structural analysis. The methods are complementary rather than exclusive. Janan's approach to Catullus gets to the heart of an old controversy about the validity of psychological analysis of ancient texts. Those who find the approach useful will welcome her method while others may prefer routes providing more apparently tangible results.

Judy K. Deuling
Victoria University of Wellington


Broadly, the themes prioritized in these studies were historiographical. The unifying factor in more recent work,
however, is political. Historiographical themes still claim notice, though there seems to be a shift from method to epistemology, as in Jacqueline de Romilly’s *La construction de la vérité chez Thucydide* (1990); but political philosophy is taking centre stage, as in Michael Palmer’s *Love of Glory and the Common Good: Aspects of the Political Thought of Thucydides* (1992) and in a crop of 1993 papers which includes P.A. Brunt on the Funeral Speech,¹ A.B. Bosworth on the Melian Dialogue,² and Josiah Ober’s ‘Thucydides’ Criticism of Democratic Knowledge’.³

Opportunely, Clifford Orwin’s *The Humanity of Thucydides* has appeared now. It is the work of twelve years (ix), though Orwin’s concerns in it also reflect his ‘youthful experience of the sixties and ... unresolved preoccupation with the horrors of the decades preceding’ (12). Taking his cue from W.R. Connor and, earlier, Leo Strauss, Orwin discusses Thucydides’ History with the assumption that it develops a coherent political argument, and he leaves to contemporary historians of antiquity the task of criticizing Thucydides ‘from the standpoint of “what really happened”’ (13). *Vorarbeiten* have been in journals such as the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Scholar* and the *Journal of Politics*.

The title is keyed to the book’s argument, as Orwin explains: ‘agreeing with Reinhardt, Grene and Stahl that Thucydides evinces a profound humanity, I argue that this humanity is a matter not just of temperament but of thought, a consistent outlook that remains to be expounded. It follows from his understanding of “the human” (to anthropinon, 1.22.4), in particular from his articulation of the problem of justice and compulsion’ (11).

---


Densely packed exposition follows. The Funeral Speech takes first place, and Orwin draws out the themes of empire as a ‘freely chosen project’ and of the primacy given to the public over the private. He is not afraid to be outspoken: unsatisfied with the idea of the speech as ‘the first “secular” vision of society’, he argues that ‘Pericles presents Athens as the first “atheistic” society ... perfectly self-sufficient at the highest level of human happiness, Athens can dispense with the gods because there is no longer any role for them to play’ (20).

Yet in Orwin’s scheme the Funeral Speech has only a preliminary role. The substantive question posed is developed by degrees through chapter two (30-63), which discusses the Corcyreans and Corinthians at Athens, then the Athenians and King Archidamus at the congress in Sparta. What can fairly be expected of a city in terms of justice towards other cities, and what place should piety take in determining cities’ actions? The occupation of the Pelasgian ground contrary to the oracle (‘better the Pelasgian ground left unworked’) encapsulates the complexity of the issue. Ordinary Athenians would believe that the plague was a consequence and not merely a concomitant of the occupation of the Pelasgian ground, but Thucydides explains the oracle in a reverse sense: ‘the misfortunes of the city did not arise from the illegal occupation, but the necessity of the occupation from the war’ (Thucydides 2.17.2, and 87-90).

Orwin’s case is that Thucydides subscribes here and elsewhere to a developed view of the compulsion side of the justice-compulsion problem. Thus after the Mytilene debate and the Spartan trial of the Plataeans, Orwin, advancing to exposition of the Melian Dialogue and the Sicilian sequence which follows it, formulates, as the principal matter on which Thucydides’ work reflects, an ‘Athenian thesis’ that ‘man is compelled to assert himself by a necessity of his nature’ (106)—later, more briefly, referring to the Athenian thesis as ‘the primacy of advantage over justice’ (113). Paradoxically, ‘most Athenians have never been as “Athenian” as their envoys to Melos, never as self-reliant or as conscious of the folly of relying on the divine’ (122-3), so that failure in Sicily comes ‘not because the project is doomed from the
start, but because Nicias and the rank and file doom it by their Melianism’ (123).

A chapter on domestic politics (172-92) rounds out the case Orwin puts for following Hobbes and treating Thucydides as an important political theorist. Plato and Aristotle discussed city life, but ‘neither ... even raises the question of the best international order’ (172). With his material on the plague and stasis, though, ‘Thucydides ... corrects the Funeral Oration and implies a more moderate position’—a position moderate, in effect, to the point of pessimism: ‘Thucydides shows us that the chasms that yawn beneath us in politics are deeper than the peaks that beckon us are high’ (183). The Humanity of Thucydides is the best read about Thucydides since F.M. Cornford’s Thucydides Mythistoricus (1907). Orwin, a man without Cornford’s propensity for being provocative to the point of mischief-making, offers the tighter discussion, but he has the same capacity for originality and dislike of compromise. Scholars whose views on the incomplete state of Thucydides’ work and on possible inconsistencies in his outlook make them reluctant to adopt definite positions on the author will be uncomfortable with Orwin, though I hope few will be tempted to ignore the case he has made: this is a very good book indeed, and one which ought to become influential.

Paul McKechnie
University of Auckland.


The published papers (10) of the Cardiff 1991 conference on Sparta’s image abroad amount to a brave attempt to gauge the impact of Sparta’s image not only on a variety of authors but over the full 200 year span 500-300 BC. Has it succeeded? Not entirely.