D. THOMAS BENEDIKTSON / TULSA, OKLAHOMA

Ut balatus ouis sic est rugire leonis
Medieval Composition and Modern Editing

Wernsdorf printed the first three lines of a Latin poem 'in nostrae bibliothecae Academicae Mspto veteri.' Reifferscheid printed the three lines as Suetonius fragment 161c, with the comment that the poem is in the 'initium glossarii metrici Helmstadiensis.' The poem was in fact printed from cod. Wolfenbüttel Helmstedt 585, f. 25v, as Helmar Härtel kindly determined for me. Other than the three lines in Wernsdorf and Reifferscheid the poem does not seem to have been published. It exists however in ten Mss. known to me:[1]

---

[1] J.C. Wernsdorf, Poetae Latini Minores, Helmstedt 1780 – 1798, 6, 1, 255, in the expanded version of N. E. Lemaire, Paris 1824 – 1826, 7, 181; A. Reifferscheid, C. Suetonius Tranquillus praeter Caesarum Libros Reliquiae, Leipzig 1860, repr. Hildesheim - New York 1971, 312; W. Wackernagel, Voces Variae Animantium, Basel [2]1869, 45 – 47. Manuscript information can be found in H. Walther, Carmina Medii Aevi Posterioris Latina I. Initia Carminum ac Versuum Medii Aevi Posterioris Latinorum, Göttingen 1959, 1036f.; P. Dronke, Medieval Latin and the Rise of European Love-Lyric, Oxford 1968, 560; M. Marcovich, Voces Animantium and Suetonius, ŽAnt 21 (1971), 401f. – I would like to thank the following for copies of and/or information regarding Mss. used in the preparation of this paper: the Öffentliche Bibliothek, Universität Basel; Martin Germann and the Burgerbibliothek, Bern; Huldrych Gastpar and the Schweizerische Landesbibliothek, Bern; Alison Sproston and the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge; Steve Bailey, Nancy Gibson and Carrie L. Turner of Cheltenham; Perk Loesch, I. Naumann and the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden; Marie-Christina Henning and the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg; Claudia Hausberger and the Universitätsbibliothek, Innsbruck; Anton van der Lem, A. Th. Bouwman, Gogam Zandwigk and the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden; Malcolm P. Marjoram and the British Library, London; P. Gottfried Glassner and the Stiftsbibliothek, Melk; Brigitte Gullath and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich; Bruno Baudry, Laurence Camous, Pascale Chervet and the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris; Barbara Channell, Charles J. Ermatinger and the Vatican Film Library, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis; the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna; Helmar Härtel, Elke Heinemann and the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel; and Charlotte Ziegler and the Stiftsbibliothek, Zwettl.

D Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, A 167^a, of the thirteenth century. The poem appears on f. 70^v.

G Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Helmstedt 585, of the fifteenth century. The poem appears sideways at the bottom of f. 14.

I Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek, UB 355, of the fourteenth century. The poem appears on ff. 14/15 and is followed by a glossed version of Carm. Bur. 133 apparently unknown to Schumann and Wegstein.[2]

L London, British Library, Add. 18325, of the thirteenth century. The poem appears on f. 122^v and is followed by Anth. Lat. 647. The opening letter of the first word is left blank. The scribe, thinking Anth. Lat. 647 part of the same poem, began to copy the first line, then began again with the same line, this time again leaving the first letter blank.

M Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 4350, of the fourteenth century, 'from St. Ulrich, Augsburg' (Dronke). The poem appears on f. 3^v.

N Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17212, of the twelfth or thirteenth century. The poem appears on f. 51. The poem is followed by Anth. Lat. 647 as in L.

O Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 18580, of the twelfth century. The poem appears on f. 86^v. The ends of some lines are illegible to me due to the binding.

P Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 18921, of the fourteenth or fifteenth century. The poem appears on f. 6^v.

W Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 848, of the thirteenth century. The poem appears on f. 19^v.

