

a) State-of-the-art and Objectives

Summary: Aristotle, a supreme intellectual figure, transformed both philosophy and other disciplines such as natural science and literary studies. Yet his own style and language have been overlooked, although he stands chronologically between classical Attic prose and the Hellenistic *koinē* of most prose genres after the late 4th-c. BCE growth of the Greek world. This project addresses his place in the history of literature and language, especially in relation to Homer, drama, rhetoric and Plato, writing a new chapter in the narrative of prose-writing that has excluded him. It scrutinises all his treatises largely regarded as authentic, plus the contested *Athenaiōn Politeia*, using methodologies including ‘traditional’ lexicography and literary criticism, narratology, stylometric software and historical linguistics, allowing an unprecedented appreciation, in relationship to his scientific method, of his communicative medium: his illustrations, allusions, syntax, figures of speech, sentence type, paragraph and treatise structure, language and vocabulary. The outputs offer complementary perspectives: 1) illustrations and allusions; 2) sentence types, figures, tenses and relationship with oral communication; 3) vocabulary, language and place in the evolution of Greek; 4) how ancient philosophical commentaries responded to his style; 5) dedicated studies of single treatises or stylistic and philosophical topics (International Conference); 6) annotated bibliography (Website). The results will transform Aristotelian studies by providing the first assessment of Aristotle’s neglected status as writer; this will enhance future studies, especially understanding of how Aristotle’s distinctive literary voice interacts with his scientific method and makes his ideas more lucid, vivid and memorable. The results will also inform future investigations of the Peripatetic treatises for which Aristotelian authorship has been suspected and the precise nature of the style to which his heirs and commentators responded.

Objectives

1] To make a critical intervention in the dominant scholarly narrative which denigrates Aristotle as a writer by identifying and analysing the distinctive and qualitative features of his style and language, thus providing the missing chapter in the narrative of Greek prose writing from which he has been excluded, with particular attention, in relation to philosophical method and content, to metaphors and similes, literary quotation, mythical allusion, figures of speech, rhythmical cola, hiatus, sentence type/length, first-, second- and third-person verbs, opening/closing passages, word order, aural effects, rhythm, vocabulary.

2] To demonstrate that Aristotle was highly conscious of his place in the history of Greek literature as well as Plato and others philosophers, especially in relation to Homer and theatrical poetry, and consistently modified, enriched and supplemented the traditional repertoire of imagery, paradigm and literary allusion.

3] To ask whether his own practice instrumentalises the principles he sets out in his *Rhetoric*, especially Book III; in his other works, do the recommended stylistic features aid clarity, the commitment of key ideas to memory, or advancement of the argument, and does this constitute a ‘Peripatetic mean’ style, in contrast with Isocrates and Plato, illuminating and being illuminated by Peripatetic heirs and commentators?

4] By analysing his vocabulary and language, to establish Aristotle’s contribution and position relative to the development of both philosophical prose and the Hellenistic Greek *koinē*.

5] To provide firmer bases for testing the authenticity of works whose Aristotelian authorship has been denied or disputed and of the supposed fragments of Aristotle, for example from his *Protrepticus*.

State of the Art

In *Metaphysics*, Aristotle reveals that he has wrestled with the problem that different types of lecture styles are preferred by different listeners, and are affected by what they are used to and by the nature of the discipline: ‘some people will not accept the statements of a speaker unless he gives a mathematical proof; others will not unless he speaks with illustrations (*paradeigmatikōs*); others expect to have a poet adduced as witness. Moreover, some people like very exact speakers, while others are annoyed by them, either because they cannot follow the argument or because it is nit-picking. For there is something about exactitude which seems to some to be unpolished’ (II.994b-995a). Aristotle himself uses mathematical proof’s logical precision when appropriate; he is also conscious that he is writing against a literary tradition, invoked when citing poets and providing illustrations. In *Rhet.* III he advocates a *via media* between a natural and a distinctive style. Recent attention has been paid to his theoretical concept of *lexis* from the perspective of Saussurean linguistics.¹ Yet his own practice—his styles and languages (for they do vary in details across his *oeuvre* in ways the project seeks to identify)—have historically been overlooked. This is despite the frequent analyses of Plato’s style and literary art since the pathbreaking work of Campbell and Lutoslawski² (e.g. Thesleff’s *Plato’s Styles* and Rutherford’s study of literary aspects of the dialogues³), and the unique position Aristotle holds as a prolific writer of Attic Greek prose on myriad topics in the fourth century BCE.

Too much weight has been lent to Petrarch’s complaint that Aristotle succeeded in teaching what virtue is, but lacked the diction needed to instil desire for the good and resentment of the bad that Petrarch enjoyed

in Cicero and Seneca.⁴ Although Aristotle's 15th-c. Italian translator Colombella admired his prose's lucidity and flow,⁵ the consensus arose that it lacks artistic qualities, functioning 'merely' to express philosophical arguments. Some have said that *NE* is an exception in containing examples of stylistic beauty.⁶ Others have pointed to a few passages in e.g. *Met.* and *PA.*⁷ Yet trawls of Aristotelian and Rhetoric bibliographies and *L'Année Philologique* have confirmed the astonishing dearth of studies of style and language from an aesthetically sensitive perspective.⁸ The stylometric analyses of Anthony Kenny were designed as a tool in establishing authorial authenticity and were largely confined to particle distribution and measuring word length.⁹ There has been some fine work on *pragmateiai*, the relationship of individual texts, as teaching tools, to the implied reader or listener,¹⁰ and the distinction between the style designed for delivery to others and for private reading;¹¹ a few scholars, scattered across Europe, the USA and Canada (see below), are currently investigating individual dimensions of Aristotle's style, usually as they are manifested in just one or two treatises or in one discipline (e.g. Zoology). Scholars in other disciplines, for example those specialising in orality and literature in other languages, occasionally address issues in Aristotle's style.¹² Yet the way this titanic author writes remains neglected. How can this possibly be? There are five main reasons:

i] Denigration by Atticist Grammarians

Modern academics have inherited the prejudices of the writers and grammarians of later antiquity who excluded Aristotle from the canon of 'acceptable' writers of Attic Greek, the arch-Atticist grammarian Phrynichus even judging that Aristotle's adverb *prōtōs*, which never appears in previous Greek, to be 'an utterly corrupted word' which must be replaced by the 'good' Attic *proton*; he implies that Aristotle is the worst example of prose writer he can imagine.¹³ While some other writers' claim to writing in 'pure' Attic is sometimes contested (e.g. Menander, Thucydides, Xenophon), no such commentator ever places Aristotle in the 'acceptable' category. Most modern scholars have simply recycled the Atticists' prejudice uncritically, thereby seriously 'skewing' research. An otherwise useful study of words supposedly first used by the Athenian dramatist Menander, in the generation after Aristotle, excluded the philosopher from the investigation,¹⁴ despite evidence that Menander was immersed in Peripatetic thought and syllogistic argument.¹⁵ The result is that whilst considerable attention has been paid to Aristotle's key position in the evolution of theories of prose style, both *lexis* and *taxis*,¹⁶ almost none has been paid to his practice.

ii] Concept of 'Style' Regarded as Only Relevant to Lost 'Exoteric' Works

A separate ancient tradition about Aristotle's style which has impeded modern investigation is the insistence that he had two altogether different ways of writing, one in his advanced 'esoteric' treatises for students of philosophy and the other in his (lost) accessible 'exoteric' works, at least some of which were in dialogue form, for the public. In around 500 CE, Ammonius distinguished Aristotle's two ways of writing in his commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* (6.27-7.4). In his works for his students, Aristotle 'is dense (*puknos*) and terse (*sunestrammenos*) and aporetic in his thoughts, yet not overly refined in his expression, for the sake of the discovery and clear knowledge of the truth; but he is also one who makes up words, if need be. However, in the dialogues, which he wrote for the general public, he deliberately employs a certain volume and over-elaboration of speech and metaphor...in a word, he knows how to embellish (*kallōpizein*) any type of discourse'.¹⁷ Yet, since the public works have not survived, there is scant stylistic evidence to examine if the extant treatises are ignored. Where we can be sure we are reading Aristotle's own words, e.g. the quotation from his *Eudemus* which Plutarch says he is reproducing *verbatim*,¹⁸ we find sonorous poetic diction, fables, proverbs, and avoidance of dense syllogisms. The project will turn the 'problem' of the fragmentary nature of the exoteric works into an opportunity by asking whether we can use some striking features of the style of the fragments as a partial guide to what we need to look for in the extant treatises (Eckart Schütrumpf, now preparing a new edition, is an Advisory Board member). In the lost *On Philosophy*, for example, Aristotle appealed to the non-expert philosopher by saying proverbs are concise expressions of primordial beliefs (Synesius, *Enc. Calviti* 22.85 c.0). There prominent proverbial or gnomic statements in Aristotle's extant treatises, often to articulate *endoxa* or popular beliefs; paroemiography is usually said to have begun with Aristotle in a work of his entitled *Παροιμίαι*, *Proverbs* (Diog. Laert. 5.26).¹⁹ But other ancients admire Aristotle's style *without* limiting judgement to his exoteric works. Cicero writes, in a work grounded in Aristotelian-Peripatetic argumentative theory, of the 'incredible richness and sweetness (*suavitas*) of his eloquence' (*Topica* 1.3) and in *Lucullus* (38 par. 19) of his the oratorical 'river of gold' (*flumen orationis aureum*). Mainstream scholars defend their negativity towards Aristotle's style by insisting that Cicero can only have meant the exoteric works, or even 'inauthentic' works by Aristotle's Hellenistic disciples.²⁰ But a very few Aristotelians have always suspected, as the PI does, that Cicero's metaphor evokes the total and unique impact of Aristotle's way of writing philosophy.²¹ The context in Cicero is crucial: he has just catalogued earlier accounts of the constituents of the universe, beginning with Thales and ending with a caricatured Stoic sage who tediously recites the serial facts, '*syllabatim*', that the

universe is permeated by the divine mind and will one day combust. But then, imagines Cicero, ‘in will come Aristotle, pouring forth a golden stream of eloquence, since the world never had a beginning, because there never can have been a commencement, on new and original lines, of so glorious a structure, and since it is so compactly framed on every side that no force could bring about such mighty movements of mutation, no old age arises from the long lapse of years to cause this ordered cosmos ever to perish in dissolution’.

iii] Negative Assumptions Have Foreclosed Stylistic Analysis

This passage’s stylistic eloquence is inseparable from the extraordinary impact made by Aristotelian doctrine, even if the vehicle for it was often prose composed by later Peripatetics; another explanation is that they were able to imitate his style and diction convincingly *precisely because* they were so distinctive and effective as vehicles for his revolutionary system of ideas. The complexity of the authorship/authenticity question in the case of the treatises by Hippocrates and other/later Hippocratic writers has not prevented the Hippocratic corpus from being fruitfully addressed from a stylistic point of view.²² Yet, while some, in noticing the sheer volume of writing by the Peripatetics trained by Aristotle, rather than denying the presence of a style, have asserted, rather, that he and his imitators shared an identifiable but *bad*, indeed execrable style: ‘the pupils of Aristotle were generally successful in emulating his hasty style and voluminous production (it is almost as if the treatises were composed on a system of piece-work)’; he ‘initiated a vogue for careless writing which contributed much to the decline of letters. The language of writers was more akin to the everyday language of ordinary people, so that books were read by a wider, more uncritical public than ever before’.²³ Worse, ‘a strongly mannered style like that of Aristotle, in which there was no attempt at elegance of form, and which was full of his own peculiar terminology, was certain to take hold of the minds of his school, and was much more likely to be exactly reproduced by them than a style of lucid beauty, like that of Plato, would have been’.²⁴ The results of our research are expected seriously to disrupt and transform this dominant narrative.

iv] Complex Transmission History

One barrier has been the transmission history of Aristotle’s works. Analytical scholarship that has attempted to establish chronology by discerning different layers of composition in, for example, the *EE*, and the insertions or apparent abrupt transitions indicating omissions in the *NE*, and all reliable findings will be taken into account during the research.²⁵ Moreover, some texts suffered from intrusive and sometimes ignorant editing in the centuries after Aristotle’s death as well as being buried in a trench to be attacked by insects and mould.²⁶ Themistius and other commentators reinvented Aristotelian paraphrase as an exegetical tool; paraphrases/summaries/supplements may have interfered with texts.²⁷ Other passages may not be by Aristotle, in whole or part, but were self-consciously written in the style that he pioneered. Our strategy here is to accept that the corpus was to an extent ‘dynamic’ (as Verdenius described it in an important, rare but brief overview of the nature of Aristotle’s writing²⁸) with complete openness to the possibility that some parts will resist analysis, and articulating this with candour and exactitude in the project’s outputs. Understanding more about the inconsistencies, if they prove substantial, can be embraced as a positive research finding. Further, even today, although some *Corpus Aristotelicum* texts are generally agreed to be by other authors than Aristotle, e.g. *De Virtutibus et Vitiis Libellus* and *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, the question of the extent of Aristotle’s own contribution has not been settled for others, notably *Ath. Pol.*, *Probl.*, *MM* and *Oec.* The results of this project will facilitate further exploration of that question. But since such extensive parts of such influential and substantial treatises are unquestionably the work of Aristotle himself, and at least some of the editing was done by Peripatetic imitators wholly conversant with his style, the force of this objection has not only been exaggerated but has actively impeded sensitive literary-critical, rhetorical and linguistic analysis of Aristotelian argumentation and writing.

