

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Herausgeber:** Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 30 (1984)

**Artikel:** Babrius and the Byzantine fable  
**Autor:** Vaio, John  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660924>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 14.05.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## VI

JOHN VAIO

### BABRIUS AND THE BYZANTINE FABLE

The name of Babrius is currently associated with a collection of 143 Aesopic fables written in choliambic verse.<sup>1</sup> The core of this collection is supplied by the tenth century Athoan codex, now in the British Library (Add. 22087). This MS contains 122 complete fables, the first line of the 123rd and two prologues. Most of the remaining six lines of 123 are preserved on a set of waxed tablets dated to the third century A.D. To these the Vatican codex (Vat. gr. 777) adds 12 fables; the Morgan MS (397), two. Fragments of four additional choliambic fables are

<sup>1</sup> For the reader's convenience the following bibliography with abbreviations used in this paper is given:

"Chm" or "Chambry": *Aesopi fabulae*, rec. E. CHAMBRY (Paris 1925-26), in 2 vols.

"Crusius": *Babrii fabulae Aesopeae*, ed. O. CRUSIUS (ed. maior, Leipzig 1897)

"Hsr" or "Hausrath": *Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*, edd. A. HAUSRATH and H. HUNGER, Vol. I 1 (Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1970), vol. I 2 (Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1959)

"Husselman": E. M. HUSSELMAN, "A Lost Manuscript of the *Fables* of Babrius", in *TAPA* 66 (1935), 104-126

"Per": B. E. PERRY, *Aesopica* I (Urbana, Ill. 1952)

"Perry, *Babrius*": B. E. PERRY (ed.), *Babrius and Phaedrus* (London/Cambridge, Mass. 1965)

"Perry, *Studies*": B. E. PERRY, *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* (Haverford 1936)

"Ursing": U. URSING, *Studien zur griech. Fabel* (Diss. Lund 1930)

found on the tablets mentioned above. In addition, one more fable is found in the *Hermeneumata* falsely ascribed to Dositheus; and the fragment of another is preserved by Johannes Tzetzes in his *Historiae* (XIII 258-259; 261-265) and by Natalis Comes in his fifteenth century *Mythologia*.<sup>2</sup> Doubts have been raised regarding the authenticity of fables found only in a single witness, that is, the Vatican or Morgan MSS or the tablets. Nor has the Athoan itself escaped suspicion. But external evidence does exist justifying the attribution of most, if not all, of these fables to Babrius: for example, verses quoted and assigned to Babrius by the *Suda*.

For the purposes of this paper the fables or better the *Mythiambi* of Babrius are the 143 fables conveniently found in the 1965 Loeb Library edition of B. E. Perry. That the original form in which these fables were composed and published by Babrius was radically different from the alphabetical arrangement of our MSS cannot be doubted. Our earliest witness, *POxy.* 1249 (dated to the second century A.D.), contains bits of four fables in the following order (the numbers correspond to the order of the Athoan MS): 43, 110, 118, and 25. Nor is the evidence uniform regarding the distribution of the *Mythiambi* into books. The truth is that we have too little evidence, and the original form of publication can only be speculative at best. Accordingly our point of departure into the labyrinth of the Byzantine recensions of Aesop will be the *Mythiambi* as transmitted by the ancient witnesses and the medieval MSS.

That the Byzantine world of the 10th century had a pretty fair acquaintance with the *Mythiambi* of Babrius, that is, the fables in choliambic form approximating the original, is indicated by the existence of the Athoan and Morgan MSS, both of the tenth century, and by the citations of

<sup>2</sup> On these sources see Perry, *Babrius*, pp. LXVI-LXXI.

Babrius in the *Gnomologium* of Johannes Georgides and especially in the *Suda* (some 100 verses are cited). All this suggests a considerable vogue for our author. The fragments on papyri and the waxed tablets demonstrate that Babrius was a school-text in the third and fourth centuries A.D. That he continued to be so used down to the tenth century would help explain the evidence cited above. From the eleventh century with two notable exceptions discussed below knowledge of Babrius is almost entirely indirect. The choliambic fables fell out of favor and were replaced by prose paraphrases and renderings in Byzantine verse.

The first exception to the gathering darkness is Johannes Tzetzes, who quotes 7 lines from *fab.* 141: "The Donkey and the Priests of Cybele". With welcome pedantry Tzetzes, who calls our author Babrias, carefully notes that he is quoting from the *Mythiambi*, that is, the fables in choliambic verse, not the fables in regular iambics (*Hist.* XIII 251 f.). The pseudo-Babrian trimeters will claim our attention below. Here we should note that the only complete version of this fable in the Greek recensions of Aesop is that of the Augustana: *fab.* 164 in Perry's *Aesopica* (= 173 Hsr), a version that is quite distinct from Babrius', which is found nowhere in the rest of the Byzantine tradition deriving from our Mythiambographer. Tzetzes' text of the *Mythiambi* contained at least one fable that has disappeared from all of our direct and indirect witnesses, which accordingly do not give us a complete picture of the *Mythiambi*.

The great exception to the growing ignorance of the choliambic Babrius is the Vatican codex referred to above, which is dated to the fourteenth century. This MS contains 244 fables, of which 132 belong to the Augustana recension and 82 to the Vindobonensis and the Bodleian paraphrase of Babrius. The remaining 30 are in substantially choliambic



bic form. Of these 18 are found in the Athoan codex, four in the Bodleian paraphrase. Verses of two others are quoted and ascribed to Babrius in the *Suda*; yet another is found in Avianus, a Latin fabulist who drew heavily on Babrius. Five are left for which there is no outside evidence for or against Babrian origin. Corruption is widespread, but the lines preserved in choliambic form are metrically and stylistically consistent with the attested fables. Certainty is impossible, but the balance of the evidence supports Crusius and Perry, who assign the Vatican fables to Babrius.

Even if only some of these are genuine, the importance of the Vaticanus remains. For as late as the fourteenth century a source (or sources) containing at least 30 choliambic fables was available to the scribe of this MS. True, the text of these fables had been extensively corrupted. In particular many verses choliambic in form had been transformed into Byzantine verses of 12 syllables based on a stress-accent. Nevertheless, from a time when Babrius was known almost exclusively through derivative Byzantine renderings one witness survived preserving substantial remains of the choliambic originals.

