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SECTION I.

THE COLOGNE EDITION OF 1494.
CHAPTER I.
DESCRIPTION OF THE COLOGNE EDITION.

The edition of Avianus published at Cologne in 1494 might be styled the "second" editio princeps, since it is the first complete edition, its predecessor, the famous Stainhöwel edition, containing only 27 out of the 42 fables. Although the name of the publisher is not given, it was undoubtedly from the press of Heinrich Quentell, as is proven conclusively by the identity of certain fonts of type with those used by Quentell in other books published about this time; and also by the fact that the wood cut in the frontispiece is the one he used between the years 1492-1496, this book bearing at the end the date 1494. The book had formerly been assigned to Jacques de Breda by L. Hervieux, "Les Fabulistes Latins," III, 121ff.

Hervieux, following Panzer, gives the most complete description of the edition available, but his work is far from accurate in its details. He was acquainted apparently with only two copies, one being in the British Museum at London, and the other at Cologne at the Public Library. There is now also a copy in Harvard Library, which, through the kindness of the librarian, was loaned to me for examination, and is the basis of the description given below.

The volume is a duodecimo, printed on thin, ridged paper, resembling rice paper. It contains five quires, numbered from a to e, each having six sheets, making in all thirty sheets, or sixty pages. The text is in heavy, Gothic lettering, exceedingly full of contractions and abbreviations, and difficult to read. It greatly resembles many manuscripts of the same century.

The title, "Apologus Aviani Civis Romani Adulescentulis ad Mores/et Latinum Sermonem Capescendos Utilissimus," is printed in large Gothic letters at the top of the title page. Below is a woodcut representing a man designated "Esop," giving instruction to two boys. On a scroll appears the hexameter:

"Accipies tanti doctoris dogmata sancti."

The folio title is: "Apologus Aviani/ cum Commento." At the end of the book, in small letters, is the following colophon:

"Apologus Aviani civic Romani adulescentulis ad/ mores et latinum sermonem capescendos utilissimus. Fi/nit feliciter Anno

* For discussion of this question see: Oldfather, New Manuscript Material, pp. 113-114, and to literature there cited add:
E. Vouilleme, Der Buchdruck Kölns, D. 90,
MCCCVIII quarto idus Septembris."

It will be observed that the first part of this subscription is exactly like the title, except that it is printed in much smaller type, and has very few capitals. The last line, however, is exceedingly important, as it contains the date on which the edition was completed.

There is no epistle to Theodosius at the beginning of the work, in which it agrees with most of the manuscripts dating from the XIII Century on. There is, however, an introduction, beginning on quire a, page 3, the woodcut and title being on the first page. This introduction will be taken up fully in chapter III, below.

The edition contains forty-two fables, printed in Gothic lettering, with numerous interlinear glosses in a smaller, unlead font of type above the word or words which they explain. There is also a full commentary on each fable, in the same font as the glosses. It comes at the end, and not along the side, as in some old books, but leaves a much narrower margin on each side of the page than the fable itself.

All the commentaries are fairly uniform in outline, being divided into three parts: first, a simple, but full, prose version of the fable, with explanations where the editor considered them necessary: second, an Utilitas, or moral; and third, an Allegoria, or parable to illustrate some principle of mediaeval theology or ethics. In many cases the Utilitas and Allegoria are not only without any reference to each other, but even entirely inconsistent, a point which does not seem to have embarrassed the editor. Thus, in the first fable, the Utilitas commends to the reader: "Do not trust the words of a woman!" but the parable naively goes on to explain that the woman represents the Church, her child the sinner, and the wolf, the Devil. This would seem to point to an entirely separate origin for the Utilitas and the Allegoria, which were later combined without regard to their contradictory sentiment.

There is abundant proof that this edition of Avianus was intended primarily as a school book. The title, stating that it is "useful for learning morals and the Latin language" - the two most important subjects for schoolboys of the fifteenth century - the picture of Aesop instructing the two boys, the careful glosses for almost every verb and noun, the long commentary with its simple, running style, and its parable and moral, all point to this purpose. Avianus was, too, next to Cato, the most common school text of the middle ages.

CHAPTER II.
COMPARISON OF MANUSCRIPTS.

A comparison of the peculiar readings of about seventy manuscripts of Avianus, available for purposes of study in the form of photographs, shows that they fall into certain groups, a relation which probably indicates their descent from a common archetype. The 1494 edition was probably taken from a fifteenth century manuscript, as it contains regularly those modifications of spelling which became most prevalent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, i.e., e for ae in the genitive singular and nominative plural, etc. Also the great number and the complexity of the abbreviations and contractions would indicate the same thing, as it seems to have been customary in old books to take over all such characteristics from the manuscript used. In earlier centuries only Nomina Sacra, legal and technical terms, etc., were commonly abbreviated, but in the fifteenth century an elaborate system was built up, with arbitrary symbols to show the passive and infinitive of verbs, the insertion of ir, or, ri, re, and so on, a great number of which are to be found in this edition. Indirectly, of course, it bears a definite relation to other and earlier manuscripts, from which its fifteenth century original was descended.

This edition, as stated above, was clearly intended for school use, and there are also evidences that the editor used considerable freedom in making slight changes of the text, glosses, etc., from the manuscript which he copied.

The titles of the forty-two fables illustrate this point particularly well. The most closely related manuscripts, including the one from which the edition was probably wholly, or almost wholly taken, give no titles. By a careful comparison with all the other available manuscripts, it becomes evident that seventeen out of the forty-two titles do not agree with, nor even closely resemble, those of other manuscripts. The rest, however, all agree with one or more manuscripts, ranging over a wide list of eighteen, that is, nearly all that have titles. Moreover, an examination of these titles makes it evident that they are of the more common sort, such as X. De Calvo Milite, which would be the most obvious heading to anyone who read the fable.

Manuscripts Nos. 20, 22, and 26, (Dr. Oldfather's numbers) each agree with the edition on seven titles, but not the same seven, there being only a few instances where two of the three agree on the same one. The first two mentioned are now in the Oxford Library, and the last is from Dijon, France, all being thirteenth century manuscripts.

No. 56, (Wolfenbüttel 87.5 Aug.), also a thirteenth century manuscript, agrees six times, with the following titles:

* For this comparison I have used Prof. Oldfather's collations, except in a few cases where he had not yet collated a certain MS.; in these cases I have compared all the unusual readings, i.e.
I. De rustica et lupo.
XV. De pavone et grue.
XXV. De puero et fure.
XXVI. De leone et capra.
XXXIV. De formica et cicada.
XL. De pardo et vulpe.

Other manuscripts from a variety of places agree once, or perhaps three or four times, with the edition, but never do more than three manuscripts coincide on a title, and this only two or three times. None of the distinctive titles have manuscripts agreeing with them, but show every sign of being the original captions of the editor; as for example, XXXVI. De vitulo saltante et hove latrante", which is an obvious pleasantry, and a very bad title, as the calf does not dance, nor does the ox bark.

