

# Purāṇic Time and the Archeological Record

Presented at World Archaeological Congress 3, December 4–11, 1994, New Delhi, India

Copyright © 1994, [Michael A. Cremo](#)

Research Associate in History and Philosophy of Science

Bhaktivedanta Institute, P. O. Box 1920, Alachua, Florida 32615 U.S.A.

The time concept of modern archeology, and modern anthropology in general, resembles the general cosmological-historical time concept of Europe's Judeo-Christian culture. Differing from the cyclical cosmological-historical time concepts of the early Greeks in Europe, and the Indians and others in Asia, the Judeo-Christian cosmological-historical time concept is linear and progressive. Modern archeology also shares with Judeo-Christian theology the idea that humans appear after the other major species. The author subjectively positions himself within the Vaiṣṇava Hindu worldview, and from this perspective offers a radical critique of modern generalizations about human origins and antiquity. Hindu historical literatures, particularly the *Purāṇas* and *Itihāsas*, place human existence in the context of repeating time cycles called *yugas* and *kalpas*, lasting hundreds of millions of years. During this entire time, according to the Purāṇic accounts, humans coexisted with creatures in some ways resembling the earlier toolmaking hominids of modern evolutionary accounts. If one were to take the Purāṇic record as objectively true, and also take into account the generally admitted imperfection and complexity of the archeological and anthropological record, one could make the following prediction. The strata of the earth, extending back hundreds of millions of years, should yield a bewildering mixture of hominid bones, some anatomically modern human and some not, as well as a similarly bewildering variety of artifacts, some displaying a high level of artistry and others not. Given the linear progressivist preconceptions of generations of archeologists and anthropologists, one could also predict that this mixture of bones and artifacts would be edited to conform to their deeply rooted linear-progressive time concepts. A careful study of the archeological record, and the history of archeology itself, broadly confirms these two predictions. Linear-progressivist time concepts thus pose a substantial barrier to truly objective evaluation of the archeological record and to rational theory-building in the area of human origins and antiquity.

The practically employed time concept of the modern historical scientist, including the archeologist, strikingly resembles the traditional Judeo-Christian time concept. And it strikingly differs from that of the ancient Greeks and Indians.

This observation is, of course, an extreme generalization. In any culture, the common people may make use of various time concepts, linear and cyclical. And among the great thinkers of any given period, there may be many competing views of both cyclical and linear time. This was certainly true of the ancient Greeks. It can nevertheless be safely said that the cosmological concepts of several of the most prominent Greek thinkers involved a cyclic or episodic time similar to that found in the Purāṇic literatures of India. For example, we find in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (129–234) a series of ages (gold, silver, bronze, heroic, and iron) similar to the Indian *yugas*. In both systems, the quality of

human life gets progressively worse with each passing age. In *On Nature* (Fragment 17) Empedocles speaks of cosmic time cycles. In Plato's dialogues there are descriptions of revolving time (*Timaeus* 38 a) and recurring catastrophes that destroy or nearly destroy human civilization (*Politicus* 268 d ff). Aristotle said in many places in his works that the arts and sciences had been discovered many times in the past (*Metaphysics* 1074 b 10, *Politics* 1329 b 25) In the teachings of Pythagoras, Plato, and Empedocles regarding transmigration of souls, this cyclical pattern is extended to individual psychophysical existence.

When Judeo-Christian civilization arose in Europe, another kind of time became prominent. This time has been characterized as linear and vectorial. Broadly speaking, this time concept involves a unique act of cosmic creation, a unique appearance of the human kind, and a unique history of salvation, culminating in a unique denouement in the form of a last judgement. The drama occurs only once. Individually, human life mirrored this process; with some exceptions, orthodox Christian theologians did not accept transmigration of the soul.

Modern historical sciences share the basic Judeo-Christian assumptions about time. The universe we inhabit is a unique occurrence. Humans have arisen once on this planet. The history of our ancestors is regarded as a unique though unpredestined evolutionary pathway. The future pathway of our species is also unique. Although this pathway is officially unpredictable, the myths of science project a possible overcoming of death by biomedical science and mastery over the entire universe by evolving, space-traveling humans. One group, the Santa Fe Institute, sponsor of several conferences on "artificial life," predicts the transferal of human intelligence into machines and computers displaying the complex symptoms of living things (Langton 1991, p. xv). "Artificial life" thus becomes the ultimate transfiguring salvation of our species.

