will also be noticed that the sentence concludes with a clausula (cretic + spondee) which is one of Cicero's favourites. A further refinement emerges, however, if the poet's name is spelled out in full, something precluded by the naming conventions of the inscription:

Cārmēn cōmpŏsŭīt ´ Quīntŭs Hŏrātĭūs | Flaccus.

The inscribed sentence incorporates an Asclepiad line, the 'signature' metre of *Odes* 1–3, which are framed by Horace's only two poems in stichic Asclepiads. In identifying the author of the *Carmen Saeculare*, the sentence also acknowledges the collection of poems which won him the commission.

*Durham* A.J. WOODMAN
ajw6n@virginia.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000843

## NOTES ON THE TEXT OF *CATALEPTON* 10[1]

*Catalepton* 10 (*Sabinus ille*) is a unique survival from antiquity: it is the only parody of an entire poem to reach us, and is written in pure iambic trimeters, a near intractable metre. Addressed to Sabinus, an upstart muleteer, the poem launches a stinging attack at him, and draws attention to his status as a parvenu. It remains incredibly close to its charming model—Catullus 4 (*Phaselos ille*)—in structural, lexical, stylistic and metrical terms, but rather different in purport. In attempting to reassess a number of problems in the text of the poem, the textual critic ought largely to be guided by the relationship of *Sabinus ille* to its model, as it is clear that the author of *Catalepton* 10 was an incredibly close reader of the Catullan text and sought not only to imitate through parody but also to subvert and deflate his predecessor's poem.

(1) *Catal.* 10.9–11:[2]

bidente dicit attodisse forcipe
comata colla, ne Cytorio iugo
premente dura uolnus ederet iuba.

He says that he used to trim shaggy necks with two-bladed shears, so that the harshness of the mane did not cause soreness as the Cytorian [that is, boxwood] yoke pressed on it.

The *dura ... iuba* of the paradosis seems odd. The adjective is used nowhere else to describe hair or fur of any sort, and quite why the 'hardness' or 'harshness' of the mane

[1] My sincere thanks to Stephen Heyworth and Stephen Harrison for their comments and discussion, and to my good friend Jessica Carter for explaining various matters relating to the care of equids to me.
[2] The lemmata are taken from R.E.H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis libellus qui inscribitur Catalepton*, 2 vols. (Assen, 1946 and 1963).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press

should be in question is unclear.[3] I very tentatively conjecture *densa ... iuba*. The adjective *densus* is apposite for describing hair and the like (*TLL* 5.1.545–7), and the collocation is found elsewhere of a *pullus* (for example Verg. *G.* 3.86 and Columella, *Rust.* 6.29.2; cf. Varro, *Rust.* 2.7.5 *iuba crebra*). It also gives greater saliency to the shearing spoken of in v. 9: it is precisely the quantity of hair that is at issue. The *densa iuba* of the *pullus* may be a positive feature in Virgil, but the horse of *Georgics* Book 3 is not intended as a draft-horse, for which an excessive mane may cause difficulties. As Telleen notes of equids used for drafting in the modern day, '[c]lipping the shoulders of long-haired horses and mules just where the collar fits on seems to help prevent sore shoulders because it keeps the hair from matting on the collar. This condition, if unchecked, sometimes irritates the skin and starts a collar sore … If the mane and tail are too long and thick, they should be thinned out by using a pocketknife or pulling some of the extra hair out with the fingers.'[4] The corruption from *densa* to *dura* is straightforward enough given the similar shape of the words.[5]

(2) *Catal*. 10.20–1:

> neque ulla uota semitalibus deis
> sibi esse facta praeter hoc nouissimum.

Nor [he claims] did he make any vows to the gods of the byways, except this most recent one.

Since the 1517 Aldine edition, *facta*, extracted from the text of Catullus (*neque ulla uota litoralibus deis | sibi esse facta*, 4.22–3), has been printed by all editors; this is, however, problematic. It is perhaps easiest to understand *uota* as referring to 'votive offerings' here, rather than 'vows' in the light of the mention of the *lora* and the *pecten* in v. 22 (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.279; Petron. *Sat.* 89 with Habermehl ad loc.).[6] That being said, the phrase *uotum facere* properly means 'to make a vow', not 'to make a votive offering'. The model is thus of little use here, as the author of *Catal.* 10 is concerned with votives, not with vows (as at Catull. 4.22): a different verb is needed. (Trappes-Lomax suggests that *uotum facere* may be taken as effectively meaning 'to make a vow to dedicate [a votive offering]' in and of itself; such a sense, however, is unparalleled.)[7] The manuscripts all read *sancta*. The verb *sancire*, however, is rarely attested with *uota* as

