral shown to be stoichiometric iron sulfide (FeS), a new species virtually limited to meteorites. In 1863, at the urging of Wilhelm Karl Haidinger (1795–1871) in Vienna, Rose named this mineral troilite in honor of Domenico Troili who, as noted above, had first noted this brassy mineral in the Albareto stone in 1766. Even after its composition was known, disputes on the crystallography and occurrence of troilite continued into the twentieth century.

By applying the technique used by Proust, Howard confirmed Proust's value of 10 wt% Ni in the iron of Mesón de Fierro from Argentina, and he measured several percent of nickel in the three other irons and in the metal grains of the four stones. The presence of nickel decisively linked the stones with the irons and set "fallen bodies" apart from all known rocks and all manufactured metals. De Bournon (1802a:208) described the transparent, yellowish-green substance in the Pallas Iron as similar to peridot (gem olivine); Howard's analyses confirmed its identity. Chladni (1794:40) struck the mark when he called it olivine before he ever saw a sample.

Howard (1802:198) discussed the marked differences between his results on the stones and those obtained by the academicians on the Lucé stone in 1769 and by Barthold on the Ensisheim stone in 1800. In both cases, the chemists analyzed bulk samples in which they detected no nickel. Howard believed both would have found nickel if they had analyzed the metal fractions separately. Fourgeroux et al. (1777) reported 55.5% of "vitrifiable earths" without attempting to distinguish between silica and magnesia. Barthold reported 14% MgO in his bulk analysis of Ensisheim. This was close to Howard's values, but Barthold also reported 2% of CaO and 17% of Al₂O₃ of which Howard found neither. Howard suggested that if Barthold's alumina should prove to be silica, their results would be in closer agreement. After reading Howard's report, the French chemist Antoine de Fourcroy (1755-1809) analyzed a sample of the Ensisheim stone and reported 2.4% Ni and 1.4% CaO but no alumina (Fourcroy, 1803:303).

Howard (1802:201) reported that he passed an electric discharge over a freshly fractured surface of a stone from Benares in an attempt to form a black crust on it. The stone was rendered luminous in the dark for a quarter of an hour, and the trace of the electric fluid turned black. He lay no stress on this because many substances become luminous by electricity. This was, however, the first observation of thermoluminescence in a meteorite.

Howard (1802:211) summed up their findings on the stones: They all have pyrites of a peculiar character. They all have a coating of black oxide of iron. They all contain an alloy of iron and nickel. And the earths which serve them as a sort of connecting medium, correspond in their nature, and nearly in their proportions.

Fortunately for the founding of meteoritics, all of the four stones examined by Howard and de Bournon were ordinary chondrites. To Howard, their results, coupled with reports of witnesses to their falls, removed all doubt as to the descent of these stony substances and to the irons as well. To disbelieve on the mere ground of incomprehensibility, he said, would be to dispute most of the works of nature. Howard added that it is not necessary to further defend the fact of falls to those of impartial judgement but is useless to argue against those who do not wish to believe in them.

Attempts to reconcile these occurrences with known principles of philosophy already were abundant, wrote Howard (1802:200):

It is, however, remarkable that Dr. Chladni, who seems to have indulged in these speculations with most success, should have connected the descent of fallen stones with meteors...and that the descent of the stones near Benares, should have been immediately accompanied with a meteor.

Howard (1802:212) concluded with two questions: "1st. Have not all fallen stones, and what are called native irons, the same origin? 2ndly. Are all, or any, the produce of the bodies of meteors?"

Howard's paper introduced hard science into the controversy, and, as argued by Sears (1975:223), it was the single most important factor in bringing about wide acceptance of fallen stones. It is interesting to learn, therefore, that his feelings about them were much more positive than stated in the text. Sears (1976:138) reported that a large number of alterations were made in the manuscript before its publication, some probably by Howard himself and others by Edward W. Gray, the secretary of the Royal Society. Many of the alterations tempered the style so that assertions became possibilities. For example, the title which had read "...substances which have at different times fallen" was changed to "...are said to have fallen" (Sears, 1976:138).

Today, the Siena, Wold Cottage, Tabor, and Benares stones are classified, respectively, as LL5, L6, H5, and LL6 chondrites; Krasnojarsk (the Pallas Iron) is taken as the type specimen of pallasites; and Steinbach (the Bohemian iron) is classified as an anomalous IVA stony-iron. Although the Mesón de Fierro itself lies lost in the chaco, the abundant irons collected at Campo del Cielo, Argentina, are fragments of a IA coarse octahedrite. The Siratik iron in which Howard reported 5-6% Ni presents a problem: two specimens labeled Siratik in the British Museum, which would have been available to Howard, consist of cast iron with <0.1% nickel. In other European museums, certain samples labeled Siratik from the same source area are fragments of a hexahedrite containing about 5% nickel (Buchwald, 1975:1135). Did de Bournon fail to recognize cast iron? Did Howard report 5% nickel in a sample of cast iron? Or, more likely, did they analyze a hexahedrite fragment that is not in the British Museum?

Howard read his report at three successive meetings of the Royal Society, on 1802 February 25, March 4, and March 11. The sessions were well attended partly because his presentations were interspersed with new observations on the planet Ceres. Howard's manuscript, which included sections authored separately by de Bournon and a letter on the Benares fall by John Lloyd Williams. was published in the 1802 February, issue of Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (Williams, 1802). In short order, the Howard-de Bournon paper received much attention in England and France. The March issue of the Philosophical Magazine published an extract of it. Pictet himself attended the Royal Society meetings and published his account in the May issue of Bibliothèque Britannique. The following autumn, a 30-page extract signed by Citizen Tonnellier (Louis-Auguste Tonnelier-Breteuil, 1730-1807), curator of minerals at the Ecole des Mines in Paris and a former president of the Academy, appeared in the 1802 October-November, issue of the Journal des Mines (Tonnellier, 1802). Extracts also appeared in both the Journal de Physique and Annales de Chimie et de Physique.

Significance of the Chemical Studies-The chemical and mineralogical work of Howard and de Bournon placed meteorite studies on a firm scientific basis and set new directions for laboratory procedures. Subsequently all analysts separated fallen stones into their main components and performed quantitative determinations of nickel on the metals. Most of them also adopted the alkali fusion method of analyzing silicates.

In the spring of 1802, Howard visited Paris and learned that Vauquelin had analyzed stones from the Barbotan and Siena showers. His results were similar to Howard's, and Howard urged him to publish them. In 1802 October, Pictet presented Howard's results to the National Institute of Sciences and Arts (into which the Royal Academy of Sciences had been absorbed during the Revolution), and four months later, in 1803 February 10, Fourcroy presented Vauquelin's results to the Institute. These chemical data persuaded several leading members that the fallen bodies do indeed constitute a separate type of matter that must originate outside the Earth.

A Second Small Planet: Between Mars and Jupiter

On 1802 March 28, Wilhelm Olbers discovered a second small planet, he named Pallas, in orbit between Mars and Jupiter. Olbers suggested that the two small bodies were fragments of a planet that had been destroyed by an internal explosion or a collision with a comet. He predicted that more pieces would be discovered.

Lunar Volcanic Origin: Laplace's Hypothesis?

In 1802 September, Pierre-Simon Laplace (1749–1827) wrote to the astronomer Franz Xaver von Zach at Gotha raising the question of whether fallen stones might be ejecta from volcanoes on the Moon. Laplace raised this issue again in 1803 February, following Fourcroy's presentation of Vauquelin's results to the Institute. His question aroused much interest among the members. Siméon-Denis Poisson (1781–1840) began calculations to test it. Jean-Baptiste Biot (1774–1862) supported the idea with enthusiasm (Biot, 1803a). In December, after news of "Laplace's hypothesis" reached Bremen, Wilhelm Olbers (1802:121) wrote to Carl Gauss:

What say you to stones fallen from heaven, and Laplace's idea that perhaps they are the product of lunar volcanism? The *possibility* of a selenitic origin of these stones I suggested 7 years ago in a lecture here in the Museum on the shower of stones from Siena.

Olbers said that back in 1795 he had not taken a lunar origin seriously because he understood that Hamilton had seen similar rocks on Mt. Vesuvius. However, Olbers had calculated the lunar escape velocity and concluded that a vertical force of only about 7,800 to 8,000 feet per second would be required to project heavy bodies off the lunar surface. Such a force seemed well within that of the violent eruptions that were required to form the lunar craters. To Olbers, therefore, it appeared not altogether impossible that the stones, which so closely resembled each other but were unlike those of the Earth, had come from the Moon.

While a lunar origin seemed possible, Olbers saw great difficulties with this idea. First, the forward motion of the Moon would require that, to fall on the Earth, the ejected bodies must assume elliptical orbits with perigees within the Earth's body or its atmosphere. Only a few fragments would follow such orbits, while a great many more would circle the Earth as satellites. Meanwhile, the Moon should dwindle in size from a constant loss of mass. Although Olbers was intrigued with the idea, he was far from asserting that the fallen stones had been projected from the Moon. It was the same with Laplace, who raised the question and discussed it but never seriously proposed a lunar origin.

Olbers (1803b:289) discussed all the difficulties with a lunar source in a second letter to von Zach and added:

It is much to be wished that the ingenious Chladni would favor us with a new edition of his celebrated essay on the mass of iron found in Siberia, as he no doubt would be able, from Benzenberg and Brandes' observations on fallen stars, Howard's chemical examination, and from various other documents, to make considerable additions to it.

It is interesting to learn that, in 1803, a leading German astronomer was calling for a second edition of Chladni's book. Sixteen years would pass before Chladni issued his second book, *Über Feuer-Meteore* (1819) in which he compiled all extant information about the occurrences and physics of falls and the composition of meteorites.

Olbers (1803a) finally published his lecture notes of 1795 along with his calculations of the lunar escape velocity. Today, he generally is credited (*e.g.*, Burke, 1986:61) as the first person to speculate that meteorites might be lunar volcanic ejecta, but we already have met with that idea in a letter from William Thomson to Soldani written in 1794.

The Debates Intensify

The Conversion of Saint-Amans–In 1802 March 30, Jean F. B. Saint-Amans (1748–1831), then a professor of natural history at Agen, sent an excited letter to *Bibliothèque Britannique*. Saint-Amans recounted the story of the fall at Agen (Barbotan) in 1790, his own demand for a notarized document, and the subsequent editorial by Berthelon that despaired of the popular belief in an impossible phenomenon. Saint-Amans wrote (1802:87):

Afterward, citizen, this event entirely faded from my memory; I had forgotten the meteor, the stones, and the deposition...(until) reading your description of the stones that were said to have fallen from the clouds, I remembered that along with the deposition I had received a sample of one of the stones from Agen. I ran to my cabinet and found that, by sheer chance, I had saved the sample; such was my surprise, I dare say my delight, when I saw in this sample a striking identity with those which you described: a shiny surface, grainy fracture, metallic grains in the interior! It is impossible not to be astonished with such a resemblance. This new observation...seems worthy of being communicated to you. (I find it) very remarkable that all the "fallen" stones...from different countries present exactly the same characteristics, and I remain convinced that, however absurd the allegation may have appeared...one must hurry up to ascertain the facts.

Saint-Amans soon was leaving for England and wished to know where he could see the stones being studied; he would bring along his own for comparison.

Guillaume DeLuc versus Marc Pictet: Second Round-Immediately following Saint-Amans letter in the *Bibliothèque Britannique* was a four-page account by Pictet (1802:89) of Howard's paper in the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. He reviewed the methods employed by Howard and de Bournon and reported their results, emphasizing the importance of Howard's discovery of nickel in the metals of both the irons and stones. Writing in a matter-of-fact tone as though he were reporting well-established facts, Pictet cited the nickel as evidence of an origin outside the Earth.

Guillaume DeLuc, who had attended Howard's final presentation to the Royal Society in 1802 March 11, read Pictet's summary with growing concern which he voiced in an article that, by chance, was printed directly after Tonnellier's extract of Howard's paper in the *Journal des Mines*. DeLuc protested that he already had rebutted Chladni's ideas of rocks falling from space and had shown it to be inconceivable that large bodies can form in the atmosphere or that ordinary rocks may be transformed to metal by lightning bolts, except in folk tales. Nothing is more common, declared DeLuc (1802:94) than stones or rocks, coarse-grained on fractured surfaces, of the type that so astonished M. Saint-Amans. Grits, sandstones, granites, all contain mineral particles that look like that; examples multiply when we consider volcanics.

DeLuc once more raised the issue of the Wold Cottage stone. Meteors always were said to occur in the form of luminous globes; how, then, he asked, could this angular, irregular stone of gray granite have fallen from a meteor? In any case, the supposed fall was attested to by a mere laborer. DeLuc did not doubt that the laborer believed his own story, but the reports of others in the area had convinced DeLuc that a sudden peal of thunder had occurredas sometimes happens in December and January-and a bolt of lightning had struck a rock nearby impregnating it with a strong odor of sulfur and sending up chips of surface material all around the laborer. DeLuc attacked Edward King's conjecture that the stone might have formed from ash of Mt. Hecla; the impossibility, he said, was only too evident. Nothing falls from the sky, declared De-Luc: no pieces of planets, no thunder stones, no concretions of volcanic vapors. Nowhere in this paper does he mention Howard by name or allude to his analytical results.

Eugène Patrin Challenges Howard and de Bournon–In contrast to Saint-Amans, who willingly abandoned his earlier prejudices, Eugène Patrin responded to Howard's paper with 17 pages of biting criticism in the 1802 June, issue of the *Journal de Physique*. His opening salvo set the tone (Patrin, 1802:376):

To present to the public marvelous facts is to be assured of pleasing the great majority of readers; to destroy the marvelous and to return events to the common order is not the way to be received so favorably; but the zealous love of science and nature demands that sacrifice.