v] Aristotle Has Fallen through Cracks in Traditional Periodisation

Some studies of Greek prose style discuss no authors beyond the 5th century.²⁹ But Wright’s history of post-classical Greek begins after the death of Aristotle, said to reflect (with Demosthenes) the end of the classical age.³⁰ Aristotle, then, sits awkwardly in the conventional periodisations dividing classical from Hellenistic Greek. Precisely this period, however, is of immense linguistic importance: Greek was evolving fast in its internal structure and geographical distribution. But even transhistorical studies of Greek prose routinely omit Aristotle. They may take their cue from Eduard Norden’s canonical 2-volume *Die antike Kunstprosa*, which devotes less than one page to Aristotle and Theophrastus combined,³¹ compared with 12 for Plato; moreover, he is more interested in what the two Peripatetics had to say about Gorgias than in their own styles. A handbook of ancient prose-rhythm published two decades later surveys almost every writer of Greek prose *except* Aristotle.³² Aristotle has been overlooked in general histories of ancient Greek prose style;³³ the ten authors from whom Dover chose passages, in an influential monograph, are pseudo-Xenophon, Herodotus, Hippocrates, Gorgias, Antiphon, Thucydides, Lysias, Plato and Isocrates.³⁴ Wifstrand explains why he has excluded Thucydides from the list of authors worth studying as exemplars of ‘truly classical, mostly Attic prose, the manner of expression in Herodotus, Xenophon, Plato, Isocrates,

Demosthenes, that Greek prose literature which has had and still has the greatest importance and whose principal works have served as lofty paradigms';³⁵ Thucydides is omitted because his style is 'highly individual, compressed, often heavy and almost, at times impenetrable'. But Aristotle's omission does not merit an explanation, although he was Demosthenes' coeval, came from an Ionian town and had Ionian parents with Euboean and Andrian ancestry, spent most of his adulthood in Athens and wrote in Attic dialect. Moreover, as Blomqvist has shown with Aristotle's avoidance of juxtaposed *te kai*, the classification of Aristotle's language which subsumes it to the 'Hellenistic' category 'in the sense that it falls short of the grammatical correctness and literary qualities of his Athenian contemporaries' is unfair, for in this, as other cases, 'Aristotle evidently sided with the stricter Attic of the orators against e.g. Plato and Xenophon'.³⁶

Our Contribution

This project will repudiate the constricting assumptions underlying these five obstacles and transcend them to create a new, constructive approach to both the contribution Aristotle made to the evolution of prose writing and the role style played in clarifying his methods and philosophical argumentation. This will be achieved by documentation and analysis of Aristotle's style and language in his extant treatises from literary-critical (PI=Hall), rhetorical (PDRA1=Vatri) and vocabulary-sensitive (PDRA2=Cartlidge) perspectives as well as a philosophical one (CO-I=Horkey), revealing the deliberate care, stylistic acumen, linguistic innovation and marriage of form to content—idea and argument to medium of communication—with which they were crafted to fulfil his philosophical aims: as Natali has said in a rare appreciation of rhetoric in *NE*, it represents 'the result of conscious reflection and careful planning'.³⁷

Prima facie it would be strange if this were not so. Aristotle wrote a treatise entitled *Poetics* (Book I survives), which advanced the study of verse genres immeasurably, divorcing the art/science of poetry, the *poiētikē technē*, from the political sphere.³⁸ He also wrote the earliest surviving handbook on composing speeches and other forms of prose discourse, the *Rhetoric*, central to all this project's strands. In Book III he gives advice for crafting suitable prose for different genres, including treatises for use in education. He stresses that 'in every system of instruction there is some minor obligation to pay attention to style (*lexis*); for it does make a difference, for the purpose of making a thing clear, to speak in this or that manner' (III.1404a).³⁹ Yet he does concede that, for example, geometry teachers do not need to craft their didactic prose elaborately. Since Aristotle wrote highly technical treatises on formal logic as well as elaborate works on questions of moral, political and metaphysical philosophy, it is hardly surprising that he would think hard about which style and language would most enhance his over-riding intellectual aim of clarity (*saphēneia*).

Yet even monographs and commentaries on the *Rhetoric* (as opposed to annotated translations) are few. None reads the text to illuminate Aristotle's own prose writing or vocabulary. Spengel's 1867 annotated Teubner edition draws connections between the text and the rest of the rhetorical/philosophical tradition.⁴⁰ Cope, conversely, explicitly aims 'to render Aristotle's *Rhetoric* thoroughly intelligible'.⁴¹ His exegetical method constructs a sensible version of Aristotle's arguments but without engaging with the rest of the ancient rhetorical or philosophical traditions.⁴² Grimaldi's commentary for modern rhetoricians has little interest in ancient Greek style or language, and only covers the first two books of the *Rhetoric*.⁴³ Rapp's 2002 German commentary devotes far fewer pages to book III than to the other two, and examines the *Rhetoric* in the sole context of Aristotle's philosophy, ignoring the history of prose, prose style or rhetoric.⁴⁴

The project will alter the discourse surrounding Aristotle's style (or alleged lack of it) by revealing his unobtrusive verbal artistry. It is used as an instrument for enhancing comprehension of intellectual content without distracting the listener from the process of cognition: *ars est celare artem*. The word *pezographos* (prose-writer) in the project title is chosen because it is primarily used when a distinction is being made between metrical and non-metrical writing, e.g. Diog. Laert. IV.2.15, of Aristotle's rival, the Platonist Xenocrates, who wrote elegiac poetry badly! Aristotle's own preferred term is *psiloi logoi*, 'bare' or 'naked' words, and the ambiguity of this term is itself revealing. Although it is used of language without metre, it can also imply purity (e.g. of water when unalloyed with wine, Hippocrates *Int.* 35) or be used where an effect of simplicity or baldness *masks* the skill and effort which created it (e.g. when applied to the smooth, dense pile of Persian carpets, Callixenes fr. 2). Aristotle's theory of persuasion in *Rhet.* presupposes that effective prose may have a distinctive flavour, but that the artifice required to produce it must be concealed (III.1404b). It is essential that it appears 'natural' rather than artificial (μη δοκεῖν λέγειν πεπλασμένως ἀλλὰ πεφυκότως): 'that which is natural persuades, but the artificial does not'. Aristotle reveals his debt to theatre in illustrating this with the example of the nonpareil 4th-century Athenian tragic actor, Theodorus, who stood out from others because his voice *seemed to be* the authentic voice of the character speaking in the play. Concealing the artistry in prose is likened to a highly skilled and trained actor *feigning* what sounded natural. One hypothesis to be tested in this project is that Aristotle has actually misled many of his readers into thinking he simply recorded the speech that came naturally to him in oral discourse.

The concealment of the art can also explain why Aristotle's style, even in *Rhet.* itself, can make the reader work hard to follow the argument,⁴⁵ even though Aristotle regarded clarity as the prime virtue of speech (*Rhet.* III.1404b1–3).⁴⁶ It can be elliptical; gaps sometimes need to be filled if the listener is to make full sense of the passage.⁴⁷ But rather than arbitrarily condemning such moments as evidence of careless writing, the project will be sensitive to the recommendation of ellipse which positively *aids* the understanding of the addressee made by Aristotle's disciple Theophrastus, 'who repeats, develops, and elaborates the theories of his master', while 'nowhere departing from Aristotelian critical theories in any important respect'.⁴⁸ Theophrastus insists that the writer 'must leave some things for your hearer (or reader) to perceive and work out for himself. When he infers what you have omitted he will be not merely your hearer but your witness, and a quite friendly one, because he thinks himself rather clever and you have given him the chance to exercise his intelligence. To say everything is to convict your hearer of stupidity, as if you were talking to a fool' (Dem. *Eloc.* 222). Asper thoughtfully suggests that Aristotle's over-riding objective was to 'construct a consensus as starting-point for further discussion and even research in each of the fields treated', and so we are to imagine the treatises as the results of a complex teaching process about which we know little, a process which explains 'the strong drive of Aristotelian knowledge-presentation towards charting terms and their relations, towards definition, classification, and taxonomies', but which may also help explain ellipse.⁴⁹

This project will put Aristotle as prose composer, language user and intellectual *communicator* at the centre of the academic radar. When its outputs are completed, Aristotle's status as a writer will not only have been established, thus fundamentally changing the narrative of the development of ancient Greek, but scholars will have permanent access to six separate (although intersecting) open-access research resources. These will enrich their appreciation of Aristotle's style and the contribution it makes, across his contributions in discrete disciplines, to clarifying, illuminating and rendering more memorable his scientific method and intellectual arguments. The first five will consist of publications on (1) Aristotle's illustrations of his argument via comparisons and literary allusions; (2) his syntactical and rhetorical features including sentence type, relationship to spoken Greek, figures and rhythm; (3) his language and vocabulary within the history of Greek and especially Peripatetic and philosophical writing; (4) the light ancient commentators can throw on how his style was understood. Output 5 will be an edited collection of essays arising from the final conference, focussing on the differentiae between the writing in individual treatises and types of discourse within them and the relationship between style and scientific method(s). Output 6 will be the website, providing annotated lists of relevant secondary bibliography.

The project's contribution will be facilitated by both traditional philological tools, especially Eucken's study of Aristotle's particles and Bonitz's canonical 'dictionnaire raisonné'. *Index Aristotelicus*,⁵⁰ and interpretive strategies recently absorbed into the study of ancient literature, including narratological analysis,⁵¹ and software which makes the identification and scrutiny of stylistic/lexical features of Greek texts far more time-efficient, thorough and precise (*TLG*, the *Diogenes* Desktop Application, and now the Diorisis Ancient Greek Corpus, which the proposed PDRA1 co-created. It will be instrumental in our extraction and quantification of stylistic data).⁵² These will also produce new criteria for testing both the authenticity of Peripatetic treatises for which Aristotelian authorship has been suspected and the precise nature of the style which his followers adopted. A further major contribution will be made by the Advisory Board (AB), all of whom have agreed to participate. There remains a pressing need for a centripetal research initiative with the over-arching objective of bringing the few existing dispersed research efforts into dialogue with another and providing shared core resources which will enable unprecedented light to be thrown on Aristotle's status in the history of Greek prose writing. With this collegial aim in mind the PI has invited 21 scholars interested in some aspect of Aristotle as writer to be Advisors, indicated hereafter with an asterisk before their *name. *Newman's *Aristotle and Style* focusses on one characteristic (metaphor) in *NE*. Two essays by *Schütrumpf analyse rhetorical figures in a few passages of *Pol.*⁵³ The work on reconstructing Aristotle's lost *Protrepticus* by *Hutchinson and *Ransome Johnson has required minute study of some syntactical and lexical aspects of Aristotle's style.⁵⁴ *Netz published a pioneering study of the shape of the Aristotelian paragraph.⁵⁵ *Föllinger has written on the *pragmateiai*, literariness/oral aspects of some scientific works.⁵⁶ *Mayhew has considered question-and-answer formats and citations of Homer.⁵⁷ *Mendell has investigated style in parts of *Phys.*, and mathematical and astronomical passages.⁵⁸ Asper, van der Eijk and *Schironi have included Aristotle in some discussions of technical and scientific prose.⁵⁹ *Coxhead has studied Peripatetic style in a pseudo-Aristotelian treatise on mechanics.⁶⁰ These scholars have often been working in international isolation, and from the perspectives of divergent national intellectual traditions. French-language scholars have been most interested in rhetoric and oral delivery, including breathing,⁶¹ and comparison with Isocrates;⁶² the Dutch and Germans have focussed on technical writing, and some Italians on the Peripatetic school as a communication-system. But this project will draw together an unprecedented team of experts on a wide range of aspects of style/language and philosophical method across individual Aristotelian treatises.

