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/53.2.285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The chapter headings mesh with the promises of the blurb: (1) 'Euripides and His World'; (2) 'Tragedy and the Hippolytus Story'; (3) 'A Summary of the Play'; (4) 'The Major Themes of the Play'; (5) 'Critical Views of Euripides and Hippolytus'; and (6) 'The Afterlife of Hippolytus'. In Chapter 1, the ancient biographical tradition is dismissed (*à la* Lefkowitz, who is not, however, cited), and there is much both on women's 'role in Athenian culture' (which 'seems appalling to us', p. 14; cf. p. 69) and on the sophists. (Conacher's recent book, not noted, would be more helpful to the putative readership than Guthrie or Kerferd, noted on p. 131 n. 10.) In Chapter 2, after a general treatment of tragic production and of myth (material readily available elsewhere), the extant play is set against other Hippolytus dramas (some anticipation here of Chapter 6). Chapter 3, a simple plot summary, tends to present interpretation as fact (p. 36, on statues in staging; p. 46, on Adonis) and is sloppy in expression (p. 37, 'the goddess Aidos'; p. 38, 'an Athenian queen'). At times, the language is reminiscent of Mills and Boon: Ariadne in her 'romantic misfortunes' is 'unlucky in love' (p. 39; cf. p. 26 'unhappily involved with Theseus'). The disproportionately long Chapter 4 covers much ground, rather discursively and repetitiously, but has little to do with the promised topic, themes. The introductory section brings in the sophists (again) and earlier plays (again); then there are sections on Phaedra (forward references to the ensuing chapter), the Nurse, Hippolytus, Theseus, gods and men, the Chorus (with an unsatisfactory passing reference to an 'extra male chorus', p. 81), language and uncertainty, and duality and repetition. Chapter 5 recapitulates much material already treated implicitly or explicitly, and there is much oversimplification. (The statement that 'some older commentators suggest that the large age gap between Theseus and his wife leads her to look elsewhere for satisfaction', p. 103, is unhappily ambiguous.) Chapter 6 is fresher than the rest of the book; it is good to see at least a tentative step taken in this neglected direction.

In some respects, the book is curiously old-fashioned: there is nothing on ephebic themes (and only a passing reference to young girls' rites of passage, p. 27); there is much rather uncritical reliance on Aristotle's *Poetics* (p. 25 etc.). Linguistic remarks are imprecise or unhelpful: *sophrosyne* is awkwardly and misleadingly, in view of its constant sexual connotations, translated 'safe-mindedness' (p. 72 etc.); the words 'arrogant' and 'proud' are regarded as 'a pun in Greek' (p. 133, first n. 4). The writing is functional and inelegant to the point of solecism, with misuse of relative pronouns throughout (e.g. p. 9, 'who'; p. 27, 'which'). Occasional trendy or colloquial asides (as pp. 30, 61, 87) are merely incongruous. The 'guide to further reading' (pp. 142–6) is otiose, as the judgements are either anodyne ('useful', 'readable', etc.) or replicate material already in the notes; and its relation to the following bibliography (pp. 147–53) is not made clear. The map is a mere rudimentary sketch and the illustration of the theatre comes from a published souce (pp. 6, 22; there are no other illustrations). The chronological table (pp. 156–7) is an idiosyncratic compilation, listing together theatrical adaptations of the Hippolytus story and editions of the Euripidean text; Gilbert Murray's verse translation is included but not his (or Diggle's) edition.

The book meets the description of the blurb, but cannot be said to do it well. Is there a need for such publication? In terms of scholarship, the answer is a firm 'no'; in terms of pedagogic exigencies, a qualified 'perhaps'; in terms of career development (promotion and tenure procedures), it has become 'yes'. And then, how many? Such do exist already.

University of St Andrews E. M. CRAIK

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.285 Published online by Cambridge University Press