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anschließende Teile einer einzigen Kolumne anzusehen sind; ebenfalls der Faserverlauf macht die Kolumnenreihenfolge (1) Fr. 80 + 81 I + 82 (Inhalt unklar), (2) 81 II (Inhalt unklar), (3) 98a (zu Alkaios) wahrscheinlich, aus welcher sich wiederum die Möglichkeit ergibt, daß die Fr. 80II so auch die beiden vorangehenden Kolumnen sich mit Alkaios bese- 
sen. Wenn Porro also Fr. 82 als Alkaios-Material hier aufnimmt, so wäre es folgerichtig, zumindest auch das darauf folgende Fr. 81 II einzubeziehen,5 auch müßte dies alles in Zu-

schmang mit ihrem Vorschlag zu Fr. 102 (S. 258) diskutiert werden. Was Fr. 98b be-
trifft, so sagt bereits Page selbst, es könnte auch niedriger anzusetzen sein (a. O. 44: «the vertical relation [der Fasern] is certain, the horizontal probable but not quite certain»).

Fr. 102, 5–6: Besser wäre ντόν Ἀντωνίου [τόν ὁδηγεῖ]· τών τὸν Ἀλκαίου. Alc. 14, 13: Eher γενέθησατα. Alc. 13 Fr. 6–7, 4: Vielleicht προφανέος bsw. -προφανός, in Zusam-

menhang mit den Bewegungen des Myrsilos? Alc. 16 Fr. 1 I 11–12: Wäre γομον εἶναι ην ὅτι εἶναι ην όν, ότι ὅν möglich? Fr. I 1 14: Es scheint οἱ (ed.pr.) vor 544v/9β nicht vergessen wor-

den zu sein, was die Zeile zu kurz macht (könnte äußerst viel, 'aufgestellt sein', gelesen werden?). Komm. zu Fr. I II 17–30, S. 235: Für die Übersetzung «i n conformità con il sa-
cerdotio» für ἐπὶ τῷ ἐρωτήνων wäre die Anführung von Parallelen willkommen gewesen. Nicosia

Demokritos Kaltsas

Ovid, Heroides. Edited by Arthur Palmer. New introduction and bibliography by 
Duncan F. Kennedy. Vol. 1: Introduction and Latin text, with Greek translation by 

Arthur Palmer (henceforth P.) passed away in 1897, leaving unpublished the un-

finished manuscript of his edition of Ovid's Heroides. At his request P.'s col-

league in Trinity College (Dublin) Louis Claude Purser completed his work,3 

which finally appeared in 1898 (Oxford Clarendon Press). This work was re-

printed in 1967 by Olms (Hildesheim) and still remains the only English edition and commentary on the entire collection. In the following years both the original 
edition and its reprint gradually became difficult to obtain, therefore Bristol 

Phoenix Press (an imprint of The Exeter Press) rightly decided to include this ti-
tle in their Classic Editions Series, whose aim is to reprint important old works on Greek and Latin authors with new introductions.

A major change from both the original and the Hildesheim edition is the dif-
f erent format of this new reprint. It now consists of two complementary and 

handy volumes, as opposed to the bulky and hence unwieldy single volume of the 

old editions. Volume I (in purple cover) comprises an introduction to the 

new edition by Prof. Duncan F. Kennedy (henceforth K.), a select bibliography 

compiled by K. himself, followed by the original preface, the original introduc-
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1 Sonst müßte sie die Frage der Plazierung der Fragmente neu aufgreifen.

2 Particular thanks are owed to Prof. Robert Maltby for his valuable criticism on a first 
draft of this review.

3 Purser’s contribution to the work is much more substantial than what can be deduced 
from the humble credit he takes for himself in his Preface. He has written the General 
Introduction, the introduction and the notes on Her. 29–21, and a great part of the notes 
on Her. 15–17. He has also compiled the Index and has made numerous additions and 
criticisms, among which his notable defence of the Ovidian authorship of the double 
estistles (pp. xxxii) in opposition to Palmer’s opinion (expressed at pp. 436f).
tion, the Latin text and Maximus Planudes’ 13th century Greek translation of the letters. Volume II (in white cover) comprises P.’s commentary on all the letters of the collection, followed by the two original Appendices (on Hiatus and on Bentley’s conjectures), and the original Index. A most sensible decision of the new editors has been to preserve the pagination of the original edition, so as not to complicate cross-referencing.