The remaining survivals are few and sporadic. The first is found in a MS of the fourteenth century (Paris. gr. 2511). This is a fable in choliambic form agreeing almost exactly with the text of *fab.* 58 in the Athoan codex. The fable is ascribed to Balerios (*sc.* Βαλερίου), which is at least nearer the mark than the Athoan's Βαλεβρίου. The fable and ascription of the Paris MS are found also in the 17th century Harley MS 3521. This fable is otherwise known only from the Bodleian paraphrase (*fab.* 44 = 124 a-b Chm) and is not without relevance to contemporary life, since it is a variation on the myth of Pandora which at least absolves woman from opening the fatal jar. In this version the jar contains all good things, until a man without self-control opens it,

and everything but hope, which is caught in time, flies back to heaven.

The fate of *fab.* 78 in the Athoan is much the same. Here an ailing crow and his mother find a late 15th century nest in Vaticanus Barberinianus 354. The MS contains a fragment of a Greek grammar copied in 1479. This is followed by a recension of the *tetrasticha* of Ignatius the Deacon, who composed versions in four trimeters of fables taken mainly from Babrius. In fact, this recension bears the title *Tetrasticha Babriou grammatikou kai Hellēnos*. Between this title and the first tetrastichon we find the fable in question in a choliambic form found apart from the Athoan only in the waxed tablets mentioned above.

The last survival is in fact the first fable of Babrius to be printed, albeit in an abridged form and attributed to Gabrias. It was published in 1505 by Aldus Manutius in his *Life and Fables of Aesop*. The fable is no. 12 in the Athoan MS and is found also in the Vatican and Morgan MSS. The 24 verses of the medieval MSS are here reduced to 13 and come at the end of a recension of *tetrasticha*.

With the exception of the Vatican codex attested knowledge of the *Mythiambi* in choliambic form is reduced after the tenth century to isolated instances involving only four fables. What replaces Babrius' choliambi are the prose paraphrase, some of whose versions trickle down into the Accursiana recension, the fables in Byzantine 12-syllable verse, found chiefly in the Vindobonensis recension, and the *tetrasticha* of Ignatius and his imitators. Apart from MSS of the latter, the Byzantine versions of Babrius are either grouped with anonymous fables traditionally ascribed to Aesop or in the case of the paraphrase simply ascribed to Aesop.

We turn now to this paraphrase, called Bodleian after its principal MS (Auct. F. 4. 7 = Ba in Chambry). Com-

parison with the extant *Mythiambi* shows that down to the late 15th century the fables, if not the name, of Babrius were in many cases preserved to a considerable extent. The relation of the Bodleian codex to Babrius was first perceived by Tyrwhitt in his pioneering monograph of 1776 (*Dissertatio de Babrio* [London]). The MS was first carefully and scientifically edited in its entirety by Knoell in 1877 (*Fabularum Babrianarum paraphrasis Bodleiana* [Vienna]). Knoell dated it to the 13th; Chambry, to the early 15th century. The true date is the late 15th century, indicated by the evidence of the watermarks and confirmed by the fine eye of Mr. Nigel Wilson.

Thus the most important witness of this collection is perhaps the latest, written two centuries after two MSS of this recension, whose text is less complete, that is, 28 and 91 fables as against 148 in the Bodleian. We should bear this in mind when considering the relation of the MSS of the paraphrase to the text of the *Mythiambi*.

Like the Aesopic tradition in general the scribes of two MSS belonging to the paraphrase do not aim to produce accurate copies of their model; rather they rewrite it freely. Thus a brief narrative in the Bodleian is amplified and expanded, or descriptive touches are added to the presentation of the characters—all this from the free invention of the scribes, to judge from the evidence of Babrius' version. The text of these MSS is of interest for the light it throws on the evolution of Babrius in his Byzantine tradition. But apart from this, they occasionally preserve bits of the *Mythiambi* missing from the more conservative witnesses. For example, one of the innovating MSS (Vat. gr. 949 = Bd in Chambry) alone preserves a prose version of Babrius' amusing 54th fable: "The eunuch who wants to be a father". Bd's paraphrase (= *fab.* 114 Chm) is very close to the original; indeed, one verse is preserved almost intact.

Babrius in prose is a living tradition, whose development we can document from the 13th to the 15th centuries. Moreover, the source (or sources) of the paraphrase contained at least one fable missing from the Bodleian MS as well as four other witnesses of this tradition. In this case the conservative witnesses yield to one of their opposite number.

The second of the MSS that freely rewrite their source is a 13th century MS in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris. gr. 1277 = Bc in Chambry). Yet here too we find traces of the choliambic original missing from Ba. For example, consider Babrius *fab.* 42: "Two Dogs at Dinner". Babrius begins by telling us, "A man was having a splendid supper after sacrificing in the city". The Bodleian MS reduces this to three words, "A man was having supper". The Paris MS changes the verb from εἶχε to ἐτέλει, but keeps Babrius' adjective, "splendid" (λαμπρόν). The man's dog then meets a canine friend and invites him to supper (ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ἡρώτα in Babrius). Ba reads only ἐκάλει, and we must assume the point of the invitation. The Paris MS, on the other hand, reads εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον μετεκαλεῖτο.<sup>3</sup>

This is not to say that the Bodleian itself does not rewrite Babrius. On the contrary, it shows the same tendency as the MSS considered above. Along with versions that contain hardly a word or idea not found in Babrius, we find some very strange changes indeed. For example, Babrius *fab.* 32 tells of a weasel who fell in love with a man and was changed into a beautiful and irresistible woman by Aphrodite. The paraphrase begins with a very close rendering of Babrius' first verse, but then we read that the weasel importuned Athena! (τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἐδυσώπει) to transform her. In Babrius the weasel is the passive recipient of Aphrodite's favor; in the paraphrase she is the active sup-

<sup>3</sup> Bodl. *fab.* 27 = *fab.* 179 d Chm. *Fab.* 21 Bc = *fab.* 179 e Chm.



pliant of Athena. Again, in Babrius the young man sees the transformed animal, is overcome by desire and decides to marry her, whereas in the paraphrase the weasel's request includes the plea that he should fall in love with her. Babrius stresses the goddess's active role; in the paraphrase the weasel is the main performer and incomprehensibly importunes not the goddess of love, but her stern and martial half-sister (paraphr. *fab.* 19 = 76 c Chm).

