

Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2007.09.53

Andreas N. Michalopoulos, *Ovid Heroides 16 and 17. Introduction, text and commentary. ARCA: Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 47.* Cambridge: Francis Cairns, 2006. Pp. x, 409. ISBN 10: 0-905205-44-8. ISBN 13: 978-0-905205-44-1. £80.00.

Reviewed by Antonio Ramírez de Verger, Universidad de Huelva (rdverger@uhu.es)

Word count: 4117 words

This volume comprises an introduction (pp. 1-80), the Latin text of letters 16 and 17 accompanied by a critical apparatus of a sort (pp. 83-103), and a lengthy commentary (16 on pp. 105-272; 17 on pp. 273-357). The book closes with an extensive bibliography (pp. 359-388) and a number of indexes (pp. 389-409: Latin Words and Phrases, Greek Words and Phrases, Passages Discussed, and General Index).

The fairly comprehensive introduction includes a brief and useful outline of the letters, which with a few exceptions (on 16.217-58 [not 215-58 as indicated on p. 4] and 17.65-74) is not repeated later in the commentary; the mythological exempla that appear in these two letters are examined to support the line of argument between Paris and Helen, the relationship between Virgil's *Aeneid* and *Her.* 16 and 17, and the analogy between *Her.* 7 and *Her.* 16 and 17; the 'personae' of Paris (*Her.* 16) and Helen (*Her.* 17) are outlined; the 'dramatic irony' of the letters is examined in some depth; the now familiar 'Ovidian humour and wit' is reviewed; echoes of other Greek and Latin works in the letters are presented; the letter from Oenone to Paris (*Her.* 5) is assessed as evidence 'for the full appreciation of the correspondence of Paris and Helen'; the important role of Venus in Paris's seduction of Helen is recalled; the letters are interpreted as letters of 'love elegy' in which Paris is 'an elegiac amator', Helen 'an elegiac puella', and Menelaus the rival or 'elegiac vir'; some points of comparison between *Her.* 16-17 and the *Ars amatoria* are illustrated; and a detailed study is presented of the style of the letters (rhetorical figures, language, vocabulary, word order and etymology). The introduction closes with a *Conspectus siglorum* and a Comparative table of readings. In the *Conspectus siglorum* 'Putaneus' appears as 'Puteanus' and a codex 'Planudeus' is cited, in allusion, I assume, to the *Maximi Planudis Metaphrasis* or *Interpretatio Planudea* from the end of the 13th century, which has been preserved in a number of manuscripts (Ambrosianus Graecus 119 A s. XIV, Vaticanus Barberinianus Graecus 121 s. XIV, Scorialensis 933; .III.13 s. XIV, Vaticanus Reginensis Graecus 133 s. XIV, Parisinus Graecus 2848 s. XV/XVI, codex Musei Britannici XVI D IX 2, a. 1615; cf. A. Gudeman, 33; .III.13 s. XIV, Vaticanus Reginensis Graecus 133 s. XIV, Parisinus Graecus 2848 s. XV/XVI, codex Musei Britannici XVI D IX 2, a. 1615; cf. A. Gudeman, *De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo*, Berolini, 1888; Palmer 159, M. Papathomopoulos XII). The comparative table of readings is something of a misnomer, as it would have been more accurate to call it a comparative table of readings adopted by the editors cited (Palmer, Dörrie, Showerman-Goold, Rosati, Kenney) and by Michalopoulos himself (hereinafter M.), as is made clear in his critical apparatus. In passing, his proposal at 17.128 *nam mea vox quare quod cupio esse neget* (99 and 315) is impossible because 'there is no case of an elision of a long open vowel' (in the last half of the pentameter, cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 89; see also Kenney in *Exemplaria Classica* 11, 2007, forthcoming). Then at 17.197 M. reads *neges* (codd. aliquot saec. XII-XV

according to Giomini XLIV and 90) in place of *negas*, the reading of the manuscripts rightly defended by Kenney ('strictly true', 141). The reading *praemonuisse* at 17.240 is not Palmer's but that of the manuscripts, and neither is *pudore* at 17.259, this again being the majority manuscript reading (cf. Dörrie 230).

