

anatomical and fossil evidence, the gradual transformation of small generalized mammals similar to tree-shrews into the higher Primates, and even into Man himself. Although the fossil record is still far from complete, it is yet sufficient to allow us to link up one evolutionary stage with another in a natural sequence. The gaps which remain in this sequence are no longer of such an order as to demand any great effort of scientific imagination to fill them with hypothetical 'missing links.' We can readily conceive the transition from a tree-shrew type of ancestor to the primitive lemuroids and tarsioids of Eocene times, from these small Primates to progressive tarsioids with many simian features, from these again to the small gibbon-like animals of the Oligocene, to the larger generalized apes of the Miocene, to the remarkable *Australopithecinae* of South Africa, and to primitive men of the *Pithecanthropus* group. In Pleistocene times the transition from these primitive types of Man to Mousterian Man of the extreme Neanderthal type in one direction, and to the less specialized Acheulian Man in another, is equally easy to follow. Lastly, the structural contrast between Acheulian Man and modern representatives of *Homo sapiens* is so slight as to be quite unobtrusive."

-- W. E. Le Gros Clark, *History of the Primates* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 177-178.

"The bearing of the three great classes of facts now given is unmistakable. But it would be superfluous fully to recapitulate the line of argument given in detail in my 'Origin of Species.' The homological construction of the whole frame in the members of the same class is intelligible, if we admit their descent from a common progenitor, together with their subsequent adaptation to diversified conditions. On any other view, the similarity of pattern between the hand of a man or monkey, the foot of a horse, the flipper of a seal, the wing of a bat, etc., is utterly inexplicable. It is not scientific explanation to assert that they have all been formed on the same ideal plan. With respect to development, we can clearly understand, on the principle of variation supervening at a rather late embryonic period, and being inherited at a corresponding period how it is that the embryos of wonderfully different forms should still retain, more or less perfectly, the structure of their common progenitor. No other explanation has ever been given of the marvelous fact that the embryos of a man, dog, seal, bat, reptile, etc., can at first hardly be distinguished from each other. In order to understand the existence of rudimentary organs, we have only to suppose that a former progenitor possessed the parts in question in a perfect state, and that under changed habits of life they became greatly reduced, either from simple disuse, or through the natural selection of those individuals which were least encumbered with a superfluous part, aided by the other means previously indicated.