# TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN PROPERTIUS

# Dr HEATHER WHITE

 1.1.31-36

 uos remanete, quibus facili deus annuit aure,

 sitis et in tuto semper amore pares.

 in me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras

 et nullo uacuus tempore defit Amor.

 hoc, moneo, uitate malum: sua quemque moretur
 35

 cura, neque assueto mutet amore locum.

line 33 noctes: voces v. l.

In his discussion of these lines, Stephen Heyworth<sup>1</sup> argued that "no convincing interpretation of the text as it stands has yet been offered". He therefore suggests that *in*, in line 33, should be altered to *nam*. I would like to point out, however, that textual alteration is not necessary. We should print the variant reading *voces*, and translate as follows:

"My beloved (*nostra Venus*<sup>2</sup>) exercises (*exercet*<sup>3</sup>) her bitter voice (*voces*<sup>4</sup> ... *amaras*<sup>5</sup>) against me (*in me*)."

<sup>1.</sup> Cf. S. J. Heyworth, Classical Quarterly 34,1984, page 396.

<sup>2.</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, A Latin Dictionary, s.v. Venus I, B, 2: "Like the Engl. love, to denote a beloved object, beloved."

<sup>3.</sup> Cf. Plautus, Poenulus 12 exerce vocem ("exercise your voice").

<sup>4.</sup> Note that voces is a poetic plural: cf. my Studies in the Text of Propertius (Athens 2002), page 142.

<sup>5.</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, A Latin Dictionary, s.v. amarus II,B: "Of speech, bitter, biting, acrimonious ... dictis amaris, Ov. Tr. 3, 11, 31". Propertius has employed adjectival enallage. Cynthia's words are said to be bitter, because she is herself bitter. For adjectival enallage cf. my Studies, page 164. Postgate (apud Hanslik) accepts the reading voces.

## 1.10.11-14

sed quoniam non es ueritus concredere nobis,

accipe commissae munera laetitiae.

non solum uestros dididi reticere dolores:

est quiddam in nobis maius, amice, fide.

#### line 13 dolores: furores v. l.

Heyworth<sup>6</sup> explains that "in poem 1.10 Propertius spends ten lines expressing his delight at witnessing the consummation of an affair of Gallus". Heyworth was puzzled by the meaning of *dolores* in line 13. I would like to point out that perfect sense can be restored to this passage if we print the variant reading *furores*. We should translate as follows: "I have not only learnt to conceal your passion (*furores*<sup>7</sup>)"

#### 2.1.39-42

sed neque Phlegraeos Iouis Enceladique tumultus

intonet angusto pectore Callimachus,

nec mea conueniunt duro praecordia uersu

Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos.

#### line 40 intonet: intonat v. l.

Heyworth<sup>8</sup> discusses the use of the subjunctive in verse 40. He notes that, according to Burmannus<sup>9</sup>, *intonat* occurs as a variant reading in this passage. Heyworth then adds that the subjunctive *putet* occurs at 4.1.38. I would like to point out, however, that the correct reading at 4.1.38 is *pudet*. Propertius states that the Roman foster-child (i.e. Romulus) had (*habet*) nothing from his father except his name, and that he was not ashamed (*non pudet*) that a she-wolf had nourished his race. It will be noted that *pudet* is a historical present<sup>10</sup>.

12

40

<sup>6.</sup> Op. cit., page 397.

Cf. Giardina *ad loc*. Cf. also Lewis and Short, *op. cit.*, s.v. *furor* (1): "... of the fierce passion of love, Prop. I, 13, 20". Cf. moreover Horace, *Sat.* II, 3, 325 *Mille puellarum, puerorum mille furores* ("your thousand passions for girls and boys").

<sup>8.</sup> Op. cit., page 399.

Burmannus used manuscripts in order to correct the text of Propertius: cf. my Studies, page 16 (note 3).

For other examples of the historical present cf. Fedeli, *Propertius* (ed. Teubner 1984), page 329, s.v. praesens.

#### 2.8.31-2

uiderat ille fuga stratos in litore Achiuos,

feruere et Hectorea Dorica castra face.

line 31 stratos: fractos v. l.

Heyworth<sup>11</sup> notes that Propertius is describing here "Achilles' impassivity in the face of Greek defeats." Heyworth was, however, puzzled by the meaning of line 31. Textual alteration is, nevertheless, not necessary. We should print the variant reading *fractos* and translate as follows:

"he saw the Greeks on the shore weakened by exile (*fuga*<sup>12</sup> *fractos*)". Propertius is referring to the fact that the Greeks spent many years at Troy.<sup>13</sup>

## 2.18.5

quod mea si canis aetas canesceret annis

canis: moltis v. l.: cf. Hanslik's apparatus ad loc.

