

APPENDIX

<uo> and <uu> in Catullus

In Chapter 8 I have collected epigraphic evidence for an earlier development of /uo/ to /uu/ (around the beginning of the first century BC) than of /wɔ/ and /k^wɔ/ to /wu/ and /k^wu/ (around the middle of the first century BC). A possible non-epigraphical source of supporting evidence for this is the spelling of these sequences in the poems of Catullus, who was writing in the 50s BC.¹ The key early manuscripts of Catullus from the fourteenth century are the *Oxoniensis* (O = Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MS Canon. class. lat. 30), *Sangermanensis* (G = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS lat. 14137) and *Romanus* (R = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Ottob. lat. 1829). The non-extant manuscript from which G and R were copied is known as X, and the manuscript, thought to be in Verona around AD 1300, from which both O and X descend is called V.² There is also a much earlier manuscript, the *Codex Thuaneus* (T = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS lat. 8071), of the ninth century AD, which contains only poem 62 (on all of this see Thomson 2003: 23–38; Kiss 2015; Oakley 2021). For the manuscript readings, I use Thomson (2003), who normally prints <uu> for both /wu/ and /k^wu/, and /uu/, and does not note spellings with <uo> in the apparatus unless there is some other variant textual feature, but mentions *Caluos* (53.3) and *nouos* (61.54) in the commentary on the latter.³ The edition of Mynors (1958) does generally print the spelling <uo> where this can be found or conjectured in OGR or T, and thus provides one additional case, *equos* at 66.54.⁴

¹ It would of course be interesting to see if the pattern identified below was true for other Classical authors. I have restricted myself to Catullus partly because of the fairly short amount of text, and partly because of the relatively restricted apparatus, as well as the availability, in Mynors (1958), of an edition which prints <uo> spellings when these are justifiably to be found in the predecessor of the earliest manuscripts (V). V also contained other optional spellings discussed in this book, in the form of <k> for /k/ in *karum* (2.6) and <ei> for /i:/ in *Furei* for *Furī* (23.1; not included in Thomson's 2003 apparatus), *mei* for *mī* (27.3), and probably also in a number of cases where textual corruption can be explained by confusion caused by original <ei>, such as *ne* (6.2 and 14.1) for *nī*, and *tauri* et for *taurī* (63.10). As shown in Chapters 12 and 3 respectively, both <k> before /a(:)/, and <ei> for /i:/ continued to be used after Catullus was writing (and for many centuries in the case of <k>, especially in the word *cārus*).

² Some scholars think that O and X are derived from a copy (known as A) of V, a manuscript thought to be in Verona around AD 1300 (Kiss 2015: xviii). If correct, this has no consequences for the textual criticism of the poems.

³ Curiously, he does print *diuolso* at 64.257, and *uolturium* at 68.124.

⁴ That this spelling is in V is confirmed by the apparatus at Catullus Online (www.catullusonline.org/CatullusOnline/?dir=poems&w_apparatus=1, accessed 25/07/2022), along with

<uo> and <uu> in Catullus

In Catullus' poetry there are 44 instances of /wu/ and /k^wu/, of which 4 are spelt <uo> in all of O, G and R (and hence in V); a further 5 are printed by Mynors on the basis either of one of the principal manuscripts or of highly plausible conjectures. In addition, a spelling *seruos* also lies behind 23.1 *seruus*, as noted by Thomson (2003: 262). By comparison, of 39 instances of /uu/, there is only evidence of 2 instances which may have been spelt <uo> (both conjectures, although highly plausible ones). See Table 46 for all the examples. This distinction, between 10/44 <uo> and <quo> spellings for /wu/ and /k^wu/ and 2/39 <uo> spellings for /uu/, is statistically significant.⁵

Table 46 Possible cases of <uo> and <quo> in the archetype of Catullus

Words containing /wu/ and /k ^w u/			Words containing /uu/		
Poem	Original spelling	Manuscript readings and conjectures	Poem	Original spelling	Manuscript readings and conjectures
23.1	seruos	seruo est OG: est seruo R: seruo al. seruus est R ²	63.92	tuos	Ellis: tuo V
53.3	Caluos	V	64.288	non uacuos	Bergk: non accuos O: non acuos GR: al. non- acrios R ²
61.54	nouos	V			
61.202	uolt	Calphurnius: uolunt V			
62.40	conuolsus	T: conclusus OGR: con- tusus R ²			

digital images of the manuscripts. However, OGR have *uolt* for Mynors' *uolt* at 8.9 (I am grateful to Stephen Oakley for pointing this out to me).

⁵ A Fisher exact test gives a *p*-value of 0.0293 for these figures, i.e. the difference between the rates is significant at *p* ≤ 0.05. The test was carried out using the Easy Fisher Exact Test Calculator at Social Science Statistics (www.socscistatistics.com/tests/fisher/default2.aspx, accessed 25/07/2022).

Appendix

Table 46 (*cont.*)

Words containing /wu/ and /k ^w u/			Words containing /uu/		
Poem	Original spelling	Manuscript readings and conjectures	Poem	Original spelling	Manuscript readings and conjectures
62.60	aequom	equom T: equo V			
63.5	deuolsit	Haupt: deuo- luit V			
64.257	diuolso	V			
66.54	equos	V			
68.124	uolturium	uoltarium V			

If the greater frequency of <uo> spellings for /wu/ and /k^wu/ reflects the spelling of Catullus himself (which is of course not certain), it could result from the fact that the <uu> spelling for /uu/ was better established at the time he was writing than <uu> and <quu> for /wu/ and /k^wu/, the latter having only just developed from /wɔ/ and /k^wɔ/. Alternatively, it is possible that Catullus wrote <uo> both for /wu/ and /k^wu/, and for /uu/, and the divergence in the spelling reflects the earlier loss of the spelling <uo> for /uu/ than for /wu/ and /k^wu/. That is, copyists were more likely to replace <uo> with <uu> when it represented /uu/, since <uo> for /uu/ became uncommon relatively early, whereas <uo> for /wu/ and /k^wu/ was maintained for much longer.