Abstract
The paradox of Propertius 3.1.27: *Idaeum Simoenta Iouis (cunabula parui)* is either lacunose (N) or nonsensical (all other manuscripts). Gustav Wolff’s celebrated *...cum prole Scamandro* runs against objections in terms of paleographical verisimilitude, intertextual relevance, and conformity with elegiac diction. This paper provides arguments in favor of *...ruisse in pabula parta*, which echoes two Homeric passages (*Il.* 5.773-7, 12.19-22) while pointing, intertextually, to Lucretius and the archaic forms of epic poetry. Paleographically, *ruisse in pabula parta* can easily have yielded *Iouis cunabula parua*. Moreover, Petrarch’s use of *cunabula parua* in 1342 suggests that his (lost) copy of Propertius, and the (now incomplete) manuscript A from which it was made in 1333, bore *parua*. If *parui* is a later correction, the standard theory, according to which the manuscript tradition of Propertius divides into the N and A families, is vindicated against the alternative theory recently put forward by James L. Butrica and Stephen J. Heyworth.
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1. The paradox and Wolff’s conjecture

Except for N (copied around 1200), which stops after *Iouis*, all manuscripts of Propertius transmit a complete, but rather enigmatic, paradox for verse 3.1.27. Obviously, some scribe confused the Simois river, which springs up in the Trojan Ida, and the Cretan Ida, where Zeus-Jupiter was believed to have been born:

nam quis equo pulsas abiegeno nosceret arces,  
fluminaque Haemonio comminus isse uiro,  
Idaeum Simoenta, Iouis cunabula parui,  
Hectora per campos ter maculasse rotas?

‘For who would know that a citadel was pulled down by a wooden horse,  
and that waters/waves battled against the Thessalian hero,  
Idaean Simois, cradle of the little Jupiter,  
that Hector thrice stained the chariot wheels [with his blood] across the plain?’

Relying on parallel examples like:

Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto
Mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae.  
(Verg. A. 3.104-5)

certe ego non patiar Iouis incunabula, Creten
(V. Met. 8.99)

Cresia uos tellus aluit, moderator Olympi
donauti caelo; meritum custodia fecit,
quod fidae comites prima incunabula magni
fouerunt Iouis […]  
(Germ. Arat. 32-5)

Titanas senes, Iouis et cunabula magni  
(MAN. 2.15)

Palmer (cf. Smyth 1970, 89) and Giardina (2005, 236) think it possible to maintain a reference to the cradle of Zeus-Jupiter:

Idaeos montes, Iouis incunabula parui  
(Palmer)

Idaeum montem Iouis et cunabula magni  
(Giardina)

But nothing indicates that Propertius, when alluding to the Homeric corpus, had any reason for mixing up the Trojan Ida with the Cretan Ida (see Housman 1972, 251; Fedeli 1985, 78). Consequently, most editors and commentators adopt Gustav Wolff’s brilliant conjecture, as reported by Haupt (1876, 53-56):

fluminaque Haemonio comminus isse uiro,  
Idaeum Simoenta Iouis cum prole Scamandro

‘and that [two] rivers battled against the Thessalian hero,  
Idaean Simois with Scamander, Jupiter’s offspring’

Indeed, Homer says Scamander (*Σκάμανδρος*), alias Xanthus (*Ξανθος*), to be the offspring of Zeus.
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Ξάνθου δυνήστος, δι' ἀδάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς

(Hom. Il. 14.434 = 21.2 = 24.693)

‘of whirling Xanthus, a stream whose father was Zeus the immortal’

and, when fighting with Achilles, Scamander invites his brother Simois to join him:

[...] κόρυσσε δὲ κύμα ρόολο
νύσσ’ ἀειρόμενος, Σιμώνετι δὲ κέκλητ’ ἄυσας:
"φίλε κασίγνητε, σθένος ἀνέρος ἄμφωτεροι πέρ
σχώμεν [...]"

(Hom. Il. 21.306-23)

‘[Scamander] high uplifting the wave of its waters
gathered it to a crest, and called aloud upon Simois:
“Beloved brother, let even the two of us join to hold back
the strength of a man [...]”’