Thus, in effect, Patrin began by challenging the motives and scientific integrity of Howard and de Bournon. There are some today, he said, who regard it as something juridically proven that there fall to Earth, from time to time, stony and metallic masses, some of which are of considerable size. Some believe they are the matter of fireballs; others regard them as pieces of other planets. Mr. Howard, a very competent English chemist, has accepted the reports of various witnesses that tend to prove the fall of these stones, but it is very important to note who all these persons are. Mr. Howard has declared that these stones have nothing in common with thunder, and that since we have learned of the identity of the phenomena of thunder and electricity, the idea of a thunderstone "is ridiculous." Nevertheless, if the reports of the witnesses can prove anything, it is that the stones in question are veritable thunderstones, of the sort that Howard, himself, has called ridiculous. Patrin composed the following list of seven facts, here severely condensed, cited by Howard and his own reflections upon them:

Fact 1: Howard reported that Mr. Southey provided a notarized document detailing the fall of a stone in Portugal on 1796 February 19. Patrin's response: I can only observe that reports of such marvels, even when juridically certified, especially in certain countries, are always doubtful.

Fact 2: Howard stated that the Abbé Bachelay had sent a stone to the Royal Academy that persons said they had seen fall on 1768 September 13. Patrin's response: The chemists of the Academy, including Lavosier, analyzed it and said that it had not fallen from the sky but was simply a pyrite-rich substance struck by lightning. This stone was much the same as a sample of rock covered with glassy blisters that was collected on the summit of Mt. Blanc in 1787 by the illustrious Horace-Bénédict de Saussuré, who concluded that it had been struck by lightning. Fact 3: Howard described the large stone known as the "thunderstone of Ensisheim" that was said to have fallen in Alsace on 1492 November 7. Patrin's response: Professor Barthold at Colmar analyzed a sample and found it to be nothing else than a spheroidal concretion of the sort frequently found in beds of pyrite-rich argillite. Barthold concluded that the glitter of pyrite had fooled the superstitious populace into giving the stone a miraculous existence that was contrary to the first principles of physics.

Fact 4: Mr. Howard invoked the alleged fall of stones at the feet of men, women, and children after a series of detonations at Siena in 1794. Patrin's response: it is easy to see that this type of evidence is not to be relied upon; thousands of absurdities have been certified by thousands of witnesses of that sort. In simple truth, the stones of Siena were, like the one from Lucé analyzed by Lavoisier, pyriterich masses struck by lightning. Inasmuch as Howard's analyses bore no resemblance to that of the three French academicians, they were not to be relied on.

Fact 5: Howard described the fall of a 56 pound stone at Wold Cottage in Yorkshire and the many attestations by witnesses to the event. Patrin's response: Howard was taken in by the testimony of mere laborers. Lightning had struck a pyrite-rich concretion in the chalk beds of the area.

Fact 6: Howard described a supposed shower of stones containing pyrite and metal near Benares in 1798 December 19. Patrin's response: Mr. John Lloyd Williams in his letter to Sir Joseph Banks (included in Howard's report) stated that neither he nor any persons he could name had actually seen stones fall. He relied on villagers at some distance from Benares. In addition, Howard passed an electric discharge over a sample from Benares and found that the trace of the electric fluid had turned black. Howard did not seem to realize that he had performed with his battery the same thing that lightning performed in the fields of Benares.

Fact 7: Howard analyzed a stone from Tabor, Bohemia, among his "fallen stones." Patrin's response: the celebrated mineralogist Ignaz von Born, himself, had written that the pyritiferous stone from Tabor was nothing extraordinary, although he noted that some credulous people claimed that it fell in the midst of thunderclaps on 1753 July 3. Here, again, is a thunderstone of the sort that Howard, himself, has called ridiculous.

Before challenging Howard's chemical findings on isolated masses of iron, Patrin disputed the value of each of the mineralogical descriptions by de Bournon. In sum, he found nothing in these stones with black crusts and gray, gritty interiors scattered with metal, gray globules, and pyrite that set them apart from ordinary rocks. When he finally mentioned Howard's findings of nickel in the metals, Patrin declared that many minerals contain nickel, none of which are under the slightest suspicion of being related to metcors. Patrin (1802: 393) concluded: "...the love of the marvelous is the most dangerous adversary of science."

De Bournon Takes up the Challenge–De Bournon (1802b: 294) responded in high dudgeon. How could Patrin dismiss detailed analytical work on stones without ever seeing them or any others like them? If he had seen those that he and Howard had worked on, Patrin would know they did not consist of pyrite but had very small amounts of pyrite scattered through them. Patrin did not approve of the witnesses Howard relied upon; he would prefer them to be educated people. So, perhaps, would we, said de Bournon, but stones fall mainly in the countryside and are observed by country people who provide descriptions of marked similarity. How did Patrin explain nickel in these stones and none in deposits of pyrite? If, as

Patrin believed, lightning bolts had transformed veins of iron ore into the 1,600 pound mass of metal from Siberia and the 30,000 pound mass in Argentina, what bolts of lightning those would be! Patrin himself must love marvels! Patrin must choose whether he will claim that the lightning bolts changed part of the iron to nickel or introduced nickel into the metal. Since issuing their report, he and Howard had analyzed two more stones, those from Salles and Barbotan, and both were of the same kind as the four analyzed earlier. It was, de Bournon wrote, beyond the laws of chance to find, time after time, the same unusual type of stone where people have seen them fall, whatever the social rank of the witnesses.

The Concession of Eugène Patrin-In the December issue of Journal de Physique, Patrin (1803:392) conceded all points. He said that he regretted his previous attack on the proofs given for the fall of stony masses from flaming meteors. He had mounted his attack, he explained, because, independently of his respect for the savants who reported them, he had a great interest in seeing demonstrated with certainty a fact that would support his theory of volcanoes. He had founded his theory on his conviction that matters that nourish volcanoes and those that belch forth from them are furnished by the fluids of the atmosphere, which, after having circulated within the Earth's crust where they are modified and recombined, erupt as inflammable metallic and stony matters that produce all the phenomena of volcanism. Nothing could be more analogous to this than the theory that masses of inflammable stony and metallic matter form in the atmosphere and are accompanied by burning meteors as they fall.

Patrin said he was not at all surprised to see that solid matter held in solution in inflammable gases could recombine into masses of more or less considerable size. It certainly was not the possibility of this fact that Patrin had pretended to contest; on the contrary, he contested it only because he wished to see it confirmed, and he much regretted that he had not accepted the testimony of the eyewitnesses to this reality.

Now, wrote Patrin, the new proofs set forth by de Bournon left nothing to be desired. Patrin was gratified, he said, to have given this respected naturalist the occasion to authenticate more and more of these facts that are of such importance to our terrestrial sphere. No further objections to fallen stones were to be heard from Eugène Patrin.

Over the New Year, 1803–1804, the *Journal des Mines* published a French translation by Eugène Couquebert of Chladni's book *Ironmasses*.

NEW FALLS: FRESH EVIDENCE

The Fall at Salles, France, 1789: A Belated Report, 1803

In 1803 March, Etienne Marie Gilbert, the Marquise de Drée (1760–1848), who was said to possess the finest mineral collection in France, wrote in great excitement to the National Institute that he had examined one more fallen stone. On a visit to Lyon in 1802 February, de Drée had been told by Dr. Pétetin, president of the Medical Society of Lyon, of the fall of a stone that had occurred at 8:00 P.M. in 1798 June 17 at Salles, near Villefranche. Scarcely able to contain himself, de Drée asked to see a sample. The doctor promised to send him one if he could find it. Shortly thereafter, he had received the stone and de Drée wrote: (1803a:372):

I was struck with more than a grand surprise when I found in this stone a perfect identity with the samples I have of those from Benares and Wold Cottage; an identity not only manifested by the In those years, person after person was experiencing the shock of recognition that led to confirmation of an entirely new natural phenomenon.

De Drée, 1803: The First Meteorite Classification

De Drée took a great interest in meteorites and immediately began to work out a classification of them based chiefly on their materials, as reported by Howard and Vauquelin, and the circumstances of their falls. He distinguished the following four classes (de Drée, 1803b:410):

Class I: Stones consisting of similar materials that fell in serene weather without thunderstorms: Salles, Ensisheim, Barbotan, Benares, Wold Cottage.

Class II: Stones of the same materials as Class I but which fell from enflamed clouds with lightning flashes with or without detonations: Siena, Tabor.

Class III: Masses mainly of malleable iron, of which the only observed fall occurred at Agram in Croatia after a fireball and an explosion followed by rumbling sounds.

Class IV: All masses for which the circumstances of fall are not verified and their compositions fall outside those of the first three classes or are uncertain: his list of about 20 included the irons found in Siberia, Argentina, and Senegal; stones from observed falls including Lucé, Eichstädt, and Portugal, and about a dozen historical accounts taken mainly from Chladni.

De Drée's attempt illustrates the importance given at that early time to the circumstances of falls as though they might have genetic significance. It also shows the immensity of the labors that lay ahead in efforts to understand meteorites and construct meaningful classifications of them.

The Fall at L'Aigle, France, 1803

In 1803 April 26, at one o'clock in an afternoon of clear skies, a fireball coursed northwestward out of a single high, gray cloud in the vicinity of L'Aigle in Normandy. After three violent detonations, nearly 3000 stones fell into the fields with loud hissing noises. Thunderous reverberations continued for the next ten minutes. Affrighted persons who picked them up found the stones to be very warm and smelling of sulfur. The stones were polygonal in shape, covered with black crusts, and ranged up to 17 pounds in weight. Fourcroy obtained stones and analyzed them in conjunction with Vauquelin. They found them to closely resemble all other fallen stones. On June 19, Fourcroy (1803:304) reported their results to the Institute and supported Chladni's hypothesis of fallen stones.

A Report by Charles Lambotin-The first published account of the event appeared in the May-June issue of the *Journal de Physique*. It was written by Citizen Charles Lambotin (1803), a student of mineralogy and dealer in natural history objects in Paris. Lambo-

FIG. 14. Map of the L'Aigle area. The notation in the margin reads: "Topographic idea of the place where the stones fell from the atmosphere, drawn by Citizen Marais for inclusion with the memoir of Citizen Lambotin, naturalist." The dotted line outlines the area where stones were found. Notations at upper left key the locations and weights of 5 stones, ranging from 3 to 17 pounds. Dated Messidor, An XI (1803 June 20–July 18), this was the first map to outline a strewn field. Unfortunately, the map was not published with Lambotin's mémoir, which had appeared the previous month (Prairial). (From de Brébisson, 1916; from the Paneth reprint collection, courtesy of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution.)

tin quoted from a letter written on May 3 by an eyewitness, one Citizen Marais of L'Aigle, to a friend who lived in the same house in Paris as Lambotin. The friend, M. Château, passed Marais' letter to Lambotin, urging him to bring this matter to the attention of the National Institute. Lambotin immediately wrote to L'Aigle for more information and commissioned a search for stones. Before the month was out, the person in charge reported that, despite the most zealous efforts, no more stones were to be found in the countryside. By then, however, Lambotin possessed a sufficient quantity to sell stones to all the great and small collectors in Paris.

In the month of Messidor An XI (1803 June 19–July 18), Citizen Marais drew a sketch map of the L'Aigle district (Fig. 14) to be included in Lambotin's memoir. It shows a large, somewhat lopsided area, open-ended just north of L'Aigle, within which stones were found. This is the earliest map to represent a meteorite strewn field. Unfortunately, the map was not included with Lambotin's memoir, which had been published the previous month. However, 16 years later Lambotin's memoir, accompanied by Marais' map, was inserted by the editor, Eugène Patrin himself, into the article on "Pierres Météoriques" in the first edition of the *Dictionnaire d' Histoire Naturelle* (1816–1819). More than a century later, Lambotin's article and map were rescued from obscurity by R. de Brébisson (1916) from whose article the map of Fig. 15 was taken.

A Report by Jean-Baptiste Biot-Meanwhile, perhaps through the influence of Laplace who wished to test the likelihood of a source on the Moon (Burke, 1986:54), Jean-Antoine Chaptal (1756-1832), Minister of the Interior, sent the young Biot to gather more data on the fireball trajectory and the extent of the fall. Carrying along a stone from the Barbotan fall of 1790, Biot left Paris on June 26 and approached L'Aigle by an indirect route, questioning people along the way, learning who had heard explosions from what direction, who had seen a fireball, how high and bright it appeared, which way it was moving, and where stones had fallen. Three weeks later, Biot sent a report to Chaptal and then on July 17, he read his account to the Institute, where it was taken as the definitive proof that stones fall from the sky. The Institute printed his 45-page text (Biot, 1803b) the following month (but did not issue it as a Mémoire until 1806). Meanwhile, on July 21, Biot sent Pictet a copy of his letter to Chaptal saying (Biot, 1803c:394):

It is to you that we owe our knowledge of the works of Chladni and the English chemists on meteoritic masses. It is you who were the first, at the National Institute, to raise this great question, and you never have ceased to report facts and conjectures that will serve to decide it...You have earned a certain right to receive any new observations...

Biot described the following findings:

The meteor did not burst at L'Aigle but at the distance of half a league from it...I traversed all the places where it had been heard; I collected and compared the accounts of the inhabitants; at last I found some of the stones themselves on the spot, and they exhibited to me physical characters which admit no doubt of the reality of their fall...No meteoric stones had been found in the hands of the inhabitants before the explosion...The founderies, iron works, and mines in the neighborhood...exhibited nothing...which had the least affinity to these substances. No traces of a volcano are found in the country.