According to Chambry (vol. I p. 17) this is one of 11 fables sufficiently unlike Babrius as to suggest another source. But with the exception of one of these, verbal coincidence with the choliambic model justifies the assumption of Babrian origin. This exception is Babrius *fab.* 25: the hares are about to commit suicide by drowning, because they are such cowards; they go to a pond, where they frighten the even more cowardly frogs and so decide to live. Verbal coincidence in the Paraphrase (*fab.* 101 = 192 e Chm) is limited to the main characters, hares and frogs, and to the scene of the crime, the pond. The outline of the narrative is more or less the same, but the details are significantly different. For example, Babrius begins with the following: "The hares decided to live no longer but to throw themselves one and all into the dark waters of a pond, because they were the feeblest of all living creatures, cowardly in spirit and knew only how to flee." In the paraphrase we read that they all gathered together at one place and said, "Our life is not worth living, for eagles and dogs and men are wearing us out." In the rest of the fable the paraphrase is similarly distinct from Babrius and together with the Vindobonensis and Accursiana recensions offers us a new and quite different variation on a theme found also in Babrius and the Augustana, who are in turn distinct from one another.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Vind. = *fabb.* 192 b-c Chm. Accurs. = *fabb.* 143 b-c Hsr = 192 F, d Chm. Aug. = 138 Per = 143 a Hsr = 192 a Chm.



In another case there may have been no Babrian original to begin with. The truth has been pointed out by Professor Adrados (*Emerita* 37 [1969], 257 with n. 1), whom I follow. The fable in question is no. 56 in the paraphrase, printed as *fab.* 150 by Crusius in his edition of Babrius. It concerns a kite who flies off with a serpent in his clutches and is fatally bitten for his pains. The MSS of the paraphrase offer two versions (136 a, 136 c Chm), which together with a version in dodecasyllabic verse (136 b Chm) are very closely related. Until 1935 there was no evidence against the natural assumption that the three Byzantine versions derived from a choliambic fable of Babrius. But in that year a version in iambic verse was published (cf. Husselman, 124 f.). This iambic fable is found in the Morgan MS together with 29 choliambic fables assigned to Babrius on the evidence of the other MSS, Georgides and the *Suda*. Between this fable and the Byzantine versions cited above there are many, striking verbal coincidences; and the iambic fable of the tenth century witness is presumably the parent of the Byzantine fables attested no earlier than the 14th century. Tzetzes notes the existence of iambic fables attributed to Babrius (*Hist.* XIII 252), and the Morgan fable may come from this pseudonymous group. Thus the assumption of a choliambic original is not only unnecessary, but unwarranted.

So far we have considered two possible types of contamination in the paraphrase: (1) a fable in that recension treats the same theme as its counterpart in the *Mythiambi*, but in a manner distinctly different; and (2) the paraphrase contains a fable deriving from a source distinct from the *Mythiambi*. Add to these frequent contamination with the Augustana or rather branches of that recension. Our example is the well known fable about a tree (or trees) uprooted by the wind, while reeds remain unscathed. In Babrius' version the reeds are called slender and feeble (*fab.*

36,7: λεπτός τ' ἔὼν καὶ βληχρός—the singular is collective). The paraphrase describes them as ἀσθενεῖς ὄντες καὶ λεπτοί (Bodl. *fab.* 29,2 f. = 101 c, 2 f. Chm), virtually the same phrase found in one version of the Augustana (239 a,4 Hsr = 101 e,4 Chm). Again, the single oak of Babrius is naturally addressed in the second person singular. The paraphrase begins with a single oak, which is later addressed in the plural. The Augustana begins with *trees* and naturally keeps the plural throughout. Finally, the reeds of the paraphrase conclude with the phrase, “we remain unharmed” (ἀβλαβεῖς διαμένομεν). The idea and the wording are found, not in Babrius, but at the beginning of the Augustana fable. There are other examples which could be cited for this type of contamination, but the one given above is enough to show that the MSS of the paraphrase like many MSS of the anonymous fables reflect not one, but several sources.

We turn next to the Byzantine fables deriving from Babrius and written in dodecasyllabic verse. These are found chiefly in the Vindobonensis recension (about 40 fables). The Vatican MS mentioned at the beginning of this paper adds some 30 of its own, and of the seven dodecasyllabic fables found in the fifteenth century Parisinus suppl. gr. 1685 (= Chambry's Pd and Hausrath's S) five are unique to it. All these fables are closely related to the Bodleian paraphrase and have been thought to derive from it. (The 28 dodecasyllabic fables of Paris. suppl. gr. 105 (= Chambry's Cd and Hausrath's T) are related neither to Babrius nor to the paraphrase and are not discussed in this paper.)

I begin with one fable from the Paris MS (Pd), since it raises an important question relevant to the origins of the paraphrase. The fable, no. 42 in Pd, was omitted by Chambry. It is closely related to *fab.* 1 in the paraphrase (= 224 e Chm) and through it to Babrius *fab.* 16. All three versions

are distinct from those of the recensions of anonymous fables (*fabb.* 163 a-b Hsr).

The fable may be summarized as follows. The scoldings of an impatient nurse—she'll throw the baby to the wolves, if he doesn't stop crying—reach the ears of a credulous wolf, who waits in vain for the promised delicacy.

Comparison of Babrius with the paraphrase and Pd reveals the following. (1) Parts of two choliambi are found in the paraphrase, where they constitute the subject and participial clause of the second sentence. Almost the exact words of the paraphrase are found transposed in Pd where they are a dodecasyllabic verse. (2) The main clause of the second sentence in the paraphrase changes Babrius' wording considerably. Very close to the paraphrase is the fifth verse of Pd. (3) The beginning of the fable in the paraphrase differs both from Babrius 16,1 f. and 42,1 Pd, but with one transposition it yields another dodecasyllabus.

- (1) λύκος δ' ... τὴν ... γραῦν ἀληθεύειν νομίσας ...  
(Babr. 16, 3-4);  
ὁ δὲ λύκος τὴν γραῦν ἀληθεύειν νομίσας ...  
(Paraphrase);  
τὴν γραῦν δ' ὁ λύκος νομίσας ἀληθεύειν ...  
(42,4 Pd.)
- (2) ἐκαρτέρησε μέχρις ἑσπέρας πεινῶν ...  
(Paraphrase: contrast Babr. 16, 4-6);<sup>5</sup>  
ἐκαρτέρησεν νῆστις ἄχρις ἑσπέρας. (42,5 Pd)

<sup>5</sup> As it stands in the paraphrase (2) is an ancient, though not Babrian, choliambus; and could be an interpolation in the metrical source of the paraphrase. On the other hand, with the participle transposed to the beginning of the verse, we get an ancient trimeter and at the same time a Byzantine dodecasyllabus. Since (1) and (3) can only be dodecasyllabi, (2) would most likely be transitional between Babrian scazon and Byzantine dodecasyllabus.

