

A. N. MICHALOPOULOS, *Ovid Heroides 16 and 17*. Introduction, Text and Commentary, Cambridge: Francis Cairns, 2006, x + 409 pp., ISBN 0-905205-44-3 (hardback), 978-0-905205-1 (paperback).

Michalopoulos accepts the case for Ovidian authorship of these poems as seemingly settled, according it only a brief discussion (pp. 70-1 and nn. 170, 171)¹. Dissident voices will, I am sure, still be heard, but what matters is that, whoever wrote them, it is now at last coming to be realised that *Heroides* 16-21 'are poetry from the major league of Augustan verse' (A. Barchiesi, *BMCR* 8.1, 1997, 47). To my own edition of all six epistles there has succeeded Gianpiero Rosati's of 18-9 (Florence 1990); and now Barchiesi's hope for 'especially a full commentary on Helen & Paris' (ibid. 41) has been realised on an ample scale in this edition. Acontius and Cydippe await their own interpreter; stimulating critical vistas are opened up in Victoria Rimell's *Ovid's Lovers. Desire, Differences, and the Poetic Imagination* (Cambridge 2006), which appeared too late for M. to take account of it.

The Introduction covers a number of topics in a somewhat disjointed fashion. The sections most pertinent to appreciation of Ovid's poetical art are those on his metaliterary ironies and his etymologizing. M. has previously explored this latter topic in his monograph, *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Commented Lexicon* (ARCA 40, Leeds 2001); and discussion of the part played by fun and games with etymology in Ovid's depiction of these two self-centred puppets of Fate is a notable feature of the commentary. M. frequently detects nuances which I confess passed me by; and if I sense here and there a tendency

¹ In that connexion, I was not so rash as to 'state' (p. 1 n. 2) that the double epistles may be a first draft lacking the author's final revision. All that I claim for the suggestion is that it saves the phenomena.

to overinterpret, to read too much into Ovid's words, I account that, in his case, a fault on the right side.

Particularly significant, given her role in furnishing the *casus belli* for the Trojan war, is the way in which Ovid exploits the various etymologies of Venus. Mercury's injunction to Paris to decide *uincere quae forma digna sit una duas* (16.70) reveals to the alert reader that the contest is a put-up job: 'Venus is *a priori* the final winner, since victory is inherent in her name' (p. 47), and it is as Venus Victrix that she leaves the scene, *uictorem caelo rettulit illa pedes* (16.88). Etymology is likewise deployed to ironical metaliterary effect at 16.40 *missilibus telis eminus ictus amo*, where the fanciful etymology (which M.'s note suggests that he takes seriously) of *telum* from Greek τηλοῦ is a reminder that Paris is himself an archer who engages in battle at a distance and who, as future poets will tell, is fated to succumb to a real, not a metaphorical, arrow. Not all the instances that M. detects seem completely convincing to me, but such reminders of the need to be perpetually alert to the implications of Ovid's playful way with language are never amiss. Irony is pervasive in his metaliterary 'complicity with his readers' (p. 26 and n. 60). So at 17.1-2 M. picks up a point acutely made by Federica Bessone, that in deciding to answer Paris' letter Helen is 'setting the new rules of the game in the double *Heroides*' (p. 274). Helen takes a hand herself in the metaliterary game at 17.191-6, where she 'cites the example of other heroines as if she had read their misfortunes herself' (p. 331). That was a technique which Ovid was to exploit to great effect in the *Metamorphoses*, as when at 7.62-5 Medea is seen 'acting as critical commentator on her own story' (S. Hinds, *MD* 30, 1993, 16). Sometimes it is the single word now christened the 'Alexandrian footnote' that signals the intervention of the *doctus poeta* (it is interesting to note that the origin, if not the name, of this identification can be traced as far back as Norden's commentary on the *Aeneid* (see the bibliography at 16.137-8n.). So Paris' *memini* at 16.249, recalling his emotions when he saw Helen's breast suddenly revealed, is a reminder placed in his mouth to the reader of the scene recorded by Euripides and others of Menelaus' first meeting with Helen after the war. Likewise at 17.240 we have an instance which I missed, of one of the standard markers of such 'footnotes' in *ferunt*, designed

to underline the significance of the Ennian diction and syntax of the preceding couplet.

