

M. LLOYD, *Euripides: Andromache*. Second edition. The Plays of Euripides, Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2005, 208 pp., ISBN 0-85668-770-7.

Under the able editorial direction of Christopher Collard, Aris & Phillips' series of commentaries on the plays of Euripides is now almost complete. Michael Lloyd's 1994 *Andromache* was an excellent addition to the series, and it now appears in a new edition. This seems to be the only volume in the series so far to have been accorded the distinction of a second edition. While it is not clear why Lloyd's *Andromache* has been singled out in this way, we should be grateful for the improvement that this opportunity has afforded. A considerable amount of scholarship, on Euripides and on this play, has been published in the decade since the first edition and Lloyd has done a splendid job of incorporating references to much of it. (In addition, Collard has updated his "General Bibliography for Euripides," pp. 179–88, which is very good although, in conformity with the aims of the series, it refers mostly to work published in English.) In particular, Lloyd has had to take account of David Kovacs' Loeb edition of the play (1995) and his textual discussions in *Euripidea Altera* (1996) as well as William Allan's important monograph on the play (2000).

As in the first edition, the text is that of Diggle's OCT, with a greatly abbreviated apparatus. The translation, which is clear and accurate, has been "tinkered with" and the introduction is "essentially unchanged" (vii), although the references have been revised to take account of recent literature. The twenty-page "General Introduction to the Series" by Shirley Barlow, which appeared in the first edition, has been dropped, allowing Lloyd to expand the commentary somewhat. Even with a dozen pages added to its length, the commentary is still compact, but it manages to provide the student with a good deal of assistance in a small amount of space. Lloyd's judgment is on the whole

sound and, while he is committed to presenting and commenting on Diggle's text, he occasionally expresses an independent view, as at 475, 784, 861–2 and 1246 (on which see further below). Disagreements with Diggle and with other scholars are invariably expressed with exemplary tact. But Lloyd is not satisfied merely to practice politeness. He is a theoretician as well, having published an important article in which he accounts for the phenomenon known as “the tragic aorist” in terms of contemporary politeness theory (*CQ* 49, 1999, 24–45) and, more recently, an illuminating piece entitled “Sophocles in the Light of Face-Threat Politeness Theory,” in I. J. F. de Jong and A. Rijksbaron (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language: Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics*, *Mnem.* Suppl. 269, Leiden–Boston 2006, 225–39. A number of the notes added to, or expanded in, the second edition reflect Lloyd's recent researches in this area of linguistic pragmatics (e.g. 530–1, 785, 866, 1234), and they are especially welcome. He has also taken advantage of the additional space by providing brief quotations in English translation, often from other Aris & Phillips volumes, in place of the bare citation in the first edition (e.g. 777–84, 791–801). This will serve to make the commentary still more useful and accessible.

Most of the new material is included in order to address recent scholarship. So, for example, reference to work by Seaford and Henrichs has prompted the addition of the note on 315, Chadwick's *Lexicographica Graeca* provokes a note on κινεῖν at 607 and (unrelated to the foregoing) a number of scholars are invoked in a discussion intended to justify Lloyd's revised rendering of ὁμιλία at 683 (“meeting other people”). Most often, however, Lloyd introduces references to recent work in order (politely) to disagree. Lloyd uses economical means to make telling points when he takes issue with Kovacs (241–2, 500, 535–6, 591, 777, 1004), Allan (500, 777) and Scullion (1241). But I am not sure his dismissal of Kovacs' rendering at 759–60 (“by the gods' grace I rule over a great army of cavalry and foot soldiers”) is well justified. Lloyd notes that “word order suggests that οὐνεχ' . . . governs all three nouns” (gods, cavalry and foot-soldiers), and he cites *Hec.* 852–3, θεῶν θ' οὐνεκ' . . . καὶ τοῦ δικαίου, where word order is indeed decisive. Here, however, we have τε . . . τε rather than τε . . . καί, and the first connective comes after the second of three

nouns. Even *Hipp.* 495 εὐνῆς οὐνεχ' ἡδονῆς τε σῆς, not cited by Lloyd, is not parallel, since there we have single τε following the second of two nouns.

My own disagreements with Lloyd are few and, like the foregoing, are concerned with relatively minor matters. His practice in the commentary of referring to portions of the text that are not choral odes as “acts” is, I think, misleading. And the translation of vocative γύναι with a proper name (117 and throughout) is odd, considering that the same form of address is used in the case of a woman whose name is not known (e. g. *Ion* 238, 244, *IT* 483, *Hel.* 82, 84). Nor do I understand how the same word (294) can be both an “internal accusative” and “in apposition to the sentence.” At line 1099, as in the first edition, Lloyd translates “in the colonnaded temples.” But despite the plural δόμοις the reference is surely to a single temple, the ναόν of 1095. The plural is similarly used at 1144, where Lloyd appropriately translates “temple.”

