

simply place side by side the passage in which they first appeared, and the Duke's criticism, and confidently ask whether there is any foundation for the sweeping accusation made by the noble Duke.

The Duke says: 'For here I must observe that Archaeologists are using language on this subject which, if not positively erroneous, requires, at least, more rigorous definitions and limitations of meaning than they are disposed to attend to. They talk of an Old Stone Age (Palæolithic), and of a Newer Stone Age (Neolithic), and of a Bronze Age, and of an Iron Age. Now, there is no proof whatever that such Ages ever existed in the world. It may be true, and it probably is true, that most nations in the progress of the Arts have passed through the stages of using stone for implements before they were acquainted with the use of metals. Even this, however, may not be true of all nations. In Africa there appear to be no traces of any time when the natives were not acquainted with the use of iron, and I am informed by Sir Samuel Baker that iron ore is so common in Africa, and of a kind so easily reducible by heat, and

My words, when proposing the terms, were as follows:—

'From the careful study of the remains which have come down to us, it would appear that the prehistoric archaeology may be divided into four great epochs.

'Firstly, that of Drift, when man shared the possession of Europe with the Mammoth, the cave-bear, the woolly-haired rhinoceros and other extinct animals. This we may call the "Palæolithic" period.

'Secondly, the later or polished Stone Age; a period characterised by beautiful weapons and instruments made of flint and other kinds of stone, in which, however, we find no trace of the knowledge of any metal, excepting gold, which seems to have been sometimes used for ornaments. This we may call the Neolithic period.

'Thirdly, the Bronze Age, in which bronze was used for arms and cutting instruments of all kinds.

'Fourthly, the Iron Age, in which that metal had super-