

12

A New Manuscript of Babrius: Fact or Fable?¹

JOHN VAIO

In 1857 the British Museum purchased from Minoides Mynas the Athoan codex of Babrius and a second manuscript (L).² The later, Mynas claimed, was a copy of a codex discovered by himself on Mt. Athos. It contained a prologue and 94 fables written in what was intended as choliambic verse—about half the lines actually scan. Mynas' copy bore the title Ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Βαβρίου χολιάμβων and was published as such by G. L. Lewis.³ The latter admitted that the text was badly corrupt, but still believed that many genuine verses and phrases of Babrius, not extant elsewhere, had been preserved.

The integrity of this new collection and of its vendor was soon attacked. Cobet and Dübner began with general and sweeping indictments of forgery,⁴ which were then substantiated by Conington's detailed and devastating critique.⁵ Most scholars accepted these charges as proved, and "Babrius, Part II" was dismissed as a patent forgery. Sauppe and

¹ A preliminary version of this paper was presented to the Oxford Philological Society on 13 June 1975.

² On this transaction see A. Dain, "Un recueil Byzantin des Fables de Babrius," *Hellenica* suppl. 9.3 (1958) 103 f. (henceforth: Dain, *Babrius*); *id.* "Sur deux recueils de Babrius trouvés par Minoïde Mynas," *BullBudé* (1960) 120 f. (henceforth: Dain, *Mynas*).

³ *Babrii fabulae Aesopeae . . . partem secundam* ed. G. C. Lewis (London, 1859) (henceforth: Lewis). The new fables were included by T. Bergk in the second edition of his *Anthologia Lyrica* (Leipzig, 1868) pp. 290–342.

⁴ Cobet, *Mnemosyne* 8 (1859) 339 f., 9 (1860) 278–287. Dübner's views were reported in *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique* n.s. 3 (1860) 83–86.

⁵ "De parte Babrianarum fabularum secunda," *RhM* n.f. 16 (1861) 361–390; reprinted in J. A. Symonds (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings of John Conington* II (London, 1872) 460–491 (cf. I.417–422).

Bergk, however, rejected the majority's opinion,⁶ but in spite of their spirited resistance the views of Cobet and Conington emerged as orthodox, especially after the adherence of Crusius in his masterly edition of Babrius.⁷

But the final chapter on "Part II" had not yet been written. For in 1953 at the Ninth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, A. Dain revealed the existence of a manuscript which appeared to preserve a Byzantine recension of Babrius.⁸ This manuscript is Paris. suppl. gr. 1245 (Mq),⁹ which consists of two parts. The original folia contain the prologue and 61 of the 94 fables found in L. The text of Mq differs markedly from that of L, but interleaved with the original folia of Mq are additional pages, where Mynas has written alternate verses, many of which recur in L. Mq's principal text is a "copie figurée," that is, a copy that imitates (or pretends to imitate) the style of writing of its original.¹⁰ The cataloguers of the Bibliothèque Nationale assign Mq's script to the twelfth century.¹¹ But Mr. Nigel Wilson, who has generously inspected rather outside photographs of Mq at my request, suggests an Italian hand of the Renaissance as the original or model of this manuscript.¹²

Dain's claims for Mq are two. (1) It is a copy of a genuine Byzantine collection of fables imitative of Babrius. (2) In five fables preserved elsewhere in choliambic form Mq represents an independent tradition offering superior readings in some passages. It is the second of these assertions that is the subject of this paper.

Dain adduces three examples, which turn out to weaken rather than support his case. The fable in question is 29 Mq corresponding to Babrius 124. (It does not appear in L.) This is one of twelve fables preserved only by the Vatican codex (V) of Babrius. Lacunae occurring at lines 7, 10 and 20 in V's text are not found in Mq, which thus supplies the missing words, according to Dain.¹³

⁶ Sauppe, *NAKG* (1860) 249-253; Bergk, *AnthLyr²* pp. XXXII-XLI (cf. *supra* n. 3); *Philologus* n.f. 1 (1889) 387-397.

