servation, except their horny beaks, nothing might remain to indicate their presence except these marks on the bottom. Mr. Matthew therefore conjectures that there may have been large cuttlefishes in the Cambrian. Since, however, these are animals of very high rank in their class, and are not certainly known to us till a very much later period, their occurrence in these old rocks would be a very remarkable and unexpected fact.

A discovery made by Walcott in the Western States since Mr. Matthew's paper was written, throws fresh light on the question. Remains of fishes have been found by the former in the Cambro Silurian rocks nearly as far back as Mr. Matthew's comb-tracks. Besides this, Pander in Russia has found in these old rocks curious teeth, which he refers conjecturally to fishes (Conodonts). Why may there not have been in the Cambrian large fishes having, like the modern sharks, cartilage or gristle instead of bone—perhaps destitute of scales, and with small teeth which have not yet been detected. The fin rays of such fishes may have left the comb tracks, and in support of this I may say that there are in the Lower Carboniferous of Horton Bluff, in Nova Scotia, very similar tracks in beds holding many remains of fishes. Whichever view we adopt we see good evidence that there were in the early Cambrian animals of higher grade than we have yet dreamt of. Observe, however, that if we could complete the record in this point it would only give us higher forms of life at an earlier time, and so push farther back their possible development from lower forms. I fear, indeed, that I can hold out little hopes to the evolutionists that a more complete geological record would help them in any way. It would possibly only render their position more difficult.

But the saddest of all the possible defects of the geological record is that it may want the beginning, and be like the Bible of some of the German historical critics, from which they