an always-noisy audience of engaged citizens), while the other suggests instead mute helplessness—the heavy, deadening power of silence always threatening, in Greek eyes, to overcome civic culture itself. In tragedy, too, silence is articulated as an organizing principle (characters call for silence to mark something important), but is rarely allowed on stage. Female choruses can keep silent at the request of a female character, while male choruses leave the stage rather than remain mute. The pathology of Phaedra's attempted silence in the *Hippolytus* is juxtaposed somewhat improbably with the pathological muteness of a dying female patient in the Hippocratic corpus.

Despite many acute individual observations, difficulties remain in M.'s project, as she has formulated it here. First, silence itself is never defined as a concept or group of concepts, let alone as a coherent set of Greek terms. Thus M. includes in her study literary depictions of the refusal to speak (for any number of reasons, prudential, ironic, or other), soft or muttered speech, speechlessness imposed on someone, veiled and/or presumably invisible characters on stage, pathological silence, calls for silence on the part of speakers or poets, and even the brooding, ominous silence of the natural world. We are not given any reason to think the Greeks saw these as part of a single coherent concept or aspect of culture. One misses two other organizing structures as well. Given M.'s interest in Greek logocentrism, it is surprising that no discussion occurs of historical change (something Loraux has recently focused on in *La cité divisée. L'oubli dans la mémoire d'Athènes* [Paris, 1997]), in particular, the changes created by the sophists in fifth-century Athenian verbal and literary culture. Equally surprising, considering the importance M. places on the work of Zeitlin and Loraux, is the fact that gender is not more systematically in evidence as a fundamental fact structuring Greek notions of silence.

We are left with the general impression that at least the Greeks who created our literary texts were made uncomfortable by silence. But at the end of the study, even this becomes problematic, since the final chapter describes the power given to silent but cunning endurance in the *Odyssey*. When one adds this to Diomedes' prudent refusal to reply to Agamemnon in *Il.* 4, the supportive silence of Patroclus in *Il.* 9 and of Pylades in the *Choephorae*, the small tongue of the noble youths of yore in the *Clouds*, or the clear preference for (silent) Aeschylus over (noisy and speech-inducing) Euripides in the *Frogs*, one wonders if any coherent negative cultural nexus remains, particularly given the performative nature of many of the acts of silence M. so acutely unpacks. That is, silence itself (at least as depicted in a number of Greek literary genres) is part of a much larger and more complicated semiotic system, one that has been explored intensively in the last decade or so by scholars interested in Greek art, non-verbal communication, and performativity in general. M. has shown us that silence is not a slave or metic in the land of *logos* but rather one of its most active and polyphonic voting citizens.

University of Southern California CAROLYN DEWALD

DRAMATIC SUSPENSE

A. FUCHS: *Dramatische Spannung: moderner Begriff—antikes Konzept.* Pp. x + 349. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 2000. Paper, DM 60. ISBN: 3-476-45252-2.

This book is the revised version of F.'s thesis (hence the great number of footnotes). It looks at ancient and modern texts (including works of literary theory) concerning

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the topic of suspense and gives an interpretation of two passages of Euripides' *Electra* from this viewpoint. Since there is no expression for dramatic suspense in antiquity, F. uses other methods of defining and analysing the phenomenon. First, he notes that suspense has two perspectives: (i) the suspense in the performance itself; and (ii) the suspense which the audience experiences during a performance. These are connected and should not be seen separately from each other. Since one cannot exactly know the feelings and expectations of an ancient audience, F. suggests that dramatic suspense should be seen as a potential which each recipient can actualize for himself. Dramatic suspense can be divided into three categories—emotion, knowledge, and time—which influence and overlap each other. F. explains that between the fictive time within a play and the performance-time of a play there is a potential dramatic suspense. On the emotional side, dramatic illusion is crucial for the creation of dramatic suspense, i.e. the spectators' identification with the play. The tragedies frequently use existing myths which parts of the audience would already know. However, if the spectators become emotionally involved, this knowledge does not prevent the recipients from experiencing dramatic suspense. Indeed, dramatic irony, which can be created as a result, can increase suspense.

In the next part F. looks at examples from ancient texts that refer to the concept of dramatic suspense. He notes that Aristotle (*Po*. 1452a18–21) already hints at the fact that the knowledge of the causal coherence of the action of a play can enhance the audience's suspense because certain scenes can be hoped for or dreaded. *Φόβος* and *ἔλεος* in this sense are a kind of emotional identification with the action; and so is hope. Furthermore, the scholion on *Ajax* 398c states that messengers' reports do not decrease the audience's suspense, but actually enhance it. F. also points out that in Roman rhetoric a stylistic figure called 'sustentatio' existed, which refers to the structure and surprising end of a passage which can create suspense, similarly to the case of drama.

