

Etrurian question; but why has he nothing to say about the Phoenicians, apart from an irrelevant allusion on page 4? Yet few things in the darkness of the prehistoric period are clearer than the presence of the Phoenicians on the Campanian coast long before the traditional date of the foundation of Rome.

In his account of the Social War, too, we think our author might have made the issue clearer. The Italians went to war with Rome not to win their independence, but to be allowed to become Romans. This seems to make this war, a fierce and bitter struggle, almost unique in history, and is a great testimony to the strength of the foundations on which Rome was built. When Signor Ferrero says that their idea that they would benefit by Roman citizenship was a "delusion" (p. 316), he seems to us to be quite mistaken.

We now proceed to points of detail, which are fairly numerous. We find not only in two or three places in the text (pp. 1, 5), but also on the Title Page and the Paper Cover an incorrect date for the foundation of the city (754 instead of 753); the correct date is given on p. 26, so that there is not even uniformity in error. The year 754 is not even one of the nine different dates given by the ancients themselves. The date now universally adopted is that of Varro, whence the name Varronian era. The following sentence on p. 5 shows a curious confusion of thought. After talking about 754 B.C. as the date "now universally accepted," Signor Ferrero continues:—"An ingenious historian is never at a loss for subtle arguments in support of any thesis of which he is enamoured, but in this case, unfortunately, all these conjectures and arguments are shattered by the clear and simple fact that Rome by her chronology *ab urbe condita* always officially affirmed that the foundation of the city took place about the middle of the eighth century, B.C." Even the uninitiated reader will see that if the Romans had *always* counted from the foundation of the city, that date would be attached to some particular year and not to *somewhere about* the middle of the eighth century. The fact that nine different dates ranging from about 875 to 729 were given in ancient times for the foundation of the city, shows—what we already know from other sources—that the date of the foundation of the city was not "always officially affirmed" but was the subject of learned enquiry at a later date. As a matter of fact we find traces of an early use of other systems of dating. Two of these, viz.: *post reges exactos*; *post Capitolinam dedicatam*, are older than the system *ab urbe condita*; there are also half a dozen others. The student who finds the modern reckoning *anno domini* universal in Christian countries and is afterwards introduced to the Greek systems of reckoning from the first Olympiad, and the Roman system from the foundation of the city, does not realize that there were dozens of different eras current in antiquity. The Christian era by the bye was first inaugurated in its