

Review

Author(s): Gerald A. Press

Review by: Gerald A. Press

Source: *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1985), pp. 65-66

Published by: Penn State University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40237427>

Accessed: 30-06-2016 14:13 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Penn State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Philosophy & Rhetoric*

20, is far too little and too late). Synthesis is not enough; simultaneous analysis and synthesis are required.

Paul Newell Campbell

University of Kansas

Art and Eloquence in Byzantium. Henry Maguire. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. Pp. xxiii + 148; 111 black and white figures

Rigid disciplinary distinctions produce fragmentation in education as a social institution and in the intellectual culture of the individual. This is a part of our legacy from the Greeks of which Cicero (*De Oratore* 3.16.59–61) already complained and to which the existence of *Philosophy and Rhetoric* is partially a response. In Cicero's time the problem was merely the separation of the two halves of the educational curriculum, philosophy and rhetoric; in ours the curriculum is fragmented into so many "disciplines" that we feel compelled to mention, as does the dust jacket of this book, that a book or a course is "interdisciplinary." Cicero was correct in believing that the unity of the person requires a coherence in the education that, in turn, generates and perpetuates the unity of a culture. Culture does not exist in departments; and cultural artifacts—including philosophies and rhetorics—are products of interactions among *various* modes of creative activity. Our fragmented curriculum tends to conceal the complexity of creative work; this is misleading and it has a pernicious effect on the creativity of those who receive such an education. This is especially true of the disciplinary isolation of rhetoric and the concomitant prejudice against it that has given the very name a negative, corruptive connotation in the twentieth century. Thus Henry Maguire's study of the constructive influence of rhetoric on visual art in Byzantine culture is to be welcomed.

The general thesis of the book is that rhetoric as it was taught in Byzantine schools and practised in Byzantine literature passed into the sermons and hymns of the church, and from there "influenced the ways in which visual artists illustrated narrative texts" (3) in manuscripts, mosaics, frescoes, and carved ivories or sarcophagi. Chapter I is a general account of Byzantine rhetoric and its role in the church. Chapters II–V examine the rhetorical tech-

niques of description, antithesis, hyperbole, and lament, respectively. Each chapter moves from explanation of the technique in question as taught by the rhetoricians to its development in ecclesiastical literature, and then to an examination of particular works of art (reproduced in black and white photographs at the back of the book) whose motifs or composition reveal, by comparison with earlier art and contemporaneous literature, the transformation of a verbal into a visual technique. A brief conclusion (109–11) summarizes the expository chapters and points out three patterns in the influence that rhetoric exercised on art.

First, rhetoric helped artists to add vividness to their art by filling out the bare narration of sacred texts with dramatic detail. Second, rhetoric helped artists to structure their compositions, especially through parallel scenes that were set off against each other in antithesis. Third, rhetoric helped artists to enrich their work with images, so that a work of art could become as flowery as a literary description of the springtime, or as desolate as a lament.

The book may be criticized for displaying far greater sophistication on the art history than on the rhetoric side of the argument. It might profit, for example, by more clearly relating the particular rhetorical techniques discussed to the art of rhetoric as a whole; and, although we have not exactly been inundated with research on Byzantine rhetoric, Maguire might have considered such work as Baur and Ameringer's on John Chrysostom, Reuther on Gregory of Nazianzus, and George Kennedy's recent work on Greek rhetoric in late antiquity and in the Byzantine tradition.

Princeton University Press is to be praised, as always, for their handsome and excellent production; I would fault them, however, for using endnotes (113–40) rather than footnotes, which unnecessarily complicates scholarly reading. But, in sum, the book is certainly worthy of attention by those interested in philosophy and rhetoric, not only for its demonstration of the creative influence of rhetoric on visual art, but also as an example of the kind of research that helps us to overcome the fragmentation of our education and our culture.

Gerald A. Press

Stanford University