

underlay the others in that, whether it were a case of religious possession or of self-dedication for any reason, it could be recognized that the deity had 'seized' the person concerned and that his adoption into temple-*paramone* was in either case but the human fulfilment of the divine will.

Obviously there is much more here than a mere papyrologist can fairly be asked to assess: the legal aspects of the argument and the derivation from Eastern and, in particular, Semitic sources must be tested by those with special knowledge in these fields. But it would seem to be clear that, though Delekat's case has been carefully presented and thoroughly documented, he has had to resort more often than one would like to the use of hypothesis and even, in places, to straining the papyrological evidence. One cannot feel that the last word has been said on the subject of *katoche*, even after reading Delekat's intensive study of the problem.

University College, Cardiff

B. R. REES

KEVIN HERBERT: *Ancient Art in Bowdoin College*. Pp. xv + 212; 48 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1964. Cloth, 56s. net.

THANKS to the generosity and good taste of E. P. Warren, Bowdoin College in Maine has an unusually good small collection of antiquities, of which the Attic Red-Figure pottery forms the most notable part. Herbert begins with an interesting history of the collection and then catalogues separately the Mesopotamian and Egyptian objects, Greek and Roman sculpture, pottery, terra-cottas, bronzes, gems, coins, lamps, glass, and inscriptions, and various miscellaneous objects.

An appendix lists ten forgeries, a creditably small number if complete. The entries are workmanlike and useful, though (as is likely to happen where one person has to cover so wide a range) the general statements are not always accurate. The illustrations are good, if wasteful of space. The book is well printed and bound, and should be a helpful guide to the collection.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Volume 68. Pp. 422. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1964. Cloth, 76s. net.

J. A. NOTOPOULOS, *Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry*; Mason Hammond, *Three Latin Inscriptions in the McDaniel Collection*; L. A. Post, *Menander and the Helen of Euripides*; Wendell Clausen, *The Textual Tradition of the Culex*; id., *An Interpretation of the Aeneid*; V. Ehrenberg, *Caesar's Final Aims*; T. M. Woodward, *Electra by Sophocles—the Dialectical Design*; G. W. Bowersock, *C. Marcius Censorinus, Legatus Caesaris*; C. P. Segal, *God and Man in Pindar's First and Third Olympian Odes*; J. A. Coulter, *The Relation of the Apology of Socrates to Gorgias' Defence of Palamedes and Plato's Critique of Gorgianic Rhetoric*; Ramsey MacMullen, *Imperial Bureaucrats in the Roman Provinces*; William Whallon, *Maenadism in the Oresteia*; Cora Angier, *Verbal Patterns in Hesiod's Theogony*; C. R. Beye, *Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues*; Robert Renehan, *The Collectanea Alexandrina—Selected Passages*; J. P. Maguire, *The Differentiation of Art in Plato's Aesthetics*.

CORRESPONDENCE

IN *C.R.* lxxviii (1964), p. 239, Mr. C. J. Herington argues that the *Prometheus* is later than the *Oresteia*, and points out in a footnote that evidence in support of this dating has been adduced by J. D. Denniston (1934), E. C. Yorke (1936), E. B. Ceadel (1941), H. J. Rose (1957), and himself (1963). I would remind him that in my edition of the *Prometheus* (1932), I had already argued, on

linguistic, metrical, and other grounds, with acknowledgements to Wackernagel (1902), W. Schmid (1929), and E. Harrison (1931), that 'the *Prometheus* is the latest of the extant plays of Aeschylus' (p. 46). See further my *Aeschylus and Athens* (1941), p. 448.

GEORGE THOMSON

University of Birmingham