⁷ *Babrii fabulae Aesopaeae* ed. O. Crusius (ed. mai. Leipzig, 1897) pp. XIII-XIV, LXXXIV-IX. Cf. *Babrius* ed. W. G. Rutherford (London, 1883) p. lxix n. 1.

⁸ Dain, *Babrius* 101 ff., esp. 109-111. Cf. Dain, *Mynas* 119-121; *Babrius and Phaedrus* ed. B. E. Perry (Cambridge [Mass.] and London, 1965) pp. lxxv-vi.

⁹ The ms., if genuine, belongs in the class of Chambry's *codices mixti* (Ma, Mb, etc.): cf. *Aesopi fabulae* ed. A. Chambry I (Paris, 1925) pp. 19 ff.; C. E. Finch, *TAPA* 103 (1972) 127 ff. Reports of Mq are based on autopsy. ¹⁰ Cf. Dain, *Babrius* 107 f.

¹¹ C. Astruc and M.-L. Concasty, *Bibliothèque Nationale. Département des mss. Catalogue des mss. grecs. Troisième partie. Le Supplément grec.* vol. III (Paris, 1960) on no. 1245.

¹² A date after 1300 is indicated by fable 47 Mq, which is based on Planudes' life of Aesop. ¹³ *Babrius* 110 f.

But let us look further. The first gap is at line 7, where V offers τὸ λοιπὸν δικτύω τί ποιήσεις.¹⁴ Either x - is missing in elements 1-2, or - x in 4-5.¹⁵ Mq supplies οὖν τῶ (= τῶ) in the latter position. This yields a line without caesura and violates a rule of Babrian meter established on the basis of the attested fables. If admitted, Mq's supplement would be the only exception of its type.¹⁶ Thus the metrical anomaly in a matter so important as caesura suggests that οὖν τῶ is the work of a later "editor" and not of Babrius.

Mq's second supplement in line 10 involves only the obvious addition of a missing article and is of little value as evidence for the superiority of the new manuscript. The third case, however, is more complex and damning. Crusius' text of line 20 reads ὄμως δὲ δεῖ σχεῖν <τὸν φίλον> τί δειπνήσει; (= V with K. E. C. Schneider's supplement). Here Dain declares, ". . . au vers 20, au lieu de τὸν φίλον . . ., on écrira τὸν ξένον, tiré de notre manuscrit."¹⁷ Mq, however, reads quite differently: ὄμως δὲ δεῖ σχεῖν δειπνίσω τι [sic] τὸν ξένον. Thus Mq does not supply a cretic in elements 6-8¹⁸ but completes the line with an antibacchius in 10-12. This entails rewriting and transposing V's text, and results in awkward word order and inferior prosody, since a trochaic properispomenon is far less common at the end of Babrius' trimeter than a spondaic paroxytone. Again Mq's variant is more likely a later alteration than the original reading, and the supplement in v. 20 like that in v. 7 is probably an invention of Mq rather than Babrius' phrase.

Moreover, the assumption that Mq's supplements in vv. 7, 10 and 20 are later additions is strengthened by the evidence of v. 1 (not reported by Dain). Here V reads αἴφνης for ἐξαίφνης.¹⁹ Mq supplies ὄψ' αἴφνης, whose awkwardness betrays post-Babrian invention.

Thus in vv. 1, 7, 10 and 20 evidence of style, meter and prosody confirm the view that Mq is based either on V itself or on a text marred by the same lacunae, and that Mq's supplements are to be regarded as conjectures and not as independent readings. In these passages Dain's claim for the new manuscript fails.

¹⁴ Reports of V are based on autopsy. Photographs of V's texts of Babrius 126-129 (discussed below) may be found at Merkelbach-van Thiel, *Griechisches Leseheft* (Göttingen, 1965) pl. 19 (pp. 63 ff.).