- (3) αἰτοῦντι τροφήν νηπίῳ καὶ κλαίοντι . . .  
 (Paraphrase);  
 αἰτοῦντι τροφήν καὶ κλαίοντι νηπίῳ . . .  
 (dodecasyllabus)

In addition to "The Disappointed Wolf", other fables in the paraphrase show traces of dodecasyllabic composition, and we may provisionally conclude that in one of the sources of this recension the fables of Babrius had been wholly or in part recast into dodecasyllabi, which were in turn resolved into the prose fables of the extant paraphrase. This process can be seen directly in the prose fables of the Accursiana which derive from dodecasyllabic fables in the Vindobonensis: compare, for example, 61 a Chm with 61 b-c (= 284 b-a Hsr) and contrast the paraphrase (*fab.* 97 = 61 e Chm) and Babrius *fab.* 119.

We turn now to the dodecasyllabic fables of the Vindobonensis and consider those cases where the choliambic original is extant as well as the paraphrase. In most of these the version of the paraphrase is found to be closer to Babrius, that is, no element of the choliambic fables occurs in the dodecasyllabic version that is not in the paraphrase, which in turn preserves traces of the original missing from its dodecasyllabic counterpart. The line of descent would naturally be thought to be the following: the paraphrase derives from the *Mythiambi*, and the version in Byzantine accentual verse derives from the paraphrase.

For an example of this line of descent we return to the fable "Two Dogs at Dinner", that is, Babrius *fab.* 42, where the tale is told succinctly in a straightforward narrative occupying eight lines. The paraphrase here is best represented by a consensus of the conservative MSS (*fab.* 27 = 179 d Chm) supplemented at a few points from the innovating MSS discussed above (179 e-f Chm). With the exception of the last line the paraphrase follows Babrius



almost word for word and point by point. Indeed, it even compresses the narrative slightly. This is decidedly not the case with the dodecasyllabic version of the Vindobonensis (*fab.* 179 b Chm). There the narrative is expanded to 23 lines, whose main stylistic features are prolixity and empty repetition.

Take for example the dramatic climax of the fable. One dog, you recall, invited his friend to share his master's feast. The other dog came, but the cook picked him up and threw him out over the wall and into the street. So reads Babrius followed very closely by the paraphrase (Babr. 42,4-6 with *fab.* 179 d,2 f. Chm). The version of the Vindobonensis reads as follows: "The other dog came and stood there enjoying himself and looking at the great feast. He shouted (βοῶν) in his heart: 'My gosh! What great joy has just now appeared before me. Suddenly it has overcome me just now. For I shall be fed and shall dine to satiety so that tomorrow I shall not be at all hungry.' While saying this to himself the dog wagged his tail cheerfully at the friend who had invited him to dinner. Then the cook as soon as he saw him wagging his tail around this way and that, caught hold of him by the leg right away and threw him out the door" (*fab.* 179 b, 5-17).

Admittedly the Vindobonensis does not always expand on this scale nor with such a grand display of ineptitude. But this fable gives us a good idea of what it is capable of doing and often does. Nor in all this arid wasteland is there anything that is not in the paraphrase. The latter offers the reader a faithful rendering of the spirit and style as well as the matter of Babrius' fable, the taste and simplicity of which submerge and are utterly drowned in the garrulous mire of the Byzantine poetasters.

If we follow our fable a bit farther through the labyrinth of the Byzantine recensions, we find a pair of offspring only a bit less hideous than their unnatural parent,



the unfortunately fecund Vindobonensis. These two find a place in two branches of the Accursiana (*fab.* 179 a, 179 c Chm = 283 b-a Hsr), each showing different features of its direct source. Both are about three times the length of the paraphrase, from which they derive indirectly.

As stated earlier, most dodecasyllabic fables of the Vindobonensis exemplify the relationship with Babrius and the paraphrase just illustrated. But this neat and simple picture is shattered by our next example. In this case a fable in Byzantine verse deriving from Babrius is found not only in the Vindobonensis (*fab.* 52 e Chm) but also in the Augustana (*fab.* 52 d Chm). In addition, the latter has another version of its own (*fab.* 52 a Chm = 31 Hsr = 31 Per). Among the MSS of the Augustana which include the dodecasyllabic version is the tenth century Morgan MS.<sup>6</sup> Thus we have a version of Babrius in Byzantine verse three centuries earlier than the oldest witnesses of either the Vindobonensis or the paraphrase. In addition, the Morgan MS, together with the coeval Athoan, preserves Babrius' choliambic version (*fab.* 22).

The fable tells of a middle-aged man with two girl friends, one young, one old. The former wanted her lover to look young, the latter desired the opposite. So one pulled out his white hairs; the other, his black ones. The result was a bald-headed lover for them both.

In addition to the dodecasyllabic fables, there are two versions of the paraphrase: the Bodleian, or primary version (*fab.* 15 = 52 b Chm) and a secondary version found in one of the innovating MSS discussed earlier (52 c Chm). All these versions are closely related to Babrius *fab.* 22 and are distinct from the other fable of the Augustana. (In examining the relationship of the 'Babrian' versions I fol-

<sup>6</sup> The fable is no. 238 in the MS added to its collection of Augustana fables (nos. 1-236): see Perry, *Studies*, 146. For the variants of the Morgan MS see *op. cit.*, 145.

low the account given by Professor Adrados at *Emerita* 38 [1970], 15.)

We begin with the dodecasyllabic version of the Augustana and the primary version of the paraphrase. As we shall see, both versions are independent of one another, that is, the dodecasyllabic version cannot derive from the paraphrase. In fact, both versions go back to a common source which is at least one step removed from the original.

In the first place, the dodecasyllabic version preserves significant elements of Babrius not found in the paraphrase. (1) Both Babrius and the dodecasyllabic fable describe the lover as a man who was neither young nor as yet an old man (cf. Babr. 22,2-3 and *fab.* 52 d,2-4 Chm). The paraphrase omits this point. (2) Babrius' hero still had time for love affairs and revelry (22,4). The dodecasyllabic version refers to this enviable *dolce vita* (*fab.* 52 d,1 Chm). The paraphrase does not. (3) The Morgan text of Babrius *fab.* 22,11 is almost exactly reproduced in the dodecasyllabic version. The paraphrase makes two important changes.

