whereas the name Pleistocene should not be extended to the Post-glacial age. The close of the Glacial period, introducing great physical and climatal changes, some new species of mammalia and man himself, should be regarded as the end of the Pleistocene, and the introduction of what some French geologists have called the *Anthropic* period, which I have elsewhere divided into Palanthropic, corresponding to the so-called Palæolithic age, and Neanthropic, corresponding to the later stone and metal ages.[1] These may be termed respectively the earlier and later stages of the Modern period as distinguished from the Pleistocene Tertiary.

In point of logical arrangement, and especially of geological classification, the division into historic and pre-historic periods is decidedly objectionable. Even in Europe the historic age of the south is altogether a different thing from that of the north, and to speak of the pre-historic period in Greece and in Britain or Norway as indicating the same portion of time is altogether illusory. Hence a large portion of the discussion of this subject has to be properly called "the overlap of history." Further, the mere accident of the presence or absence of historical documents cannot constitute a geological period comparable with such periods as the Pleistocene and Pliocene, and the assumption of such a criterion of time merely confuses our ideas. On the one hand, while the whole Tertiary or Kainozoic, up to the present day, is one great geological period, characterized by a continuous though gradually changing fauna and series of physical conditions, and there is consequently no good basis for setting apart, as some geologists do, a Quaternary as distinct from the Tertiary period; on the other hand, there is a distinct physical break between the Pliocene and the Modern in the great Glacial age. This, in its Arctic climate and enormous submergence of the land, though it did not exterminate the fauna of the northern hemisphere,

[1] "Modern Science in Bible Lands."