30.10.4: *apertus* (cf. n. 346); 31.1.4: *uaga aquila* (cf. n. 349); 31.2.17: *uiuendi sed etiam armaturam* (at least the best suggestion yet); 31.3.5: *a Greuthungorum ualle*; 31.7.3: *locis in solis* (retaining V's *repperiens* with *fames*) (cf. n. 448); 31.7.8: *cruditati* (cf. n. 457); 31.10.21: *et adrogantius custodiret* (cf. n. 492); 31.12.8: *exercuere*; 31.16.2: *proditum*. In the notorious crux at 29.4.1 S. reads *in regendo uerius milite barbaris quam pellendis*. This is admittedly close to V, but the order is harsh and surely what is required is a choice of ways of dealing with the barbarians. Simplest might be to substitute *regendis* for *regendo* in S.'s text.

The notes are in general concisely informative on questions of prosopography, topography, and imperial administration; they sometimes also explain and attempt to justify S.'s readings. AM's language and thought attract much less attention. The treatment of Theodosius' campaign against Firmus is somewhat strange. The introduction briefly acknowledges the links with Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum* and remarks on the hollowness of Theodosius' success, yet the notes repeatedly present as strained and desperate panegyric precisely those passages where AM is most concerned subtly to undermine the official version of Theodosius' achievement. (Cf. further *Histos* 1 [1997]: www.dur.ac.uk/classics/histos.) The treatment of Sapor's embassy concerning Armenia (30.2.1ff.) is also inadequate. (Cf. *Chiron* 26 [1996], 281ff.) But these are minor blemishes which do not detract from the value of a work which leaves all who study AM deeply indebted to S. and his fellow editors.

University of Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER

ORALITY

E. A. MACKAY (ed.): *Signs of Orality. The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 188.) Pp. x + 261, 16 pls, 7 figs. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased, $85.50. ISBN: 90-04-11273-1.

This book is an exceptionally important collection of papers originally delivered at a conference entitled 'Epos and Logos'. Its eleven challenging essays explore various aspects of 'orality' in Homer (Chapters I–V) and the influence of the oral tradition on other genres such as vase-painting and inscriptions (Chapters VI–VII), Greek and Roman oratory (Chapters VIII and XI), Platonic and later dialogues (Chapter IX), and Virgil's *Aeneid* (Chapter X). Many of them are ground-breaking and open up new approaches to Greek and Roman literature.

J. M. Foley's introduction provides a theoretical link for the whole volume. Chapter I by E. J. Bakker radically changes the perspective on the studies of 'oral poetry'. By asking the question, 'What do we mean by "oral" or "orality"?', he attempts to redefine the terms. First he points out that the contrast between 'oral' and 'literate' is not a clear-cut dichotomy, but a continuum in which different shades of orality and literacy can come in. On the one end of the continuum is oral composition in performance, and on the other is composition by writing. However, an orally composed text may be written down (writing in the sense of transcription) or a text composed by writing may be transmitted orally. Then he points out that the concept of 'oral' is a construct of our own literate perspective, denoting a lack of the literate conception of language which cannot exist without writing. In other words, before

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.58 Published online by Cambridge University Press

literacy, there were not only no literate poets but also no oral poets. Thus he tears down the myth of oral and written composition as mutually exclusive and diametrically opposite concepts. He observes that Homer's texts require oral performance in order to reach their full potential, but we do not know—nor does it matter—how they were composed.

This essay is followed by more specific studies of some aspects of orality in Homeric poetry. In Chapter II E. Minchin continues with her research into Homer aided by cognitive science. Chapter III, by S. A. Nimis, re-examines the implications of ring-composition, challenging the existing views which tend to see it as the indication of the poet's forward-planning over everything. Instead he argues that it is a result of the poet's backtracking, correcting himself or restating while composing. This view, however, does not seem to tie in easily with Chapter VI, by E. A. Mackay et al., who observe 'in Early Greece enclosure or ring composition is the fundamental and natural means of structuring paratactical sequences, whether verbal or visual', apparently taking ring-composition as a result of deliberate design, not of spontaneity. Chapter IV, by R. Scodel, competently examines Odysseus' reluctance to reveal his identity.

Chapter V, by W. Kullmann, offers an exciting and lucid analysis of how much historical memory could be found in Homer's poetry. By using a result of anthropological research that oral memory can survive only for eighty years (i.e. handed down from grandparents or great-grandparents), he concludes that Homeric epics cannot be purely oral. The application of such a study to Homer as well as the study's claim is controversial, but K.'s conclusion obviously has important implications for our perception of 'oral poetry' in general, and the creation and transmission of Homeric poetry in particular.