Biot's discovery of stones *in situ* indicates that Lambotin's meteorite hunters had not cleared out the district after all. Biot constructed a map (Fig. 15) showing the meteorite strewn field as an ellipse measuring 10×4 km, with its long axis trending SE to NW, the direction of the fireball and also that of the Earth's magnetic axis at that site, a point he emphasized in his account. The map was published with his report to the Institute (Biot, 1803b) and so, although Biot's map was drawn later, it takes priority as having been published earlier than Marais' map. Biot's is the more elegant of the two maps, and it gives a more accurate representation of the elliptical strewn field, as would be expected of a rising young physicist and mathematician. Biot called the stones "Laiglites" and noted that the largest specimens, which were reported as the first to fall, were found near the southeastern end of the ellipse. This observation is not in question, although it contradicts our current expectation that the larger fragments will travel farthest. Biot concluded (1803c: 405):

I leave to the sagacity of the philosophers the numerous consequences that may be deduced from (these facts); and I shall consider myself happy if they find that I have succeeded in placing beyond a doubt the most astonishing phenomenon ever observed by man.

Thus ended, very nearly, the controversy about falling stones.

The Swan-Song of Guillaume DeLuc-In 1803 May 10, DeLuc wrote one more letter to *Bibliothèque Britannique*: "New Considerations on the Mass of Iron in Siberia and on Stones supposedly fallen from the Sky to the Earth." In it, he made no mention of the fall at L'Aigle, presumably because the news had not reached him in Geneva. Protesting that his previous objections to fallen stones had not been answered, DeLuc scorned Howard's remark that it is useless to argue against those who do not wish to believe in them. In closing, he declared that if the universe owes its existence to blind nature rather than to a powerful, wise, and intelligent Being who maintains order according to the laws He establishes, we are left in deep sadness, without consolation or hope.

DeLuc (1803:112) added a postscript saying that he had just learned of the alleged fall of a stone at Salles. He critically analyzed the fireball reports in an effort to discredit the verity of the fall. Finally, DeLuc remarked on a recent report of a rain of limon (mud) at Friouli, (Italy). Anyone who can believe that, he said, can easily believe in rains of stones, metals, and minerals. This letter generally is taken as the swan-song of Guillaume-Antoine DeLuc (*e.g.*, Carozzi, 1990:188) and, indeed, it was the last of his journal articles on this subject. However, Westrum (1978:484) refers to a review of Izarn's book written by DeLuc in 1803 in which he accepted the reality of the fall at L'Aigle very reluctantly.¹²

An Analysis by Martin Klaproth-In 1803, the chemist Martin Heinrich Klaproth (1743–1817), in Berlin, published an analysis of a stone from Siena. He said (1803:338) that after the fall at Siena in 1794 he had obtained stones and analyzed them, but he had not published his results then because the idea of fallen stones was so controversial. Klaproth did not say how soon he received the stones from Siena; but inasmuch as he wrote nothing at the time, we still may accept Chladni's report that the first account of the Siena fall to be published in Germany appeared in 1796.

Joséf Izarn: Lithologie Atmosphèrique, 1803

Shortly after the fall at L'Aigle, a 422-page book by Joséf Izarn (1766–1834), a medical doctor and physicist, came off the press in Paris (1803). Its title declared its contents: Stones Fallen from the Sky, or Atmospheric Lithology; Presenting the Advance of Science on the Phenomena of Lightning Stones, Showers of Stones, Stones Fallen from the Sky, etc.; with Many Unedited Observations Communicated by MM. Pictet, Sage, Darcet, and Vauquelin; with an Essay on the Theory of the Formation of These Stones.

In Part I, Izarn compiled reports and opinions on falling bodies that had been published in France between 1700 and 1803, includ-



FIG. 15. "Map of the places over which the meteor exploded on 6 Floréal An XI (April 26, 1803) in the environs of L'Aigle, Department of Orne," by Jean-Baptiste Biot. The dashed line is labeled "Limits of the area in which the stones were flung down." Biot included a scale, which is lacking in Marais' map, and showed the strewn field as a closed ellipse. This map appeared in Biot's report to the National Institute of Sciences published in the month of Thermidor, An XI, (1803 July 19–August 17). Thus, it is the earliest published map of a meteorite strewn field. (From Biot, 1803b; from the Paneth reprint collection, courtesy of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution.)

ing extracts of articles from foreign journals. This brought the whole story together in the earliest history of the beginnings of meteoritics. Part II was a critical examination of current opinions on the reality of the fall of stones from the atmosphere. Izarn compiled a table listing all of the falls of matter for which he could find references, from Moses' account of Sodom and Gomorrah to 1798. There were 34 of them. The majority of the falls were stones, two were irons, and a few were falls of mercury, sulfur, or viscous matter. His table also listed the four main hypotheses of the origin of falling stones, volcances or hurricanes; lightning striking terrestrial rock; concretions in the atmosphere; and masses foreign to our planet, along with the names of scientists who, in the past or present, advocated each one. Guillaume DeLuc appeared among those opining that the solid substances were ejected by terrestrial volcances or dropped by hurricanes.

Izarn began Part III, with a quote from Vauquelin, who had said that the wisest course would be to avow freely that we are entirely ignorant of the origin of the stones and the causes that produced them. However, Izarn (1803:253) did not follow this good advice. As implied by his title, Izarn believed strongly in an origin by consolidation within the atmosphere, and he devoted Part III, by far the longest section of his book, to this theory, claiming that it was founded on the best-established principles of physics and included no hypotheses. Izarn discussed Howard's results in detail and found no problem with the presence of nickel in atmospheric products.

Responses to Izarn-The following month, de Drée (1803c:77) published a short review of Izarn's book in *Bibliothèque Britannique* along with an updated version of Izarn's table (Fig. 16). Inasmuch as Izarn had written his book before the event, de Drée added the fall at L'Aigle and also the one at Sales (Salles) and the names of Delalande to those favoring an origin by volcanoes or hurricanes and Soldani to those favoring concretions in the atmosphere.

Delamétherie (1803a:441) published a 17-page extract of Izarn's book in the widely-read *Journal de Physique*. He said Izarn had rendered a true service in Part I to savants who wished to study this extraordinary phenomenon, and that in Part II he had assembled a wide spectrum of opinions on the matter and concluded that the fall of stones on the Earth is a genuine natural phenomenon. Delamétherie devoted his remaining 15 pages to outlining Izarn's theory of origin with virtually no commentary of his own.

In Germany, Izarn's book received a scathing review in *Annalen der Physik* by the editor, Ludwig Gilbert (1803:437), who wrote that Izarn seemed to be a stranger to most principles of physics, that many of his ideas were illogical, and that he clearly did not understand Dalton's theory of atmospheric gases or the teachings of his compatriots, Fourcroy and Berthollet, about chemical combinations and affinities.

With some exceptions, Izarn received mostly friendly reviews in England. In all these countries, a sizeable number of publications favoring an atmospheric origin followed that of Izarn.

Meteorites in America—The first news of falling stones reached America in 1803 September, in a letter from Robert Livingston (1746– 1813), the U. S. Minister to France, to Andrew Ellicott (1754– 1820), a friend of President Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826). Livingston wrote that philosophers in France had put almost beyond a doubt the fall of stones from the sky and now were disputing whether the stones are generated in the atmosphere or sent to us by volcanoes on the Moon. Ellicott passed along this intelligence to President Jefferson who responded, in 1803 December 23, that he found nothing surprising in the raining of stones in France, nor yet had they been mill-stones. He observed that there were in France more real philosphers than in any country on Earth but also a greater proportion of pseudo-philosophers (Burke, 1986:56).

Ellicott remained skeptical of falls until 1805 when he received a packet of publications from France that convinced him that stones, differing from ordinary stones, actually do fall from the sky...and are formed within the atmosphere. When he informed the President of his new belief, Jefferson wrote back, on 1805 October 25, that he had not read all the papers but he had read Izarn's *Lithologie Atmosphèrique*. He could not say that he disbelieved, nor yet that he believed it, chemistry was too much in its infancy to satisfy us that lapidific elements exist in the atmosphere and can be formed into stones there. Burke (1986:86) pointed out that in this passage Jefferson appears to question not the fall of stones but their formation in the atmosphere.

Two years later, a brilliant exploding fireball showered stones over Weston, Connecticut, at 6:30 in the morning of 1807 December 14. Professor Benjmin Silliman (1779–1864) at Yale College identified them as meteorites and analyzed them along with Professor James S. Stringham (1775–1817) and Dr. John Kemp (1763– 1812) at Columbia College in New York. They all had read the European literature and knew they should separate the constituents and look for nickel. Meanwhile, a Mr. Daniel Salmon of Weston wrote to President Jefferson that he had retrieved a 37 pound stone from his oat field; it had been examined by Dr. Archibald Bruce, a well-known collector in New York, who wrote to him (Salmon, 1808:161):

The stone in your possession from its similarity with those in the Cabinet of Mr. Greville in London and mr. de Drie in France (who possess the largest collection of these meteor stones) and likewise from its agreing in all its Externall Characters with a fragment in my possession of the one that fell at Ensisheim in upper Alsace in 1492...I have no Doubt that this mass weighing 37 pounds is of meteoric production.

Mr. Salmon asked if he should send his sample to the President and the national legislature for their consideration. Jefferson replied (Bergh, 1907:440) that a more effectual examination might be made by a scientific society than by the national legislature.

We certainly are not to deny what we cannot account for...It may be very difficult to explain how the stone you possess came into the position in which it was found. But is it easier to explain how it got into the clouds from whence it is supposed to have fallen? The actual fact, however, is the thing to be established...

We have all read that when President Jefferson first heard of the Weston fall, he remarked that he would sooner believe that those two Yankee professors would lie than that stones would fall from the heavens. Jefferson may have said, "It is all a lie," although that remark was not ascribed to him until after his death in 1826. In any case, we may be certain that the phrase "two Yankee professors" are a later embellishment of the story (Marvin, 1986:146).

In their paper of 1809 describing the fall at Weston, the Yale professors Benjamin Silliman and James L. Kingsley (1778–1852) favored the hypothesis proposed by President Thomas Clap of Yale (1703–1767), and published posthumously (Clap, 1781), that fireballs are earth-orbiting comets following long elliptical orbits with a perigee of 25 miles and apogee of about 4,000 miles. Silliman and Kingsley concluded that, on closest approach, such a comet had shed some stones at Weston and continued on its rounds.

Metallography of Irons: Thomson, 1804; von Widmanstätten, 1808

In 1804, Guglielmo Thomson at Naples sent an extract in French of Dominico Tata's 1794 treatise on the Siena fall to *Bibliothèque* DE LA

SUBS QU'O ÉTRE

de

de

DES LANC PAR LES VOI

Fréret. Gassendi Muschembroel

Barthold

Delalande

G. A. Deluc

		the second s	Bill. Brit. Sc. et Arti,	Pol. AAIII, pag. 77.
0	B S E R	V A T	I O N	S
	ANCIENNI	ES ET MODI	ERNES	
HUTE DE	DIVERSES SUBST.	ANCES SOLIDES SU	R LA SURFACE DI	E LA TERRE
NCES	LIEUX	ÉPOQUES	TÉMOINS	PAGES CT PARAGRAPHES
DIT	OU L'ON DIT	D E	NARRATEURS	il en est fait mention.
MBÉES.	LES AVOIR VU TONBER.	LEUM CHUTE.	DU PHENOMENE.	Pages Parage
ande	A Rome . Rome	sous lo règne de Tullio Hostilius . consolat de C.Martins et Manlins Torq. l'année avant la défaite de Crassus 2*. année de la 78*. olympiade l'an de J. C. 452 4 janvier 1717 4 janvier 1717 en janvier 1766 en 1510 6 avril 1719 en 1658 en 1658 en 1658 en colobre 1751 en teptembre 1753 en teptembre 1753 en 1768 en 2768 le 24 juillet 1790 13 décembre 1795 13 décembre 1795 13 décembre 1798 13 décembre 1798 14 décembre 1798 15 décembre 1798 14 décembre 1798 15 avril 1800. très ancienne en juillet 1753 1 piùllet 1753 1 piùllet 1754 1 piùllet 1	Trie Live . Julius Obsequens . Pline . Dion . Dion . Chronique du Comte Marcellin . M. Geolfroy le cadet . Paul Lucas . Cardan, Liv. 14, Ch. 7a. (Variét.) Gassendi . Le père La Feuillée . Moise . Spangenberg . Olaus Wormius . Siegeaber . Muschembrock . M. Bachelay . M. Bachelay . M. Bachelay . M. Bachelay . M. Morand . M. Morand . M. Mist Armans, Baudin , etc. Le Conte, de Bristol . Le Captene Topham . MM. Scievre et de Drée . M. Southey . John Loyd Williams , esq. De Bon . M. Southey . Darcot fils . Lomet , etc Batecholen . Acatémie de Bourdelot . De Drée . Fourcroy.	14 14 17 16 19 15 20 22 21 23 23 23 24 24 23 24 24 24 23 34 24 23 251 65 251 66 251 66 251 66 251 66 251 66 251 60 251 60 260 27 30 108 109 145 109 145 116 153 126 145 126 25 126 25 126 25 126 25 126 25 255 25 329 76
	т а	BLEAU	1	
PRI	NCIPA	LESOP	INIONS	3
En	nises jusqu'à ce jour , sur les S	UBSTANCES SOLIDES (ombées sur notre Globe.	
N	OMS DES PHYSICIEN	S QUI LES ONT REG.	ARDÉES COMME	
LODULT.	S DES SUPETANCES MIN	ÉRALES DE S. CONCE	ÉTIONS DES M	ASSES
E LA TERES	FORDUES PAR LA FOURI	E. FORME	11 17117	GÈRES
S OU LES OURAG	ANS. à l'endroit même où on les a	trouvées. DANS L'ATNOI	FRÉRE. A NOTRE	PLANĖTE.
I 	Pages et 16 Lemery	Pages Descartes	Pages	Pages
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	24 Les Académiciens t 292 Agricola	. 61 Lesser		

FIG. 16. "Observations, ancient and modern of the fall of diverse solid substances on the surface of the Earth." This is de Drée's updated version of Izarn's table in *Lithologie Atmospherique*. The two versions are identical except that de Drée added the falls at Sales (Salles) and L'Aigle, the name of Delalande to those favoring an origin from volcances or hurricanes, and of Soldani to those favoring consolidation in the atmosphere. The fall at Sales actually appears twice (second and eleventh from the end). Izarn dated it as occurring on 1798 March 17, giving de Drée as his source. To that entry, de Drée added the fall of March 12 without deleting Izarn's entry. Note that although Enlightment scholars had abolished falls of milk, blood, and flesh, which were reported in ancient and Medieval times, they retained substances such as mercury, sulfur, and viscous matter. (From de Drée, 1803c.)

