

CATULLUS 64, 196

quas ego, uae misera, extremis proferre medullis
 miserae *dett.* uae miseram *Friedrich* me miseram *Schmidt* ex
 imis *Vulpius* (*teste Schwabe*) "Casaubonus maluit 'ex imis'" *teste*
Baehrens.

Vae is regularly associated with the dative case. Fordyce, who takes *uae* 'absolutely' here, remarks on 8. 15 that the construction with accusative, as implied by the emendation *uae te* at that passage --- the MSS have *ne te* --- is "very rare"; he adds that Froehlich's version of 8. 15 (*quae te (uae tibi) manet uita*) is "tempting". As there is no other use of *uae* in the text of Catullus in order to find parallels for the 'absolute' use of the word Fordyce has to have recourse to Virgil (*Ecl.* 9. 28) and Horace and Ovid. If we concede to Fordyce that in the instance under discussion we should take the word *uae* absolutely, then we must punctuate thus: *quas ego, uae, misera extremis* etc. But as Friedrich observed, "*Vae! misera* ist sehr matt gegenüber den kommenden *inops, ardens, amenti caeca furore*. Viel energischer und somit passender wäre das *uae miserae! der Itali.*" In fact, not only at the above-quoted passage of the Ninth Eclogue but in Ovid, *Her.* 3. 82 and 21. 169 (cf. also *Ibis* 205, *Frag.* 2. 1) *uae miserae* appears, at just this place in the verse, i. e. in a parenthesis after an opening dactyl. The effect achieved both by Catullus, if as I think he wrote *uae miserae* here, and by Virgil and Ovid who certainly did so in a similar position in the line, is one of pathetic emphasis—an emphasis that will be lost if we have to abandon the *-ae* of the epithet or to absorb the final syllable of the epithet into an elision which deprives the verse of a penthemimeral caesura.

Let us look for a moment at *extremis*. It is to be noted, since editors unanimously conceal it or are unaware of the fact, that whereas OGR read *extremis*, a corrector's hand (R^a) in R underlines the word and adds in the margin "al(iter) imis". The difference between this Humanistic correction and that attributed variously to Casaubon and Vulpus lies in the omission of *ex*; that is, R^a would read the line thus: *quae miserae imis*, etc.; and

his substitution of *imis* for *extremis* proves of itself that he understood the proper reading of the epithet to be *miseræ*, not *miserâ*.) Now, everywhere else in Catullus and in all of Latin poetry, with the solitary exception of Ov. *Her.* 4.70 *acer in extremis ossibus hæsit amor* (Palmer offers no comment), *extremus* means either "final" in a time—series (Cat. 64.130 e. *querellis*, 64.169 e. *tempore*, 64.217 e. *fine senectæ*, 76.18 e. *opem or e. morte*, are instances), or else "outermost" in space (Cat. 11.2 e. *Indos*, 68.100 e. *solo*); the latter being almost the opposite of the sense required here, which is in fact served by Catullus' use of the word *imus*: 64.93 *imis medullis*, 64.125 *imo e pectore*, 64.198 *pectore ab imo* (note its proximity to the phrase under discussion), 76.21 *imos . . . in artus*; cf Virgil, *Aen.* 10.464–5 *sub imo corde premit gemitum*, etc.

There is a further reason for preferring *imis* to *ex imis*. Apart from the plays of Plautus, in Latin poetic usage the verb *proferre* seems always to govern a simple ablative and not, as in Cicero and Caesar, the ablative with *ex*. E. g. Lucr. 1.207 *semine quo proferrier*, Ov. *F.* 3.353 *protulerit terris*. (There are two instances of the verb in Virgil and two in Propertius, but they offer no evidence as to the syntax).

As indicated above, the hiatus which would occur if the line were read with *miseræ*, *imis* tends to have an emphatic and pathetic effect especially as it coincides with the penthemimeral caesura. M. Zicàri, in an article entitled "Some metrical and prosodical features of Catullus' poetry" (*Phoenix*, 18.3.1964. 193–205), points out that Catullus does not to the same extent as his elegiac successors (M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, 58) avoid hiatus at the *penthemimeres* of the hexameter when he is writing elegiac couplets; e. g. he has them at 107.1 (cf. also the similarly-treated hiatus at the diaeresis of the pentameter in 68.158 and 99.8 (Zicàri p. 199), also those at 66.48, 67.44, 76.10, 97.2 (Zicàri p. 204)). So also, Virgil freely admits hiatus at the *penthemimeres* in the epic hexameter. Even the Augustan elegists show a number of such hiatuses in the hexameters of their couplets, e. g. Prop. 2.32.45, 3.7.49; Ovid, *Her.* 8.71 and 9.131 (quoted by Zicàri, p. 205). Zicàri shows hiatus of this kind to be linked to the requirements of expressiveness: p. 200, "Emphasis, modifying as it did the tempo of spoken delivery, could not but produce an effect similar to that of a pause, thus creating a situation favourable to hiatus . . . (p. 201) Hiatuses (were) related to expressiveness . . ."

There are, therefore, as it seems to me, sound reasons for preferring to read: *quas ego, uae miserae, imis proferre medullis.*

It remains to suggest how *miseræ extremis* might have arisen from *miseræ imis*. Possibly at a certain stage of the transmission of the text what was offered was a pair of alternatives, thus:

miserâ imis,

and a somewhat careless attempt was made to remove the 'a' by crossing-out either with an *x* or with a stroke; consequently, if we remember that the recognized abbreviation for *extremis* (current in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, according to Cappelli) was *ex̄mis*, we can make a reasonable conjecture at the origin, or one possible origin, of the reading which turned up in V. One final consideration: we should observe the added strength given to the line by the retention of the penthemimeral caesura.

It may perhaps be noticed how frequently Catullus uses *imus*; K. Büchner ("Der Superlativ bei Horaz", *Hermes* 79. 1944. 116) indeed describes it as a "favourite" superlative.

University College,
University of Toronto.

D. F. S. Thomson

MISZELLEN

Der Codex Pithoeanus des Phaedrus in der Pierpont Morgan Library

Lange Zeit war der wichtigste unter den spärlichen Textzeugen der Phaedrus-Fabeln, der Codex Pithoeanus aus dem 9. Jh., in streng gehütetem Privatbesitz der Familie de Rosanbo und konnte deshalb von den Herausgebern nicht eingesehen werden. Sie mußten sich ganz auf die édition paléographique dieser Handschrift stützen, die Ulysse Robert im Jahre 1893 besorgt hatte¹⁾.

¹⁾ Vgl. Postgate im Vorwort seiner Ausgabe (Oxford 1919) S. III: „Inter codices familiam ducit Pithoeanus, P, quem nomine repertoris sui