Chapters VII–XI examine the impact of writing on the still largely 'oral' society of ancient Greece and Rome, an area so far little explored. Each of these chapters is pioneering in its own way, but the star article to my eye is Chapter VII, by N. W. Slater (previously published in Italian translation in *Kleos* 2 [1997], 43–59). Slater speculates that vase inscriptions functioned as a trigger for oral activities at symposia, such as singing and discussion. (This incidentally reminds me of the Japanese tea-ceremony in which the designs and inscriptions on the tea cup are meant to trigger discussion.) Whether the hypothesis convinces or not, the fresh perspective provided by this article in urging us to see vase inscriptions as part of oral culture is an invaluable one.

Chapter VIII, by M. Gagarin, examines the differences in style of speeches written for oral performance and those written for reading. The first study of the sort, it underscores the 'fundamentally oral nature of Athenian law and legal procedure' (p. 176). Chapter IX, by H. Tarrant, examines how the genre of intellectual dialogue developed after Plato in the hands of Plutarch and Lucian.

Chapter X, on Virgil by M. Sale, puts Parry's most extreme claim, the theory of audience indifference to repeated traditional formulae, firmly behind us. By showing how Virgil mastered Homer's formulaic techniques and made them his own, this essay effectively detaches 'orality' from formulaic composition. Chapter XI, by E. Fantham on Pliny's *Panegyricus*, draws to our attention two separate levels of orality involved in the process of composition, i.e. the oral performance before a small circle of friends and more formal recitation, both of which aided the revision of the final, published text. Again the first study of this sort, this essay highlights different types and uses of orality within literate society.

This book's greatest contribution is in its radical challenge to the static definitions

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.58 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of oral and literate as mutually exclusive modes of creation. It is likely to have a far-reaching impact on the studies of 'oral' poetry as well as of 'written' texts.

The Open University NAOKO YAMAGATA

NEW MODEL RHETORIC

E. SCHIAPPA: *The Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory in Classical Greece*. Pp. x + 230. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999. Cased, $30. ISBN: 0-300-07590-1.

We have been here before with Thomas Cole's *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore, 1991), though it has to be said that Schiappa's version of what he calls 'the origins-of-*rhētorikē* thesis' is more nuanced and theoretically aware than that of Cole. With astonishing self-confidence, S. sets out to disprove or show flaws in no less than seventeen commonly held claims in the history and development of rhetorical theory. Some of these claims turn out to be made of straw or already past their sell-by date. For example, S. is right to challenge claim 14 that 'the Sophists were relativists who eschewed any positive notion of "truth" in favor of subjectivism', but there are few scholars or critics who would make such a sweeping, terminologically anachronistic, and vague generalization anyway. He is also right to question claim 11 that there was a commonly identified group of individuals in the fifth century known as the sophists, when such a claim involves the insistence that sophistry was an identifiable pre-Platonic school for which people like Hippias and Gorgias had membership cards, whilst Socrates' card had 'philosopher' on it. The problem is that few scholars would now make that claim in the first place.

So, the first difficulty with this book is that much of it seems intent on debunking a standard account of the history of rhetoric to which many classicists have never subscribed. Nevertheless, S. does sometimes find aspects of this account in certain canonical works, such as George Kennedy's *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton, 1994), and he can be forgiven for wanting to revise simplistic or outdated views, which have a habit of reproducing themselves.

For S. the most distorted and distorting element of the standard account is that rhetorical theory originated with the Sophists of the fifth century. He argues that the word *rhētorikē* was certainly not coined until the fourth century and probably first occurred in Plato's *Gorgias*. This is a well-worn area of controversy and S. does a good job in defending his view that Socrates' reference to 'so-called rhetoric' does not mean that the term was already well-known at the time when *Gorgias* was written. S. is not committed to arguing that the *Gorgias* coins the term but he does insist that it is not conceived before the beginning of the fourth century. One of his key arguments is that *rhētorikē* does not occur in *Clouds* or the *Dissoi Logoi*, where one would most expect to find it. The problem with this is that *rhētorikē* does not occur in places where one would expect to find it *after* the beginning of the fourth century either. There are plenty of occasions when fourth-century Athenian orators attack opponents for being sophists and clever speakers but they never invoke the term *rhētorikē*. As S. himself is happy to concede, *rhētorikē* is a term which is almost exclusively confined to the writings of Plato and Aristotle.

For S., this fact of fourth-century coinage has important consequences: the terms and problems constituting what we would normally call 'rhetorical theory' had not yet been formed in the era of the early sophists. By appealing to Kuhnian

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.58 Published online by Cambridge University Press