with a graduate Greek class in the Antipodes and it was well received.
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This book is the mature reflection of a highly respected scholar in Graeco-Roman rhetoric. The author investigates the nature of rhetoric over a wide range of cultures (the primates, Australian Aborigine, African, Polynesian and Maori, North American Indian, Ancient Near Eastern, Ancient Chinese, Ancient Indian, and only finally Ancient Greek and Roman). This is in order to illuminate the subject by cross-cultural comparison. In particular the author searches these cultures for the equivalent of the main elements of rhetoric as defined by Aristotle and others. These elements include the five stages in the production of a speech: invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery; the three species of speech: judicial, deliberative and epideictic; and the use of ethos, pathos and logos as the means of persuasion.

The first surprise for the traditional classicist will be the very wide definition of 'rhetoric'. K seeks a place for rhetoric in 'nature', not just 'art', and finds that it is a form of mental and emotional energy that arises from the instinct for self-preservation and is therefore a conservative faculty.

Thus the primates and other animals: stags and birds. Here for the first time K demonstrates that broad knowledge of non-
classical fields which he has promised. Most educated people know something about the behaviour of primates. This focuses on their use of that mental and emotional energy defined as rhetoric. The question of whether their rhetoric is intentional is addressed. I confess to initial scepticism about the breadth of the definition, but the themes addressed in this chapter grow in acceptance as they are developed, particularly the idea that the 'natural' use of rhetoric is to reconcile the community or a particular opponent in the interests of self-preservation. Yet the use of rhetoric to acquire power and possessions is also noted.

In passing from animals to humans, K discusses various theories of the origins of human language (humorously: the bow-wow, pooh-pooh, ding-dong, yo-he-ho and la-la theories). He then suggests ways in which the influence of the rhetorical situation has been given insufficient attention in these theories.

K finds no classic rhetoric in the aboriginal cultures of Australia because of their lack of group gatherings (such as formal councils) where original speech was expected, but he does find examples of persuasion in their oral literature, which he defines as 'epideictic' because it reaffirms the beliefs of the community. He is brave to address living cultures like these, which are even now constructing their modern self-image. It would be interesting to hear their reaction to his analysis of their rhetoric.

The Maori of New Zealand, who have formal debates particularly on their marae, are also included in the analysis. Someone has not spelled them correctly ('Mauri' in the text [65] and index [235], 'Maori' in the bibliography [81]). I hope that what the author describes as 'the most aggressive and violent of native societies even before the arrival of the Westerners' can forgive that. (I like that even. Westerners did not always have the best of it after they arrived. Perhaps more rhetoric would have helped. But I digress). K puts Maori in a group of 'traditional' societies (also described as nonliterate, which is unfortunate if, as it seems, he is describing the modern version of
their culture), and these societies, generally speaking, use rhetoric to defuse conflict and achieve consensus; their best speakers are regarded as those who present the cultural unity of the people. K contrasts for the first time the feature of Graeco-Roman rhetoric that is almost unique: the use of votes to settle the outcome of a contentious debate. He says that traditional societies avoid this because it identifies winners and 'loosers' (sic! 65 has many typos; K deserves better). They also prefer to use veiled or formal speech, designed to soften the edge of confrontation.

Yet K draws attention to the changing nature of rhetoric in traditional societies as they become more open to change. I have an idea that if the bibliography went beyond Salmond in 1975, there would be changes to note in Maori rhetoric. Whether women should speak on the marae is a hot issue that may need to be resolved if consensus is to continue. But it is precisely on the marae that some women attempt to achieve change through the 'mental and emotional energy' that is rhetoric.

There is a great deal of useful human knowledge in this book. Eskimo have contests of song to replace physical violence. In the Philippines a 'go-between' first delivers the case for the opposition against the defendants, then for the defendants against the opposition. Ah, the infinite variety of mankind, but mostly (it is argued) in the cause of the prevention of more physical confrontation between parties with grievances.

The chapter on the Ancient Near East addresses the influence of writing on rhetoric. The analysis of exemplary texts continues. Ethos, pathos and logical argument all occur. Rhetorical debates prepared scribes in the schools in Mesopotamia. The Egyptian 'Instruction of Ptahhotep' may be the first rhetorical handbook, with its analysis of what one does 'If you meet a disputant in action' when he is first your superior, then your equal and then your inferior. Concern for ethos in the sense of reputation in a highly stratified society is high on the list of priorities.
The development of formal rules for rhetoric is noted in Ancient China. The culture again dictated what was necessary. 'All Chinese thinkers ... accepted an authoritarian society' so that rhetoric revolved around the emperor and his relations with his courtiers and generals and people. The Shu Ching attests again that the best speaker was the one who showed that 'the good of each one inhered within what was good for all'—but frank speech rather than veiled allusion was the order of the day. There are touches of Isocrates to Nicocles of Cyprus.