K.’s introduction starts off by setting the edition in its own context: it offers some interesting pieces of information on the life of P., on his relationship with Purser, on the latter’s contribution to the work, and on Housman’s famous review of P.’s edition. 1 K. then goes on to provide a balanced and up-to-date survey of some of the most important issues concerning the Heroides, always in relation to P.’s and Purser’s standpoint towards them: the text and its transmission, the epistolary character of the collection, intertextuality and its metaliterary aspects, and finally the «politics of gender» related with the existence of two notional authors of any epistle, one male (Ovid) and one female (a heroine). K.’s introduction is not intended to shed new light on the above issues, however it constitutes a clear, concise and illuminating presentation, which will surely prove very useful for anyone interested in the Heroides.

In addition to K.’s new introduction, a most welcome addition to this new reprint of P.’s work is the bibliography compiled by K. himself. The absence of bibliography and references in general was a serious drawback of P.’s original edition. K. has put together a select bibliography divided in two parts: Part I includes editions of the (whole) Heroides and Studies on the Text and its Transmission, while Part II comprises General Literary Studies on the Heroides, Commentaries and Articles on separate letters, and studies on the Reception of the work. To K.’s well-selected and comprehensive list perhaps some more items might be added, 2 but that of course depends on how long a bibliography the editor wishes to compile.

Moving on to the original work, one needs to state beforehand that judging an old work by modern standards and particularly in the light of the vast bibliography on the Heroides published in the years between is not an ordinary task. Purser’s introduction to the original edition includes a helpful but rather obsolete general survey of the Heroides, a description of the chief MSS, a chapter on Planudes’ Greek translation of the collection and a final chapter containing some of Housman’s critical notes on the Latin text.

---

Given the problematic status of the transmission of the *Heroides*, nicely outlined by K., in his introduction (pp. X–XI), P. has managed to produce a decent and readable Latin text,¹ which the modern editor / reader of the work should not fail to consult, despite its excessive reliance upon Parisinus Latinus 8242 ("Puteaneus"), the best yet by no means flawless Heroidean MS.

Many of P.’s conjectures, emendations and careful choices of readings have managed to stand the test of time [e.g. *haec* instead of MSS *hanc* (1.1), *quid commuerere* instead of MSS *quid meruerer* (7.77), *appouisse* instead of Heinsius’ *appouisse* (9.60), *aue* instead of MSS *habe* (17.114), *cunctatæ* instead of MSS *cunctas* (17.260)]. On the other hand P.’s text has been considerably improved by the subsequent work of numerous scholars, [e.g. *dein* [Barchiesi] and not *deo* [P.] 2.17, *referetur* [Casali] and not *defertur* [P.] 9.13, *putas* [Casali] and not *patet* [P.] 9.66, *victor victo nempe pudendus eras* [Casali] and not *victori victo nempe pudendus erat* [P.] 9.70, *mississet* [Besson] and not *merisset* [P.] 12.123, *dixit* [Reeson after Riese and Leeper] and not *aisti* [P.] 11.61, *fraxina virga* [Reeson] and not *fraxinus acta* [P.] 11.78, *dextra* [Housman] and not *districa* [P.] 16.277, *sceptra* [Kenney] and not *regna* [P.] 17.61, *forma* [Kenney after Bentley] and not *fama* [P.] 17.167, *adversis* [Rosati] and not *inversis* [P.] 18.36, *credis* [Rosati] and not *credes* [P.] 18.121, *adluc* [Rosati after Leeper] and not *nunc* [P.] 18.169, to name but a few.

