meridiano) in *Ps* 90:6. The text for the Psalms is the *Iuxta Septuaginta* version, also known as the Gallican Psalter (vol. III, p. xxx), not Jerome's *Iuxta hebraicum*. Thus, the reader will find there the Latin text familiar from, e.g., Renaissance vocal music. The editor has made a conscious choice to print the Psalms and other poetical books in prose-style full lines. This decision is justified by the observation that "neither the Latin nor the English is poetic" ("Introduction", p. xi). While an under-standable decision, it is perhaps not very convenient for the reader. If the reader misses something in these volumes it will probably be Jerome's prefaces that were traditionally copied along with the actual books.

In these first three volumes of the new edition of the Douay-Rheims version, the reader will find a useful tool for making sense of the Latin text: the translation is literal enough to almost work as an interlinear translation, but, at the same time, the English is easy enough to make pleas-ant reading. The layout is beautiful and I did not notice any printing errors. Each volume has four appendices: "Note on the Text" explaining the basic features of the Latin text, "Notes to the Text" providing a condensed *apparatus criticus*, "Alternate Spellings" providing possible alternatives for the proper nouns, and a "Bibliography" of the sources and some secondary literature.

Tuukka Kauhanen

Davıd M. Timmerman – Edward Schiappa: *Classical Greek Rhetorical Theory and the Disciplin-ing of Discourse.* Cambridge University Press, New York 2010. ISBN 978-0-521-19518-8. X, 192 pp. USD 103.

This volume, jointly written by David Timmerman and Edward Schiappa (henceforth T&S), pre-sents a welcome and thought-provoking addition to the on-going discussion on the early history of ancient Greek rhetorical theory. Clearly written and understandable in its own right, the book is, in this reviewer's mind, best understood as an independent *addendum* to a revised history of the early stages of the history of Greek rhetorical theory, defended by Schiappa in his earlier publications such as *The Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory in Classical Greece* (1999) (also partly co-written by Tim-merman) and *Protagoras and Logos* (1991, 2003[2]). Thus, it seems reasonable to begin this review by placing this publication in the context of this ongoing research program.

In his earlier contributions, Schiappa has defended the claim that rhetoric (understood not as a practice *of* speaking, but as a theoretical reflection *on* the practice of speech) was established as a distinct discipline or subject in the 4th rather than in the 5th century B.C.E. – contrary to many scholars who have traced the subject's history deep into the 5th century, to the innovations of the Syracusan orators Teisias and Corax. According to Schiappa, the birth of rhetoric took place when authors active in the 4th century – most notably Plato and Aristotle – defended definitional accounts on the nature of rhetoric, contrasted rhetoric with other forms of discourse (such as philosophy), dis-tinguished its various forms and genres, discussed its main aims, and developed technical vocabu-lary specific to rhetoric as a subject of its own. The most notable case in point, also briefly discussed by T&S on pp. 9–11 of the present volume, is the Greek word *rhêtorikê* itself, which makes its first appearance (at least in the sources preserved to us) in Plato's *Gorgias*. Before such inventions there was, according to the authors, no clear-cut difference between intellectual activities and domains

that we have later become accustomed to differentiate as philosophy on the one hand and rhetoric on the other. The authors are convinced that new technical terms do not plainly describe neutrally some already given phenomena, but also *establish* new differences and distinctions in places where none existed before. T&S also relate this basic idea to some contemporary linguistic and psychological theories (see especially pp. 4–8). While it is, of course, advisable to make one's theoretical commitments clear and to look for theoretical foundations for one's claims, T&S's references to contemporary theories remain on a very superficial level and seem to be fairly eclectic in nature.