¹⁵ The choliambus is analyzed according to the system of P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, trans. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford, 1962) 66-71.

¹⁶ Contrast two examples of caesura after two prepositives in elements 4-5: Babrius 6.4, 33. 8 (cf. Maas, *op. cit.* 86). ¹⁷ *Babrius* 111.

¹⁸ The reading attributed by Dain to Mq is in fact a conjecture of Mynas appearing on one of the interleaves. It had also been proposed by J. G. Schneider in 1812

¹⁹ V omits the prefix in order to turn Babrius' trimeter into a dodecasyllabus: cf. Vaio, *CPh* 64 (1969) 156 with n. 32.

Apart from minor orthographica there are other variants in Mq, which Dain does not consider. These may be grouped as follows. I. Correction or minor errors in V, which does not indicate an independent tradition, given the evidence for editorial tampering established above. The instances are *ἡμερώσας* (5), *ἐβουλήθη* (12) and *ώρόμαντιν* (15). *οἶδας* (19) corrects the sense but distorts the meter. II. Inferior variants in Mq: *θύμβρην* (2), *γεννητήρα* (11). III. A variant which could be an arbitrary alteration of V's unexceptionable reading in line 5: *εἶχεν εἰς* V, *εἶχε πρὸς* Mq. IV. Interpolations in Mq: line 2 is repeated after 3 with the addition of un-Babrian hiatus and Byzantine prosody (*σέλινα ἐσθίειν*); line 14 attested by both V and the *Suda* is omitted, a new verse being substituted (*πῶς ἄν με θύσαις* (ἄν μεθ. cod.) *ῶφελουῖντά σε πλείστον*). V. Shared error: *δὲ* V Mq (4). VI. In line 13 Mq sides with the *Suda* against V, but given the evidence for editorial activity in Mq, we may assume contamination rather than a separate tradition.

There is no decisive support here for Dain, and we may conclude that in Babrius 124 Mq offers no significant variant of independent value, superior to the readings of V.

Furthermore, if we examine the other fables that Mq shares with V, Dain's case becomes even weaker. For example, fable 9 Mq corresponds to Babrius 127. The first four verses of this fable have been wretchedly contracted and corrupted by V, and the version of the Bodleian paraphrase of Babrius (Ba) offers no real help in restoring the original. Mq's version of the opening lines follows:²⁰

Ἐν ὀστράκῳ γράφοντα τὰς ἀμαρτάδας
ὁ Ζεὺς τὸν Ἑρμῆν κέλλετ' ἐν κιβωτίῳ
ἐγγύς θ' ἑαυτοῦ θέντα σωρεύειν ταύτας
ὅπως ἕκαστον τὰς δίκας ἀναπράσση.

Here is a passage where Mq might prove its excellence, if based (as Dain supposed) on an independent and superior tradition. Instead these new verses offer nothing that could not be spun out of V and Ba.²¹ Moreover, they exhibit five violations of ancient prosody and Babrian meter: *brevia* scanned as long in element 11 of vv. 1 and 2; *longa* in element 9 of vv. 2 and 3, which violates the meter of the attested fables of Babrius, as does *-ās* in element 12 of v. 1.²² Note also that Mq omits *ἐρευνησας* attested by V and (as Lachmann saw) probably the end of a Babrian

²⁰ Fab. 51 Lewis has been radically revised by Mynas drawing on suggestions of Lachmann. It is found in Mq on one of the pages added at the beginning of the ms. (3^v). Mq's own version appears on f. 16^v. In line 2 one might suggest *κέλλετ'* for *κέλλετ'*.

²¹ The texts of V and Ba are conveniently cited by Perry in his *apparatus ad loc.* (*op. cit.* [*supra* n. 8] p. 164). "Ba" = Perry's "B".

²² On Babrius' practice cf. Crusius, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) pp. XL-XLII.

choliambus. We are thus entitled to infer that Mq's opening verses are un-Babrian concoctions based on the defective versions of V and Ba.