By using similar analytical and hermeneutic approaches in reading treatises across the entire Aristotelian corpus, we will transcend the limitations of approaching Aristotle solely as the author of an individual work,⁶³ or as a writer about e.g. ethics, constitutions, the soul, biology or syllogisms. This interdisciplinary approach will enable a better understanding of Aristotle's total project and how certain images structured his method and thought: athletes abound in his simile-world in the ethical and political treatises: the four modes of political theorising he identifies in *Politics* IV.1288 are compared with the four categories of advice a trainer might offer an athlete, relating to advantage, excellence, universality and disposition. Athletic agonism had been used metaphorically in previous literature, notably Pindar, and in the sophists in relation to competing rhetorical prowess.⁶⁴ But in the *Lesser Hippias*, which Aristotle believed to be by Plato (*Met.* V.1025a), Socrates rejects the validity of athletics metaphors to moral life. It was Aristotle who not only accepted its validity but turned it into one of the most dominant metaphors in ancient philosophy.⁶⁵ It even affected his prose rhythm: in an athletics analogy at *NE* I.1099a3-21, ἰσχυρότατοι στεφανοῦνται at colon end imparts a dactylic/dactylo-epitrite rhythm reminiscent of both Homer and Pindar.⁶⁶

b) Methodology

The fundamental research methodology consists of a detailed reading of Aristotle by the Core Team (CT) in twice-weekly 3-hour seminars, held in the Durham Centre for Ancient & Medieval Philosophy (DCAMP) across the first 4 years of the project. The seminars will identify and analyse features of Aristotle's style and language relevant to the proposed outputs, the tracing of consistent patterns across his *oeuvre*, the identification of unusual or atypical phenomena and the relation of style to philosophical method. The CT will develop arguments that will feed into and structure the project outputs. The unprecedented reading method will be informed by the PI's extensive acquired expertise in ancient Greek literature in order to assess Aristotle's use of existing repertoires of image and allusion and the extent of his creative innovations; qualitative assessment of these and other features of style and language will be supplemented by the identification of parallel usages and quantitative information by running key syntactical and lexical items through lexicographical and stylometric software systems, especially *TLG* and *Diorisis*, and refined by assessment of their relationship to scientific method, philosophical content and the Peripatetic commentary tradition by our Co-I, DCAMP's Professor Phillip Horky. He is an expert in classical Greek philosophy and its ancient reception after the fourth century BCE.⁶⁷ The ancient philosophical tradition includes a mass of under-examined evidence for the reception of Aristotle's prose style and a professional philosopher is required to guide the team through the reception history. Consultation of secondary literature relevant to each seminar, especially where detailed commentaries exist, will feed into the analysis and the contents of the book or article briefly summarised on the website's bibliographical section. Summaries and examples of the results will be relayed to the AB in termly newsletters and subjected to intensive review at the virtual workshops in the first four years; subsequent reading practice will be informed by the Board's feedback. Deliberation about the potential structure of the outputs by the PI, Co-I and PDRAs will be conducted from the outset, so that reading practice develops responsively with the project's emergent findings. The final year will be devoted to writing up the final versions of the monographs and articles.

A primary strength of the vision underlying the research method is the complementary skills of the CT Team, allowing a rigorous joint reading of Aristotle from overlapping perspectives, the results of which, under the supervision of the PI, will add up to much more than the sum of the parts. Illustration via metaphor or literary allusion on the one hand, rhetorical figures and sentence structure, and diction/vocabulary, work in generative synergy to support Aristotle's methods and arguments, creating the total effect of his writing.

Aristotle's style is varied and flexible, but the project will attempt to draw distinctions between his distinctive tonalities and manners of speaking, ranging from the formal to the surprisingly casual and intimate, the business-like to playful and supremely grand, and syntactically from the periodic to the telegraphic.⁶⁸ The reading process will apply the sophisticated methods developed by analysts of other, often very different, authors of classical prose, building on classical rhetoric, to probe the subtle use of participles, genitive and accusative absolutes, concessive clauses, parataxis and hypotaxis, hyperbaton and chiasmic structures, antithesis, hyperbaton, isocola and Aristotle's preference for the avoidance of exact concinnity, his fondness for rising bicola and tricola, paronomasia, polyptoton and alliteration.⁶⁹

Aristotle may well have composed a discourse on method, the *methodikoi logoi* (*Rhet.* I.1356b20–3) or *Methodika* (Diog. Laert. V.23), in which he argued that 'the use of exemplars and enthymeme in rhetoric corresponds to the use of induction and deduction in dialectic'.⁷⁰ This association of different stylistic features with rhetoric and dialectic respectively suggests that the CT's focus needs to remain on the precise nature of the interaction between writing style and the philosophical method underlying any particular passage. Are there stylistic features associated with his preferred organisational division of branches of learning into the three *epistēmai*—theoretical, practical, and productive? In endoxic passages, Aristotle does

Aristotle's style show verbal patterning across treatises when he is stating the *phainomena*, gathering the *endoxa*, examining them for difficulties (*aporai*), or revising the most promising original *endoxa* after removing the difficulties? How do the verbs chosen to portray 'travel' on the inductive 'path' from 'the first universal in the soul' to first principles (*APo* II.100b3-4) relate to earlier Greek vocabulary for mental activity? What are the recurring vocabulary, syntactical structures and examples where he is defining his ten categories, four causes and teleology? How does his distinctive treatment of change, time, hylomorphism, essentialism, homonymy, potentiality and actuality build on and modify the vocabulary of earlier philosophers in accordance with his revision of their ideas? In natural science, his accounts of ingredients and ratio tends to move from dispositional properties to composition in ways easy to syllogise: how does the abundance of inferential particles and conjunctions, especially *gar*, in such passages point out the underlying syllogistic thought? Does his style alter in identifiable and consistent ways as he alternates between deductive and apodeictic argumentation? What is the semantic cluster (wonder, truth, beauty) and type of example (often relating to pre-Socratics such as Thales or Heraclitus) operative across the sudden 'epideictic' and/or protreptic passages of great rhetorical beauty, for example in *PA* I.645a17-23?⁷¹

It is worth briefly considering an individual passage. All the CT would have prepared it before the reading seminar, identified features according to their specialist 'camera angle' on the writing (illustration, allusion, rhetoric, vocabulary, philosophical argument). Where Aristotle discusses whether the soul moves and if it does, whether directly or indirectly, at *de A.* I.405b31–407a2, he uses two comparisons: how the passengers in a ship move (indirectly, *καθ' ἕτερον*) and how the body moves when walking (directly, *καθ' αὐτό*). There is an illustration of an argument in Democritus by reference to a comedy by Philippus in which 'Daedalus made his wooden Aphrodite move by pouring in quicksilver' (=Philippus fr. 1 *PCG*)—an arresting concrete visual image which helps listeners understand the complicated idea that a soul itself might have some kind of body. The PI would comment on the place of the ship analogy in Aristotle's maritime imagery and relate the second reference to other citations of comedy in Aristotle, the PhD student to his other uses of craftsman myths. The passage focusses attention on the visual image of the soul by use of neutral impersonal constructions (e.g. *episkepton*, *eirētai*, *dēlon*), academic 'we' (*legomen*), aural patterning which signposts the steps in the argument through high cohesion (density of anaphoric/cataphoric expressions), and low lexical variety. The consistent unpacking and refinement of statements and definitions may be compared with the systematic and methodical approach of medical prose, while the parallelism, which assists cognition, is reminiscent of Isocrates. The noun *ἠρέμῃσις* (406b24, 'rest' in opposition to movement), is not found in extant texts prior to Aristotle: the question of nouns ending in *-sis* is contested. They are often held to be characteristic of *koinē*, but they may have ceased to be particularly productive in the 4th century before being reinvented in the Imperial period (certain types of derivational pattern become common later). The termination may be genre-specific rather than diachronic: these nouns are characteristic of philosophy. Finally, early on in this passage Aristotle deploys fundamental philosophical oppositions (e.g. *καθ' ἕτερον* and *καθ' αὐτό*), allowing us to track his underlying categorial axiology both horizontally across his philosophical system (he goes on to mention the four types of movement which inform his physics, 406a13–15) and vertically within a history of philosophy (these terms are central to Plato's category structure in the *Sophist*). Aristotle's interweaving of these four features is effortless and presents no conflict between rhetoric and philosophical argumentation, as he seeks to undermine the case that the soul is or is essentially marked by motion—an argument maintained by his central competitor in the Academy, Xenocrates (404b27–30).

Outputs

1] *Aristotle's Literary Art: Illustration, Comparison, Allusion*, the PI's monograph, will discuss Aristotle's illustrations of his philosophical arguments through metaphor, simile, imagery and literary allusion and offer an inviting overview of his artistry. It will argue that Aristotle, sensitive to his place in the history of literature, especially in relation to Homer, theatrical poetry and Plato, modifies and enriches an inherited repertoire of imagery, paradigm and allusion. As the founder of detailed study of metaphor (a category to which he subsumes similes), discussed in both *Poet.* and *Rhet.*,⁷² he argues that it is essential for authors of both poetry and prose to master, but that it requires an ability, which cannot be taught, for identifying similarities (*Poet.* 1459a6–7; *Rhet.* III.1405a8). 'Metaphor' at its best vividly 'puts before the eyes' a concrete picture, as at *HA* 6.18 when wild boars prepare for battle 'they put on armour breastplates' by toughening up their hides, which makes the reader see them like hoplites readying themselves for combat. But metaphors must avoid extremes—i.e. being laughable, overly elevated, too far-fetched or obscure (*Rhet.* III.1405a). Aristotle largely draws metaphors from real-world activities familiar to all Greeks of his day. Some he extends across a treatise or treatises (e.g. the idea that sparing use of literary ornament acts on everyday language as condiments enhance plain food [*Rhet.* III.1406b]); many put abstract ideas vividly before the eyes: *GA* succeeds uses an extended comparison between the vocal chords and the threads which

women stretch by use of weights when weaving at the loom, as does *NE* I.1253b when imagining a futuristic world in which shuttles can weave of their own accord, obviating the need for assistants or slaves.

The precise structure of the monograph will evolve in the CT seminars. But the Introduction will examine Aristotle's remarks about 'illustration' by metaphor, simile and allusion. Ch. 2 will outline examples which he borrows, inherits but often adapts from earlier authors (e.g. the Ship of State), especially Plato (e.g. where Plato had used the term *antistrophos* as 'counterpart'—musical education is the counterpart to gymnastic—in Aristotle it is used of different branches within the category of speech: he opens *Rhetoric* with Ἡ ῥητορικὴ ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφος τῇ διαλεκτικῇ). Three sections will then address (1) imagery, subdivided into individual chapters on the broad spheres of activity to which comparisons are made (e.g. music, visual art, medicine); (2) references to individual poets and poetry (Homer, Hesiod, the tragedians, etc.); (3) jokes (e.g. the 'fire-spouting-goat' at *GA* IV.769b16–20), sayings and proverbs (*NE* I.1098a, 'one swallow does not make spring'). Stress will be placed (i) on the points in the argument at which Aristotle regards it as cognitively expedient to introduce an illustration; (ii) the means by which he fulfils his aim of 'putting before the eyes'; (iii) how the example relates to others using the same sphere of activity, image or author, especially in treatises on different subject-matter; (iv) the different functions performed by illustration—it can be a direct, partial or actually negative comparison; it can illustrate an activity (doing philosophy, making decisions in accordance with equity), introduce an area of enquiry (earlier thinkers about Physics 'went off the track')⁷³ or a philosophical argument (what Democritus means by the soul's movement?), a psychological state (amnesia), or a constitution (where state organisation is compared with a Homeric community).

In the study of Aristotle's capacious definition of metaphor, the method will be informed by Keith's seminal dissertation. He argued that, in Homer, metaphors usually concern non-concrete entities being described by more concrete ones, e.g. ('a black cloud of grief covered him', *Il.* 18.22). Keith sorted Homeric metaphors/similes into categories (body parts, body processes, kin relationships, dress, occupation, structures, animals, plants, minerals, liquids, weather, fire, light and darkness, journeys and paths). The value in this list lay not only in the taxonomic order, but the demonstration that 'metaphorical source domains were largely based on...structured physical entities that were readily available to both the poet and his listeners'.⁷⁴

In Aristotle, some treatises have one or more 'master' comparisons, instances of which are carefully placed across the text: medicine and shipbuilding in *NE*, housebuilding in *de A.*, statuary in *Phys.*, drawings, paintings and seals in *Mem.*, Homeric warfare in *HA*; a few have attracted individual studies (e.g. on *skopos*, or 'archery target' in *NE* and a few passages of poetry in *Pol.*).⁷⁵ Athletics and musical/theatrical performances are often sources of analogy; this must be understood in the context of Aristotle's interest in athletics and musical/theatrical competitions, evidenced in the list of victors in the Pythian games at Delphi as well as of the organizers of the contests there, compiled with his nephew Callisthenes.⁷⁶ The PI's research will test her hypothesis that the parallels between being a spectator at such events and being a philosopher enquiring into the nature of things fundamentally structured Aristotle's conception of his philosophical activities, just as he writes in what is probably an authentic fragment of his *Protrepticus*, 'For as we travel to Olympia for the sake of the spectacle itself...and as we view the Dionysia...so too the contemplation of the universe is to be honoured above all the things that are thought useful. For surely it cannot be right that we should take great pains to go to see men imitating women and slaves, or fighting and running, just for the sake of the spectacle, and not think it right to view without payment the nature and reality of things'.⁷⁷

There are many more than a hundred direct references each to the worlds of athletics and performance distributed across Aristotle's *oeuvre*. In arguing that the ways in which people can practise being a good person through daily acts will vary from individual to individual, Aristotle uses the analogy of an athlete in training: some athletes need bigger portions of food than others. He cites Milo of Croton, the most famous wrestling champion Greece ever produced, as an example of a big eater. A beautiful theatrical metaphor illustrates one of the most fundamental planks in his *Virtue Ethics*. He says that it is an advantage in the pursuit of happiness, which is ultimately dependent solely on internal goods, nevertheless to have the necessary equipment in terms of external goods, and this he calls *chorēgia* (*NE* X.1099a). The relationship between internal and external goods is like that of the dramatic text—the words themselves—to the aspects of performance—dancer training, costumes, props and scenery—*opsis* and *melopoia* as he calls them in the *Poetics*—which it was the responsibility not of the dramatic writer, but of the *chorēgos* or official funder of the production, to provide. In another example, he argues that 'it makes a great difference whether those who are connected with any occurrence are alive or dead, much more so than it does in a tragedy whether the crimes and horrors are assumed to have taken place beforehand or are enacted on the stage' (*NE* I.1101a).

