

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Ovid. Amores, Epistulae, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris, ex Rudolphi Merkelii recognitione edidit R. Ehwald. Lips. 1888. (Being Vol. I. of the Teuhner text of Ovid.) 1 Mk.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 05 / May 1889, pp 212 - 212
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194855, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194855

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 212-212 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194855

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

trisyllable), 272 (note) *sīmus*. In 115 fin. (p. 131), *-mono* should be *-monā*; 206 (p. 229), *hominibus pedibus* are put in the wrong order; 151 fin. *ραδίον* and 196 *ἰσπύρα* are wrongly accented, 167 fin. *τυμᾶν* and 241 fin. *tetuli* wrongly marked as non-existent. In 298 fin. 'Théocr. Syracus. 58' might be put more simply as 'Théocr. 15, 58.' The table of contents comes at the end of the book, as often in French writers: it is surely more convenient to place it at the beginning.

The first edition of the work appeared last

year. In the second edition few changes have been made: the most important of them the more detailed account of the history of *vs* (47), a reference to the theory (on which see Thurneysen in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxx. p. 494 sq.) that e.g. *dandi* = **damenay* (115 fin., note), and some remarks on the genesis of forms like *jugă* (190 fin.). The new derivation of *bubulcus* from *fulciō* (179, p. 182) is not attractive.

E. R. WHARTON.

Ovid. Amores, Epistulae, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris, ex Rudolphi Merckelii recognitione edidit R. EHWALD. Lips. 1888. (Being Vol. I. of the Teubner text of Ovid.) 1 Mk.

DR. EHWALD'S revision of the first volume of the Teubner text of Ovid has been executed with that caution and care for which he has long been known to Ovid students by his exhaustive reviews in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, as well as by his text of the *Tristia*. The MS. material used is with slight exceptions the same as that of Merkel, the chief additional matter employed by the editor being the works of Palmer, Sedlmayer and Vahlen on the *Heroides*, De Vries on the *Epistula Sapphus*, Kunz on the *Medicamina formae* (not *faciei* surely, a form of the genitive which Ovid would not have used: cf. *A. A.* III. 205), and an Oxford MS. published by Ellis for Book I. of the *Ars Amatoria*. I cannot but regret that the apparatus criticus is printed in a continuous and most inconvenient form as a preface, instead of (as in Baehrens' Teubner texts) at the foot of the page. What reader, especially of poetry, and most of all of such poetry as the *Ars Amatoria*, can be expected to pause in his reading and research among the closely printed remarks of a critical preface of forty-one pages? Also, would not Dr. Ehwald have done more wisely if he had given the readings throughout of the one or two best MSS. in all important passages, and less of the emendations and suspicions as to the genuineness of particular lines of scholars ancient and modern? Apart from these slight defects it must be admitted that this text is far superior to any that has yet appeared of this part of Ovid, and the editor deserves our warmest thanks. He has frequently restored a MS. reading unnecessarily deserted by Merkel (e.g. *Am. I. viii. 11 stillantia* for *stellantia*); his own conjectures, which are few, are always clever and often convincing, e.g. *Am. I. xiii. 19 atque uades sponsum stultos ante Atria mittis: Ep. Sapph. 63 sparsit opes frater meretricis captus amore*. I mention a few points in which I cannot agree: *Am. I. ix. 5 quos petiere duces annos in milite forti, | hos petit in socio bella puella viro*: for *annos* Ehwald accepts *animos*, a conjecture of Rautenberg, which destroys the point of the couplet: Ovid meant that a lover must be a *iuuenis*, as he says in the preceding line *turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor. H. VII. 45*. Ehwald reads from his own conjecture *non ego sum tanti (quidni cuncteris, inique ?) for quid non uerearis*. I propose *quid me uerearis, inique ?* which seems to me to be supported by *me fugis* in the next line. *H. IX. 126*, marked as corrupt by Ehwald, might, I think, be read after the MS, P. *fortunam uultu*

fassa tegente suam, and explained 'confessing her fortune with looks that belie it.' *H. XII. 17* Ehwald reads *semina iecisset, totidemque et semina et hostes*, where *que*, though possible, is awkward. I propose *semina iecisset totidem, quot seuerat, hostes*. In conclusion I could wish that the Paris MSS. had been collated anew for this edition, for there are serious discrepancies between the collations of Keil, used by Ehwald, and those of Sedlmayer.

S. G. OWEN.

Ad historiam carminum Ovidianorum recensio-nemque symbolae. Scripsit R. EHWALD. Gotha. 1889. 1 Mk.

EHWALD, the cooperator of Merkel in the Teubner 1884 edition of Ovid's *Fasti Tristia Pontic Epistles* and *Ibis*, and since Merkel's decease the re-editor in 1888 of the *Amores* and other works contained in the first volume of this edition (the *Metamorphoses* edited by Merkel himself appeared in 1881), has in a short treatise of twenty pages collected a great number of facts bearing on the study of the *Tristia* after Ovid's death, not only in writers who might still be called Roman, but through the Middle Age on to the time of Petrarch and Mussato in the 14th century. Those who know the care with which Ehwald has edited the *Tristia*, or who have read his minute and thorough examination of the literature on Ovid which has appeared within the last ten years in Bursian's, now Iwan Müller's, *Berichte über die fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, will not be disappointed to find in this little work (he calls it himself a *Commentariolum*) an amount of information primarily on the *Tristia*, incidentally on many other points connected with Ovid, which might recommend it not merely for skimming in a public library, but for repeated and serious reference. In few words, it will more than repay the shilling which it costs. Among other points in which Ehwald here deserves careful study is his citation, in the most exact way, of some readings of the most valuable MSS. of Ovid. Thus the now famous Marcianus (of which Mr. S. G. Owen has given a collation, so far as it goes, in his edition of the first book) is more than once brought before us: similarly the Guelferbytanus, and that splendid specimen of later 12th century calligraphy, the Turonensis 879, of such infinite value for the text of the *Ibis*.

On p. 3 a suggestion of new Ovidian fragments is offered, which deserves the attention of the next editor of a complete Ovid.

In his general summary, p. 4, Ehwald says the *Tristia* are rarely cited by the Grammarians; never