And what of the lines preserved almost intact by the other witnesses (vv. 6-10)? They read as follows in Mq:

τῶν δ' ὀστράκων συγκεχυμένων ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις 5 (= 6 Crusius)
 τὸ μὲν βράδιον τὸ δὲ τάχιον ἐμπίπτει
 εἰς χεῖρα Διός, εἴ ποτ' εὐθύνει δόξοι.²³
 τῶν δὴ πονηρῶν οὐ προσήκε θαυμάζειν
 10 εἰ θᾶσσον ἀδικῶν τις ὀψέ κακῶς πράξει.

The wretchedly corrupt state of these lines requires little comment. The lack of caesura in v. 5 (6) results from misguided adoption of Ba's prose variant. But the perverse distortions of vv. 7 (8) and 9 (10) must be assigned to the miserable invention of the editor, whose work was observed in the fable previously discussed. Thus Mq's plausible variants (ἐκαστον 4, τῶν δὴ 8 [9]) may be regarded as of no independent value.

Fable 9 Mq then is a text corrupt far beyond even the defective witnesses on which Babrius 127 Crusius is based. And whereas we find no definitive index of an independent tradition in Mq, there are strong indications of close dependence on those witnesses. The same is true of fable 26 Mq, which corresponds to Babrius 126. Mq's version was reproduced with extensive changes by Mynas in L (= fab. 52 Lewis). Again V has contracted and contorted Babrius' opening verses, which cannot be restored even with the evidence of Ba.²⁴ And again Mq offers verses whose defects of meter and prosody, poverty of style and general vacuousness reveal them as the product of Mq's fancy feeding on the remains of Babrius available in V and Ba (vv. 1-8 Mq correspond to 126.1-4 Crusius):²⁵

Ἵδοιπορῶν ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἐρημαίην
 μόνην ἐστῶσαν εἶρεν ἐν κατηφείῃ
 σεμνήν γυναικ' ἀλλ' οὐ δοκοῦσαν εὖ πράττειν.
 καὶ φησιν αὐτῇ "τί πέπονθας ἀρίστη;
 5 καὶ τίς ἂν εἴης; τοῦ χάριν μένεις ᾧδε;"
 "ἔγώ, ὦνερ," εἶπεν "εἰμί σοί γ' Ἀληθείη".²⁶
 πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐθαύμασ' ὀδοιπόρος κέπηρώτα·
 "τί οὖν πόλις ἀφείσα τὴν ἐρημίην ναίεις;"²⁷

Nor does the rest of Mq's version offer any firm indication of a tradition independent of V and Ba. Lines 9, 12 and 13 (= 5, 9-10 Crusius) reproduce V including the unmetrical word order in 13 (10), although

²³ Mq reads εὐθύνει δόξοι.

²⁴ Cf. Crusius' *apparatus ad loc.*

²⁵ Apart from line 6 the text has been corrected only by the addition of missing accents and breathings.

²⁶ ἔγῶνερ cod.

²⁷ Mynas has erased the first two words of this verse and added epsilon-iota over the iota of πόλις.

one negligible variant occurs in 9 (5)—τάδ' V, ταῦτ' Mq. The same is true of the end of v. 11 (7)—ἐλήλυθε ψευδός Mq V. And in v. 10 (6) V's concluding phrase is altered only slightly in Mq: παρ' ὀλίγοις τὰ ψεύδη (corrected from ψευδός). The only major variants in Mq are found at the beginnings of v. 10 (6)—ὅτι ποτέ V, ἐν τοῖς πάλαι γὰρ Mq—and of v. 11 (7)—νῦν εἰς πάντας βροτοὺς V, νῦν δ' εἰς βρ. ἅπαντας Mq. But given the scope of editorial activity in Mq, these may be regarded as conjectures, the former probably based on Ba's ὅτι τοῖς πάλαι καιροῖς.