79 Edward King Soldani 165 Eusebe Salverte

100

145 Gronberg .

59 Patrin



FIG. 17. William (Guiglielmo) Thomson's drawings of fragments of the Pallas iron. Numbers 1 and 2 are two polished surfaces of the same sample showing peridot (white) in a matrix of Ni-Fe (stippled). "I have drawn with a scrupulous exactitude the configuration of iron and peridot," wrote Thomson (1804:148). Number 3 is a rough, cellular fragment of the metal with no visible peridot. Number 4 is the first drawing ever made of the octahedral pattern formed by bands and fields of metallic Ni-Fe of three different compositions. Number 5 represents the patterns formed in iron slag from a foundery. Thomson is said to have permanently damaged his eyesight in making these sketches (From Thomson, 1804).

Britannique. In an addendum, Thomson (1804:266) wrote:

It has been nearly ten years since the Mémoire from which this extract was taken appeared in Naples. And assuredly, if literary communications had been better established than they are in this little continent of Europe, those in France would have been more familiar than they were not long ago with the grand phenomenon of lithified meteors; and the time taken either to laugh at it or to deny it would have been more usefully employed examining the evidence.

Later that year, Thomson (1804:135,209) published a detailed discussion of the Pallas Iron in *Bibliothèque Britannique* with drawings of the metallographic patterns he discovered on surfaces he had polished and etched with acid (Fig. 17). He observed that the metals dissolved at three different rates and so must differ in composition. Two of the metals formed thick and thin lamellae intersecting at angles of 76° and 104° in an octahedral structure (Fig. 17c). Although Thomson referred to Howard's finding of nickel in the metals and to Biot's report of the fall at L'Aigle, he still favored an origin by consolidation in the upper atmosphere. In 1808, after Thomson died, Pére Soldani had this article reprinted in the *Journal of the Academy of Science of Siena*.

Also in 1808, the characteristic patterns of etched octahedrites were independently discovered by Alois Beck von Widmanstätten (1753-1849), the Director of the Imperial Industrial Products Cabinet in Vienna. A year earlier, Von Widmanstätten had sold his familv's printing establishment in Graz. To him, a slab of an etched iron meteorite must have looked much like a printing plate (Clarke and Goldstein, 1978). He began polishing and etching iron meteorites, inking their surfaces, and printing the patterns directly on paper. Von Widmanstätten never published his "nature-prints," but he showed them to colleagues and friends who began calling them Widmanstätten figures. Not until 1820 did his friend, Carl von Schreibers (1775-1852), Director of the Imperial Natural History Cabinet, publish von Widmanstätten's prints in Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kenntniss meteorischer Stein und Metallmassen... a 97-page volume that was issued as a supplement to Chladni's book Über Feuer-meteore of 1819. Some librarians catalog it under "Chladni" rather than "von Schreibers," but that is misleading; von Schreibers' book stands in its own right as an important contribution to meteoritics. It includes a "nature-print" of the Elbogen iron (Fig. 18) that clearly depicts the intriguing patterns that the world has ever since called Widmanstätten figures.

It is difficult to fathom why Thomson's article of 1804 in the widely-read *Bibliothèque Britannique* passed unnoticed until the latter part of this century. It was rediscovered in 1974 by Marjorie Hooker (1908–1977), of the United States Geological Survey, who spoke on it at a meeting of the International Mineralogical Association in Berlin (Hooker and Waterston, 1974:72). Since then, Thomson's article has been discussed by Paneth (1960), Smith (1962) and Clarke and Goldstein (1978), among others. All agree that Thomson holds clear priority for his publication, but von Widmanstätten deserves credit for discovering the figures independently and bringing them to the attention of scientists. In any case, it would be out of the question today to reverse nearly two centuries of usage and change the name of Widmanstätten figures to Thomson figures.

Von Schreibers (1820) also printed engravings of historic stony meteorites including those that fell at Eichstädt, Tabor, Siena, and L'Aigle (Fig. 19).

Two More Small Planets Discovered between Mars and Jupiter

The third small planet, Juno, was sighted in 1805 by Carl Friedrich Harding (1765–1834), and the fourth, Vesta, in 1807 by Wil-



FIG. 18. "Nature-print" of the Elbogen iron by Alois von Widmanstätten who polished, etched, and inked the surface and printed the pattern on paper. With this technique, he ran no risk of eye-strain. (From von Schreibers, 1820, Plate 9).

helm Olbers. Orbital calculations showed that all four asteroids could have diverged from a common node, a shattered planet. Olbers was not ready to propose such a source for fallen stones, but Chladni was delighted. Chladni (1805:272) wrote that as a child he had been fascinated by the large empty space between Mars and Jupiter and had predicted that a planet would be found there. Indeed, in his book of 1794, debris from a disrupted planet, although not necessarily of our own solar system, was Chladni's second choice as a source of meteor-stones.

Pierre M. S. Bigot de Morogues: The First History of Meteoritics, 1812

In 1812, Bigot de Morogues (1776–1840), who started his career as a mineralogist and later turned gentleman farmer, published Mémoire Historique et Physique sur la Chute des Pierres Tombées sur la Surface de la Terre à Divers Époques, a 361-page book which qualifies as the first history of meteoritics. In his preface, Bigot acknowledged the excellent writings of Izarn and Chladni and articles in French journals as his main sources. He also informed his readers that he had no new theory of his own to offer; he felt that those of Laplace and Lagrange were the only ones to accord with all the findings. His book is a clearly written compendium of information on falls and finds, mineralogy, chemical analyses, and hypotheses of origin up to 1812. Some critics complained that it was derivative of Izarn, and indeed it was to some extent. But Izarn finished writing his book just before the fall at L'Aigle, and there were only so many original sources to consult up to that date. Bigot carried the story up through the first fall of a carbonaceous chondrite, at Alais, France, in 1806, and the fall of a chondrite at Charsonville, France, in 1810. Westrum (1978:488) justifiably calls this book the best overview of the meteorite controversy. However, it is to Bigot that we owe our negative impressions of the Royal Academy of Sciences as a group of elitists disdainfully refusing to consider the possibility of falls despite the rapidly accumulating evidence. Burke (1986:31) suggests that his attitude may reflect the coming-of-age of Bigot, who was not an aristocrat during the French Revolution.

METEORITE ORIGINS: FROM CHLADNI'S TIME TO THE PRESENT

Origins Within the Earth-Moon System

The problem of the origin of meteorites, raised by Chladni, was not satisfactorily resolved until the latter part of our own century.



FIG. 19. Engravings of stones from four historic falls: Eichstädt, Tabor, Siena, and L'Aigle. (From von Schreibers, 1820, Plate 2.)

This issue is of such importance that we will briefly trace the main trends of thought on it from his time to our own.¹³

The first hypotheses of meteorite origin to be abandoned, *ca.* 1805, were those that falling stones and irons were terrestrial rocks that had been ejected by volcanoes, transported by hurricanes, or transformed *in situ* by lightning bolts. As long as savants were unwilling to seek sources beyond the Earth-Moon system, that left a choice between an origin within the Earth's atmosphere or in volcanoes of the Moon.

Atmospheric Origin circa 1796–1860–When scientists began to take seriously the authenticity of fallen stones and irons, many of them accepted Lavoisier's assertion of 1789 that solid bodies may coagulate within the upper atmosphere. Alexander von Humboldt (1799:18) explained:

...it is well known that hydrogen gas volatilizes iron. If this gas forms clouds several leagues high in the atmosphere and an electric spark sets it afire, the dissolved iron reunites in a solid mass and falls in the form of flaming balls. I believe that these facts merit to be carefully considered, before searching for other explanations.

This idea, championed in 1803 by Josef Izarn, gained widespread support in Europe and America. The final recruit appears to have been an American, Mrs. G. (Hepsa Ely) Silliman, who wrote (1859:7):

It seems not in accordance with ascertained science to ascribe mysterious appearances on the earth, or in its atmosphere, to causes proceeding from planets, or spheres moving in space, independent of the earth and its system.

But, given the difficulties of accounting for the great volumes of solid matter that must instantly be congealed, the strong similarities in textures and composition of the bodies, and the presence of nickel in both stones and irons, the idea of atmospheric origin finally was abandoned in the 1860s.

Lunar Volcanic Origin circa 1794–1860. When William Herschel (1787:230) reported observing four volcanic eruptions on the Moon, Lichtenberg was delighted. He wrote to Herschel that the Moon might, even now, be forming its own atmosphere, and in a few centuries we might be able to discern its indistinct twilights and clouds. Other astronomers of that period who subsequently reported sighting volcanic eruptions on the Moon included the Astronomer Royal, Nevil Maskelyene (1731–1811), Jêrome de Lalande (1732–1807), Jean-Dominique Cassini (1748–1845), Johann Bode (1747–1826), Franz Zaver von Zach, and Johann Schröter (1745–1816) (Home, 1972:8).

It was but a short step from seeing lunar eruptions (or having famous astronomers see them) to believing that the eruptions ejected meteorites. When he called this mode of origin "Laplace's hypothesis," Biot (1803a) lent it great prestige among both scientists and the public. In England, it was popularized so intensively by Thomas Young, the Foreign Secretary of the Royal Society, that a guidebook to Yorkshire (*ca.* 1810) described the Wold Cottage stone as a piece of the Moon (Pillinger and Pillinger, 1996).

Chladni, himself, announced in favor of a lunar volcanic origin in 1805. He said he was persuaded to this view by the uniform textures and compositions of stones, which implied a common origin, by their abundance of unoxidized nickel-iron consistent with the Moon's lack of an atmosphere, and by their average specific gravity of 3.3 g/cc, equivalent to that of the Moon. Chladni (1805:260) wrote:

At the present time I completely agree, that the stone and iron masses, which often fall with a fireball, are nothing other than ejecta from volcanoes on the Moon, and it is enough for me to have been the first in modern times to demonstrate in my treatise that 1) ...the reports of such falls were not fabrications but actual observations and 2) that these masses come from outside of the atmosphere.

These were Chladni's proudest claims ten years after the publication of his book. Notably, he no longer insisted on linking every falling body with a fireball. He must have been puzzled about falls with no reported fireballs, but at that time Chladni could not have understood that daylight falls frequently are witnessed after the terminal explosion has extinguished the fireball. Thirteen years later, Chladni (1818:10) reversed himself and argued, once again, that the velocities of meteors in the Earth's atmosphere so far exceed those expected of bodies from the Moon that he returned to his original hypothesis of an origin in cosmic space.

Support for a lunar volcanic origin of meteorites continued until 1859 when the American astronomer Benjamin Apthorp Gould (1824–1896) delivered the *coup de grace*. Gould (1859:185) calculated that of each five million fragments ejected by lunar volcanos only three would be likely to hit the Earth. At that rate, given the growing inventory of some 160 meteorites that had fallen or been found by mid-century, the Moon should have visibly shrunken in size and altered in its librations and nutations, but none of this had happened. This problem, recognized by Olbers as early as 1795, had become insurmountable.

Meanwhile, J. Lawrence Smith (1818–1883), an American chemist and meteorite collector, had had another idea. In a paper supporting the premise that meteorites have been projected to Earth by lunar volcanes, doubtless long extinct, he postulated that they may also have been ejected by some other disruptive force. Smith (1855:170) wrote:

The views here advanced do not at all exclude the detachment of these bodies from the Moon by any other force than volcanic. It is useless for us to disbelieve the existence of such a force merely because we cannot conceive what that force is...suffice it to know that meteorites are fragments and, if so, must have been detached from the parent mass by some force.

More than 125 years were to pass before a process would be identified that would qualify as Smith's "other disruptive force."

Asteroidal versus Interstellar Origin, circa 1854-1959

Asteroidal Origin-Although questions were raised about a possible asteroidal origin of meteorites when the first four small planets were discovered in 1801-1807, no strong support for that hypothesis was voiced at that time. After 1807, no additional asteroids were found until 1845. Then a series of discoveries revealed 20 more asteroids by 1854. That year, the English scientist Robert P. Greg (1826-1906) argued that meteorites were the minute outliers of asteroids, all of which had been separated from a single planet by a tremendous cataclysm. As evidence, Gregg pointed out that asteroids, like other planets, revolve counterclockwise around the Sun in elliptical orbits and are angular in shape rather than spherical, as shown by sudden changes in their optical reflectivity. While the hypothesis of an asteroidal origin of meteorites gained increasing attention from astronomers, geologists and mineralogists already had began to study meteorites for clues to the nature of their parent planet.