One is tempted to propose that the modern human evolutionary account is a Judeo-Christian heterodoxy, which covertly retains fundamental structures of Judeo-Christian cosmology, salvation history, and eschatology while overtly dispensing with the scriptural account of divine intervention in the origin of species, including our own. This is similar to the case of Buddhism as Hindu heterodoxy. Dispensing with the Hindu scriptures and God concepts, Buddhism nevertheless retained basic Hindu cosmological assumptions such as cyclical time, transmigration, and *karma*.

Another thing the modern human evolutionary account has in common with the earlier Christian account is that humans appear after the other life forms. In *Genesis*, God creates the plants, animals, and birds before human beings. For strict literalists, the time interval is short—humans are created on the last of six of our present solar days. Others have taken the *Genesis* days as ages. For example, around the time of Darwin, European scientists with strong Christian leanings proposed that God had gradually brought into existence various species throughout the ages of geological time until the perfected earth was ready to receive human beings (Grayson 1983). In modern evolutionary accounts, anatomically modern humans retain their position as the most recent major species to occur on this planet, having evolved from preceding hominids within the past 100,000 or so years. And despite the attempts of prominent evolutionary theorists and spokespersons to counteract the tendency, even among evolution scientists, to express this appearance in teleological fashion (Gould 1977, p. 14), the idea that humans are the crowning glory

of the evolutionary process still has a strong hold on the public and scientific minds. Although anatomically modern humans are given an age of about 100,000 years, modern archeologists and anthropologists, in common with Judeo-Christian accounts, give civilization an age of a few thousand years, and, again in common with Judeo-Christian accounts, place its earliest occurrence in the Middle East.

I do not here categorically assert a direct causal link between earlier Judeo-Christian ideas and those of the modern historical sciences. Demonstrating that, as Edward B. Davis (1994) points out in his review of recent works on this subject, needs much more careful documentation than has yet been provided. But the many common features of the time concepts of the two knowledge systems suggest these causal links do exist, and that it would be fruitful to trace connections in sufficient detail to satisfactorily demonstrate this.

I do, however, propose that the tacitly accepted and hence critically unexamined time concepts of the modern human sciences, whether or not causally linked with Judeo-Christian concepts, pose a significant unrecognized influence on interpretation of the archeological and anthropological record. To demonstrate how this might be true, I shall introduce my own experience in evaluating this record from the alien standpoint of the cyclical time concepts and accounts of human origins found in the *Purāṇas* and *Itihāsas* of India.

My subjective path of learning has led me to take the Vaiṣṇava tradition of India as my primary guide to life and the study of the visible universe and what may lie beyond. For the past century or so, it has been considered quite unreasonable to bring concepts from religious texts directly into the realm of the scientific study of nature. Indeed, many introductory anthropology and archeology texts make a clear distinction between “scientific” and “religious” ways of knowing, relegating the latter to the status of unsupported belief, with little or no utility in the objective study of nature (see, for example, Stein and Rowe 1993, chapter 2). Some texts even go so far as to boast that this view has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court (Stein and Rowe 1993, p. 37), as if the state were the best and final arbiter of intellectual controversy. But I propose that total hostility to religious views of nature in science is unreasonable, especially for the modern historical sciences. Despite their pretensions to areligious objectivity, practitioners unconsciously retain or incorporate into their workings many Judeo-Christian cosmological concepts, especially concerning time, and implicitly employ them in their day to day work of observation and theory building. In this sense, modern evolutionists share some intellectual territory with their Fundamentalist Christian antagonists.