While there is a relatively recent dissertation on some aspects of metaphor in the scientific treatises,⁷⁸ the PI will argue that Aristotle's imagery needs to be illuminated by asking how the systems of comparands manifest *across* his treatises in different disciplines: the image of the saw (*priōn*) is used in scientific works but also in *EE*.⁷⁹ When Aristotle argues in *Poet.* 1448b5-15 that we enjoy looking at likenesses of things

which are themselves painful to see, one example he gives is pictures of ‘low beasts’, probably meaning the type of diagrams of animals which he used in his zoology, and indeed discusses in his ‘Invitation to Biology’ in *PA* (645a 6-19). Such creative intellectual movement through an image can work in the other direction, where his experience as aesthetician, moralist, political theorist or rhetorician contributes to the formulation of an idea in the natural sciences. In *GA*, Aristotle explains how the raw matter out of which a new animal is created acquires its potential form from semen. But the movement which allows the matter to achieve that potential does not take effect immediately. It imparts the potential, but is no longer in direct contact with it at the later moment when the potential is actualised (II.734b5-17): ‘this works like the miraculous automatic puppets. For, while at rest, their parts somehow have potentiality (*dunamin*) to move potentially; and when something external moves the first part, then immediately the next part comes to be in actuality’. Aristotle clarifies his puppet-parts/potentiality analogy further (II.741b8-9): ‘As the parts of the animal to be formed are present potentially in the matter, once the principle of movement has been supplied, one thing follows on after another without interruption, just as it does in the miraculous automatic puppets.’ What he means is illustrated in *On Mechanical Problems* probably compiled by an early Peripatetic (848a), which discusses mechanical robotic devices used in sanctuary displays. Aristotle thus experiences his everyday world, with all the objects human ingenuity has devised, and from it draw analogies illustrating biological reproduction. Similarly, he compares marionette strings with animal sinews in *MA* (701b2-10) and the inadequacy of human perception of familiar things with ‘the eyes of bats in daylight’ (*Met.* II.993b). Reading illustrations from particular spheres of activity *across* works on different subjects enhances our understanding of his total thought: playing the *aulos* occurs in *Phys.* II.197a to distinguish an efficient cause from an incidental property; in *Pol.* (II.1267b, III.1282b, VIII.1341b) to distinguish types of citizen, and what support and education each should be given by the state; in *HA* 601b on the responses of horses to music; in *NE* I.1097b to distinguish between discrete functions men can acquire. We meet *aulos*-makers, *aulos*-players inferior and excellent, powerful men who listen to *aulos* recitals, and others who use *aulos* music to train horses.

Aristotle’s literary quotations and allusions have hardly begun to be investigated, despite the ancient perception, discernible in e.g. Neoplatonic doxography, that Aristotle and the other Peripatetics were well-read ‘literary’, even ‘bookish’ authors,⁸⁰ and *Halliwell’s observation that Aristotle ‘cites and quotes poetry regularly in his own writings in ways which indicate the influence on him of a prevailing mentality that regarded poets and philosophers as pursuers...of a common wisdom.’⁸¹ In *HA*, for example, poems by Homer, Simonides, Stesichorus, Musaeus, Hesiod and Aeschylus are quoted. When illustrating moderation in respect to any of the virtues, he often provides a Homeric/mythical figure as exemplar: Niobe of excessive pride in her children (*NE* VII.1148a), the Cyclopes as failing to educate all citizens uniformly (*NE* VI.1180a), Priam as a man whose happiness is sabotaged by bad luck, the Trojan War as an example of something that can never be undone (*NE* VI.1139b). *Mayhew has collected but not interpreted most Homeric citations in three treatises, to advance understanding of the contents of Aristotle’s lost *Homeric Problems*.⁸² Others have tried to list citations of poetry in the treatises other than *Poet*,⁸³ but their lists contains errors and omissions and the analysis of the material is minimal,⁸⁴ implying incorrectly that such citations serve a monolithic purpose: in fact, distinctions need to be drawn. They will be interrogated using the questions *Halliwell put to similar citations in Plato,⁸⁵ but these questions will be adapted in line with the far greater breadth of subject-matter into which Aristotle inserts such allusions.

Fables, anecdotes and references to historical figures current in popular and/or intellectual culture, such as ‘The toper of Byzantium’ or Cheiron, but without specified or known sources, also abound in Aristotle, especially in works on Ethics and Zoology and near the beginning and end of treatises. The story of Solon and Croesus gives ring composition to *NE* and the idea of the relation between time and change which opens *Phys.* IV (218b) is illustrated by the story of men who ‘slept with the heroes’ in Sardinia and were unaware of changes which had taken place while they slept. In *MA* the myths of Tityus, Boreas and Atlas Tityus, Boreas and Atlas aid consideration of motion and stillness.

The PI will also analyse the moral dilemmas in drama Aristotle discusses to test the idea that his ethical theory was substantially built on examples of human behaviour in both tragic and comic theatre.⁸⁶ As an extreme example of selfless *philia*, Aristotle offers mothers who allow their child to be adopted because it is in his best interest, citing a tragedy by Antiphon in which Andromache, to save her son Astyanax, tried to smuggle him out of Troy hoping that some other woman would adopt him (*EE* VII.1239a37). But the tragedian who dominates Aristotelian references to tragedy is Euripides, who is quoted exactly or alluded to for myriad reasons, including as a source of jokes, proverbs and syllogisms. Citations in *Rhet.* suggest that Aristotle had paid attention to live delivery of both tragedies and comedies in the Athenian theatre during his extended periods of residence in that city, 367-347 BCE and 335-323. The latter period was during Lycurgus’ government and the creation of canonical texts of the great tragedians (long ago linked by Jaeger with Aristotle’s work on theatre texts⁸⁷). Aristotle’s lost works include *On Tragedies*, *Victories at the*

Dionysia, and *Didaskaliai* (Diog. Laert. 5.1.22-7), revealing his project of a comprehensive chronological record of the results of the dramatic competitions at Athens, possibly in collaboration with Lycurgus.

3] PDRA 1 (Alessandro Vatri) *Aristotle's Style in the Light of Rhetoric III*. This monograph will be centred on an analysis of Aristotle's own discussion of *lexis* and *taxis*, with illustrations and examples from Aristotle's own works and where relevant those by others, with a focus on their aesthetic effects as aids to cognition and memory.⁸⁸ Aristotle's remarks need to be interpreted against the background of Aristotle's philosophy, his contemporary cultural environment, and the rhetorical tradition,⁸⁹ and alongside other Aristotelian works (especially *Poet.*, *SE* and *Int.*), the doctrines and observations of Antisthenes, Alcidamas, Isocrates, and Plato, the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, and Aristoxenus, whose musical writings reveal terminological and conceptual overlaps with Aristotle's observations on the acoustic perception of speech.⁹⁰

Aristotle's recommendations on style and figures, which are informed by his principles that discourse should be clear, comprehensible, concise, and memorable, have received attention in scholarship on almost every aspect of ancient and modern rhetoric *except* his own practice. Yet every one of his recommendations is put into practice in his own writing, including in *Rhetoric* itself. Central to this output will be Aristotle's distinction at *Rhet.* III.1049a between the 'continuous style' (εἰρομένη λέξις) and the 'periodic' (κατεστραμμένη ἐν περιόδῳ). The latter is both (a) more pleasant for hearers/readers because the beginning of each sentence or colon suggests where it is going syntactically and that they 'have the end in sight' and (b) makes the process of learning easier 'because it can be easily retained in the memory'. This precept is illustrated everywhere in Aristotle's works, where there is an abundance of categories of sentence type, never before comprehensively documented, all structured so that the important issue raised at the beginning leads, in a cognitive arc, to the illuminating material emphasised by its position at the end. The other material 'sandwiched' in between: in the opening sentence of the example above, the listener is invited by the opening to know this that sentence will constitute a simile, 'Just as at the Olympic games' and therefore to expect the comparand, 'so in life', which is suspended until the end of the sentence. Similarly, Aristotle's many sentences beginning 'what difference does it make (τί διαφέρει) whether situation *a* applies (where the Greek would use an infinitive) or situation *b*, encourage the listener to expect that the sentence will end with a second infinitive, e.g. *Pol.* II.1269b: 'Yet, what difference does it make whether the women rule or the rulers are ruled by the women?' (καίτοι τί διαφέρει γυναῖκας ἄρχειν ἢ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἄρχεσθαι;). Again, sentences beginning with 'that *x* has been demonstrated in the above arguments' make the listener expect a word or colon that qualifies the statement, such as 'is clear' (*phaneron* or *dēlon [estin]*); this kind of sentence routinely appears at the end of paragraphs (e.g. *Phys.* IV.201b), although there are patterns of variety in the 'formulae' used to mark the conclusion of a particular stage in the argument (for example in *Phys.* I.184a, διωρίσθω ἡμῖν οὕτως; II.195b ἔστω ἡμῖν διωρισμένα ἰκανῶς; IV.217b, διωρίσθω τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον; VIII.252b, εἰρήσθω τσσαῦτα). This monograph will be divided into chapters, some of which will address individual aspects of style according to Aristotle's own categories (e.g. the sparing inclusion in otherwise idiomatic spoken Greek of elevated or unexpected words to give a heightened (*xenikon*) air, connecting particles, repetition and asyndeton, period and colon length—on which he offers explicit advice at III.1409b—rhetorical figures and rhythm). Figures are richly instanced in some Aristotelian treatises, to point an argument, analogy or antithesis, but in unobtrusive ways far removed from those of Gorgias or Isocrates: *Pol.* III.1287a23-24 employs homoioteleuton, paronomasia, repetition, parallelism and chiasmus in order to stress his crucial point that even under monarchy there must be rule of law, even though some people might object that 'that any case which the law appears to be unable to define, a human being also would be unable to decide' (*alla mēn hosa ge mē dokei dunasthai diorizein ho nomos, oud' anthrōpos an dunaito gnōrizein*).⁹¹ Yet some characteristics of Aristotle's style are *not* explicitly addressed in *Rhet.*, but are in with other rhetorical handbooks, especially the figure of *hypophora* (asking a rhetorical question or series of them). Hypophora is familiar from Greek tragedy and Isaeus, but Aristotle uses it distinctively, often (with 2-3 questions) at the opening of sections to identify the crucial issues he is to address (e.g. the spectacular opening of *Physics* VIII; *Pol.* II.1281a; VII.1318a), or, with *anthypophora* (question-and-answer) formats similar to *Problems* or marking intense dialectical thought (*Pol.* III.1309b).⁹²

Aural beauty and rhythm, Aristotle believes, are important to prose style, and while advising that the iambic is the most commonly 'found' metre in ordinary speech, he adds that certain form of the paean should be used at the beginning and end of sentences (3.1409b). Close reading of the texts aloud in the CT's seminars will systematically uncover evidence for Aristotle's sound effects and rhythmical practice—even if it turns out that he tended to *avoid* metrical effects altogether—for the first time.⁹³ In *Rhet.* Aristotle distinguishes between the temporalities of different genres of prose (I.1357a36–b29), and notes the effect of different pronouns to characterise the identity of the community he is addressing in his remarks on introductory formulae such as 'Who does not know?' and 'Everybody knows' (3.1408a). This monograph will use techniques developed in Narratological studies, which have so far ignored Aristotle's own practice,⁹⁴

to examine his tenses, moods (especially in conditionals) and interlacing of a singular expository ‘I’ voice with the more inclusive plural ‘we’ (which can shift in meaning between ‘we’ in the sense of the students in a particular class, in the sense of Peripatetics as opposed to Platonists, of ‘everybody following this argument now or in the future’,⁹⁵ or a more historic ‘we philosophers’ or ‘we members of the human race’).⁹⁶ Third-person pronouns and verbs also occur in passages of narrative, or description of general human behaviour.

