

they might be analysed causally. I found the inclusion of this chapter slightly jarring after the introductory steps provided by the first two sections, especially since the philosophical resources which it employs are not used again until chapter 6. The main chapters begin and end with Aristotle but contain extensive discussions of other thinkers, such as Kant, Hume and Anscombe, except for the two chapters on matter, which follow Aristotelian texts more closely.

Hennig's approach is tirelessly philosophical. Near the beginning he outlines his analytic aim to 'repeat' what Aristotle said rather than merely 'report' it, stating that '[i]n general, I endorse the claims that I attribute to Aristotle, so that I am as accountable for their intelligibility and truth as I think Aristotle is' (9). This bold strategy pays great dividends in many contexts. For instance, in chapter 7 Hennig defends as Aristotelian the view that causation should not be understood as a relation between two distinct things, that is cause and effect, as Hume maintained, but as a process within which cause and effect are parts. Chapter 5 also sees Hennig develop the notion of a 'type' to demonstrate that, for Aristotle, the formal cause (or essence) of a natural thing is subject to certain standards of typicality, which may not always be reflected by particular instances of that thing (understood as a 'type'). In both of these cases, Hennig's insights not only overturn the simplistic traditional picture of the efficient and formal causes as the agent and shape, respectively, but also seem deeply Aristotelian (compare, for example, the notion of the formal cause as a generic type with its description as a 'paradigm', *Ph.* 2.3, 194b26).

In sum, Hennig's book is a demanding read but it offers a rewarding and impressively coherent study of Aristotle's four *aitiai* that, at least for this reader, is superior to the traditional way in which they are understood. It certainly deserves to be read (and reread) by anyone interested in Aristotle's philosophy of nature or causation in general.

JONATHAN E. GRIFFITHS

University College London and University of Oslo

Email: j.griffiths.17@ucl.ac.uk

DESTRIÉE (P.) *Aristote. Poétique* (GF n°1637 - Philosophie). Paris: Flammarion, 2021. Pp. 272. €20.43. 9782080712295.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000921](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000921)

As a specialist in Aristotle's *Poetics*, Pierre Destrée provides an annotated French translation of the text. The translation is accompanied by an introduction; a bibliography that gathers the most useful editions, translations, commentaries and studies, as well as articles that deal with specific issues listed by topic (253–64); and an index of authors and titles (265–70). The translation is a revised version of the annotated translation published in P. Pellegrin (ed.), *Œuvres Complètes d'Aristote* (Paris 2014), and is based on the OCT edition by Kassel (Oxford 1966). A list of the *lectiones* borrowed from other editions is provided (249–51).

The book opens with a long and illuminating introduction (5–83), in which the author gives an overview of the issues raised by the *Poetics* from antiquity up to the present, and pertinently questions the targeted readership of the treatise. Does Aristotle address future poets? Does he, as a philosopher, set rules to learn how to develop critical thinking skills?

By embedding the text in its historical, cultural and philosophical contexts, Destrée sheds light on several controversial issues. For instance, he raises the question of the value of poetry and its relationship to ethics; he defends the idea that, in spite of what is usually said, Aristotle does not rule out or underestimate the role of staging among the parts of tragedy (18–22); he explains the famous idea according to which poetry is more philosophical than historical by offering a convincing interpretation of the adverb *katholou* ('selon une structure générale', according to a general structure) in *Poet.* 9 (44–48). Finally, he

offers a global explanation of katharsis (67–75). If in the wake of Bernays' *Zwei Abhandlungen über die aristotelische Theorie des Drama* (Berlin 1857), 'medical' exegetes stated that spectators sought to purge their emotions, 'ethical' exegetes read the *Poetics* as a counterpart of the *Ethics* and interpreted katharsis in regard to the idea of 'right measure' ('katharsis would be the "purgation" of an emotional overflow, which would allow for the "purification" of piety, or its just measure, which transforms it into a virtue', my translation from the French, 71). The interpretation of Martha Nussbaum ('Tragedy and Self-Sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 10 (1992), 107–52) relies on a different translation of *katharsis* ('clarification'), which has no relation to the musical katharsis of the *Politics*. Destrée suggests a more 'minimalistic' and 'global' interpretation of katharsis (as it also applies to comedy, according to Iamblichus and Proclus) that takes into account *Politics* VIII and Aristotle's biological corpus. By inducing fear and pity through the plot (which culminates in recognition), the katharsis of these emotions would be nothing more than their expression, which happens concretely through the tears and shouts of fear and lamentation. Like comedy and music (in the *Politics*), tragedy would therefore bring a kind of emotional relief which, in addition, does not contradict the goal of these activities, which is leisure.

The French translation is never pedantic and always tends towards transparency. In this respect, the book does not address specialists but targets a broader readership without, however, giving up on precision and scholarship. Destrée avoids literal translations that might be misleading or obscure; for example, according to the context, λέξις is translated as *langage* ('language'), *mot* ('word'), *expression* or *figure de style* ('figure of speech'). I note some wonderful solutions: for example, translating Δειλιάς as *Poltroniade* ('Cowardiad', 1448a13), where Destrée maintains the play on the word in French; *grave et sérieuse* ('grave and serious') to translate (or gloss) the adjective σπουδαίος (1449a24), qualifying the kind of action represented by tragedy; *intègre* ('upright') to render χρηστός, defining the first virtue of the characters in tragedy (1454a17); *revirement de situation* ('sudden turn') for περιπέτεια (which indeed does not correspond to the French *péripétie*, 'incident'); translating τῇ λέξει συναπεργάζεσθαι (1455a22–23) with 'when he builds his plots, the poet must help himself by reciting them' (my translation), where συναπεργάζεσθαι (usually understood as 'completing the effect [of the emotions]') and λέξις (usually understood as 'expression') are translated according to the explanation in footnote 203: for Destrée refers here to the passage in 1455a30, where *lexis* designates the attitude of the poet reading his own plot out loud. As a result, Aristotle's advice is the following: while reciting the text he is composing, the poet must visualize its action.

Reading this beautiful translation is even more pleasant because Destrée adds titles and subtitles to Aristotle's text, making clear a structure that can be hard to grasp at first sight. The footnotes (171–248) provide historical, cultural and Aristotelian context; they explain and justify, in a more technical but always clear manner, the choices made in the translation

FRÉDÉRIQUE WOERTHER

CNRS (UMR 8230, Centre Jean Pépin/ENS Ulm)

Email: frederique.woerther@cnrs.fr

GREGORIĆ (P.) and KARAMANOLIS (G.) (eds) **Pseudo-Aristotle: *De Mundo (On the Cosmos): A Commentary***. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. xi + 245; illus., maps; 24 cm. £75. 9781108834780.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000933](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000933)

The work *Περὶ Κόσμου (De mundo, DM)* is not by Aristotle. Purporting to be a letter to Alexander the Great, its author aims to present an Aristotelian picture of the universe,