

PHYSIOLOGUS LATINUS
VERSIO Y

EDITED BY

FRANCIS J. CARMODY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume 12, No. 7, pp. 95-134

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
1941



3277

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS: J. T. ALLEN, W. H. ALEXANDER, G. M. CALHOUN

Volume 12, No. 7, pp. 95-134

Transmitted October 27, 1939

Issued April 28, 1941

Price, 35 cents

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, ENGLAND

65.23322

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PHYSIOLOGUS LATINUS VERSIO Y

EDITED BY

FRANCIS J. CARMODY

INTRODUCTION

FOR MORE THAN sixteen centuries the *Physiologus* has been a favorite text on animal lore, more widely read and copied than any other tract on natural history.¹ Its obscure origins and its exotic material gave it charm not rivaled until the end of the thirteenth century; its moralizations in hexaemeral spirit, short and to the point, appealed to the religious; and its immense philological implications have kept it alive in modern scholarship.

Briefly, the history of *Physiologus* studies is as follows. The edition of the Syriac translation from a Vatican manuscript in 1795 stood alone for a half century.² Almost simultaneously Heider edited the abridged version³ lettered *L* and Cahier⁴ gave composite texts of the Latin manuscripts *A* (Brussels *MS 10074*) and *B* (Bern *Lat. 233*), and of *A* and *C* (Bern *Lat. 318*), with notes from *L* and from *De Bestiis et aliis rebus*,⁵ and the texts of the French translations by Pierre le Picard and Guillaume le Clerc. In 1855 Pitra edited the Greek and the Armenian and gathered a number of Latin fragments.⁶ Cahier resumed his work in 1874 with a French translation of the Armenian version, and Land edited in 1875 one Arabic manuscript (in the Royal Batavian Academy) and a new Syriac translation (Brit. Mus. *Add. 25878*), with Latin translations of each.⁷ Lauchert's study of the *Physiologus* in 1889 remains the most convenient refer-

¹ There are well over 250 MSS in Latin, Romance, and Germanic languages copied between 1100 and 1400, plus some 50 of *De Bestiis* and another 50 of the Theobald version in 12 chapters (ed. A. Rendell, London, 1928, and *Pat. Lat. CLXXI* [Paris, 1854]). One should also mention the extensive use by the encyclopaedists, especially Isidore, Honorius, and Vincent of Beauvais.

² O. G. Tychsen, *Physiologus Syrus*, Rostock, 1795.

³ *Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichts-Quellen*, V (1850), 552-582.

⁴ Cahier et Martin, *Mélanges d'archéologie* . . . 4 vols., Paris, 1847-56.

⁵ *Pat. Lat. CLXXVII* (Paris, 1879), 15 f.

⁶ *Spicilegium Solesmense*, Vol. III (Paris, 1855).

⁷ Cahier, *Nouveaux mélanges*, Paris, 1874; Land, *Otia Syriaca*, Leyden, 1875.

[95]



ence, though his edition of the Greek is unsatisfactory.⁸ Only two works of this period made any contribution to knowledge of the Latin translations, an edition of one manuscript related to Cahier's *B*, by Mann (Brit. Mus. Reg. 2 C xii),⁹ and the general analysis of *Physiologus* problems published by Ahrens.¹⁰ Since then the numerous publications on the *Physiologus* have concerned the versions in Romance languages, in Greek, and in the languages of Asia Minor, for which a good bibliography can be found in the most recent edition of the Greek, edited by Sbordone in 1936.¹¹ Sbordone, in his discussion of the Latin *Physiologus*, follows Cahier's unfortunate association of manuscripts *A* and *B*, and, though he claims acquaintance with other manuscripts of this translation, makes no advance in this important indirect tradition. Sbordone did, however, point out that another Latin translation was extant in three manuscripts, and gave samples of six chapters. It is these three manuscripts which are edited for the first time in the present volume. And here I must acknowledge my debt to the Editors of our series in Classical Philology for their suggestions, and to the European libraries through whose kind help I was able to procure the photostats used for the present edition.