The birth of rhetoric is thus, in T&S's view, closely tied up with linguistic and theoretical innovation: it is intrinsically related to the development of technical terminology and to the creation and moulding of concepts and of conceptual categories that are used in making sense of rhetorical practice, and put into use in describing it. The point is that the words really *do* matter in this case. This central view is introduced and discussed in the Introductory chapter of the book. It also motivates the more specific topic and aim of the volume at hand: that of investigating the emergence and content of what T&S call the 'terms of art' of rhetorical theory. With this fairly flexible term, the authors refer to specialized classificatory and technical terms of the emerging theory of rhetoric. To this reader, it remains, however, somewhat unclear how the content of the expression 'term of art' differs from that of the more common 'technical term'; is it not crucial for both that they are either (a) to some extent specialized uses of terms familiar from ordinary linguistic usage, or (b) new terms introduced for a particular technical purpose? This seems to be the point of the authors' general characterization of 'terms of art' as words and phrases "that take on reasonably specialized denotative functions within a particular language community" (p. 1). But sometimes T&S seem to put more rigid criteria for what it is to be a term of art; see for example the discussions on p. 145 and p. 170, which seem to imply that a *meta-level discussion* on the content of the terms is typical (if not necessary?) for terms of art; and this may in turn point in the direction that T&S use the expression 'term of art' in an even more restricted a sense than 'technical term'. T&S's book would surely have benefited from a more thorough discussion of the central concept of 'term of art' – presently the relevant characterizations of this term are scattered all over the book, the main discussion being on pp. 1–8; but interesting additional remarks on the genesis of terms of art are also made on p. 43 and p. 101. For some reason this important term is not even included in the short index of the book.

In the Introduction, T&S call their preferred approach to the history of rhetoric *concept driven* – and contrast this approach with more traditional thematic and author/text-centred approaches (pp. 2–4). By a concept-driven method, the authors seem to mean, in general, an approach that pays close attention to the specific content and to the historical development of a particular concept. In the case of the early history of rhetoric, the concept-driven approach takes the form of an examination of the uses a given word (and words closely related to it) has in the writings of several relevant authors active in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.E. By examining these uses one can trace how a specific term of art of rhetoric emerges in the process of a multifaceted historical development and how this emergence often takes the form of contesting earlier or competing usages of the term. The authors also use the expression 'disciplining of discourse', which appears in the title of the book, to designate such emergence of terms of art and of theoretical disciplines.

The chapters 2–4 of the book, each of which has already been published in another form elsewhere, offer three case studies of the authors' concept-driven method. Chapter 2 describes the emergence of the Platonic concept of *dialektikē* from the earlier ordinary and sophistic usages of

the relevant terms (most notably of the verb *dialegesthai*). Chapter 3 discusses the use of the term *philosophia* in Isocrates' speeches, and Chapter 4 treats the disciplining of the words *dêmêgoria* and *symboulê* in Aristotle's writings as terms referring exclusively to public deliberation. In this short review, it is, due to lack of space, regrettably impossible to deal in detail with the many interesting suggestions these three chapters contain, and I will confine myself to some general remarks.

Each of these chapters (2–4) follows roughly the same methodical pattern: first, a sketch of the earlier, often quite commonplace 5th century usage of the relevant words is given, after which the development of a more specialized and technical usage (/usages) in the late 5th and 4th centuries B.C.E. is examined. In this way, a physiognomy of the emergence of a specific term of art is given. (It is evident that the results are largely based on searches on the *TLG* database, which enables broad overviews of uses of the terms.) In some cases, the descriptions of the usages would have benefited from more extensive exemplary text passages; presently the discussion remains occasionally some-what superficial. But perhaps the authors preferred an approach which makes the general lines of development perspicuous; and since references to relevant passages are there, the interested reader may have a look at the original texts on her own.

For a book the explicit aim of which is the investigation of some key terms of *rhetorical* theory, it may be somewhat surprising that both Chapters 2 and 3 actually deal with terms that play a pivotal role in the *philosophical* tradition – namely those of *dialogue*, *dialectic,* and *philosophy*. Thus, the book is worth reading not only for scholars interested in the history of rhetoric, but also for more philosophically minded readers and, in fact, for anybody interested in the intellectual history of 5th and 4th century Athens. These two chapters make it plain that the same process of disciplin-ing the discourse that characterizes, in T&S's opinion, the early history of rhetoric, also applies to the genesis and development of philosophy in Athens of the 4th century. Chapter 2 illustrates how Plato's philosophical conception of dialectic has its roots in the practices of dialogical discussions held by some of the thinkers belonging to the so-called sophistic movement. Chapter 3 in turn shows how the idea of philosophy was, in the 4th century B.C.E., very much a contested concept, of which different notable intellectuals of the time were giving different and competing accounts; the authors point out well how Isocrates' very broad conception of philosophy, having been ever since left in the shadows of the dominant platonic articulation of this concept, has all too easily evaded correct and balanced interpretations. Thus T&S's investigation connects nicely, as the authors themselves acknowledge (see p. 66), with the ideas of such researchers as Andrea Nightingale (see especially her 1995 *Genres in Dialogue*).