All this is well brought out in the commentary. In other respects it is curiously unfocussed, leaving me with the impression that it does not seem to have occurred to M. or to anyone concerned with the production of the book to think seriously about its intended readership. On the one hand the notes appear to be aimed at advanced students and scholars, since many points of Ovidian idiom and usage on which most students, I would say, might be glad of elucidation are passed over in silence, and many notes offer a plethora of the sort of learned detail which, though not always very relevant to the interpretation and appreciation of the poetry, may be useful to scholars using the edition as a work of reference. On the other hand a good many notes do little more than provide a laborious paraphrase of what is lucidly and more succinctly conveyed by the text. Elementary metrical points are repeatedly spelled out, as when it is explained that the form of the 3rd person plural of the perfect tense in *-ere* is preferred to that in *-erunt* for metrical convenience or that the Greek form of a proper name is preferred to the Latin because otherwise the verse would not scan, or when it is observed of *pectora* that 'the quantity of its syllables (*pēctōră*) makes it especially fitting for the dactylic hexameter' (pp. 303–4). This last note, on 17.91, is also symptomatic of a pervasive failure to organize the commentary economically. It, and other notes on the poetic plural such as that on *pocula* at 16.226, would have been unnecessary if all the significant examples of this usage had been collected, either in the relevant section of the Introduction (p. 65) or at its first occurrence. In that case simple cross-references *ad locc.* would have sufficed. As it is the substance of the notes on *pocula* at 16.226 and *pectora* at 17.91 is already to be found at p. 65 n. 162. A reader wanting to be referred to all the occurrences of the poetic plural in these epistles can manage it *via* the index, which is very full, but here and in a good many other cases a more systematic ordering of the material would have rendered the commentary more user-friendly and reduced its bulk without impairing its usefulness.

Some notes invite further reflections:

16.18 *coepto*: 'The word is reminiscent of Lucretius (1.418). Given the prominent role of Venus in Lucretius, it is likely that

coeptum here in association with Venus is Ovid's clever covert nod to his predecessor'. The single occurrence of the word in the *DRN* has nothing to do with Venus; its context is the proof that the universe consists of atoms and void. Ovid uses it 24 times, more than once in invoking the assistance of a deity; cf. especially *ars* 1.30 *coeptis, mater Amoris, ades*. If any nodding is going on here, it is rather in his own direction.

16.53-6 'Enjambment is not common in the *Amores* (see McKeown, 1987, 108) but appears quite frequently in this pair of letters'. What McKeown is discussing is 'elaborate periods extending over several couplets.' True enjambment between couplets is something different, and is very rare in Ovid: Platnauer, whom M. cites in support of his comment, could find only two examples. None of the passages in *Her.* 16-7 listed by M. is relevant.

16.77-8 'The archaic use of the adverb *unde* here makes Paris' reference to Venus more impressive'. A good point; but to grasp what that 'use' is, i. e. that *unde* here means 'from whom', the uninstructed reader must look up one or other of the following references to Fraenkel, Nisbet and Hubbard, or Fedeli – labour which a simple gloss plus reference to *OLD unde* 8a would have obviated.