Sbordone's critical text of the Greek is imposing, and follows for each chapter some dozen manuscripts. His critical method is unsound, and his classification of the Greek manuscripts can be shown to be faulty in the light of the indirect tradition in other languages. This is not the time or place to present a full criticism of Sbordone's text; suffice it to say that he has successfully divided the 66 manuscripts into four distinct groups: 1° the probable primitive text, represented by 15 manuscripts, among which the best examples are Σ and *W*; 2° a very different text, represented by 8 manuscripts, of which the oldest and most important is Π ; finally, 3° a Byzantine and 4° a pseudo-Basilian text of small interest to the indirect tradition in other languages.

As between the prototype of the groups represented by *W* and Π no chronology can be determined. In both versions one might get

⁸ *Geschichte des Physiologus*, Strassburg, 1889.

⁹ *Französische Studien*, VI, pt. 2 (Heilbronn, 1888), 37-73.

¹⁰ K. Ahrens, *Zur Geschichte des sogenannten Physiologus*, Ploen, 1885.

¹¹ F. Sbordone, *Physiologus*, Milan, 1936.

the impression that the language is of the fourth or fifth century, but their use by Justinus Martyr (ob. 166), Origen (ob. 254/55), Tertullian (ob. 230), and Clement of Alexandria proves greater age, and the corrupt Greek style may depend on a slavish imitation of some Semitic original. The author cannot at present be identified, nor the exact region from which he came. The elaborate list of sources given by Sbordone may be collectively called parallelisms, since they show no convincing similarities. The Greek text was popular longer than the Latin; the latter was most read during the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Greek (to judge by the extant manuscripts) during the sixteenth and seventeenth.

Scholars have long known of the translations in the languages of Asia Minor and Africa, but have never used them in studying the Greek text. In general it has been accepted that the Ethiopic translation is related to the primitive Greek (*W*, etc.), while the Armenian was to be classed with Greek MS *II* and Latin *Y*. Latin *b* has no close relationship with Π , however, and the whole classification clearly needs reorganization. Preliminary to preparing the present edition of *Y*, I therefore established a composite text (in English) of the Ethiopic (*e*), Armenian (*d*), Syriac (*s*), and Arabic (*c*) (the last two from Land only), then adding the readings of Latin *C*, *U*, and *b*; I concluded that the frequent agreement between all these versions and Greek Π was proof of the authenticity of many readings in this text which were rejected by Sbordone. The critical text *y* bears out this contention, and is in fact the most complete and reliable Latin translation now known. Its publication will provide at once a convenient text, better than *b*, and a necessary element in the indirect tradition of the original *Physiologus*. I venture to reproduce at this point a few samples of the indirect tradition:

- y* 1.8 hi qui sursum sunt (as in *b*)
- 2.7 seculi pompa (*bCII*)
- 5.15 peccata nostra portans (*b* and Gr. *WO*)
- 13.6 per abstinentiam et trib. (*U* and implied in *c*)
- 17.15 natus nisi extensum (*b*)
- 32.9 percisus est lapis de monte (*II* and *ds*)
- 38.6 infernus (*bc*)
- 42.3 semel generat (*ds* and Greek *AEII*)
- 43.3 conculeauit (*bes* and Greek *WO*)
- 43.6 dracones in corde (*e* and Greek *AEP*, and cf. *c*)

LATIN PHYSILOGUS Y

The text of the Latin translation *y* has been preserved in three manuscripts, *Y* (Monac. *Lat.* 19417), *Y*² (*id.* 14388), and *Y*³ (Bern *Lat.* 611), with 13 chapters in *A* (*y* chaps. 10–13, 16, 19–20, 22–24, 26–27, 29) and probably several chapters in *C*, *M*, and *De Bestiis* (*E* and *H*). *Y* and *Y*² give the same text, whereas *Y*³ and *A* have been altered and contain certain chapters from *b*. The choice of variants was facilitated by the obvious grouping *YY*² as against *AY*³, and throughout by the Greek texts, *cdes*, and *CU*. For most chapters this procedure was satisfactory, though in several the manuscripts were reduced to one through loss of folios, and the surviving text left unemended for the most part. Each of the three complete manuscripts attributes the work to a different author, *Y* to Chrysostomus (as also *l*), *Y*² to St. John of Constantinople, *Y*³ to an orthodox bishop. There are at least forty-five verses from the Bible which contain one or more readings from the Old Latin, as confirmed in the works of St. Ambrose and his contemporaries (all such readings are here given in italics). The text of *y*, like that of *C* but in general unlike *b*, contains a number of transcriptions of Greek words, showing haste or ignorance on the part of the translator; such are *politeuta*, *polite nomine* (for *politeuta*), *apodumata*, *cerseus*, *dessicano*, *eutocium*, and the names of the animals. The syntax of *y* is that of the Patristic writers, perfect subjunctive after *cum* and *si*, compound tenses for the passive, future of supposition, passive participle for active, *ambo* in the plural, and consistent imitation of Greek word order. The order of chapters in *y* is in part more authentic than that of the Greek editions, and is confirmed by *H* and by *d*. There are, however, several transpositions toward the end of *y*, where groups of three to six chapters were transposed intact.