There remain two fables of Mq that require detailed discussion. Both are found in V, which alone preserves (at least in part) the choliambic original. In the case of one of these dependence on V can be demonstrated. The fable in question is 28 Mq reproduced with major changes as 54 Lewis and corresponding to Babrius 129. We are concerned with two passages, line 7 (= 8 Mq) and lines 18–20 (= 19–21 Mq). We begin with the latter.

Lines 19–20 are defective in V, which reads as follows: ἐσχάτου δὲ κινδύνου (18) θεράποντες ἐν μέσοισιν ὡς εἶδον (19) ἐσάωσαν (20). Mq adds αὐτὸν before ὡς in 19 and completes 20 thus: θρέξαντες εὐθύς δεσπότην ἐσάωσαν. But ἐσάωσαν is possible only in elements 1–3 (or perhaps 3–5) of the Babrian choliambus. And Mq's placement offends not only against ancient prosody (-σαῖ- in element 10) but also against Babrius' most characteristic metrical practice, namely, the localization of the accent in element 11 of the trimeter. Thus Mq's supplement in line 20 must be regarded as conjectural restoration of V (or a text exactly like V), and the same is probably true of αὐτὸν in 19.

We next consider v. 4, which is presented as follows: (1) V's text, (2) V as restored by the editors of Babrius, (3) Mq's text.

- (1) κινίδιον δὲ χάριν ὄν' εὐρύθμους παίζον
- (2) τὸ κινίδιον δ' ἔχαιρε παίζον εὐρύθμωσ
- (3) τὸ κινίδιον δ' ἦθυρε χαρίεν ὄν' παίζον.

Style commends the phrase ending (2) as strongly as it condemns its equivalent in (3). Moreover, the prosody of εὐρύθμωσ is characteristically Babrian, whereas properispomena ending in -ον occur only rarely in elements 11–12. Thus ἦθυρε, which fills the gap left by the omission of εὐρύθμωσ in Mq, may be regarded as interpolated. Again, χαρίεν ὄν', a singularly awkward phrase in its context, may most easily be explained as a pitiful attempt to remedy V's corruption.²⁸

²⁸ It is worth noting that this conjecture is the same as that of Furia, who first published V's text of Babrius 124, 126–129; cf. *Fabulae Aesopicae* ed. F. de Furia, vol. II (Florence, 1809) p. 208 (henceforth: Furia). Other agreements of Mq with Furia against V are noted in nn. 29, 30, 32, 33, 35. The implications of this will be considered below.

That Mq derives from V is further indicated by the following conjunctive errors. Lines 2–3 appear in the same order in V and Mq. At line 6 Mq = V, except in omitting δ'. At line 15 (16 Mq) Mq = V, except in the spelling of θλάσσειν. At line 17 (18) Mq = V. Moreover, line 6 (7) corrupted by V is even further distorted by Mq, which reads ὄνος δ' ὁ τλήμων τὴν μὲν ἀλέθων [!] νύκτα.²⁹ And line 24 (25) unexceptionable in V (apart from a minor orthographical error) is marred in Mq by a metrical anomaly (anapaest in elements 7–8), the confusion of ὄρος and ὄρεύς, and a more serious lapse in orthography: τί γὰρ παθῶν ἐν οὔρεσιν οὐκ ἐπωλεΐμην (παθῶν is clearly interpolated).³⁰

Other variants, whether better or worse, may be attributed to conjecture, arbitrary change or brute ignorance. They are listed below.³¹

1. ὄνον τις εἶχε σὺν κυνιδίῳ φέρβων (note the Byzantine prosody in element 8)
2. ὁ μὲν ἦν (καὶ ἦν V)
3. χιλὸν (χόρτον V)
- 8 (9). ἡμέρην (-ας V, -ης edd.)
- 9 (10). φέρων ἀφ' (ἦγεν ἐφ' V)³²
- 11 (12). ἀβρόττητι δ' ἐν πάσῃ
- 12 (13). δεσμούςσιν καὶ κάλως
- 21 (22). κρανὸς (κρανάης V, -έης edd.)
- 22 (23). ἔκτεινον (ἔθεινον V).³³

Finally, after line 6 Mq inserts the following verse, condemned by its own prosody: ἔσωζεν ἄθυρμα ἧδὺ παραμυθείης.

