

REVIEWS

Cristina Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. International Studies in the History of Rhetoric 5. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013. xviii + 618 pp., ISBN: 978-90-04-24984-4

When I review a book that is of high quality, I like to read it twice before submitting the review. That does not excuse the inordinate length of time it has taken me to review Cristina Pepe's *Genres of Rhetorical Speeches*, for which I apologise to the author, but it immediately indicates my admiration for the book. I shall outline its contents, before making a few observations, all of which are offered in a constructive spirit.

The book consists (suitably, given its theme) of three parts, followed by an extensive list of *Testimonia*, an Appendix, Bibliography, Index of Greek and Latin Terms, Index Locorum, and a General Index. Part One covers the fifth and fourth centuries, opening with an overview of the contexts of speechmaking in Greece and, of course, in particular Athens. Separate chapters address the practice of the Sophists (with an inevitable focus on Gorgias and the *Helen*, supplemented by observations on the origins of the praise speech); Thucydides (deliberative oratory, with an analysis of the Mytilenean Debate in Book 3); Plato (analyses of the *Gorgias*, *Phaedrus* and *Sophist*, and of Plato's conception of advice and praise); Isocrates (in particular how he defines his *logoi*); Demosthenes (his distinction between deliberative and judicial); and, in greater detail, the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (with a discussion of genres and species, and of the connected and complex ascription of the treatise to Anaximenes, without committing herself either way).

Part Two is of roughly the same length as Part One, but focuses on one author only: Aristotle. Rhetorical development, including in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, all led to the *Rhetoric*, which for Pepe was Greek rhetoric's 'crowning theoretical achievement' (p. 123; I note that this repeats the earlier judgment of Laurent Pernot in the English translation of his *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, 'the crowning achievement of rhetorical theory in Classical Greece', p. 41), though the dates of composition of the *Rhetoric to Alexander* and the *Rhetoric* were not necessarily linear. Most will not quibble with Pepe's concentration on the *Rhetoric*, even if we need to bear in mind Pernot's assessment that 'this treatise full of novel views was relatively little read in antiquity' (*Rhetoric in Antiquity* p. 44). Pepe examines

the system of genres in the *Rhetoric* in minute and instructive detail, paying a great deal of attention to epideictic, which *Rhetoric* scholars agree Aristotle introduced 'as a genre in its own right' (p. 144), but also indicating the 'aspects of originality with respect to tradition' of his treatment of the deliberative genre (p. 159). Very helpful chapters on the different topics that are used in the three genres (Chapter Twelve), and on the style and arrangement of the genres (Chapter Thirteen), precede a final chapter in this Part on the relatively little-studied treatise, the *Divisiones Aristoteleae*.

Part Three takes us through the Hellenistic period and into Rome (the title 'Rhetorical Genres in the Hellenistic and Imperial Ages' perhaps does not do full justice to the material on the Roman Republican period). This might be thought the least satisfying of the three parts, not because of any lack of knowledge, but simply because it covers, inevitably in less detail, such a wide range of material, in Greek and Latin, from Hellenistic theory to the *progymnasmata* and declamation (Chapter Twenty). There is thus no individual chapter on Cicero or Quintilian, rather an approach that looks at topics from a combined Greek and Roman angle, such as the vocabulary used for each of the three genres in Chapter Sixteen. But this synthesis of a vast amount of material is also a great strength, which will ensure that the book becomes the starting-point for future investigations in these areas. Chapter Seventeen is invaluable, a thorough examination of later approaches that moved away from the Aristotelian tripartite division; while Chapter Eighteen contains a useful discussion of stasis theory.

As if the discussions of the genres in the various periods were not enough, Pepe adds afterwards a list of 258 *Testimonia*, with the Greek or Latin text followed by a translation. This collection of source material is an invaluable resource in itself and adds another dimension to the utility of the volume as a whole. In an Appendix Pepe surveys a range of modern theories and theoreticians of rhetoric with respect to speech genres. As in Part Three, she covers a great deal of ground here, and her essay will serve as a useful introduction to the modern theories, though for me it is rather too brief to be fully informative. The extensive Bibliography and two indexes are again useful resources in themselves, and are indicative of the thoroughness of Pepe's scholarship.