From these points, i.e. from the many titles having no authority, the irregularity of agreement, the common character of the titles which do have prototypes, and the extremely wide range of manuscripts which agree with some of the titles, it seems fair to conclude that the manuscript Quentell employed contained no titles, but that they were supplied by the editor. He may, or may not, have consulted other manuscripts, but it seems, for a number of reasons, more likely that he did not. In the first place, the variations are so numerous, and the possible forms relatively so few, that had he made all the titles himself, he could scarcely have avoided coinciding with other manuscripts in as many cases as he did. Then too, it seems very improbable that he should have had access to so wide a range of manuscripts. Neither would it have been customary, in the fifteenth century, to make so thorough going comparison as would here be represented. There seems, too, to be absolutely no preference for any one of the above mentioned manuscripts, nor is there, in a single case, any other point of resemblance sufficient to support the hypothesis of its use in making the edition.

If then, as seems most likely, the editor supplied his own titles, this has an important bearing on the rest of the work; if he was independent in this particular, he would be likely to be so in others; and this independence would easily account for some unimportant changes or variations from the one manuscript which, as I shall endeavor to prove, was his archetype. Several points which strengthen this conclusion should be noted here; the edition mentioned above does not agree so closely with the manuscript referred to, in the commentary upon the first few fables as it does later on; for though the same material has been used, there has been a rearrangement, with some additions and omissions, while the fact that much of it corresponds word for word, leaves no doubt as to the relationship. However, this variation gradually becomes less till, in the tenth fable, there is an almost exact likeness, while the few differences could easily be accounted for by the natural variation of a copy from its original. The introductions of the two show striking parallels also, as they contain a few passages that are word for word, identical; yet that of the 1494 edition is plainly not a mere copy of the manuscript introduction, but a re-
working of the same material. This hypothesis of a certain degree of independence on the part of the editor is likewise upheld by the variation in the reading of the fables themselves, which show the marks of being either misreadings, or an attempt to improve upon the original. These latter points will be more fully discussed with illustrations, in chapter III below.

The 1494 edition probably came, then, as stated above, from a fifteenth century manuscript, and, it would be most natural to surmise, from a German one, since it was printed at Cologne, a typically German city, within reach of many monasteries famous for their manuscripts.

This view is supported by a very significant fact. The Germans of the Renaissance, and even earlier, were especially fond of commentaries upon authors, and manuscripts with glosses, explanations, and commentaries, including morals, so that a high percentage of German manuscripts have one or all of these features, while the manuscripts of Italy, France, and England have them much more rarely. The oldest commentaries proper on Avianus are from Tegernsee, now preserved in the Hof- und Staatsbibliothek at Munich, and they contain what is obviously the basis for the morals, allegories, etc., in the later German manuscripts.

The three of these commentaries which parallel the edition of 1494 most closely are: Munich CMM 631 S.XII,p. 146ff., Munich 19475 SXII, and Munich 19479 SXII, the latter two being evidently either copies of the same archetype, or one a copy of the other.

Eleven of the seventy odd available manuscripts of Avianus have glosses and commentaries similar to those of this edition. Only a few others have commentaries, and they are entirely different in content. Of these eleven, three are now at Rome, and show from their script, etc. that they are Italian manuscripts. They are Vatic. 1536, S XVI, (74), Vatic. 1683, S XIII, (63), and Palat. 1573, S XIII, (72). Besides the resemblance in commentaries, which have the same allegory in most of the fables, there is a striking resemblance in text. It seems quite likely that their archetype may have been the ultimate source of the eight evidently related German manuscripts previously mentioned. These are, (in order of resemblance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maihingen</td>
<td>635, A.D.1451</td>
<td>(43A)</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich 18910</td>
<td>S XV</td>
<td>(48A)</td>
<td>1-15, 13 om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakau 2195</td>
<td>S XV</td>
<td>(12A)</td>
<td>Comp. &amp; Vocab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakau 2469</td>
<td>S XV</td>
<td>(1A)</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich 23404</td>
<td>S XV</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfenbüttel 185</td>
<td>S XV</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All numbers in brackets throughout this section are those used by Dr. Oldfather, L.M.
Of these eight, the two Prag manuscripts may be discarded at once, as they bear only slight resemblance to the text of the 1494 edition, differing on more than half the important readings; the commentaries are only similar in a general way.

The two Krakau manuscripts, likewise, have only enough in common with the edition to make it certain that they belong to a related group.

The Wolfenbüttel manuscript is much more similar. It bears the title, "Aviani Fabulae Cum Commento", but in a different and later hand. The glosses and text are clearly related, though they differ on many points. The allegories, especially, are rather strikingly like.

Munich 22494 has introduction, glosses, and commentary, but they show no marked similarity to those of the edition, while there are many decided differences in the text.

The two remaining, Munich 18910, and the Meihingen manuscript, are very closely related, the latter being almost certainly the one from which the edition was taken, or a copy of it. The text of the former is as close a parallel as that of the latter but the commentaries and glosses do not concur so closely. It is also incomplete, containing only fables 1-15, with 13 omitted, although, of course, a part may have been lost. The relations of these two to the edition will be taken up in chapter III below.

Certain other manuscripts should perhaps be mentioned here, which, while they have neither glosses nor commentary, agree in many text readings, which show that they are probably related to the same general group. These are:

(67) Bib. Comm. Sand. 97, SXV
(69) Rome, Bib. Apost. Vatic. 1662, S XIII
(77) Switz. Basel, Oeffent. Bib. ANLI42, S XV
CHAPTER III.  
THE MANUSCRIPT USED BY THE EDITOR OF THE COLOGNE EDITION.

Of the two manuscripts mentioned in chapter II as resembling this edition most closely, one is incomplete, Munich 18010. It has no introduction, but begins with the words, "Carmen fabularum per Allegorias", written in the same hand as the text, though in somewhat larger letters. There are numerous glosses, written in an extremely fine, almost illegible hand, a kind of cursive script, between the lines. These for the most part correspond closely to the glosses in the edition, though they are both fuller and more numerous. This may be illustrated briefly by the first line of the first fable:

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{villana} & \text{fiorati} \\
\text{Ed.} & \text{Ustica deflenti puero iuraverat olim} \\
\text{mulier quaedam} & \text{villana fiorati} \\
\text{MS.} & \text{Rustica deflenti puero iuraverat olim} \\
\end{array} \]

The text of this manuscript agrees almost perfectly with that of the edition. Not only are the same abbreviations and characteristic spellings used throughout, but in such unusual readings as III, 7, nisi feras, (nisu ferens), IV, 9, collo duplicem (lateri duplicem), V, 14, donat, (domat), IX, 23, repetes, (repetas), XI 12, erat, (erit) and XII, 1 femore, (vomere), where no other manuscript agrees, they are exactly alike. In many places where the edition is unlike this or any other manuscript, the readings seem to have been mistakes, either because of the difficulty of reading the original, or through misunderstanding of the meaning. Such cases are: XIV, 12, et abire, (abolere), and Ibid. 14, olbus, (omnibus). Both of these misreadings have a distinct resemblance to the proper words in their abbreviated form, but make no sense. In almost all cases where the 1494 edition differs from all known manuscripts, the same thing is true. This certainly leads to the belief that the variations in this book were largely the work of the editor, that many were mistakes, and that even where a conscious change or correction is made, it is of little worth. There are, to be sure, a certain number of variations which belong to a different class, i.e. those words adopted from the glosses and incorporated into the text; of this there are a number of instances, such as I, 1, puero, instead of parvo.