Z Zwettl, Zisterzienserstift, Stiftsbibliothek, Stift Zwettl, Codex Zwetl 58, of the twelfth century. The poem appears on f. 200^v.

Thanks to the generosity of all seven libraries I have been able to examine copies of the relevant folios of all ten Mss., and present here what I believe to be a complete account of the Ms. tradition. The poem, like many in the Middle Ages, appears in more than one redaction. I present here first the shorter version, in *DLNOWZ* (illegible line endings in *O* not reported):

> Ut balatus ouis sic est rugire leonis.
> ut latrare canis barritus sic elephantis,
> est hinnitus equi nec non ruditus aselli.

---

[2] A. Hilka - O. Schumann - B. Bischoff (edd.), Carmina Burana. Mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten Wilhelm Meyers, Heidelberg 1930, 1, 2, 223 – 225; W. Wegstein, Zur Überlieferung der "Versus de volucribus, bestiis, arboribus", Studia Linguistica et Philologica. Festschrift für Klaus Matzel zum sechzigsten Geburtstag, edd. H.-W. Eroms - B. Gajek - H. Kolb, Heidelberg 1984, 285 – 294.

ut mugire bouum sic est ululare luporum.

5   sic grunnire suis dabitur saeuire sed ursis.

sibila das, anguis, sed tu, uulpecula, gannis.

grus collata, gruis. pro praeda, milue, lanugis.

merulus at frindit, anser litoralia fugit.

hinc pupulat pauo, peregrina minurrit hirundo.

10   at turdus truculat, sed aquatica rana coaxat.

turturis est gemitus, galli sub domate cantus.

cum crocitat coruus, stridet sibi bubo perosus.

mellis mater, apes, obscura susurria iactes.

1. Ut *DNOWZ*, -t *L*. 3. est *DLNOW*, ast *Z*. 5. sic *OZ*, sit *DLNW*. 6. das *LOWZ*, dat *N*, dans *D*. sed *DLNWZ*, et *O*. gannis *DLOWZ*, gangis *N*. 7. pro praeda *DLNWZ*, propida *O*. 8. at frindit *DOWZ*, et frindit *L*, affringit *N*. litoralia *DL*, littoralia *W*, litteraria *NOZ*. fugit *NWZ*, fligit *DL*, figit *O*. 9. hinc pupulat *NZ*, hinc populat *DOW*, pupulat hinc *L*. minurrit *DLOZ*, minurie *W*, mimirdit *N*. hirundo *DLNOW*, yrundo *Z*. 10. At turdus truculat *DO*, ast turdus truculat *LWZ*, ast truculus turdus *N*. coaxat *DNOWZ*, choaxat *L*. 12. crocitat *W*, crucitat *D*, crocit et *NOZ*, crocet et *L*. stridet *DLNOW*, *om. Z*. 13. mellis mater apes *DLOW*, mellis mater apis *Z*, mellis apes mater *N*. susurria *DLNWZ*, susuria *O*.

A second redaction is given by *GIMP* (corrections in *M* not noted):

Ut balatus ouis sic est rugire leonis.

ut latrare canis barritus sic elephantis,

est hinnitus equi nec non ruditus aselli.

ut mugire boum sic est ululare luporum.

5   sic grunnire suis data uox uncare sed ursis.

sibila das, anguis, sed tu, uulpecula, gannis.

cum turdus truculat tunc sturnus pusicat ore.

cacabat hinc perdix et gracticat improbus anser.

accipitres pipant. miluus lupit oris hyatu.

10   cucurrire solet gallus. gallina gracillat.

pullulat et pauo nimium uaga crissat hirundo.

psictacus humanas depromit uoce loquelas.

atque suo domino uel „aue" sonat, aut modo „beue."

bombilat ore legens munera mellis apis.

15   porro trinnit anas, uaga luxuriando per undas.

mus auidus mintrit. rana coaxat aquis.

