

low the argument. It is an important book not only for Judaists but also for ancient historians and the general historian who is interested in revolutions.

Doron Mendels

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Rev. Peter Schenk, *Die Gestalt des Turnus in Vergils Aeneis. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 164 (Verlag A. Hain, Königstein/Ts. 1984), 420pp.

It is unusual for a German Ph.D. thesis (Köln) to be published as a book within the year. It is also unusual that a reviewer takes up such a volume (in typescript, not print; the technique used apparently excluded the correction of the very numerous misprints) seven years after publication, when at least five reviews are already in print (*vidi*) and registered in *APh*. The detailed summary by S. Harrison (*CR* 36 [1986], 40-3) and the telling remarks of E. Karaggerud (*Gnomon* 59 [1987], 61-2) exempt me both from a minute study of the text and from a detailed critique of its extraordinarily narrow and extreme thesis. I limit myself therefore to (1) a minimum of observations on Schenk's treatment of the book (7), upon which I have (mis-)spent, intermittently, twenty-five years (288-332 and four shorter passages), and (2) some even briefer remarks on Schenk's position and method.

(1) Schenk's German is lucid and his thesis simple. On the ideology and morality of the *Aeneid* he has read widely, especially in German and English. Thus (*e.g.*) on the use of *audax* in literature (28ff.) he is quite useful — or so it might appear until you realize that he has not read Hellegouarc'h's indispensable study of political terminology (*Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques* [Paris 1963]); that he ignores Miss Taylor and Prof. Wirszubski goes almost without saying. You cannot understand Turnus without Catiline and Mark Antony. S. tells us nothing, either, of Turnus' helmet and shield, of his allies, or of the significance of the torch hurled at his breast (*cf.* 310). With the help of a concordance and a little ingenuity it is only too easy to impose a moral argument on the text of the *Aeneid*. Given industry and the resources of a good library that argument can be adorned with the appearance of learning. The result need, may, can have little to do with the actual text of the *Aeneid* as one struggles through its subtleties, ambiguities, allusions, depths, complexities. A few moral terms, or an analysis based on certain values, cannot be wrenched from its context and studied in isolation. S. has not studied *Aeneid* 7 in terms (*e.g.*) of the historiography of the outbreak of a civil war, or as an antiquarian reconstruction of military practice in primitive Italy. Eduard Fraenkel's classic article in *JRS* 1945 would have led him to both ideas, but Fraenkel's bibliography he has not followed up. Discussion of Turnus' previous "engagement" to Lavinia (296)

is similarly insufficient, though S.'s conclusion is correct. There is no point in listing other avenues S. has not followed, other books S. has not read, though the invaluable A. O'Brien Moore, *Madness in Ancient Literature* (Ph.D. dissertation, Weimar 1924) really should not have escaped him. Thus S.'s 672 footnotes do not even represent a precious bibliographical repertory. It is hard to see just how and why the serious reader of Virgil would want to consult this large book (except as yet another contribution to an over-long and sterile debate).

(2) Let me spell it out in words of one syllable: to Schenk, Virg. *Aen.* 7-12 are books of but one voice and one tone, with but one end and one goal. That all may be mixed and vague, less sure and clear, that Virg. may speak one way (or two) to the head and two ways (or three, or four) to the heart would be, I fear, to S. but a sign of my "soft" line of thought. To return briefly to longer words: such conceptual over-simplification helps not one scrap our understanding of Virgil. Even to one who believes (as I do) that Aeneas was entirely justified in executing Turnus, there is tragedy in the reaching of that decision and the moral and emotional complexities to which Virgil invites us are bewilderingly and continuously polysematic. S.'s overall evaluation, I can hardly deny, contains quite numerous valid elements; the book, however, leads to a judgement which travesties the complexity of Virgil's text and intentions.

Nicholas Horsfall

Rome

Eduard Meyer - Victor Ehrenberg. Ein Briefwechsel 1914-1930, edd. G. Audring, Chr. Hoffmann and J. v. Ungern-Sternberg (Berlin-Stuttgart 1990), pp. 162.

The correspondence, of which the bulk was conducted during the Great War, between the young student-turned-soldier Ehrenberg and the doyen of ancient history in Germany, is both a valuable document of its time and an engaging contribution to the history of classical scholarship. Ed. Meyer has recently had a volume dedicated to his achievement,¹ while V.E.'s unpublished typescript, "Personal Memoirs", has been circulating among interested scholars for some time:² the present volume offers valuable insights into the characters of both men. The wartime letters between E.M. — who was an extreme nationalist, lecturing and writing relentlessly against England and America while enthusiastically active for such causes as unrestricted submarine warfare — and his student

¹ W.M. Calder and A. Demandt, edd., *Eduard Meyer — Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers. Mnemosyne Suppl.* 112 (Leiden 1990).

² My thanks are due to Prof. P.R. Franke of Saarbrücken for a reproduction of the copy he received from the author, as well as for a typescript of his forthcoming paper, "Victor Ehrenberg. Ein deutsches Gelehrtschicksal 1891-1976".