But there are other ways to comprehend historical processes in nature. How this is so can be graphically sensed if one performs the mental experiment of looking at the world from a radically different time perspective—the Purāṇic time concept of India. I am not alone in suggesting this. Gene Sager, a professor of philosophy and religious studies at Palomar College in California, wrote in an unpublished review of my book *Forbidden Archeology* (Cremo and Thompson 1993): “As a scholar in the field of comparative religion, I have sometimes challenged scientists by offering a cyclical or spiral model for studying human history, based on the Vedic concept of the *kalpa*. Few Western scientists are open to the possibility of sorting out the data in terms of such a model. I am not proposing

that the Vedic model is true. . . . However, the question remains, does the relatively short, linear model prove to be adequate? I believe *Forbidden Archeology* offers a well researched challenge. If we are to meet this challenge, we need to practice open-mindedness and proceed in a cross-cultural, interdisciplinary fashion” (personal communication, 1993). The World Archeological Congress provides a suitable forum for such cross-cultural, interdisciplinary dialogue.

This cyclical time of the *Purāṇas* operates only within the material cosmos. Beyond the material cosmos lies the spiritual sky, or *brahmajyoti*. Innumerable spiritual planets float in this spiritual sky, where material time, in the form of *yuga* cycles, does not act.

Each *yuga* cycle is composed of 4 *yugas*. The first, the Satya-yuga lasts 4,800 years of the demigods. The second, the Tretā-yuga, lasts 3,600 years of the demigods. The third, the Dvāpara-yuga, lasts 2,400 years of the demigods. And the fourth, Kali-yuga, lasts 1,200 years of the demigods (*Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 3.11.19). Since the demigod year is equivalent to 360 earth years (Bhaktivedanta Swami 1973, p. 102), the lengths of the *yugas* in earth years are, according to standard Vaiṣṇava commentaries, 432,000 years for the Kali-yuga, 864,000 years for the Dvāpara-yuga, 1,296,000 years for the Tretā-yuga, and 1,728,000 years for the Satya-yuga. This gives a total of 4,320,000 years for the entire *yuga* cycle. One thousand of such cycles, lasting 4,320,000,000 years, comprises one day of Brahmā, the demigod who governs this universe. A day of Brahmā is also called a *kalpa*. Each of Brahmā’s nights lasts a similar period of time. Life is only manifest on earth during the day of Brahmā. With the onset of Brahmā’s night, the entire universe is devastated and plunged into darkness. When another day of Brahmā begins, life again becomes manifest.

Each day of Brahmā is divided into 14 *manvantara* periods, each one lasting 71 *yuga* cycles. Preceding the first and following each *manvantara* period is a juncture (*sandhyā*) the length of a Satya-yuga (1,728,000) years. Typically, each *manvantara* period ends with a partial devastation. According to Purāṇic accounts, we are now in the twenty-eighth *yuga* cycle of the seventh *manvantara* period of the present day of Brahmā. This would give the inhabited earth an age of 2.3 billion years. Interestingly enough, the oldest undisputed organisms recognized by paleontologists—algae fossils such as those from the Gunflint formation in Canada—are just about that old (Stewart 1983, p. 30). Altogether, 453 *yuga* cycles have elapsed since this day of Brahmā began. Each *yuga* cycle involves a progression from a golden age of peace and spiritual progress to a final age of violence and spiritual degradation. At the end of each Kali-yuga, the earth is practically depopulated.

During the *yuga* cycles, human species coexist with other humanlike species. For example, in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (9.10.20) we find the divine *avātara* Rāmacandra conquering Rāvaṇa’s kingdom Laṅkā with the aid of intelligent forest dwelling monkey men who fought Rāvaṇa’s well-equipped soldiers with trees and stones. This occurred in the Tretā-yuga, about 1 million years ago.

Given the cycle of *yugas*, the periodic devastations at the end of each *manvantara*, and the coexistence of civilized human beings with creatures in some ways resembling the human ancestors of modern evolutionary accounts, what predictions might the Purāṇic account give regarding the archeological record? Before answering this question, we must also consider the general imperfection of the fossil record (Raup and Stanley 1971).

Hominid fossils in particular are extremely rare. Furthermore, only a small fraction of the sedimentary layers deposited during the course of the earth's history have survived erosion and other destructive geological processes (Van Andel 1981).