The final chapter is on Greece and Rome. Their rhetoric is unusual for its degree of contentiousness, the extreme development of judicial rhetoric and as a result, a rhetorical system of education of the young. This is particularly the case in the democracy of Athens. Their system gave the West the beginnings of its own rhetorical culture of confrontation (and flattery, which is its corollary). In Homer, Hesiod and Herodotus, the contention and its solution through quarrelsome rhetoric and majority voting is traced, as well as the effects of that solution. ‘The acceptance of majority decision, even a majority of one, has significant effect on rhetorical practice. If a speaker does not need to secure consensus, he need not try to conciliate the more extreme opponents, can largely ignore some of their concerns, and can concentrate on solidifying support with those already inclined to agree and winning over the doubtful. Vigorous, even personal, attack on opponents and their motives contributes to this end. Voting thus provided an answer to how to make a decision in a contentious society, but in the process polarized views and encouraged contentiousness’. The western use of the formal title in parliament indeed now loses its conciliatory effect beside the invective.

The reader may in conclusion be tempted to read the values of Graeco-Roman rhetoric as negative, and the traditional desire to reconcile as more positive and even correct, inasmuch as it is 'natural'. Yet the final chapters admit that contentiousness and love of argument, which have substantially replaced the ‘natural’ conciliatory function of rhetoric in the Graeco-Roman tradition,
have also been fundamental factors in the advance of knowledge and understanding in the West, through their challenge to traditional assumptions and beliefs. Conflict was perhaps a small price to pay for this.

The presentation of the argument is admirably clear throughout. Each culture group merits its own chapter. In the best rhetorical style also, each chapter begins with a survey of the culture addressed and ends with an epilogue, which, though inclining to repetitiousness, has the virtue of clarity. This is from the conclusion on China:

‘Deliberative speeches were ... delivered by rulers to their courts, armies and people, and individuals addressed speeches of advice to rulers and lesser officials. Some of these speeches are divided into a proemion, narration, proof and epilogue in the manner of Western oratory. The authority and ethos of the speaker was the most important means of persuasion ... but logical argument is employed, largely in the form of citation of examples or analogies. There is little use of pathos except in exhortations to the troops (sic). Rhetoric was conceptualized ... and terminology was created to describe features of invention and style, but speech was not studied as a separate discipline ... Standards of public address ... include politeness and restraint, but ... added a demand for frankness on the part of the speaker...’.

The book is not without humour. The first use of a visual aid, as a classicist is bound to demonstrate, comes from the Greek Aristagoras, who displayed an overhead transparency equivalent in order to explain to the Spartans where they must go to contend with the forces of the East.

This seems to me a brave book. It is courageous to essay into other cultures, some of them still living, and try to summarise their processes. There are bound to be omissions and descriptions that do not allow for sufficient complexity. Certain themes (conciliation v. confrontation) may be pushed too far. Nestor in
Iliad I steps between the confrontation of Agamemnon and Achilles and argues for reconciliation and unity against the Trojans. Isocrates’ panhellenic speeches aim to reconcile the Greeks in order to unite them against the Persians. And there will surely be more instances outside Graeco-Roman rhetoric of non-conciliatory stances. Yet K’s argument will stimulate interest in comparative rhetoric, as he hopes, and has raised questions to which there will be some very interesting responses, perhaps from the cultures chosen for comparison, certainly from those already in the Western tradition. As the author says in the concluding chapter, he has no wish to impose Western rhetoric on other cultures, rather to modify Western notions by comparison with other traditions in the interests of coming to an understanding of rhetoric as a more general phenomenon of human life.

Vivienne Gray
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In this book Lyons (L) makes a fascinating and sophisticated study of the role of heroines in myth and cult. Arguing that not only was there a distinct category of hero/ine, but also that heroines had a place generally denied them ‘within the category of heroic beings’, she starts from the general working definition, developed in chapter one, of a heroine as a ‘female figure in epic, myth, or cult.’ Throughout the rest of the book, L goes on to refine and complicate this, finally concluding that heroines along with heroes acted as intermediaries between gods and mortals.