imperial order; Pheraulas' view of child–parent relations; Cyrus' 'abject failure' to maintain with the principles of 3.3.51–2; the identity of the *kratistoi* of 8.1.46.

Finally, N.'s conception that Cyrus commits suicide because the game is up is falsely unsympathetic to Xenophon's representation of a more-than-banally-human element in his demise. Cyrus is a necessarily flawed hero, but still a hero, and the quasi-mystic quality to his end (whatever it owes to Iranian story-telling) reflects this, just as the palinode both assures us that praise of a Persian is not to be taken wholly outside the context of fourth-century Greek reactions to the empire and underlines that the fourth-century empire is a squalid remnant of a grand, if intrinsically flawed, experiment.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

ARISTOTLE'S TREATISES

R. LENGEN: *Form und Funktion der aristotelischen Pragmatie. Die Kommunikation mit dem Rezipienten*. (Philosophie der Antike 16.) Pp. 245. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002. Cased, €50. ISBN: 3-515-07798-7.

Students of Aristotle's *pragmateiai* will be delighted by this monograph in which, for the first time in a book-length study, systematic attention is given to Aristotle's language, style and method of literary composition. Traditionally, this has often been dismissed, rather crudely, as 'lecture notes' or 'Notizenstil', as opposed to the 'golden fluency' which, according to Cicero, characterized Aristotle's (lost) dialogues; and the undeniable clumsiness and carelessness of parts of Aristotle's surviving writings has long prevented classicists from taking a closer interest in the intricacies of Aristotelian discourse. However, with the advent of reception studies, discourse analysis, the study of the pragmatic functions of texts (rather than their supposed literary or non-literary nature), and the renewed interest taken in the rhetorical nature of scientific discourse, Aristotle's works present an interesting challenge. For any student of Aristotle will recognize that, however impersonal the tone of his works and however careless the structure of his argument may appear, his writings nonetheless contain a hidden but undeniable psychagogic rhetoric that is clearly meant to make the reader agree with his conclusions, for example, in the subtle balance between confident explanation and seemingly genuine uncertainty, resulting in a careful alternation of dogmatic statements and exploratory suggestions. These, and many other features of Aristotle's way of writing, are the subject of Lengen's book (a revised Ph.D. thesis from Freiburg University, one of the many interesting fruits from the 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit' programme directed by Wolfgang Kullmann). L. takes his cue from what Aristotle himself says in *Metaphysics* α (and elsewhere) about the ideal recipient of his discourses. Aristotle is clearly aware of the ways in which a scientific discussion of a topic should take account of the knowledge, background, needs and expectations of its intended audience (e.g. in the level of accuracy and technicality, the level of background knowledge to be presupposed, the nature of the arguments used). Thus, he could be said to reflect an early awareness of what in reception studies has come to be known as the 'Appellstruktur' of texts. It should be noted that, although L. is obviously familiar with reception theory, his method is largely and refreshingly descriptive, and his use of theoretical terminology

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.326 Published online by Cambridge University Press

very moderate (indeed, the bibliography is somewhat scanty on titles in general linguistics and discourse analysis). L. illustrates the audience-orientedness of Aristotle's discourse by means of analyses of two whole works (the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Rhetoric*), as well as two comparative case studies of different Aristotelian treatments of the same topic (the discussions of *eudaimonia* in *EN* I, *Rhet*. I 5 and *Pol*. VII 1–3, and the discussions of animals in *PA* II–IV and *HA* I–VI). These analyses show how differences of style, emphasis, and degree of detail, and even apparent differences in doctrine between the various treatments, can be better understood from the overall nature of the text and its orientation towards particular types of audience or users. Thus, L. points out that the *EN* strongly involves the audience in the argumentation and is typically a text that would be suitable for oral presentation, whereas the *Rhet*. has much more the nature of a reference work, serving the varying needs of individual readers; and he reaches similar conclusions regarding the difference between *PA* and *HA*. This point about intended audience is of course somewhat problematic, since we know so little about what ancient audiences could or could not master, and especially in cases where the intended use is not so clear (such as the *De anima*), or where there is a mixture of styles within one text (as in the *Metaphysics* or the *Politics*, neither of which can really be regarded as a unity), there is the danger of the fallacy of audience limitation—quite apart from the fact that texts can be, or sometimes can even be meant to be, user-unfriendly. Yet even if not all of L.'s conclusions can be warranted in all detail, there is much to be appreciated in his treatment of the actual material. He discusses and compares a whole range of stylistic and argumentative procedures, expository techniques, formulae, and mannerisms which will be familiar to every student of Aristotle (and, indeed, of most ancient scientific and philosophical prose), such as Aristotle's habit of giving the wrong answer before putting things right, his aporetic style, his method of finding the right answer by means of elimination, his use of direct and indirect questions, rhetorical and disjunctive questions, his presentation of imaginary opponents, his use of formulae expressing caution (potential optatives, use of δοκεῖν, ἐοικέναι, φαίνεσθαι, ἴσως, etc.), announcements, pauses, summaries halfway through, definitions, enumerations, catalogues, and addressing the reader. What gradually unfolds from L.'s analysis is a kind of 'grammar' or 'rhetoric' (in the sense of a set of formal procedures) of Aristotelian discourse, and one feels a growing appreciation for the craftmanship that has gone into an Aristotelian argument and for the care that has been taken in the selection of the relevant formal techniques. This is all very illuminating, both for students in linguistics and for Aristotelian scholars. L. deserves to be congratulated for this pioneering piece of work, which will hopefully stimulate further research in this much neglected but deeply fascinating field. There is a very useful index of topics and of modern authors, though regrettably no index of passages discussed.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne PHILIP VAN DER EIJK

ARISTOTLE AS ETHICAL TEACHER

T. W. Smith: *Revaluing Ethics. Aristotle's Dialectical Pedagogy*. Pp. xiv + 325. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 0-7914-5142-9 (0-7914-5141-0 hbk).

Smith reads the *Nicomachean Ethics* as a protreptic work that seeks to transform the

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.326 Published online by Cambridge University Press