Taking the above into account, I propose the Purāṇic view of time and history predicts a sparse but bewildering mixture of hominid fossils, some anatomically modern and some not, going back tens and even hundreds of millions of years and occurring at locations all over the world. It also predicts a more numerous but similarly bewildering mixture of stone tools and other artifacts, some showing a high level of technical ability and others not. And, given the cognitive biases of the majority of workers in the fields of archeology and anthropology over the past 150 years, we might also predict that this bewildering mixture of fossils and artifacts would be edited to conform with a linear, progressive view of human origins. A careful investigation of published reports by myself and Richard Thompson (1993) offers confirmation of these two predictions. What follows is only a sample of the total body of evidence catalogued in our lengthy book. The citations given are for the single reports that best identify particular finds. Detailed analysis and additional reports cited elsewhere (Cremo and Thompson 1993) offer strong confirmation of the authenticity and antiquity of these discoveries.

Incised and carved mammal bones are reported from the Pliocene (Desnoyers 1863, Laussedat 1868, Capellini 1877) and Miocene (Garrigou and Filhol 1868, von Dürker 1873). Additional reports of incised bones from the Pliocene and Miocene may be found an extensive review by the overly skeptical de Mortillet (1883). Scientists have also reported pierced shark teeth from the Pliocene (Charlesworth 1873), artistically carved bone from the Miocene (Calvert 1874) and artistically carved shell from the Pliocene (Stopes 1881). Carved mammal bones reported by Moir (1917) could be as old as the Eocene.

Very crude stone tools occur in the Middle Pliocene (Prestwich 1892) and from perhaps as far back as the Eocene (Moir 1927, Breuil 1910, especially p. 402). One will note that most of these discoveries are from the nineteenth century. But such artifacts are still being found. Crude stone tools have recently be reported from the Pliocene of Pakistan (Bunney 1987), Siberia (Daniloff and Kopf 1986), and India (Sankhyan 1981). Given the current view that toolmaking hominids did not leave their African center of origin until about 1 million years ago, these artifacts are somewhat anomalous, what to speak of a pebble tool from the Miocene of India (Prasad 1982).

More advanced stone tools occur in the Oligocene of Europe (Rutot 1907), the Miocene of Europe (Ribeiro 1873, Bourgeois 1873, Verworn 1905), the Miocene of Asia (Noetling 1894), and the Pliocene of South America (F. Ameghino 1908, C. Ameghino 1915). In North America, advanced stone tools occur in California deposits ranging from Pliocene to Miocene in age (Whitney 1880). An interesting slingstone, at least Pliocene and perhaps Eocene in age, comes from England (Moir 1929, p. 63).

More advanced artifacts have also been reported in scientific and nonscientific publications. These include an iron nail in Devonian Sandstone (Brewster 1844), a gold thread in Carboniferous stone (*Times of London*, June 22, 1844), a metallic vase in Precambrian stone (*Scientific American*, June 5, 1852), and a chalk ball from the Eocene (Melleville 1862), a Pliocene clay statue (Wright 1912, pp. 266–69), metallic tubes in Cre-taceous chalk (Corliss 1978, pp. 652–53), and a grooved metallic sphere from the Pre-



cambrian (Jimison 1982). The following objects have been reported from Carboniferous coal: a gold chain (*The Morrisonville Times*, of Illinois, U.S.A., June 11, 1891), artistically carved stone (*Daily News* of Omaha, U.S.A., April 2, 1897), an iron cup (Rusch 1971), and stone block walls (Steiger 1979, p. 27).