It would be highly unusual in a book of this length not to find errors or questionable statements. The speeches referred to on p. 11 n. 16 were delivered before two different Councils – Lysias 3, 4 and 7 were addressed to the Council of the Areopagus, not the Council of Five Hundred like the others; the number of jury members in Athens did not range 'from a minimum of 501 to a maximum of 1501' (p. 10 n. 3: even if we accept that juries were made up of an odd number of citizens, both figures are wrong, the smallest jury in private cases numbering 201 and And. 1.17 telling us that the largest jury consisted of all 6000 members of the jury panel); Andocides' speech *On the Peace*, genuine or not, dates to 391, i.e. the fourth not fifth century (p. 13); there are not 'some ten poorly constructed speeches which make up the *Fourth Philippic*' (p. 14: there is repetition of Dem. 8.38–67 in 10.11–27 and

55–70); and it is misleading to state (p. 244) that the Roman Senate was made up of ‘the heads of the leading patrician families and ex-magistrates’ (patrician exclusivity only applies to the regal and early Republican period, while serving magistrates were also members). I attribute the erroneous dating of *PHib* 26 ‘to the 3rd century AD’ to a simple typographical error, as the following ‘(ca 285–250 BC)’ shows. The English translator, along with the readers noted in the Acknowledgements, is to be congratulated on producing a flowing text, though occasional extraneous use of the definite article remains (e.g. the title of 11.5 does not need ‘The’ at the start, nor does ‘stasis theory’ on p. 347 require a preceding article) and there are some other infelicities (‘Trials were indicted by a magistrate’, p. 246; ‘How do the Greeks call this?’, p. 486; use of ‘we’ instead of ‘I’, as ‘We prefer’, p. 396). Finally, some might wonder about the absence of a discussion of the situation pre-fifth century.

This is a remarkable first book. I would expect a scholar whose PhD was supervised by Luigi Spina to be of the first rank, and Cristina Pepe certainly is that. The book is the fifth in the ISHR series of International Studies in the History of Rhetoric edited by Laurent Pernot and Craig Kallendorf. Since this review is by the current (as I write) President of ISHR for ISHR’s journal *Rhetorica*, there might seem to be a risk of nepotism. I would counter that no reviewer could do full justice to a book of this size and coverage, with its meticulous philological and rhetorical scholarship. In my opinion it is eminently worthy both of the series and of the Society, and it will, I am sure, remain a key textbook in the study of classical rhetorical genres for many years to come.

MIKE EDWARDS,
University of Roehampton, London

Jacques-Emmanuel Bernard, *La sociabilité épistolaire chez Cicéron*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 2013. 641 pp. ISBN 978-2-7453-2591-4

Bien qu’immense, la bibliographie cicéronienne a donné lieu à peu de monographies portant spécifiquement sur les lettres de Cicéron (p. 14). Certains se sont intéressés à la correspondance comme source d’information sur l’histoire et la civilisation romaines (Deniaux, 1993; Ioannatou, 2006) ou sur la personnalité de Cicéron et son environnement socioculturel (Boissier, 1865; Carcopino, 1947), d’autres comme support pour l’étude de la langue, de la grammaire et du style cicéroniens (Bornecque, 1898; Monsuez, 1949) (p. 14–7), ou pour s’interroger sur le statut littéraire de la lettre, ses spécificités structurelles et ses aspects textuels et rhétoriques (Wistrand, 1979; Hutchinson, 1998) (p. 18). D’autres enfin ont pris en considération les règles sociales qui déterminent les relations entre Cicéron et d’autres hommes politiques romains, relations sur lesquelles se fonde sa correspondance (Hall, 2009; White, 2010) (p. 19–20). C’est dans ce cadre bibliographique que