In his interpretation of Euripides' *Electra* F. focuses on how dramatic irony (which arises from the discrepancy between the levels of knowledge of the audience and the characters) and dramatic suspense interact. He analyses two scenes which display dramatic irony particularly clearly: lines 107–289, where Orestes in disguise speaks to his sister, and lines 988–1099, Electra's discussion with Clytaemnestra. F. argues that the audience is emotionally affected here by their identification with the weaker, unsuspecting character Clytaemnestra, which relativizes Electra's arguments. In contrast, the beginning of Euripides' play disappoints the spectators' knowledge of the myth so that no dramatic irony and thus not much emotional suspense can develop. Instead a cognitive form of dramatic suspense is created because the recipient is aware of the fact that he cannot rely on his mythological knowledge now. Thus, this play is a clear example of the significance of the different perspectives regarding transmission of information for the creation of dramatic suspense.

The first part of the book provides an engaging synopsis and evaluation of different ancient and modern approaches to the concept of dramatic suspense. The author here looks not only at a wide range of literature but also at ancient vase-paintings on the Telephus myth, which he finds are most successful in creating dramatic suspense if they depict the moment just before the crucial deed is done and if they give hints of what is about to happen. F. also considers films by Alfred Hitchcock, which, as he shows by applying the three categories of suspense, are similar to ancient Greek tragedy in terms of their understanding of suspense. This approach is interesting, but the chapter is rather drawn out. The same problem applies to the whole theoretical first part of the book, which is convincing but too long in comparison with the following interpretation

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the *Electra.* Some parts, such as that on Hitchcock's films, could have been kept much more concise as they are not absolutely necessary for our understanding. Instead, introducing the analysis of the play at an earlier stage would have made the theoretical discussion clearer and less dry. Alternatively, F. could have expanded his 'Ausblick' (which includes two more tragedies, Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and Aeschylus' *Supplices*, and raises further thought-provoking questions), and interpreted one or both of these plays at greater length and compared the results with that of the analysis of Euripides' *Electra.*

The interpretation of *Electra* is very enjoyable to read. It not only supports and displays an application of the theoretical part of the book, but also shows how artfully the passages are composed to create dramatic suspense. Since this interpretation will also be understandable without knowing all of the theoretical discussion, I would recommend the reader to start by reading the second part of the book, i.e. the interpretation of *Electra*, before tackling the more tedious theoretical part.

University of Birmingham BABETTE PÜTZ

DEMOSTHENES THE STATESMAN

I. WORTHINGTON (ed.): *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator*. Pp. xiv + 289. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-415-20457-7.

In the words of its editor, the aim of this collection is to make good the long-standing 'lack of a modern treatment of Demosthenes [D.] within two covers' (p. viii). That such a book is a desideratum, at least in English (see below), is beyond question. The nine chapters cover D.'s public career (Badian, Ryder, Worthington, Buckler), his judicial and deliberative oratory (Mirhady, Milns), the use of his speeches as a source for the writing of social history (Golden), and his reputation in antiquity and later (Cooper, Harding).

Badian writes on D.'s early career. After some general remarks on the nature of the Demosthenic corpus, he discusses D.'s family background, the dispute with his guardians, and the early speeches down to the *First Philippic.* He emphasizes D.'s personal reasons for involving himself in the prosecutions of Androtion and Timocrates, and plausibly represents him as an ambitious politician with as yet no real policy. Of particular interest is his suggestion of a link of some kind between the families of D. and Aeschines (pp. 14–15). Ryder provides a clear and judicious account of D.'s policy towards Philip. Worthington argues that D. judged resistance to Alexander to be futile, and correctly advised caution at the time of Agis' revolt and again when Harpalus fled to Greece; his conviction by the Areopagus is attributed as much to the collapse of his policy of diplomatic engagement with Alexander over the Exiles Decree as to his venality. Buckler's chapter on D. and Aeschines is thorough and forthright: D. is sharply criticized for his misjudgement of the military and political situation in 346, and little merit is seen in his prosecution of Aeschines in 343. A valuable appendix considers the problems involved in using the speeches of D. and of Aeschines as historical evidence.

Golden first tries to qualify the common belief that statements made by the Attic orators must have been plausible to their audience, and then uses allusions to athletics in D. 19 and Aesch. 2 to demonstrate his point. The discussion of plausibility is

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press