CRITICAL METHOD

The conditions of editing *y* were that it belonged to the fourth or fifth century, that it represented valuable evidence of the indirect tradition of the lost original, and that at present it exists in only three manuscripts. For the most part, the recommendations of the Union Académique Internationale¹² were observed; but since many

¹² *Emploi des signes critiques, description de l'apparat*, Paris, 1938.

of the devices therein defined concern reediting known works, it seemed wise to modify them to accord with those of the *Société des Anciens Textes Français*,¹³ whose experience concerns texts of variable language for which no fixed standards have been determined. I shall describe the compromise as here effected.

Sigla.—A desire to preserve the sigla assigned by Cahier and others and to add to them, and the further need of ample lettering for the several hundred Latin manuscripts known today required the use of superscript numerals to distinguish between manuscripts, not between scribes. Lower-case letters are reserved for versions or texts, such as *b* (critical text of the MSS *BMZ*, *DHL*, *B*¹²³⁴⁵⁶*EE*²*H*, *A*), *l* (critical text, unpublished, of *LL*¹²³⁴⁵ etc.), and *y* (*YY*²³*A*). Sigla for Greek manuscripts are preceded by *Gr*.

Text.—The best manuscript, *Y*, has been reproduced in every detail of spelling and word order, either in the text or in the apparatus; full-size photostats were rechecked a number of times; and, except conceivably for the utterly chaotic punctuation, *Y* need not again be examined. The retention of the spelling of *Y*, even when inconsistent, reconciles the recommendations of the *Société* and those of the best practices for editions of patristic texts.¹⁴ All the variants of *Y*² have been similarly recorded (except spelling of common words) and rechecked from full-size photostats. *Y*³ was examined from microfilms and the principal variants recorded; the original pale palimpsest should some day be consulted. *A* was used from Cahier's transcription, and should eventually be checked from the manuscript; MS *Gud. 131* at Wolfenbüttel is reputed to contain the same text as *A*, and should be seen, but Rouen 638 contains only those chapters of *A* which are related to *b*.

Apparatus.—The lemmata are followed by a bracket; they (and the text) reproduce the spelling of *Y* except when *Y* lacks the word in question, in which case preference is given respectively to *Y*² or *Y*³. Each chapter is followed by the list of manuscripts containing its text. Omissions (*om.*) are of the lemmata as given, not of the lemmata as parts of longer omissions, as of lines or folios. A study of the habits of the several scribes permitted solution of most of the abbreviations, though some (notably & for *ex*, *it*, *et*, *ec*, etc.) had to

¹³ *Romania*, 52 (1926), 241–256.

¹⁴ Plater and White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate*, Oxford, 1926.

ecclesia; ⁷cum autem dimissi fuerint, proiciunt uerbum ex auditibus suis, et fiunt ut dicitur in psalmo LVII: ⁸Sicut aspidis surde et obturantis aures suas, que non exaudiet uocem incantantis, et uenefici que incantantur a sapiente [Ps. 57. 6].

Codd.: Y Y² Y³.

1 similis Y. — 2 accepit Y. — 3 generet Y. — 7 LVIII Y. — 8 surdo et obdurantes Y; exaudiunt Y³; incantantium Y²; ueneficiis incantantis sapienter Y².