Human skeletal remains described as anatomically modern occur in the Middle Pleistocene of Europe (Newton 1895, Bertrand 1868, de Mortillet 1883). These cases are favorably reviewed by Keith (1928). Other anatomically modern human skeletal remains occur in the Early and Middle Pleistocene of Africa (Reck 1914, L. Leakey 1960d, Zuckerman 1954, p. 310; Patterson and Howells 1967, Semut 1981, R. Leakey 1973), the Early Middle Pleistocene of Java (Day and Molleson 1973), the Early Pleistocene of South America (Hrdlicka 1912, pp. 319–44), the Pliocene of South America (Hrdlicka 1912, p. 346; Boman 1921, pp. 341–42), the Pliocene of England (Osborn 1921, pp. 567–69), the Pliocene of Italy (Ragazzoni 1880, Issel 1868), the Miocene of France and the Eocene of Switzerland (de Mortillet 1883, p. 72), and even the Carboniferous of North America (*The Geologist* 1862). Several discoveries from California gold mines range from Pliocene to Eocene (Whitney 1880). Some of these bones have been subjected to chemical and radiometric tests that have yielded ages younger than suggested by their stratigraphical position. But when the unreliabilities and weaknesses of the testing procedures are measured against the very compelling stratigraphic observations of the discoverers, it is not at all clear that the original age attributions should be discarded (Cremo and Thompson 1993, 753–794).

Humanlike footprints have been found in the Carboniferous of North America (Burroughs 1938), the Jurassic of Central Asia (*Moscow News* 1983, no.4, p. 10), and the Pliocene of Africa (M. Leakey 1979). Shoe prints have been reported from the Cambrian (Meister 1968) and the Triassic (Ballou 1922).

In the course of negotiating a fashionable consensus that anatomically modern humans evolved from less advanced hominids in the Late Pleistocene, scientists gradually rendered unfashionable the considerable body of compelling contradictory evidence summarized above. It thus became unworthy of discussion in knowing circles. Richard Thompson and I have concluded (1993) that the muting of this evidence was accomplished by application of a double standard, whereby favored evidence was exempted from the severely skeptical scrutiny to which unfavored evidence was subjected.

One example from the many that could be cited to demonstrate the operation of linear progressive preconceptions in the editing of the archeological record is the case of the auriferous gravel finds in California. During the days of the California Gold Rush, starting in the 1850s, miners discovered many anatomically modern human bones and advanced stone implements in mineshafts sunk deeply into deposits of gold-bearing gravels capped by thick lava flows (Whitney 1880). The gravels beneath the lava were from 9 to 55 million years old, according to modern geological reports (Slemmons 1966). These discoveries were reported to the world of science by J. D. Whitney, state geologist of California, in a monograph published by the Peabody Museum of Natural History at Harvard University. From the evidence he compiled, Whitney came to a nonprogressivist view of human origins—the fossil evidence he reported indicated that the humans of the distant past were like those of the present.

To this W. H. Holmes (1899, p. 424) of the Smithsonian Institution replied: “Perhaps if Professor Whitney had fully appreciated the story of human evolution as it is understood today, he would have hesitated to announce the conclusions formulated, notwithstanding the imposing array of testimony with which he was confronted.” This attitude is still prominent today. In their college textbook, Stein and Rowe assert that “scientific statements are never considered absolute” (1993, p. 41). But they also make this very absolute statement: “Some people have assumed that humans have always been the way they are today. Anthropologists are convinced that human beings . . . have changed over time in response to changing conditions. So one aim of the anthropologist is to find evidence for evolution and to generate theories about it.” Apparently, an anthropologist, by definition, can have no other view or purpose. Keep in mind, however, that this absolute commitment to a linear progressive model of human origins, ostensibly areligious, may have deep roots in Judeo-Christian cosmology.

One of the things Holmes found especially hard to accept was the similarity of the purportedly very ancient stone implements to those of the modern Indians. He wondered (1899, pp. 451–52) how anyone could take seriously the idea that “the implements of a Tertiary race should have been left in the bed of a Tertiary torrent to be brought out as good as new, after the lapse of vast periods of time, into the camp of a modern community using identical forms?” The similarity could be explained in several ways, but one possible explanation is the repeated appearance in the same geographical region of humans with particular cultural attributes in the course of cyclical time. The suggestion that such a thing could happen is bound to strike those who see humans as the recent result of a long and unique series of evolutionary changes in the hominid line as absurd—so absurd as to prevent them from considering any evidence as potentially supporting a cyclical interpretation of human history.