In 1847, Adolph André Boisse (1810–1896) showed that by arranging meteorites concentrically by decreasing density—with nickelirons representing a core overlain by pallasitic stony-irons that are overlain, in turn, by stony meteorites of increasingly silica-rich compositions—he could produce a working model of a meteorite parent planet (Fig. 20) that was analogous to the interior of the Earth. This convinced numerous geologists that meteorites are,

Coupe d'une Sphère Minufications observes hypothetique contenant tous Jano la serie des Frences Les Elements roconnus dans les Revolitiques Rewlithes. Ter motorique pur Compacte on cristallin . Riverwites Indiles 1.444 Squelelle Ferrugineux Collutaire avec on saw olivine . Mason presence . contessant la graine métalliques dissonnas . Notiondes Renew Richallifice Norno avono diviso en Vilicates nou alumineux ferraferes en vilicates aluminence, lea minieraux orticates que forment co masses. La proportion des premiero you sout los plus pesants et les plus riches en for" parait décroître en même temps que celle des grans magnetiques et de la Pyrite L'inverse à tien pour les. rilicates alumineux 5 Mouver pierreman, saus mula l'uneux melange de grains metallique and offrank une diructure tantén compacte et grenne comme " collo des Mi. granulairea. metalliferor tantos cristalline. et granitour. Id . Keisse 12 . Callery in Trace and

FIG. 20. The earliest cross-section of a hypothetical meteorite parent planet. The concentric shells are subdivided into three main groups, which are indicated by brackets. The innermost group consists of a core of crystalline iron enveloped within a thin zone of cellular iron, with or without olivine. In the second group, stony meteorites, rich in ferrous silicates and grains of Ni-Fe, gradually give way to those with aluminous silicates and scarcer metal. The outermost group consists of achondrites. (From Boisse, 1847:169).

indeed, the debris of a shattered planet. However, once astronomers were prepared to venture beyond the Moon for sources of meteorites, the asteroidal theory met with strong competition from Chladni's old hypothesis of cosmic (interstellar) origin.

Interstellar Origin-Chladni argued for an interstellar origin of meteorites because many meteors and fireballs seemed to exceed the maximum velocity of 42 kilometers per second for bodies following elliptical orbits around the Sun. To many, a cosmic origin seemed assured after the night of 1868 January 30, when a great shower of stones fell at Pultusk in Poland. By sheer chance, 37 persons, including an amateur astronomer at Breslau and one at Danzig, were observing that part of the sky. Calculations indicated that the Pultusk meteorite was traveling at a hyperbolic velocity of 56 kilometers per second, hence, it appeared to have entered the solar system from interstellar space.

Observations of hyperbolic velocities continued well into the 1950s. According to F. A. Paneth (1940:12), the Estonian astronomer Ernst J. Öpik (1893–1985) declared in 1935 that the interstellar origin of meteorites could be taken for granted, and in 1937 Cuno Hoffmeister, who had published a catalog showing hyperbolic orbits for 79% of well-observed bright meteors and fireballs, stated that the interstellar origin of meteorites was well established. In 1953, Lincoln LaPaz (1897–1985), the founder and first director of the Institute of Meteoritics at the University of New Mexico, listed as his most important research contribution of the past 20 years the verification by new, independent, nonvisual (radar) methods the existence of meteorites moving in hyperbolic orbits with respect to the Sun. LaPaz argued that meteorites are from two sources: planetary and galactic (Leonard, 1953:72).

Other astronomers believed that the high velocities reported for meteors and fireballs must reflect a systematic error. Compilations of long-term records such as those begun by Gregg in the 1850s were showing that a great majority of meteorite falls occur between noon and midnight, as if bodies orbiting the Sun were overtaking the Earth. In the 1930s and 1940s, painstaking photographic studies of meteors by Professors Fred L. Whipple and his colleagues at the Harvard College Observatory and C. C. Wylie at the University of Iowa showed elliptical solutions for the orbits of all the well-documented meteors and fireballs they measured. Öpik disputed their findings until 1959 when he abandoned the idea of hyperbolic orbits on his own evidence and wrote to Whipple apologizing for his previous criticisms (Marvin, 1993:277). That year the Pribram fireball passed through an area of sky being monitored by several meteor cameras and dropped stones near Prague, Czechoslovakia. Calculations showed that the meteoroid had followed an elliptical orbit with aphelian between the asteroid belt and Jupiter (Fig. 21). By 1960, a recalculation of the trajectory of the Pultusk body had shown that it, too, followed an elliptical orbit and was a member of the solar system. Today, all scientists agree that meteorites are fragments of planets, but which ones?

Meteorites from Asteroids and Other Planets

When diamonds were discovered in iron meteorites in the late 1880s and early 1890s, they were taken as tangible evidence that meteorites originate in a large planet with high core pressures. In the 1950s, Harold C. Urey (1893–1981), the distinguished nobelist in chemistry who had turned his attention to planetary science, argued that formation of diamonds would require high gravitational pressures in bodies at least as large as the Moon. A few years later, however, Urey and others calculated that a molten iron core in a

moon-sized planet could not have solidified in the entire 4.5 billionyear age of the solar system. Subsequent cooling-rate calculations showed that Widmanstätten figures could form only in small bodies less than 250 km in diameter. The contradictory demands for large vs. small parent bodies were not resolved until the late 1950s, when the General Electric Company succeeded in creating diamonds in shockwave experiments. The resulting clumps of angstrom-sized carbonado diamonds resembled those in the Canon Diablo iron and led to the conclusion that meteoritic diamonds result from shock pressures incurred during collisions with the Earth or in space (e.g., Lipschutz and Anders, 1961). Once the mineralogical requirements for a large parent planet were removed, several lines of evidence led to the currently accepted belief that asteroids originated as small bodies and meteorites are collisional fragments of asteroids. Since 1981, however, two other planetary bodies have been identified as sources of meteorites.

Meteorites from the Moon and Mars-In 1982 January, the first meteorite from the Moon was discovered on the Antarctic ice sheet (Fig. 22). Scientists from 17 laboratories around the world agreed on its lunar origin when they found close matches between its mineralogical, chemical, and isotopic compositions with lunar highland samples collected on the Apollo 16 mission. The meteorite was not, however, a sample of volcanic ejecta; it had been projected from the surface of the Moon by the impact of an asteroidal fragment that accelerated it into an earth-crossing orbit. Were he with us today, J. Lawrence Smith might be proud to claim impact as the unknown force he intuitively felt might exist for projecting crustal samples from the Moon to Earth.

By the spring of 1996, 15 fragments representing at least eleven meteorites from the Moon had been collected on the Earth: 14 from Antarctica and one from Australia. About half of them consist of anorthositic breccias from the lunar highlands, and half are basalts and basaltic breccias from the maria. The sample from Australia contains a small component of lunar KREEP (a rock enriched in potassium, rare earth elements, and phosphorus).

The finding of lunar meteorites prompted a serious reconsideration of possible meteorites from Mars. A martian source had been suggested in 1979 when crystallization ages of only 1.3 billion years, indicative of an origin within a large, well-insulated body, were measured on certain igneous achondrites (Walker et al., 1979). But at that time, martian meteorites were in disfavor on statistical and dynamical grounds: if we had no meteorites from the nearby Moon, we could not expect to find them from Mars. Furthermore, the martian escape velocity (5.5 km s⁻¹) would require so energetic an impact that any escaping samples would be crushed or shocked beyond recognition. The first martian meteorite was confirmed as such in 1982 when analyses of an igneous achondrite from Antarctica showed it to be similar in bulk composition and rare gas content to the martian soil and atmosphere analyzed in situ by the Viking Landers on Mars in 1976 (e.g., McSween, 1994). Today, we recognize at least 12 meteorites from Mars, 6 found in Antarctica and 6 on other continents. Eleven of them are relatively youthful crystalline rocks from volcanic terrains and one is a sample of the 4.5 billion-year-old crust of the red planet.

Planetary Meteorites: Cosmic Grains-Today, meteorites are universally accepted as debris from collisions of asteroids with each other and with the Moon and Mars. Millimeter-sized micrometeorites are believed to be grains released by the sublimation of ices in comet nuclei. Although all of these bodies are members of the solar system, isotopic anomalies have led to the discovery that cer-



FIG. 21. The calculated orbits, projected onto the plane of the ecliptic, of the first three meteorites of which fireball trajectories were photographed simultaneously by at least 2 cameras. The aphelia of all three bodies lay between Mars and Jupiter. Eleven cameras photographed the fireball of the Pribram meteorite which fell in Czechoslovakia at 7:30 P.M. on 1959 April 8. Pribram orbited closer to Jupiter than any other known meteorite. Four cameras of the Smithsonian Prairie Network photographed the fireball of the Lost City meteorite that fell in Cherokee County, Oklahoma, at 8:14 P.M. on 1970 January 3. This was the first instance when a meteorite was found strictly as a result of photographs taken by the Meteorite Observation and Recovery Program of the National Research Council of Canada. (Courtesy of I. Halliday and *Sky & Telescope*, 1977:339.)



FIG. 22. Lying on the ice sheet at a remote site west of the Allan Hills of Antarctica, this 32 g stone, about the size of an apricot, was collected by a U. S. search team on 1982 January 25. It proved to be the first sample of the lunar crust to be identified on the Earth and opened a new era in meteoritics and planetary science. (The hand-held numbering device has a 6 cm scale; NASA photograph.)

tain meteorites contain minute grains, including silicon carbide, diamonds, and alumina from interstellar sources older than the solar system (e.g., Huss, 1988; Anders and Zinner, 1993). This unpredicted circumstance indicates that the primeval solar nebula did not consist of a homogeneous mix of dust and gas. Certain unvolatilized components, ejected by supernovae or red giant stars, entered the cloud and accreted into the growing planetary bodies 4.6 billion years ago. Although Chladni had no such idea in mind, he surely would be interested to learn that although meteorites themselves belong to the solar family, some of them do, indeed, carry to Earth narticles from interstellar space.

PREMATURE IDEAS IN METEORITICS

It may come as a surprise to most meteoriticists to learn that Chladni was not the first person to write that the Pallas Iron fell from the sky, nor was he the first to report the fall of the Hraschina irons. Scientists in all fields, perusing old documents, often discover intriguingly "modern" ideas written in the past and forgotten. Very often the ideas were ignored in their time because they were premature. Perhaps the best definition of premature ideas or discoveries was offered by Gunther Stent (1978:99), a professor of microbiology at the University of California at Berkeley:

A discovery is premature if its implications cannot be connected by a series of simple, logical steps to canonical, or generally accepted knowledge.

Paneth (1940:8) wrote much the same thing:

...if the light of historical studies is thrown on 'new' scientific conceptions, more frequently than not they bear out the truth of Goethe's saying: 'Every bright thought has already occurred to somebody; the whole point is to think it again.'

To better evaluate Chladni's contributions to the beginnings of meteoritics, it may be helpful to examine some examples of prematurity in this field.

Two Treatises by Franz Güssmann, 1785 and 1803

In 1785, nine years before Chladni's book appeared, Franz Güssmann (1741-1806), a professor of natural sciences at the University in Vienna, published a physico-mineralogical treatise, Lithophylacium Mitisianum, a 632-page systematic mineralogy beginning with the native elements. In the section on Ferrum Natiuum, Güssman (1785:127) described the mass seen by Pallas in Siberia. Through his access to the archives of the Imperial Cabinet, Güssmann also described the fall of the irons at Hraschina, five years before Andreas Stütz published his account from the same manuscript. Güssman mentioned the dazzling fireball and explosions and said that the sworn testimony of the seven witnesses seemed entirely credible. He theorized that these irons had been melted in the Earth by stupendous electric fires that launched them into the sky as a mortar throws a bomb. Despite Güssmann's position in the heart of scientific circles in Vienna, his ideas on fallen irons immediately passed into limbo; he was not cited by Stütz or Chaldni. In 1803, Güssmann wrote a second book, Uber die Steinregen, to prove the mathematical impossibility that falling bodies could have come from the Moon. In it, he protested the neglect of his earlier work.

In 1803 November 2, a Dr. DeCarro, who acted for many years as the Vienna correspondent to the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, wrote to Pictet that the subject of fallen stones had excited the curiosity of several savants in Vienna. For example, he said, there just appeared a work by the excellent mathematician Güssmann. DeCarro (1803: 289) sent Pictet a copy of Güssmann's *Steinregen* and a reference to his *Lithophylacium*. Güssmann, he said, theorized that the irons originated as molten masses that had been thrown into the sky and fallen back in fireballs. With respect to Güssmann's "markedly original" hypothesis, DeCarro raised two questions: first, how is it that, given the numbers of people who have seen these flaming bodies, no one has seen them lift up from the Earth; secondly, how, by this process, can we explain the presence of such a rare metal as nickel that is found in almost all these products?

Decades later, in 1859, Wilhelm Karl Haidinger, director of the Imperial Natural History Cabinet in Vienna, wrote that he first learned of Güssmann's treatise of 1785 from two notes that his predecessor, Paul Maria Partsch (1791–1856), had written in works he found in the archives. The first note appeared in the margin of page 245 of Chladni's book *Über Feuer-Meteore* (1819) where Chladni discussed the fall at Hraschina. The second was on a manuscript page from Güssmann's *Lithophylacium Mitisianum* where Partsch wrote (in Haidinger, 1859:362):

He [Güssmann] connected fiery meteors with falling meteorites earlier than Chladni. There was found in his book also a discussion of the Agram [Hraschina] mass. This surely is the first printed notice (unless an earlier published report exists).

Haidinger remarked that Chladni apparently knew of neither the one nor the other, referring to Güssmann's linking of meteorites with fiery meteors and Güssmann's description of the fall at Agram.