16.109, 111 These are rightly described as 'golden lines', but M. implicitly limits that description to lines of what he terms the *a-b-a-b* pattern (in my terminology abAB). He has on his side the authority of L. P. Wilkinson: 'Let us restrict the term, as is generally done, to lines in which the epithets and nouns appear in the corresponding order' (*Golden Latin Artistry*, Cambridge 1963, 215) – but what is the justification for this restriction? Dryden's formulation does not in fact privilege the *a-b-a-b* (abAB) configuration over *a-b-b-a* (abBA), and to my mind the latter arrangement is if anything the more satisfying as the more symmetrical. M. indeed recognises it at 16.110, but the reference there to pp. 71-2 confuses the issue, because the pattern there is lumped in together with other kinds of chiasmic word-order. At 16.111n. it is attractively suggested that the golden line 'visually renders the "interweaving" of the planks for the construction of the ships', but that picture is incomplete, since the following pentameter, though not 'golden', is also patterned, in this case

b-a-b-a (bABA), and the couplet describes one operation, not two, a point M.'s note does not make clear. Cf. 113-4n. where he remarks that the chiasmic pattern *a-b-b-a* (aBbA) 'befits the construction of a ship'.

16.131-2 The elision of *quidem* is duly noted, but the note misses the point that the elision of iambic words ending in *-m* is rare in Ovid (Platnauer, 83 n.5) and that this type of elision belongs in the same category as those discussed at 17.97 *disce meo exemplo*, in which, as here, the following word is compounded with a (for metrical purposes) semi-separable preposition.

16.163 I am puzzled by M.'s assertion that *da modo te* stands for *si modo te das* rather than *si modo te dederis: nosces* in the apodosis identifies this as a future condition.

16.200 The construction, which eluded commentators until Housman explained it (*CP* 439), is not discussed. I note that Showerman-Goold's rendering 'who now is with the gods, and mingles water with the nectar for their drinking' could be taken to imply that *dis* is doing double (amphibolic) duty. A nice point.

16.204 Like M., I read *concubuisse* as present in sense, a common Ovidian idiom, but I now wonder if it is not a true perfect; Venus rejoices, as indeed suggested in M.'s note, at having become *Aeneadum genetrix* – another mataliterary wink to the reader.

16.228 *inuito crescit in ore cibus*: 'Out of embarrassment and outrage Paris fills his mouth with food'. No: his gorge rises and he can hardly swallow. Of the parallels cited by M. those from Seneca and Juvenal contradict his reading and *Pont.* 1.10.7-8 is irrelevant.

16.314 *iners* means 'idle', not 'sexually impotent'.

16.345 *Erechthida*: 'This form of the name is preferable to *Erechthida* with the double aspirate'. That is correct, but this is not a truth universally known to editors of texts; and readers who need in what follows to have it explained to them that 'Ovid maintains [?] the Greek accusative of the patronymic because the ending *-a* is short' might also like to know why the singly aspirated form of the name is 'preferable', or at least be told where they may find the answer.

17.87 On *orbe... in mensae*, 'The anastrophe of the preposition does not merely serve the metre but also displays Helen's emotion'.

This is a lot to read into a not all that unusual manipulation of word-order.

17.231-2 *Aeetes*: 'Ovid uses the Greek form of the name... and not the Latinized form *Aeeta* (*Her.* 12.29, *met.* 7.170) for metrical reasons, in order to avoid the elision of the final *-a*.' At *Her.* 12.29 *Aeeta* is vocative (read *accipis*); *met.* 7.170 is doubtful (*secl.* Bentley, Tarrant). For this as the usual form of the vocative of such names cf. *Ov. met.* 5.242, *fast.* 6.494, *Cic. Tusc.* 3.26, *al.* (N-W I 64).

Though M.'s choice of reading is rarely indefensible, he is apt to treat textual problems summarily without troubling to argue the case:

16.13 *iamque illud* (Damsté) printed for *iamdudum* (MSS) without comment, save for parallels for the elision,

16.22 Heinsius' conjecture *Phalacraea* is registered in the apparatus but not commented on. In his text he printed *Phereclea*, the vulgate (not due to Palmer, as the critical note might lead the unwary to infer: I return to this below). In the absence of comment, the reader has to refer to Heinsius' note to discover what prompted his tentative ('*Forté*') conjecture, which was the variant tradition recorded by Lyc. 24, suggesting that Ovid may have written *Phalacraea* here, identifying not the builder of the ships but the source of the timber from which they were built, Phalacra. That conflicts with 16.109, where the source is given as Gargara, one of the peaks of Ida. In my note there I duly registered the contradiction, but it is only now that M. has thus inadvertently focussed attention on the point of its possible significance, if Ovid did indeed write *Phalacraea*, emerges: that, as he does elsewhere, he may be signalling awareness of discrepancies in the mythographical tradition. I should be tempted, if I ever edited this text, at least to accord Heinsius' conjecture a '*fort. recte*'.