The text presented by M. is a revised text using the editions of Palmer (1898), Dörrie (1971), Showerman-Gould (1977), Rosati (1989) and Kenney (1996). The apparatus criticus is not a critical apparatus *sensu stricto* but a series of critical notes based on the apparatuses of Palmer, Dörrie and Kenney. In my opinion there is not much point in this type of critical apparatus when not a single manuscript has been read, as M. himself admits (p. 77), and not all the editions of these two letters have been used, especially most of those prior to Palmer. The model of apparatus criticus provided by A. Barchiesi (*Her.* 1-3, 1992, 57-60, 113-117, 191-5) is not an example to follow. By contrast, the models, for instance, of Casali (1995, 20-6), Knox (1995, 39-85), Kenney (who refers to his as 'critical notes appended to the text', 1996, 27), Bessone (1997, 43-53) or Reeson (2001, 13-34) are good examples of selective critical apparatuses. A clean text of the *Her.* with full apparatus criticus remains a desideratum among Classical scholars. Some years ago J. B. Hall (*ICS* 15, 1990, 263) promised a new critical edition for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana 'with an accurate apparatus criticus', but I fear we may still have a few years to wait. If we compare the commentaries of Palmer (succinct, textual, but incomplete) and Kenney (brief, but dense) with that of M., the latter, with the exception of textual questions, will be found to be a work of reference in all other respects: Greek and Latin sources (e.g. 16.375-6, 17.3, 116, 253, and passim), lexis (e.g. 16.174, 17.57, 93, 17.265), morphology (e.g. 16.345), syntax (e.g. 16.205, 215, 341, 17.29, 127, 182), metre (e.g., 16.14, 290; 17.97), style (57-77, and e.g. 16.372), although his interpretations of rhetorical figures seem to me to be somewhat speculative: e.g. 16.6, 203, 216, 225, 236, 317-8, 320, 332, 361, 17.82), literary criticism (e.g. 17.12), sexual innuendos (31-3, and e.g. 17.10, 263), amatory topoi (e.g. 16.128, 231-2; 17.39), mythology (e.g. 16.182, 201-2, 17.21, 247-8), realia (e.g. 16.151-2, 251-2, 335, 17.13, 63-4), etymology (e.g. 16.360), etc.

It goes without saying that the merits of the commentary are numerous, but the lack of 'pietas' towards editors and commentators prior to Palmer (1898), as well as the very limited space devoted to reasoned argument on problems of textual criticism prompt the following comments and observations, offered as brief indicators of how much is still to be done on the text and commentary of Ovid's *Heroides*.

16.1-2 read also I. Vahlen II 81-3.

16.13 neither Damsté's *iamque illud* (*Mnemosyne* 33, 1905, 47), accepted without comment by M., nor Häuptli's *iam primum* (154 and 275), passed over in silence by M., improve the textus receptus: *iam dudum gratum est*, 'I'm already grateful' (Kenney 85, Terpstra 402).

16.24 Naugerius (not cited by M.) has the reading *nil mirum* (FVW et alii) for the *nimirum* of other mss.; cf. Burman 220, Jahn 127, Loers 386, Weise 79 (*nil mirum* in parentheses), Giomini 61, Dörrie 194; Luck (*Exemplaria Classica* 6, 2002, 17).

16.38 Kenney's proposal (*tulit vulnus ... mihi*, pp. 32 and 87-8), accepted by M., is a variant on those of Housman (*tulit vulnus ... mihi*; *CR* 11, 9, 1911, 425-6) and Palmer (*mihi vulnus ... tulit*, p. 438). Housman's seems unnecessary to me, since the expression appears in Lucretius (4.1033-34: *conveniunt simulacra foris e corpore quoque, / nuntia praeclari voltus pulchrique coloris*). M. himself reminds us that 'repetition of the same word within the same line or the same couplet or between two couplets is especially frequent in *Heroides* 16-17. Normally such repetitions are the result of emotional intensification or confusion ... or are used for emphasis' (p. 61); see also Hunt (*CPh* 70, 1975, 222), Watt (*RFIC* 17, 1989, 66-7).

16.39-142 read also Loers 387-8, Jezierski 15-18.

16.39 see also Cucchiarelli (*MD* 37, 1996, 239-243).

16.44 to find the exact meaning of *iusto pondere* we must read Kenney 89: 'its full weight', that is, the birth was overdue; cf. Terpstra 406: 'aequo, legitimo, cui nihil deest vel superest'; Ruhnken 92.

