

objection to taking *sustulit* as a perfect tense remains. It can be removed by a change of punctuation: *qua gradibus domus ista, Remi se sustulit olim: | unus erat* etc. It is true that *gradibus se tollit*, of the temple of Quirinus, 'suggests an imposing building' (Camps), but this does not mean that *se sustulit* (without *gradibus*) is inappropriate to the primitive dwelling of the brothers; indeed, the sentence gains point if the same expression is used of both the modern and the primitive buildings ('where now rises . . . there once rose . . .').

King's College, Aberdeen

W. S. WATT

CIRIS 89-91

quidquid et ut quisque est tali de clade locutus,
 †omnia sim†; potius liceat notescere cirin
 atque unam ex multis Scyllam non esse puellis.

omnia sim H, *omne suam* AR; *omnia sunt* (recc.) looks like interpolation.

THE most popular emendation has been Heinsius's *somnia sunt*. I find the tone of this misplaced (cf. F. Leo, *Ausg. Kl. Schriften*, ii. 118-19). The poet has since 66 laboriously catalogued variant aetiologies of Scylla *monstrum*. It is inappropriate that he should immediately follow this with the statement that all of them were 'fancy' or 'nonsense'. For a start, we may note that the summation *quidquid et ut quisque* . . . presumably includes the version of Homer (66), to whose authority the poet had appealed (62) in the case of the erroneous contamination of the two Scyllas. Next, I suppose that if Scylla *monstrum* had been the subject of his poem, the poet might have wanted to say that some of the versions were wrong—or at least of less good authority, or less attractive than others for one reason or another. But Scylla *monstrum* is not the subject of his poem. He confutes, because it is his concern, the contamination; the listing of the rest, variants in a story not his subject, issues largely from an 'Alexandrian' delight in such learned display. It calls for no estimation of their rightness or wrongness: neither relative to one another—and certainly not absolutely. The text supports this assessment. His attitude towards the *monstrum* variants among themselves seems demonstrably *neutral*—witness his simple adduction, without consequent comparative judgement, of additional authority for the final variant (87-8). And the natural tendency of the *siue* clauses of 66 ff. would seem to be to lead to nothing much more than an expression of dissociation by the poet from the whole Scylla *monstrum* complex, with (very probably) a reason for his preference for Scylla *Nisi* implicit in that expression of dissociation—or it may be the reason that is more explicit, the dissociation implicit. A clue to the nature of such a reason, and indeed a pointer to the fact that a reason was included, may lie in the stress in 90-1 on the singularity of *Nisi* Scylla's story; and, by a pun, on her 'selectness' (with *unam ex multis* cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2. 66 'tenuis Lucius Verginius unusque de multis')—after the numerous (but not for that erroneous) stories that have accumulated around Scylla *monstrum*.

Anyway †*omnia sim*† must conceal the heralded (reasoned) dissociation. 'Whoever is the mother, whatever is the aetiology of Scylla *monstrum*, <that is

not my subject), *potius liceat* . . . I can find no conjecture to hand that convincingly meets the stated expectations. Worth consideration perhaps is Vollmer's *dimittam*; but it does not suggest any reason for the dissociation. Leo (loc. cit.) assumed an ellipsis, writing *iam Nisi* (after Sillig's *Nisaeam*); but *Nisi* (and *Nisaeam*) is peculiarly collocated with *cirin*—or peculiarly separated from *Scyllam*. In fact it seems impossible to concoct out of the *ductus* all that is wanted. (Leo's plan seems to reflect this frustration.) I find the paradosis so intractable that I suggest we allow thought to roam free and consider what might satisfy sense and context regardless of the *ductus*. The beginning of *Georgics* 3 comes to mind where Vergil claims that all myths are hackneyed—*omnia iam uulgata* (*Georg.* 3. 4). It occurs to me that our poet might be saying the same about the various versions of *Scylla monstrum*—not that they are nonsense, but that they are hackneyed. I suggest in fact that he wrote *uulgatum*; that a scribe recalled the Vergilian passage and wrote his parallel *omnia iam uulgata* in the margin. *omnia iam* was then included in the text, and when the time came for metrical surgery, the wrong amputation was made: *omnia iam* [*uulgatum*] *potius liceat* . . . (Quite possibly a similar process of corruption occurred at *Cir.* 175 where †*caeli*† may originate in *Catal.* 3. 2 *altius et caeli sedibus*.) *uulgatum* gives nice point to *potius notescere*—point which it would lack after, say, *dimittam*; and it meets our stated requirements, conveying the poet's dissociation from *Scylla monstrum* and his reasons: 'Scylla *monstrum* has numerous tales told about her and each one is public knowledge (the girl one feels is rather *common*); so, *potius liceat notescere cirin*, and let Scylla in my story not be one out of many girls (being the single storied *Nisi* she will not be); let my Scylla be a *select* heroine.' Of course to say that all the variant versions of *Scylla monstrum* from line 66 on were each one commonplace was probably a very considerable exaggeration; and the comparative freshness of the *Ciris* as a story (also implied) rather depends on when the poem was written and how often in fact the story had been told—neither of which we can confidently say. But the whole stance, whether strictly justifiable or not, is an extremely plausible one for a selfconsciously 'Callimachean' poet; nor would it be a long step to proceed from the feeling that the *Scylla monstrum* story was as a whole now overplayed—as illustrated by the numerous variants that had grown up around the protagonist—to the claim of commonplaceness for each of those variants.

Balliol College, Oxford

R. O. A. M. LYNE

A MATCH FOR ALCESTIS: PLUTARCH *MOR.* 243 d

IN the introductory remarks to his *Mulierum Virtutes*, Plutarch notes the value of comparisons for establishing the diverse manifestations of the same virtue: 'Achilles was brave in one way, Ajax in another; and the intelligence of Odysseus differed from that of Nestor, nor were Cato and Agesilaus just in the same way, nor was Irene loving of her husband (*φίλανδρος*) as Alcestis was, nor Cornelia high-minded in the manner of Olympias' (243d). All the examples are well known, and quite apposite, except for Irene (*Εἰρήνη*). Who is this