Heyworth<sup>14</sup> was puzzled by the meaning of this line. The reader will note, however, that perfect sense can be restored to the text if we print the variant reading *moltis*.

```
Heyworth also discusses 2.34.20:
```

ipse meas solus, quod nil est, aemulor umbras,

stultus, quod stulto saepe timore tremo.

line 21 stulto: nullo Heinsius

Heyworth states that Heinsius read *nullo* in line 21. It should be noted that Heinsius used manuscripts in order to correct the text of Propertius. Thus at 4.10.43 Heinsius<sup>15</sup> took the reading *iaculanti* from a manuscript.

<sup>11.</sup> Op. cit., page 400.

Cf. Lewis and Short, op. cit., s.v. fuga I, A, 2: In partic. "flight from one's native land, expatriation, exile, banishment", and O.L.D. s.v. fuga, 4.

<sup>13.</sup> Unfortunately, the reading fractos is not recorded by Hanslik or Viarre.

<sup>14.</sup> Op. cit., page 400 f.

<sup>15.</sup> Cf. my Studies in the Text of Propertius, page 166 (note 1). However, given the fact that repetition is common in Propertius (cf. my Studies, page 53 and G. Giangrande, Orpheus 24, 2003, page 356) it is possible to retain the reading stulto. For repetitions such as stulitor stultissimo, stultior stulto, stultus ... stulte etc. cf. Lewis and Short, op. cit., s.v. stultus (1). The enallage is common: cf. stultum errorem Phaedr. V, 7, 30. For these reasons, Forcellini, s.v. stultus accepts the reading stultus ... stulto.

## 2.19.17-18

ipse ego uenabor: iam nunc me sacra Dianae suscipere et Veneri ponere uota iuuat.

line 18 Veneris v.l.

In his discussion of these lines, Heyworth<sup>16</sup> argues that the correct reading is *Veneri*. I would like to point out, however, that the variant reading *Veneris* makes perfect sense. Propertius states that he intends to devote himself to the rites of Diana, and "to lay aside (*ponere*) the desires (*vota*<sup>17</sup>) of love (*Veneris*)."

### 2.19.23-24

haec igitur mihi sit lepores audacia molles

excipere et structo figere avem calamo.

line 24 structo: stricto v. l.

Scholars<sup>18</sup> have been puzzled by the meaning of line 24. I would like to suggest that Propertius is alluding here to the fact that Hercules shot Periclymenus<sup>19</sup>, who had turned himself into an eagle. Thus Propertius hopes to hunt hares and to transfix (*figere*<sup>20</sup>) an eagle with an arrow (*stricto ... calamo*).<sup>21</sup>

## 2.32.11-16

scilicet umbrosis sordet Pompeia columnis

porticus, aulaeis nobilis Attalicis,

et creber platanis pariter surgentibus ordo,

flumina sopito quaeque Marone cadunt,

et leviter nymphis tota crepitantibus urbe 15 cum subito Triton ore recondit aquam.

- 18. Cf. Heyworth, op. cit., page 402 f.
- Cf. Ovid, Met. 12, 556 ff. Propertius adopted an allusive narrative technique: cf. my Studies, page 91.
- Cf. Lewis snd Short, op. cit., s.v. figo I, B: "Transf., to fix by piercing through, to transfix, pierce."
- 21. Viarre prefers structo = "un roseau préparé" (i.e. covered with glue). Cf. Butler-Barber ad loc., who correctly understand stricto to signify "drawn from the quiver": their explanation is confirmed by Ovid, Met. 12, 556 ff., quoted by me.

<sup>16.</sup> Op. cit., page 401 f.

<sup>17.</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, op. cit., s.v. votum B,1: "A wish, desire, longing".

Heyworth<sup>22</sup> notes that scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of line 14. Burmannus<sup>23</sup> explained that Propertius is referring here to the aqueduct which carried the water of the Anio to Rome. The following text was supplied in an early edition:

Flumina suspense quaeque Anione cadunt.

It should be noted that Triton, in line 16, means "the sea".

The waters of the Anio are said to vanish into the mouth of the sea.

Conclusion. I hope that I have demonstrated that textual alteration is often not necessary if we have sufficient knowledge of Propertius' *Sprachgebrauch*.

<sup>22.</sup> Op. cit., page 404.

<sup>23.</sup> Cf. my Studies, page 71 f.