Interpolation also plagues Mq's text of Babrius 128 (= fab. 27 Mq repeated with major changes by Mynas in L [= 53 Lewis]). A choliambic version attributed to Babrius is found in V and probably derives from Xen. *Mem.* 2.17.13. We begin with Mq's expansion of lines 5–6 V (= lines 6–9 Mq):

πλέον γὰρ ἡμῖν οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ φορβήν
 πᾶσαν φέρει σοι γῆ τιθηνίς ἀπάντων.
 κἂν τοῖς ὄρεσιν εὐθαλές τι γενῆσσι σοι
 ὠραίη βοτάνη καὶ δρόσου γεμισθεῖσα.

²⁹ τὴν μὲν νύκτα ἀλέθων Furia, τὴν μὲν νύκταλατρεύων V (ἀλετρεύων ci. Rutherford).

³⁰ Cf. παρ' οὔρεσιν Furia, παρ' οὔρησιν V. Mq, V and Furia all read ὡς δὲ in line 22 (23Mq).

³¹ The reader is spared the epimythium of two verses added by Mq (meter and prosody are Byzantine and non-Babrius).

³² Mq agrees with Furia in reading ἀφ'.

³³ Mq agrees with Furia against V.

Interpolation is proved by the accent at the end of line 6 and by the prosody of line 7 (element 10). That V is the basis of Mq's invention is indicated by the conjunctive error in line 9 (7 V): *ώραίη (-α V) βοράνη* Mq V, β. <γ' > *ἀραιή* edd.³⁴ Lines 6, 8–9 follow V fairly closely; line 7 is spun out of two words in V (*sc. γῆς πάσα*).³⁵

The verses just quoted are framed by two lines not found in V. Style, repetitiousness and context justify their condemnation.

5 σὺ δ' οὖν ὀδηγεῖς πρὸς μόνον νομὴν ἤμας
10 ψέκασμα δῖον ὑψόθεν πεπωκυῖα.

Next, the following verse is inserted after line 10 V (= 13 Mq), its spuriousness revealed by lack of caesura and by false prosody:

14 ᾧ σύ γε βληχάζουσ' ἀσυμβολὸν βάζειν.

Finally, a verse damned by illogic and otiosity precedes line 13 V (= 18 Mq):

17 κἄν ἦτε θύμα θηρίοισι παντρώκταις.

So much for interpolation.³⁶ The dependence of Mq on V noted above is further indicated by three important conjunctive errors: *τοιάδε* at the end of line 1,³⁷ V's unmetrical line 8 (= 11 Mq) repeated almost exactly by Mq (only one accent is changed), and *πάντοθεν* in line 13 V (= 18 Mq). As for Mq's variants (listed below), they do not necessarily indicate anything beyond conjectural change or correction of V's text:

1. ποτ' / νομῆα
3. ἀμέλγοντ' ἔστιν εἰ
10 (= 13 Mq). παροῦσα δ' ἤκουσ' ἢ κύων ἀπημείφθη (the *longum* in element 9 is un-Babrian)
11(15). μέσοις ἐπωλούμην

³⁴ By a combination of erasure and rewriting Mynas has succeeded in changing Mq's original reading to *ἀύρας νοτίας*. The conjecture recurs with orthographic changes on an interleaf (30^v) and with a more important change for the worse (*νοτείης*) at fab. 53.10 Lewis. Bergk restored *αὔρας τε νοτίης* against Babrian meter and declared the new reading part of a *versum Babrio dignissimum (op. cit. [supra n. 3] p. XXXVI)*. The evidence of Mq unmasks Mynas' conjecture and reveals the danger of such pronouncements, based as they are on purely subjective criteria.

