This book is based on a 1998/99 Münster doctoral dissertation; it is not clear to what extent it has been revised, though there are a few references to subsequent publications. It is built around a reading, or rather three partial readings, of Aeschylus’ *Suppliants* (hereafter *Supp.*) which constitute Chapter 4; these focus respectively on the theme of flight, on the Danaids’ techniques of persuasion, and on actions that can be categorized as overstepping of boundaries. Chapter 1 is an introduction; Chapter 2 analyses the phenomenon of supplication in Greek society generally; Chapter 3 explores treatments of it in the Homeric epics and in six tragic dramas. Lastly, Chapter 5 seeks to reach conclusions about the significance of ritual in Greek, and especially in Aeschylean, tragedy as a whole. (The title of this final chapter is ‘Tragödie – Ritual und Rhetorik’, but both here and in the rest of the book ritual consistently gets the lion’s share of attention).

G.’s interpretative principles (pp. 8–10, 75–79) strongly privilege the text as the object of interpretation. She says, to be sure (p. 78), that she does not wish to imply that stage-realization is of secondary importance compared with the text and its reading, but she proceeds not merely to imply, but to assert, just that. Her concern is with the ‘virtual performance’ which «der dramatische Text selbst entfaltet … auch ohne Bühne»; she will not ask «ob die Personen des Dramas die Hikesie-Gesten, auf die ihr Sprechen verweist, tatsächlich ausführen »; the action (Geschehen) of a drama is constituted by «was die Figuren sagen … nicht, was sie in einer von vielen möglichen Bühnenrealisierungen des Textes tun». This approach, for which she claims the authority of Aristotle (p. 76), totally ignores what she herself calls the ‘historical finding’ that «die Tragödien des fünften Jahrhunderts … sicher nicht für die Lektüre konzipiert wurden»; it ignores the fact that the author of the text was also the composer, choreographer, director, stage-manager, and in Aeschylus’ case the lead actor too; it ignores the fact that authors of the fifth century (Gorgias, Aristophanes), when they discuss the good or bad effects of drama, invariably think of its effect on the spectator, not on the reader. Of course it is impossible to reconstruct all the original (oral) stage-directions for *Supp.* or for any other ancient play. What follows from that, however, is that our knowledge of the play can never be complete; not that we are entitled to treat the part we know about as if it were the whole. We can reasonably expect that the non-verbal aspects of the performance will hardly ever have contradicted the clear implications of the verbal text; but they may quite often have crucially guided the audience’s interpretation of passages which for a reader are ambiguous – a very important consideration for an interpreter who relies as heavily as G. on reading significance into ambiguities.

---

1 One of many things that remain unclear throughout the book is precisely what G. means by ‘ritual’. On p. 23 n. 53 she cites three definitions of ritual from recent studies of Greek religion (by Bremmer, Burkert and Zaidman & Pantel); these definitions are not equivalent, and G. gives no indication which, if any, of them she endorses. For another see S. Scullion, ‘Nothing to do with Dionysus’: tragedy misconceived as ritual, ClQu 52, 2002, 162–137, at pp. 130–1 (well thought out, but too restrictive in requiring that a ritual be performed ‘at regular intervals’).
Some of G.’s other principles and axioms are equally dubious. She takes it for granted (p. 21 and elsewhere) that the play was entitled Hiketides when it was originally performed and that the title will have influenced its audience’s reception and interpretation of it. In fact it is very doubtful whether plays which, like Sapp., were components of connected trilogies had separate titles at all in Aeschylus’ time; if they did, it is extraordinary that two of the five such plays certainly by Aeschylus that have survived, Seven against Thebes and Eumenides, have titles that do not fit their content. G. takes it for granted, too, that the ‘mythological history’ dramatized in tragedy ‘nicht bloß der Unterhaltung dient, sondern im Kontext eines Kultes oder Rituals anzusiedeln ist’ (p. 7). If this is a statement about myth in general, it is either false or else so vague as to be useless: even if all Greek myths were in some sense ritual in origin (and few would now wish to be dogmatic about that), they are so flexible, so freely alterable, that most classical Greeks must have lost any sense of a connection between a given (centuries-old, much-changed) myth and the (centuries-old, scarcely-changed) ritual with which it had once been associated. If it is a statement about the plots of tragedy, it stands or falls with the belief that tragic drama was itself, in some sense and to some extent, a cultic or ritual event; a belief which G. certainly holds (cf. p. 225, «Weder ist die Aufführung eines Dramas im Dionysos-Theater ausschließlich Religion noch lediglich Kunst»), in common with much of present-day scholarship, but which rests on very shaky foundations.\(^1\)

