Discite sanari, per quem didicistis amare (Rem. 43): at the beginning of the exordium of his last didactic poem Ovid stresses its medical purport and at the same time reminds the reader of its immediate predecessors in the ‘erotodidactic’ field, the three books of the Ars amatoria. With the Remedia amoris the author wound up his elegiac corpus of poetry about love, in which he had progressively substituted the irrational and emotional sides of the subject by ars and cultus, and finally posed as an experienced physician. The poem has received less scholarly attention than the other parts of the corpus mentioned. This lack of interest can even assume bizarre shapes: in 1969 H. J. Geisler published a critical edition of the Remedia with a thorough introduction and a detailed commentary on its first half (vss. 1-396). This useful Berlin dissertation, sponsored by F. Munari, was never mentioned in l’Année philologique nor deemed worthy of a place in M. L. Coletti’s bibliographic survey in ANRW 31.4 (pp. 2385-2435). When A. A. R. Henderson in 1979 published his edition with a commentary on the whole of the text (reviewed in this journal XXXVI 217-220), he confessed that he had only made the acquaintance of Geisler’s commentary after he had finished his own work. History nearly repeated itself, for the author of the book now under review tells that her own preparations had been made when Henderson’s book arrived. Mrs. Lucke, however, was able to take that commentary and Henderson’s other publications about the same matter into account, with a certain amount of rivalry, which once or twice runs off the rails (e.g. on p. 109, where Henderson’s tentative note on ceratas (447) is styled ‘absurd’).

A first cursory glance at the contents of this dissertation, which was also sponsored by Munari, shows that L. suffers from a high degree of ‘horror vacui’. If it could be rightly objected to Henderson that his commentary here and there is too elliptic, L. is the absolute contrast in that she comments on everything, vast lists of parallel passages being one of her favourite techniques: erat quod tollere uelles. It is even experienced as a small relief to find that for one reason or other she has nothing to say on v. 672 (Henderson has). But let this pass, far worse is the presentation of the material:

the lay-out of the text is such that after the lemma (usually a whole verse or a large part of it), which is underlined, L.'s notes follow in \( \varepsilon\varphi\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon \ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \), without the slightest typographical help for the reader: there is is no question of italics, bold types, indentations, spacing, underlining etc., in short no effort has been spared to reach a maximum of uninviting unattractiveness. This is most regrettable, the more so, because L.'s notes are far from worthless; she often provides interesting information and explanations backed up by useful bibliographical references.

L.'s style consists in offering as much traditional philological background for the understanding of the text as possible, restricting herself to sound and matter of fact annotations; obviously she will have nothing to do with any sort of imagination: whereas Henderson suggests that \textit{aliquis casus} (673) means ‘an unforeseen stroke of bad luck’ (which seems somewhat exaggerated), L. merely dwells on the adjectival use of \textit{aliquis}; the clever oxymoron in 720 \textit{ardoris sit rogus iste mei} (about the burning of love letters) only entices her to present some parallel texts for the metaphoric use of \textit{ardor} (‘Liebesglut’) and this statement about \textit{rogus}: ‘übertreibender Gebrauch des Wortes rogus in pathetischer Überschwang’; Henderson’s suggestion that \textit{dira Charybdis} (740) may throw ‘a punning glance at \textit{dia \chi\`{a}\`{r}y\`{b}d\`{i}c\`{i}}} (\textit{Od.} 12.104), seems far too explicit for L.

In her introduction L. discusses some scholars’ attempts to present a convincing structural scheme of the poem, winding up with the sceptical conclusion: “Die genannten Aufbaumodelle machen deutlich, dass man die Remedia nicht einem bestimmten Schema unterwerfen kann” (p. 51). Perhaps this is put too strongly, but L. rightly points to the lack of organization in the second part of the poem. In textual matters L. shows herself stoutly conservative: she sticks to \textit{attrahet} (435) against Bentley’s \textit{attrahat}, to \textit{concedat} (477) in spite of Goold’s defence of \textit{concedet}, to \textit{domiae} (492), where many have preferred \textit{glacie}. The proposal to athetize the disticha 405/6, 565/70 and 745/6, most recently championed by Henderson in \textit{Cl.Q.} 1980, 159 sqq., is amply combated by L. Pace Henderson I must admit to have been impressed by L.’s arguments in most of the cases mentioned: the distichon 669/70 still seems rather suspect to me, but perhaps I have fallen a victim to Heinsius’ categoric “\textit{nemo mihi persuaserit hoc distichon Nasonianae venae foetum esse}”.

Some miscellanea: 487 \textit{artes tu perlege nostras}: L. is not amused by Henderson’s \textit{Artes}, which aims to make the reference to the \textit{Ars