This approach also provides a starting-point for the reassessment of the long-standing conundrum concerning the relationship between the Aristotelian corpus and oral delivery.⁹⁷ Key to Aristotle’s recommendations about stylistic level is his discussion of the term *onkos* (literally, ‘swelling’) beginning at *Rhet.* 3.1407b25. Aristotle contrasts the rhetorical quality identified by this term with his ideal of conciseness (*syntomia*), but *onkos* does not equate straightforwardly with verbosity; for example, the use of the plural for the singular is also mentioned as a source of *onkos*. Spengel interprets the opposition between *onkos* and *syntomia* as one between an elevated and an ordinary style;⁹⁸ Cope follows suit, specifying that *onkos* is connected to ‘pomp’ or ‘dignity’ in later rhetorical writers, while noting that in *Topics* it means ‘nothing more than a device for swelling out, increasing the bulk of, discourse or argument’.⁹⁹ Roberts argues that ‘a neutral rendering like ‘amplitude’, ‘grandeur’, ‘impressiveness’, seems best.’¹⁰⁰ Kennedy chooses ‘expansiveness’, even though in later writers it is often a pejorative term for swollen style.’¹⁰¹ Rapp stresses, however, that it is hard to see how the examples Aristotle gives of *onkos* indicate the opposite of *syntomia*.¹⁰² And one of Aristotle’s examples of *onkos* as opposed to *syntomia*, most revealingly, compares a paratactic structure consisting of *two* coordinate participles with a hypotactic structure where only one of the verbs is in the participle, while the other, ‘concise’ one is in the indicative (*Rhet.* III.1407b38–8a1). Besides the increased word count determined by the coordinating conjunction, the *onkos* of the paratactic structure lies in the storing of the verbs as separate ‘information chunks’ in the reader’s/listener’s memory leading to an impression of ‘fullness’ in contradistinction to the participle plus indicative construction, where the verbs are integrated into one, pedagogically more easily intelligible and retainable information chunk.¹⁰³

4] PDRA 2 (Benjamin Cartlidge) *The Language of Aristotle (monograph)*. Aristotle was a remarkable linguistic innovator, who both coined numerous neologisms, and redeployed familiar lexical items (for example, those relating to potentiality, actualisation and possibility), and created a new kind of language to articulate his ideas across a wide range of disciplines. But the 4th century is a crucial phase in the history of Greek as a relatively uniform language, the *koinē*, took over the roles formerly accorded to different dialects. The loss of much Hellenistic Greek prose leaves Aristotle’s works as one of the only representatives of the period, much as Menander’s comedies are some of the only evidence for Greek verse.¹⁰⁴ The comparative data from the contemporary orators (Demosthenes and Dinarchus being important as comparands for Aristotle and Menander respectively) are synthesised in the grammatical literature (the ‘standard grammars’). There exists no comprehensive investigation of Aristotle’s language across synchronic (descriptive) and diachronic (what forces are at work?) axes. Aristotle’s Greek is startlingly under-represented in the same standard grammars that codify other authors.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, studies of this period face problems of method and terminology in dealing with the *koinē*, the origins of which are still debated. One standard approach, for example, is to select a ‘*Koinē* text’ as a standard for comparison: inscriptions, papyri, or the New Testament.¹⁰⁶ But this approach downplays specific problems of genre or text type: papyri and the NT arise in contact situations; inscriptions use stereotyped formulae that conceal linguistic change; both papyri and inscriptions need contextualisation as physical objects; the Bible arose several hundred years later than Aristotle and Menander, and its value as a point of comparison is therefore doubtful.¹⁰⁷

An alternative is to set the study of *koinē* texts in a sociolinguistic framework, and to ask how they reflect the contact between speakers of different dialects which the evolution of the *koinē* presupposes.¹⁰⁸ At all stages, the study of the Greek language is bedevilled by the interaction of dialect with both genre and idiolect: genres can be dialectally marked; idiolects can select archaising over contemporary variants; choices based on genre can be overlaid by interference from an author’s own dialect. Consider e.g. verbal periphrasis with *echō* (have) and the perfect middle-passive participle: this has been identified as a feature of allegedly ‘lower’ register in Aristotle; yet the data, which include periphrases of similar function in Herodotus and the earlier Hippocratic texts, might point to an interpretation as an Ionic feature;¹⁰⁹ it is just as important to ask why this kind of language was useful to Aristotle—that is, how his linguistic choices reflect his ideas and world-view. The language of Aristotle therefore requires approaching from three perspectives: (a) genre, i.e. the linguistic requirements internal to the text; (b) dialect, i.e. what we can reconstruct as the language that Aristotle will have used, and the stage of development of the Greek language in this period; (c) what we can reconstruct of Aristotle’s personal idiolect. This last is an ambitious goal, but the strongest outcome would be a new series of criteria to test for the authenticity of the texts of the corpus,¹¹⁰ avoiding judgements based on *a priori* theories of Aristotle’s ‘chronological development’ or ‘character’; rather, such criteria would emerge as by-products of our intensive re-reading of Aristotle’s text and the systematisation of

the linguistic data derived from those readings and from the use of electronic corpora (particularly *TLG*). If it transpires that no such wholly individual criteria emerge, this will itself be an interesting outcome, producing the result that Aristotle created a marked philosophical style—a systematised language for a still relatively new intellectual genre—which could be imitated by later practitioners. The resulting monograph will be divided into a synchronic (descriptive) part and a diachronic (explanatory) part. Key issues in the synchronic description of Aristotle are the relation of his language to his philosophy and the creation of a terminology which had permanent value (as can be seen in the writings of Theophrastus and the later Peripatetics).¹¹¹

Crucially, Aristotle created a vocabulary governed by rules which can operate across disparate fields of intellectual inquiry—a metalanguage in the logical works which determines the description of phenomena from the natural world as well as philosophical reasoning about the principles governing that description.¹¹² Aristotle exploits various features of Greek in order to do this, for example word-formation rules (governing the creation of abstract nouns in *-sis*, *-ma* and *-(s)mos*, adjectives in *-ikos*, verbs in *-euō* and *-izō*, etc.); compounding structures, allowing the definition of one object in terms of another; and extremely free use of the relative pronoun (later copied by Heidegger) to denote predicates. All of these existed in ordinary language already; several were features of academic discourse that could be parodied in the fifth century;¹¹³ but Aristotle was able to systematise these structures and exploit them to create an explicitly philosophical language. At *GC* 323a12-22, Aristotle uses the terms *κινητικός* and *κινήτός* to refer to ‘moving’ and ‘being moved’ (corresponding to the more general terms *ποιητικός* and *παθητικός* for ‘active’ and ‘passive’ respectively).¹¹⁴ The suffix *-τικός* has thus become an *active marker*, used to derive an active meaning from a passive participle in *-τός*. The growth in these terms is normally linked to the history of the Greek language in general; this study sees them instead as features of a philosophical, or even Aristotelian, style.

The definition of Aristotle’s language as genre-determined clarifies the extent to which his language innovates. By analysing Aristotle’s language from a structural perspective, we will be able to isolate more easily the linguistic features which are determined by his thought, and those which are due to linguistic evolution. Equally, some features of Aristotle’s Greek will play less of a role in philosophical language *per se*, but can be quantified against what is known about the history of Greek in general, for example the use of negatives.¹¹⁵ Negative particles in Greek show variation between forms with *th* and forms with *d* (e.g. οὐθέν vs. οὐδέν, ‘nothing’); the version with *th* is a later creation, and its origin is unclear.¹¹⁶ The monograph will thus produce a systematic study of Aristotle’s language from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives, concentrating in particular on features which can be governed by systematic principles.

5] Co-I (Phillip Horkey) Style in the Aristotelian Commentators and Beyond (2 Substantial Articles)

Further illumination of Aristotle’s prose style can be gained from examining its reception within the subsequent Peripatetic writing traditions, from immediate successors in the Lyceum (e.g., Theophrastus and Eudemus) to the commentary traditions taking shape in the 1st century BCE (e.g., Andronicus and Boethus) and the 1st/2nd centuries CE (e.g., Aspasius, Adrastus, and Alexander of Aphrodisias). Important scholarship on the philosophical views and exegetical approaches of these figures has appeared recently, especially in the light of research on the first commentary on Aristotle’s works that survives, Aspasius’ on the *Nicomachean Ethics*.¹¹⁷ But because scholars have not sufficiently grappled with the problem of Aristotle’s own style, its influence for the later Peripatetic traditions, and the information those traditions contain about how his style was apprehended by ancient Greek readers, remain obscured.¹¹⁸ For example, Barnes characterises Aspasius’ commentary style as ‘paraphrastic in method and elementary in content’, chiefly because it was ‘written for debutant philosophy students.’¹¹⁹ But how much of this is down to the stylistic clarity that Aristotle championed? If there is a substantial difference between elementary and advanced exegetical approaches to Aristotle’s texts, how is that conditioned by Aristotle’s own explicit comments on style, or implicit enactment of its tenets? Similarly, Alexander of Aphrodisias (whose works survive more substantially, both as commentaries and as stand-alone treatises), appeals to the styles deployed by Aristotle and his immediate successors, for example in glosses to neologisms and this comment on Aristotle’s refutational style: ‘This kind of speech was customary among the older philosophers, who set up most of their classes in this way — not on the basis of books as is now done, since at the time there were not yet any books of this kind’ (*In top.* 27.13)?¹²⁰ Further, can Aristotle’s own way of writing be illuminated by the differences between the styles adopted in these Peripatetic works and those in commentaries and treatises developed among the Middle and early Neoplatonists, whose style is arguably more eclectic and florid than that of the early Aristotelian commentators? The Co-I will respond to these questions in two substantial articles (circa 20,000 words each), focussed on the reaction to and appropriation of Aristotle’s style, and its relation to the project, method and audiences of philosophy (a) from the 4th century BCE until the late 1st century BCE (the early Peripatetics, the first Commentators, and the ‘Pythagorean’ pseudepigrapha ascribed to Ocellus of Lucania and Archytas), and (b) from the 1st century CE until the 3rd century CE (the doxographers, the Peripatetics Aspasius, Adrastus and Alexander, the Platonists Plutarch, Porphyry and Iamblichus).

6] *Aristotle's Styles*, volume of twenty-six essays co-ed. by PI/PDRAs/Co-I arising from International Conference addressed by 21 AB members (+5 CT members): Sara Newman (Kent State, Ohio); Christopher Rowe (Durham; Giulia Bonasio (Durham); Eckart Schütrumpf (Colorado); Stephen Halliwell (St. Andrews) Ineke Sluiter (Leiden); Tim Whitmarsh (Cambridge); Sophia Connell (Cambridge); Carlo Natali (Venezia); Doug Hutchinson (Toronto); Monte Ransome Johnson (UC San Diego); Reviel Netz (Stanford); Shaul Tor (KCL); Jon Hesk (St. Andrews); Pierre Destrée (Louvain); Ralph Rosen (UPenn); Robert Mayhew (Seton Hall, NJ); Henry Mendell (UCLA); Francesca Schironi (Ann Arbor MN); Sabine Föllinger (Marburg); Mike Coxhead (KCL).

7] Website: *Aristoteles Pezographos*

The website will provide a bibliographical guide to Aristotle's style and language, filling a yawning gap in the current scholarship. Books, articles and discrete passages within them will be documented in one of four ways: a summary written by the relevant member of the CT; quotation of short passages; full uploading of public-domain documents, or links to the texts on other websites. The content will be organised by a relational database allowing searches organised by author, date, topic, language, material type and keywords. The website will also provide a virtual meeting-point for CT/AB members and other researchers and a platform for uploading reports on progress, newsletters, workshop/conference arrangements and blogs.

SUMMARY: *These Outputs will supplement analysis of philosophical method with literary-critical, rhetorical and language-historical interpretive approaches to Aristotle's texts, thereby transforming the understanding of Aristotle's nature and status as a writer, and of his relationship to the evolution of Peripatetic, philosophical and koinē Greek prose.*

Role of the Core Team Members: The CT consists of the PI (Prof. Hall), Co-I (Prof. Horkey) and two PDRAs (Dr Alessandro Vatri and Dr Ben Cartledge). The PI will take responsibility for the project, intellectually, financially, administratively, and in terms of internal liaison with Durham University and the ERC and external liaison with the website designer and AB. She will organise and lead the reading sessions, prescribe primary and secondary reading, write the termly newsletter and blog and ERC reports, and host the workshops and conference. She will mentor the PDRAs, looking after skills and career development. Like AB members Coxhead (and until recently Bonasio), the PDRAs need extra support since they are at early career stages; despite acclaimed publications and teaching records, the current employment climate means they have held only short-term posts. A five-year attachment to DCAMP, and a major ERC-funded project resulting in a second monograph each, will facilitate their progress into secure academic posts. The PI has an almost unrivalled record of mentoring her research students and post-docs into permanent academic or allied-field posts.¹²¹ in 2021 she was awarded the Supervisory Excellence Award at KCL.