³⁵ Again note the agreement of Mq with Furia against V at the end of line 8 (= 6 V): *γενῆ σοι* Mq Furia, *γενήσει* V.

³⁶ An epimythium of two verses is added by Mq. One of these lacks caesura and contains a split anapaest in elements 7–8 (a major offense against Babrian meter).

³⁷ Apart from minor variants noted below this verse is essentially the same in both Mq and V. In Mq Mynas has erased the three words following *δῖς*, altered the case of *νομῆα* (*sc. -ῆι*), and added the monstrous compound *προσεξήγυδα* after *τοιάδε* (cf. fab. 53.1 Lewis).

12(16). ἀφθονον ποίην

13(18). ἐγὼ περιτρέχουσα.

We have so far considered five fables common to Mq and V (*sc.* Babrius 124, 126, 127, 128, 129), and may now summarize the results of our inquiry. In these fables Mq derives principally from V with some contamination from Ba and the *Suda*. It does not represent an independent tradition, and its few plausible variants are to be attributed to conjectural activity on the part of the "editor" responsible for the massive and demonstrable interpolations noted above.

Seven other fables in Mq correspond to extant fables of Babrius. They are listed below together with the corresponding numbers of the fables repeated in L and published by Lewis (*cf.* n. 3).

Mq	L	Babrius
5	13	141
22	42	65
30	59	134
36	66	138
46	—	142 Perry (<i>cf.</i> 143 Crusius)
51	81	136
58	88	143 Perry (<i>cf.</i> 147 Crusius)

In the case of all these fables, except for lines cited by the *Suda* and other indirect witnesses, there is nothing in Mq that could not have been manufactured on the basis of known versions, which preserve little or nothing of Babrius' original. Nor is there anything to indicate with certainty or even probability that Mq had access to a source preserving more Babrius than the witnesses available to us.

A detailed examination of each fable is not required, since the reader can easily verify the statement made above by comparing the versions published by Lewis (which will do for the purpose despite Mynas' alterations) with Babrius.³⁸ One example will suffice—fab. 46 Mq, which does not recur in L.³⁹

³⁸ Conington's strictures on fab. 13 Lewis (= 5 Mq) are equally valid for Mq's version: *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 5) pp. 364–366 (= pp. 464 f. of the reprint). The problem raised by Mq's agreement with Lachmann's conjecture in line 4 (*cf.* 13.4 Lewis, 141.4 Crusius) will be considered in a later paper.

³⁹ M's epimythium is omitted. It is based on the paraphrasts (*cf. infra* n. 41) and consists of two verses, one of which lacks caesura. The text of lines 1–7 is reported exactly as it appears in the ms. except for the addition of two missing accents and a breathing. Two marginal variants keyed to the text are found in the original writing. They are ἀνταί (for ὑμεῖς 5) and σκοίη [*sic*] (for εἶχε [corrected from ἔσχε by the first hand] 7). Variants added by Mynas in his own hand are not reported.

- τὸν Ζῆν' ἐμέμφονθ' αἱ παλαιφάτοι δρῦες·
 "ὠφελles ἡμᾶς μηδ' ὀλως θέλειν φῦναι
 φυτῶν μετ' ἄλλων. δενδροπήμονες πάντες
 τέμνουσιν ἡμᾶς νηλεῶς γενηθείσας."
 5 ὁ Ζεὺς ἔειπ' "ὕμεις παραίτιοι τούτου
 εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὑμεῖς στεῖλαι πάντα τίκτοιτε,
 οὐκ ἂν γεωργὸς πέλεκυν ἐν δόμοις εἶχε."