1. balatus *GIP*, bellatus *M*. est *GIP*, *om. M*. rugire *GP*, regire *M*, rugiere *I*. 2. barritus sic *GIM*, sic barritus *P*. 3. est *GIP*, et *M*. hinnitus *GPM*, hinitus *I*. 4. ut *MP*, et *G*, est *I*. mugire *MPG*, mugiere *I*. ululare *MP*, ullulare *GI*. 5. sic *GIP*, est *M*. grunnire *MP*, grunire *I*, grinire *G*. uncare *IP*, urcare *G*, usare *M*. sed *IMP*, sic *G*. ursis *GIP*, ursus *M*. 6. sibila das, anguis, sed tu uolpocula *P*, sibila dat anguis, sed tu uulpecula *IM*, sibila anguis, sed uulpecula *G*. gannis *IMP*, gamnis *G*. 7. turdus *IMP*, turtur *G*. truculat *scripsi*, cruculat *G*,

trucilat *P*, crutilat *IM*. pusicat *GIP*, pusitat *M*. 8. cacabat *GIM*, caccabat *P*. gracticat *G*, graccitat *P*, cractitat *M*, guticat *I*. 9. accipitres pipant *IMP*, accipiter pipicit *G*. oris hyatu *scripsi*, oris hyacu *P*, oris hiacu *I*, oris hyani *M*, ore hyatu *G*. 10. cucurrire *GP*, curcurrire *I*, gucturrire *M*. 11. pullulat *GIM*, pululat *P*. uaga *IMP*, uagat *G*. trissat hyrundo *P*, crissat yrundo *GI*, crusat hyrundo *M*. 12. psitacus *I*, psictycus *M*, phitacus *P*, phistatus *G*. humanas *IMP*, hinnanat *G*. depromit *GMP*, depremit *I*. 13. *om. GI*. paue *M*, uel aue *P*. beue *M*, bere *P*. 14. bombilat *P*, bonbilat *M*, ponpilat *GI*. mellis *GIP*, millis *M*. apis *GPM*, apra *I*. 15. *om. G*. porro *IP*, pauo *M*. trinnit *P*, tricimit *M*, stercirmit *I*. uaga *IP*, uagit *M*. undas *IP*, aquas *M*. 16. coaxat *IMP*, coxat *G*.

The first redaction is clearly of better quality. Some lines in the second version do not scan as hexameter. There are two possibilities here: either the second version is an attempt to revise the first version, or the second version is a draft of which the first version is the final product. There is a certain appeal to the second scenario in terms of modern methods of composition, but Mss. *GIMP* are all of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, and this would seem to preclude this possibility. Moreover, some of the additions in the second version are from Anth. Lat. 762 Riese (see Appendix), as was recognized as early as Wernsdorf.[3] Lines 7 and 8 are almost identical to 762, 17 and 19, and line 9 is an attempt to turn 762, 24 into a hexameter. Line 10 is the same as 762, 25. Line 11 expands 762, 26 from pentameter to hexameter by adding *nimium*, while lines 12/13 repeat 762, 31/32, again trying to extend the pentameter. Line 14 is the same as 762, 36, still reading as a pentameter. Line 15 seems to be the poet's own creation, while the very peculiar line 16 is Anth. Lat. 762, 61 until the caesura, followed by the last half of the pentameter 762, 64 after the caesura. The author of the *GIMP* version is apparently trying to improve upon the *DLNOWZ* version by adding lines from Anth. Lat. 762.

Both versions are part of a broad tradition of texts descending from a lost text of pseudo-Suetonius (fragment 161 Reifferscheid). Marcovich thought all of the poetic texts in this tradition to descend from Anth. Lat. 762, but this is not so; a poem in Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek, Universität Basel XI. 8 (see Appendix), for example, is based on a catalogue of the type associated with Polemius Silvius, as I have shown. I have listed in the Appendix all of the poems known to me which descend from pseudo-Suetonius as well as bibliographical information on them. The use of verbal nouns built on the supine stem as in our poem is not common in either prose or poetic catalogues in this tradition. Such forms appear in Audax (7, 323 Keil) and Diomedes (1, 420 Keil), and in various classical texts

_____

[3] F. Bücheler‑A. Riese, Anthologia Latina, siue Poesis Latinae Supplementum, Leipzig 1894–1926, repr. Amsterdam 1972, 2, 246–250; references below to Anth. Lat. or to Riese will be to this edition; Wernsdorf ap. Lemaire (see n. 1), 7, 181.

