the fifth-century city and its audience into the drama' (p. 24). On many or most of the tragedies he discusses, R. has interesting things to say both about metatheater and about Athenian anachronisms. But 'the play of space' refers both to the messages and the medium of this book, and readers will have to sort out the messages for themselves.

An appendix surveys ancient Greek theories of space. Connections with the theater are tenuous at best. In the long production process of a book from a university press, someone ought to have caught Uranus the father of Zeus (p. 158) and Alathaea the mother of Meleager (p. 261).

Rutgers University LOWELL EDMUNDS

SOPHOCLEAN SELF-KNOWLEDGE

E. LEFÈVRE: *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen. Sophokles' Tragödien*. Pp. xi + 320. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 90-94-12322-9.

The 'pietists' in Sophoclean studies (as opposed to the 'hero-worshippers', in Winnington-Ingram's handy term) have been very active in Germany in recent years. Their discussions are mostly uninfluenced by contemporary English-language scholarship on tragedy. This book's treatments of each play begin with Goethe and the Schlegels. These summaries are interesting, but also troubling. If our disagreements are the same as theirs, will continuing the debates achieve progress? Do we need a treatment of Sophocles' ethics that ignores the contributions of Nussbaum, Blundell, and Foley?

Lefèvre claims that Sophocles' tragedies are explorations of failures of self-knowledge in the sense of the Delphic 'know yourself', defined as the absence of *sophrosyne*. He begins with a brief treatment of the *Poetics*, comparing Sophoclean with Aristotelian *hamartia*, which is typically action undertaken under the influence of excessive affect. In his definition, all morally wrong action indicates lack of self-knowledge. Sophocles is a devout optimist: 'Unrecht zu Fall, Recht zum Ziel kommt'. Human beings are entirely responsible for their own calamities. The gods are harsh, but only in reaction to human wrongdoing.

Deianeira, driven by fear, lacks an awareness of proper limits; Heracles is hubristic; Hyllus judges his mother intemperately. Ajax is guilty of hubris against Athena; Teucer lacks respect for authority; Agamemnon and Menelaus do not control their resentment; only Odysseus knows himself. Antigone and Creon both lack self-knowledge, as does Haemon, but Ismene has moderation. Creon is the moderate man of *OT*; Oedipus is rash and hot-tempered. He is entirely responsible for his fate. Readings of the later plays are more surprising. Electra lacks *sophrosyne*, as does her mother, while both Orestes and Chrysothemis exemplify it. In *Philoctetes*, L. treats the story that Philoctetes rejected Chryses sexually as part of the plot, so that Philoctetes is to blame for his suffering and entirely wrong to reject the Greek cause, while Odysseus is in the right (and has self-knowledge). In *OC*, Theseus and Antigone have self-knowledge, while Creon, Polynices, and Oedipus lack it. Finally, he suggests that Sophocles was a greater influence on Menander than was Euripides.

My great difficulty with the book is methodological. L. has no hesitation in

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.284 Published online by Cambridge University Press

announcing that a particular passage represents Sophocles' own opinion, while another is misguided, or that a difficult passage means one thing rather than another. He states that scholars who disagree with him are wrong. He ignores anything in the text that might point in a different direction (there is, for example, no discussion of *Ant*. 278–9, or *Electra* 1058–97). He repeatedly refers to 'Sophocles, the priest' in references to the poet's theology. There is no sign that he has thought about his own critical assumptions. He seems to assume both that Sophocles was unconcerned about any possible contestation of the meaning of *sophrosyne* itself, and that either no conflict among virtues was possible for Sophocles or that *sophrosyne* trumped all others automatically. None of this is self-evident. As a result, I find the book unconvincing quite apart from the actual interpretations. It makes some valid points (though many are familiar), and could be a useful corrective to extreme views on the other side.

Since the implied author of the book does not distance his own views from those of Sophocles, its interpretations have political and moral implications. *Sophrosyne* as understood here demands great deference to legitimate authority, even when it abuses its power, and great caution in opposing even illegitimate power. For example, Chrysothemis exemplifies *sophrosyne*. L. makes the valid point that Electra's incessant laments have led to Aegisthus' plan to imprison her. If this plan were carried out, she would be in no position to help Orestes, while Chrysothemis would be. He also stresses that salvation comes from outside, from Orestes and the gods. This is quite true, but the only positive action Chrsyothemis takes, appropriating the offerings, is suggested by Electra. Chrysothemis is not a secret, but active, opponent of the regime. She is an internal emigrant. Sophocles thus seems to recognize the complexity of moral action under tyranny.

Sophocles was surely, among other things, a teacher of *sophrosyne*: but I do not believe that he was as complacent as this book would make him—or we would not still be arguing about him.

The University of Michigan RUTH SCODEL

HIPPOLYTUS

S. MILLS: *Euripides:* Hippolytus. Pp. 160, map, ills. London: Duckworth, 2002. Paper, £9.99. ISBN: 0-7156-2974-3.

In fairness, I must admit to a deep prejudice against work of this sort, which seems to pander to a degenerate educational taste for bland, processed fare, providing predigested material for easy undergraduate regurgitation. However, let us try to judge the book on its own terms. The jacket blurb states:

> This new series provides accessible introductions to ancient tragedies. Each volume discusses the main themes of a play and the central developments in modern criticism, while also addressing the play's historical context and the history of its performance and adaptation. A guide to further reading, glossary and chronology are included, all Greek and Latin is translated, and technical and theoretical terms are clearly explained.

Accessible, yes. The targeted reader will take comfort in the side-stepping of issues which threaten to become 'complex' (pp. 81, 98, and elsewhere).

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.284 Published online by Cambridge University Press