

des ersten Buches Genüge getan wird. Man fragt sich, ob denn die übrigen Bücher des *Gall.* nicht auch zu dieser Politik Caesars in Gallien gehören, ob die Bibliographie, auch wenn nicht direkt zitiert, was im übrigen meist kritisiert heißt, doch wenigstens einige grundlegende, weiterführende Werke enthalten sollte, ob der philologische und historische Aspekt bei den einzelnen Themen wirklich genügend verknüpft sind, um eine vollständigere Interpretation zu erreichen. All diese Fragen sind sicher diskutabel. Trotz allem kann das vorliegende Buch sicher frische Anstöße zu neuen Diskussionen geben.

*Uta-Maria Liertz*

*The Cambridge Companion to Virgil.* Edited by CHARLES MARTINDALE. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997. ISBN 0-521-49885-6 (pb). xvii, 370 pp. GBP 14.95 (pb).

The aim of this Cambridge *Companion* is to offer guidance to the readers of Virgil. Though mastering Latin is not required, one assumes – and hopes – that those who consult this book have some knowledge of Virgil in translation, or, at least, a basic idea of his poetry and the world where it was composed. The contributions are hardly recommendable for absolute beginners. The themes discussed in the individual essays are very wide-ranging, with special emphasis put on Virgil's singular heritage (translations, receptions in antiquity and later, reflections in art, literature and politics, etc.), the literary genres in which he wrote (pastoral poetry, *Georgics*, epic, together constituting a paradigm of a "poetic career"), contextualisation of Virgil's work (with an important essay on intertextuality in Ch. 3), and various issues concerning form and contents (characterisations, narrative techniques, stylistic questions, etc.). Generally, this is not a collection of unanimous views about Virgil and his poetry, but a ramified series of both traditional and innovative perspectives that are often in disagreement with each other. (This, of course, is not to say that traditional discussion implies lack of freshness.) Diversity may be a good approach, for at best it makes the reader understand that there are as numerous ways of responding to Virgil now as there were in antiquity.

The introductory chapter (1) on 'the classic of all Europe' by the editor of the volume is followed by twenty-two essays (written by seventeen scholars) which are divided into four main sections: Part 1: Translation and reception. (2) C. Burrow, Virgil in English Translation; (3) D.F. Kennedy, Modern Receptions and Their Interpretative Implications; (4) R.J. Tarrant, Aspects of Virgil's Reception in Antiquity; (5) D. Fowler, The Virgil Commentary of Servius; (6) C. Burrow, Virgils, from Dante to Milton; (7) M.J.H. Liversidge, Virgil in Art. – Part 2: Genre and poetic career. (8) C. Martindale, Green Politics: the *Eclogues*; (9) W. Batstone, Virgilian Didaxis: Value and Meaning in the *Georgics*; (10) D.F. Kennedy, Virgilian Epic; (11) E. Theodorakopoulos, Closure: the Book of Virgil. – Part 3: Contexts of production. (12) R.J. Tarrant, Poetry and Power: Virgil's Poetry in Contemporary Context; (13) J.E.G. Zetzel, Rome and Its Traditions; (14) S. Morton Braund, Virgil and the Cosmos: Religious and Philosophical Ideas; (15) J. Farrell, The Virgilian Intertext. – Part 4: Contents and forms. (16) J.J. O'Hara, Virgil's

Style; (17a) D. Fowler, Virgilian Narrative: Story-Telling; (17b) A. Barchiesi, Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis; (18) A. Laird, Approaching Characterisation in Virgil; (19) E. Oliensis, Sons and Lovers: Sexuality and Gender in Virgil's Poetry; (20) P. Hardie, Virgil and Tragedy; (21) F. Cox, Envoi: The Death of Virgil.

*Mika Kajava*

HORATIUS: *Opera*. Editio quarta. Edidit D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. In aedibus K. G. Saur, Monachii et Lipsiae 2001. ISBN 3-598-71234-0. x, 372 p. EUR 29.

Shackleton Baileys zum ersten Mal 1985 erschienene Stuttgarter Horaz ist jetzt bis zur vierten Auflage gekommen, hat also nach der Wende in buchhändlerischer Hinsicht ihre Leipziger Rivalin von Borzsák in den Schatten gestellt. Und zwar zurecht. Freilich gilt Horaz seit jeher als ein besonders schlecht geeignetes Objekt für Konjekturekritik, deren vollblütiger Vertreter Sh. B. ist, aber Borzsák wiederum hat mit seiner extrem konservativen Haltung dem Horaztext eher geschadet. Und jedenfalls zeigt der Vergleich der zwei Ausgaben, dass eine kritische Neubewertung des Horaztextes nötig ist. Diese Umwertung gilt auch für unsere Einstellung zu Bentley's Einsatz am Horaztext. Und gerade in dieser Hinsicht ist Sh. B's Ausgabe wichtig, indem sie zeigt, dass der Pendel wieder in die Bentleyische Richtung schwingt. – Im vorliegenden Abdruck sind einige Druckfehler ausgemerzt worden. Sonst bemerke ich nur, dass Sh. B. neue von Borzsák ans Licht gezogene Lesarten der hsl Tradition nicht der Erwähnung wert hält, so findet sich keine Notiz von der von Borzsák in einer Handschrift in Queen's College, Oxford gefundenen neuen Lesart *tunsa* in der Drususode 4, 4, 57, die m. E. vorzuziehen wäre. – Eine Unstimmigkeit ist in dem neuen Abdruck geblieben: auf S. X liest man die veraltete Angabe "vide quae in *HSCP* 89 (1985) prolaturus sum".

*Heikki Solin*

TACITUS: *Dialogus de oratoribus*. Edited by ROLAND MAYER. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001. ISBN 0-521-46996-1 (pb). ix, 227 pp. GBP 15.95.

This is a welcome introduction and commentary on the least studied Tacitean writing, the *Dialogus de oratoribus*. The introductory part contains a concise presentation of the relevant issues (Tacitus' career, the cultural discussion about oratory that lies behind the *Dialogus*, the lay-out of the work and its date). As regards the date, Mayer argues convincingly for a late composition (the early first decade of the second century), the work being thus posterior to the *Agricola* and *Germania*. (I personally remember having been taught that the *Dialogus* is Tacitus' earliest surviving work.) I am not quite sure if this volume is addressed to students and scholars alike. A student would probably at times expect more rudimentary explanations, while a scholar may find the comments unsatisfactory for other reasons (e.g., sometimes a little bit too brief and not very deep).