Part of the value of a commentary like Lloyd's is that it serves to open up to literary and scholarly scrutiny a text by a major author, in the case of *Andromache* one that has often been neglected. My own reading of this text has benefited from engagement with Lloyd's commentary, and I should like to conclude with some observations on individual passages that his notes have aroused. When Andromache expresses fear that a pair of vultures (γῦπες, 75) will kill her son, Lloyd rightly notes that vultures eat carrion, and then goes on to cite Garvie's learned note on *Soph. Aj.* 169–71 in support of the contention that “the Greeks may not have distinguished them clearly from eagles.” What ought to be pointed out is that, in the parodos of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, the vultures (49) that represent Menelaus and his brother are transformed into predatory eagles (114, 137) who symbolically devour the young of Troy. Here the vultures are Menelaus and his daughter, intent upon eliminating the last of the Trojan children. On 106 χιλιόναυς . . . ὠκύς Ἄρης Lloyd notes that ὠκύς is a frequent epithet for warriors in Homer. It is also used of ships (*Il.* 8.197, *Od.* 7.34, 9.101). Lloyd is undoubtedly right to note that the terms in which Andromache laments at 116, as she supplicates the statue of Achilles' mother, recall descriptions of the transformed Niobe. But surely the passage

to cite is *Il.* 24.602–17, where Achilles tells Niobe’s story as part of his consolation of Priam over the death of Andromache’s husband Hector.

When Hermione says (178) that it is not right for one man to hold the reins of two women, Lloyd points to the frequent use in tragedy of the metaphor of the yoke in connection with marriage. But since the two women at issue here are one Greek and one Asiatic, it is not unreasonable to see an allusion to Xerxes’ disastrous attempt to manage the reins of two such women in Atossa’s dream at Aesch. *Pers.* 181–96. At 427 Lloyd supports the reading in Diggle’s text by noting that Jackson’s ἔχω σ’ for the manuscripts’ ἐγὼ σ’ “introduces a common wrestling metaphor.” But does the introduction of that metaphor compensate for introducing an anomaly into the text? Adoption of Jackson’s suggestion causes the following sentence to begin, not only in asyndeton, but with the conjunction ἵνα which, unlike the relative adverb, is not used as the first word of a sentence. (The only exceptions to this general observation are instances like *IA* 885 and Ar. *Eq.* 494, where a question is answered with a ἵνα-clause, or like Ar. *Nub.* 1192, *Pax* 409 and *Eccl.* 791, where a question is introduced with an expression of the sort ἵνα δὴ τί.) The sequence τί ταῦτα, πῶς ταῦτ’; (548) strikes me as inept. I wonder if we should not read instead τί ταῦτα; πρὸς τοῦ κάκ τίνος λόγου νοσεῖ / δόμος; For πρὸς τοῦ compare *Med.* 705, *Held.* 77, *Hipp.* 1164 and especially fr. 682 K. νοσεῖ . . . πρὸς τοῦ; For the double question, cf. *Hec.* 773 θνήσκει δὲ πρὸς τοῦ καὶ τίνος πότμου τυχών;

The resemblance between 1008 δαίμων . . . οὐκ ἔῃ φρονεῖν μέγα and Hdt. 7.10 οὐ γὰρ ἔῃ φρονέειν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄλλον ἢ ἑωυτόν is so striking that some comment was warranted. Did Euripides influence Herodotus or vice versa? Or, rather, is this a *geflügeltes Wort* snared by both writers independently? Indeed, one of the few weaknesses of Lloyd’s commentary, undoubtedly attributable to the compression imposed by the format of the series, is the sparse treatment of the influences that affected Euripides in his composition of this play and of the play’s *Nachleben*. Virgil’s *Aeneid* is scarcely mentioned and, unless I have missed a reference, Ennius’ *Andromache* and Racine’s *Andromaque* not at all. This is unfortunate, particularly in the

case of Virgil, whose *exsultat telis et luce coruscus aena* (*Aen.* 2.470), referring to Neoptolemus shortly before he murders Priam at an altar adjacent to a laurel tree (513), is an ironic translation of *Andr.* 1146 ἔστη φαεινοῖς δεσπότης στίλβων ὄπλοις, describing Neoptolemus shortly before he is murdered at an altar by a band of men who ambush him from the cover of a laurel tree (1115). In this connection, Virgil's comparison of Hecuba and her daughters taking refuge at the altar to doves (516) may owe something to Euripides' description of Neoptolemus' attackers running from him like doves before a hawk (*Andr.* 1140–1), where Lloyd refers only to passages from Homer and tragedy.

Finally, in his note on 1246 Lloyd fairly and concisely presents the issues surrounding the question of whether Andromache and her son are on stage at the end of the play, noting that παῖδα τόνδε “is *prima facie* evidence for the presence of the child, and thus also of Andromache.” As he points out, however, tragic technique would lead us to expect these characters to be explicitly introduced, and he ends his note by apparently approving Mastronarde's παῖδα τῆσδε, which that scholar proposed in his review of Diggle's OCT and which has since been adopted in Kovacs' Loeb. The awkward τόνδε can be eliminated equally well, and perhaps better, by reading τοῦδε, referring to Neoptolemus, who is, unlike the boy's mother, actually on stage in the form of a corpse and is elsewhere in the scene referred to with the deictic (1239, 1264, 1277).

In short, this is a sound and useful edition, with a reliable translation and a sensible commentary. The introduction presents a good, brief account of *Andromache* as a *nostos* play with a twist, namely that the hero returns only as a corpse, and includes an excellent section on “wives and concubines.” In combination with William Allan's extended treatment of the play, this edition should help to rescue this intriguing drama from the neglect that it has routinely suffered.

DAVID SANSONE  
University of Illinois  
dsansone@uiuc.edu