The similarity between edition and manuscript continues to the thirteenth fable, which is omitted in Munich 18010. Number fourteen has neither glosses nor commentary, and does not follow the edition closely in text, although it is written in the same hand: it would seem to have been added last, and carelessly, perhaps from another source. This view is strengthened by the fact
that thirty-two lines, (XIII and XIV with their epimythia, and the commentary, would just fill one page, so that had one page been lost from the archetype, it would account both for the omission of XIII and the deviation of XIV. The fifteenth fable, which is the last one in the manuscript, returns to the same style as the first six fables, and parallels the edition in almost every detail.

Were it not for the unusual circumstance of this omission and the dissimilarity of XIV, Munich 18910, so far as text goes, would seem to have been the archetype of the edition, and we might conclude that the rest had later been lost. But the omission and variation do not occur in the Cologne edition, and hence we must conclude that this manuscript is a fragmentary copy of the real archetype, or some very closely related one.

In the fables having epimythia, Munich 18910 corresponds exactly to the Cologne edition, having the same lines, and almost the same wording, except in one or two instances where there is a slight change in spelling and position. The epimythium of the first fable is indicated by a rude drawing of a pointing hand, with the word "Allegorva". This corresponds closely to the emphasis put upon the parable of the fable both in the edition and in the Mainz manuscript. (See below)

Additional evidence supporting the hypothesis that this is not the original of the edition, may be derived from the commentaries written in the same fine script as the interlinear glosses, at the end of the fables. These have some very peculiar features. In the first place they are much shorter than those of the edition, although they are of the same general structure and content, having a brief synopsis of the fable, a moral and an allegory. However, a close examination makes it clear that they are condensations of a fuller commentary, rather than a basis afterward enlarged.

The commentary on the first fable starts exactly like that of the Cologne edition, and follows it word for word through about five lines. Then it diverges and becomes much briefer, though employing the same phrases here and there. It becomes, indeed, so very condensed as to give no idea of the story. Then, suddenly breaking away from the narrative without the formality of completing the preceding sentence, comes the word, written in much larger letters, -- "Tunc ibi haece sunt dicta quaedem" These are the words beginning the Utilitas of the 1404 edition, although they are not there distinguished from the rest of the text. In small letters the sentence is continued, almost as in the book, but instead of ending with "sic lupus deceptus fuit," as does the edition, it has: "Quemadmodum hic lupus deceptus a" after which appears in large letters the word, "ALLEGORVAM" (sic). Then follows, scarcely legible and much abbreviated: "Per rustica (sic) ecclesia intelligitur, per puerum", with which abrupt and ungrammatical conclusion "leaves off. These words do not even end the line, but leave about one third of it blank. These peculiarities seem to leave no reasonable doubt that a longer commentary was here copied by someone who was not only in a hurry, but did not understand what he was writing. In point of fact, just such tasks were often set for the monks of the middle ages as instruction or penance. The carelessness continues throughout, and the similarity tends to grow less, i.e., as the carelessness increases.
From a careful consideration of these facts in their relation to one another, it does not seem unlikely that this is a fragmentary copy of a much more perfect manuscript: perhaps the enforced labor of some monk who was learning Latin. This would account for the missing page, — perhaps carelessly misplaced, the sudden ending, and the ruthlessly abbreviated commentaries. In this case, it would seem to have been either a copy of the manuscript next to be discussed, or of one extremely similar.

Maihingen 635 seems to me to show unmistakable evidence of being, either the archetype of the Cologne edition, or a copy of it. It is highly probable that the editor, having decided to make a school book of Avianus, selected a manuscript used for this purpose, but started out to edit it with a certain degree of originality. Every point, not only of resemblance, but of difference as well, between the edition and the Maihingen manuscript bears out this theory.

In the first place, the Maihingen manuscript has no epistle, but like the Cologne edition, it has an introduction, containing a discussion of the reasons for studying fables, the various kinds, and Avianus especially. Both end with a moral: both have quotations, one of which in particular, a line from Horace, is given in both, but in the Cologne edition it is completed, that is, both lines of the couplet are given. This quotation is not found in any other manuscript, nor is there any similar introduction. A comparison of the two, with their parallel passages, follows:

**Edition of 1494.**

"Apologus Aviani."
A statement of the value of fables, illustrated by a quotation from Pindar.

"Fabularum duo esse genera decent veteres quam greci quam latini; alius de his rebus que neque vere ferent neque verisimiles." (Illustration from Plautus and quotation from Aristotle.) "Alius de his que sunt si non vere, tamen verisimiles, que fieri potuerunt." (Compara-

**Maihingen 635.**

"Apologus Aviani. — Rustica deflent parvo iuraverat olim ne taceat rabido lupo—Circa inicium Aviani. "Statement of the purpose of the fables, i.e. to teach morals: a comparison of virtue and knowledge with the mixed perfume of lilies and roses.

"Et fabula est que neque vera neque verisimilia continet, historia est res gesta cum narratur ut gesta est. " (followed by a quotation without any name.)

*This comes near the end of the manuscript introduction.*

*For discussion of this point see page 4.*
son with Plautus, and a quotation from Simonides.)

"At Horatuar inquit:

Aut prodesse volunt vel deceler tari poete
Aut simul et incunda et idonea dicere verba.

Quod Avianus, civis Romanus, Esopii imitator, attente revolens mente, quendam apologum artificiosissime in unum redigit ad preces nobilis Theodosii civis Romani." (The purpose of the fables, to direct men toward morality, is to be illustrated by inanimate objects and talking animals.)

"Quas qui diligenter inspexerit, inveniat sera locis ac ludis preposita."

"Aves, ollas, lapides, dumos, bestiarum atque plurimos greges loquentes inducit pro cuutuslibet fabule morale utilitate approbando."

"Quibus iuenibus magis paratur moralis philosophia via, quamquam Aresto, moralis noluerit discipline idoneos auditores esse iuvenes. Habetur itaque adolescentes ante oculus huius libelli exempla familiaria, quibus nixi cadere nequeant, quorum ductu per rectam gradiamtur viam, quorumque memoria facile incundiores sint et vita meliores. Vale.

"Talia tamen possumus probare per oraculum qui dicit aut prodesse volunt aut deletori poete."

"Dico autem quod Avianus composit hunc librum ad preces consuluum romani qui petivit cum compilare fabulas de moribus et virtutibus quare auctor sc. Avianus hesopum imitavit quia et incipit in hoc opere apologetos." (The purpose of the fables, to direct men toward morality, is to be illustrated by inanimate objects and talking animals.)

"Nam efficiens fuit avianus qui composit hunc librum de moribus et virtutibus non solum deliciis verum etiam propter graves utilitates que latent."

"Apologus est de brutis animalibus ad humani vite instructus formas et etiam dicit quidam sapientius fabulis sunt addendae sed non imitande, bene dicit addenda quod utilitas horum et providentia operum boni et mali comprehenduntur sub fabulis.)