It is noteworthy, however, that a fairly openminded modern archeologist, when confronted with the evidence catalogued in my book, himself brought up, in a somewhat doubting manner, the possibility of a cyclical interpretation of human history to explain its occurrence. George F. Carter, noted for his controversial views on early man in North America, wrote to me on January 26, 1994: “If your table on p. 391 were correct, then the minimum age for the artifacts at Table Mountain would be 9 million [years old]. Would you think then of a different creation—[one that] disappeared—and then a new start? Would it simply replicate the archeology of California 9 million years later? Or the inverse. Would the Californians 9 million years later replicate the materials under Table Mountain?”

That is exactly what I would propose—that in the course of cyclic time, humans with a culture resembling that of modern North American Indians did in fact appear in California millions of years ago, perhaps several times. “I find great difficulty with that line of reasoning,” confessed Carter. But that difficulty, which encumbers the minds of most archeologists and anthropologists, may be the result of a rarely recognized and even more rarely questioned commitment to a culturally acquired linear progressive time sense.

It would, therefore, be worthwhile to inspect the archeological record through other time lenses, such as the Purāṇic lens. Many will take my proposal as a perfect example of what can happen when someone brings their subjective religious ideas into the objective

study of nature. Jonathan Marks (1994) reacted in typical fashion in his review of *Forbidden Archeology*: “Generally, attempts to reconcile the natural world to religious views end up compromising the natural world.”

But until modern anthropology conducts a conscious examination of the effects of its own covert, and arguably religiously derived, assumptions about time and progress, it should put aside its pretensions to universal objectivity and not be so quick to accuse others of bending facts to fit religious dogma. *Om Tat Sat*.

## References

- Ameghino, C. (1915) El femur de Miramar. *Anales de Museo nacional de historia natural de Buenos Aires*, 26: 433–450.
- Ameghino, F. (1908) Notas preliminares sobre el *Tetraprothomo argentinus*, un precursor de hombre del Mioceno superior de Monte Hermoso. *Anales de Museo nacional de historia natural de Buenos Aires*, 16: 105–242.
- Ballou, W. H. (1922) Mystery of the petrified “shoe-sole” 5,000,000 years old. *American Weekly* section of the *New York Sunday American*, October 8, p. 2.
- Bertrand, P. M. E. (1868) Crane et ossements trouves dans un carriere de l’avenue de Clichy. *Bulletin de la Societe d’Anthropologie de Paris (Series 2)*, 3: 329–335.
- Bhaktivedanta Swami, A. C. (1973) *Śrī mad-Bhāgavatam (Bhāgavata Purāṇa)*, Canto Three, Part Two. Los Angeles, Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.
- Boman, E. (1921) Los vestigios de industria humana encontrados en Miramar (Republica Argentina) y atribuidos a la i poca terciaria. *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografia*, 49(43): 330–352.
- Bourgeois, L. (1873) Sur les silex considē rē s comme portant les margues d’un travail humain et dē couverts dans le terrain miocē ne de Thenay. *Congrē s International d’Anthropologie et d’Archē ologie Prē historiques, Bruxelles 1872, Compte Rendu*, pp. 81–92.
- Breuil, H. (1910) Sur la prē sence d’i olithes a la base de l’Iocene Parisien. *L’Anthropologie*, 21: 385–408.
- Brewster, D. (1844) Queries and statements concerning a nail found imbedded in a block of sandstone obtained from Kingoodie (Mylnfield) Quarry, North Britain. *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Notices and Abstracts of Communications*, p. 51.
- Bunney, S. (1987) First migrants will travel back in time. *New Scientist*, 114(1565): 36.
- Burroughs, W. G. (1938) Human-like footprints, 250 million years old. *The Berea Alumnus*. Berea College, Kentucky, November, pp. 46–47.
- Calvert, F. (1874) On the probable existence of man during the Miocene period. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 3: 127.
- Capellini, G. (1877) Les traces de l’homme pliocē ne en Toscane. *Congrē s International d’Anthropologie et d’Archē ologie Prē historiques, Budapest 1876, Compte Rendu*. Vol. 1, pp. 46–62.



