After reading the book those for whom it is meant will have gathered adequate information on the poet, his sources, his interests and intentions, and his style; the professional classical scholar may not have learned much, but he will have appreciated the succinct and clear way in which the problems are dealt with. He will not always agree with Mr Camps, e.g. on the much-discussed problem of the structure of the *Aeneid*: the author (pp. 52-4) sees a unity in books 1-4 and 7-12 (the latter part to be subdivided after 8), books 4-5 being a transition. Personally I think this is quite sensible, although I am sure that a *communis opinio* will never be reached.

I like best the chapter on 'Poetic expression' (pp. 61-74), with many illuminating examples of Virgil's style and grammar, rhythm and sound. The author might have added a few lines on Virgil's handling of the dactylic hexameter, especially the well-known clash between word-accent and *ictus*.

I am less happy with some of the *Appendices*, e.g. 4 on the poet's so-called shortcomings, for Mr Camps' criticism here is sometimes very subjective and not always reasonable: p. 134 he does not appreciate Virgil's description of Turnus in *Aen.* XII 219 ff. In my opinion, these lines belong to the very best in this book and are psychologically quite comprehensible (cf. Page a. l.; Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Vergils*, 195).

And I like *App.* 5 least of all, where the author is manifestly under the influence of the dangerous book by D. L. Drew, *The Allegory of the Aeneid* (1927); here he goes too far and suggests things he could never prove; so we read p. 142: "Thus Caesar the father is represented in the *Aeneid* by Anchises, and Caesar the fallen friend and comrade in arms is represented by Pallas", etc.

On the whole, however, the book is sensible, stimulating, well written and deserves a wide public.

Groningen, Zuiderpark 12  
R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma


Books on what is traditionally called Antiquities are no longer written nowadays, least of all by one writer. Accordingly, this book purports to present something new: a dynamic analysis of the interrelations between environment, society, people and civilization; the author proposes to intermingle the historical aspect with what he calls the *ontical* aspect, in which the latter, i.e. the intrinsic value of Greek views and ways of life, is to dominate. *This work has,
however, turned out to be a great disappointment at least for this reviewer. It is in fact an old-fashioned book on antiquities, daily life, arts and crafts, functions of the gods, philosophical and scientific schools. Even so it could be useful, if it contained new evidence and references to recent research. But at least it could be expected to be well-edited, reliable and free from the most obvious inconsistencies. Unfortunately it fails on all three counts.

I can only give a few examples: as regards editing: it is not clear to what notes the nrs. 11, 12 and 13 on p. IX refer on p. XII; presumably n. 10 on p. XI/XII corresponds to reference 11 on p. IX; n. 7 and 8 on p. 306 are about matters different from the reference-paragraphs on p. 30-31; on p. 87 ref. 22 is lacking (cf. p. 322); id. on p. 210 ref. 2 (cf. p. 354, presumably in section 3 of the text); what does ref. 22 on p. 216 mean? id. p. 222 ref. 31 and p. 231 ref. 46; ref. 13 on p. 223 quotes Democritus, but the note on p. 355 quotes Heraclitus; on p. 340 n. 110 commences presumably with 'Zahl der Spartiaten'; and so on. On p. 359 n. 15 there is a reference to F. Scheminzky; I have not been able to find this book in a previous note; in the foreword it is stated that full titles will be found in the bibliography; it is, however, not there; nor are a great many other books. This bibliography itself is an incredible accumulation of titles, relevant and irrelevant, modern and totally antiquated, some with page-numbers, others without them, mostly with place and year of publication, sometimes conspicuously without them (what, e.g., does 'Kronasser, H., Sprache 13. 1967' mean?); Nilsson's *Gesch. der gr. Religion* is still quoted as I (1941); II (1950). The references in the notes are equally chaotic. The reader is continually referred to the 'Artemis Lexicon', as if there were any point in referring from a thematic handbook to an alphabetical one. Apparently it was the author's intention only to refer to German or to literature translated into German; therefore the most authoritative books are omitted if there happens to be no German translation; but it is not a system, for now and then quite unexpectedly a French or English work is mentioned.

As regards reliability, again only a few examples: the pentere is, according to p. 90, a five-tier ship; talanta means 'spit' (p. 98); the krypteia was directed against the perioeci (p. 140; cf. p. VIII); metics were exempt from military service (p. 84, but on pp. 129 and 135 we find the correct view); Asia Minor and Italy had, properly speaking, no oracles (p. 183); Odysseus was really a son of Sisyphus (p. 173); ἀμφιβολία was a Stoic virtue (p. 240); Thales left no writing (p. 213; admittedly this was controversial, but it is stated here bluntly).

As to consistency: according to the foreword, there was no history of art or literature to be included; but vase-painting