"Autor semem singularis fabulis utilitates subiunctum ita postulavit ut optimae operis praesto pare paro iuvator." (End of Introduction.)
In the arrangement of these parallel passages, all of the introduction of the edition, in proper sequence, has been included, excepting a few passages whose content is explained by a parenthesis. The introduction of the manuscript, which is much longer, and in style rather confused and incoherent, has been quoted only in passages that show a likeness either in wording or in general content, these being placed parallel to the ones they resemble. The parts omitted consist of a confused repetition of practically the same ideas.

From these examples one may fairly argue that not only in the wording of many phrases and sentences, use of material, etc., but in the general purpose, there is a certain relationship. The printed introduction is, however, more compact and clear, and contains more quotations, by which the editor seems to have liked to display his own learning.

As stated above, the commentary of the first fable is not so close a parallel in manuscript and book as the later ones. The story and the Utilitas, while not agreeing word for word, are clearly related, having many of the same phrases, but the Allegoria, though not so conclusive an example as some of the others, is yet noteworthy. (See interlinear comparison on following page.)
FABULA I.

Ed. Allegoria sive misterium fabule predicte est quod

NS. Allegoria

per rusticam ecclesia intelligitur, per puorum peccator, per
per rusticam ecclesia intelligitur, per puorum peccator, per
lupum diabolus, sicut enim rustica iurabat puero quod vellet
lupum diabolus, sicut enim rustica iurabat puero quod vellet
ipsum dare lupo nisi taceret ita ecclesia minatur peccatorii
ipsum dare lupo nisi taceret ita ecclesia minatur peccatorii
quod velit ipsum dare lupo i. diabolo nisi recedat a peccatis.
quod velit ipsum dare diabolo nisi recedat a peccatis-

Hic est scienandum quod post finem eunus-

se. textus scripturis.

fabule semper sequuntur duo versus totam fabulam qua ad eius

utilitatem vel fructum experimenes quapropter pre ceteris plus

sunt memorie mendandi.

The last few lines, plainly an addition on the part
of the editor, recall the close of the manuscript introduction.
(Cf. above.) The words, "sive misterium fabule predicte" have
no parallel in any manuscript or edition. They are probably
the editor's own explanation of the word "allegoria."

To show the relation of text and glosses, the first
six lines of the first fable are appended in the same manner.
FABULA I.

Ustica deflenti puero iuraverat olim

Rustica deflenti parvo iuraverat olim

ni taceat rabido quod foret esca lupo

ni taceat rabido quod foret esca lupo,

credens multieris:

credulus hanc vocem lupus audit et manet ille

credulis hanc vocem lupus audit et manet ille

pervigil ante fores irrita vota gerens

pervigil ante fores irrita vota gerens,

nam lassata puere dat nimum membra quieti.
This example from the text, chosen at random, contains fully as many variations as any passage of equal length. The numbers appearing above the words of the manuscript were evidently placed there to assist the learners who used it as a text, not an uncommon device. One case in this passage shows the adoption of a gloss into the text. (line one, nucro.) The unusual gloss "villana" is found only in this edition and in the two manuscripts, Munich 18210 and Maibingen G35. In the text the word "ille" in line three, is unique, as this edition is the only place where it occurs.

The commentary of X is also especially interesting, because, while taken almost word for word from the manuscript, the three parts are transposed, the Utilitas serving as an introduction, without any heading: which by the way, is omitted after the first three or four fables, although the word "Allegoria" is regularly inserted. In the interlinear comparison, I have put the Utilitas in its customary order, but it will be observed that the first line is fuller than that of the manuscript, because in the edition it opens the commentary.

* * * * *
FABULA X.

Et hoc probat autor per quendam militem qui valde

quondam calvus miles valde

strenuus erat ad militaria opera, scilicet ad hastiludendum

et ad alia. Sed ille miles erat calvus et fecerat sibi quam-

ille feterat sibi quan-

dam mitram artificiosam splendentem crinibus quan-

dam mitram artificiosam splendentibus crinibus instructam quam

solebat die noctuque et omni tempore in capite habere et num-

solebat die noctuque et omne tempore in capite habere et num-

quam solitus est illam deponere. Sed ille miles quondam temp-

quam solitus est illam deponere, sed ille miles quodam tempore

ad campum nitidis suis arros veniebat ad torneamentum sive has-

ad campum nitidis suis arros veniebat a torneamentum sive has-

tiludium exercendum et cepit suum equum flectere faciliter cum

tiludium exercendum et cepit suum equum flectere faciliter cum

freno et boreas fuit sibi contrarius deponens eodem galeam in

freno et boreas fuit sibi contrarius et deposuit sibi galeam in
qua fuit quidam clavus in quo mitra illa dependebat itaque
qua erat quidam clavus       cui illa mitra erat alligata et
ventus              mitram cum galea deponebat et sic stetit
quam ventus militi mitra cum galea deposuit et sic
in medio hominum  denudatus et erat    ridiculus omnium
in medio illorum hominum denudatus stetit et ridiculus omnium
illorum circumstantium et cum miles hoc videret quod omnes
illorum hominum stetit et cum miles hoc videret quod omnes
astantes       cum deriserunt tunc admissuit iocosa verba dicens
ibis stantes   cum deriserunt         admissuit verba iocosa dicens
non ammiramini quod alligati crines sunt mihi per ventum amoti
non miremini quod alligati crines sunt mihi per ventum amoti
quod prius crines mei naturales dereliquerunt me et ita derisi-
qui prius crines mei naturales me dereliquerunt et ita deris-
one evasit.
one evasit enim non credas artificialia durare cum naturalia
non durent.

(Next comes the Utilitas of the fable, paralleled by the beginning of the text commentary.)
Sermo huius apologet est: quod quilibet derisione incidens Utilitas quilibet derisione aliorum
decet illam per verba locosa expellere. Ita quod quicum-
ique in risum alterius positus est non decet prop-
que in risum sive cachinnum aliorum est positus non decet prop-
terea contristari sed similibus verbis se excusare. Quod
terea contristari sed potius similibus verbis se excusare quia
de quanto aliquid magis irascitur, de tanto plus deridetur.
de quanto magis aliquid irascitur de tanto magis ab aliis de-
ridetur ergo per locum ridicula depellere debes nam qui vult

abesse risum provocat.

(Many such obscure lines as the last of this commentary in
the manuscript have apparently been purposely omitted by
the editor of the 1494 edition; Cf. part 1 of this comen-
tary. Next comes the Allegoria, which, in the edition,
follows the synopsis. In it, as in I, the editor has added
a conclusion of his own, carrying the simile out.)

Allegoria Per militem possimus intelligere christum, per ponu-
allegoria per calvum militem christus in cruce deridatus in-

iur iudicem intelligitur, quod christus derisus fuit a iudeis
intelligitur qui animas per suam passionem sibi subiugavit.
quanto amavit mitram i. coronam et victoriam in sacrae crucii
dicentibus illi si filius dei es descend de cruce.