16.49 *arsuram*, the correction by Heinsius 75, should be kept, as it is by Bentley (on Hor. *carm.* 3.3.23), Weise 80 and M., who rightly defends the feminine gender for 'Ilios' (acc. 'Ilion'); cf. Burman 222.

16.53-6 M. uses the term enjambment for what Platnauer understands as enjambment of couplets (*Latin Elegiac Verse*, 27-33). Strictly speaking, enjambment is 'also called "run-on" in prosody, the continuation of the sense of a phrase beyond the end of a line of verse' (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s. v.; J. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, Paris 1962, 308; A. Holgado, 'El encabalgamiento versal y su tipología en la Farsalia de Lucano', *Cuad. Filol. Clásica* 13, 1977, 213-267; Dámaso Alonso, *Poesía española*, Madrid 19715, 86-88).

16.83 on *dulce* as an adverbial accusative, see Terpstra 411.

16.97 Heinsius 136-7 and Burman 226 do not include the distich in the text, although they defend it in their critical notes. I prefer the reading by Liberman (*RPh* 71, 1997, 355): *quas super Oenones faciem mirabar in urbe*, not *in orbe*, as printed by M. 97 and 158).

16.101 M. accepts Bentley's correction (*animi*), sanctioned by Kenney 97, but lines 16.37 and 7.25-26, cited by M., suggest *te vigilans oculis, animo te nocte videbam* ('when awake I saw you with my eyes, at night with my mind'), as maintained by Palmer (I, p. 104 and II 441 coll. Petr. ap. Baehrens, *PLM* IV 100 *te vigilans oculis, animo te nocte requiro*); cf. van Lennep 267, Werfer 512, Rosati (*MD* 24, 1990, 171-4).

16.104 M. adduces two parallels for the fire of love (cf. G. Spatafora, *Maia* 58, 2006, 449-63). Both of them (*am.* 2.16.11-2 and *Her.* 21.209-210) were already presented by Heinsius 137, as were those of Virgil, *ecl.* 3.66 and Nemes. *ecl.* 4.4-5; cf. Burman 226-7.

16.112 on *textitur* see also Loers 399.

16.135 Paris's reaction to the visit of Helen is in Theocritus (11.82) and in Virgil's eighth eclogue (8.42 and Conington-Nettleship commentary ad loc. on pp. 97-8).

16.143-4 see M. Deufert, J. F. Gaertner, M. Winterbottom (*Hermes*, 130, 2002, 504-5).

16.151 on *nitida ... palaestra*, see also Burman 230, Loers 403, Ruhnken 94.

16.177 'I believe that the reading *sceptra* is preferable to *regna*': rightly so, as *sceptra* are an ancient symbol of monarchy and synecdoche for *regnum*, in both Gk. and Lat.; cf. Palmer 443, Horsfall ad *Aen.* 7.422.

16.202 on *Noctis* with a capital, cf. Ruhnken 95.

16.205 like M., I believe that *annis* is preferable to *armis*, pace Kenney; 'de armis postea (ll. 357-8) agetur', notes Heinsius 139-40.

16.223 the hendiadys of *rumpor et invideo* (= 'invidia rumpor', cf. Terpstra 429; Kenney 111) should be kept. For *rumpor et invidia* (M.'s reading) see also Austin and Reeve (*Maia* 22, 1970, 7, n. 5).

16.258 on secret signs and nods between lovers, cf. Terpstra 433-4, P. Green, *The Erotic Poems*, London, 1982, 272; J. Booth, 1991, 119.

16.260 on 'blanditiae', cf. G. Némethy (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores*, Budapest, 1907, 245) and A. Ramírez de Verger-M. Librán ('Irritamenta Veneris en Marcial', *Hominem pagina nostra sapit. Marcial, 1900 años después*, Zaragoza, 2004, 209-26).

16.273 the variant **praestans** from the Planudean version for **praesens** should not be rejected outright; cf. Nissen (*Hermes* 76, 1941, 90) and Liberman (*RPh* 71, 1997, 355).