16.33-4 *lentus* (Bentley) preferred to *ueluti* (MSS) as 'not a bad option'. Heinsius indeed had noted 'τὸ *veluti* suspectus est de mendo' but suggested no remedy; Burman's *ut multi* will not do, since it is clear that Paris does not regard Sparta as attractive to tourists. I see nothing wrong with *ueluti* = 'as for instance', 'as being' (*OLD* 1.6), though it would not be missed if it were not there. *Hor. Ep.* 2.1.178, cited by M., is irrelevant.

16.43 *partum* (Hall) preferred to *partu* (MSS). Hall's objection was to the juxtaposition of two ablatives, but his emendation complicates the syntax by making *utero* do double (amphibolia) duty as instrumental ablative with *tenebar* and as ablative absolute. I also question whether the adjacent ablatives would be felt as inelegant: *partu remorante* functions in effect as a self-contained adverbial phrase.

16.53 *in mediis nemorosae uallibus Idae* (Francius) preferred to *in mediae nemorosis uallibus Idae*; that this latter is the transmitted reading is obscured in the critical note, where it is credited to Dörrie. Francius supported his emendation by *ars* 1.289 *forte sub umbrosis nemorosae uallibus Idae*, cited by M., but not in full. M.'s preference is also seemingly supported by 'the pattern *a-b-a-b*' (abAB), which ignores the fact that, as I have noted on 16.109, 111 above, Ovid is just as fond of the *a-b-b-a* (abBA) pattern; and he appears not to have noticed that *am.* 1.14.11 *qualem cliuosae madidis in uallibus Idae*, which he quotes in his note, is an example of *a-b-b-a*.

16.116 *picta* (π) preferred to *ficta* (Palmer). This may well be right, but I do not know why the parallel at *trist.* 1.4.8 *insilit et pictos uerberat unda deos* is described as 'symptomatic'.

16.145 *crede sed hoc* (ξ) preferred to *credis et hoc* (π, not Palmer, as implied by the critical note). Here M. has Reeve on his side, but I cannot see any real difference in sense of emphasis between these alternatives. For the question compare perhaps the Irish 'Do you know what I'm going to tell you?'

16.177 *sceptra* (MSS) preferred to *regna* (Bentley), with no grounds stated and no mention of the abrupt switch from the metaphorical to the literal in *sceptra ... obeunda*, for which 'awkward' (Palmer *ad loc.*) is a mild term. In favour of *sceptra* is that at 17.61-2 *sceptra tuae quamuis rear esse potentia terrae* eqs. throws Paris' words back in his teeth; perhaps the strongest argument against *regna* is that Ovid elsewhere, and other writers, consistently use it to identify territory rather than a 'sway'; cf. e.g. 16.301 *Cresia regna. sceptra* therefore may be what Ovid wrote; does one account it a slip, bearing in mind the possibility that these poems may have lacked the poet's *ultima manus*, or some kind of learned catachresis? Some discussion would have been in order.

16.205 Here, though he is too polite to say so, M. has caught me out. *armis* in my text is a pure oversight, as the lack of a critical note shows. It is a lapse for which I cannot account. *forma ... et annis*, which is clearly what Ovid wrote, is hendiadys = ‘youthful beauty’.

16.223 *quidni tamen omnis narrem*: *quidni* is attested only in one MS, W, but it is supported by *quid ne* in G ζ. What M. prints has been the vulgate since Heinsius and gives unexceptionable sense, but it cannot have been what originally stood in P, which counsels caution. My own *quianam non omnia narro* (‘too epical’ Diggle) was admittedly in the nature of a *ballon d’essai*, and one cannot blame an editor who plays safe.

