In the Pliocene, though the facies of the mammalian fauna of Europe becomes more modern, and a few modern species occur, the climate becomes colder, and in consequence the apes disappear, so that the chances of finding fossil men are lessened rather than increased in so far as the temperate regions are concerned. In Italy, however, Capellini has described a skull, an implement, and a notched bone supposed to have come from Pliocene beds. To this it may be objected that the skull—which I examined in 1883 in the museum at Florence—and the implement are of recent type, and probably mixed with the Pliocene stuff by some slip of the ground. As the writer has elsewhere pointed out,[1] similar and apparently fatal objections apply to the skull and implements alleged to have been found in Pliocene gravels in California. Dawkins further informs us that in the Italian Pliocene beds supposed to hold remains of man, of twenty-one mammalia whose bones occur, all are extinct species, except possibly one, a hippopotamus. This, of course, renders very unlikely in a geological point of view the occurrence of human remains in these beds.

In the Pleistocene deposits of Europe—and this applies also to America—we for the first time find a predominance of recent species of land animals. Here, therefore, we may look with some hope for remains of man and his works, and here, in the later Pleistocene, or the early Modern, they are actually found. When we speak, however, of Pleistocene man, there arise some questions as to the classification of the deposits, which it seems to the writer Dawkins and other British geologists have not answered in accordance with geological facts, and a misunderstanding as to which may lead to serious error. They have extended the term Pleistocene over that Post-glacial period in which we find remains of man, and thus have split the "Anthropic" period into two; and they proceed to divide the latter part of it into the Pre-historic and Historic periods,

[1] "Fossil Men," 1880.