

Europeans; that the Hernici were perhaps Sabines (p. 31); that Laelius was called Sapiens because he dropped an unpopular bill—an idea borrowed from Plutarch (p. 248); that the *equites* had before Sulla “acquired with much difficulty the privilege of seats of honour at the public spectacles” (p. 356).

To call Cæsar “an elegant and intelligent youth” (p. 389) is more than quaint; the same may be said of “young man” as a description of a Roman consul (p. 200); “the lot was cast” (p. 458) presumably means “the die was cast”; “hostis” (pp. 336, 452) is sufficient without the addition of “publicus.” We are surprised to hear of Cicero’s “modesty” (p. 391); is it possible that the authors mean moderation? The years 510, 509 B.C. (p. 26) are by an oversight called “early years of the sixth century.”

Finally there are a few passages which we confess we do not understand. Such are the description of Jerusalem as the “royal seat of Saul and Salome” (p. 386), and the law which “recalled the knights who had been banished after Marius’s political ruin in 89” (p. 332). We should like to be sure that Ariminum (p. 171) and Puteoli (p. 455) are not misprints for Arretium and Populonia respectively. We have heard of Italia Subalpina, but Gallia Subalpina (p. 339) is new to us; moreover we thought that Cn. Pompeius was operating not in Gaul but in central Italy (same page); the authors cannot surely be thinking of App. B.C. I 66. More obscure still are the allusions to agriculture. On p. 244 we learn that “vines and olives began to be cultivated” in the times of the Gracchi, and again on p. 390 we read that about 65 B.C. “the efforts to improve agriculture by planting vines and olives everywhere” seem to have been one of the “chief causes of the aggravation of a burden which was becoming intolerable to many.” As a matter of fact it was just at this time that the cultivation of the vine and olive was beginning to be abandoned in favour of cattle raising, because the former did not pay. In passing we may note that this development was due to the competition of the provinces, i.e., of Romans driven from their native Italy by one-sided legislation. We were also quite unprepared for the following on p. 454:—“In 52, Italian merchants had for the first time been able to export to the provinces oil made in Italy.” Here the preciseness of the date furnishes a slight clue. Is it possible that Signor Ferrero is thinking of a passage in Cicero’s *Republic*, which was published about 52 B.C.? The passage in question is as follows:—“We do not allow nations beyond the Alps to plant olives and vines in order to enhance the value of our own olive plantations and vineyards.” But even if we do not press the point—which we have every right to press—that the book *De Republica* is a dialogue supposed to have been held in 129 B.C., still all that Cicero says is that Italian interests are unfairly favoured. We may commend the passage to the consideration of our modern Tariff Reformers; instead of merely putting a prohibitive tax on foreign manufactures, their Roman predecessors would have suppressed competition altogether.