* * * * * * *
The commentary upon fable XXXII, one from the last half of the book, illustrates sufficiently the fact that the Cologne edition becomes even more like the Waihingen manuscript toward the end.

Ed. Sententia fabule talis est quondam rusticus pellens

Quidam rusticus pellens
currum suum solito more venit in quandam aquam
currum suum solito more venit in quandam aquam sive paludem lu-
tosam in qua ille currum fixe stare permansit itaque boves cur-
tosam in qua ille currum fixe stare permansit itaque boves cur-
rum extrahere non poterant et rusticus iratus pre dolore in
rum extra-heres non potuerunt et rusticus iratus pre dolore se
terram se prostravit et deos superiores invocavit ut sibi in
in terram prostravit et deos superiores supplicavit ut sibi in
auxilium venirent sc. quod currum de luto extraherent et ipse suis
auxilium venirent sc. quod currum de luto extraherent et ipse suis

propriis viribus opus illud non fuit aggressus ideo totum
autem propriis viribus opus illud non fuit aggressus. ideo to-
frustra fuerat quod petiverat et cum inse rusticus

tum vanum et frustra fuerat quod petebat et cum inse rusticus
diu sic deos invocasset tandem ille summus deus scilicet tirricius
diu sic deos invocasset tandem ille summus deus scilicet tirricius
hoc est hercules, vocatus tirricius a monte in quo ut fabulose
vel mercurius vel alios hercules
scribitur Hercules natus est sive in quo coelebatur

ad eum dixit o fatue rustice putasne quod nos descendamus

ad eum dixit o tu fatue rustice putas tu quod nos descendamus

tibi in auxilium tu enim inaniter et frustra rogas. Accede tuos

tibi in auxilium tu enim inaniter et frustra rogas accede tuos

boves laborando et etiam manibus tuis iuva currum ad levandum rotas

boves et etiam manibus tuis iuva currum ad levandum rotas sic

sic postquam aggressus fueris illud opus propriis tuis viribus tunc

postquam aggressus fueris opus illud propriis tuis viribus tunc

invoca deos et tunc poteris consequi auxilium ab eis sic quod

invoca deos et poteris consequi auxilium ab eis sic quod

tu cum tuo curro evadere valebis.

tu cum tuo curro evadere valebis.

(In this fable, which is a fair example of most of them, the Utilitas follows immediately in both manuscript and edition.)

Utilitas non debemus temptare deum vanis et illicitis

Utilitas non debemus temptare deum vanis et illicitis temptati-

petitionibus scilicet pro re facili et vana auxilium implorando

onibus vel petitionibus scilicet pro re facili et vana auxilium
et tamen illud propriis manibus prius non aggrediendo implorando et tamen illud propriis manibus prius non aggrediendo deus namque tales faciles et inutiles petitiones non exaudit vel deus namque tales faciles et inutiles petitiones non exaudit vel advertit sed quicumque vult habere deum placabilem ut advertit sed quicumque vult habere deum placabilem videlicet ut sibi praestet auxilium ad aliquod opus compleendum ille primo sibi praestet auxilium ad aliquod opus compleendum ille prius aggrediatur illud opus suis laboribus tunc deus compatiens iuvabit aggrediatur illud opus suis viribus tunc compatiens deus iuvabit eum. Ergo nullus decet quidquam a deo petere nisi possit talem. ergo nullus decet quidquam a deo petere nisi possit in habere spem ut exaudiatur. Quicumque enim deum injuste illis bene exaudiri. quicumque enim (deum) inustet et illicite advocaverit ab eo non rationabiliter exaudiet et illicite deum advocaverit ab eo non rationalibiliter exaudietur. Allegoria per rusticum quilibet tabernarius vel etur. Allegoria per rusticum quilibet tabernarius vel homo voluptuosus intelligitur qui a deo petit salvari sed ieuin- homo voluptuosus intellectur qui a deo petit salvari sed ieuin- are sive elemosinam dare penitus recuset. Nec talis are sive elemosinam dare penitus recuset vel se excusat. Nec
aliquod opus meritorium percipere desiderat et in die do-
talis aliquod opus meritorium percipere desiderat et in die do-
minico talis petit sibi regnum dei appropinquare quod per suam
minico talis petit sibi regnum dei advenire quod per suam
pigriciam consequi non vult bene operando.
pigriciam consequi non poterit sed deus vult ut

tigiles et bonis operibus persistas.
As a comparison of text and glosses from the second half of the book I have chosen the first three and the last two lines of XXI, a fable which seems to show more variation in the glosses than any other, in spite of which fact it has unmistakable evidences of relationship.

Ed. Parvula progeniem terre mandaverat ales

MS. Parvula progeniem terre mandaverat ales

Qua stabat vididi cespite flava seges.

Qua stabat viride cespite flava seges,

Rusticus hanc fragili cupiens decerpere culmo

* * * * *
The two tables following give a comparison of the unusual readings in the text of the Cologne edition with those of the Maihingen manuscript, and the instances where glosses have been incorporated in the text.
TABLE I.
Containing Unusual Readings Agreeing With Maihingen 635
And Munich 18910, But With No Other Manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unusual Reading</th>
<th>MSS. Agreeing.</th>
<th>Common Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 15. seque</td>
<td>48 A. 43 A.</td>
<td>(omit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, 1. quenque</td>
<td></td>
<td>quenque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI, 5. que</td>
<td></td>
<td>quod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; , 9. vulpes</td>
<td></td>
<td>vulpis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 18. solum</td>
<td></td>
<td>sonum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 5. arva</td>
<td></td>
<td>auras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ridendumque</td>
<td></td>
<td>irridendumque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX, 13. ast</td>
<td></td>
<td>verum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. repetes</td>
<td></td>
<td>repetas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X, 7. micuit</td>
<td></td>
<td>rituit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI, 2. flumine</td>
<td></td>
<td>flumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. agebat</td>
<td></td>
<td>habebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. sive</td>
<td></td>
<td>seu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII, 3. aratrum</td>
<td></td>
<td>aratra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. seque</td>
<td></td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. cum</td>
<td></td>
<td>nunc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 9. nam</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 9. fasto</td>
<td></td>
<td>vasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. auras</td>
<td></td>
<td>austros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. nymbus</td>
<td></td>
<td>nimbus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I.
(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXII, 16, quondam</th>
<th>43 A. olim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 3, habere</td>
<td>&quot; haberi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 1, zeta</td>
<td>&quot; seta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 5, pullos (77)</td>
<td>&quot; nidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, e (omit)</td>
<td>&quot; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, extraneis</td>
<td>&quot; externis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII, 16, iuvat</td>
<td>&quot; vivat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII, 11, magna (77)</td>
<td>&quot; magni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 3, caperent</td>
<td>&quot; cuperent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV, 4, sibi</td>
<td>&quot; modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI, 3, te precor (77)</td>
<td>&quot; et prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, verbis rectis</td>
<td>&quot; rectis---verbis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII, 2, tenuem (77)</td>
<td>&quot; minimam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII, 4, defrenuisse</td>
<td>&quot; defrenuisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, ratone</td>
<td>&quot; ratione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX, 1, pruina</td>
<td>&quot; bruma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, inusum</td>
<td>&quot; in usum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, successeris</td>
<td>&quot; successerit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, geris</td>
<td>&quot; ferat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX, 2, momenta</td>
<td>&quot; monimenta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, verbo iustam</td>
<td>&quot; iustam verba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI, 7, tali</td>
<td>&quot; iusto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII, 1, liquerat</td>
<td>&quot; linquerat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innectens</td>
<td>&quot; et nexos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII, 1</td>
<td>quae (omit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>in nidis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>metuens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV, 10</td>
<td>humida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV, 13</td>
<td>moxque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV, 13</td>
<td>quoque (omit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI, 17</td>
<td>homine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>manet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIII, 3</td>
<td>desperctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>dabat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>affers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIX, 4</td>
<td>quicque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>reluctantem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trepidantibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLI, 14</td>
<td>victa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>facta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLII, 4</td>
<td>constitit (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>tibi subeunt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * * * *
TABLE II.
Showing Unusual Readings of the Cologne Edition
Agreeing With Gloses of Maihingen 635,(43A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unusual Reading</th>
<th>Gloss of 43 A.</th>
<th>Common Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 12, me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>(omit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 8 gressus</td>
<td>gressus</td>
<td>gradus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII, 1 femore</td>
<td>femore</td>
<td>vomere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 6 debiles</td>
<td>debiles</td>
<td>fragiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII, 5 extorquens</td>
<td>contorquens</td>
<td>contorquens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 15 stultum inquit est</td>
<td>stultum inquit est</td>
<td>miserum est inquit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII, 13 concessa</td>
<td>concessa</td>
<td>permissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV, 6 auri conqueritur</td>
<td>(auri in text, conqueritur in gloss.)</td>
<td>auri conqueritur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX, 18, sufflat</td>
<td>sufflat</td>
<td>reflat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII, 1, preciosa</td>
<td>preciosa</td>
<td>pretioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV, 14, subridens</td>
<td>deridens in se</td>
<td>tunc ridens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV, 3, eduxit</td>
<td>eduxit</td>
<td>educit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, reliquit</td>
<td>reliquit</td>
<td>remisit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII, 10, refert</td>
<td>offert</td>
<td>ferat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLII, 10 mactata</td>
<td>mactata</td>
<td>vittata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * * * * * *
TABLE III.