Under this interpretation, the plural noun flumina refers to both Simois and Scamander: even if Homer does not tell us that Simois really came to help his brother, it is a reasonable extrapolation to think that he did and that, as a consequence, Achilles had to fight with two rivers simultaneously (Richardson 1976, 320; Fedeli 1985, 78-9; Heyworth 2007b, 283-4).

2. Objections to Wolff’s conjecture

Wolff’s proposal runs against several objections.

2.1. From a purely paleographical viewpoint, it is surely not easy to understand how cunabula parui can have emerged from cum prole Scamandri. Housman (1972, 251), Butler & Barber (1933, 264), Fedeli (1985, 79) and Heyworth (2007b, 284) assume the archetype (or a predecessor) to have been seriously deteriorated, or even torn away, after cu(m), cu or c. In this hypothesis, N’s copyist simply dropped cu(m), cu or c because he was unable to make sense of it; as for cunabula parui, it was produced by a scribe who attempted to complete the verse by taking cu(m), cu or c as a starting point. For Richardson (1976, 321), however, «[o]ne can see how cum prole might have been corrupted into cunabula, but parui must have been pure conjecture on the part of the copyist ». If Richardson is right (and, at this point of the discussion, nothing compels us to doubt it), we have to look for the reason why parui came to replace Scamandri. Here are two plausible stories.

Suppose cum prole was first corrupted into cunabula; some scribe may have corrected the unmetrical sequence cunabula Scamandri by writing cunabula parui under the influence of those (quite numerous) verses where, due to obvious semantic parameters, a form of paruus appears in the context that surrounds cunabula; see e.g.:

[...] quid enim cunabula paruo
Pelion et torui commisimus antra magistri? (Stat. Ach. 1.38-9)

[...] cunabula paruis
ipsa dedi [...] (Clavd. 1.144-5)

[...] merito te laeta creaui,
infantem gremio tenui, simul ubera paruo
Vrbs mater tremibunda dedi cunabula praestans (Drac. Romul. 5.295-7)

[...] parui cunabula lecti (Coripp. Ioh. 6.86)
One even finds the genitive phrase *parui Iouis* in a strikingly close passage:

\[ \text{cedat his terris terra Cretensis parui Iouis gloriata cunabulis} \quad (\text{PANEG. 12.4.5}) \]

Yet, given the implausibility of any contamination of the Propertian tradition by this piece of prose, one would rather expect *Iouis* to combine with *magni*,\(^5\) as suggested by \text{VERG. A. 3.104, GER\textsc{M.} \text{Arat.} 34-5, MAN. 2.15} and other parallel examples like:

\[ […] \text{magno cunabula grata Tonanti} \quad (\text{CLAVD. \text{Carm.Min.Ap.} 2.131}) \]
\[ […] \text{mallent cunabula magni} \]
\[ \text{Hectoris aut Semeles thalamum aut penetrale ruisse} \]
\[ \text{Harmoniae.} \quad (\text{STAT. \text{Theb.} 7.601-3}) \]
\[ \text{nam fulsisse ferunt huius cunabula magno} \]
\[ \text{lumine […]} \quad (\text{ENNOD. \text{Carm.} 1.9.99-100}) \]

According to the second story, some copyist added the gloss *paruo* to *Scamandro* because this item made him think of the following verses of Horace:

\[ \text{inuicte, mortalis dea nate puer Thetide,} \]
\[ \text{te manet Assaraci tellus quam frigida parui} \]
\[ \text{findunt Scamandri flumina lubricus et Simois,} \]
\[ \text{unde tibi reditum certo subtemine Parcae} \]
\[ \text{rupere nec mater domum caerula te reuehet.} \quad (\text{HOR. \text{Epod.} 13.12-6}) \]

Then *paruo* ousted *Scamandro*, and the resulting paradox *cum prole paruo* (or *parua*?) was subsequently corrected into *cunabula parui*. Although this explanation better accounts for *parui*, it is only fair to say that it reduces to a purely conjectural reconstruction – not to mention the fact that many editors of Horace reject the reading *parui*.\(^6\)

2.2. Interestingly enough, Horace’s example happens to show that the plural form *flumina* – as a translation of Homeric *pēeθoia*, especially frequent in \text{II. 21} \(^7\) could refer to the waters or waves of one river only, which seriously weakens one of the arguments that supposedly ground Wolff’s hypothesis. Several examples of this use can be found in Propertius: see \text{1.20.7, 1.20.43, 2.17.5, 2.19.25, 2.19.30, 2.28.18, 2.32.14, 3.17.27.}\(^8\)

2.3. One can wonder, in addition, why Propertius, when alluding to the two fighting rivers, would mention in the first place the one that played the more marginal role, if any, in the battle with Achilles.