16.293 the manuscripts (Dörrie 208) transmit a number of variants: **amorum**, **morum**, **armorum**, **avorum** and **amoris**. Since Merkel (1877, 131) most editors, including M., have opted for **morum** (cf. Goold, *Gnomon* 46, 1974, 477-8), a genitive depending on **vires** that 'seems unexampled' (Kenney 117). Heinsius 141 adduced a passage of Persius (1.103-4 **haec fierent, si testiculi vena ulla paterni / viveret in nobis?**) to defend the reading **avorum** in the sense of 'ancestors or forefathers' ('avorum igitur universe dictum pro patrum', states Loers 418). If our forefathers transmit their genes, then Helen, like her parents Jupiter and Leda, cannot be chaste. Terpstra 291 explains the passage as follows: 'si sunt vires in semine avorum] Indicat Helenam ex stupro Jovis et Ledaee conceptam castam esse non posse, si verum sit liberos plerumque referre indolem parentum. Huc spectat locus Horatii IV 4.29. Drakenb. et Oud.'; Ruhnken 96 states that 'tales nascuntur liberi, quales sunt parentum'. On the divine seed, cf. Lucr. 2.991 (**denique caelesti sumus omnes semine oriundi**), Ovid *met.* 1.78-9 (**natus homo est, sive hunc divino semine fecit / ille opifex rerum, mundi melioris origo**), *fast.* 6.5-6 (**est deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo; / impetus hic sacrae semina mentis habet**), Sil. 16.429 (**quantum divini praecellat seminis ortus**). Cf., however, Reeve (*CR* 24, 1974, 61).

16.299 the proposal of Damsté (**re nec non voce**), accepted by M., is no more convincing than the common reading (**rebus non voce**).

16.303 M. accepts Bentley's proposal (**risit et**), but the emendation by Heyworth (*Mnemosyne* 37, 1984, 103-5) also seems a good solution (**ipse et ut**). Naugerius opted for **exit et** (cf. Luck 2002, 17), while Heinsius 141 proposed **haesit et**. The readings of Naugerius are not cited by M. The vulgate reading is **ivit et**. See also Hunt (*CPh* 70, 1975, 216), Liberman (*RPh* 71, 1997, 355) and Watt (*BICS* 42, 1997-98, 147-8).

16.307 **sine pectore** means 'without a heart', that is, without feelings (Palmer 445), not 'stupid', pace Terpstra 441 ('sine prudentia ac sensu communi'), Ruhnken 96, and Kenney 119.

16.313 read **sic ut, not sicut**, as pointed out by Liberman (*RPh* 71, 1997, 355).

16.358 the sexual interpretation ('a bold and humorous sexual innuendo') is convincing. 16.374 **certamen ... movent** is an epiphoneme rather than a sententia and therefore there should be a colon after **coniuge**, as in, e.g., Loers 426, Terpstra 449.

17.10 on the paronomasia 'hostis/hospes' see Terpstra 453.

17.14 on **tenor** see also Loers 428.

17.16 M. alludes to Kenney's commentary on **sedeo** but omits reference to the previous comments by Palmer 447 (cf. Loers 428, Terpstra 454) and there is no mention whatsoever of the variant **videor** (GiK(vl)P(mg)), defended by Heinsius 144 in place of **sedeo**; cf. *ars* 2.453 (**quem videat lacrimans, quem torvis spectet ocellis**; see Janka ad loc.).

17.17 M. accepts **vixi** (cf. Reeve, *CQ* 23, 1973, 329) and not **lusi** without putting forward any argument of his own (95 and 281), when editors are clearly divided between the two readings. Heinsius 144, for example, opted for **lusi**, adducing *fast.* 4.9 (**quae decuit primis sine crimine lusimus annis**; cf. Fantham 92) and *trist.* 3.2.5 (**nec mihi, quod lusi vero sine crimine, prodest**). Here 'ludere' is almost equivalent to 'amare', cf. Pichon 192, Montero 189. See also Sedlmayer 1880, 28.

17.34 Palmer 448 explains the sense of **quando** thus: 'quando after ne = aliquando, as in si quando'. Liberman (*RPh* 71, 1997, 356) reads **neu quando**.

17.37 **quo** is not an emendation by Burman but a defence of what he had read in some manuscripts. This is how he puts it (vol. I, p. 245): 'In Mediceo et Argentinensi erat quo, quod Latinius et elegantius censeo'; cf. Sedlmayer 129, Palmer 448, Giomini 83, Dörrie 218.

17.75 The sound proposal of Liberman (**quae tu facis for quae nunc facis**), accepted by M. (**RPh**71, 1997, 355), is already to be found in Werfer 561-2.

17.89 Liberman (**RPh** 71, 1997, 356) put forward the attractive proposal: **credere sed tamen**.

17.93 on **rara** read also Terpstra 462, Ruhnken 98.