16.257 *ueterum* (Hall) preferred to *ueteres* (MSS), ‘convincingly’. I remain unconvinced. Hall’s contention that ‘as far as the Latin goes, these amours might have been his own’ flies in the face of the Latin: *uetus* means ‘ancient’ (this is a young man speaking), and *amores* here = ‘love-songs’, ‘love-stories’ (OLD 5). *Veteres* gives good and unambiguous sense.

16.261 *se* (Hall) preferred to *mihi* (MSS). Not a necessary change, and the reason for the corruption is hardly obvious: deliberate interpolation, given that the sense is perfectly clear, seems unlikely,

16.294 *potes* (more numerous attested, but not therefore more authoritatively, the reading of P being uncertain) preferred to *potest*. *Vtrum in alterum abiturum?* As M. acknowledges, ‘this couplet does look like a *sententia* and could be more general and impersonal’ – also I think, with *potest*, more rhetorically effective.

10.299 *re nec non uoce* Damsté, which I should have taken note of, though my suggestion *rebusque et uoce* is on the same lines. Either gives good sense: for *re* cf. Ter. *Haut.* 86 *aut consilio aut re*, for *rebus* Ov. *fast.* 2.374 ‘*non opus est uerbis, credite rebus*’ *ait*.

16.303 *risit et* (Bentley), one of some half-dozen more or less plausible conjectures. ‘Paris intentionally misquotes Menelaus’ mandates to Helen’ as quoted by her at 17.159-60, *risit* picking up *omine laetatus*. This is ingenious, but in fact the two versions of Menelaus’ words hardly differ in substance, and the reader is left wondering what he had to laugh about until arriving at the

latter passage. The obelus is the only safe recourse here (as in my text: M.'s critical note misrepresents me).

16.321-2 *meque | astringam uerbis in tua iura meis*: the more numerous—supported (but here too we do not know what originally stood in P) *meis* preferred with Courtney to *tuis*, ‘in order a) to avoid the repetition after *tua* and b) to stress the antithesis *meis uerbis/ tua iura*’. The logic of this eludes me. The repetition is allowed by Courtney to ‘give more point than *meis* ... the emphasis given by *tua ... tuis* is neither displeasing nor irrelevant’ (*Mnemosyne* 27, 1974, 299). M. may not have taken sufficiently into account that Courtney’s argument is predicated on non-Ovidian authorship: ‘we can probably allow this author to write a little less pointedly than Ovid himself’, an allowance which M. ought, consistently with his stated views, to have no truck with. But what, in any case, do we want with an antithesis here? Reading *meis* introduces a *caveat*; Paris will submit, but on his own terms. In the warfare of love, only unconditional surrender will do. So Propertius submitted to Cynthia: *indixit leges; respondi ego ‘legibus utar’./ riserat imperio facta superba suo* (4.8.81-2).

16.331 *Troia classis*: though elsewhere in these epistles *Troicus* is preferred, Ovid may well have written *Troia* here: cf. *met.* 11.773 *Troius heros* (Bömer’s note there has nothing to say about ‘the use of the epithet in the place of *Troicus*’), 14.156 *Troius Aeneas* (= Virg. *Aen.* 1.596, 6.493, 7.221). If so, it was not ‘for metrical reasons, so that the *i* is long’. The word is a trisyllable; Servius’ comment on the prosody of the disyllable noun *Troia* (*GLK* IV 423.26-9) is irrelevant.

17.0a-b This introductory couplet is attested according to Kirfel in two late MSS; Dörrie was unable to find it in any. Kirfel accepted it as authentic (*Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroïdes Ovids*, 1969, 78-80). M. is rightly cautious; and I now incline to think that I was too receptive to Kirfel’s arguments (*CR* 20, 1970, 195), and to recur to my original objection that the words *seruarem numeros sicut et ante probas* constitute a premature acknowledgement on Helen’s part that the game is up; she must go through the motions of maintaining her probity even if she knows in her heart that she will in the end give in. Moreover, it is not clear to me that, as Kirfel maintains (p. 79)

numeri here can mean ‘Pflicht’, ‘Würde’. At *am.* 3.7.18, *Her.* 4.88 the word means ‘activities’, ‘pursuits’ (*OLD* 12b), not quite the same thing.