P.’s commentary is laid out in the following form: there are short introductory sections² to each letter followed by the notes. P.’s is not a line-by-line commentary. His notes are selective and quite often at the level of a school-book. He lays emphasis on textual matters, grammar, syntax, Ovidian usage and language, but is not helpful on matters of intra- and inter-textuality, relationship between external and internal author, gender issues and other important matters which concern the modern reader of the collection. He often offers translations to illustrate his interpretation and gives parallel passages not only from Greek and Latin literature but also from modern authors. Summary sections on larger parts of the letters are missing and the focus is limited to small-scale detail. Nonetheless, a good number of P.’s notes are still informative for the modern student of the *Heroides* [e.g. on 1.15 (Antilochus), 1.87 (Dulichii Samiique et quos talis alta Zacynthos), 6.99 (adscribi factis), 12.49 (lumina custodis...), 12.123 (on Scylla), 15.171 (the Leucadian promontory), 16.182 (Phoebeae structa canore lyrae), 18.12 (in speculis esse) etc.].

Despite the passing of more than a century, P.’s edition of the *Heroides* remains a good starting point for the examination of the work and can still prove useful for the student and the professional scholar, provided of course that it is used in conjunction with the rich and up-to-date commentaries and other scholarly work on the *Heroides*. This is absolutely crucial, since many of the views expressed by P. (or Purser) are outdated and have been corrected or improved by subsequent scholarship on the collection (most notably the idea expressed on p. xiii that the *Heroides* «are little else than *suasoriae*, the subject of which is deserted or unprosperous love»).

¹ Housman (1972) 471 claims that «no critic of the century has purified the text so much, and no critic but Madvig so brilliantly», although on the next page he calls Palmer «an amateur».

² Admittedly, Purser’s prefaces to *Her* 20–21 are much more informative and useful than P.’s shorter and less instructive introductory sections to the other epistles.
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A major asset of P.’s edition is that it conveniently offers Maximus Planudes’ Greek translation of the epistles – a text not easy to find elsewhere –, which occasionally provides good ground for the choice between alternative readings of the Latin text. On the other hand, the enrichment of the original Index and the production of an Index locorum, absent from the original edition, would undoubtedly have been most welcome and would have made this reprint of P.’s commentary much easier to use by modern readers.

Both volumes are elegantly produced and reasonably priced. On the cover of each volume the reader can enjoy Lord Leighton’s expressive and emotional ‘Last Watch of Hero’, exhibited in the Manchester Art Gallery. Bristol Phoenix Press and Prof. Duncan F. Kennedy are to be commended for undertaking the task of making this classic piece of scholarship on the Heroides easily accessible to the aficionados of the poet from Sulmo.

Andreas N. Michalopoulos


Précédé par cinq articles conséquents (Praecursoria Valeriana) publiés de 1986 à 1991, dans Mnemosyne, le commentaire d’A. J. Kleywegt (K.) est le plus volumineux jamais écrit sur un chant particulier de Valerius Flaccus, le plus détaillé et peut-être le plus important, en dépit d’insuffisances non négligeables. Le texte latin est présenté par petits groupes de vers dépourvus d’apparat critique et suivi d’un abondant commentaire exégétique et critique. K. distingue dans l’ensemble du texte des parties et des sous-parties dûment analysées dans des introductions soignées et parfois copieuses. Un index trop restreint termine le volume et fait pendant à une maigre introduction, où (p. XIV) apparaît un défaut qui affecte le corps de l’ouvrage. Il ne se dégage pas, en effet, de ce dernier une conception cohérente de la tradition du texte, et la façon dont K. utilise les données de cette

1 Typos are rare and unimportant, e.g. the comma after the parenthesis in n.34 (p. XIX) instead of a full-stop, «Portuguese» instead of ‘Portuguese’ in n. 41 (p. XIX), and «Femal» instead of ‘Female’ in the title of Lindheim’s book (p. XXIII). Perhaps more unfortunate is the omission of the phrase περιγραφή Πηγελόπτη in K.’s quotation of Palmer’s comment on Her. 1 (p. XIV), obviously caused by problems concerning the Greek font.