

The final topic, that of chapter eight, is *lexis*, "style." Enos says very little about traditional features of style (e.g., *pleonasm*, prose rhythm), but discusses instead Demosthenes's "stylistic strategy," which consists primarily of what he calls "chiastic contrasting" (191). More than to *chiasmus*, this seems connected to *antithesis*, that is, the "polar" or "diametrical" opposition between Aeschines and himself. Enos concludes that like Lincoln, Churchill, and King, Demosthenes raised political oratory to a literary art and created a speech perfectly fitted for the political and rhetorical moment.

The book could have used some good copy-editing and proof-reading; in particular, the bibliography is not easy to use. It consists of four sections; texts and translation of Demosthenes, translations and studies of Aeschines, studies of Demosthenes, and general studies. The first section is especially difficult: almost all works are under Demosthenes as author, followed by the title, so that if one is looking for X's translation, one needs to remember its exact title (some of the Texas series have the title *Demosthenes: Speeches . . .*, whereas others are just *Speeches . . .*). Dilts's OCT is listed as a translation, as are several commentaries (e.g., Wankel's). One author is "Harris Edward Monroe." Etc.

In sum, this book has much of value, especially Walker's chapter. But starting from scratch rather than revising a fifty year old publication might have improved its value.

MICHAEL GAGARIN
The University of Texas

Vasiliki Zali. *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric: A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus' Histories with Special Attention to Books 5-9*. International Studies in the History of Rhetoric 6. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015. VIII + 383 pp. ISBN: 9789004278967

This is a well-researched, detailed, and well-presented literary analysis of the *Histories* of Herodotus that substantiates the author's claim that the *Histories* is an under-appreciated contributor to the development of rhetoric in the 5th century. As Zali explains, the intent of the work is "to show that in the *Histories* there is great interest in the rhetorical situation *per se*; that speakers are very well aware of the process of manipulating and adapting their arguments to suit the particular audience, and they do so systematically" (3). In this way, Herodotus can be understood as anticipating the rhetorical developments of Thucydides and the more theoretically oriented works of both Aristotle and the author of the *Rhetoric to Alexander*. *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric* is characterized by the use of specific textual examples to illustrate claims about how the text operates. It also provides an impressive mixture of contextual information that is historical, political, and cultural in scope. These elements are trained on the larger

purpose of “a comprehensive study of particular modes, kinds and effects of speech, exemplified through in-depth discussions of case studies and of the ways these related to two overarching narrative themes: the Greco-Persian polarity and the problem of Greek unity” (31).

The focus on these two themes, through the analysis of Herodotus’ rhetorical choices, is divided into three sections. In the first section, “Allocation of Speech,” the analysis extends to the impact of the speeches both included and excluded as well as the selective use of both direct and indirect speech. Zali takes these selections and choices by Herodotus to be rhetorical, choices that are made in order to advance his interpretive and persuasive goals. They are also shown to be empowering for the Greeks as presented in the text and disempowering for the Persians. Zali thus makes a strong case that these choices by Herodotus were not random. As a result, while Cicero and many others have viewed him as the father of history, Herodotus should also be viewed as a significant figure in the development of rhetoric. The text includes an appendix that categorizes all of the debates and conversations in books 5-9 by speaker, addressee and mode of speech (i.e., direct, indirect, and record of a speech act).

In the second section of the book, Zali shows that a narrow definition of debate, as consisting only of instances reported as direct speech, yields a reduced sense of its presence in *Histories*. An expanded conception of debate opens up the significant role it actually plays. Such an expanded conception includes both indirect speech and narration. Zali seeks to expand the long held and dominant perspective on debate in this period, following Thucydides, as consisting entirely of direct and explicitly argumentative speeches. The text also shows how this “flexible definition of debate” brings to light the differences between Herodotean, Homeric, and Thucydidean debate (105). A series of case studies involving a range of speakers from Themistocles to Xerxes shows the cultural differences in the use of debate by the Greeks and Persians. For both the results are poor, as “debate fails in both Greek and Persian contexts” (166). There is a contrast as well between the more open and free debate style of the Greeks and the more formal and restrained style of the Persians.

The last section of the book, “Speech and Typology,” focuses on alliance speeches and pre-battle speeches. Alliance speeches are “the rhetorical arguments the Greeks put into practice in the *Histories* in order to achieve unity against the vast forces of the enemy” (171). Zali draws attention to the description of this speech type and the argumentative strategies for them as described in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* and in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*. Zali presents a typology of rhetorical devices used in the *Histories* followed by a series of case studies from the text, both Greek and Persian. The last part treats on pre-battle speeches as a genre. Here again, the focus remains on the themes of “the Greco-Persian polarity and Greek unity” (238). Zali develops a typology to capture the unique manner in which Herodotus constructs these speeches, or “Herodotean harangues” that is unique to Herodotus but that is also later seen reverberating in Thucydides (238).

The conclusion of this work is quite substantive. Zali takes up the question of Herodotus' authority as an author as it has been positioned and debated by scholars. He brings in the question of the extent to which Bakhtin's theory of dialogism can inform our understanding of Herodotus and the openness or closedness of the work for the reader. Zali presents and supports the view that Herodotus constructed an open text for readers through the strategic inclusion of Greek and Persian voices in multiple forms. That is, the *Histories* persistently calls the reader into conversation with historical figures and events. In addition, Zali places his study of the *Histories* in the context of the recent scholarly trend of interpreting the text metahistorically. Zali sees his treatment of Herodotus as consistent with this interpretive trend and even pushing that trend further in terms of its elucidation of Herodotus' "stance towards current oratorical practices, for his method of writing history, and for how readers are supposed to approach his work" (312).

While this is already a lengthy study, the effort would have been stronger had the author better and more fully situated the main study within contemporary and historical studies of Herodotus. More specifically, given that the author's main claim concerns the significance of Herodotus' *Histories* in the development of rhetoric in the 5th Century, this work needed to situate the reader within the extensive scholarship of this development which has been generated over the last several decades in the fields of Rhetoric, English, Philosophy, and Communication Studies. Nevertheless, I enjoyed this meticulous and well-presented study of Herodotus and the argument made concerning its role in the development of rhetoric, and I highly recommend it to others.

DAVID M. TIMMERMAN
Carthage College

Bialostosky, Don. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Rhetoric, Poetics, Dialogics, Rhetoricity*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press, LLC, 2016. 191 pp. ISBN 9781602357259

In the centerpiece essay to the collection entitled *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, Mikhail Bakhtin takes upon himself the task of distinguishing between linguistics and metalinguistics. To illuminate this distinction, he argues that linguistics is best exemplified by the sentence, and that metalinguistics is best exemplified by the utterance. Bakhtin then proceeds to catalogue the differences between these two units of analysis, and it is clear that his interests lie with the latter. In charting out these differences, Bakhtin makes a claim that is particularly germane to the work reviewed here—namely, that while the sentence is endlessly repeatable (because as decontextualized linguistic "matter," it neither answers nor addresses anyone),