In our day, it is difficult to understand why Güssmann's books were so quickly forgotten, particularly since he proposed a terrestrial origin for native irons and linked them with fireballs. Clearly, his ideas that the Krasnojark and Hraschina irons fell from the sky were premature when he published them in 1785. That is indicated by the fact that five years later Stütz denied the "alleged" Hraschina and Eichstädt falls and rejected the reports as due to the credulity of country folk. Perhaps, Stütz chose not to dignify the idea of falls with an earlier citation. Chladni, who wrote about falls of the Pallas and Hraschina irons only nine years after Güssmann did, would have totally rejected Güssmann's explanation of them. But, in his effort to cite as many references as possible on falls, it seems unlikely that he would have skipped Güssmann's work if he had been aware of it. Evidently, he found no copy in the library at Göttingen.

The "Firsts" of William Thomson, 1794 and 1804

As noted above, Thomson performed the first magnetic separation of iron grains and wrote the first mineralogical descriptions of fallen stones (from Siena in 1794). He was the first to propose a name (soldanite) for the new type of rock he observed in fallen stones, and the first scholar to suggest in print the possibility of their lunar volcanic origin. Thomson also was the first person to polish and etch meteoritic metal (of the Pallas Iron), to recognize that the pattern he saw was formed by three metals of differing compositions arranged in an octahedral structure, and to publish drawings of this pattern in a widely read journal. For all that, William Thomson remained virtually unknown to meteoriticists until recent years when a number of scientists began to document his contributions.

Ironmasses by Ernst Chladni, 1794

Prematurity also applies to Chladni's own first book in which his hypotheses of fallen stones and irons of cosmic origin contradicted the canonical knowledge of his day. Fortunately, his hypothesis of falls remained premature for only two months when the shower of stones at Siena began the dramatic series of events that led to his vindication.

However, besides being premature, Chladni's reliance on eyewitness reports was a flawed approach, aspects of which would be as unacceptable today as it was to his contemporaries. As we have seen, Chladni repeated story after story that fallen stones filled the air with sulphurous fumes and/or were too hot to touch. For the past half-century or more, few, if any, witnesses have reported sulphurous fumes (although the fumes might result from burning troilite). However, today, every curator hears stories that fallen stones or irons were hot to the touch (even when the proffered specimens are fragments of bog iron or slag). *Why Did Meteorites Lose their Smell?* queried Sears (1974:299). He suggested that in earlier times when everyone was aware of biblical "fire and brimstone" they reported both; now that brimstone is out of fashion, they still report fiery hot meteorites. It seems that eyewitness reports tend to be biased in favor of what we expect.

In fact, meteorites do not strike the Earth scorching hot. They are enveloped in fireballs for only a few seconds, and, after incandescence ceases, the bodies fall through the air for several miles. Buchwald (1975, I:8) compared the process to heating a massive lump of cold iron with oxyacetylene torches for a few seconds then changing to forced cooling with jet air streams. Freshly fallen meteorites are either cold or, at most, slightly warm. Thus, meteoriticists of the 1990s frequently find themselves harboring attitudes closer to those of the Abbé Stütz in 1790 than to those of Chladni: how is it that people say they found a meteorite too hot to handle when such fairy tales violate the laws of physics? Chladni's reliance on historical reports, however convincing they were to his lawyer's ear, worked surprising well in view of the pitfalls in this method.

Catastrophic Impacts

Not all meteorites lose their cosmic velocity during flight. Today we are well aware that large bodies sometimes plunge into the Earth and excavate craters. In rare instances, hypervelocity impacts give rise to worldwide geological and biological catastrophies. The importance and ubiquity of meteorite impact as a geological process of global importance has been recognized only since the opening of the Space Age. There is, however, a long record of premature hypotheses on this subject.

Well into the 1840s, Professor Benjamin Silliman at Yale University expounded the hypothesis that meteorites fall from Earthorbiting comets which never plunge to Earth. In public lectures, which must have been spellbinding, Silliman (in Burke, 1986:66) would declare:

May they [the comets] not one day come down entirely? Shall we desire it? They might sweep away cities and mountains—deeply scar the earth and rear from their own ruins colossal monuments of the great catastrophe.

At present, when similar rhetoric has become commonplace, should we credit Benjamin Silliman as the founder of the concept of mega-impacts? We cannot do so because Silliman had predecessors. As examples, we may consider one such visionary (there were others) in each of the last four centuries: in 1752, Pierre de Maupertuis (1698–1759) wrote that comets striking the Earth might have caused vast disruptions, possibly with wholesale extinctions of living things due to heat, poisioned air, and acidified water. In 1696, William Whiston (1667-1752) described comet impact as the predominant factor in shaping the early Earth, tilting its axis, starting it rotating, cracking the crust to release the flood, while its tail condensed to form torrential rains. In our own century, Harvey H. Nininger (1887-1986) wrote in 1942 that impacts of Earth-crossing asteroids like Hermes, which passed us within a few 100,000 miles in 1937 October, might well cause geological revolutions, violent climatic changes, and the cataclysmic destruction of species. All of these prophets spoke prematurely when their ideas could not be reconciled with contemporary knowledge. Although Nininger wrote his paper at a time when meteorite impact *craters* had been validated, geologists still thought of them as natural curiosities of no importance to global geology.

Not until 1980 when the group of scientists led by Luis Alvarez (1911-1988), at the University of California at Berkeley, presented geochemical evidence that a mega-impact at the end of the Cretaceous period had deposited excess iridium in the boundary clay worldwide, and may have triggered the massive extinctions of dinosaurs and other biota, did large scale research on this subject begin. Later in that decade, a consensus began to form that a collision with a Mars-sized planetoid disrupted the early Earth, tilted its axis, and spun off the debris that aggregated to form the Moon. (e.g., Cameron, 1986). After 200 years, the idea of collisions of large and small planetary bodies with the Earth have begun to occupy the forefront of scientific thinking. Indeed, Spaceguard, an international program is now in operation with the aim of detecting the approach of near-Earth asteroids or comets with lead times sufficient to devise plans to alter their courses. This vision gained momentum from the dramatic crashes of 22 fragments of comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 into Jupiter in July, 1994.

CONCLUSIONS: THE FOUNDING OF METEORITICS

Chladni's Views On The New Science: 1809

Chladni's own observations on the founding of meteoritics appeared in the preface to a French version of his *Traité d'Acoustique* (1809), which he translated and revised from a German version of 1802 during a long stay in Paris at the invitation of Laplace. During this visit, Chladni was awarded an honorarium of 6,000 francs by Napoleon Bonaparte for his discoveries in acoustics. Chladni wrote (1809:9):

At the beginning some did not agree with me; some German critics even supposed that I had not advanced these ideas seriously but with the intention, a bit mischievous, to see which side philosophers would take, and how far the credulity of some persons would go...In France...most did not even believe in the possibility of a fall of stones until the Memoir by Howard in 1802, and in 1803 the fall of the stones at L'Aigle, followed by the report by M. Biot, proving that my book was not a flight of fancy.

Thus, Chladni himself listed Howard's memoir, the fall at L'Aigle, and Biot's report as factors that played crucial roles in the acceptance of his book.

To Chladni's own list, we must add the truly extraordinary series of observed falls over the turn of the nineteenth century. Chladni had compiled reports of only 18 falls from ancient times to the fall at Eichstädt in 1785. Suddenly, four witnessed and widely-publicized falls took place in five years, from the fall at Siena in 1794 to that in Benares in 1798, nearly one every year. Without the falls, there would have been no chemical analyses, and it was the chemical work that led to acceptance of falls as authentic natural phenomena a year *before* the fall at L'Aigle.

In seeking answers to the questions raised at the beginning of this paper, we have found that the early reviews of Chladni's book in Germany were negative and that even his mentor, Georg Lichtenberg, said that he wished that Chladni had not written it. Chladni had relied too heavily on folk tales to persuade his contemporaries of the existence of falling bodies, and he violated the rules of Newtonian physics by postulating their origin in cosmic space. It seems unlikely that any of his contemporaries changed their minds on these subjects simply as a result of reading Chladni's book. Therefore, it appears that if neither a series of witnessed falls nor chemical analyses had taken place for half a century after Chladni's book appeared, meteoritics would have languished for half a century. On the other hand, given the activity in the skies and in the laboratories, meteoritics would have been established as a new field of inquiry in 1802 even if Chladni had not written his book.

But Chladni did write his book. Possessing no positive evidence for falling stones and irons, he had proposed his radical hypotheses at a time when they ran counter to the accepted laws of physics and when witnesses to actual falls were withholding their evidence for fear of ridicule. When events forced his contemporaries to accept meteorite falls, they reread his book and referred to it. Without question, Chladni was a leader in the founding of meteoritics.

In addition to Chladni, our pantheon of the founding fathers of meteoritics must include Georg C. Lichtenberg, who provided Chladni with the background knowledge and the inspiration to investigate fireballs and falling masses; the Abbé Ambrogio Soldani, who gathered information and stones at Siena and published the first scholarly treatise on a meteorite fall; Marc-Auguste Pictet, who cofounded a new journal that welcomed letters on meteorites and served as an international center of communications during the controversial formative years of the science; Sir Joseph Banks, who saw the need for chemical analyses of fallen stones and predicted that the results would open a new field of inquiry; Edward C. Howard, who took up Banks' challenge of analyzing "the bodies of fiery meteors" and made the extra effort to assemble a significant number of samples of stones and "native irons"; and Jacques-Louis de Bournon, who saw the necessity of separating stones for analysis into their main components, thereby concentrating the metal grains that made possible Howard's discovery of nickel that linked the stones with the irons.

As often is true, a certain amount of good luck contributed significantly to the founding of meteoritics. Certainly, the fall of stones at Siena, just two months after Chladni's book appeared, was a stroke of great good fortune. The large number of witnesses prompted leading scholars in Italy to make serious investigations that were passed along to English natural historians, who experienced their own fall at Wold Cottage the following year. The coincidental eruption of Mt. Vesuvius added confusion to questions of meteorite origins for years to come but did not delay acceptance of falling stones.

Also very fortunate was the fact that all of the stones analyzed by Howard and de Bournon happened to be ordinary chondrites and that the witnessed falls occurred at just the time when recent advances in chemistry made possible quantitative determinations of silica, magnesia, lime, and nickel. Had their samples included achondrites, with neither chondrules nor nickel-iron, their results would have been far less convincing.

Chladni continued to write and to lecture on meteorites throughout his lifetime. Chladni also collected meteorites. Ultimately, he acquired pieces of 31 stones, 2 stony irons, and 9 irons, the largest private meteorite collection of the early nineteenth century. Despite his straitened circumstances, Chladni did not sell his meteorites. A man of great integrity, he willed them to the mineralogical museum of the newly founded University of Berlin (now Humboldt University). In 1994, in celebration of the 200th anniversary year of his book, a new purchase by the University brought the total inventory of "The Old Chladni Collection" to 500 meteorites. Today, with the addition of many from the Sahara Desert, the number has surpassed 1050 meteorites. Recognition of a very special kind was accorded to Chladni in 1993 when a new phosphate mineral $(Na_2CaMg_7(PO_4)_6)$ was named chladniite in his honor. It was discovered in the Carleton iron meteorite from Texas and described by a group of investigators led by Timothy J. McCoy at the University of Hawaii. Assuredly, Chladni would be greatly pleased with this type of commemoration 200 years after the publication of his *Ironmasses*.

Acknowledgements-I wish to thank the librarians at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics who searched out and obtained copies for me of several books and papers that are very difficult to find. I also thank the librarians at the Dibner Library of the Smithsonian Institution and the Houghton Library of Harvard University, who provided me with photocopies of key passages and granted permission to publish prints from their rare book collections; and the librarian of the Deutschen Staatsbibliothek in Berlin for a print and permission to publish the portrait of Chladni. I thank Roy S. Clarke, Jr. and Linda Schramm of the Division of Meteorites of the Smithsonian Instutition's National Museum of Natural History for providing me with rare materials from the Paneth Collection of reprints; Günter Hoppe for sending me a copy of his invaluable book on Chladni; Wolfgang Czegka for reprints of his articles on Chladni; L. Lindner for sending me Haidinger's paper of 1859 "for brushing up on my German;" A. Hildebrand for sending me the Essay de Cosmologie by Maupertuis; and Jörn Koblitz for reprints of the paper by Carozzi and other important articles. I greatly appreciate much help from my husband, Tom Marvin, in translating French and German and reorganizing and proofing my ungainly manuscript, and the many helpful suggestions I received for improving my manuscript from Roy S. Clarke, Jr., Howard Plotkin, and Derek W. G. Sears. I acknowledge with thanks the support I have received from the Smithsonian Institution's Research Opportunities Fund and from NASA Grant NAGW-3438.

Editorial handling: D. W. G. Sears

NOTES

1. "Meteoritics" is used herein to denote "studies of meteorites;" this covers the whole range of meanings from Chladni's initial efforts to the current interdisciplinary science. Usages of familiar terms are difficult to dispense with in writings on history. For example, the words "scientist" and "physicist" were not invented until the 1830s, but I have applied both of them to earlier savants and natural philosophers.

2. Chladni (1803:323) wrote that the conversation with Lichtenberg took place in 1793 February, later, Chladni (1809:viii) recalled the date as late in 1792. Lichtenberg makes no mention of this conversation in his writings.

3. For information and guidance to original sources, I am much indebted to the writings of Günter Hoppe and Wolfgang Czegka on Chladni, James Burke on the history of meteoritics, Albert V. Carozzi on the great debates, and Derek Sears on the early chemical work on meteorites. I have made constant use of the facsimile of Chladni's book with an introduction by John Wasson, who presented a copy to all participants of the Meteoritical Society meeting in Los Angeles in 1974.