2.4. Recent commentators have also failed to come to grips with Solmsen’s (1948, 109 footnote 25) acute observation that Wolff’s conjecture «would be attractive if there were other instances in which Propertius uses a hexameter to develop the exemplum given in the pentameter of the preceding couplet»; indeed, according to the standards of elegiac diction, the content conveyed by *flumina* should normally be expanded in the whole following distich.

3. A new solution

Given all those problems, I am inclined to prefer a quite different solution:\(^9\)
nam quis equo pulsas abiegno nosceret arces,
fluminaque Haemonio comminus isse uiro,
Idaeum Simoenta ruisse in pabula parta,
Hectora per campos ter maculasse rotas?

‘For who would know that a citadel was pulled down by a wooden horse,
and that a river [Scamander] battled against the Thessalian hero,
that Idaean Simois ran to the pastures he made grow,
that Hector thrice stained the chariot wheels [with his blood] across the plain?’

3.1. The noun phrase pabula parta alludes to the Homeric episode where Simois grows a
divine grass (άμβροσίης) for Hera’s horses:

άλλ’ ὄτε δὴ Τροίην Ἑξον ποταμῷ τε ἑρέωτε,
ἡχὶ ῥοάς Σιμώεις συμβάλλετοι ἦδε Σκαμάνδρος,
ἐχθ’ ἵππους ἐστήσε θέα, λευκόλενος Ἡρη,
λύσασ’ ἥξ ὄχεων, περὶ δ’ ἥρα πουλίν ἕσεν.
τοῖσιν δ’ άμβροσίην Σιμώεις ἀνέτειλε νέμεσθαλ. (Hom. II. 5.773-7)

‘Now as they came to Troy land and the two running rivers
where Simois and Scamander dash their waters together,
there the goddess of the white arms, Hera, stayed her horses,
slipping them from the chariot, and drifting close mist about them,
and Simois grew as grass ambrosia for them to graze on.’

The tight association of Simois with Scamander in this passage probably inspired Propertius
to shift thematically from one river to another; moreover, ῥοάς (verse 774) clearly
corresponds to ἱέθρα or flumina. When dealing with Rhesus’ horses, Virgil links the
Trojan pabula to Scamander/Xanthus:

ardentes avertit equos in castra, priusquam
pabula gustassent Troiae Xanthumque bibissent. (Verg. A. 1.472-3)

Due, in particular, to the frequent use DRN makes of the stock-expression pabula laeta
in verse-final position (Lucr. 1.15, 1.257, 2.317, 2.364, 2.596, 2.875, 2.1159), the plural form
pabula was felt to be a typical Lucretian item. In addition, Lucretius had already used pabula
parta for referring to the food that dogs, horses, oxen, cows and sheep get without any fear or
effort thanks to the protection of men; parta there means ‘obtained’:

nam cupide fugere feras pacemque secuta
sunt et larga suo sine pabula parta labore,
quae damus utilitatis eorum praemia causa. (Lucr. 5.868-70)

In Propertius, the participial form regains its literal meaning (‘generated’) while occurring
without any complement that might designate the generating entity. This marked ellipsis
is recoverable through the implicit anaphoric link to Simoenta; as a discursive strategy, it
emphasizes the traditional status of the feature in hand, i.e. the fact that the whole story of this
mythical generation is assumed to belong to the semantic-encyclopaedic memory of the
hearer or reader.
From a formal viewpoint, my reconstruction strictly parallels the two undisputable examples of *pabula* in Propertius, in that the word both occurs in the fifth foot and alliterates in *p*- with the following bisyllable:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tu uitiis hominum crudelia pabula praebes} & \quad (\text{PROP. 3.7.3}) \\
\text{ieiuni serpentis honos, cum pabula poscit} & \quad (\text{PROP. 4.8.7})
\end{align*}
\]