- Charlesworth, E. (1873) Objects in the Red Crag of Suffolk. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 2: 91–94.
- Corliss, W. R. (1978) *Ancient Man: A Handbook of Puzzling Artifacts*. Glen Arm, Sourcebook Project.
- Cremona, M. A., and Thompson, R. L. (1993) *Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race*. San Diego, Bhaktivedanta Institute.
- Daniiloff, R., and Kopf, C. (1986) Digging up new theories of early man. *U. S. News & World Report*, September 1, pp. 62–63.
- Davis, Edward B. (1994) Review of Cameron Wybrow (Editor): *Creation, Nature, and Political Order in the Philosophy of Michael Foster (1903–1959); The Classic Mind Articles and Others, with Modern Critical Essays*, and Cameron Wybrow: *The Bible, Baconism, and Mastery over Nature: The Old Testament and Its Modern Misreading*. *Isis* 53(1): 127–129.
- Day, M. H., and Molleson, T. I. (1973) The Trinil femora. *Symposia of the Society for the Study of Human Biology*, 2: 127–154.
- De Mortillet, G. (1883) *Le Pr̄ historique*. Paris, C. Reinwald.
- Desnoyers, J. (1863) Response in des objections faites au sujet d’incisions constat̄es sur des ossements de Mammiferes fossiles des environs de Chartres. *Compte Rendus de l’Acad̄mie des Sciences*, 56: 1199–1204.
- Garrigou, F., and Filhol, H. (1868) M. Garrigou prie l’Acad̄mie de vouloir bien ouvrir un pli cachet̄, d̄i pos̄ au nom de M. Filhol fils et au sien, le 16 mai 1864. *Compte Rendus de l’Acad̄mie des Sciences*, 66: 819–820.
- The Geologist*, London, 1862 Fossil man, 5: 470.
- Gould, S. J. (1977) *Ever Since Darwin*. New York, W. W. Norton.
- Grayson, Donald K. (1983) *The Establishment of Human Antiquity*. New York, Academic Press.
- Holmes, W. H. (1899) Review of the evidence relating to auriferous gravel man in California. *Smithsonian Institution Annual Report 1898–1899*, pp. 419–472.
- Hrdlicka, A. (1912) *Early Man in South America*. Washington, D. C., Smithsonian Institution.
- Issel, A. (1868) R̄i sum̄ des recherches concernant l’anciennet̄ de l’homme en Ligurie. *Congr̄s International d’Anthropologie et d’Arch̄ologie Pr̄ historiques, Paris 1867, Compte Rendu*, pp. 75–89.
- Jimison, S. (1982) Scientists baffled by space spheres. *Weekly World News*, July 27.
- Keith, A. (1928) *The Antiquity of Man*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott.
- Langton, C. G. (1991) Preface. In Langton, C. G., et al., eds. *Artificial Life II: Proceedings of the Workshop on Artificial Life Held February, 1990 in Santa Fe, New Mexico*. Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity, Proceedings Volume X. Redwood City, Addison-Wesley, pp. xiii–xv.