Repeatedly G. commits the fallacy of illegitimate conversion, inferring ‘all A is B’ from ‘all B is A’. She argues, for example (p. 147) that by saying at the start of Sapp. that they are in flight (\(\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\rho\sigma\sigma\tau\nu\nu\epsilon\), v. 5) the Danaids «geben … ihr Selbstverständnis als Schutzflehten-de kund, denn zur Verfahrt des hiketes gehört es, auf der Flucht zu sein». That is a doubly bad argument. In the first place, it is not true, even in Aeschylus, that a suppliant is necessarily a person in flight: Thyestes became a suppliant (\(\pi\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\nu\oslash\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicr

\(^1\) In Seven, Thebes and the Thebans are never referred to under those names; in Eumenides the Erinyes are called Erinyes, Arai and (at the end) Semnai Theai, but never Eume-nides. See Hermes 117, 1989, 435–6 and my article ‘The titles of Greek dramas’, to appear in SemRom.

\(^2\) In the interpretation of an ancient culture – indeed of any culture other than one’s own – it is vital to bear in mind that not all the connections between cultural phenomena that might be perceived by a sophisticated outside anthropologist can have been present to the minds of, or even subconsciously influenced the behaviour of, the persons actually within the culture. Many far better scholars than G. have forgotten this (or write as if they had).

A related fallacy appears in G.’s discussion (pp. 154–6) of the connection she sees between the Danaids’ threats of suicide and the Prokne\textsuperscript{1} myth which they refer to in vv. 60–67. Starting from the word \textit{αὐτοφῶνος} (v. 61), G. rightly notes that Greeks often regarded suicide and the killing of close kin as species of the same genus, both involving the shedding of one’s own blood. Relying on a rather imprecise formulation of this idea by Oudemans and Lardinois,\textsuperscript{2} she proceeds as though suicide and kin-murder could be regarded as synonymous (’gleichbedeutend’), and argues that «Prokne … wird, indem der Mord [des Itys] auch als Selbstmord lesbar wird, mit ihrem Sohn identisch» and, conversely, that references by the Danaids to suicide «auch als Spiegelung des bevorstehenden Verwandtenmordes deuten». Presumably this valuable interpretative tool can be applied more widely: Orestes becomes his own mother; Eteokles and Polyneikes are virtually one person; Iokaste’s suicide is also (why not?) a symbolic killing of the son who has ruined her life …

All too often G.’s prose is impenetrably obscure. I have many times given up in despair the attempt to fathom what her conclusion is on this or that issue (it is sometimes easier to establish what her conclusion is not). The conclusion of the whole book is a fair sample; I do not pretend to know what it means:

«Aischylos eignet sich das Spezifische seines Materials – der Mythen, der Riten – an und entwickelt daraus die Gesetze seiner Dramen-Poetik. Indem er dabei die Tradition zerlegt, um sie neu zusammenzusetzen, zeigt er das seine Kultur bestimmende Gleiche – die Mythen, die Riten – als ihr Anderes.»

The conclusions drawn from the specific analyses of epic and tragic supplications, in Chapter 3, are a little clearer (pp. 143–6), but not very enlightening: either too narrow to be general, or too broad to be useful. Supplication, we are told, «dient … häufig dazu, einen Raum zu schaffen, aus dem heraus derjenige, der bereits dem Tod anheim gegeben ist, noch zu sprechen vermag». Even if, as we must, we water down ‘delivered into the hands of death’ to ‘threatened with death’ – as G. does in her next sentence – it still does not apply to all or even most of the cases considered in the chapter. When, on the other hand, we learn that something common to all these cases alike is ‘ihr Interesse an einer Auseinandersetzung mit der strukturellen Dynamik von Übergängen, von Passagen’, the only possible response is ‘so what?’ Such an interest is not characteristic of supplication scenes in particular: every story worth telling is going to contain transitions, passages, changes of state or status, what Aristotle called \textit{μεταθλοκτί}, and certainly every tragic drama does. Equally G.’s claim that the situation of the suppliant is often presented as «ein Grenzen aufhebendes Zugleich von Leben und Tod» (p. 145) is of little interest until it is shown that this is \textit{distinctively} associated with supplication scenes: the Greek drama, after all, in which this paradoxical interplay of life and death is most strongly stressed is Sophocles’ \textit{Antigone} – which contains no supplication scene (though it easily might have done – say during Antigone’s last appearance on stage – had Sophocles so wished).

