(2) 1.49:

multi enim faciunt multa temeritate quadam sine iudicio †uel morbo in omnes uel† repentino quodam quasi uento impetu animi incitati; …

This is a *locus conclamatus*, for which no satisfactory solution has been found.[4] The first *uel* should surely be emended to *uelut* so as to show that *morbus* is being used metaphorically;[5] the two possibilities could have induced readers to think of a *uel* ... *uel* construction, even though the two parts are not truly parallel.

Holford-Strevens *apud* Winterbottom proposed supplying *prodigi* after *omnes*, but there appears to be no parallel for construing *prodigus* with *in* + accusative,[6] and it would be hard to explain the corruption. Perhaps rather *in omnes* <*liberales*>, the thought thus rounded off with a ditrochaic clausula. *liberalis* is not negative *per se*. *liberalitas* is, however, the main topic of this section (1.42: *de beneficentia ac de liberalitate dicatur*), with repeated discussion of who does or does not qualify as *liberalis*. That the quality is carried too far is implied by *in omnes* and made explicit by *uelut morbo*. For *liberalis* with *in* + accusative, see *Planc.* 63: *Cyrenis liberalem in publicanos, iustum in suos fuisse*; Sen. *Ep.* 20.3: *obserua te ... numquid in te liberalis sis, in tuos sordidus*.[7] The error is easily explained by saltation from *-es* to *-es*.[8]

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000855

NVMEROSVS HORATIVS?

One of the most famous inscriptions to have survived from ancient Rome is the *acta* of the Ludi Saeculares of 17 B.C. (*CIL* 6.32323 = *ILS* 5050),[1] and one of the most evocative of all epigraphic sentences occupies a line to itself (149): *Carmen composuit Q. Horatius Flaccus*. This reference to the author of the *Carmen Saeculare*, says Fraenkel, 'was the result of a carefully considered decision of the highest authorities'.[2] The degree of careful consideration is initially evident from the prominent positioning of the poet's name directly above those of Augustus and Agrippa in the following line.[3] It

[4] For discussion, see A.R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero*, De officiis (Ann Arbor, 1996), 164–5.
[5] So already M. Pohlenz, *Antikes Führertum: Cicero De officiis und das Lebensideal des Panaitios* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1934), 36 n. 3.
[6] See *TLL* 10.2.1612.10–19. The usage of Sil. *Pun.* 15.495–6 (*belloque parata | prodigere in bellum*) is dubiously relevant to Cicero.
[7] See further *TLL* 7.2.1291.11–45; *OLD* s.v. *liberalis* 4.
[8] I would like to thank this journal's reader for helpful suggestions.

For comment I am grateful to I.M.Le M. Du Quesnay and J. Nelis-Clément.
[1] The standard edition is B. Schnegg-Köhler, *Die augusteischen Säkularspiele* (Munich and Leipzig, 2002); on the Games, see e.g. D. Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome* (Cambridge, 1998), 28–31.
[2] E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 406.
[3] See J. Nelis-Clément and D. Nelis, '*Furor epigraphicus*: Augustus, the poets, and the inscriptions', in P. Liddel and P. Low (edd.), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 2013), 317–47, at 322–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000843 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/S0009838819000843 Published online by Cambridge University Press