

The Pliocene and Pleistocene show living species, though in the former these are very few and exceptional, while in the latter they become the majority.

With regard to the geological antiquity of man, no geologist expects to find any human remains in beds older than the Tertiary, because in the older periods the conditions of the world do not seem to have been suitable to man, and because in these periods no animals nearly akin to man are known. On entering into the Eocene Tertiary we fail in like manner to find any human remains ; and we do not expect to find any, because no living species and scarcely any living genera of mammals are known in the Eocene ; nor do we find in it remains of any of the animals, as the anthropoid apes, for instance, most nearly allied to man. In the Miocene the case is somewhat different. Here we have living genera at least, and we have large species of apes ; but no remains of man have been discovered, if we except some splinters of flint found in beds of this age at Thenay, in France, and some notched bones. Supposing these objects to have been chipped or notched by animals, which is by no means certain in the case of the flints, the question remains, Was this done by man? Gaudry and Dawkins prefer to suppose that the artificer was one of the anthropoid apes of the period. It is true that no apes are known to do such work now ; but then other animals, as beavers and birds, are artificers, and some extinct animals were of higher powers than their modern representatives. But if there were Miocene apes which chipped flints and cut bones, this would, either on the hypothesis of evolution or that of creation by law, render the occurrence of man still less likely than if there were no such apes. The scratched and notched bones, on the other hand, indicate merely the gnawing of sharks or other carnivorous animals. For these reasons neither Dawkins nor Gaudry, nor indeed any geologists of authority in the Tertiary fauna, believe in Miocene man.