(Cicero, Tusc. Disp. 5, 116; Varro, Ling. Lat. 5, 103; Lucan, Phars. 6, 688; Apuleius, Flor. 17, 80; Augustine, Prin. Dial. 6). The most likely ultimate source of the format for this poet is Eugenius of Toledo (Anth. Lat. 730, see Appendix), who was influenced by Ausonius (Ep. 80 Green = 5 Peiper, see Appendix). The poet of *DLNOWZ* has not only Eugenius but also a prose catalogue of the type associated with Polemius Silvius. In fact most of the twenty-five animals and their sounds match up very well with the Polemius tradition. In two of the places which differ from Polemius, Eugenius may be at work (both Eugenius and the author of *DLNOWZ* call the *asinus* an *asellus* and the *uulpes* a *uulpecula*); a few animals are additions not in Polemius (*gallus*, *anguis*, *pauo* and *bubo*, the last of which borrows its sound from Polemius' *ferrum*); the *anser* and the *apis* have been radically altered in syntax, being given verbs and direct objects rather than simple verbs of sound. Really only one animal in both Polemius and this poem differs: *leo fremit* has become *leonem rugire*. This is a common animal taking both verbs, and this is surely not significant; the poem in Basilensis B XI. 8 shares this sound with our poem. The clincher is the curious *lanugis* of the *miluus* of *DLNOWZ* line 7; this can only come from the curious corruptions in the Polemius tradition, where the unique readings *linugit*, *lingit*, and *linguit* appear. The author, then, is modelling his poem on Anth. Lat. 730 (probably not Ausonius, who calls the *canis* a *catulus* and the *asellus* an *asinus*), and draws most of his sounds from a Ms. belonging to the Polemius tradition.[4]

   The poet of *DLNOWZ*, examining Eugenius (Anth. Lat. 730) and a Polemius text, decided to create a tour de force in which twenty-five animals would appear in thirteen hexameters (leonine, as Wackernagel observed). The author added variety. Some sounds appear in infinitive, some in indicative, and some in verbal nouns of the supine stem. The vocatives and second singular verb forms add variety, as do the occasional periphrases like *sibila das anguis* for *sibilas*. The result is mannered to say the least, although mannerism is normal during this period as Curtius has argued. The poem (*DLNOWZ* version) was written sometime between

---

[4] Reifferscheid (see n. 1), 247–254 and 308–312. The Polemius texts are published by D. T. Benediktson, Polemius' Silvius "Voces Varie Animancium" and Related Catalogues of Animal Sounds, Mnemosyne 53 (2000), 71–77, but add Cambridge, Trinity College Library O. 1, 18, f. 1ᵛ, which is very near to Leiden, Vossianus F 24, f. 111ʳ; Walther (see n. 1), 698. For Ausonius and Eugenius see F. Vollmer, Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae. MGH Auct. Ant. 14, 1905, 257; Marcovich (see n. 1), 401; J. M. Ziolkowski, Talking Animals: Medieval Latin Beast Poetry, 750–1150, Philadelphia 1993, 37. For the traditions descending from pseudo-Suetonius see Marcovich 399–416 (407f. for Diomedes); Benediktson (see above), 71f.