What of the reading(s) of \textit{Supp.} itself? G. certainly has some good interpretations of particular issues, though few of them are new; but some other conclusions bear little relation to the evidence. In her discussion of the passages in

\textsuperscript{1} We do not know whether Tereus’ wife was known to Aeschylus by the name of Prokne, but like G. I shall for convenience call her so.

\textsuperscript{2} Oudemans and Lardinois cite R. Parker, \textit{Miasma} (Oxford, 1983) 123 and n. 73; but Parker there in turn refers to his Appendix 2 (p. 351), and there we read merely that \textit{αὐτοφῶνος} and some other \textit{αὐτό-} compounds ‘are used in tragedy of kin-murder, and occasionally of suicide’.
which the Danaids exploit the story of Io to bolster their claim for protection
(whether addressing Pelasgos or Zeus) she concludes that behind both of them
stands the insight «daß Überzeugung sich nicht in erster Linie der Wahrheit ver-
dankt, sondern einer mimetischen Fähigkeit zur Produktion von Geschichten,
die der Wahrheit ähnlich sind» (p. 197). If this is the insight that Aeschylus is
trying to convey, he has chosen a very odd way of conveying it. In speaking to
Pelasgos (vv. 291–322) the Danaids succeed in convincing him that they are of
Argive descent by telling him facts about Io’s life in Argos which he knows to be
true (cf. v. 312) and presenting a genealogy linking Io with themselves which is
presumably also true. In addressing Zeus, the Danaids base their claim on the
fact that they are his descendants, by Io, through Epaphos (vv. 527–535, 588–9);
that is true too. Both arguments, however, might seem to founder on the fact that
the Danaids’ hated pursuers are also descended from Zeus and Io through
Epaphos. In their appeal to Pelasgos the Danaids actually mentioned this, un-
prompted (vv. 321–3) – and still the appeal was successful, because it is backed
by the power of the suppliant to threaten divine wrath if his/her plea is ignored.
In their appeal to Zeus they suppress the inconvenient fact – and still the appeal
is unsuccessful, because Zeus can neither be hoodwinked nor blackmailed
(despite the Danaids’ attempt to do so in vv. 154–175). If these scenes suggest
anything at all about what persuasion depends on, they suggest it depends, not
on the ability to tell a plausible tale, but on the ability (i) to produce true, chek-
kable facts and (ii) where the facts are against you, to do some arm-twisting.

The best thing in the book is the discussion of touching (pp. 219–238). This
creatively and revealingly links a range of touchings that are of importance in
Supp.: the saving, healing, generative touching of Io by Zeus (which is neverthe-
less at least once explicitly [v. 1067], and perhaps once implicitly [v. 315 ὄφθαλμος],
spoken of as an act of violence1); the violence (often spoken of using verbs like
ἐπίπτομαι or χορμᾶσθαι) which the Danaids fear or suffer from their cou-
sins; and the violence which their cousins will later suffer at their hands. The
hand itself, the instrument of touch, is brought into the analysis, from the
‘hand-held things’ (ἐγειρισμένοι) of v. 21 which are both olive-branches and (by anticipa-
tion) daggers to the hands that ‘make the air quiver’ (628) when they are raised to
vote the decree of asylum in the Argive assembly.2 There are rich thematic linka-
ges here, which could well be pursued into further ramifications (the imagery of
Supp. has been nothing like as well analysed as that of the Oresteia). This section
might well have had a stronger impact had it been published as a separate article.

But as a whole, the book is deeply disappointing. This is largely due to G.’s
inability – quite understandable in a graduate student – to maintain sufficient
critical distance from the scholars in whose footsteps she is avowedly following.
She speaks of her text-based approach as «ein wenig aus der Mode» (p. 9). On
the contrary: she is all too unquestioning a follower of fashion.

Nottingham

Alan H. Sommerstein

1 But violence of a very different kind from that of the Aigyptiads, to which G. assimil-
lates it on pp. 237–8, as different as the violence of the surgeon is from that of the assassin
or rapist.

2 And thereby, we might add – though they know it not – vote, many of them, for their
own deaths in battle: the raising of those hands was for many, in effect, an act of suicide.