17.95 on the problems with adversative **sed**, see the note by Kenney 132 (cf. Heinsius 148: 'pro vel altera, quamvis altera'; Dörrie 221). Kenney's proposed **sic** is attractive, but **vel** would be the 'lectio difficilior'.

17.97 on the periphrasis 'posse + inf.' in Ovid read Loers 437-8.

17.102 Reeve citing. **fast.** 6.115 (1973, 330), Kenney and M. follow the reading **sed nimis oris adest**, in which M. attributes **nimis** to Riese (also Palmer 450 and Reeve 1973, 330). However, **nimis** was already present in the ed. Medional. of 1517 (**sed nimis oris inest**, f. LXXXV). Heinsius 148 read **sed magis oris inest** (Weise 93 **minus oris inest**), with the support of **am.** 2.1.12 (**et satis oris erat**, cf. McKeown ad loc.) and **trist.** 1.1.113 (**si satis oris habebis**, cf. Luck ad loc.). Perhaps we should read **nec tibi plus cordis, sed satis oris adest**, meaning 'and you do not have better spirit but an excess of impudence (Spanish: 'no tienes más gusto sino descaro de sobra'). The Spanish term 'descaro', from the Greek 'kára', in the sense of 'desvergüenza, atrevimiento, insolencia, falta de respeto [shamelessness, audacity, insolence, lack of respect]' (DRAE, s.v.) is a term which probably reflects Ovid's meaning quite well; cf. van Lennep 273 'sed ita os pro impudentia sumendum'; Loers 438-9, Terpstra 463, Ruhnken 98.

17.119 M., like Heinsius 149, rightly defends the **corpora** of the majority of the manuscripts against the **numina** of the edd. vett., Weise 94 and Kenney 135-6.

17.127 **infirmo** in the sense of 'discredit' (Kenney 136) is not attested outside Cicero. Heinsius read **inficior** (88) and proposed (150) **insimulo**, as at 6.22 and **am.** 2.7.13 with McKeown comm.; see also Watt, **BICS** 42, 1997-98, 148.

17.137 if 'repugno (not 'pugno') + inf.' is only found in Lucr. 4.1269 (where the inf. depends on two verbs, as noted by Kenney 137) there should at least have been a reference to the reading **recuso** of other manuscripts and edd. veteres (Jahn 150, Dörrie 223).

17.145 for **nescia rerum** 'ignorant of the world', cf. Palmer 451, Kenney 137.

17.150 on the shortening of the last syllable as an argument against Ovidian authorship of this letter, cf. Lachmann 1848 Eschenburg, 20, Palmer 451.

17.157 Naugerius (cf. Jahn 151, Dörrie 224; Luck 2002, 18) made an attractive suggestion: **iussum est** instead of **visum est**, comparing it to 16.364, where the manuscripts are divided between **viso** and **iusso**.

17.159 **resque domusque** is a 'formula sollemnis', cf. Tibull. 1.9.72 with Smith's comm., Hor. **epist.** 1.2.51, Burman 253, Terpstra 471, Ruhnken 99.

17.166 for the proverb (**an nescis longas regibus esse manus?**) see also Palmer, 452; on this the most complete commentary is still that of Burman, 253 with references to those of Ciofanus and Heinsius.

17.171 the defence of **relicta**, the reading of manuscripts D and P, in preference to

relictam is not to be attributed to Goold (1974, 482) and Reeve (1973, 330), as M. claims, but to Naugerius (Jahn, 151, Dörrie 1971, 225; Luck 2002, 18).

17.177 the phrase **exacta voluntas** is explained at great length (M. says nothing) by Burman 254; cf. Loers 446, Terpstra 473, Ruhnken 99, Palmer, 452, Kenney, 139. 17.186 on **rusticitas** see E. Linse (**De Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore**, Dortmund [not Leipzig, p. 376], 1891, 30: 'h. XVI (= XVII) 186, XIX (= XX) 59, am. I 8, 44, art. I 672, III 128. imitati sunt posteriores'); cf. also Terpstra 22 ad 1.77, Kenney 110-1, 192.

