held in enchantment, the moon labours, in eclipse. Obviously, the Propertian manuscripts' 'fraternis Luna laboret equis' finds an echo of sorts in Ovid's 'cantatis Luna laborat equis'. I suggest that the echo is better than their *fraternis* would allow, that *fraternis* is corrupt, that Propertius wrote: 'aut cur frenatis Luna laboret equis'. The *equi* are the moon's own horses, curbed in bewitchment, in lunar eclipse. By metathesis, inspired by *rat-* of *rationem* in the preceding line ('harum nulla solet rationem quaerere mundi'), *frenatis* was copied as *fratenis*, and *fratenis* then was emended easily and corruptly to *fraternis*.

Pennsylvania State University   A. ALLEN

PROPERTIUS 4. 1. 9

quo gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulit olim
unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus.

quo] quod *N*: quot *Dieterich*: qua *codd. dett.*

MOST modern editors adopt one or other of two readings: (1) *quot*[1] *gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulit! olim | unus erat* etc.; (2) *qua gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulit, olim | unus erat* etc.

It is true that a large number of steps leading up to a temple is an indication of its magnificence; cf. Ovid, *Pont.* 3. 2. 49 f. *templa manent hodie vastis innixa columnis, | perque quater denos itur in illa gradus.* Nevertheless in this context *qua* is more probable than *quot*, in view of the local relative clauses in line 1 (*qua maxima Roma est*) and line 3 (*ubi Navali stant sacra Palatia Phoebo*).

Adopting the first of the two readings given above, Camps[2] translates *se sustulit* by 'has reared itself', and explains the perfect tense by the fact that the reconstruction of the temple in question (that of Quirinus) 'was a new feature at the time when this elegy was written'. *A priori* in this passage, 'in which, throughout, the contrast is between present splendour . . . and past simplicity' (Camps), one would have expected *sustulit* to be an aorist, referring not to an event of the recent past but to the remote age of simplicity, like all the other past verbs in both the preceding and the succeeding context.

Another point which may tell against the first reading is that Propertius very seldom, except where anaphora[3] is involved, begins in the sixth foot of the hexameter a new sentence which runs on into the pentameter. The only real parallel[4] to this passage in the whole of Propertius would be 1. 9. 15 f. *quid si non esset facilis tibi copia? nunc tu | insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam.*

For these reasons I believe that the second reading should be preferred to the first (the reference of *domus* would still be to the temple of Quirinus),[5] but my

[1] The alternative *quo* ('to what height'), with the same construction, has sometimes been advocated, but is less convincing.

[2] In his edition of Propertius Book iv (Cambridge, 1965).

[3] e.g. 3. 3. 15 f. *quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te | carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?* Such examples, and other cases of

sense-stops in the last two feet of the hexameter, are conveniently collected in the 'Index metricus et prosodiacus' appended to Schuster's Teubner text (p. 177 of the 1954 edition).

[4] I do not regard *an quae* at 1. 12. 9 as beginning a new sentence.

[5] And not to the (or a) *casa Romuli*.

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