

*Myrtia*, n° 25, 2010

Properzio, *Elegie*, Edizione Critica e Traduzione a cura di Giancarlo Giardina, Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo 2005, 418 pages.

Prof. Giardina has produced a text and translation of Propertius' elegies. In the introduction, he discusses the manuscript tradition of the poems. He is heavily indebted to the study by Butrica (Toronto 1984). Giardina is not, however, aware of my research on the text of Propertius. In my *Studies in the Text of Propertius* (Athens 2002) I have attempted to show that, due to the influence of Lachmann, recent editors have neglected many variant readings which are contained in Burmannus' edition of Propertius. For the importance of these readings cf. G. Giangrande, *Orpheus* 24, 2003, page 354 ff. Giangrande has explained, moreover, that Hanslik has carried out very valuable research work on the manuscripts of Propertius. For Burmannus and Hanslik cf. also *Myrtia* 18, 2003, page 371 ff. I would now like to make the following observations concerning the text of Propertius' poems.

On page 15 G. discusses 4, 2, 34. Textual alteration is not necessary in this passage, since perfect sense is provided by the reading *Faunus*. Vertumnus states that he appears as Faunus to feathered game: cf. my *Studies*, page 132.

On page 16 G. comments on 2, 3, 22. Perfect sense is provided in this line by the variant reading *lyricis*. Cynthia compares her writings with those of ancient Corinna, and considers that those songs do not equal her own lyric poems (*lyricis...suis*). In other words, Cynthia claims to write better lyric poetry than Corinna: cf. my *Studies*, page 38.

On page 20 G. discusses 4, 3, 10. I have explained that this line should be printed as follows: *ustus et Eois decolour Indus equis*. The poet is alluding here to the chariot of the sun: cf. my *Studies*, page 135.

On the same page G. quotes 1, 13, 24. It should be noted that perfect sense is provided by the variant reading *aetheriis*. Hercules is said to have burnt with love for Hebe on the ethereal heights (*in aetheriis...iugis*), i. e. on Olympus: cf. my *Studies*, page 24.

On page 32 (line 13) G. prints the alteration *verbere*. Textual alteration is, however, not necessary. Milanion is said to have been stunned by the weight (*pondere*) of the club of Hylaeus: cf. my *Studies*, page 9.

On page 38 (line 31) the variant reading *percurrens* makes good sense. The light of the moon is said to pass through the windows of Cynthia's room: cf. my *Studies*, page 13.

On page 106 (line 24) G. prints *fervidus*. It should be noted that perfect sense is provided by the variant reading *arduus*. Propertius is alluding to the literary *topos* according to which Amor is cruel. Thus the words *arduus...Amor* mean “troublesome Love”: cf. my *Studies*, page 39.

On page 136 (line 1) G. prints the alteration *Bactra*. It should be noted, however, that the mss. reading *Etrusca* makes good sense. Propertius is referring to Omphale, a Lydian queen. Omphale dressed herself in the clothes of Hercules and wore his quiver: cf. my *Studies*, page 51.

On page 216 (line 14) G. prints *sopito...Marone*. It should be noted that Markland printed the reading *suspensio...Anione*. Burmannus explained that there is an allusion here to the fact that the Anio was conveyed to Rome in an aqueduct. Note that *suspensio... Anione* = *suspendere rivos* at Manilius 4, 265: cf. my *Studies*, page 71.

On page 220 (line 12) G. prints the alterations *mandisti* and *arbuta*. Textual alteration is again not necessary. Propertius states that Io remained hidden (*abdita*) in the stable after she had been fed in the fields: cf. my *Studies*, page 74.

On page 226 (line 29) G. prints the alteration *Smyrnaei*. Textual alteration is not necessary. Line 29 should be printed as follows: *aut quid Tyrtaei tibi prosunt carmina lecta?* Propertius means that Tyrtaeus’ poetry is of no help to a lover. Thus he urges Lynceus to imitate Philetas instead: cf. my *Studies*, page 75. For the variant reading *Tyrtaei* cf. Burmannus’ note *ad loc.*

On page 226 (line 53) G. prints the alteration *vectabitur*. Good sense can, however, be restored to this line if we print the reading *Stygias...erumnas*: cf. my *Studies*, page 78.

On page 236 (line 27) G. prints the alteration *Idaeum montem*. Textual alteration is not necessary. Propertius refers to Idaean Simois as the “cradle of baby Jove” (*Iovis cunabula parvi*): cf. my *Studies*, page 84.

On page 240 (line 7) G. prints the reading *cecinit*. The correct reading here is, however, *cecini*. Propertius states that he sang of the Curian fathers (*Curios patres*) and the Horatian javelins. The Curii were the forefathers of the Romans: cf. my *Studies*, page 85. Note that the variant reading *patres* was preserved for us by Burmannus.

On page 314 (line 3) G. prints the alteration *e vite*. Textual alteration is not warranted. Propertius refers here to Dindymus and “the fashioned girl of sacred Cybele” (*sacrae fabricata iuvenca Cybelae*): cf. my *Studies*, page 113.

On page 334 (line 125) G. prints Lachmann’s alteration *Asisi*. It should be noted, however, that Propertius is referring here to Mevania and the waters of the

Clitumnus. He states that the lofty city wall of Mevania rises with a towering peak (*scandentique...vertice*): cf. my *Studies*, page 129.

On page 340 (line 8) G. prints the reading *Sericus*. Better sense is provided by the reading *Noricus*. The poet is alluding to the fact that Noricum was annexed by the Romans in 16 B. C. For the Alpine territory of Noricum cf. Nisbet-Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford 1970), page 208.

On page 358 (line 3) G. prints the alterations *ara* and *niteat*. Textual alteration is, however, not necessary. The words *cera...Romana* mean "Roman writing". Propertius is referring here to the Garland Of Philip: cf. my *Studies*, page 152.

On page 386 (line 43) G. prints *maculatis*. I have argued, however, that the correct reading in this passage is *iaculanti*. The reading *iaculanti* was preserved for us by Heinsius: cf. my *Studies*, page 166 (note 1), quoting Hanslik.

Conclusion. Prof. Giardina's edition is the product of long labours, but unfortunately suffers from two grave faults. First of all, he has failed to study the manuscript tradition of Propertius beyond Lachmann, whose theories Butrica follows: this failure has very seriously damaged Giardina's attempted *constitutio textus*. Secondly, owing to his improbable belief that the scribes of Propertius altered whole lines or whole sentences at will, he offers many conjectures which are totally unwarranted.

Giardina has nevertheless written a very interesting edition, in which he provides the reader with much important information concerning the early editions and the history of the text of Propertius, a field in which Professor Giardina is very well versed. Giardina should be thanked by us and congratulated on the production of a very useful and learned tool of research.

Heather White