Eugenius in the seventh century and the earliest copies in the twelfth. The reviser whose work appears in *GIMP* decided to improve the work by incorporating material from Anth. Lat. 762.[5]

Only chance doomed this piece to obscurity, since had the poem caught the attention of a Burman it might have made its way into the Anthologia Latina and been canonized with hundreds of poems which in many cases are not of demonstrably higher quality than *DLNOWZ*. We would then be faced with an editorial dilemma: how should the piece be printed? Should a 'best version' of the ten Mss. be selected and followed, with others reported in the apparatus criticus? Or should a composite version be created, which in fact would report not the work of a medieval writer but the work of a modern editor?[6] I perceive two different poems here, and would edit them separately. If one version must be selected it should be the older version in *DLNOWZ*, and the *GIMP* version should be placed in the notes or an appendix. A stemma codicum would be a dubious addition; *D* and *W* are perhaps the best of the *DLNOWZ* group, but neither is the parent of all the others, and the *GIMP* group is perhaps a toss-up. In any case we should be grateful that at least ten scribes thought the poem(s) worthy of preservation and did so in such a way as to allow us to reconstruct the stages of composition. The result is a better understanding of medieval modes of poetic composition and revision. A modern editor owes it to a reader to present an edition in such a way as to reveal these stages, and not to create a new version of his or her own.

Appendix: Poems Based on Pseudo-Suetonius (161 Reifferscheid)

The following seven poetic texts also deriving from pseudo-Suetonius are known to me. Bibliography aims at most important items only; on all of these poems see Marcovich 1971, 401f.:

---

[5] Wackernagel (see n. 1), 47; E. R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, translated by W. R. Trask, New York 1953, 273–301. Biographical information on Eugenius is in Jülicher, RE 6.1 (1907), 987; Marcovich (see n. 1), 401.

[6] E. Vinaver, Principles of Textual Emendation, in: Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature Presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope, Manchester 1939, reprinted Freeport 1969, 351–369; H. J. Chaytor, From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Vernacular Literature, Cambridge 1945, 13f., 115–137, 148–152; E. B. Ham, Textual Criticism and Common Sense, Romance Philology 12 (1959), 204–215; L. Bieler, The Grammarian's Craft: An Introduction to Textual Criticism[3], Welleren, n. d., especially 18f., 25–27, 31f., 34, 39, 45; J. A. Asher, Truth or Fiction: The Text of Medieval Manuscripts, AUMLA 25 (1966), especially 13f.; E. J. Kenney, The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1974, 128, 131–133, 135.

Ausonius, Epigram 80 Green (= 5 Peiper). R. P. H. Green, Decimi Magni Ausonii Opera, Oxford 1999, 94.

Anth. Lat. 762, De Philomela, De Volucribus et Iumentis. Riese's edition based on nine Mss. is now replaced by that of Klopsch, using fifty-three Mss. Riese 2, 246–450; P. Klopsch, Carmen de Philomela, Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter. Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. A. Önnerfors - J. Rathofer - F. Wagner, Darmstadt 1973, 173–194.

Anth. Lat. 733, De Cantibus Auium. Bondam and Burman edited the poem from Leid. Voss. 8^0, no. 15, f. 68^r, as kindly discovered by Anton van der Lem of the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit via computer search of the Leidenses. Riese edited from Rome, Vat. Lat. 644, 10th or 11th century (the poem appears not on f. 33, as Riese states, but somewhere between ff. 34 and 75^v: M. Vattasso - P. F. de' Cavalieri, Codices Vaticanae Latini, Rome 1902, 1.495); Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Aug. 10 3, f. 86^v, 10th century (of which I have examined a copy), and Paris, BN 8069, f. 5, 10th or 11th century (it is not on a copy of BN 8069, f. 5, generously sent to me by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France). P. Burman, Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum, Amsterdam 1759, 2, 434–436; J. Klein, Zur lateinischen Anthologie, RhM 23 (1868), 378f.; Riese 2, 218f.

Eugenius of Toledo, Anth. Lat. 730 (= 41 Vollmer). Riese and Vollmer edit from Legionensis 21 (22), and BN 8440, f. 38, both of the 10th century; Vollmer's edition is preferable because taking into account Albarus (below). I have not examined these Mss. Riese 2, 216; Vollmer (see n. 4), 257.

