
This is an excellent addition to the Aris and Phillips series. The translation, facing the Greek text, is accurate, clear and readable. The commentary is concise, lucid and informed, covering a range of material both interpretative and more technical, and never becoming pedantic. The introduction to the play (covering 'The Myth', 'Structure and Themes', 'Wives and Concubines', 'Locale and Staging', 'Date and Place of Production', and 'A Note on the Greek Text') is similarly concise, readable, and helpful apart from a disappointingly meagre treatment of staging. This introduction also nicely complements the preceding general introduction to the series by Shirley Barlow, which offers most useful insights into various aspects of the ancient theatre and Greek Tragedy in general, drawing extensively yet judiciously on recent scholarship, along with a balanced view of Euripides.

The big question about this book, however, is: who is going to be able to make use of it? This is a question which has often been asked about the whole Aris and Phillips series, given that it appears to fall between various stools. The general problem is highlighted when we find ourselves dealing, especially in a New Zealand context, with a play such as Euripides' *Andromache*.

Greekless or minimally Greeked Classical Studies students will almost invariably be introduced to Euripides via one or more of the better known plays such as *Bacchae, Medea* or *Hippolytus*, and will probably not go beyond these. Those few who do make a more specialised study of Euripides will want to read a more 'exciting' translation of a play like *Andromache* than the literal version offered by Lloyd, excellent of its type though this is. And such students will normally not want, or be in a position, to make use of the
Greek text (they would, however, definitely be well advised to read the Lloyd commentary and introductions).

With regard to the sadly minimal number of Greek language students who advance beyond the introductory level to what might be called an intermediate level, Lloyd's _Andromache_ would in theory make an excellent introduction to Greek Tragedy. However, the convenient presence of a facing English translation deters some teachers from prescribing this type of text for students who are supposed to be focusing on Greek (suitable texts from the Cambridge Greek and Latin series are often preferred), and in any case one of the more 'classic' tragedies might well be given the nod where this might be the only experience of a Greek tragedy in Greek which the students would ever have. Advanced Greek students and scholars would naturally opt for the more detailed Stevens edition, so once again Lloyd would probably miss out.

It will clearly not be easy, then, for the Lloyd edition to find its place in the sun. This is a pity, because on its own terms it is excellent, and even advanced scholars would gain much from reading it, whether in conjunction with Stevens or as a means of providing a fresh approach to a reread of the play. The present reviewer confesses that he had not read _Andromache_ straight through in Greek for 21 years, and Lloyd made this exercise a real pleasure.

In the following comments on points of detail I generally (but not exclusively) have in mind Greekless or near Greekless readers. It must be appreciated, too, that my criticisms must be seen against a general background of appreciation, and indeed admiration, at the way in which Lloyd manages to convey so much pertinent comment so lucidly and economically.

First Act (1-116) - Scene: unhelpful on staging, both in general and in particular on the shrine of Thetis. The earlier discussion in the Introduction (10) is also much too vague with regard to the various possibilities. There is no attempt even to begin to come to grips with how the dramatic space might have been used. A comment such as 'There is no reason why it (i.e. the shrine of Thetis) should not have been represented by a free-standing structure somewhat to the side of the stage' (10) simply
does not address issues such as dramatic focus and the movement of actors and chorus and their interrelationship.

line 1 'Asian homeland': the brief note on σχήμα, and indeed most of the notes on the particular Greek words or phrases to which attention is judiciously drawn throughout the commentary, would be extremely helpful to those students who might have enough Greek to be able to take advantage of them. The same applies to the similarly judicious choice of notes of a textual critical nature, and references to Diggle.

line 10: it would have been useful to find a cross reference to the discussion of Astyanax on p.1.

lines 103-116: model note for this kind of commentary on Andromache's elegiac lament.

First Choral Ode (117-146): The comment 'E often reduces the impact of the chorus' entry by preceding it with actor's lyrics ... The chorus is thus subordinated to an actor in dramatic impact' may be true in a sense, but it nevertheless presents a negative view of what E is doing. The chorus contributes significantly to a particular dramatic effect.

line 117 'floor': the note 'on the meaning of δαπεδον, see Barrett on Hi. 230' is an example of an unhelpful note (other examples include the note on 883 'for ἄταρ δή, see Seaford on Cyc. 84'). Intermediate Greek students will be concentrating on coming to terms with the Greek text and will not want to be looking up Barrett, Seaford et al, even if they have ready access to them. Lloyd's references to fuller discussions, for those who require them, are much more useful when they follow, as they usually do, his own brief discussion of the points at issue. Such a brief discussion will be sufficient for some readers, and the others can then chase up the further references. In general, though, it is one of the excellent features of Lloyd, that he so often points a reader to relevant and well-chosen recent authorities on points which he does discuss, whether these are linguistic points which require reference to a scholarly commentary, or interpretative points which require reference to a book or article.

Second Act (147-273): Lloyd is extremely good at explaining technical features clearly and concisely. With regard to the agon in particular, he does not allow his expertise to spoil his aim of enlightening the uninitiated.

lines 159-60 'mind of Asiatic women': this is one place where I miss a reference to some further discussion, specifically in connection with the female reputation for skill in the use of drugs.

line 221 'conceal': these days a term such as 'gnomic aorist' needs to be explained.

line 230: Porson's law requires a brief explanation.

Fourth Act (494-765): I miss some discussion of staging again, e.g. the possible interaction between the attendants of Menelaus and Peleus.
line 617 ‘cases’: a brief comment would have been helpful rather than the bare reference to Sparkes.

Fourth Choral Ode (766-801): especially good commentary here, though the comment on all the choral parts is exemplary (with the possible exception of 464-493 where, however, the subject matter does not exactly lend itself to stimulating comment!), and there is a particularly useful discussion of the problems associated with the second antistrophe of 1009-46.

lines 885-6: a brief note establishing the locality of Dodona would have been useful.

Sixth Act (1047-1288): a little more comment on Delphi in the fifth century and especially the treasuries (see 1093) would have been useful.

lines 1186-7 ‘O marriage, marriage...’: comparison with ‘cursed marriage’ cries in Sophoclean contexts such as Antigone and OT would have enhanced this note.

lines 1266-88: a little more could usefully have been said about the mechane, even though reference is made to further more detailed discussions.
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St Ambrose is one of the most remarkable figures of the early Church. Hailed bishop before he had even been baptised, the