The CT will meet twice weekly for 3-hour seminars to discuss the text allocated by the PI, after preparing it individually with commentaries, lexica and analytical software. The seminars will run for 40 weeks p.a. (=80 seminars p.a.; total up to 1200 hours). Reading speed is expected to accelerate. Since it may not be possible to discuss every single Bekker page, and the average seminar will cover between 2 and 4, the PI will prescribe which sentences and paragraphs need most attention before individual preparation takes place (she has prepared a provisional schedule after reading the entire corpus in Greek while writing her recent book and peer-reviewed articles on Aristotle,¹²² including two pilot studies of Aristotle as a writer¹²³).

Role of Advisory Board: 21 scholars whose expertise ranges over the entire Aristotelian corpus have agreed to act as AB members. Their role is to provide feedback electronically on the CT's findings, presented in 3 newsletters a year; to test-run the draft website in April 2023 before its launch in July 2023; to assist the CT in keeping up-to-date with new scholarly publications in each Advisor's discrete area of specialisation; to attend an annual July Workshop in the first four years, preferably in physical person, to discuss the year's results, with the specialists in that year's text(s) delivering extended feedback; to give a paper at the 2027 conference on a specific text/topic which will be included in the conference proceedings (see **Output 5**).

Workshops and Conferences: The AB's involvement is central, a core aim being to bring together scholars working in isolation on details of Aristotle's writing to collaborate and share ideas. To facilitate discussion, the CT will host AB members at **Annual Workshops**, virtually in July of Years 1-4, where the results of the year's CT analysis, communicated in 3 x termly newsletters, will be discussed by all participants after papers offering detailed feedback from the AB members whose research is most relevant (see **Summary Timetable**). In Year 1 only, there will be an *virtual* April workshop to discuss initial results, any modifications to method/scope, and the draft website. The climax will be the in-person **International Conference** in April of Year 5 when the AB/ CT will share papers on individual treatises and topics. The CT will also disseminate findings via panels at two conferences, the UK Classical Association (April 2025) and the US SCS (Jan. 2026) to elicit feedback from wider intellectual communities. **Milestones:** By end of Year

1: launch of website, review of achievements so as to modify methodology/scope of project if necessary, successful completion of 1st AB workshops.

By end of Year 2: dissemination of results at CA meeting and review of progress at AB workshop.

By end of Year 3: dissemination of results at SCS meeting and review of progress at AB workshop.

By end of Year 4: publishers approached for contracts for Outputs 1-4; review of progress at AB workshop.

End of Year 5: successful completion of International Conference; approach made to publisher for contract for Output 6; debriefing session with plans for achieving/maintaining all Outputs including website.

YEAR	READ	CORE TEAM OTHER ACTIVITIES	ADVISORS
1 (2023-2024)	<i>Rhetoric</i> <i>Poetics</i> <i>Organon</i>	Set-Up: Establish weekly reading programme/dates for all events to end of project. Create secondary bibliography and allocate to CT members with timetable. Establish emailing lists/protocols for 3x4-monthly newsletters to AB. Organise 2024 AB virtual workshops. Design/ commission 1st draft of website.	April 2024 Virtual Advisory Board workshop to provide feedback on initial results and draft website design. July 2024 Virtual AB workshop to review results so far; one day for each of the three texts; dedicated feedback from agreed AB members.
2 (2024-2025)	<i>NE</i> <i>EE</i> <i>Politics, Ath. Pol.</i> <i>MM, Fragments</i>	Present findings on a panel at CA annual meeting April 2025 (probably in England; venue t.b.a.) Submit 3 x 4-monthly newsletters to AB. Plan and organise 2025 AB virtual meeting.	July 2025 AB virtual workshop to review results so far; dedicated feedback from agreed AB members.
3 (2025-2026)	<i>Physics</i> <i>Metaphysics</i> <i>De Anima</i> <i>De Caelo</i>	Present findings on a panel January 4-7, 2026 SCS 157th Annual Meeting. Submit 3 x 4-monthly newsletters to AB. Plan and organise AB meeting.	July 2026 AB virtual workshop; dedicated feedback from agreed AB members.
4 (2026-2027)	<i>Treatises on Animals</i> <i>Parva Naturalia</i> <i>Meteorologica</i>	Submit proposals for 3 monographs to publisher and 3 x 4-monthly newsletters to AB. Organise AB meeting.	July 2027 virtual AB meeting to review results; dedicated feedback from agreed AB members.
5 (2027-2028)		Writing Up of Outputs. Conference Planning. July 2028: Project wind-down; debrief; plans for completing outputs/ website maintenance.	April 2028 International Conference, 'Aristotle's Prose Styles', with papers delivered by AB members, in Durham.

Methodological Risks and Risk Management

The project's scope may require modification. The CT plans to read c. 1000 'Bekker' pages during the project, at a rate of about 1 an hour; the precise speed of progress will not be determined until the reading sessions have become established in the first few weeks. The risk is mitigated by (i) the extended reading of Aristotle which the PI, Co-I and PDRAs have all already achieved; (ii) the catalogue of promising passages which the PI has already identified across the corpus; she will continuously revise the schedule according to progress; (iii) the sharing of the reading across the CT; each will focus on single aspects of Aristotle's style; (iv) the PI's timely completion of all promised outputs, however ambitious, on all previous research projects; (v) the substantial weekly hours the PDRAs (100%) and the PI (60%) will dedicate to the project; (vi) the control of CT travel (only 2 'away' conferences in 5 years) and other distractions from the single-minded pursuit of aims.

The second risk is the continuing threat to travel posed by pandemics. While even the final conference with the AB members could if necessary be hosted on a virtual platform, lockdown of libraries could impede access to bibliography. This risk will be ameliorated by flexible timetabling so that collection and scanning of bibliographical items are prioritised by the whole team whenever libraries re-open.

¹ Ana Kotarcic (2020) *Aristotle on Language and Style: The Concept of Lexis* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 2020).

² Lewis Campbell (ed.) *The Sophistes and Politicus of Plato* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867), especially xix-xlv; Wincenty Lutosławski, *The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic With an Account of Plato's Style and of the Chronology of his Writings* (London: Longman's, Green & Co., 1905), especially 64-193.

³ H. Thesleff, *Studies in the Styles of Plato* (Helsinki: Societas philosophica Fennica, 1967); Rutherford, *The Art of Plato* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U.P., 1995).

⁴ *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia* (1367) ed. Enrico Fenzi (Milan: Mursia, 1999) 266.

⁵ Eugenio Refini (2020) *The Vernacular Aristotle: Translation as Reception in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (Cambridge: CUP, 2020) 105.

⁶ Christopher Rowe, 'Aristotle's other Ethics: some recent translations of the *Eudemian Ethics*', *Polis* 32 (2015) 213–234 at p.214.

⁷ A. Long, 'Aristotle', in P. Easterling & B. Knox (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 1985) 527-540.

⁸ E.g. J. Barnes, M. Schofield & R. Sorabji, *Aristotle: A Selective Bibliography* (Oxford: OUP, 1977).

⁹ A. Kenny, 'The stylometric study of the Aristotelian writings' (1973) and 'A stylometric comparison between five disputed works and the remainder of the Aristotelian corpus' (1983), both reprinted in his *Essays on the Aristotelian Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001) 127-49 and 150–170; *The Computation of Style* (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982), especially 111-116.

¹⁰ Ralf Lengen, *Form and Function of Aristotelian Pragmatism: Communication with the Recipient* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002).

¹¹ Richard Graff, 'Reading and the "written style" in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 31 (2001) 19-44; Harry Lesser, 'Style and pedagogy in Plato's and Aristotle's philosophy', *Philosophy* 57 (1982) 388-94.

¹² Daniel F. Melia, 'Orality and Aristotle: aesthetics and methods', in *Oral Performance and Its Context, (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, vol. V)*, ed. C.J. Mackie (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004) 117-28.

¹³ W.G. Rutherford (ed.) *The New Phrynichus* (London: Macmillan, 1881) 366 and 306.

¹⁴ D.B. Durham, *The Vocabulary of Menander Considered in Its Relation to the Koine* (PhD. Diss. Princeton, 1913).

¹⁵ T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Menander* (Manchester: Manchester U.P., 1950) 198-201; Valeria Cinaglia, *Aristotle and Menander on the Ethics of Understanding* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

¹⁶ G. Kennedy, 'The evolution of a theory of artistic prose' in G. Kennedy (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990) 184-199.

¹⁷ Trans. S. Marc Cohen & Gareth B. Matthews, *Ammonius: On Aristotle Categories* (Ithaca N.Y. & London: Cornell U.P., 1992) 15, from the edition *Ammonii in Categoriais* ed. A. Busse (Berlin: Reimer, 1895) 7.

¹⁸ *Consolation to Apollonius = Moralia* 115c-e; see the analysis of Edith Hall, 'Aristotle's lost works for the public & the politics of academic form', in P. Vasunia (ed.) *The Politics of Form in Ancient Greek Literature* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2021).

¹⁹ Aristotle's younger friend and colleague Theophrastus, who wrote a treatise on delivery, also wrote a *Περὶ παροιμιῶν, On Proverbs*. Others who wrote on proverbs included Aristotle's student, the Peripatetic Clearchus of Soli in Cyprus.

²⁰ Olof Gigon, 'Cicero und Aristoteles', *Hermes*, 87 (1959) 143-162.

²¹ E.g. J.O. Urmson, in a 1978 Oxford lecture heard by the PI; his account of the difficulties presented by the way *NE* is written, while also insisting that it certainly bears all the hallmarks of having been written by Aristotle himself in his distinctive style, has fundamentally informed this project: *Aristotle's Ethics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988) 4-8.

²² James Cross, *Hippocratic Oratory: The Poetics of Early Greek Medical Prose* (London: Routledge, 2017).

²³ A.S. Osley, 'Greek biography before Plutarch', *Greece & Rome*, 15 (1946) 7-20 at pp.15 and 12.

²⁴ Alexander Grant, *Aristotle's Ethics*, vol. I, 3rd ed. (London: Spottiswood and Co., 1879) 29.

²⁵ For large bibliography and incisive critique of the Aristotelian 'analysts', see William Robert Wians (ed.) *Aristotle's Philosophical Development: Problems and Prospects* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996).

²⁶ Strabo 13.1.54. See further Edith Hall, 'Aristotle's lost works for the public & the politics of academic form', in P. Vasunia (ed.) *The Politics of Form in Ancient Greek Literature* (London: I.B. Tauris, forthcoming 2021). On the composition of Aristotle's corpus more generally, see M. Hatzimichali, 'The texts