3.2. The directional prepositional phrases *ad/in pabulum/-a* are well-documented, as is the collocation *ruo in + accusative.* The following example of Manilius, which derives, thematically, from the beginning of *DRN,* contains not only this construction, but also the stock-expression *pabula laeta* and the noun *partus;* which leads me to view it as a formal imitation of both Lucretius and the Propertian verse I propose to reconstruct:

\[
\begin{align*}
tum pecudum uolucrumque genus per pabula laeta & \\
in Venerem partumque ruit, totumque canora & \\
uoce nemus loquitur frondemque uirescit in omnem. & \quad (\text{MAN. 3.654-6})
\end{align*}
\]

Propertius has several examples of *ruo* (3.2.24, 3.15.44, 4.1.71, 4.4.71, 4.9.31), most of which refer to a rapid and violent movement. When applied to rivers, *ruo* indicates that the waters are rushing down; see e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
et diuersa ruens septem discurrit in ora & \\
usque coloratis amnis deuexus ab Indis & \quad (\text{VERG. G. 4.292-3}) \\
[\ldots] & \\
ruunt de montibus amnes. & \quad (\text{VERG. A. 4.164}) \\
\text{monte decurrens uelut amnis, imbres} & \\
\text{quem super notas aluere ripas,} & \\
\text{feruet immensusque ruit profundo} & \\
Pindarus ore & \quad (\text{HOR. Carm. 4.2.5-8}) \\
\text{exspatiata ruunt per apertos flumina campos} & \quad (\text{Ov. Met. 1.285})
\end{align*}
\]

This feature is in harmony not only with the Homeric intertext and the expected allusion to the Trojan Ida (*Idaeum*):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ŏssoi ἀπ’ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἀλαδε προφέουσιν,} & \\
\text{Ῥῆσος, Ὡ Εὐπάπορος τε Κάρησος τε Ὀρδός τε} & \\
\text{Γρημίκος τε καὶ Αἰσθητος δίος τε Σκάμανδρος} & \\
\text{kai Σιμέδες […]} & \quad (\text{HOM. II. 12.19-22})
\end{align*}
\]

‘all the rivers that run to the sea from the mountains of Ida, Rhesos and Heptaporos, Karesos and Rhodos, Grenikos and Aisepos, and immortal Scamander, and Simois […]’

but also with the epithets given to Simois by Virgil (*rapidum Simoenta,* A. 5.261) and, perhaps, Horace (*lubricus […] Simois, Epod. 13, 14; see above).

The perfect infinitive *ruisse,* which also occurs in *Stat. Theb.* 7.602 (see above) and *Plin. Ep.* 6.20.15, parallels *pulsas (esse), isse* and *maculasse,* so that each verse of the two couplets in hand summarizes an episode in the *Iliad* by means of an independent subordinate predication. As for *parta,* it can be understood either literally (in which case Simois runs to
pastures he has already made grow) or proleptically (i.e. as referring to a future state of affairs resulting from his rushing down); since I do not think we have to choose between these two readings, I maintain a similar indeterminacy in my translation (‘Ideaean Simois ran to the pastures he made grow’). The combination of *ruisse* (in ) – which includes *isse* both from a formal and a semantic viewpoint – with *pabula parta* creates an extremely synthetic formula that conflates a concrete, factual property of Simois with an abstract, unreal action of his. Similarly, verse 25 presents the very abstract, intricate stratagem of the wooden horse as if this artifact produced the fall of the Trojan citadel by virtue of a purely concrete, physical causation.\(^{14}\)

3.3. One could object to my conjecture that the occurrence of *pabula parta* in the last two feet does not conform to Propertius’ general tendency to avoid locating, after the hepthemimeral caesura or the bucolic diaeresis, a noun followed by an attributive (or predicative) adjective or participle when both forms end with a short -a. Indeed, only three other verses of this kind are to be found in his elegies:\(^{15}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{obuia nescio quot pueri mihi turba minuta} & \quad (\text{PROP. 2.29.3-4}) \\
\text{uenerat […]} & \\
\text{aut quid Erechthei tibi prosunt carmina lecta?} & \quad (\text{PROP. 2.34.29}) \\
\text{uidi ego labentes acies et tela caduca} & \quad (\text{PROP. 4.2.53})
\end{align*}
\]

Notice, however, that 2.34.29 and 4.2.53 imitate the pre-Virgilian diction of the epic or didactic hexameter,\(^{16}\) while 2.29.3 quite surprisingly combines this archaic phrasing with a construction the first certain examples of which come from Virgil.\(^{17}\) Given the unsophisticated syntax I propose to assign to verse 3.1.27, the clausula *pabula parta* can be interpreted here not only as an intertextual pointer to Lucretius, but also as an ambiguous homage paid to the outdated (Ennian) forms of epic poetry.