In this Table A Comparison Is Made of the Epimythia of the Cologne Edition With Mayningen 635 (43 A).

IV. 43 A has exactly the same, word for word.

V. " " " " " " "

VI. 43 A has no epimythia to this; the ones in the edition are the same as those of V, and have evidently been re-copied by mistake.

VIII. 43 A is exactly like.

X. " " " "

XI. In the edition there are two lines: the first is exactly the same as that of 43 A: the second line is quoted, showing the divergences.

1494. Namque fides illi cum parili melior est.

43 A. Nam brevis est illi cum meliora fides.

XII. The edition has "tibi vota tua" instead of "tua vota mihi" and "aliis" for "alii": otherwise the same.

XIII. Edition and manuscript are the same except for two slight differences of spelling.

XIV. The four lines of the edition are exactly like the first four of the manuscript, which, however, has two more lines, found nowhere else. They have no especial point, and were quite probably purposely omitted by the editor.
TABLE III.
(2)

XVII. Edition and manuscript are exactly alike; the lines in both, moreover, have an unusual order found nowhere else, 3,4,1,2.

XVIII. Edition and manuscript are alike except that the former has the spelling "damna", the latter "dampna".

XIX. 43 A has four lines, of which the last two are exactly like the two lines of the edition: the first two are a repetition of the epimythia of XVIII, and were evidently copied in by mistake, but were omitted by the editor of the edition.

XXI. Edition and manuscript are exactly alike, except that the manuscript has "quum" instead of "quando", but "quando" is written just above as a gloss.

XXIV. 43 A is the same, word for word.

XXV. 43 A is the same, except that it has "cum" for "dum".

XXVI. " " " " " "moneant" for "monuit".

XXVIII. Four lines, exactly alike.

XXIX. Two " " " 

XXXI. " " " " 

XXXVIII. Manuscript and edition are alike except that the latter has "si quam" for "quisquam".
XXXIX. Manuscript and edition are exactly alike, except that the former has "fati" instead of "causati", but it contains "causati" just above as a gloss.

The fables not here mentioned by number are those that have no glosses in either edition or manuscript.
CHAPTER IV.

The tables given above do not include the great majority of less striking variations, where four or more manuscripts agree with the edition, but in all these cases the Maihingen manuscript is consistently parallel. This reduces the points of dissimilarity to a small number, divided between words very evidently misunderstood or misspelled, and places where the editor seemingly tried to emend. In most of these instances no manuscript agrees, which makes it appear improbable that any other was used for purposes of reference. Examples of the first class are: IV, 7, "impulsi" for "impulsis", (probably an oversight) V, 1, "des" for "decei". The abbreviation of decei used in the manuscript greatly resembles des; the same mistake occurs again in the last line of XXVIII. Examples of the second are: "ede" for "dic quod", in XVII, 11, a reading which is found nowhere else, and which is apparently an attempt to improve the metre.

The small number of variations, (less than twenty in the entire forty-two fables) between the text of the edition and manuscript 43 A, considering the difficulty of reading the manuscript, its frequent abbreviations, contractions, etc., seems negligible, when compared with the consistent agreement of glosses, commentary and text.

The Edition of 1494 is, then, as proven above, so similar to the Maihingen manuscript, that it loses all special value for the criticism of Avianus, being a more or less accurate copy of a late manuscript now extant, or of one very closely related to it. Even the variations are not of particular importance, since they belong to one of two classes: first, those due to the editor's misreading of the text, and second, those in which he made an attempt at improvement. The main interest of the text, therefore, lies in the fact that it is a typical school-book of the fifteenth century.
SECTION II.

THE STAINHOEWEL EDITION OF AVIANUS.
CHAPTER I.
DESCRIPTION OF THE STAINHOEWEL EDITION.*

One of the most celebrated editions of Avianus, and undoubtedly the earliest, although it is incomplete, is that contained in Stainhöwel's Aesop; the first edition of this, which has since been the basis of numerous reprints, was edited by Dr. Heinrich Stainhöwel, as appears from the first part of the introduction, which follows:

"Das leben des hochberühmten Fabeldichters Esopi usz
kriechischer zungen in latin durch Rimicum gemacht an
den hochwürdigen vatter, herren Anthonium des titels
sancti Chrysogeni priestern cardinaln und fürbas das selb
leben Esopi mit synen fabeln die etwan Romulus von Athen-
is synem sun Thiberino usz kriechischer zungen in latin
gebracht, hat gesendet, und mer etlich der fabel Aviani,
auch Doligami, Aldefonsii und schirmdreden Poggii und
anderer; ietliche mit ierem titel ob verzeichnet usz
latin von doctore Mainrico Stainhöwel schlecht und ver-
stentlich getütscht,nit wort usz wort sunder syn usz
syn----usw."

The place of printing is established by the following
colophon at the end of the book:

"Geendet seliglich von Johanne Zeiner zuo Ulm."