4. The reference commonly cited for this new knowledge is Jussieu (1723). In a short note to the Royal Academy, Anton-Laurent de Jussieu (1682–1758), a botanist and paleontologist in Paris, wrote that he had at hand examples of stone implements, resembling so-called lightning stones, from the Caribbean islands and Canada, that were made by savages who, with infinite patience, ground one stone against another without the aid of iron or steel. Inasmuch as Europeans had been traveling since the 1400s in Africa, the South Pacific, and the Americas, 1723 would seem an astonishingly late date for this fact to become known.

5. Chladni may have found his ideas of new worlds aggregated from the wreckage of old ones in the work of his older contemporary Emmanuel Kant (1724–1804), with whom, incidentally, he shared the German publisher, Johann Friedrich Hartknoch in Riga, then a part of Russia.

6. Lavoisier was not involved in the second investigation because he was on a long tour of the Chalons region carrying out his activities as a tax farmer (Smeaton, 1957). Burke (1986:27) questioned whether Lavoisier's tax-farming duties kept him away from the laboratory during the analysis of the Lucé stone, but they did not. Lavosier's appointment began in May, the month after he read the report on Lucé to the Academy. For his appointment as a tax farmer, Lavoisier ultimately paid with his life at the guillotine.

7. A subsequent calculation showed that, to reach Siena, ejecta launched from Mt. Vesuvius at the most favorable angle of 45° must follow a parabola 20 times the height of Mt. Blanc with a force nine times that of a cannon ball (*Statement on Parabola*, 1796a, 1:405).

8. Sowerby inserted a special section on Wold Cottage, with pages numbered 1*-19*, ahead of Page 1 at the beginning of Vol. II.

9. This remark commonly is dated as 1797, but Benzenberg (1839: 232) noted that the although the Taschenbuche entry came out in 1797 it was written in 1796.

10. Southey was poet laureate of England from 1818-1843.

This was the stone of which von Born had written that some credulous people claimed the stone had fallen in a thunderstorm on 1753 July 3; the fact that he kept the stone in his own collection casts serious doubt on the story told by Paneth (1940:128): "...the newly appointed curator of the Imperial Collections at Vienna, I. von Born, discovered a drawer labeled: 'Stones fallen from Heaven' and, trained in the new school of thought, with a scornful laugh ordered their removal."

12. Apparently, this was issued as a booklet, of which I have been unable to obtain a copy.

For detailed coverage of the late nineteenth through twentieth cen-13. tury debates on meteorite origins, see Burke (1986: Chapter 5).

REFERENCES

- ALVAREZ A. (1926) El Meteorito del Chaco. Casa Jacobo Peuser Ltda., Buenos Aires, 222 pp.
- ALVAREZ L. W., ALVAREZ W, ASARO F. AND MICHEL H. V. (1980) Extraterrestrial cause for the Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction. Science 208, 1095-1108.
- ANDERS E. AND ZINNER E. (1993) Interstellar grains in primitive meteorites: diamond, silicon carbide, and graphite. Meteoritics 28, 490-514.
- BARTHOLD C. (1800) Analyse de la pierre de tonnerre. Jour. de Phys. 50, 169 - 176.
- BAUDIN N. (1796) Extrait d'un météore igné qui a paru dans la Gascogne, le samedi 24. Jiullet 1790. La Décade 8, Année 4, 385-396.
- BENZENBERG J. F. (1839) Die Sternschnuppen. Perthes, Besser und Maure,
- Hamburg, Germany. 358 pp. BERGH A. E., ED. (1907) The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. The Thos. Jefferson Memorial Assn., Washington, D. C., XI, 440-442.
- BERTHOLON P. (1791) Observation d'un globe de feu. Jour. des Sci. Utiles 4,224-228.
- BERTRAND L. (1801a) Lettre de M. Louis Bertrand, aux Rédacteurs. Bibl. Brit. 17, 433-441.
- BERTRAND L. (1801b) Lettre de M. L. Bertrand sux Rédacteurs. Bibl. Brit. 18, 432-434.
- BINGLEY W. (1796) Stones fallen from the air a natural phenomenon. Gent's Mag. 66, 726-728.
- BIGOT DE MOROGUES P. M. S. (1812) Mémoire historique et physique sur les chutes des pierres tombées sur la surface de la terre à diverses époques. Jacob Ainé, Orleans, France. 361 pp.
- BIOT J.-B. (1803a) Hypothese La Place's über den Ursprung der Meteorischen Steine, vorgetragen und erötert. Ann. Phys. 13, 358-370.
- BIOT J.-B. (1803b) Relation d'un voyage fait dans le département de l'Orne pour constater la réalité d'un méteoré observé à l'Aigle le 6 floréal an XI. Baudouin, Imprimeur de l'Institut National de France, Thermidor, An XI, Paris. 47 pp.
- BIOT J.-B. (1803c) Lettre à M. Pictet, l'un Rédacteur. Bibl. Brit. 23, 394-405.
- BOISSE A. (1847) Recherches sur l'histoire, la nature et l'origine des aérolithes. Cramaux, Mem. Soc. des Letts., Sci. et Arts de L'Aveyron 7. 180 pp.
- BOURNON J. L. COMTE DE (1802a) Mineralogical descriptions of the various stones said to have fallen upon the Earth; and Description of various kinds of native iron. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 92, 180-186, 203-210.
- BOURNON J. L. COMTE DE (1802b) Lettre à la M. Delamétherie, en résponse à la critique de M. Patrin à l'égard des pierres tombées de l'atmosphére. Jour. de Phys. LVI, 294-304.
- BRÉBISSON R. DE (1916) Les météorites ou pierres tombées du ciel a L' Aigle (Orne) en 1803. Bull. Soc. Hist. de l'Orne XXXIV, 5–24.
- BUCHWALD V. F. (1975) Handbook of Iron Meteorites. Univ. California
- BUCKWALD V. P. (195) Handbook of how interestings. Conv. California Press, Berkeley, California. 1418 pp.
 BURKE J. G. (1986) Cosmic Debris: Meteorites in History. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, California. 445 pp.
 CAMERON A.G.W. (1986) The impact theory for origin of the moon. In Ori-California and the impact theory for origin of the moon. In Ori-
- gin of the Moon (eds. W. K. Hartmann, R. J. Phillips and G. J. Taylor), pp. 609-620. Lunar and Planetary Institute, Houston, Texas.
- CAROZZI A. V. (1990) Trois grands protagaonistes: Marc-Auguste Pictet, Guillaume-Antoine DeLuc et Jean Tollot. Mémoires de la Soc. de Phys. et d'Hist. Nat. de Genève 45, 170-189.
- CASSIDY W. A., VILLAR L. M., BUNCH T. E., KOHMAN T. P. AND MILTON D. J. (1965) Meteorites and craters of Campo del Cielo, Argentina. Science 149, 1055-1064.
- CELIS DON MIGUEL RUBIN DE (1788) An account of a mass of native iron found in South America. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 78, 183-189.

- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1794) Über den Ursprung der von Pallas Gefundenen und anderer ihr ähnlicher Eisenmassen, und Über Einige Damit in Verbindung stehende Naturerscheinungen. Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, Riga. 63 pp.
- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1797) Fortsetzung der Bermerkungen über Feuerkugeln und niedergefallene Masses. Mag. für den Neuest. Zust. der Naturkunde, Jena, 1, 17-30.
- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1798) Account of a remarkable fiery meteor seen in Gascony, on the 24th of July 1790; by Professor Baudin, Professor of Philosophy at Pau. With some observations on fire-balls and shooting stars, by Professor Chladni at Wittenberg. *Phil. Mag.* 2, 225–231. CHLADNI, E. F. F. (1803) Chronologisches Verzeichniss der mit einem
- Feuermeteor Niedergefallenen Stein-und Eisenmasses, nebst einigen Bemerkungun. Ann. Phys. 15, 307-339.
- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1805) Einige Kosmologische Ideen, die Vermehrung oder Verminderung der Masse eines Weltkörpers betreffend. Ann. Phys.19, 257-281
- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1809) Traité d'Acoustique. Courcier, Paris, France. 375 pp.
- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1818) Verscheidene physikalische Bermerkungen. Ann.
- CHLADNI E. F. F. (1916), Versener-Meteore und die mit denselben Phys. 59, 1-11.
 CHLADNI E. F. F. (1819) Über Feuer-Meteore und die mit denselben herabgefallenen Massen. J.G. Heubner, Vienna. 434 pp.
 CLARKE R. S., JR. AND GOLDSTEIN J. I. (1978) Schreibersite growth and its neuroscience on the metallography of coarse-structured iron meteorites. Smithsonian. Contrib. Earth Sci. 21, 1-80.
- CLAP T. (1781) Conjectures upon the nature and motion of meteors. J. Trumbull, Norwich, Connecticut. 28 pp.
- COQUEBERT E. (1803-1804) Réflexions sur l'origine de diverse Masses de fer natif, et notamment de celle trouvée par Pallas, en Sibérie. (Translation of Chladni's book of 1794.) Jour. des Mines XV, 286-320, 446-485
- CZEGKA W. (1993) Die Entstehung und frühe Diskussion von E. F. F. Chladni's Schrift: "Ueber den Ursprung der von Pallas gefundenen und anderer ihr ähnlicher Eisenmassen..." (1794). Chemie der Erde 53, 376-391.
- DECARRO J. (1803) Lettre au Prof. Pictet. Bibl. Brit. 24, 288-293.
- DELAMÉTHERIE J.-CL. DE (1803a) Sur les pierres tombées à L'Aigle, Departement de l'Orne. Jour de Phys. 56, 428.
- DELAMÉTHERIE J.-CL. DE (1803b) Lithologie atmospherique. Jour. de Phys. 56, 441-458.
- DRÉE É. MARQUIS DE (1803a) Rélation et description de la pierre tombée dans las Commune de Sales, près de Ville-Franche, Départment du Rhône. Bibl. Brit. XXII, 371-386.
- DRÉE E. MARQUIS DE (1803b) Suite de recherches sur les masses minérales dites tombées de l'atmosphère sur notre globe. Jour. de Physique LVI, 405-427.
- DRÉE E. MARQUIS DE (1803c) Notice sur les pierres tombées près d'Ensisheim et dans les environs d'Agen. Bibl. Brit. XXIII, 61-77.
- DELUC G.-A. (1801a) Sur les pierres tombées. Bibl. Brit. 17, 309-322.
- DELUC G.-A. (1801b) Encore sur les pierres tombées. Bibl. Brit. 18, 272-298
- DELUC G.-A. (1801c) Observations sur la masse de few de Sibérie. Jour. des Mines XI, 213-220.
- DELUC G.-A. (1801-1802) Sur la Masse de fer de Sibérie, et sur les Pierres supposés tombées de l'atmosphère. Jour. des Mines 13, 92-107
- DELUC G.-A. (1803) Nouvelles Considérations sur la Masse de Fer de Sibérie et sur les Pierres supposées tombées du Ciel sur la Terre. Bibl. Brit. XXIII, 78-113.
- DINGLE H. AND MARTIN G. R., with the assistance of Eva Paneth (1964) Chemistry and Beyond, a Selection from the Writings of the Late Professor F. A. Paneth. Interscience Publishers, New York, London. 283 pp.
- DOSTROVSKY S. C. (1971) Chladni, E. F. F. In Dictionary of Scientific Biography (ed. C. C. Gillispie), pp. 258–259. Charles Schribner & Sons, New York, New York.
- FOUGEROUX A. D., CADET L. C., AND LAVOISIER A. (1777) Rapport fait à l'Academie Royale des Science, d'une observation communiquée par M. l'Abbe Bachelay, sur une pierre qu'on prétend etre tombée du Ciel pendant un orage (read in 1772). Jour de Phys. 2, 251-255.
- FOURCROY A.-F. DE (1803) Memoire on the stones which have fallen from the atmosphere, and particularly near l'Aigle in the Department of l'Orne, on the 26th of April last. Phil. Mag 16, 299-305.
- FULDA F. C. (1799) Observations on Fire Balls. Phil. Mag. 3, 66-76.
- GESNER C. (1565) De Rerum Fossiliuum, Lapidum et Gemmarum Maximé, figuris et similtudinibus liber non solum Medicis, sed omnibus rerum Naturae ac Philologiae studiosis, utilis et iucundus futurus. Tigguri, Zurich. 169 pp.

GILBERT L. WM. (1803) Hypothese über die Ursprung der Meteorsteine von Joseph Izarn. Ann. Physik 15, 437-462.