Paulus Albarus 4 Traube - Dümmler. E. Dümmler, MGH Poetarum Latinorum Medii Aeui, Berlin 1880ff., 3, 128.

Carmina Burana 132 Schumann (= 96 Schmeller), Carmen de Vocibus Auium atque Animalium. Wackernagel edited using CLM 19411, f. 7, 12th century. Part of the poem appears in CLM 4660, f. 56^r, 13th century, edited by Schmeller. Schumann used both but not CLM 19107/8, f. 163^r, 12th century, which includes part of the poem and confirms Kugler's - Wackernagel's emendation *croccitat* in line 32. J. A. Schmeller, Carmina Burana, Stuttgart 1847, 175; F. T. Kugler, De Werinhero, Saeculi XII Monacho Tegernseensi, et de Picturis Minutis, Quibus Carmen Suum Theologicum de Vita B. V. Mariae Ornavit, Diss. Berlin 1838, 37; E. Du Méril, Poiésies populaires latines du moyen age, Paris 1847, 213; H. Patzig, Zur Handschrift und zum Text der Carmina Burana, ZfdA 36 (1892), 197–199; Hilka - Schumann - Bischoff (see n. 2), 1, 2, 220–223; Walther (see n. 1), 494; H. Plechl, Die Tegernseer Handschrift Clm 19411. Beschreibung und Inhalt, DA 18 (1962), 418–501; B. Bischoff, Carmina Burana. Faksimile-Ausgabe der Handschrift Clm 4660 und Clm 4660a, Brooklyn 1967, 23, 27, 36 (= 9, 13, 33); G. Berndt, Carmina Burana. Die Lieder der Benediktbeurer Handschrift, lat.-dt. Ausgabe, Munich

1979, 440–445, 905, 934f.; B. C. Vollmann, Carmina Burana, Frankfurt am Main 1987, 466–473, 897–901, 1121–1123; H. Unger, De Ovidiana in Carminibus Buranis quae Dicuntur Imitatione, Strassbourg 1914, 57f.

Eberhard of Béthune, Graecismus 19, 32–41. The 'poem' is edited by Wrobel, but appears as an independent text in five or six Mss. (I have not been able to examine Cheltenham 20640, 12th century): Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Helmstedt 542, f. 99[v]; Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Yg 4[0] 22, f. 238[r] (also with glossed version of Carm. Bur. 133 unknown to Schumann and Wegstein; see note 2, above); Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 18436, of the year 1436, f. 197; Melk, Stiftsbibliothek 1795 (I 73. D 9), 15th century, f. 318[v]; and Rome, Vat. Lat. 819, f. 285[v]. I. Wrobel, Eberhardi Bethuniensis Graecismus, Wratislaw 1887, 182; H. Schenkl, Bibliotheca Patrum latinorum Britannica, SBW 121, 123f., 126f., 131, 136–139, 143, 150 (1891–1905), repr. in 1 vol., Hildesheim and New York 1969, 1, 2, 142; F. Henrici, Sprachmischung in älterer Dichtung, Berlin 1913/14, 47f.; Walther (see n. 1), 239, 1007, 1016.

Burgerbibliothek Bern, cod. 358, ff. 38[r]–39[v], De Carminis Impeditione Causa Thematis Tropologice. The poem is edited by de Winterfeld. P. de Winterfeld, MGH Poetae Latini Medii Aevi 4, 1, Berlin 1881–1923, 4, 242–244.

Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek, Universität Basel B XI. 8. The poem is edited by Wackernagel, Klenner and Benediktson. Wackernagel (see n. 1), 46, 106; K.-E. Klenner, Der Tierstimmen-Katalog als literarisches Phänomen, Diss. Münster (Westfalen) 1958, 32; Benediktson (see n. 4), 77f. Walther (see n. 1), 1108.