4. The corruption of the line and the manuscript tradition of Propertius

The substitution of *paru-* for *part-* was perhaps favored by a Virgilian parallel: \(^{18}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nigra uelut magnas domini cum diuitis aedes} & \\
\text{peruolat et pennis alta atria lustrat hirundo,} & \\
\text{pabula parua legens nidisque loquacibus escas} & \quad (\text{VERG. A. 12.473-5})
\end{align*}
\]

But a paleographical drift *part-* > *parc-* > *paru-* is more plausible. Scribes frequently mix up the sequences *part-* and *parc*:- see e.g. the alternations *parto-parco-pacto* in \textsc{LUCR. 2.680} (Martin 1963, 67); *partis-parcis* in \textsc{LUCR. 5.354} (Martin 1963, 188); *parte-parta-parca* in \textsc{PROP. 3.5.18} (Hanslik 1979, 110), where I personally opt for *pacta* (Dominicy 2008a); *partit-parcit* in \textsc{SEN. Her. F. 3.26} (Viansino 1968, 20); *partam-parcam* in \textsc{JUV. 10.116} (Labriolle & Villeneuve 1962, 128); *partos-parcus* in \textsc{MART. 9.101.19} (Izaac 1933, 72). The subsequent alteration of *parc-* into *paru-* appears all the more probable since the three sets of forms are related both at the paleographical and the semantic level: see e.g. *partim-parum* in \textsc{LUCR. 4.1240} (Martin 1963, 171); *parca-parua* in \textsc{PROP. 4.3.60} (Hanslik 1979, 162), \textsc{OV. Fast. 2.538} (Schilling 1992, 49) and \textsc{MART. 10.41.6} (Izaac 1933, 92); *percula-peruula-paruula* in \textsc{PROP. 4.5.70} (Hanslik 1979, 170); *parito-paruo* in \textsc{MAN. 3.626} (Housman 1916, 63); *partum-paruis* in \textsc{SEN. Phaed. 899} (Viansino 1968, 305).\(^{19}\)
Neither is there any difficulty in assuming a progressive corruption ruisse > iuisse > iuous (see Eisenhut 1983, 70) because this form was first altered into ruerint and then modified as rapiant > capiant on semantic grounds; in MAN. 2.15 (see above), we find iuisse for Iouis (Housman 1912, 4; 1930, xv). Similarly, corruerint (Lachmann) should probably be substituted for cur iterent in CATUL. 66.93 (Eisenhut 1983, 73), while diuerberet alternates with diruerent in LUCR. 4.407 (Martin 1963, 142), and irruerit with iuuerit in MAN. 5.318 (Housman 1930, 40). Given that in or i— is easily confused with cu— or c—, and p with u (see saepe for saeue in PROP. 2.25.12 [Hanslik 1979, 79] and the list of u—p confusions provided by Housman 1972, 102), we eventually obtain a sequence (say iuuis(se)cūnabula) that anybody would read as Iouis cunabula.

At this point, we get a paradosis Iouis cunabula parua; indeed, the genitive parui requires the modifier to be further construed with Iouis. In fact, some evidence supports the hypothesis (which, as far as I know, has never been put forward) that this ultimate correction did not appear in manuscript A, which was copied around 1230-60 and now stops after 2.1.63. In the Epistola Metrica he wrote in 1342 to persuade Pope Clement the Sixth to come back to Rome (see Wilkins 1964, 56), Petrarch referred to Jesus’s cradle by means of the noun phrase cunabula parua, combined with a genitive modifier (nostrae […] salutis) that goes back to Virgil’s gentis […] nostrae (A. 3.105):20

quid referam nostrae cunabula parua salutis
et sacros postes, ubi rerum conditor ingens
to circus, somnos blandu suadente Maria,
lac quoque uel pueru optatum uel uirginis almae
leue puerperium? […]