*In this description I have employed, not the original edition which is very rare, but H. Oesterley's Reprint, made for the Literarischer Verein, Stuttgart, Tübingen, 1872, Vol. CXVII.
The date of the edition is not given, but it can be definitely placed between 1474 and 1482. It cannot have appeared before the first named date, because in that year is dated the first Latin translation of Aesop by Rimieux, on which it was based. (Cf. quotation above). In 1482, however, a dated reprint of the Latin text by Gerard Leeu appeared. At approximately the same time as this edition, Zeiner also published the Latin and German texts separately, and it was evidently from this that Leeu made his copy. Moreover, dated French manuscripts and dated French and English translations had already been published in 1484, which would indicate that the Stainhöwel work must have attained a fairly wide circulation before this time. In view of these facts, it seems most likely that the Stainhöwel edition had appeared not later than 1480.

The book, which is a small one, is, according to Hervieux, composed of 288 leaves. However, in the Oesterley reprint, where the page numbers are inserted in brackets, 277 b is the last page. Having no means of access to the original, I have no way of explaining this variation, but a comparison of Hervieux's statements with the numbering of the reprint, shows that the two agree up to the point of the fables of Avianus. In this place the table of contents is placed at the end of the fables, instead of at the beginning, as in the previous books. Hervieux evidently takes no account of this fact, numbering as though the index were at the beginning: from here the divergence increases. This, taken with the fact that Hervieux is notably careless in such details, seems to indicate that it was an oversight on his part; this is the more likely, as he expressly states that the pages are not numbered in the original, but are divided into twenty-nine quires, likewise unnumbered, and not all containing the same number of pages. The first twenty-six each have ten, the twenty-seventh, twelve, the twenty-eighth, six, and the twenty-ninth, ten.

The edition is printed in large Gothic type, which will not permit more than thirty three or thirty four lines on a page, and more commonly has only thirty or thirty one. There are many woodcuts, of which the first, occupying the whole second page of the first leaf, is intended as a full length portrait of Aesop.

First comes the German introduction mentioned in the quotation given above, occupying a little more than a page: then a life of Aesop in Latin followed by the German translation, a prologue, and six books of the fables of Aesop. Next come those of Avianus, occupying 143 b to 226 a. (According to Oesterley). At the beginning are simply the words "Aviani Fabule Sequuntur". Each fable is followed by a free translation, as is the practice.

* See L. Hervieux, Les Fabulistes Latins; Ed.?, Vol. I, pp.121 ff., Vol. III, pp.133 ff., for all the following, unless otherwise stated.
elsewhere in the book. At the close are the words, "Fabularum Aviani Finis. Sequitur Registrum Earundem." with the names and numbers of the twenty seven fables.
CHAPTER II.
DISCUSSION OF THE SELECTION OF THE FABLES.

The first noteworthy fact about the Stainhöwel edition of Avianus, is that only twenty seven fables are included. One would be inclined to the opinion that the book had been copied from an imperfect manuscript containing this number: however, only one of the entire collection available—about seventy—has twenty seven, and they are in regular order, beginning with the first, while the Stainhöwel collection is selected, commencing with the first, and including the forty second. The idea of a voluntary choice is supported by the statement in the introduction, "und mer etlich der fabel Aviani." As he speaks of "some of the fables" he must have been familiar with, and therefore have had access to, the entire collection.

In this case, the question arises, why were these especial ones chose? There was certainly no intention of keeping a definite relation between the numbers in the various parts, since the first four contain twenty, the next two, seventeen, and the book after Avianus, twenty three. Neither is there any regularity in selection or omission. The fables not used are: 4, 10, 12, 16, 21, 23, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40.

The selection, then, seems to have been arbitrary, depending perhaps on the ones which the editor considered most interesting. No particular kind or class is preferred or rejected; although one might fairly say that the ones left out are the commonest and best known. (De Vento et Sole, De Calvo Equite, etc.) This edition was clearly different in purpose from that of 1494. While the latter was intended as a school book, the former is for entertainment—for profitable or amusing reading, but not for instruction. This point is emphasized by the omission of all glosses, and commentaries, as well as by the translation into the vulgar tongue. Then too, no emphasis is laid on the morals contained in the epimythia, and in some divisions of the book, the schimpfreden, for example, the character of the stories shows that moral instruction was the last object in view.

There is no proof that the manuscript original did not have all the paraphernalia of a school text, however; on the other hand, it probably did have, since almost all the German manuscripts were of this kind, and since it seems to show traces of the glosses from one manuscript in particular.

* Cf. Chapter V, below.
CHAPTER III.

T I T L E S.

The titles in this edition are not distinctive, and have no relation with those of any of the manuscripts collated. The only one with which the book agrees more than twice is 28, which has the titles written in by a much later hand; the agreement being consequently of no value. It is significant, also, that at the beginning of V are repeated the same epimythia with which IV ends: which would indicate that a manuscript without titles had been used.

CHAPTER IV.

EPIMYTHIA.

The epimythia agree in every case with those of the Maihingen manuscript, (43 A), except for slight differences in spelling and word order. My attention was first directed to this by the noticeable likeness between this edition and that of 1494. As there could be no question of either one having exerted any influence, direct or indirect, on the other, there remained only one possibility, that they might have been derived from the same, or from related sources. The comparison of the epimythia of this edition with those of the Maihingen manuscript confirmed this surmise. Moreover, a careful examination of the peculiar readings throughout gives rather surprising results; the majority agree exactly, a number of others are like the glosses written above the word in the manuscript, and others are easily accounted for by misreading or a change of spelling on the part of the editor.

On the whole, it would seem not unfair to risk the assertion that the Stainhöwel edition of Avianus was prepared, either from the Maihingen manuscript, or from one not now available, but very closely related. However, the fact that certain variations do occur, as well as the absence of glosses, commentaries, introduction, etc., by means of which a more conclusive identification could be made, render it impossible to establish this relationship as firmly as in the case of the Cologne edition. That it belongs to the Tegernsee group is certain.
CHAPTER V.

TABLE OF UNUSUAL READINGS.

