

XENOPHON: *Hiero the Tyrant and Other Treatises*. Translated by ROBIN WATERFIELD, with introductions and notes by PAUL CARTLEDGE. Penguin Books, London – New York 1997. ISBN 0-14-044682-6. xxxi, 248 pp. GBP 7.99 / USD 13.95.

Waterfield had previously published, together with H. Tredennick, the *Memoirs of Socrates* in 1990 in a volume entitled *Conversations of Socrates* in the same Penguin Classics. Now he presents a new translation of *Hiero, Agesilaus, Hipparchicus, De re equestri, Cynegeticus, and Poroi*. The six treatises are translated from Marchant's Oxford edition from 1920 (he would have had some more recent editions at his disposal, but neglecting them may not have caused any great harm); at the end of the volume the reader is offered some textual notes. Waterfield's translations seem to be – if a non-native speaker of English be permitted to judge – clear and accurate. The volume is opened by Paul Cartledge's succinct and well-written Introduction.

*Heikki Solin*

MELISSA S. LANE: *Method and Politics in Plato's Statesman*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1998. ISBN 0-521-58229-6. 229 pp. GBP 35.

Until quite recently, the interest in Plato's so-called late dialogues has been considerably weaker than in the dialogues considered earlier. In the latter, language, style and drama are often more elaborate, and thus they are more enjoyable to read as well as, sometimes, easier to understand. Even among the less entertaining late dialogues, the *Statesman* has sometimes been judged as exceptionally dull. With the new interest in the philosophical content of the late dialogues, several studies have shown that an assiduous inquiry into this neglected side of Plato has much to offer. Melissa Lane's book on the *Statesman* belongs to this significant new wave of study.

The aim of the author is to give an account of the *Statesman* in which the remarks on methodology are combined with the politics presented. The dialogue is not merely a discourse on the method of dialectic. In Lane's view, Plato is attempting to do something much more challenging. The *Euthydemus* raises the question of what could be the subject matter of political expertise. The *Republic* champions the view that rulers ought to base their rule on a pervasive understanding of the Good. The *Statesman* presses a question: What counts as political knowledge? *How* does the statesman rule? (275a.) The new emphasis is on the political. Does not a good ruler or politician need something more genuinely political and practical than philosophical understanding of the Good?

The answer Lane finds in the dialogue has two sides. Political expertise is partly knowledge of the relation between other forms of knowledge – i.e., the capacity to coordinate the work of different experts – partly knowledge of temporal demands of the right moment of action – i.e., *when* different expertise ought to be performed. With the last demand Plato brings an important dimension to the discussion: that of time.

The first part of the book argues that in the *Statesman* dialectic is complemented by a method of example. The different steps in the method of division seem to rely on the slippery notion of similarity. How to decide which similarities are relevant? This difficulty is displayed by the unsuccessful divisions of different kinds of shepherding in