It is generally admitted that Petrarch got or made a copy of A, then owned by the library of the Sorbonne, during his stay in Paris (1333); see Wilkins 1964, 25, Rose 2001, 195, Gavinielli 2006, 401-3. This leads me to assume that, in Petrarch’s (lost) Propertius, verse 27 ended with cunabula parua, and that the reading parui of manuscript F (a copy of Petrarch’s manuscript written around 1380) is a later correction, due to Petrarch himself or to Lombardo Sirichi (also called «da Serico» or «della Seta»), who was in charge of Petrarch’s books after his death (1374).

Yet, such a claim cannot remain disconnected from the current debate on the manuscript tradition of Propertius (for an uncommitted survey, see Rose 2001, 186-210). In the standard «NvsA» theory defended e.g. by La Penna (1951-2; 1977, 243-9; 1989), Hanslik (1979), Fedeli (1965, 1984, 2005, 2006), Gooold (1988, 1989, 1990), Murgia (2000) and Giardina (2005), the whole tradition divides into the N family and the A family; but all descendants of N, and all descendants of A posterior to 1423 (or even to 1417), exhibit (direct or indirect) interpolations between the two groups. According to the alternative theory put forward by Butrica (1984, 1997, 2006) and Heyworth (1986; 2007a,b), and adopted by several philologists today,21 some manuscripts that the standard theory considers as indirect descendants of A derive from a lost manuscript (Butrica’s X, Heyworth’s Λ) that cannot be viewed as (in)directly subordinate to either N or A. While Butrica (1984, 172; 1997, 178) grouped X with N, Heyworth (2007a, xlix-l, lxviii; 2007b, xiv) assumes the A and Λ families to stem from a common source; for him, Λ might be the archetype, with variants, corrections and additions posterior to the copying of N (or N’s exemplar) and even A (or A’s exemplar). Given that parui appears in all the manuscripts that supposedly belong to the pure X(Λ) tradition (i.e. that are assumed not to derive from A, and not to have been (in)directly...
contaminated by it, at least for what concerns the passage in question), the alternative theory makes it totally implausible that *parua* might have been the reading of the archetype. But if the standard theory is right (as I believe), then nothing rules out an archetypal paradosis *cunabula parua*, and the fact that N’s scribe dropped it can be explained by its very oddity within the context at hand. Furthermore, this story also proves incompatible with Butrica’s controversial hypothesis that Z (Hanslik’s ρ, copied in 1453) is an independent descendant of A; indeed, Z bears *paruí*, like all extant manuscripts except for N.
Footnotes

1) I am grateful to an anonymous referee for numerous suggestions.

2) See e.g. Enk 1946, I, 57; Fedeli 1985, 78-9; Heyworth 2007b, 284.

3) The English translations of Homer are taken from Lattimore 1951; for uniformity I will replace Lattimore’s Skamandros, Simoeis and Xanthos with Scamander, Simois and Xanthus, respectively.

4) Murgia (2000, 206) simply takes N’s lacuna to be archetypal.

5) Hence Giarda’s magni (see above).


7) Il. 21.9, 25, 218, 235, 244, 311, 352, 354, 361, 365, 382, which amounts to 12 occurrences out of a total of 19 (the remaining examples being 2.461, 2.533, 7.135, 8.369, 14.245, 17.749; 23.205); see also Watson 2003, 433.

8) 3.11.51 (fugisti tamen in timidi uada flumina Nili) is evidently corrupt. The vulgate prints uaga (c) flumina. Personally, I prefer to correct flumina into femina, since the confusion between these two words is attested elsewhere (see MACR. 1.19.16; Willis 1970, 111) and the use of the vocative accounts for the (otherwise unmotivated) shift to the grammatical human second person. I have found this emendation handwritten on p. 175 of the exemplar of Paley 1872 owned by the library of the Université libre de Bruxelles; given that Smyth (1970, 105) does not record it, I suppose it should be attributed to a learned and insightful reader whom I have unfortunately been unable to identify.