[3] The reader for *CQ* notes that, by referring to the mule's *iuba* as *dura*, the poet may be referring to a harshness caused by dirt in the hair of the mane (which, I suppose, could lead to matting and irritation); were this the intended sense, it is unclear to me why the poet should not have more straightforwardly referred to the mane as 'dirty'. αὐχμηρός at Soph. fr. 475 Radt (διὰ ψήκτρας σ' ὁρῶ | ξανθὴν καθαίρονθ' ἵππον αὐχμηρᾶς τριχός) is offered as a possible *comparandum*. A ψήκτρα (a curry-comb), however, is used to rub down equids, not to comb their manes (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1173–5 ἡμεῖς μὲν ἀκτῆς κυμοδέγμονος πέλας | ψήκτραισιν ἵππων ἐκτενίζομεν τρίχας | κλαίοντες; *Hippiatr. Cant.* 57.11 ἀναξυέσθω δὲ πρότερον μετὰ ψήκτρας ἢ ὀστράκου, μέχρις ἂν ἐκβάλλῃ αἷμα, καὶ οὕτως ἀλειφέσθω; *Anth. Pal.* 6.233.6 and 6.246.5). In the light of this, the *comparandum* does not seem to me entirely apt: rubbing (NB ἀναξύω) a mane would achieve little by way of cleaning it.

[4] M. Telleen, *The Draft Horse Primer* (Emmaus, PA, 1977), 181–3.

[5] The phrase *uolnus ederet* is not precisely paralleled elsewhere, but for *edere* used in this more figurative sense we may compare Verg. *Aen.* 10.602 *edebat funera* with S.J. Harrison, *Vergil, Aeneid 10* (Oxford, 1991), ad loc.

[6] P. Habermehl, *Petronius,* Satyrica *79–141: Ein philologisch-literarischer Kommentar, Band I:* Sat. *79–100* (Berlin and New York, 2006), 167–8.

[7] J.M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal* (Swansea, 2007), 43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press

its object and, where it does occur, it comes to mean 'to make a vow': *feralia sanxi | uota deis* (Stat. *Theb.* 11.344–5).

I propose reading *posta*. Whilst rare, the collocation *uotum ponere*—'to make an offering'—is paralleled (for example Prop. 2.19.17–18 *ipse ego uenabor: iam nunc me sacra Dianae | suscipere et Veneri ponere uota iuuat*). The syncopated *posta* is at home in a poem that admits the forms *attodisse* (9) and *deposisse* (16), and is found elsewhere (for example Lucr. 3.857, 6.965). A medieval scribe's ignorance of the form may have resulted in attempted emendation; alternatively, the not infrequent liturgical use of *sancta* may well have allowed the word to creep in quite unintentionally after *uota*. (Stephen Harrison has suggested *pacta* to me as another possibility, adducing Hor. *Carm.* 3.29.59 *uotis pacisci*, but *uota* refers to 'vows' in this context, rather than to 'votive offerings' of the sort found in *Catal.* 10.)

(3) *Catal*. 10.22:

paterna lora proximumque pectinem.

[He made offerings of] his father's reins and the near-by comb.

Sabinus describes his *lora* as *paterna*: this invites us to recall that he has been a *mulio* from his earliest days (*ultima ex origine* [14]), and emphasizes the innate nature of his lowly status. As regards the description of his *pecten*, the transmitted *proximum* seems to me to be implausible. It has been understood in a number of ways, most of which are without parallel in describing an object.

Where *proximus* is used of time in the past ('the most recent', 'the last', 'the latest'), it refers to the most recent period of time (for example Plaut. *Amph.* 548) or instance of something (for example a *congiarium* [Tac. *Dial.* 17]; a military campaign [Caes. *BGall.* 1.44.9]; a letter received [Cic. *Att.* 11.11.1]; the holding of an office [Cic. *Sen.* 42]). It is not used to refer to objects, as far as I can see (cf. *TLL* 10.2.2037.61–2039.8).[8]

Birt proposed two possible interpretations of *proximum*: (i) 'the next in value [*sc*. after the *paterna lora*]'; (ii) 'the nearest and dearest [to Sabinus]'.[9] Neither of these senses of *proximus* finds a parallel in relation to a tangible object. Heyne understood *proximus* to mean 'iuxta lora suspensum, eodem pariete';[10] he has been followed by Klotz ('proxumus a loris subiugiis pecten dedicatus erat, qui antea in iugo ipso proxume a loris suspensus fuerat'), by Sabbadini and by Galletier (who unhelpfully adduces Hor. *Carm.* 3.26, which is concerned not with the proximity of various parts of the votive to one another but with the placement of the offering in relation to the building).[11] This is the only plausible meaning for *proximus*, though as Birt rightly