XXXV. DE MONOCERATON

Moyses de monoceraton in Deuteronomio dixit, benedicens Ioseph: *Primitiūs tauri species eius, cornua unicornui cornua eius* [Deut. 33. 17]. ²Monoceras, hoc est unicornis, hanc naturam habet: pusillum animal est, hedo similis, acerrimum nimis, unum cornum habet in medio capite. ³Non potest ei uenator appropriare, propter quod ualde fortissimum est. ⁴Quomodo ergo eum uenantur? uirginem castam proiciunt ante eum; ⁵exilit in sinum uirginis, et illa calefacit eum, et nutrit illud animal; ⁶et tollit in palatium regum.

⁷Unum cornum autem habet, propter quod dixit saluator: Ego et pater unus sumus [Ioh. 10. 30]. ⁸Suscitauit enim nobis cornu salutis, in domo Dauid pueri sui [Luc. 1. 69]; ⁹ueniens de caelo, uenit in utero uirginis Mariae: ¹⁰Dilectus sicut filius unicorniorum [Ps. 21. 23], sicut Dauid in psalmo.

Codd.: Y Y². Trans. alt.: B Y³.

2 animalem Y²; cornu Y. — 3 adpropinquare Y². — 7 autem habet / ^{86.12} demus] deest fol. Y. — 10 unicornuorum Y².

XXXVI. DE CASTORE

Est animal quod dicitur castor, innocentissimum ualde et quietum. ²Uirilia autem eius in medicinam proficiunt; ³inuenitur in palatium regis. ⁴Uenator autem currens, ut cum consequatur in montibus, ⁵castor autem uidens uenatorem persequentem, se ore suo incidit uirilia sua, et dat uenatori proiciens. ⁶Si autem alias uenatori persecutus postea fuerit, proicit se supinum, et ostendit se uenatori; ⁷et uenator uidens se non habere uirilia, discedit ab eo.

⁸O et tu, qui uiriliter agis, politeuta dei, si dederis uenatori que ei

sunt, amplius non accedit ad te; ⁹hoc est si habueris concupiscentiam malam, cupiditatem, moechiam, furtum, excide haec a te, et da diabulo. ¹⁰Dixit ergo et apostolus: Reddite omnibus debita, cui tributum tributum, cui honorem honorem, et cetera [Rom. 13. 7]. ¹¹Prius turpitudines peccatorum, que in nobis sunt, proiciamus diabulo, hoc est opera eius; ¹²et sic demus deo queque dei sunt, uota orationis, fructum bonorum operum nostrorum.

Codd.: Y². Fragm.: Y. Trans. alt.: B Y³.

5 persequente Y². — 6 subinum Y². — 8 accedit Y². — 10 cui tributu tr. cui honore hon. Y². — 12 deo ... nostrorum] YY²; orationes Y.

XXXVII. DE YENA HOC EST BELUA

LEX dixit: Non manducabis beluam neque similem ei [cf. Deut. 14. 8, Leu. 11. 27]. ²Est arenotelicon, hoc est masculo-femina; aliquando autem masculus fiet, aliquando uero femina: inmundum tamen est animal propter quod duas naturas habet; ³et ideo et Hieremias dixit: Numquid spelunca beluae hereditas mea mihi [Hier. 12. 9].

⁴Sic et omnis uir duplex animo belue comparatur: ad signum colligentis ergo aliquam masculorum habent exinde, hoc est animum; ⁵cum autem dimissa fuerit collecta, muliebrem naturam accipiunt. ⁶Bene dixit Phisiologus.

Codd.: Y Y².

ei] Y eius Y². — 2 arenotelicon] edit. corsnotelicon Y² arsnotelicon Y; mascul fī& Y². — 3 spelunca] add. ac Y².

XXXVIII. DE NILUO

Est animal quod dicitur niluus, hoc est in flumine, figuram habens canis. ²Inimicus autem est corcodrilli; ³si autem uiderit corcodrillum dormientem, et apertum os eius, uadit niluus et unguit se totum luto; ⁴et cum persicauerit lutum, insilit in ore corcodrilli, ⁵et omnia intestina eius et uiscera eicit.

⁶Sic est inintellegibilis infernus, rapiens omnem animam et mortificans: ⁷celestis autem noster saluator, accipiens terrenum corpus, descendit in infernum, ⁸donec raperet educens eos qui antea mortui