17.51 M. prints *quod* in preference to the better-supported *et* or Housman’s *sed*, correctly in my opinion, but a comment would have been in order.

17.75 *tu* (Liberman) preferred to *nunc* (MSS). Admittedly *nunc* is not very pointed, but *tu* is otiose and imparts an unwanted emphasis. Perhaps *tunc*, qualifying *apposita ... mensa*, ‘then, when dinner is on the table’, and looking forward to *cum* eqs. at 77 – where, however, M. prints his own *et* without comment (misleadingly signalled in the apparatus, in the absence of specific attribution, as the transmitted reading), to the detriment of the sentence-structure.

17.109-10 *optarem* preferred to *optarim* as ‘better’ – how?

17.113 *me* (Damsté) preferred to *sed* (MSS, implicitly attributed to Palmer in the apparatus). Damsté quoted Prop. 1.6.25-6 *me sine, quem semper uoluit fortuna iacere* eqs., but Ovid is freely adapting rather than quoting, and after *nunc* at 111 I feel that an adversative is wanted. M. adds that *sed sine* ‘is fine too’, suggesting that in any case emendation is gratuitous. Editors should start with Madvig’s principle, that something should be demonstrably wrong with the transmitted text if emendation is contemplated. Cf. Richard Tarrant on ‘the analogist assumptions that led [Heinsius] to favour readings that could be paralleled elsewhere in Ovid or in other Latin poets’ (P. Hardie, al., eds., *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*. Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. Vol. 23, Cambridge 1999, 298).

17.119-20 ‘*corpora* is to be preferred to the alternative readings *pectora* or *numina*’; but the note does not address the oddity of the expression with *formam* following. Moreover, I now question whether *caelestia corpora* in the passages quoted for the phrase by M. and myself is simply a paraphrase for *caelestes*. In all of them there is an implicit emphasis on the physical embodiment of the deity, which is not quite the point here and indeed would spoil the point, which is the contrast in hexameter and pentameter between the ethereal dignity of the goddesses and the physical indignity of parading their naked bodies before

a mortal, for whom normally the sight of a deity in any guise would be *nefas*.

17.128 *nam mea uox quare quod cupio esse neget?* M. has unfortunately installed this unmetrical conjecture of his own (implied in the apparatus to be the transmitted reading) in the text, a mistake from which reference to Platnauer (p. 89) would have saved him.

17.171 *relicta* rightly preferred to *relictam*, but Goold's fussy punctuation should have been ignored. Students (and on occasion scholars) should be encouraged to read Latin sentences as wholes, not as series of discrete syntactical snippets.

17.186 *foret* preferred to the better-supported *fuit* without argument, wrongly: potentiality is sufficiently conveyed by the gerundive and does not need to be duplicated. *Her.* 6.144, cited in the apparatus, apparently as a parallel, reads *terra roganda fuit*; cf. also 7.143 *Pergama uix tanto tibi erant repetenda labore*.

17.197 *neges* M. for transmitted (not Palmer) *negas*, gratuitously: Paris has not denied deceiving Oenone, he has evaded the question.

17.204 *uelis* (Francius) preferred to *uentis* (MSS, not Palmer). I am now inclined to think that *uelis* is what Ovid wrote; I had overlooked *rem.* 280 *irrita cum uelis uerba tulere Noti*, cited by M.

