

exposition of the four causes. I do not challenge the notion that "cause" is the *sine qua non* of the Stagyrite's work, only that the various subject matters require differing emphases in their applicability.

ANTHONY NEMETZ  
The University of Georgia

*The Structure of Thucydides' History.* By HUNTER R. RAWLINGS III.  
Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981. Pp. xiv and 278. Cloth.  
\$21.00.

Rawlings argues that, although Thucydides considered the Peloponnesian War to be one great war lasting twenty-seven years, he also saw it as comprising two distinct wars; and that comparisons and contrasts between the events of these two wars provided a "double vision," which is "the wellspring of Thucydides' *History*" (p. 6). He identifies two diplomatic incidents as the formal *archai* of the Archidamian and Decelean wars and boldly maintains that Thucydides deliberately chose these chronological beginnings so that both wars would be identical units of ten years, confirming the explicit parallelisms in his treatment. Thucydides consciously wrote about each war with the events of the other in mind to illustrate his principle (1.22.4) that the study of the past and future offers mutual enhancement.

Rawlings relentlessly scrutinizes this parallelism with specific conclusions that are often, but not always, compelling: in general Books 1 and 6 provide similar introductions to each war; 2 and 7 are alike in their characterizations of problems and leaders; and 3 and 8 emphasize revolt and revolution. Most provocative is the reconstruction of Books "9" and "10," which would have pitted the events of 410-404 against those of Books 4 and 5: the battle of Cyzicus matching that of Pylos, the character of Lysander that of Brasidas, and in conclusion an ironic dialogue between the triumphant Spartans and defeated Athenians, mirroring the crucial Melian dialogue, which now would stand pivotally in the centre of the masterpiece.

Some of Rawlings' perceptions are disconcerting. He naively thinks (p. 3) that the structure of an historical work has not often been seriously studied and appears too narrowly committed to the thesis that structural analysis offers the magical key to a profound understanding of tragic literature. His tenacity leads to a myopic emphasis upon the novelty of his approach and that of recent scholarship; yet he is not completely unaware (p. 4, with n. 2) that many in the past have been sensitive to the manifold artistic nature of ancient historiography.

Rawlings vehemently condemns (pp. 250-54) the voluminous literature concerning the notorious problem of the composition of the *History*. Nevertheless, despite identification of differences, his book affords theoretical support for a unitarian theory about Thucydidean composition and, like many another such thesis for the advanced student, it is by no means futile, but stimulating and rewarding in literary insights that, fortunately, cannot be subject to scientific criteria of absolute proof.

ROBERT J. LENARDON  
The Ohio State University

*The Hellenistic World.* By F.W. WALBANK. Atlantic Highlands, NJ:  
Humanities Press, 1981. Pp. 287. Cloth. \$42.75.

*The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation.* By M.M. AUSTIN. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981. Pp. xviii and 488. Cloth, \$59.50; paper, \$17.95.

How does one teach Hellenistic history, a subject that even its practitioners find hard to handle coherently, and for which continuous narrative accounts from antiquity are lacking? These two books will have to come into consideration by any teacher asking that question. I should say that I am not entirely a disinterested party, as the coauthor of another Hellenistic sourcebook (*Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period*, with P.S. Derow. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), which shows my own biases clearly enough.

In teaching classical Greek history, I never use a modern synthetic textbook; but for the Hellenistic period it is hard to avoid such, given the students' need for some sort of anchor. Walbank's history is part

of the Fontana "History of the Ancient World" series. In 250 pages he describes the political history of the earlier Hellenistic period as a whole, then treats each kingdom separately. There follow chapters on "Inter-city Contacts and Federal States," social and economic developments, culture, the frontiers, religion, and "The Coming of Rome," along with eight well-chosen plates, maps, a chronological chart, and a well-selected bibliography.

The approach is largely reminiscent of C.I. Préaux's great synthesis, *Le Monde hellénistique* (Paris, 1978), to which Walbank makes frequent reference: description and analysis rather than narrative (though the latter is not omitted). While it is no substitute for the English translation of Préaux which one would like to be able to give at least to good students, it is generally current in its scholarship, apt in the use of excerpts from documents, and judicious in assessment of major problems. The specialist may differ here and there, but this is overall the best-balanced and most readable short treatment of the Hellenistic world in English today.

Austin's massive sourcebook provides a wealth of material translated from original sources: 20 items (some include more than one text) from Alexander's reign, 27 for the successors, 35 for "Macedon and the Greek Mainland to the Roman Conquest," 55 for the life of Greek cities, 55 for the Seleucids, 24 for Pergamon, and 63 for Ptolemaic Egypt. The work is well done: the translations are clear and usually both accurate and readable, the bibliography good (weakest on the papyri), the comments brief and to the point, and the index full.

The conception of the work and method of selection raise some doubts, however. Not much under half of the texts are excerpts from literary works, about three-quarters of these from authors of whom ten or more excerpts are included but who are readily accessible in other translations. What kind of Hellenistic history course will buy this sourcebook but not read Polybius (39 texts)? Who will use this book for Alexander yet not read Arrian (12) and Diodorus (18)? If there are such courses, it is regrettable. The book's construction, if anything, encourages one to avoid reading the entirety of the ancient authors in translation, and that cannot be welcomed. Cutting Arrian, Diodorus, Plutarch (*Lives*), Polybius, and Livy would have lightened the book by a third and, one hopes, lowered its price, while still keeping the scattered passages of Athenaeus, Heracleides Creticus, Pseudo-Aristeas, etc., which are usefully assembled.

On the positive side, the selection of inscriptions (about 130 of them) is imaginative and diverse; I have not the space to go into detail, but well-known basic texts are balanced with less famous but important and interesting ones. The papyri are many fewer (32, about half also in Bagnall-Derow, half not); a good selection but insufficient.

In sum, for \$17.95 one gets a lot; but for \$12 one might have had a better book. Its strength lies in the inscriptions, and even those who do not have students buy the book will want it on reserve for the epigraphical material.

All in all, these are two major gains for our teaching resources in Hellenistic history; if only the students could afford them! Walbank at \$42.75 is one of the most preposterous prices I have seen. (Addendum: A paperback edition of Walbank has now been announced by the Harvard University Press at \$6.95.)

ROGER S. BAGNALL  
Columbia University

*Xenophon of Ephesus.* By GARETH L. SCHMELING. Boston:  
Twayne, 1980. Pp. 187. Cloth. \$14.95.

Gareth Schmeling's study of Xenophon of Ephesus confirms and advances important trends in the study of ancient narrative. The ancient novels are intriguing and delicious works, all quite different from each other, which have suffered somewhat in the last three centuries from pejorative and aesthetically irrelevant comparisons both to fifth-century classicism and to modern novelistic norms. If we can agree on the essential fatuousness of older criticism, which concerned itself with asserting that Xenophon of Ephesus was not, on the one hand, Sophocles, nor, on the other hand, Defoe, we can begin to inquire what the *Ephesiaca* positively was. Schmeling's critical approach is eclectic and flexible, appropriate for an exploration in search of qualities hitherto ignored, and he is often very successful in delineating the enjoyment and significance of that work.

The two approaches which Schmeling uses best are those from