[8] *pace* F. Zimmermann, 'Virgil und Catull', *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932), 1119–30, at 1128; H. Wagenvoort, 'Ad Verg. Catal. X 22', *Mnemosyne* 1 (1934), 145; R.E.H. Westendorp Boerma, 'Adnotationes ad Verg. Catalepton 10', *Mnemosyne* 14 (1961), 233–8, at 236–7; Westendorp Boerma (n. 2), 2.47–8; and N. Zorzetti, 'L'ironia della differenza (A proposito di Catull. 4 e *Catal.* 10)', *AFLN* 15 (1972–3), 29–54, at 50. Were it possible for *proximus pecten* to mean 'his last, or most recent, comb', Zorzetti's observation that ***paterna*** *lora* and ***proximus*** *pecten* juxtapose 'il primo e l'ultimo degli strumenti del mestiere' would have been an attractive one.

[9] T. Birt, *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton* (Leipzig, 1910), 123.

[10] C.G. Heyne, *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera uarietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustrata* (Leipzig, 1775), 3.154.

[11] R. Klotz, *De Catulli Carmine IIII Eiusque Parodia Vergiliana* (Leipzig, 1868), 7; R. Sabbadini, *[P. Vergili Maronis] Catalepton, Maecenas, Priapeum* (Turin, 1917), 33; and E. Galletier, *(P. Vergili Maronis) Epigrammata et Priapea: édition critique et explicative* (Paris, 1920), 200.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press

noted, 'der Umstand ist doch gleichgültig, wie nahe der Kamm beim Zügel aufgestellt war'.[12]

A number of conjectures have been made. Several identify the material from which the *pecten* was made as boxwood (Salmasius's *buxinumque*, Heinsius's *buxeumque*, Schmid's *pyxinumque*, comparable to πύξινος; of these *buxeus* is by far the most well-attested form). This is not implausible in and of itself (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.311), but there seems to be little point to it in the context, and it is odd after the circumlocutory use of *Cytorius* to describe the *iugum* as 'made of boxwood' in v. 10. The suggestion by Garrod that *pecten* may refer not to a comb but to the teeth of a speedometer (or, perhaps, more properly, an odometer), is ingenious, but I am unable to convince myself that it is what the parodist wrote;[13] less plausible still is the notion of Holland, that Sabinus dedicated a *ploxenum* (a 'wagon-box' or 'wagon-bed'), a possibility also considered by Scaliger.[14]

I tentatively conjecture *propriumque*. This provides good sense: the adjective draws attention to the fact that it is Sabinus' own comb, not one inherited from his father (cf. *paterna lora*); for its usage to denote ownership of an object, see Manilius 2.59 (cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 21; Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.9). There may also be a supplementary use of *proprius* here to refer to the appropriateness of sacrifices; cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 862 with Lindsay ad loc. and *CIL* 6.32323.[15] The first syllable of *proprius* is, in most cases, treated as short, since the *o* comes before a mute + *r*, but its lengthening may be paralleled at *Aetna* 530 *haec prōpria uirtus*; cf. *prōprietate* at *Aetna* 513. Fittingly for a parodist who emulates Catullan metrical and prosodic practice, vocalic lengthening of this sort is not unusual in Catullus' iambics; there are two instances in the model of *Catal.* 10 (cf. Catull. 4.9 *Propontidā* ***tr****ucem*, 4.18 *impotentiā* ***fr****eta*, 22.10 *cā****pr****imulgus*, 31.8 *perē****gr****ino*). Variation of treatment within the same poem is also Catullan (for example 29.16 *expă****tr****auit* and 29.22 *pā****tr****imonia*); it is thus not problematic that the parodist would treat the *o* of *proprium* as long, whilst not lengthening the *a* of *lōră* before ***pr****oprium*, nor that of *Crĕmōnă* before ***fr****igida* (12).[16]

*Trinity College, Oxford* T.E. FRANKLINOS
tristan.franklinos@classics.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000752

[12] Birt (n. 9), 123.
[13] H.W. Garrod, 'On the meaning of *PLOXINVM*', *CQ* 4 (1910), 201–4.
[14] R. Holland, 'Vergils Sabinus- und Catulls Phaselusgedicht', *Philologische Wochenschrift* 45 (1925), 59–63, at 61; and J.J. Scaliger, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Appendix, cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum poematum ueterum poetarum* (Lyons, 1572), 508.
[15] W.M. Lindsay, *The Captiui of Plautus* (London, 1900), 314.
[16] The reader for *CQ* has drawn my attention to the fact that *propriumque* has already been conjectured by W.S. Watt, 'Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*', *Eikasmos* 12 (2001), 279–92, at 290, though Watt does not account for the metrical oddity of *proprium* at all, nor does he indicate the appropriateness of such a solecism to this parody in the light of Catullan practice.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000752 Published online by Cambridge University Press