17.194 **in ... lusa** (FGT, alii) seems to me to be the best option in the context of heroines deceived by their beloved, as kept by many editors; cf., e. g., Loers 448, Weise 96, Dörrie 226; see Luck **MH** 63, 2006, 68-72; Bentley, in addition to **pacta**, proposed to read **laesa**, cf. Hedicke 15, but this conjecture had already been put forward by Burman, t. IV in Addenda, p. 246, on the basis of 4.114. M. endorses **de (Francius) ... questa** (Heinsius 253), like Kenney 140. It should be mentioned in passing that the suggestion by Roncaioli Lamberti (**GIF** 20, 1989-90, 271-2), **in ... iuncta**, appears in various different manuscripts and is the reading of the edd. vett., such as the Mediolanensis of 1517 (f. LXXXVII), cf. Jahn 152. In addition, M. says nothing of the legal term exhibitis ('exhibere', 'produce in court', Kenney 140-1); cf. Loers 448, Terpstra 475, Palmer 453.

17.201 on **nox**, i. e., 'concupitus', read Ruhnken 99.

17.203-4 **novitatis plena ... gaudia**] 'the love of Paris and Helen will be something entirely new'. But where is the novelty in sexual joys? 'Gaudia' in marriage are 'gaudia pacta' (cf. **ars** 3.461 and Gibson's comm.). The suggestion here is of the 'erotic pleasures' of a new love, that of Paris and Helen (**nova Venus** in **met.** 9.141, 9.727-8). Hubertinus interpreted these gaudia as 'tantummodo inchopta' (ap. Terpstra 477).

17.226 the reading **ista**, preferred by M., was not only defended by Burman but also by the edd. vett., Heinsius 91 and Burman 257.

17.244 **causam non tenuere** is a technical expression to state that Juno and Minerva lost the trial against Venus; cf. **met.** 13.190; Terpstra 481, Ruhnken 100 and Palmer 453.

17.251 M. says nothing here or at 17.43 about the so-called epistolary 'quod', cf. Palmer 454, Kenney 129. Lindemann (194, 351) opts for the indicatives **iacatas ... recenses** of some of the manuscripts (Dörrie 229) instead of the subjunctives **iacates ... loquaris**.

17.261 the reading **timore** of BiT, defended by M., was proposed by Naugerius and Bersman (mg.) (cf. Jahn 156, Luck 2002, 18) and in my opinion is no improvement on the collocation **deposito ... pudore**, cf. Hor. **epist.** 1.9.11, **fast.** 6.620, Priap. 29.3, Mart. 3.68.5. In the passage adduced by M. in support of **timore**, **Her.** 18.57, the manuscripts also read **pudore** (cf. Dörrie 1971 235; see Heinsius 156-7).

17.263 On the proverb **adhuc tua messis in herba est** Heinsius also adduces (cited by Burman 260) a passage of Aulus Gellius (13.18.1), cited in part by Otto (161), where the meaning of the proverb is explained (cf. Ruhnken 100: 'proverbialis locutio pro nondum res matura est'); also adduced is **fast.** 4.645 (see Fantham ad loc.), cf. Palmer 454, Kenney 145.

The bibliography is very inclusive, especially from the 20th century onwards, but, as I have mentioned above, there are older works which we are obliged to know and read, since there is the possibility that some interpretation or attempted elucidation of a difficult or dubious passage clarified matters years ago. In the section covering editions (pp. 359-60) I believe it is useful to add the volume and page numbers, especially for the oldest and rarest editions, for ease of reading: G. Bersmann (1582, 1607) I 86-109; D. Heinsius (1629) I 80-100; N. Heinsius (1658) I 74-92, 134-157; P. Burman (1727) I 219-60; J. C. Jahn (1828) I 126-156; D. J. van Lennep (1812, 2nd ed.) 89-112, 262-279; V. Loers (1829) 384-457, 665-9; H. Lindemann (1867) 158-195, 342-52, 377-8; A.

Palmer (1898, 2005) I 100-23, II 436-54.

