

A man like Cato the younger is therefore to our author "obstinate and narrow minded" (p. 397). His ancestor Cato the Censor does not fare much better (pp. 215, 216). It seems to us that when these men foretold ruin to their country unless the Romans mended their ways, they were amply justified by the result. Again, Signor Ferrero evidently looks with suspicion on the historians of the German school, whose criticism is mostly destructive (p. 23). But he himself seems to be open to the charge of giving too much play to his fancy; we are told, for example, that "broad, straight streets" were "traced by the kings" (p. 55); that "in the remote period of the first kings we may think of Rome as a busy workshop, where the traveller heard the constant beating of hammers in the factories where the bronze and tin and iron workers laboured" (p. 13); that "every year at Rome and in the cities of the Latins and allies were opened new schools of rhetoric" at the end of the second century, B.C. (p. 315); we doubt whether chapter and verse could be given for any of these statements. We do not quite see eye to eye with the author in the history of the earliest period; take for example the all-important question of the reasons for the rapid development and importance of Rome. This question has been generally ignored; we believe it was Herbert Spencer who suggested that the position of the city on the Tiber, near the mouth, was the great factor in its early and rapid progress. Signor Ferrero seems to favor the same view (p. 13). But this is to judge by modern conditions; in antiquity the principles which regulated commerce were different, and it is notorious that the great commercial cities were regularly founded not on the great rivers but near them on the coast. Such were Miletus, Smyrna, Thessalonica, Alexandria, Marseilles, Tarraco, Tyre, Amisus (the capital of Mithradates), Cadiz and Carthage. Again, if the situation of Rome was so suitable, how is it that almost the earliest Roman measure we hear of is the foundation of the port of Ostia at the mouth of the Tiber? As a matter of fact Rome was rather badly situated for commerce by sea; this seems to be indicated by the fact that in later times its port—or *échelle* as the French call it—was at the distant town of Puteoli. We prefer another explanation of Rome's early greatness, one that would account for the importance of Troy and the Boeotian Thebes as well as that of Rome.

In the first chapter a good deal of attention is devoted to the Etruscans. We venture to take exception to the statement on p. 11, "If Rome was, in fact, founded and governed for more than two centuries by the Etruscans, how are we to explain the fact that under the Republic she Latinized herself to all appearance so completely as entirely to dissemble her origin?" Surely the Norman Conquest of England furnishes a parallel. Why again does the author assume (p. 26) that the patricians were the Latin element? They are at least as likely to have been Etruscans. We are glad to see that Signor Ferrero gives this prominence to the vexed