Babrius' version is preserved by a single witness (G) and the *Suda*, which cites two verses attributing them to Babrius.⁴⁰ Mq takes lines 6–7 from the *Suda* (with minor variations) and creates five verses on the basis of two branches of the paraphrastic tradition.⁴¹ The new verses are a miserable hodgepodge of faulty usage, syntax, style, meter and prosody. G's version, though marred by corruptions curable and incurable, is incomparably superior.

Thus Mq, even if a product of the late Byzantine age, is a witness of no independent value for the text of Babrius. The new manuscript draws upon the known sources of Babrius' *Mythiambi* as well as other Aesopica to vary and expand the authentic fables with its own invention and to recreate the others anew in a pseudo-imitative style, whose ineptitudes boggle the mind. Dain's belief in the importance of his discovery is thus revealed as premature, overoptimistic and utterly unfounded, as far as Babrius is concerned.

And what of Dain's assumption that Mq is a copy of an authentic Byzantine codex? The proof that this new manuscript is a forgery concocted by Mynas requires examination of all Mq's fables and their relationship to those published by Furia and Koraës in their editions of Aesop,⁴² and will not be undertaken here. We may conclude, however, by noting a strong index of forgery occurring in the fables discussed above. Of the thirty Babrian fables preserved by V all but six were published by Furia in 1809. V was rediscovered and re-examined by Knöll in 1878, who noted that certain readings in Furia differed from the actual lections of the manuscript.⁴³ Mq agrees with Furia against V in five important

⁴⁰ G's text was first published by E. Husselman, *TAPA* 66 (1935) 122 f. Cf. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana, 1952) fab. 302 (p. 440); *id.*, *op. cit.*, (*supra* n. 8) pp. 184–187 (fab. 142). The fab. is no. 143 in Crusius' ed. On G's textual problems cf. Vaio, *CPh* 64 (1969) 157 ff.

⁴¹ The *Suda's* entry is Σ 1030 (4.427.27 f. Adler). For the paraphrastic versions cf. Chambry, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 9) I.197 f. (fab. 99a–b). The texts in question are also reported by Crusius, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) p. 135.

⁴² Furia, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 28); A. Koraës, *Μύθων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγή* (Paris, 1810). Note, for example, the fable just quoted. Dain's Byzantine pseudo-Babrius would have had to combine two paraphrases in addition to exploring the *Suda* in order to create 46 Mq. Mynas had merely to turn from p. 230 to p. 407 in Koraës!

⁴³ P. Knöll, "Neue Fabeln des Babrius," *SBWien* 91 (1878) esp. 683–685.

variants.⁴⁴ Given the editorial activity observable in Mq, any one of these agreements could be mere coincidence. But their cumulative force is considerable and strongly supports the view that Mq is a forgery.⁴⁵

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

⁴⁴ Cf. *supra* nn. 28, 29, 30, 33, 35. On the other hand, Mq's agreements with V against Furia are relatively minor (readings in parenthesis are Furia's): 126.5 εὐθὺ (-ὺς); 128.8 φέρβοις (-εις); 129.13 ἡλθ' (ἡλθε), 16 ἡλόησε (ἡλοίησε), 22 καὺτὸς (καὶ αὐτός), ἐκπνέων V -είων Mq (ἐκπνεεν).

⁴⁵ But is Mynas' the original hand of Mq? At *Babrius* 108 Dain suggests tentatively that this is the case. But at *Mynas* 119 f. he abandons this view. His evidence is a statement of Mynas found in an unpublished essay on *Babrius* (Paris, suppl. gr. 748 f. 9^r): "Avant de faire une dissertation sur les 62 autres fables inédites de Babrius [presumably the fables of Mq], dont je viens de recevoir une copie presque fac-similé . . ." But Mynas is a notorious liar in such matters, as Dain himself shows (*Mynas* 117 f.), and this statement proves nothing. Who else but Mynas had the motive and incentive to forge such a document as Mq? For an instructive example of Mynas' forgery of *Babrius* on a much smaller (but far more successful) scale, cf. Rutherford, *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 7).