ἕως φαλακρὸν ἀντέδωκαν ἀλλήλαις ... (Babr.)<sup>7</sup>

ἕως φαλακρὸν ἀπέδωκαν ἀλλήλαις ... (Aug.)

ἕως ἂν αὐτὸν φαλακρὸν ἐποίησαν ... (Paraphr.)

Thus the dodecasyllabic version cannot derive from the paraphrase. Nor can the latter derive from the former, since it too preserves elements of the original missing from its Byzantine counterpart. (4) At Babrius *fab.* 22,1 we read that our hero was already in the mid-season of life. Here the paraphrase, unlike the dodecasyllabic version, imitates Babrius fairly closely. (5) The promythium of the paraphrase (wrongly printed as the epimythium of *fab.* 52 b Chm) is an expanded version of lines 15-16, which have

<sup>7</sup> For the text see Husselman, 113, and Perry, *Babrius*, 34 with n. on 22, 11-12.

been interpolated in the Morgan text of Babrius *fab.* 22.<sup>8</sup> The dodecasyllabic version has an epimythium of its own.

Thus the paraphrase and the version in Byzantine verse preserve bits of Babrius (or pseudo-Babrius) independently of one another. That they derive from a common source is indicated by the following. (6) At *fab.* 22,6-7 Babrius makes two points: (a) the young woman wanted her lover to look young, and (b) the old lady wanted him to look old like herself. Both our Byzantine versions render (b) with a phrase strikingly similar to one another, and they both omit (a): cf. *fabb.* 52 b,3, 52 d,9 Chm. (7) Finally, the sequence of ideas at Babrius 22,8-10—the young woman plucks out white hairs; the old lady, black ones—is reversed in both derivative versions, possibly from contamination with the other version of the Augustana (*fab.* 52 a,2-6 Chm = 31,2-6 Hsr = 31,1-4 Per).

Thus both our Byzantine versions, that is, the primary text of the paraphrase and the dodecasyllabic version of the Augustana, derive independently from a common source which had made two important changes in its version of Babrius. As for the secondary text of the paraphrase (*fab.* 52 c Chm), it has no element of the original which is not found in the primary text, and is an expanded version presumably deriving from the latter.

The dodecasyllabic version of the Vindobonensis (*fab.* 52 e Chm) has a more complex relationship to its Byzantine counterparts. Firstly, it follows the other dodecasyllabic version fairly closely except for its ending and epimythium, where it follows the primary text of the paraphrase: cf. 52 e,1-9, 11 and 52 d,1-11; 52 e,13-18 and

<sup>8</sup> For the text see Husselman, 113 f. Perry, *Babrius*, 34 rightly brackets the verses (= his *fab.* 22,14-15).

52 b,4-8 Chm. Thus it derives from its Augustana counterpart, which it contaminates with the paraphrase.<sup>9</sup>

The Byzantine offshoots of Babrius *fab.* 22 have taught us that we can no longer assume that the paraphrase is uniformly the parent of its medieval fellows. This lesson is especially important for fables whose choliambic original has not survived. In such cases we must now reckon with the possibility that a dodecasyllabic version may preserve elements of the lost original omitted in the paraphrase.

Consider, for example, the fable of "The Boy Who Cried Wolf". The paraphrase reads as follows. "A boy tending sheep used continuously to run up a mound and shout, 'Wolf! Help!' The country people ran there and found it a lie. When the wolf really came and the boy shouted, no one believed him or came to his aid. So the wolf killed the sheep" (*fab.* 120 = 319 e Chm = Babr. *fab.* 169 Crusius).

The dodecasyllabic version (*fab.* 319 c Chm) is closely related to the paraphrase, as against the version of the Augustana (319 a Chm = 226 a Hsr = 210 Per). Two other versions derive from the Vindobonensis. One of these, a prose rendering of the dodecasyllabi, is found in a secondary MS of the Vindobonensis recension (*fab.* 319 d = 226 b Hsr). Another prose version deriving from the Vindobonensis is found in one branch of the Accursiana (*fab.* 319 b Chm = 226 c Hsr).

The twelve verses of the dodecasyllabic version offer a simple and straightforward narrative which is in stark con-

<sup>9</sup> The above inference is possible even on the basis of the garbled version based on defective witnesses and published by Chambry. The text of the Moscow MS (= Hausrath's Mo), unknown to Chambry, confirms the inference. On this MS see Ursing, esp. 1-6. For the Moscow text of 52 e, 1 Chm and its implications see Ursing, 89 f. The verse in Vind. (52 e, 12 Chm) expressing the idea that the young woman did not wish her lover to be old, that is, point (a) omitted by 52 b-d, is invented by Vind. on the basis of 52 e,9 (cf 52 d,9) and does not go back to Babrius.



trast to the repetitious nonsense that characterizes other verse fables of the Vindobonensis. Indeed, it follows the paraphrase pretty closely retaining many of its expressions. It differs, however, in one important point.

The shepherd lad of the Vindobonensis, like his paraphrastic clone, shouts for help. The country people come to his aid and find that he's not telling the truth. We then read that the boy repeated this many times, and his neighbors again found it to be a lie. The explicit reference to repetition is an important element in the narrative and is needed for the fable to make its point. It is surprising then to find it reduced to the adverb "continuously" (συνεχῶς) in the paraphrase.

Assuming that the fable was included in the *Mythiambi*, an assumption that is probable but not certain, we may conclude either that Babrius telescoped his narrative in the manner of the paraphrase or, more likely, that the version of the Vindobonensis and its derivatives reflect Babrius more closely than the paraphrase. In any case, until we find a choliambic version in a trustworthy source, the question must remain open.

Let us now turn to another problem, namely, contamination of the medieval witnesses of the anonymous fables with Babrius or a version deriving from him. We begin with Babrius *fab.* 77: a foolish crow is flattered and duped by a clever fox into opening his beak to crow, and so he drops the piece of cheese he was carrying. Babrius is very closely followed by the paraphrase, which preserves the last line intact (*fab.* 61 = 166 c Chm). A tetrastichon of Ignatius the Deacon also derives from Babrius (*fab.* 15 at Crusius, pp. 269 f.).<sup>9a</sup>

<sup>9a</sup> I follow C. F. MÜLLER's attribution of *tetrasticha* I 1-44 to Ignatius the Deacon (*ap.* Crusius, pp. 251 ff.) despite the doubts of W. WOLSKA-CONUS, in *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970), 335-339, 359.



