

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 Meyer has recently had a volume dedicated to his achievement,¹ while V.E.'s unpublished typescript, "Personal Memoirs", has been circulating among interested scholars for some time:² the present volume offers valuable insights into the characters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".

on the Western Front — who was for his part patriotic in the manner to be expected at that time from an assimilated Jew from a liberal bourgeois background — although dealing mainly with military and political events, are revealing for more than one reason. Those who know E.M. only from his caustic and haughty remarks about lesser human beings (colleagues alive and dead) will be pleasantly surprised at the truly tolerant, even liberal attitude displayed towards the views of a man so much his junior, and many will have to revise their notions of the rigid hierarchical nature of German academic life. That said, there remain some matters which are not easily appreciated even with the benefit of hindsight.

The issue of antisemitism, though referred to explicitly only in a few letters, looms large. The editors' contention (p. 31) that M.'s "Antijudaismus" was not influenced, at least until November 1918, by political antisemitism depends on one's point of view and is made problematic by the widespread difficulty of recognising certain varieties of pre-Holocaust antisemitism without evaluating them anachronistically. Certainly the editors — one of whom is working at the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in Berlin! — are surprisingly naive to believe (p. 30) that M.'s many Jewish friends and colleagues constitute proof that he was not an antisemite. At any rate, the mature E., who would forgive all colleagues (with the solitary exception of H. Berve) who had compromised themselves under the Third Reich and would continue close relations with men like Joseph Vogt and with his own *Doktorvater* Wilhelm Weber, is already foreshadowed in the young soldier.

Our generation looks with disbelief at the achievement of the giants of the past. Although one could learn about this achievement from mere lists of publications, it is amazing to realize that an important work (however misguided in its main thesis) like *Caesars Monarchie und das Prinzipat des Pompeius* was executed almost as a *parergon*. As for E., the shaping of his main interests can be discerned already in his student days and in the few letters as Privatdozent in Frankfurt (from the first year of the professorship in Prague there is one letter to congratulate M. on his 75th birthday and the letter of condolence to his widow). There is perhaps still room for a more thorough evaluation of the unique contribution to scholarship by German-speaking Jewish ancient historians: one notices that the parallel piece to E. Täubler's *Der römische Staat* was E.'s *Der griechische Staat*. On the whole this is an intriguing volume which cannot be read without some sad reflections.

Joseph Geiger

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem