article, 'Sallust's *Catiline* and Cato the Censor', *CQ* 50 (2000), 170–91. Passages from Sallust are given in German, though salient phrases which are especially relevant to the subsequent discussion are supplied in Latin in brackets within the translation. The only exception to this practice is (oddly) in the chapter on language and style, where some (but not all) extracts are translated in footnotes. Perhaps S. envisages a somewhat different readership for chapter eight.

There are some areas where more detailed discussion is perhaps called for. In Chapter 8, for example, S. ends by acknowledging the influence of Sallust on Tacitus' style and thinking (p. 139), but postpones further discussion until the chapter on reception (p. 156). This effectively means that S. does not really illustrate the stylistic cross-fertilization in any detail. Yet S.'s discussion of Sallust's reception in the Middle Ages and beyond was particularly enjoyable (pp. 158–67). Furthermore, although the individual categories for discussion of language and style are well-chosen (archaism, *breuitas*, *uariatio*, *grauitas*, and grecisms, pp. 129–37), S. could in addition have selected for analysis one passage from Sallust where readers could see the cumulative impact of these stylistic techniques in action and in context (cf. the close reading of Livy 36.10–11 in K. and W., pp. 62–70).

S. has succeeded in producing a sensible introduction to Sallust, his life and times and the genre of historiography. For a student unfamiliar with the field, his discussion should be clear without being unsubtle, and challenging without being confusing. The overall clarity of the book and S.'s tendency carefully to explain important background as he makes his arguments suggests that he has thought carefully about his audience's needs. In many ways, S. has written precisely the good general book on Sallust of which K. and W. felt the absence in 1997.

University College London RHIANNON ASH

PASTORAL CONTESTS

A. SCHÄFER: *Vergils Eklogen 3 und 7 in der Tradition der lateinischen Streitdichtung. Eine Darstellung anhand ausgewählter Texte der Antike und des Mittelalters*. Pp. 391. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 2001. Paper, £33. ISBN: 3-631-37914-5.

Aggression as a mode of conduct in man and beast provides this dissertation's frame, from accounts of natural and social agressivity to verbal arts, oral and written, exemplified in the Far and Near East, including biblical examples and detail from Akkadian, Sumerian, and Egyptian cultures, e.g. competition by garden trees for light. Readings of Virgil's two dramatic contests and *Idyll* 5 then preface a set of Latin contest eclogues (Calpurnius through the goliardic dispute between water and wine) introduced by essays and supplemented by Latin texts and German translations.

Anyone remembering Berg's comparison between the dying Daphnis and Dumezi, Tammuz, and Adonis (*Early Virgil* [1974], pp. 18–19) will welcome reminders of eastern archetypes. Convenient, too, is the gathering of medieval Latin contests. Yet recently in another *Dissertation* I found intepretative Babel forced on Virgil's text (Rumpf, *CJ* 93 [1997], 211–16 = http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/classics/jvsickle/oharb10.htm), putting me on guard.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On *B.* 3, paraphrase of scene and situation seemed interminable (in the reportorial mode of 'Menalcas says . . ., Damoetas appeals . . .' without probing for further <infra-/supra-/ultra->dramatic implication). Aiming at last for the 'Niveau' (*sic*: cognitive metaphor repeatedly employed) of poetics, S. rightly identifies the concept of song ('Begriff *carmen*') as central, along with love, and rightly would interpret the notorious riddles through recursive reference to the poem itself ('Rückbezüglichkeit'), also taking 'res est non parua' as a warning to see not merely the foregrounded herdsmen's drama but a dialectical demonstration ('dialectische Vorfürung') of Virgil's own conception of the bucolic genre ('rightly' signals affinity to arguments of my own, not cited by S. in this regard, e.g. 1978, 1986, with subsequent articles, all detailed at http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/classics/jvsickle/bbground.htm). However, S. leaps too abruptly to *Gattungskonzeption* without considering the *Niveau* of metapoetics, which would entail reading theme and dramatic characterization as enactments of genre change: for example, 'formosissimus annus' would be taken, not only as a spiritual idea of ideal time ('geistige Idee von idealer Zeit'), but also as actually extending, as itself realizing, a new poetic reach, *und so weiter*. Yet similarly, S. perceives no linkage between the problematics of boundary, limitation, envy (92–103), dismissed as motifs of herdsmen's everyday life, and the recurrent, implicitly metapoetic, concern with 'ein höheres Dichtertum'. Nor does S. betray any sense of *B.* 3 as an incremental transition between *B.* 1–2 and the still higher and wider scope of *B.* 4–5 (for which still better Segal, *AJPh* 88 [1967], 279–308). Nor, for that matter, does S. relate the growth of *B.* 4–5 to the recursive and retractive *B.* 6 (cf. 'deductum carmen'), still less properly assaying the further retractive and discriminative revision of growth in the recursive contest of *B.* 7.

On *B.* 7, paraphrase again predominates. The account of relations between *B.* 3 and *B.* 7 remains formal and external, at the level of informing us that each half book has its contest. S. makes no concretely metapoetic inferences from the arch recycling of *Meliboeus* paired with that of *Tityrus* (*B.* 6), finding no metapoetic point in the difference between equal worth of songs ('amant alterna <sc. carmina> Camenae', *B.* 3) versus victory and defeat in remembered verses ('alternos <sc. uersus> Musae meminisse uolebant', *B.* 7), and passing in virtual silence over other remarkable divergences from *B.* 3 (e.g. 'arguta ilice', 'Arcades', 'Mincius') *contra* 'molli herba', 'nunc omnis ager', 'nunc omnis parturit arbor', 'nunc . . . annus'), with short shrift also for Virgil's stagy revision of *Daphnis* (cf. *B.* 2, 3, 5), not to mention the errant *caper* (sc. *tityrus*), all of which convey the metapoetic implication of this moment in the unfolding book, building on the prior expansivity remarked on by e.g. Segal, yet differentiating and setting it up for reduction (cf. already *B.* 6, 'deductum carmen') in the ambitions recast in *Thyrsis*.

S. goes so far as to say that *B.* 3 defines Virgil as 'poeta doctus' while *B.* 7 brings him to the title of bard ('*vates*-Anspruch'), plainly ignoring the fact and its metapoetic import that Virgil assigns vatic ambition to *Thyrsis*, which is the character associated recursively with the metapoetic increments of *B.* 4 and 5, and the still vatic *B.* 6 (cf. studies cited above), but, above all, represented as defeated, in pointed contrast with the inclusive and incremental thrust of *B.* 3. Too involved in surface, engaged in paraphrase, S. falls short and overreaches the level of metapoetics, failing to explain why Virgil produced two such different contests so closely calibrated for different stages within the developing system of the bucolic book.

Brooklyn College, City University of New York JOHN B. VAN SICKLE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press