

to c. 170 B.C.), who sought to rival rather than to copy their Greek models—in the same way as the English playwrights of the sixteenth century sought to go one better than their Italian prototypes.

In spite of the studious inconsequence with which Altheim ranges over his field, his work bears throughout the traces of wide and accurate reading, of original but nicely balanced thinking. It is light literature, but of a high order.

M. CARY.

University of London.

R. P. HINKS: *Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture*. Pp. vii+35; 72 illustrations.

London: British Museum, 1935. Paper, 2s.

THE publications issued by the British Museum have too often been long printed lists with no illustrations, seldom consulted by anyone except the compilers of library catalogues. The latest product, though not strictly a catalogue, shows a welcome change of heart, for it contains seventy-two illustrations, all of them adequate for reference, and only thirty-five pages of text. This commentary is a remarkable achievement, for it is clear, concise, and expressive, and it gives an adequate survey of the portraiture of eight centuries, which will prove invaluable both to the interested layman and to the archaeological student, though it is unfortunate that the arrangement of the Museum does not allow it to be used as a guide to the Collections. New and startling conclusions are naturally absent, and criticism can be confined to slight differences of opinion, though there is one irritating misprint: 'former' for 'latter' on p. 20. The author perhaps overstates the absence of representation from early Greek portraiture; the long skull of Pericles and the snub nose of Socrates suggest that even a Greek could notice features. The blocked-out treatment of the hair of the Rhodian lady, No. 1965, is surely not a late Hellenistic invention but an imitation of the technique of Praxiteles. The book fills an obvious gap in the literature both of archaeology and of the British Museum, and it would

be interesting if the author could give us a full-dress history of ancient portraiture without confining himself to the national collection.

C. R. WASON.

University of Edinburgh.

NILS ERIKSSON: *Religiositet och irreligiositet hos Tacitus*; mit deutscher Zusammenfassung. Pp. 74. Lund: Gleerup, 1935. Paper, kr. 2.50.

A FRESH comparison and discussion of the passages in which Tacitus alludes to the part played by the gods, by *fortuna*, *fors* and *fatum* in human affairs. It is worth reading, but it does not lead to much; and that is just as well, since nothing very striking can be inferred about the beliefs and reservations of a writer whose collected references to the guidance of the world's affairs exhibit so much vagueness and inconsistency. That it is not right to call T. 'irreligious,' as some have done, and that there is no solid ground for supposing, as some have done, that his nebulous beliefs underwent a change in the course of his life, are the sensible conclusions at which the author arrives. T. of course believed in the efficacy of *deum ira* and *deum favor*, and apparently called either *Fortuna*. For the rest, *mihi in incerto fuit* probably sums up his attitude towards religion.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

L. ROBERT LIND: *What Rome has left us*. Pp. 34. Williamsport, Pennsylvania: Bayard Press, 1935. Paper, 50 c.

WITHOUT going deep, this clear and concise pamphlet in thirty-four short pages touches on all the chief aspects of its subject. Herodes Atticus would be annoyed to be called a Roman and Maine to find his epigram, that nothing moves in the world which is not Greek in origin, attributed to Shelley: and one might quarrel with some of Mr. Lind's opinions and statements. But within its limits this is an effective essay.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors.

DEAR SIRS,

In a recent review of Ashby's *Aqueducts of Ancient Rome* (C.R., p. 34), Dr. A. W. Van Buren calls in question the attachment of *Aqua* to the titles of *Aquae Anio Vetus* and *Anio Novus*, which he believes to be a spurious invention. As editor of the book, I would like to point out that there is ancient authority, quoted on p. 79 (note 5) of Ashley's work, for the use in question. *C.I.L.* vi. 2343, 2344 and 2345 are three tombstones of slaves employed upon *Aqua Anio Vetus*: the first styles himself *aquarius aquae Annionis* (sic) *veteris*; the second, *castellar(ius) aquae Annionis* (sic)

veteris; the third, *publicus aquae Anneses* (sic). The spelling of these inscriptions is poor; doubtless the dedicators could hardly afford to pay a good mason. But there is no doubt as to the usage involved. A slave who had spent his life in the aqueduct service is hardly likely to have been mistaken about the style of title employed, any more than a soldier misquotes the title of his unit. At all events, this is ancient evidence for the practice by actual employees, and as such more acceptable than a guess many centuries later in date.

Yours sincerely,

IAN A. RICHMOND.

*Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*