A major and, to me at least, a most welcome part of the research program suggested by T&S is that it provides us with tools with which to fight against conceptual anachronisms – against ten-dencies of imposing later technical vocabulary, terminology and distinctions on earlier authors and their writings. Both chapters 5 and 6 of the book make contributions in this field. Chapter 5 suggests that *Rhetoric to Alexander* has suffered from being constantly viewed in the light of a later distinc-tion between the literal genres of philosophical, sophistic and technical treatises in rhetoric, while it, according to the authors, evades such a clear-cut categorization. This chapter, unlike Chapters 2–4, is mainly concerned with the reception history and categorization of *Rhetoric to Alexander.* To bring the argument home, a more thorough investigation of the treatise's contents would be neces-sary. Chapter 6, in turn, is a critical discussion of some lines of thought defended by Stephen Usher in his 1999 *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality*. Pace Usher, T&S make a case for the claim

that the oratorical composition of speeches in the 5th century B.C.E. is not commonly governed by ideas concerning the division of speeches into separate parts – ideas that later became commonplace.

As already stated, the book is clearly written and the argumentation, in general, transparent. It does, however, contain some unnecessary repetitions, obviously due to having been partly compiled from originally separate publications. This reader also finds the recurrent direct quotations from the authors' previous works somewhat disturbing. Some references to secondary bibliography could have been moved into footnotes (surprisingly seldom used by the authors), and fellow classicists surely would not have minded quotations in original Greek. The authors' concept-driven approach, with the analytical focus on the development of specific terms of art, is apt to produce illuminating interventions in and corrections to the given historical accounts; but it meets its limitations when it comes to sketching historical narratives of a more synthetic kind. This is why the book is best viewed, as stated at the beginning of this review, as an illuminating independent *addendum* to a greater revised research program on the early history of rhetoric. I hope that the academic audience will, sooner or later, see a publication of a more synthetic kind, dealing with the fascinating interrelations between sophists, orators and philosophers in the heyday of 4th century Athens. Meanwhile, additional scholarly interventions of the kind contained in this book are also highly welcome. All in all, this is a thought-provoking and innovative piece of scholarship, highly recommended for anybody interested in the intellectual history of 5th and 4th century Greece.

Lassi Jakola

ALESSIA PRIOLETTA: *Inscriptions from the Southern Highlands of Yemen: The Epigraphic Collections of the Museums of Baynūn and Dhamār.* Arabia Antica 8. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Rome 2013. ISBN 978-88-913-0001-0. 408 pp, 235 ill. EUR 145.

There has been, in recent years, a revived interest in Arabian archaeology and epigraphy. Scholars have taken up the task of finding and studying new Arabian antiquities, pre-Islamic and Islamic-era languages and inscriptions, and so on. (It must be noted at the outset that most written evidence from pre-Islamic Arabia consists of inscriptions; we have no or at the most very few literary remains written on more perishable materials.) When, in 2000, Michael Macdonald published his trailblazing essay "Reflections on the Linguistic Map of Pre-Islamic Arabia" (*Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 11: 28–79), many of the questions concerning pre-Islamic Arabian languages remained murky. Since then, painstaking scholarly work by such epigraphists and linguists as Peter Stein, Ahmad Al-Jallad, Laïla Nehmé, and Michael Macdonald himself, has provided an answer to many questions concerning Ancient South Arabian (ASA) and Ancient North Arabian (ANA) languages as well as Old Arabic and Nabataean Aramaic. The number of finds has increased extensively as well: some 80,000 ANA and some 10,000 ASA inscriptions are known today.

While it was often suggested in the past that ASA and ANA languages formed linguistically genealogical groups or even that ANA and ASA were single languages in which there was only dialectal variation, nowadays most scholars think of these categories first and foremost as geographical ones that belie the linguistic plurality within them. It has also been noted that the categorization is