The Augustana is quite different from Babrius in almost every important detail (*fab.* 166 a Chm = 126 a Hsr = 124 Per). The Vindobonensis, however, has a version that shows dual affiliation (*fab.* 166 b Chm = 126 b Hsr). On the whole it derives from the Augustana, but at three important points in the narrative it coincides with the paraphrase. Indeed, like the latter it preserves almost intact the last line of Babrius *fab.* 77. (The epimythium of the Vindobonensis derives from the paraphrase. The dodecasyllabic fable [= 166 d Chm] derives from the Vindobonensis.)

Thus a complete verse of Babrius makes its way into a recension which in this case otherwise derives from the Augustana.<sup>10</sup> And that is not all. In one of the most important MSS of the latter—I refer to the Augustanus itself (Chambry's Pb; Hausrath's A)—we find an unmistakable Babrian touch. For this MS puts into the fox's mouth a version of Babrius' punch line taken from certain MSS of the tetrastichon of Ignatius. The lines in question follow:

ἔχεις, κόραξ, ἅπαντα, νοῦς δέ σοι (σε Vind.) λείπει.

(Babr., Paraphr., Vind.)

ἔχεις, κόραξ, ἅπαντα, νοῦν κτῆσαι μόνον. (Ignatius: VWald)

ὦ κόραξ, ἔχεις τὰ πάντα, νοῦν μόνον κτῆσαι.

(Aug. cod. Pb)<sup>11</sup>

Another instance involving a whole fable, albeit a short one, is Babrius *fab.* 80: "The Camel Who Wouldn't Dance." The paraphrase omits it. But three important MSS of the Augustana do not. They offer a prose version that clearly derives from Babrius (*fab.* 249 Per = 142 a Hsr =

<sup>10</sup> Contrast F. R. Adrados, in *Emerita* 37 (1969), 283 ff., esp. 287; 38 (1970), 17.

<sup>11</sup> Note that Pb has almost made a Babrian choliambus out of the trimeter of the Ignatian MSS.

148 a Chm; the fable is not included in the main collection of Augustana fables by Perry). This version is found in the Vindobonensis with a few changes (*fab.* 142 b Hsr = 148 a Chm), and one MS of the latter has it in Byzantine verse (*fab.* 148 b Chm). Thus a fable of Babrius missing from the paraphrase finds a home with the oldest recension of the anonymous fables.

We are not then surprised at another bit of Babrius filtering down into the Augustana. The fable in question is the one about Dr. Heron, whose fee for medical services is the fact that he has been able to remove head and neck safe and sound from his patient's jaws. The patient is of course one of Aesop's livelier performers, the wolf. The fable is no. 94 in Babrius. The paraphrase follows Babrius fairly closely, except that a crane is substituted for a stork (*fab.* 84 = 225 d Chm). The Augustana version (*fab.* 156 Per = 161 Hsr = 225 a Chm) is substantially different from Babrius', though it shows a few points of contact with its mythiambic counterpart. This is especially true of the wolf's punch line, for which a common source is likely. But in the case of two Augustana MSS, contamination with Babrius or the paraphrase can be observed. Again, we find the Augustanus (Pb) pervious to this influence along with the Vatican codex (Mb) that preserves Babrius together with fables of the Augustana. The passages follow:

“σοὶ μισθὸς ἄρκεϊ,” φησί, “τῶν ἰατρείων

κεφαλὴν λυκίου στόματος ἐξελεῖν σῶην.” (Babr. 94,7-8)

“οὐκ ἀγαπᾷς ἐκ λύκου στόματος σῶαν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐξενεγκῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μισθὸν ἀπαιτεῖς;” (Aug. *fab.* 156 Per)

“ἄρκεϊ σοι εἰς μισθὸν ὅτι ἐκ στόματος λύκου κεφαλὴν σῶαν ἐξῆξας.” (Paraphr.)

“ἄρκεϊ σοι καὶ τὸ μόνον σῶαν ἐξελεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν.” (Aug. cod. Pb)

“οὐκ ἄρκεϊ σοι ἐκ στόματος λύκου σῶαν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐξενεγκεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ μισθὸν ἀπαιτεῖς;” (Aug. cod. Mb)

(Incidentally, this is the only fable of which a version in dodecasyllabic verse deriving from Babrius finds its way into the Accursiana [*fab.* 225 c Chm] *via* the Vindobonensis [225 b] and the paraphrase.)

One lesson to be drawn from these three examples is that not even the virtue of the purest MSS of the Augustana is proof against the insidious influence of a particular iambic tradition that begins in the ninth century A.D., not to speak of a choliambic tradition which can be documented as early as the second century A.D. We should bear this in mind when we turn to more controversial cases.

Since time, space and your patience have their limits, I shall briefly summarize my views on three such cases, with the hope that this may afford a starting point for the discussion to follow.

(1) The fable of the farmer who picked up and warmed a nearly frozen viper and was fatally bitten for his pains. The choliambic verse preserved by the Augustana in one of its versions of this fable (*fab.* 62 Hsr = 82 a Chm) is taken from a fable of Babrius (*fab.* 143 in Perry's edition of Babrius)

δίκαια πάσχω τὸν πονηρὸν οἰκτεῖρας.

(Aug. *fab.* 62,5 Hsr = Babr. 143,6)

The Augustana fable is a post-Babrian product combining Babrius and the second Augustana version of the fable (*fab.* 176 Per = 186 Hsr = 82 b Chm).<sup>12</sup>

(2) The rivalry of the crane and the peacock. The version found in the codex Augustanus (*fab.* 249 Hsr = 333 a Chm) derives chiefly from the paraphrase of Babrius *fab.* 65 (paraphr. *fab.* 47 = 333 b Chm).<sup>13</sup> The opening of

<sup>12</sup> Contrast F. R. ADRADOS, in *Emerita* 37 (1969), 256, 266 f., 313 f.; 38 (1970), 18 f.

<sup>13</sup> Contrast F. R. ADRADOS, in *Emerita* 38 (1970), 29.