- of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC', in M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC: New Directions for Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) 1-27.
- ²⁷ I. Kupreeva, 'Themistius', in L.P. Gerson (ed) *Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 2010) 397-417; Edith Hall, 'Aristotle's lost works for the public and the politics of academic form', in P. Vasunia (ed.) *The Politics of Form in Greek Literature* (London: Bloomsbury, 2021).
- ²⁸ W. J. Verdenius, 'The nature of Aristotle's scholarly writings', in J. Wiesner, *Aristoteles - Werk Und Wirkung*, Band I, *Aristoteles Und Seine Schule* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985) 12-21.
- ²⁹ Saara Lilja, *On the Style of the Earliest Greek Prose* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum, 1968).
- ³⁰ F. A. Wright, *A History of Later Greek Literature* (London 1932) 9: 'Demosthenes and Aristotle, the last survivors of the classical age.'
- ³¹ E. Nordern, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1898) 125-6.
- ³² A.W. de Groot, *A Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm*, vol. 1 (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1919). G.O. Hutchinson briefly considers a few examples from Aristotle in *Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose* (Oxford: OUP, 2018) 31.
- ³³ J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952); Neil O'Sullivan, *Alcidamas, Aristophanes and the Beginnings of Greek Stylistic Theory*. (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1992).
- ³⁴ K. Dover (1997) *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) ch. 7.
- ³⁵ Albert Wifstrand, *Epochs and Styles* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 93.
- ³⁶ Jerker Blomqvist, 'Juxtaposed τε καί in post-classical prose', *Hermes*, 102 (1974) 170-178.
- ³⁷ C. Natali, 'Rhetorical & scientific aspects of the "Nicomachean Ethics"', *Phronesis*, 52 (2007) 364-381.
- ³⁸ See E. Hall, 'Is there a polis in Aristotle's *Poetics*?', in M.S. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic*, 294-309 (Oxford: O.U.P., 1995).
- ³⁹ See S. Halliwell, 'Style and sense in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* Book III', *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 47 (1993) 50-69.
- ⁴⁰ L. Spengel, *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1867). H. Yunis, 'Paraphrase, exegesis, common sense: Edward Meredith Cope's commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', in *Commenting on Aristotle's Rhetoric, from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. F. Woerther (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2018) 231-45, at pp.237-40
- ⁴¹ E. M. Cope, *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric* (London, Macmillan and Co., 1867) vii, a principle followed throughout his edition *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (Cambridge, CUP, 1877).
- ⁴² H. Yunis, 'Paraphrase, exegesis, common sense: Edward Meredith Cope's commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', in *Commenting on Aristotle's Rhetoric, from Antiquity to the Present*, edited by F. Woerther (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2018) 231-45, at pp.237-40
- ⁴³ William Grimaldi, *Aristotle. Rhetoric I: A Commentary* (New York: Fordham U.P., 1980) and Aristotle, *Rhetoric II: A Commentary* (New York: Fordham U.P., 1988).
- ⁴⁴ C. Rapp, *Aristoteles: Rhetorik* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002) vol. I, 9. J.W. Burkett's 2011 thesis *Aristotle, Rhetoric III: a Commentary* (Texas Christian University) partially summarises previous comments but ignores Aristotle's own practice except in the *Rhetoric* itself.
- ⁴⁵ See e.g. G. A. Kennedy, *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (New York & Oxford: OUP, 2007) xi.
- ⁴⁶ See D. C. Innes, 'Theophrastus and the theory of style', in *Theophrastus of Eresus: On His life and Work*, ed. by W. W. Fortenbaugh, P. M. Huby, and A. A. Long, (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers U.P., 1985) 251-67, at p.255, and C. Rapp, *Aristoteles: Rhetorik* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002) vol. I, 368.
- ⁴⁷ Andrew Bailey, *First Philosophy* vol. 1 (Calgary: Broadview Press, 2004) 38.
- ⁴⁸ G.M.A. Grube, 'Theophrastus as a Literary Critic', *TAPA* 83 (1952) 172-183 at p.176.
- ⁴⁹ M. Asper, 'Science writing and its settings: some ancient Greek modes'. (Max-Planck-Institute for History of Science, Preprint No. 495, 2019).
- ⁵⁰ R. Eucken, *De Aristotelis dicendi ratione* (Göttingen: Hofer, 1866); Hermann Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (revised edition, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1961).
- ⁵¹ Irene de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam: Grüner (2nd rev. ed. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2004); *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*.

Cambridge: CUP, 2001); ‘A narratological commentary on the *Odyssey*: principles and problems’, in R.K. Gibson and C.S. Kraus (eds.) *The Classical Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 49-66; *Narratology & Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: O.U.P., 2014). The investigation of the ‘difference’ between the author and the ‘narrator’; focalisation from different perspectives can help analyse where Aristotle is moving between ‘I’ and ‘we’ (see Alessandro Vatri, ‘The readerly ‘us’: ancient Greek criticism and the creation of textual communities’, forthcoming in Proceedings of Jagellonian University/UCL Conference *Linguistic Representations of Identity in Rhetoric Ancient and Modern*, Kraków 2017), presenting the opinions of others, or imagining an interlocutor’s potential: objection or request for further illustration or proof. Analysis of narratology’s emphasis on the category of time can help us appreciate Aristotle’s narratives (for example, the account of the man who hired a citharode in *NE* IX.1164a, or ‘Heraclitus and the Oven’ in *PA* 645a15–30, on the latter of which see John Poulakos & Nathan Crick, ‘There is beauty here, too: Aristotle’s rhetoric for science’, *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 45 (2012) 295-311); it can aid exploration of the use of tenses and extensive use of conditionals in past, present and future time (see Max Jammer, *Concepts of Simultaneity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006) 38). It can also illuminate Aristotle’s characterisation of his and his audience’s ‘here-and-now’ and place in history and those of other intellectuals he discusses (this varies between past and present tenses); while references to the spaces within which we are encouraged to imagine the treatises being written and delivered, Aristotle is often silent, creating an imagine arena for ‘pure ratiocination’, but there are indications of teaching rooms and equipment, of Lyceum and *agora* in Athens, of journeys to Thebes and Megara; the cartography of Aristotle’s world has never been addressed, even though it contains strong clues to his life experience (descriptions of the fauna of Lesbos) as well as mysterious and possibly telling silences (on Pella and Mieza, for example).

⁵² A. Vatri and Barbara McGillivray, ‘The Diorisis Ancient Greek Corpus: linguistics and literature’, *Research Data Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences* (2018) 1-11.

⁵³ *Sara Newman, *Aristotle and Style* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2005); *E. Schütrumpf, *The Earliest Translations of Aristotle’s Politics and the Creation of Political Terminology* (Morphomata Lectures Cologne, Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2014) 71; see also his ‘Form und Stil aristotelischer Pragmatien’ now in E. Schütrumpf, *Praxis und Lexis: ausgewählte Schriften zur Philosophie von Handeln und Reden in der klassischen Antike* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2009) 146–159.

⁵⁴ See <http://www.protrepticus.info/>.

⁵⁵ *Reviel Netz, ‘On the Aristotelian paragraph’, *PCPS* 47 (2001) 211-232.

⁵⁶ *Sabine Föllinger, ‘Aristotle’s biological works as scientific literature’, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 43 (2012) 237–244; ‘Literarische Strategien bei Aristoteles’, in I. Männlein-Robert, W. Rother, S. Schron and C. Tornau (eds.) *Philosophus Orator* (Basel: Schwabe, 2016) 127-44; ‘Aristoteles’ Pragmatien als Literatur’, in S.T. Farrington (ed.) *Enthousiasmos: Essays in Ancient Philosophy, History and Literature* (Baden-Baden: Academia, 2019) 68-78.

⁵⁷ *Robert Mayhew, *Aristotle’s Lost Homeric Problems: Textual Studies* (Oxford: O.U.P, 2019).

⁵⁸ *Henry Mendell, ‘Making sense of Aristotelian demonstration’, in C.C.W. Taylor, *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 16 (1998) 161-226.

⁵⁹ E.g. M. Asper ‘Peripatetic forms of writing. A systems-theory approach’, in *Phaenias of Eresus. Text, Translation, and Discussion*, ed. Oliver Hellmann & David Mirhady, 407–432 (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2015), *Griechische Wissenschaftstexte. Formen, Funktionen, Differenzierungsgeschichten* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2007) and ‘Science writing and its settings: some ancient Greek modes’ (Max-Planck-Institute for History of Science, Preprint No. 495, 2019); P. van der Eijk, ‘Towards a rhetoric of ancient scientific discourse: some formal characteristics of Greek medical and philosophical texts (Hippocratic Corpus, Aristotle)’, in: E.J. Bakker (ed.) *Grammar as Interpretation. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (=Mnemosyne Supplement 171, Leiden: Brill, 1997) 77–129; ‘Arrangement and exploratory discourse in the *Parva Naturalia*’, in R. Polansky, W. Wians (eds.) *Reading Aristotle* (Leiden: Brill, 2017) 181–214; the introduction to Marco Formisano and Philip van der Eijk (eds.) *Knowledge, Text and Practice in Ancient Technical Writing* (Cambridge: CUP, 2017) 1-11; *F. Schironi, ‘Technical languages: science and

medicine’, in E.J. Bakker, *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2010) 338-353.

⁶⁰ *M. Coxhead, ‘A close examination of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Mechanical Problems*: the homology between mechanics and poetry as *technē*’, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 43 (2012) 300-306.

⁶¹ Pierre Chiron, ‘Les côla en rhétorique: respiration, sens, esthétique’, *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoires anciennes*, 84 (2003) 31-50.

⁶² Pierre Chiron, ‘La période chez Aristote’ in *Théories de la phrase et de la proposition de Platon à Averroès*, ed. P. Büttgen, S. Diebler, M. Rashed (Paris: Editions Rue d’Ulm, 1999) 103-130; Anouk Waber, *Aristote écrivain: la rhétorique au service de la pensée scientifique* (PhD Diss. Fribourg en Suisse, 2018).

⁶³ E.g. Brink Karl Oskar, *Stil und Form der pseudo-Aristotelischen Magna Moralia* (Berlin: Karl Oskar, 1933).

⁶⁴ Deborah Hawhee, ‘Agonism and aretê’, *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 35 (2002) 185-207

⁶⁵ Earl R. Anderson, ‘Plato’s *Lesser Hippias*: a neglected document in sport history’, *Journal of Sport History* 8 (1981) 102-110; Heather Reid, ‘Athletic beauty as mimēsis of virtue: the case of the beautiful boxer’, in *Looking at Beauty: to Kalon in Western Greece*, ed. Heather L. Reid and Tony Leyh (Parnassos Press/ Fonte Aretusa, 2019) 77-91.

⁶⁶ See further A. Vatri, ‘Early dactylic prose in the history of Greek prose rhythm’, in O. Tribulato and E. Passa (eds.), *The Paths of Greek: At the Crossroads Between Literature, Linguistics and Epigraphy* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 175–95.

⁶⁷ Educated at the University of Southern California (Ph.D.), the University of Chicago (A.M.), and the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (B.A.), Prof. Horky previously held postdoctoral fellowships at Harvard University’s Center for Hellenic Studies (2010-11), and Stanford University (2007-10). He has also held the Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship at the National Humanities Center (2016) and been a distinguished visitor at the Collaborative Program in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, University of Toronto (2016). He is on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (UK), *Methexis: International Journal for Ancient Philosophy* (Netherlands/Italy), and *Archai: Revista de Estudos sobre as Origens do Pensamento Ocidental* (Brazil). He is also co-editor of the *Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics Series*, published by Cambridge University Press, and a member of the journals editorial board for the Classical Association (UK). His publications include a monograph, *Plato and Pythagoreanism* (Oxford University Press, 2013; paperback edition, 2016), on the importance of mathematical Pythagoreanism for the development of Plato’s philosophy, and an edited volume, *Cosmos in the Ancient World* (Cambridge University Press, 2019), which investigates notions of cosmic order, balance, and symmetry in ancient physics, politics, ethics, poetics, and aesthetics, from Pythagoras to Nonnus. His current research includes a commentary on selected passages of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Eudemian Ethics* and *Protrepticus*.

⁶⁸ The styles of Plato distinguished by Holgar Thesleff in *Studies in the Styles of Plato* (Helsinki: Societas philosophica Fennica. 1967) provide a suggestive starting-point for our enquiry, but will require extensive modification and supplementation to account for Aristotle’s very different and more diverse *oeuvre*: Thesleff’s classifications include ‘colloquial’, ‘semi-literary conversational’, ‘rhetorical’, ‘pathetic or affected’, ‘intellectual’, ‘mythic-narrative’, ‘historical’, ‘ceremonious’, ‘legal’, and stylistic ‘onkos or “impressiveness”’.

⁶⁹ An outstanding methodological summary of tools and concepts for analysing ancient prose style in relation to thought is C. Whitton (2013, ed.) *Pliny the Younger: Epistles, Book II* (Cambridge: C.U.P.), ‘Introduction’, 20-8.

⁷⁰ James G. Lennox, ‘Aristotle on Norms of Inquiry’, *HOPOS: The Journal of the International Society for the History of Philosophy of Science* 1 (2011), 23-46 at p. 28.

⁷¹ Pavel Gregoric, ‘The Heraclitus Anecdote: *De Partibus Animalium* I. 5.645a17-23’, *Ancient Philosophy* 21 (2001) 1-13.

⁷² *Poet.* 1457b1–1457b32, 1458a18–1459a14; *Rhet.* III.1406b4–1407a18, III.1411a1–1413b1.

⁷³ *Phys.* II.192b. There was an intimate connection in ancient Greek thought between intellectual enquiry and the idea of the journey. This association stretches far back in time beyond Aristotle to the opening of the

Homeric *Odyssey*, where Odysseus' wanderings allow him to visit the lands of many different peoples 'and learn about their minds.' But Aristotle develops the metaphor across his *oeuvre*.

⁷⁴ A.T. Zanker, *Metaphor in Homer: Time, Speech, and Thought* (Cambridge: C.U.P. 2019) 33.

⁷⁵ See e.g. the section in Denise Marie Lasky, *An Examination of the Metaphorical use of Skopos or "Target" in the Philosophical Works of Plato and Aristotle through a Study of Archery Imagery in the Greek Literary Tradition* (Diss. University of Chicago, 1994) which addresses *skopos*, or 'archery target' in *NE*, and the few passages of poetry in *Politics* discussed by Thornton Lockwood 'Is there a Poetics in the *Politics*?' in *Pierre Destrée, Malcolm Heath and Dana Munteanu (eds.) *The Poetics in its Aristotelian Context*, 129-44 (London: Routledge, 2020); Sean Coughlin, *Method and Metaphor in Aristotle's Science of Nature* (Diss. University of Western Ontario, 2013), parts of which are to be published in 'Aristotle on Art and Nature: Some Antecedents', in Christian Barth, Chiara Ferella, and Daniel Werning (eds.) *Metaphors in Ancient Cultures* (Berlin: Edition Topoi, forthcoming).