9) In 1850, Robert Unger proposed Idaeo in Simoente Louis conubia parata, a very awkward formula that does not combine syntactically with the surrounding verses (Smyth 1970, 89).

10) See also Συμφέροντος/Σκάμανδρο ρόδων in Il. 6.4 and 8.560, Σκάμανδρο σείστηκα in Il. 6.172, έφοραν/Σκάμανδρον in Il. 7.329 and έφερε/πόταμο, Σκάμανδρον in Il. 24.693-4.

11) As pointed out by Fedeli (1985, 234), the adonic clausula pabula praebes of PROP. 3.7.3 undoubtedly echoes four passages of DRN (LUCR. 1.229, 2.596-7, 2.996, 5.991); see also [Tib.] 3.7.162. There is a clear imitation of PROP. 3.7.3 in STAT. Theb. 9.300, and of PROP. 4.8.7 in V.-FL. 8.63 (see Enk 1946, I, 59, 64).

12) See e.g. LUCR. 4.684-5; OV. Met. 10.121-2; Culex 45; PLIN. Nat. 8.50.117; VAR. R. 2.2.12; LIV. 21.37.6; COL. 7.3.24 (ThLL, entry pabulum, 10, 82 – 11, 2).

13) See e.g. Hor. Carm. 1.19.9; VERG. A. 2.353, 9.438; OV. Ep. 1.88, Ars 2.379; LUC. 1.474; V.-FL. 1.698, 3.478; TAC. Ann. 1.7.1.

14) As pointed out by Heyworth (2007b, 565), the infinitive clause of verse 28 can be interpreted either as Hector maculavit rotas or rotae maculaverunt Hectora. I favor the first hypothesis for two reasons. In the reconstruction I propose, it creates a distribution of plural and singular forms that parallels the succession of the clytolds: plural subjects (arces, flumina) and singular complements (equo […] abiegeo, Haemonio […] uiro) in 25-6, singular subjects (Idaeum Simoenta, Hectora) and plural complements (pabula parata, rotas) in 27-8; while the alternative option produces a mirror-image structure: verse-final subjects (arces, rotas) in 25 and 28, verse-initial subjects in 26-7 (flumina, Idaeum Simoenta). Furthermore, noun phrases that refer to animate (in particular, human) entities show, by default, a stronger affinity with the subject function.

15) In 2.29.3, Heyworth (2007a, 85; 2007b, 239) opts for Heinsius’ minuti (against Shackleton Bailey 1956, 121-2 and Fedeli 2005, 821). But a comparison with 1.3.10 (Hodge & Buttimore 1977, 90) suggests that the pueri in question are slave-boys that drunken Ego takes for Cupids; so that the transition from nescio quot pueri to turba minuta mimics Ego’s confused perception of the external world. For a defense of the transmitted text in 2.34.29, see Dominczy 2008b, pace Heyworth 2007b, 268. In 4.4.13-4 (murus erant montes; ubi nunc est Curia, saepa: / bellicus ex illo fonte bibebat equus), I understand saepa as a substantive; see Fedeli 1965, 139 and Giardina 2005, 346, pace Heyworth 2007b, 449.

16) If not spurious (the manuscripts give labentis; see Heyworth 2007a, liv), the homoeoteleuton labentes acies underlines the archaic phrase of the subject function.

17) See Platnauer 1951, 40; Harrison 1991; Holmes 1995. Both Harrison (1990, 142) and Holmes (1995, 500 footnote 3) notice the increasing frequency of this clausula type in the second part of the Aeneid, probably due to a stronger propensity to emulate Ennius. On possible Virgilian models for 2.29.3, and parallel examples in Propertius, see Williams 1968, 726-8, 770-1 and Solodow 1986.

18) See also the confusions between pabul- and paru(ul)- mentioned by Havet (1911, 110, 262; on VERG. G. 4.201) and ThLL (entry pabulum, 5, 66-8). In OV. Met. 2.792, pabula alternates with papauera, which probably reduced to pauera in a first stage (Librán Moreno 2006, 92).


20) See the whole text in the electronic version of the Biblioteca Italiana (http://www.bibliotecaitaliana.it/). For proper virgilian echoes in Petrarck’s poetic works, see La Penna 1977, 254-61.