- GOULD B. A. (1859) On the Supposed Lunar Origin of Meteorites. Proc. Amer. Assn. Adv. Sci. 13, 181-187.
- GRAHAM A. L., BEVAN A. W. R. AND HUTCHISON R. (1985) Catalogue of Meteorites, 4th Ed. Univ. Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona. 460 pp.
- GREG R. P. (1854) Observations on meteorites or aerolites, considered geographically, statistically, and cosmically, accompanied by a complete catalog. Phil. Mag. 8, 329-342, 449-463.
- GÜSSMANN F. (1785) Lithophylacium Mitisianum: Dissertatione Praeuia et Observationibus Perpetuis Physico Mineralogicis Explicatum. Viennae: Josephi Nobili de Kurzbdeck. 632 pp.
- HAIDINGER M. W. (1859) Der Meteoreisenfall von Hraschina bei Agram am 26. Mai 1751. Sitzung. kaiserlich. kömogl. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien, Math-naturwissen. Klasse 35, 361-389.
- HAMILTON W. (1795) An account of the late eruption of Mount Vesuvius. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 85, 73-116.
- HERMBSTAEDT S. F. (1797) Observations sur les attractions prochaines. Ann. de Chimie, et Phys. 22,107–108.
- HERSCHEL W. (1787) An account of three volcanoes in the moon: Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 77, 229-231.
- HOME R. W. (1972) The origin of lunar craters: An 18th century view. Jour. Hist. Astron. 3, 1–10.
- HOOKER M. AND WATERSTON CH. C. (1974) William Thomson. Coll. Abstracts: Internat. Mineral. Assoc. Ninth General Meeting. 72 pp.
- HOOYKAAS R. (1981-1982) Pitfalls in the historiography of geological science. Histoire et Nature, 19-20, 21-34.
- HOPPE G. (1979) Über den Kosmischen Ursprung der Meteorite und Feuerkugeln (1794) von Ernst Florens Friedrich Chladni. Akad. Verlagsgesell, Leipzig. 103 pp.
- HOWARD E. C., with de Bournon J.-L. and Williams J. L. (1802) Experi-ments and observations on certain stony and metalline substances, which at different times are said to have fallen on the Earth; also on various kinds of native iron. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 92, 168-175, 179-180, 186-203, 210-212.
- HUMBOLDT A. VON (1799) In Delametherie J.-Cl. de Jour. de Phys. 48, 17-18.
- HUSS G. R. (1988) The role of presolar dust in the formation of the solar system. Earth, Moon, Planets 40, 165-211. IZARN J. (1803) Des pierres tombées du ciel ou Lithologie Atmosphérique:
- Delalain Fils, Paris. 422 pp.
- JUSSIEU A.-L. DE (1723) De l'origine et des usages de la pierre de foudre. Mem. Acad. Royal des Sciences 1, 7-11.
- KING E. (1796) Remarks Concerning Stones said to have fallen from the Clouds, both in these Days and in Antient Times. G. Nichol, London. 34 pp.
- KLAPROTH M. H. (1803) Bestandtheile mehrerer meteotischer Stein-und Metallmassen. Ann. der Physik 13, 337-342.
- KRINOV E. L. (1960) Principles of Meteoritics. Pergamon Press, London, U.K. 535 pp.
- LALANDE J. DE (1802) Lettre sur les Pierres de 'Foudre. Jour. de Phys. 55, 451-453.
- LAMBOTIN C. (1803) Mémoire des Pierres Tombées de l'Atmosphère. Jour. de Phys. 56, 458-461.
- LAPLACE P.-S. (1802) Aus einem Schreiben... Paris, 5 Thermidor An X. In von Zach Monatliche Correspondenz der Erd-und-Himmels-Kunde 6, 277
- LAVOISIER A.-L. DE (1790) Elements of chemistry, in a systematic order, containing all the modern discoveries. Translated by R. Kerr. W. Creech, Edinburgh. 529 pp.
- LEONARD F. C. (1953) Recent and future developments in meteoritics. Meteoritics 1, 66-80.
- LE ROY J.-B. (1771) Memoire sur la Météore ou Globe de Feu, observé au mois de Julliet dernier, dans une grande partie de la France. Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, Paris 2, 692–716.
- LIPSCHUTZ M. E. AND ANDERS E. (1961) The record in the meteorites-IV: Origin of diamonds in iron meteorites. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 24, 83-105.
- MARVIN U. B. (1986) Meteorites, the Moon, and the History of Geology. Jour. Geol. Educ. 34, 140-165.
- MARVIN U. B. (1992) The meteorite of Ensisheim: 1492 to 1992. Meteoritics 27, 28-72
- MARVIN U. B.(1993) The Meteoritical Society: 1933 to 1993. Meteoritics 28, 261-314.
- MARVIN U. B. (1994) The meteorite of Campo del Cielo, Argentina, its history in politics, diplomacy, and science. In Geological Sciences in Latin America: Scientific Relations and Exchanges (eds. S. de M. Figueirôa and M. Lopes), pp. 155-174. Univ. Estad. Campinas, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

- MAUPERTUIS PIERRE L. M. DE (1750) Essay de Cosmologie. In Les Oeuvres de Mr. de Maupertuis. George Conrad Walther, Dresden, 1752, 3-55
- MCCOY T. J., STEELE I. M., KEIL K., LEONARD B. F. AND ENDRESS M. (1993) Chladniite: A new mineral honoring the Father of Meteoritics (abstract). Meteoritics 28, 394.
- MCSWEEN H. Y., JR. (1994) What have we learned about Mars from SNC meteorites? Meteoritics 29, 757-779
- NECKER J. (1800) Cours de Morale Religieuse. 3 vols. Genets, Paris.
- NEWTON I. (1704) Opticks: Or a treatise of the reflexions, refractions, inflexsion and colours of light. S. Smith and B. Walford, London.
- NININGER H. H. (1942) Cataclysm and evolution. Contrib. Soc. Res. Meteorites 1, 27-29.
- OLBERS WM. (1802) Letter to C. F. Gauss, Dec. 25. In Wilhelm Olbers, sein Leben und seine Werke, 1894-1909 (ed. C. Schilling), p. 121. Springer, Berlin, 1.
- OLBERS WM. (1803a) Ueber die vom Himmel gefallen Steine. Monatliche Correspondenz 7, 148-157.
- OLBERS WM. (1803b) Letter to Baron von Zach, on the Stones which have
- GLBERS WM. (18030) Letter to Daton von Zaen, on the Stores which have fallen from the heavens. *Phil. Mag.* XV, 289–293.
 OLBERS WM. (1824) Letter to C. F. Gauss. In *Wilhelm Olbers, sein Leben und seine Werke*, 1894–1909 (ed. C. Schilling), p. 321. Springer, Berlin 2
- PALLAS P. S. (1776) Reisen durch verschiedene Provinzes des Russischen Reichs, 1771-1773. St. Petersburg 3, 412-417.
- PANETH F. A. (1940) The origin of meteorites: The Halley Lecture. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 26 pp.
- PANETH F. A. (1960) The discovery and earliest reproduction of the Widmanstätten Figures. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 18, 176-183.
- PATRIN E. M. L. (1801) Lettre de E. M. L. Patrin, Membre associé de l' Institut National, aux Rédacteurs. Bibl. Brit. 18, 204-224.
- PATRIN E. M. L. (1802) Considérations sur les masses de pierres et de matiéres metalliques qu'on suppose tombées de l'atmosphere. Jour. de Phys. 55, 376-393.
- PATRIN E. M. L. (1803) Lettre a J.-C. Delamétherie, à l'occasion des pierres tombeés de l'atmosphère. Jour. de Phys. 56, 392.
- PICTET M.-A. (1801a) Observations sur une masse de fer, trouvée en Sibérie par le Prof. Pallas, et sur d'autres masses du même genre, avec quelques conjectures sur les rapports avec certains pnénomènes naturels, par le Prof. Chladni de Wittenberg. Bib. Brit. 16, 73-88.
- PICTET M.-A. (1801b) Lettre 2 à ses collaborateurs, Pierres météoriques: Détails sur les pierres de ce genre vues chez E. Howard. Bibl. Brit. 17, 401-432.
- PICTET M.-A. (1802) Notice des Rédacteurs à l'occasion de la Lettre précédente. Bibl. Brit. 20, 89-93.
- PILLINGER C. T. AND PILLINGER J. M. (1996) Wold Cottage-Not just any ordinary chondrite. Meteorit. Planet. Sci. 31, 589-605.
- PROUST J. (1799) Sur le fer natif du Pérou. Jour. de Phys. 49, 148-149.
- REICH G. (1517) Encyclopaedia Margarita Philosophica. Basel, Liber IX.
- Review of Chladni's book (1794) In Göttingischen Anzeigen von geleherten Sachen, August 11, 1284-1286.
- Review of Soldani's book of 1794 (1803). Phil. Mag. 17, 229
- SAINT-AMANS J. F. B. (1802) Lettre au C. Pictet. Bibl. Brit. 20, 85-89. SALMON D. (1808) Letter to Thomas Jefferson. In Thomas Jefferson Corre-
- spondence, 1916. Printed from the originals in the collection of William K. Bixby, with notes. Boston, Massachusetts. 160-161.
- SAUSSURE H.-B. DE (1779) Voyages dans les Alps, I, Neuchatel, S. Fauche. 540 pp.
- SCHILLING C. (1894-1909) Olbers Leben und Werke. 3 vols. Springer, Berlin.
- SCHREIBERS C. VON (1820) Beytrage zur geschichte und kenntniss meteorischer Stein- und Metall-massen. (Suppl. to Chladni E. F. F., Feuermeteore, 1819). J. G. Heubner, Vienna. 92 pp.
- SEARS D. W. (1974) Why did meteorites lose their smell? J. Brit. astr. Ass. 84, 299–300.
- SEARS D. W. (1975) Sketches in the history of meteoritics 1: The birth of the science. Meteoritics 10, 215-225.
- SEARS D. W. (1976) Edward Charles Howard and an early British contribution to meteoritics. J. Brit. Astron. Assoc. 86, 133-139.
- SEARS D. W. AND SEARS H. (1977) Sketches in the history of meteoritics 2: The early chemical and mineralogical work. Meteoritics 12, 27-46.
- SHIMA M., MURAYAMA S., OKADA A., YABUKI H. AND TAKAOKA N. (1983) Description, chemical composition, and noble gases of the chondrite
- Nogata. *Meteoritics* 18, 87–102. SILLIMAN B. AND KINGSLEY J. L. (1809) Memoir on the origin and composition of the meteoric stones which fell from the atmosphere, in the county of Fairfield, and state of Connecticut, on the 14th of December, 1807. Trans. Amer. Philosoph. Soc. 6, 335-345.

- SILLIMAN MRS. G. S. (Hepsa Ely) (1859) On the origin of aerolites. Privately printed by W. C. Bryant, New York. 31 pp. Reprinted: Edinburgh New Phil. Jour. (1862) 16, 227–248.
- SMEATON W. A. (1957) L'Avant-Coureur. The journal in which some of Lavoisier's earliest research was reported. Annals of Science 13, 219– 234.
- SMITH C. S. (1962) Note on the History of the Widmanstätten Structure. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 26, 971–972.
- SMITH J. L. (1855) Lecture on meteoric stones. Ann. Rept. Smiths. Inst. 151-174.
- SOLDANI A. (1794) (with seven letters from G. Wm. Thomson) Sopra Piogetta di Sassi Accaduta Nella Serf de 16. Giugno 1794 in Lusignan d'Asso Nel Sanese. Dissertation, Siena. 288 pp.
- SOUTHEY R. (1797) Letters written during a short residence in Spain and Portugal. Joseph Cottle, Bristol. 551 pp.
 SOWERBY J. (1806) British Mineralogy: Or Colored Figures Intended to
- SOWERBY J. (1806) British Mineralogy: Or Colored Figures Intended to Elucidate the Mineralogy of Great Britain. 5 vols. R. Taylor & Co., London. 1*-19*.
- Statement on parabola required to loft stones from Mt. Vesuvius to Siena (1796a). Bib. Brit. 1, 405.
- STENT G. S. (1978) Prematurity and uniqueness in scientific discovery. In Paradoxes of Progress. pp. 98–113. W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, California.
- STUTZ A. (1790) Über einige vorgeblich vom Himmel gefallene Steine. Bergbaukunde 2, 398-409.
- TATA D. (1794) Memoria Sulla Pioggia di Pietre avvenuta nella Campagna Sanese il Di16. di Giugno de questo corrente anno. Aniello Nobile, Napoli. 74 pp.
- TATA D. (1804) Mémoire sur la Pluie de pierres tombées dans la campagne de Sienne, le 16 juin 1794. (Extract Communiqué aux Rèdacteurs de la *Bibl. Brit.* par Mr. W. Thomson.) *Bibl. Brit.* XXV, 240–267.

- TAYLOR K. L. (1979) Geology in 1776. In Two Hundred Years of Geology in America (ed. C. J. Schneer) pp. 75–90. The University Press of New England, Hanover, New Hampshire.
- THOMSON G. WM. (1794a) Seven letters in Soldani (1794), Sopra Piogetta di Sasso...237-263, 275-282.
 THOMSON G. WM. (1794b) Letter on mineral composition of Siena stone.
- IHOMSON G. WM. (1794b) Letter on mineral composition of Siena stone. In Tata, (1794) Memoria sulla Pioggia..., 1794, 51–70.
 THOMSON G. WM. (1804) Essai sur le fer malléable trouvé en Siberie par le
- THOMSON G. WM. (1804) Essai sur le fer malléable trouvé en Siberie par le Professeur Pallas. *Bibl. Brit.* 27, 135–154, 209–229.
- THOMSON G. WM. (1808) Saggio sul ferro malleabile trovato da Pallas in Siberia. Atti della accademia delle scienze della Siena. 9, 42–47.
- [TILLOCH A.?] (1798) Review of Chladni's book of 1794. Phil Mag. II, 1-8.
- TONNELLIER L.-A. (1802) Extrait d'un mémoire lu à la Société Royale de Londres, le 25 février 1802; par Howard et Bournon. Jour. des Mines 13, 11-29, 81-91.
- TOPHAM E. (1797) Letter to Mr. Urban. Gent's. Mag. 67, 549-551.
- [URBAN S.?] (1796) Review of Edward King's treatise of 1796. Gent's. Mag. 66, 844–849.
- VAUQUELIN L.-N. (1802) Mémoire sur les pierres dites tombées du ciel. Jour. des Mines 13, 308-322.
- WALKER D., STOLPER E. M. AND HAYS J. F. (1979) Basaltic volcanism: The importance of planet size. Proc. Lunar Planet. Sci. Conf. 10th, 1995-2015.
- WESTRUM R (1978) Science and social Intelligence about anomalies: The case of meteorites. *Social Studies of Science*, SAGE London and Beverley Hills 8, 461-493.
- WHISTON WM. (1696) A New Theory of the earth, from its original to the consummation of all things. R. Roberts, London. 635 pp.
- WILLIAMS J. L. (1802) Account of the explosion of a meteor, near Benares, in the East Indies; and of the falling of some stones at the same time, about 24 miles from that city. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London* 92, 175– 179.