Cypriot tombs of about 400 B.C. Finally, additions to the Byzantine collection are published by Orlandos, but are beyond the scope of this journal and of this reviewer.

The plates are superb. Nearly every object is reproduced life-size, and, where necessary, in several views. The text-figures, which illustrate either details of objects in the collection or comparanda in other collections, are equally good. This book is indeed a credit to Professor Amandry and the University of Strasbourg.

British Museum

REYNOLD HIGGINS

Yale Classical Studies. Volume xviii. Pp. 147. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1963. Cloth, 45s. net.

By far the greater part of this volume is devoted to a study by John F. Oates of 'The Status Designation: Πέρσης, της ἐπιγονης'. Its author first summarizes the history of the problem from 1829 to the present day; he describes and evaluates the contributions of papyrologists, historians, and jurists, showing how each has sought to explore one or more aspects of the problem without attempting a comprehensive treatment, how most have criticized the findings of others without building upon them, and how certain assumptions have become common currency without having ever been tested by a thorough examination of all the evidence. He then goes on to list and analyse that evidence, first down to 148 B.C., then to the Roman conquest of Egypt. His examination of the earlier period leads him to the conclusion that the designation της ἐπιγονης indicates a 'civilian' or 'private individual' as opposed to a military or government official, and that  $\Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta s$  is an ethnic which denotes Hellenic status, adopted by those who have no ethnic of their own but can

claim a degree of hellenization. The later period, in which the variety of ethnics decreases and the designation  $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{s} \ \hat{\epsilon} \pi \iota \gamma o \nu \hat{\eta} \hat{s}$  is found almost exclusively with  $\Pi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \eta \hat{s}$ , supports this conclusion: the two taken together signify the lowest Hellenic class, the hellenizing Egyptians.

The advantage of this view, which involves the syntactical separation of  $\Pi \acute{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \eta s$ and της ἐπιγονης, is that it offers a picture of logical development from the earlier to the later period of Ptolemaic rule: the two designations had the same broad significance in both periods but tended to become more and more associated with each other in a single phrase in the second. Thus too, in the Roman period-for which Oates accepts the view that Πέρσης, τῆς ἐπιγονῆς has become a legal fiction, making obligated persons liable to an exceptional execution on themselves in the event of failure to discharge their obligations—the hellenizing class may well have lost some of its privileges, including the right of asylum, so that in time its status designation may have come to be used solely to indicate such a loss of rights. This last suggestion is, as the author points out, no more than a reasonable hypothesis; the rest of his conclusions are fully documented and clearly argued, and he is to be congratulated for having brought this vexed question as near to a final solution as it ever can be with the available evidence. There are still some loose ends to tie up, and the origin of the phrase της ἐπιγονης remains a semantic mystery-and may always so remain.

In the second article M. J. O'Brien examines 'The Unity of the Laches' and finds it in the harmony between the incomplete definitions of courage by Laches and Nicias and their own characters: the one represents  $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$ , the other  $\lambda\delta\gamma\sigma$ s, and it is only in Socrates that the theory and practice of courage can be united.

University College, Cardiff

B. R. REES

## CORRESPONDENCE

In my brief note on Agrippina's Villa (C.R. N.S. xiii[1963], pp. 261-2) there are two errors; one a misprint, the other a slip of my own. The emendation should, of course, read Baulis Baias pervectam. Secondly, I give the impression that my identification of the

Antoniae of Tacitus Annals xiii. 18. 5 and Pliny lx. 172 is due to the mention of Antonia Minor by the former. In fact it is Pliny who writes Antonia Drusi and Tacitus who does not specify. The identification is not affected.

University of Tasmania

P. J. BICKNELL