REVIEWS


For new annotated editions of Latin authors suitable for senior school students or university ex-beginners we increasingly have to look to the USA, where the prescribed texts of the national Advanced Placement examination assure a ready market. In Britain, by contrast, nothing much has appeared since the Cambridge Texts and Handbooks of the 1970s; and the Bristol Classical Press evidently finds it worthwhile to reprint the old Goold and Whiteley editions from the Macmillan series.

Bolchazy-Carducci are now offering a new edition of the AP Ovid selection from *Amores* and *Metamorphoses*. The *Amores* are represented by 1.1, 1.3, 1.9, 1.11, 1.12 and 3.15, and, though this might not be everybody’s choice, it would be difficult to quibble with the *Metamorphoses* selection, which comprises Apollo and Daphne, Pyramus and Thisbe, Daedalus and Icarus, Philemon and Baucis, and Pygmalion. There are 180 lines altogether from *Amores* and 445 from *Metamorphoses*.

The edition offers brief introductions to Ovid’s life and works, to the *Amores* and *Metamorphoses* separately, and to the individual poems and extracts. The Latin text (taken from Kenney’s OCT and Goold’s Loeb respectively) is copiously annotated beneath at a rough ratio of three lines of notes to one line of text. At the end of the book there are grammatical Questions and Answers on each passage, brief appendices on Metrical Terms and Figures of Speech, a High-Frequency Word List of words which occur more than five times, and a full Glossary complete with principal parts and declensions. Other features are a series of six simple maps marking the places mentioned in particular passages and seven line drawings illustrating the various myths.

This is a serviceable edition which students will find useful. It began as an MA dissertation by Jestin, and has been read and improved by a number of teachers whose help is acknowledged. But a number of errors and infelicities remain.

Errors in the text include *deservitis* for *deseruistis* at *Am.* 1.9.24 and *vellete* for *vellite* at *Am.* 3.15.16. At *Am.* 1.9.46 the future *nolet* is
wrongly explained as a subjunctive, and at *Am.* 1.11.4 *dandis* is erroneously described (in Questions and Answers) as a perfect passive participle. At *Met.* 1.452 the diaeresis at the end of the fifth foot is curiously referred to as the principal caesura. Some of the grammatical terminology is unfamiliar: gerundives are described throughout as future passive participles, and open and remote future conditions are called future-more-vivid and future-less-vivid respectively. Some of the grammatical explanations are less than precise (*Met.* 4.80 *quisque*: ‘although nominative singular in form, its meaning is plural and can therefore control the previous two plural verbs’) and some verge on the opaque (*Met.* 4.87 *sit errandum*: ‘the future passive periphrastic expressing necessity or obligation. Here an impersonal use of an intransitive verb’). Macrons are placed over long vowels in the notes and the glossary, but not with a high degree of accuracy; the reviewer noticed 28 missing macrons and one or two false ones.
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