Babrius' version has been abbreviated and further corrupted in the Athoan MS, but the first two verses have been preserved by the *Suda*, and the contents of the rest may be inferred from Avianus 15,3-6. The Augustana fable may have had access to a second source which preserved some of the original opening missing from the Athoan and the paraphrase, which follows that MS closely. The dodecasyllabic version of the Vatican MS (*fab.* 333 c Chm) is based on the Augustana version.

(3) The Grasshopper and the Ant. The text of Babrius' version (*fab.* 140) is preserved in a source dated to 207 A.D. and found in two MSS of the ninth and tenth centuries (ps.-Dositheus: cf. G. Goetz (ed.), *Corpus glossariorum latinorum* III pp. 46 f., 101). Five versions derive from Babrius.<sup>14</sup> These are (a) *fab.* 146 of the paraphrase and (b) the almost identical version of the Accursiana (*fab.* 114 c Hsr; Chambry combines (a) and (b) into *fab.* 336 c). Two dodecasyllabic versions deriving from the paraphrase are found in the Vindobonensis: (c) *fab.* 336 a Chm and (d) 336 b. (e) A rather more florid and ambitious version is found in primary and secondary MSS of the Augustana. Among these is the Morgan MS, which includes it at the end of its text of the Augustana fables. Version (e) is *fab.* 114 b Hsr and 336 d Chm.

All traces of meter in the Accursiana or (b) version are found in the paraphrase (a). Almost all of these occur in Babr. *fab.* 140. One, however, may be a genuine variant in the choliambic tradition of the *Mythiambi*:

οὐκ ἐσχόλαζον, ἀλλὰ διετέλουν ᾄδων. (Babr. 140,6)

οὐκ ἐσχόλαζον, ἀλλ' ἦδον μουσικῶς (μουσικά

Paraphr.). (Accurs. Paraphr.)

οὐκ ἐσχόλαζον, ἀλλὰ μουσικῶς ἦδον. (Adrados)<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Contrast F. R. ADRADOS, in *Emerita* 37 (1969), 256, 291, 312; 38 (1970), 34 f.

<sup>15</sup> *Emerita* 37 (1969), 291.

Version (e) preserves bits of Babrius missing in versions (a)-(d): compare Babr. *fab.* 140,2, 4, 9-10 and *fab.* 114 b,2, 4-5 Hsr (= 336 d,2, 5-6, 9-10 Chm). Moreover, Babrius and (e) have one ant each: the others have many. Again, the epimythium of (e) is based on a metrically defective epimythium quoted and ascribed to Babrius by Georgides: cf. Perry, *Babrius*, p. 183 n. on *fab.* 140. Finally, and most important, the Morgan MS alone goes back to the text of pseudo-Dositheus.

Babr. γελάσας δ' ὁ μύρμηξ . . .

“χειμῶνος ὄρχοῦ”, φησίν, “εἰ θέρους ἄδεις.”

(ἄδεις ps.-Dos. cod. Par.: ἦσας ps.-Dos.  
cod. Voss.)

(e) ὁ δὲ μύρμηξ γελάσας ἔφη · “οὐκοῦν χειμῶνος ὄρχοῦ, ἐπεὶ  
θέρους ἦδες.” (Morgan MS)<sup>16</sup>

ὁ δὲ μύρμηξ γέλωτα πολὺν καταχέας ἔφη ·

“οὐκοῦν χειμῶνος ὄρχοῦ.” (Other MSS)

(a) — (b) οἱ δὲ (sc. μύρμηκες) γελάσαντες εἶπον ·

“ἀλλ' εἰ θέρους ἡὔλεις, χειμῶνος ὄρχοῦ.”

(θέρους ὥραις ἡὔλεις Accurs.)

(c) — (d) οἱ δὲ . . . ἐμειδίασαν καὶ . . . ἐβόων

(c) “χειμῶνος ὄρχοῦ, εἵπερ ἡὔλεις ἐν θέρει.”

(d) “εἰ θέρους ἡὔλεις, ὄρχοῦ ἄρτι χειμῶνος.”

In sum, where a choliambic fable written by Babrius is extant, any coincidence with it in the recensions of anonymous fables including the Augustana, derives from Babrius with or without the paraphrase as an intermediate source.

<sup>16</sup> For the variants of the Morgan MS see Perry, *Studies*, 144.



We have traveled a long and tortuous path from the *Mythiambi* to their paraphrase and other offshoots in the Byzantine recensions of Aesop. Our subject has been the evolution of a considerable group of fables showing the metrical and stylistic imprint of a single, outstanding versifier of Aesop. The final products of this long and complex process have ranged from faithful imitation to a strange and bizarre display of originality in medieval Greek prose and verse. Nor have Byzantine copies of the great, ancient collection of anonymous fables escaped contact with the Mythiambographer. From the second century of the common era to the end of the middle ages a ghostly hand stretches forth, touching and transforming even the Latin Romulus, not to speak of his Greek companion. Not all the invincible might of Ottoman armies could keep our author, whether in ancient or Byzantine guise, from taking his part in the *Entretiens Hardt* held in the fourth year of the ninth decade of the twentieth century.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Adrados*: Permettez-moi de soulever trois questions:

1) A mon avis, la *Paraphrasis* dérive, pour une part plus large que ne le pense M. Vaio, de sources autres que Babrius. Cf. p. ex. la fable H. 239: la version de la *Paraphrasis* ne dérive, pas davantage d'ailleurs que celle de l'*Augustana*, de Babrius. Les restes de vers qu'on y décèle ne correspondent pas à ceux de Babrius. D'autre part les coïncidences entre la *Paraphrasis* et l'*Augustana* ne sauraient être la conséquence d'une contamination: elles ne peuvent s'expliquer que par le recours, dans l'un et l'autre cas, à un modèle ancien.

2) M. Vaio a vu, très justement, que les versions des *Dodécasyllabes* ne dérivent pas toujours de la *Paraphrasis*; que, souvent, elles diffèrent et de la *Paraphrasis* et de Babrius, et contiennent des restes métriques originaux, qu'il arrive qu'on trouve aussi dans l'*Augustana*.