⁷⁶ W. Dittenberger (ed.) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd edition (Leipzig: Hirzelium, 1915) III.275.

⁷⁷ Iamblichus, *Protr.* 52. 16-54.5 in E. Pistelli (ed.) *Iamblichus; Protrepticus* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888).

⁷⁸ S. Coughlin, *Method and Metaphor in Aristotle's Science of Nature* (Diss. University of Western Ontario, 2013), parts of which are to be published in 'Aristotle on art and nature: some antecedents', in C. Barth, C. Ferella, and D. Werning (eds.) *Metaphors in Ancient Cultures* (Berlin: Edition Topoi, forthcoming).

⁷⁹ *Meteorologica* 390a13, *Phys.* II.200a12, *EE* 1242a13.

⁸⁰ *Carlo Natali, *Aristotle, His Life and School* (rev. ed., Princeton, NJ: Princeton U.P., 2013) 96-7.

⁸¹ *S. Halliwell, 'The subjection of muthos to logos: Plato's citations of the poets', *CQ* 50 (2000) 94-112, at p.94.

⁸² *Robert Mayhew, *Aristotle's Lost Homeric Problems: Textual Studies* (Oxford: O.U.P., 2019).

⁸³ W.S. Hinman, *Literary Allusion and Quotation in the Rhetoric, Poetics and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. New York: Staten Island, 1935) and D. Moraitou, *Die Ausserungen des Aristoteles uber Dichter und Dichtung ausserhalb der Poetik* (Stuttgart: de Gruyter, 1994) 130-42 at pp. 120-4.

⁸⁴ So e.g. the lists in Manuel Sanz Morales, *The Homer of Aristotle: study of the Homeric text transmitted by Aristotle*, Diss. Autonomous University of Madrid. Department of Classical Philology. 1991.

⁸⁵ S. Halliwell, 'The subjection of muthos to logos: Plato's citations of the poets', *CQ* 50 (2000) 94-112.

⁸⁶ Cf. Victor Castellani, 'Drama and Aristotle', in James Redmond (ed.) *Drama and Philosophy = Key Themes in Drama* 12, 21-36 (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1990).

⁸⁷ W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1923) 348-9; J. Hanink, *Lycurgan Athens and the Making of Classical Tragedy* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 2014) 191-3. The ancient source for Lycurgus' theatre reforms is [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 841f.

⁸⁸ Cf. G. A. Kennedy, *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (New York/Oxford, 2007) 21.

⁸⁹ See e.g. R. Graff, 'Prose versus poetry in early Greek theories of style', *Rhetorica* 23 (2005) 303-35.

⁹⁰ See A. Vatri, 'The nature and perception of Attic prose rhythm', *Classical Philology* 115 (2020) 467-85.

⁹¹ *E. Schütrumpf, *The Earliest Translations of Aristotle's Politics and the Creation of Political Terminology (Morphomata Lectures Cologne, Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2014) 7.*

⁹² See Diana Quarantotto, 'Aristotle's problemata-style and aural textuality', in R. Polansky & W. Wians (eds.) *Reading Aristotle* (Leiden: Brill, 2017) 97-126.

⁹³ For some possibilities, see G.O. Hutchinson on Aristotle, in *Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose* (Oxford: OUP, 2018) 31.

⁹⁴ See e.g. J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.) *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), although some of the possibilities are tangentially suggested by S. Halliwell's chapter in that volume, 'The theory and practice of narrative in Plato' (15-41).

⁹⁵ On the philosophical and scientific underpinning of Aristotle's understanding of the present, see Sarah Waterlow, 'Aristotle's now', *Philosophical Quarterly* 34 (1984) 104-128

⁹⁶ See Alessandro Vatri, 'The readerly 'us': ancient Greek criticism and the creation of textual communities', forthcoming in Proceedings of Jagellonian University/UCL Conference *Linguistic Representations of Identity in Rhetoric Ancient and Modern* held in Kraków in 2017.

- ⁹⁷ See *S. Föllinger, ‘Mündlichkeit in der Schriftlichkeit als Ausdruck wissenschaftlicher Methode bei Aristoteles’, in *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur*, edited by W. Kullmann and J. Althoff (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1993), 263-80; Leonardo Tarán and Dimitri Gutas (eds.) *Aristotle: Poetics. Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2012) 21-2.
- ⁹⁸ L. Spengel, *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica* (Leipzig, 1867) 379.
- ⁹⁹ E. M. Cope, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (Cambridge: CUP, 1877), vol. III, 64-5, cf. also his *An Introduction to Aristotle’s Rhetoric* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1867) 295.
- ¹⁰⁰ In W. D. Ross (ed.) *Rhetorica, Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, De Poetica* [=The Works of Aristotle, vol. XI] (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946) 176.
- ¹⁰¹ G. A. Kennedy, *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (New York & Oxford: OUP, 2007) 224.
- ¹⁰² C. Rapp, *Aristoteles: Rhetorik* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002) vol. II, 858-9.
- ¹⁰³ See A. Vatri, ‘Asyndeton, immersion, and hypokrisis in ancient Greek rhetoric’, in *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece*, ed. J. Grethlein, L. Huitink, and A. Tagliabue (Oxford: OUP, 2020) 210-32, at p. 218.
- ¹⁰⁴ For the language of the 4th-century writer Aeneas Tacticus see J. Vela Tejada, *Estudios sobre la lengua de la Poliorcetica de Eneas el tactico* (Zaragoza: Dept. Ciencias Antigüedad Univ. Zaragoza, 1991); for the language of Polybius, a rare large-corpus Hellenistic prose writer, see J. A. de Foucault, *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1972) and D. Langslow, ‘The language of Polybius since Foucault and Dubuisson’ in C. Smith / L. M. Yarrow (edd.) *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius* (Oxford: OUP, 2012) 86-110.
- ¹⁰⁵ The whole of the Aristotelian corpus (c. 890,000 words) is cited less in *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* by Raphael Kühner and Bernhard Gerth than Demosthenes’ *First Olynthiac* (c. 1,800 words) according to W. M. Calder’s *Index locorum zu Kühner-Gerth* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965). There are more references to Epicharmus, of whom we have not a single complete extant play, than to Aristotle in *Griechische Grammatik* by E. Schwyzer & A. Debrunner (Munich: Beck, 1966-1971) according to *Griechische Grammatik: Stellenregister* by F. Radt & S. Radt (Munich: Beck, 1971).
- ¹⁰⁶ E.g. in C. George, *Expressions of Time in Ancient Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 2014) and P. Bortone, *Greek Prepositions* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010), which nevertheless provide crucial context for the study of Aristotle’s language.
- ¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, F. Blass, A. Debrunner & C. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (14th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976) is of course an important reference work for late Greek, as are the grammars of the language of documentary papyri by E. Mayser (various edd., 1906-1970) and F. T. Gignac (1976-1981).
- ¹⁰⁸ Vit Bubeník, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1989); B. Cartlidge, *The Language of Menander Comicus and Its Relation to the Koinē* (Diss. Oxon. 2014).
- ¹⁰⁹ Low register: K. Bentein, *Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek* (Oxford: OUP, 2016) 148.
- ¹¹⁰ For the development of such a test in the case of anonymous papyri, see B. Cartlidge, ‘Heteroclis in Menander and the authorship of *P. Ant. 15*’, *ZPE* 199 (2016) 17-24.
- ¹¹¹ For whom we will use the most recent editions and commentaries identified in Appendix B to Han Baltussen’s excellent study *The Peripatetics: Aristotle’s Heirs 322 BCE-200CE*, 171-3 (London: Routledge, 2016).
- ¹¹² The philosophical implications of this have already been explored, see e.g. D. J. Allan, ‘Quasi-mathematical method in the *Eudemian Ethics*’, in S. Mansion (ed.) *Aristote et les problèmes de méthode* (Louvain: Peeters, 1961) 303-318.
- ¹¹³ See A. Willi, *The Languages of Aristophanes* (Oxford: OUP, 2003) 97-156.

¹¹⁴ A lexical approach, as undertaken e.g. by P. Pellegrin, *Le vocabulaire d'Aristote* (Paris: Ellipses Editions, 2009) is unable to capture the systematic linguistic structures governing the technical lexicon. Contrast the studies of medical Greek in I. Boehm & N. Rousseau (eds.) *L'expressivité du lexique médical en Grèce et à Rome* (Paris: Sorbonne Université Presses, 2014) illustrating both individual case studies as well as broader patterns of technical registers

¹¹⁵ See K. Chatzopoulou, *Negation and Nonveridicality in the History of Greek* (Oxford: OUP, 2019). Similarly fruitful areas of the language are those particles and prepositions which have already been studied for Aristotle; see P. T. Stevens (1936) 'Aristotle and the *koinē*—notes on the prepositions', *Classical Quarterly* 36, 204-217.

¹¹⁶ Cartlidge (2014) traced its origin to a contracted variety of the emphatic negative οὐδὲ ἓν 'not even one' found in comedy. This collocation is in fact the original starting-point for οὐδέν, but was re-created at a later stage of the language; the hypothesis is that this, secondary οὐδὲ ἓν, when contracted, produced a different outcome in Hellenistic Greek. A thorough investigation of this feature in Aristotle on syntactic lines might be able to produce criteria for the distribution of the forms with *th*.

¹¹⁷ See, e.g., the collected essays in A. Alberti and R.W. Sharples (eds) *Aspasius: the Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1999); M. Griffin, *Aristotle's Categories in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); R. Chiaradonna and M. Rashed, *Boéthos de Sidon – Exégète d'Aristote et philosophe* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2020).

¹¹⁸ This is despite the fact that the early commentators were especially interested in Aristotle's style. For example, the 2nd century CE commentator Adrastus is attested a work in six books (probably) entitled *On questions of Fact and of Style in Theophrastus' On Characters and in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (cf. J. Barnes, 'An Introduction to Aspasius', in A. Alberti and R.W. Sharples (eds) *Aspasius: the Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1999), 1-50, at 16). There is no standalone treatment of the reception of Aristotle's style in the collected essays of A. Falcon (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristotle* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

¹¹⁹ J. Barnes, 'An Introduction to Aspasius', in A. Alberti and R.W. Sharples (eds) *Aspasius: the Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1999), pp. 1-50, at 24.

¹²⁰ Translation from D. Frede, 'Alexander of Aphrodisias', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta, ed.),

URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/alexander-aphrodisias/>.

¹²¹ Her former PDRAs include Dr Henry Stead (now Permanent Lecturer, St. Andrews); Dr Lucy Jackson (Permanent Lecturer, Durham); Dr Arlene Holmes-Henderson (Senior Research Fellow, KCL); Dr Amanda Wrigley (Research Fellow, University of Reading) and Prof. Stephe Harrop (Liverpool Hope University).; her former research students include Prof. Emma Cole at Bristol (Classics and Liberal Arts) and Prof. Matthew Wright at Exeter; Dr Peter Swallow (Research Fellow, KCL); Dr Oliver Baldwin (British Academy Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, University of Reading); Dr Lottie Parkyn (Head of Research Programmes, Notre Dame University, London); Dr Kim Shahabudin (Teaching Fellow, University of Reading); Dr Emma Bridges (Permanent Lecturer, Open University); Dr Rosie Wyles (Senior Lecturer, Kent University); Dr Justine McConnell (Senior Lecturer, KCL); Dr Daniel Goad (Research Consultant, LSE); Dr Matthew Shipton (Head of Comms., City Uni, London); Dr Anactoria Clarke (Curriculum Innovator at the Open University); three are internationally acclaimed theatre directors and part-time academic teachers (Drs. Helen Eastman, Leonidas Papadopoulos, Magdalena Zira)..

¹²² Edith Hall, *Aristotle's Way* (London & New York: Penguin/Random House, 2018); 'Citizens but second-class: women in Aristotle's *Politics*', in *Patriarchal Moments* ed. Cesare Cuttica and Gaby Mahlberg, 35-42 (London: Bloomsbury, 2016); 'Aristotle's theory of katharsis in its historical and social contexts', in E. Fischer-Lichte & Benjamin Wihstutz (eds.) *Transformative Aesthetics*, 26-47 (London: Routledge, 2017); "'Master of those who know": Aristotle as role model for the twenty-first-century academician', *European Review* 25, 3-19;

¹²³ Hall, E. (2021a) 'Actors and theatre in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and beyond', in G. Moretti and Biagio Santorelli (eds.) *Atti Il Teatro dell'Oratoria* (=Maia suppl. 2021); 'Aristotle's lost works for the public and

the politics of academic form', in P. Vasunia (ed.) *The Politics of Form in Greek Literature* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2021).