- Laussedat, A. (1868) Sur une mâchoire de Rhinoceros portant des entailles profondes trouvée en Billy (Allier), dans les formations calcaires d'eau douce de la Limagne. *Compte Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 66: 752–754.
- Leakey, L. S. B. (1960) *Adam's Ancestors*, 4th edition. New York, Harper & Row.
- Leakey, M. D. (1979) Footprints in the ashes of time. *National Geographic*, 155: 446–457.
- Leakey, R. E. (1973) Evidence for an advanced Plio-Pleistocene hominid from East Rudolf, Kenya. *Nature*, 242: 447–450.
- Marks, J. (1994) Review of *Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race*, by Michael A. Cremo and Richard L. Thompson. 1993. San Diego: Bhaktivedanta Institute. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 93: 140–141.
- Meister, W. J. (1968) Discovery of trilobite fossils in shod footprint of human in “Trilobite Bed”—a Cambrian formation, Antelope Springs, Utah. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 5(3): 97–102.
- Melleville, M. (1862) Note sur un objet travaillé de main d'homme trouvé dans les lignites du Laonnais. *Revue Archéologique*, 5: 181–186.
- Moir, J. R. (1917) A series of mineralised bone implements of a primitive type from below the base of the Red and Coralline Crags of Suffolk. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia*, 2: 116–131.
- Moir, J. R. (1927) *The Antiquity of Man in East Anglia*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Moir, J. R. (1929) A remarkable object from beneath the Red Crag. *Man*, 29: 62–65.
- Newton, E. T. (1895) On a human skull and limb-bones found in the Paleolithic terrace-gravel at Galley Hill, Kent. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*, 51: 505–526.
- Noetling, F. (1894) On the occurrence of chipped flints in the Upper Miocene of Burma. *Records of the Geological Survey of India*, 27: 101–103.
- Osborn, H. F. (1921) The Pliocene man of Foxhall in East Anglia. *Natural History*, 21: 565–576.
- Patterson, B., and Howells, W. W. (1967) Hominid humeral fragment from Early Pleistocene of northwestern Kenya. *Science*, 156: 64–66.
- Prasad, K. N. (1982) Was *Ramapithecus* a tool-user. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 11: 101–104.
- Prestwich, J. (1892) On the primitive character of the flint implements of the Chalk Plateau of Kent, with reference to the question of their glacial or pre-glacial age. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 21(3): 246–262.
- Ragazzoni, G. (1880) La collina di Castenedolo, solto il rapporto antropologico, geologico ed agronomico. *Commentari dell'Ateneo di Brescia*, April 4, pp. 120–128.
- Raup, D., and Stanley, S. (1971) *Principles of Paleontology*. San Francisco, W. H. Freeman.
- Reck, H. (1914) Erste vorläufige Mitteilungen über den Fund eines fossilen Menschenkettlets aus Zentralafrika. *Sitzungsbericht der Gesellschaft der naturforschender Freunde Berlins*, 3: 81–95.

- Ribeiro, C. (1873) Sur des silex taillés, découverts dans les terrains miocène du Portugal. *Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques, Bruxelles 1872, Compte Rendu*, pp. 95–100.
- Rusch, Sr., W. H. (1971) Human footprints in rocks. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 7: 201–202.
- Rutot, A. (1907) Un grave problème: une industrie humaine datant de l'époque oligocène. Comparaison des outils avec ceux des Tasmaniens actuels. *Bulletin de la Société Belge de Géologie de Paléontologie et d'Hydrologie*, 21: 439–482.
- Sankhyan, A. R. (1981) First evidence of early man from Haritalyangar area, Himalchal Pradesh. *Science and Culture*, 47: 358–359.
- Senut, B. (1981) Humeral outlines in some hominoid primates and in Plio-pleistocene hominids. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 56: 275–283.
- Slemmons, D. B. (1966) Cenozoic volcanism of the central Sierra Nevada, California. *Bulletin of the California Division of Mines and Geology*, 190: 199–208.
- Steiger, B. (1979) *Worlds Before Our Own*. New York, Berkley.
- Stein, Philip L. and Rowe, Bruce M. (1993) *Physical Anthropology*. Fifth Edition. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Stewart, Wilson N. (1983) *Paleobotany and the Evolution of Plants*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Stopes, H. (1881) Traces of man in the Crag. *British Association for the Advancement of Science, Report of the Fifty-first Meeting*, p. 700.
- Van Andel, T. H. (1981) Consider the incompleteness of the geological record. *Nature*, 294: 397–398.
- Verworn, M. (1905) Die archaolithische Cultur in den Hipparionschichten von Aurillac (Cantal). *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse, Neue Folge*, 4(4):3–60.
- Von Dücker, Baron (1873) Sur la cassure artificielle d'ossements recueillis dans le terrain miocène de Pikermi. *Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques. Bruxelles 1872, Compte Rendu*, pp. 104–107.
- Whitney, J. D. (1880) The auriferous gravels of the Sierra Nevada of California. *Harvard University, Museum of Comparative Zoology Memoir* 6(1).
- Wright, G. F. (1912) *Origin and Antiquity of Man*. Oberlin, Bibliotheca Sacra.
- Zuckerman, S. (1954) Correlation of change in the evolution of higher primates. In Huxley, J., Hardy, A. C., and Ford, E. B., eds. *Evolution as a Process*. London, Allen and Unwin, pp. 300–352.