3) Y a-t-il contamination dans l'*Augustana*? On trouve des éléments empruntés à la *Paraphrasis* et à Babrius dans la *Vindobonensis* et dans l'*Accursiana*. Il se peut que quelques manuscrits de l'*Augustana* aient été contaminés; mais il n'y a pas de contamination affectant l'ensemble de l'*Augustana*. S'il y en avait une, elle remonterait à l'époque romaine, ce qui n'est pas impossible, mais peu probable. Ainsi, dans H. 62, le vers δίκαια πάσχω τὸν πονηρὸν οἰκτεῖρας figure et chez Babrius et dans l'*Augustana*; mais cette même fable 62, dans la version de l'*Augustana*, est bourrée de vers qui n'ont rien de babrien. De même pour le vers δίκαια πάσχω τὸν πονηρὸν οἰκτεῖρας. Ce même vers se retrouve dans tous les manuscrits, à l'exception de ceux de la *Vindobonensis*: il dérive donc du modèle ancien. Qu'il y ait des restes métriques dans des fables inconnues de Babrius, et que ces restes se retrouvent dans tous les témoins, cela ne s'explique pas par une contamination, mais par des modèles anciens.

Au demeurant, je me réjouis de constater que, comme moi, M. Vaio décèle des restes de vers dans les fables anonymes; mais il cherche à les expliquer autrement que je ne l'ai fait.

*M. Vaio:* 1) The paraphrase. My experience with the fables whose choliambic version finds a prose counterpart in the paraphrase is the following. A source different from the *Mythiambi* or a version different from Babrius is exceptional. I would estimate 80-85% of the paraphrase derives from Babrius.

2) The dodecasyllabic fables. I have concentrated on the Vindobonensis, but there are other collections: for example, the more or less dodecasyllabic fables of the Vatican MS (Chambry's Mb) and the metrical fables of the Brancaccianus MS published by Sbordone. The fables related to Babrius derive from him but not simply by way of the paraphrase. The new material in the Byzantine versions is the invention of the 'dodecasyllabists'.

3) Contamination of Augustana with Babrius. We must distinguish those cases affecting individual MSS if the Augustana from those involving a consensus. The latter offers a version that goes back at least to late antiquity (4-5th century). Even here, however, I should incline to contamination with a choliambic tradition going back to the second century. In the case of the Vindobonensis a tradition going back only to the 7th or 8th century is an even more likely candidate for Babrian infiltration.

*M. Lasserre:* Votre projet d'éditer Babrius en tenant compte, comme vous venez de le faire, de toute la tradition babrienne pourra-t-il se réaliser sous la forme d'une présentation complète des textes entrant en considération? Pouvez-vous, par exemple, envisager une présentation synoptique? Ce serait un beau service à rendre aux philologues, et qui justifierait le plan d'une nouvelle édition après celles de Crusius et de Perry.

*M. Vaio:* I concede the value of a synoptic presentation of extant Babrian versions of a given fable, but consider it impractical for a critical edition. In any case the paraphrase should be edited as a self-contained recension on its own. I am finishing an edition of the *Mythiambi* to be followed by an edition of the paraphrasis and the dodecasyllabic fables for Teubner, Leipzig. A synoptic text without apparatus based on these

would be desirable and feasible. I should like to note here the tremendous value of Chambry's *editio maior* for students of the Greek fable. This is primarily because of his synoptic presentation of all versions known to him.

*M. Lasserre*: Je comprends aisément qu'une édition synoptique présente des difficultés à peu près insurmontables, étant donné la nature des textes à présenter. Il n'en reste pas moins que ces textes sont nécessaires dans leur entier et qu'il ne suffit pas d'en citer ici et là, au titre de variante, un mot détaché de son contexte. Pourriez-vous songer à une présentation en appendice?

*M. Vaio*: As regards variants of the paraphrasis and the Vindobonensis relevant to the text of the *Mythiambi*, you are perfectly right. The context should be given. The suggestion of an appendix is a good one, which I may well follow.

*M. West*: The material presented by Mr. Vaio illustrates the danger of trying to reconstruct lost verses from prose versions. Take Babrius *fab.* 42 with the paraphrase 179 d/e/f Chambry: at the beginning of 179 d we have what appears to be a perfect trimeter: δειπνόν τις ἐτέλει λαμπρόν · ὁ δὲ τούτου κύων . . . If one is looking specifically for choliambics, a simple transposition gives δειπνόν τις ἐτέλει λαμπρόν · ὁ δὲ κύων τούτου . . . But we have the Babrian original, and we can see that this is quite wrong. Again, the words in 179 e suggest a trimeter ὁ <δ'> ὀψοποιὸς τοῦτον ἐκ σκέλους λαβὼν · or a choliambic ὁ <δ'> ὀψοποιὸς τοῦ σκέλους λαβὼν τοῦτον, but these are mirages. Babrius wrote

τὸν δὲ τοῦ σκέλους ἄρας  
ὁ μάγειρος

*M. Vaio*: Mr. West does well to note the hazards of versifying the paraphrast. One must avoid distorting the received text, such as Crusius does in editing the paraphrases of fables missing from the metrical MSS.



*M. Nøjgaard*: Il serait intéressant de savoir si la contamination concerne le seul manuscrit *Augustanus*. Il semble, en effet, d'après vos exemples, que ces contaminations ne remontent pas à la source commune des manuscrits de la collection *Augustana*, mais portent sur une partie délimitée d'entre eux.

Ces contaminations, qui ont ainsi eu lieu de Babrius à un rédacteur relativement tardif d'*Augustana*, se sont faites d'autant plus facilement qu'elles concernent surtout des formules finales. Or, il me semble certain que celles-ci ont souvent été inscrites dans les mémoires comme une sorte de résumé de la fable. Il est donc tout naturel qu'une formule particulièrement frappante — et courte — se soit glissée dans une rédaction qui suit par ailleurs un autre modèle. La fable Babr. 140, que vous citez, en offre un exemple frappant. Le cas de la fable H. 62 (= Babr. 143 Perry) est sans doute différent. Là, c'est la fable babrienne prosaïque tout entière qui s'est glissée dans l'*Augustanus*, tout simplement parce que la fable de Babrius est classée sous γεωργός alors que celle de l'*Augustana* authentique est classée sous ὁδοιπóρος. Ainsi le rédacteur d'*Augustanus* a cru se trouver en présence d'une nouvelle fable, dont il a pu enrichir son corpus. De là vient qu'il reproduit les deux versions à des endroits différents.

*M. Vaio*: I agree with Mr. Nøjgaard regarding *fab.* H. 62 (γεωργός καὶ ὄφις). I believe this version derives from Babrius and includes some points from the true *Augustana* version (ὁδοιπóρος καὶ ἔχις, *fab.* H. 186). We should note, however, that the principal MSS of the *Augustana*, the Morgan MS and the codex *Augustanus*, have both versions.