17.226 *ista* preferred to the better-supported *ipsa*. Reeve's parallels for *ista*, cited by M., will not pass muster: at *Her.* 12.80 it means 'yours' (*OLD* 1a), and at 10.85 (the couplet is in any case athetized by Bentley, probably rightly) it is disparaging. *Tellus ista* here cannot = 'my country'; I do not understand M.'s comment that '*tellus* has not been mentioned before, so *ipsa* is unnecessary'. It means 'of itself', 'by its very nature', that is by virtue of its being one's own country; cf. 17.140 *spemque sequi coner quam locus ipse negat?* 'the very nature of my situation'.

17.259 The poorly-supported *timore* preferred to *pudore* (this too credited to Palmer): a banalization, ignoring the contextual implications of *sapiens*. In elegiac parlance – and Helen, as M. rightly notes, comes across very much as an 'elegiac *puella*' (p. 52) – the word connotes being worldly-wise in the conduct of an affair, and in the vocabulary of those 'wise' in that sense *pudor*

is mere affectation. For once I think M. underestimates Ovid's wit.

I have more than once above alluded in passing to shortcomings in the apparatus criticus. This is the least satisfactory part of the edition, put together with scant regard for the generally accepted conventions. In the first place it is bulked out with superfluous and, as communicated here, misleading information in the shape of a roll-call of editors, usually starting with Palmer, who have adopted this or that reading. This is a practice against which I and others have repeatedly remonstrated. It is of no critical value whatsoever, and as employed here frequently obscures the true attribution of a reading, ascribing what is the transmitted text or the vulgate to an editor, nearly always Palmer. Similarly a lemma lacking any identification of its source is used to signal M.'s own conjectures. At 16.39 we have a particularly misleading example of careless drafting. M. prints † *sicut oporteat arcu* †, ascribing it to 'π, Dorrie, Rosati'. It is in fact the vulgate; π has *opporteat*. It is a basic principle of editing that an obelized reading should be printed exactly as transmitted. Here as elsewhere (see above on 16.303) it is implied in both the commentary and the critical note that I printed the nonsense in π as if I thought it was what Ovid wrote. I draw attention to this, not, I hasten to say, because I feel aggrieved, which I do not, but because this is precisely the sort of area where an inexperienced author needs editorial guidance (*experto credite*). Failure to pick up this particular technical point is the more surprising in a series which includes an exemplary demonstration of how to construct an apparatus criticus in McKeown's edition of the *Amores*, so as to convey accurately and economically what the reader needs to know, no more and no less.

This is also the more surprising, since in the main the book has been well produced, with very few misprints of any consequence, though there are some lapses which might have been picked up by attentive editing. In the list of sigla (p. 73) for 'Puteanus' read 'Puteaneus'; in the commentary 'Elis' for 'Helis' (16.209-10), 'indignant at' for 'indignant for' (16.215-6, a significant difference!), 'respectable' for 'respectful' (16.217-58), 'Haemon'. 'Haemonia' for 'Ae-' (17.247-8). There are indexes of Greek and Latin words, passages referred to, and subjects; and a very full bibliography

numbering some 830 books and articles, apropos of which, in addition to my remarks on bibliographical hyperplasia at *BMCR* 2001.10.39 see now A. Grafton, *The Footnote. A curious history* (1997), esp. 108-9. It omits Hardie's important *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge 2002), though this is referred to at 17.181-2n. Under Reeve (1974) for 'CQ' read 'CR'; under Wilkinson (1963) for 'line' read 'Latin'; and 'White, D. C.', correct there, at 16.45-6n. figures as 'Gould [*recte* Goold] White'.

I do not wish my critical comments to leave readers of this review with a misleading impression of Michaelopoulos's edition of these attractive and thought-provoking poems. It is a substantial achievement, with much to offer to readers prepared to use it circumspectly and selectively. In covering ground previously covered by me, M. has picked not a little that I had missed or passed over too easily, and his work has certainly enhanced my appreciation, great as it was, of the witty manipulation of myth and language which informs Ovid's epistolary psychodrama. As I have indicated, the book would have been all the better for tighter editorial discipline, but with all its shortcomings it is a valuable resource for which students and admirers of Ovid will be grateful.

E. J. KENNEY
Peterhouse, Cambridge

