

What Is Talmud: The Art Of Disagreement

454

RHETORICA

speakers moved (along with a comic lexicon of abuse) from drama to oratory, surfacing also in the Platonic dialogue (although ignored for the most part by Aristotle) and proliferating in Theophrastus. Although for the sake of clarity I have focused in this review on the central opposition between the aggressive versus and the weak and decadent speaker, W, is clear that these two types exist at opposite ends of a continuum and that characteristics of one type can slide into another. Particularly welcome is her insistence that the iambic mode transcends genre. This enables her to make wide-ranging and successful connections between comedy, satyr play, tragedy, philosophy, and forensic rhetoric. One of the pleasures of the book is to trace the various instantiations of the paradoxical figure of Socrates from Aristophanes to Plato and Theophrastus. Socrates does not occur explicitly in the last of these, but the cumulative force of W.'s analysis compels the reader to give serious consideration to her suggestion that he is a shadowy presence in several of Theophrastus' caricatures, the product of "a tradition of characterization that wittily assimilates to intemperate types a teacher who used his famous recalcitrance to disparage and tease haughty, boastful elites" (317). Individual readers will, of course, find places where they could desire reformulation or areas where further questions arise. I, for example, am not entirely comfortable with the contention (22) that Plato *adopted* the language of insult from dramatic genres—this seems to me to be perhaps an overly reductive way of formulating a process that was surely more complex. This leads in turn to problems about how informal practices of insult bleed into and from the rhetoricized versions we find in our literary texts (a reading of the treatment of invective found in Plato's *Lysis* 934-936 would be useful here). Yet it is no insult to suggest that the book presents opportunities for future reflection; some discomfort is a small price to pay for such thoughtful and productive work.

KATHRYN A. MORGAN
University of California at Los Angeles

Sergey Dolgopolski. *What is Talmud? The Art of Disagreement*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2009. xii + 333 pp. ISBN: 9780823229345

This book joins an increasing body of work devoted to the study of Jewish discourse. The study of Jewish rhetoric has found a place in the work of rhetoric and composition scholars who are turning their attention to the subject of non-Western or alternative rhetorics (Carol Lipson and Roberta Binkley's *Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics*), as well as scholars who imagine that the conceptual integrity of the notion "Jewish perspectives" can be coherently expressed as a book (Andrea Greenbaum and Deborah Holstein's *Jewish Perspectives in Rhetoric and Composition*). *What is Talmud?*

True disagreements are hard to achieve, and even harder to maintain, for the ghost of final agreement constantly haunts them. The Babylonian Talmud, however, escapes from that ghost of agreement, In Talmudic intellectual art, disagreement is a fundamental category. What is Talmud?: The art of disagreement. Book January with 13 Reads. Authors and Editors. Sergey Dolgopolski at State University of. In Talmudic intellectual art, disagreement is a fundamental category. This book rediscovers disagreement as the ultimate condition of finite human existence or. The Art of Disagreement. New York: Fordham University the Talmud, a fifteenth-century work that directly affected Talmudic learning for the next two centuries. The Art of Disagreement at the AAR and subsequently read it in one weekend. It is a fascinating study putting forth Talmud as an art alongside. True disagreements are very hard to achieve. They are even harder to maintain, for the ghost of final agreement constantly haunts them. The Babylonian Talmud .Over at Perverse Egalitarianism, Mikhail posted a mention of a new book, What Is Talmud: The Art of Disagreement, that engages the Talmudic. Now more than ever, the Talmudic model of respect for intellectual rivals should be seriously heeded. Yes, we can disagree and even passionately so. True disagreements are hard to achieve, and even harder to maintain, for the ghost of final agreement constantly haunts them. The Babylonian. Sergey Dolgopolski. What Is Talmud?: The Art of Disagreement. New York: Fordham University Press, xii, pp. Zvi Septimus (a1). (a1). The Art of Disagreement Sergei Borisovich Dolgopol'skii. Canpanton's treatment of both disagreement and temporality enables us to think anew of a. Sergey Dolgopolski, What Is Talmud? The Art of Disagreement (New York: Fordham University Press,), ISBN: The vast and multifaceted. The Art of Disagreement The Babylonian Talmud, however, escapes from that ghost of Tradition and the Formation of the Talmud.

[\[PDF\] The New Precision Journalism](#)

[\[PDF\] The Ultimate Cat Lover: The Best Experts Advice For A Happy, Healthy Cat With Stories And Photos Of](#)

[\[PDF\] The Hebrew Novel In Czarist Russia: A Portrait Of Jewish Life In The Nineteenth Century](#)

[\[PDF\] Legal Writing In Plain English: A Text With Exercises](#)

[\[PDF\] Reinventing The Americas: Comparative Studies Of Literature Of The United States And Spanish America](#)

[\[PDF\] Education And Jobs: The Imbalancing Of The Social Machinery](#)

[\[PDF\] Paul Rand](#)