A number of useful editions and commentaries are not cited: Domitius Calderinus: **P. Ovidii Nasonis Liber heroidum epistolarum ... cum expositione familiari Antonii Volsci. Ubertini clerici Cresentinatis. Domitii Calderini et Icdaci Badii singularium interpretum**, Mediolani, 1517; B. W., Häuptli, **Publius Ovidius Naso, Liebesbriefe, Heroides-Epistulae**, Düsseldorf-Zürich, 2001², 154-191, 275-6, 323-8; E. Hedickii, **Studia Bentleiana. V. Ovidius Bentleianus**, Freenwaldiae, 1905, 12-15; J. F. Heusinger, **P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini Epistolae**, Brunsvigae, 1786; F. Moya del Baño, **Ovidio: Heroidas**, Madrid, 1986; A. Palmer, **P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides**, Londini, 1894, **Corpus Poetarum Latinorum** (ed. J. P. Postgate), I 341-6; **Dav. Ruhnkenii dictata ad Ovidii Heroidas et Albinovani elegiam nunc primum edidit Frid. Traug. Friedemann**, Lipsiae, 1831, 91-100; D. W. Terpstra, D. W., **P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides**, Lugduni Batavorum, 1829, 400-483; C. H. Weise, **P. Ovidii Nasonis opera omnia**, Lipsiae, 1845, I, 79-99.

In the section 'Books and articles' I also note the absence of certain titles, such as: R. Bodenstern, **Studien zu Ovids Heroides**, Merseburg, 1882, 16-9; A. Cucchiarelli, 'I prodigi dell'arco di Amore: un paradossso ovidiano e una croce testuale (Ovidio *her.* 16,39)', **MD** 37, 1996, 239-43; E. Delbey, **Heroides d'Ovide**, Atlante 2005; M. Deufert, J. F. Gaertner, M. Winterbottom, 'Critical Notes on the Heroides', **Hermes**, 130, 2002, 504-5; B. Eschenburg, **Metrische Untersuchungen über die Echtheit der Heroides des Ovid**, Program. Lubicense 1874; J. Gilbert, **Ad Ovidii Heroides quaestiones criticae et exegeticae**, Meissen, 1887 (on 16.98, 146, 225, 328); id., **Ovidianae quaestiones criticae et exegeticae**, Meissen, 1896 (on 17.173, 213); A. St. Jezierski, **De universis P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistolis Heroidum et singillatim de Sapphus ad Phaonem epistula**, Tarnowie 1886; K. Lachmann, **De Ovidii epistulis**, Berolini 1848, 1-7 (= **Kleinere Schriften**, Berlin 1876, II 56-61, cited without page-numbering); G. Luck, **Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids**, Heidelberg, 1969, 11-43; id., 'Ovid, Naugerius and We, or: How to Create a Text', **Exemplaria Classica** 6, 2002, 17-18; D. S. McKie, 'Ovid's Amores: The prime source for the Text', **CQ** 36, 1986, 219-38; E. Montero, **El latín erótico**, Sevilla 1991; L. Mueller, **De re metrica poetarum Latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium libri septem**, Hildesheim 1967 (= Leipzig 1894); Th. Nissen, 'Übersehene Lesarten zu Ovids Heroiden', **Hermes** 76, 1941, 90; I. Vahlen, 'Über die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid' in **Gesammelte Philologische Schriften**, Berlin, 1923, II, 81-3 (= 1881); W. S. Watt, 'Ovidiana', **MH** 52, 1995, 92-3; id., 'Notes on Latin Poetry', **BICS** 42, 1997-98, 147-8; F. W. Werfer, 'Lectionum in Ovidii Heroidas specimen', **Acta Philologorum Monacensium**, 1, 1814, 495-566; A. Zingerle, **Ovidius und sein Verhältniss zu den Vorgingern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern**, Hildesheim, 1967 (= 1869-71); F. Zoellner, **Analecta Ovidiana** Lipsiae 1892, 55-115 ('De Ovidianarum epistularum Paridis Helenaëque [XVI et XVII] fontibus').

The indexes closing the volume (pp. 389-409) will undoubtedly be of great use to those seeking to look into all sorts of philological questions. The efforts of Francis Cairns Publications to provide us with first-rate commentaries on Latin authors (Sallust by G. M. Paul, Ovid's **Amores** by J. C. McKeown, Tibullus by R. Maltby, Propertius II by P. Fedeli) deserve our most heartfelt thanks.¹

Notes:

¹ This review has been translated from the Spanish by J. J. Zoltowski, whom I wish to thank for his corrections and for making his time available. Thanks are also due to Dr. Guillermo Galán Vioque for bibliographical assistance offered from Cambridge and to the Junta de Andalucía for its grant in aid of research (HUM-1019).

[Read Latest](#)

[Index for 2007](#)

[Change Greek Display](#)

[Archives](#)

[Books Available for Review](#)

[BMCR Home](#)