The following table shows only the more important readings; those where a number of manuscripts agree have not been given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unusual Readings</th>
<th>MSS. Agreeing</th>
<th>Common Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,13, predam</td>
<td>* 8.51</td>
<td>43 A² Praeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,8, est (omit)</td>
<td>* 6, 12, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, feroci</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* fero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab ungue</td>
<td>* 18 A</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, veberetur</td>
<td>* 3,</td>
<td>* moveretur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astris</td>
<td>* 7,</td>
<td>* auras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, quicunque</td>
<td>* 9,</td>
<td>* quicunque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, fert</td>
<td>* 31,</td>
<td>* dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,5, non</td>
<td>* 3, 6, 54</td>
<td>* ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transversa</td>
<td>* 6, 12, 16, 69,</td>
<td>* transverso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, monstrante</td>
<td>* 7,18, 48 A</td>
<td>* monstrantem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certius</td>
<td>* 30,54,</td>
<td>* certior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, est (omit)</td>
<td>* 2,12, 56,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI,9, vulpes</td>
<td>* 54, 48 A</td>
<td>* vulpis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII,9, trepidantia</td>
<td></td>
<td>* crepitantia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, solum</td>
<td>* 3, 77,</td>
<td>* sonum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII,5, arva</td>
<td></td>
<td>* auras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX,6, prevenit</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* convenit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX,11</td>
<td>cupiens prædam</td>
<td>30,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ast</td>
<td>14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI,6</td>
<td>agebat</td>
<td>1,57,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV,10</td>
<td>et in risum</td>
<td>(evident mistake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV,1</td>
<td>Traiciam</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iunonius</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII,15</td>
<td>quondam</td>
<td>3,77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII,1</td>
<td>iumentis</td>
<td>3,6,12,72,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>1,2,6,12,15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX,8</td>
<td>suspensum</td>
<td>77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>velum</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX,3</td>
<td>captum superas</td>
<td>1,3,77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>pastus per</td>
<td>14,24,28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caerula</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII,4</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>5,8,19,35,77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV,3</td>
<td>abortis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI,3</td>
<td>te precor</td>
<td>77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>virencia</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>verbis rectis</td>
<td>54,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII,2</td>
<td>tenucm</td>
<td>77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII,11</td>
<td>versam</td>
<td>3,57,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX,21</td>
<td>successeris</td>
<td>77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI,5</td>
<td>nimium</td>
<td>77,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>tale</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>membris</td>
<td>12,16,24,56,77,&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XXXIII, 1, quondam * 10, 13, 24, 28, 43 A * cuidam *
2, in nidis * 1, 77, * * nidis *
5, metuens * * spectans *
evanescre * 8ev. * * vanescere *
12, ille * 25, 34, 72, 77, * * inde *
XXXV, 3, namque * 9, 65, * * namque *
eduxit * (43 A in gloss) * * educit *
7, et * 3, 5, 33, 69, * * (omitted) *
13, moxque * 66, * * mox quoque *
XLI, 9, giro voluta * 8ev. * * gyro volupta *
14, ficta * 1, * * victa, facta, etc. *
18, facta * 14, 32, 59, 60, * * fata *
XLII, 4, constitit * 1, 3, 9, 11, 77, * * astitit *
8, immeritamque * 1, 3, 34, 51, * * immitti aere *
10, mactata * (43 A in gloss) * * vittata. *
CHAPTER VI.
INTERLINEAR COMPARISON.
FABLE XXXV.

Forte lupum melior cursu deluserat edus.
Forte lupum melior cursu deluserat hedus

Proxima vicinis dum petit arva casis.
proxima vicinus dum petit arva casis

Inde fugam recto tendens in menia cursu,
inde fugam recto tendens in menia cursu,

Inter lanigeras constitit ille greges.
inter lanigeras constitit ille greges.

Impiger hunc raptor mediumque secutus in urbe,
impius hunc raptor mediumque secutus in urbe,

Temptat compositis sollicitare dolis.
temptat compositis sollicitare dolis,

Nonne vides, inquit, cunctis ut victima templis
nonne vides inquit cunctis ut victima templis

Immeritam seva morte cruentat humum?
immeritam seva morte cruentat humum.

Quod si securo valeas te reddere campo,
quod si securo valeas te reddere campo
Heu mihi, mactata tu quoque fronte cades.

mactata, (g1)  
heu mihi victata tu quoque fronte cades

Ille refert, tu modo quam metuis, precor, exue curam,

   tu

Ille refert modo quam metuis precor exue curam,

Et tecum viles, improbe tolle minas.

et tecum viles improbe tolle minas.

Namque malo sacrum divis sudisse cruorem,

namque malo sacrum divis sudisse cruorem

Quam rabido fauces exsaturare lupo,

quam rabido fauces exsaturare lupo.

Epi. * Sic quotiens duplici subeunt tristissima casu,

sic quotiens subeunt duplici tristissima casu

Expedit insignem promeruisse necem.

expedit insignem promeruisse necem.

*  *  *  *  *

Fable XXXV was chosen for this interlinear comparison of Stainbőwel's edition with the Maihingen manuscript for several reasons: it contains several very unusual readings, which are underlined, two cases of agreement with a gloss, and one or two representative cases of variation, besides showing the general agreement in text, which cannot be illustrated in a table like that of the preceding chapter, where only the most essential variations are noted.
CHAPTER VII.

VALUE OF THIS EDITION.

The Stainhöwel Avianus, the first edition published, was soon after its appearance, the basis for numerous copies and translations, and was apparently very popular: still, it must have been quickly forgotten, since, only eighty years later, when Cujas, an expert in such matters, was preparing his edition, he was under the impression that Avianus had never been published. *

Both this edition, and that of 1494, had evidently so far disappeared from circulation, that a man of letters, investigating the subject, knew nothing of either. Later, it became more widely known than before and has been ever since the source of numerous reprints and editions.

Its readings, however, are not of much critical value, since it comes from a late source whose text variations seem due mainly to mistakes, or peculiarities of spelling common to the period.

* Cf. letter of Cujas, quoted by Berriéoux St.-Prix, given in Hervieux III, P.383, Editions of Avianus, under the year 1570.

† See discussion at end of I, III.
SECTION III.

THE LYONS EDITION OF AVIANUS OF 1570.
CHAPTER I.

DESCRIPTION OF THE 1570 EDITION.

The 1570 edition of Avianus might also, in a certain sense, be called an editio princeps; for, while it was published almost ninety years after Stainhöwel’s Aesop, and seventy six years after the Cologne edition, Cujas, the editor had no knowledge, according to his own statement, of either. In a letter having neither address nor date, quoted by Hervieux from Berriat Saint-Prix in the Bibliographie de France,* in the volume for 1830, pages 93-94, Cujas writes:

"Quand j'étais dernièrement à Lyon, je baillai un Avianus des fables d’Esopo au sire Jehan de Tournes, qui est un auteur fort ancien et gentil, et qui n'avait encore été imprimé, pour le remettre en lumiere."

Berriat Saint-Prix has carefully identified this letter as one written by Cujas to a friend and pupil, Pithou, in December, 1570. This edition is a small 16-mo book, clearly and beautifully printed, carefully capitalized and punctuated, containing, however, a good many of the more common abbreviations, such as & for et, a line above a vowel to indicate m, etc. Another difference between this and the two German editions is the fact that an attempt at correct, consistent spelling has been made, and critical judgment has been exercised. In short, it shows a more modern spirit.

The title is: "Aesopi Phrygis Fabulae elegantissimis eiconibus veras animalium species ad vivum adumbrantes. / Gabriae Graeci fabellae XXXIII/ Batrachomyomachia Homerii, hoc est, ranarum et murium pugna. / Galeomyomachia, hoc est,

Below this is the printer's mark, two snakes entwined to form a double circle, within which is inclosed the motto:

"Quod tibi/ fieri non/ vis alteri/ ne feceris."

Below this appears: "Lugduni/ apud Joannem Tornaesium/ typogr. regium./ MDLXX." *

The book consists of 416 pages, the fables of Avianus occupying pages 383 to 410, and an index of the whole book the last six.

At the top of page 383 appears the word, "LECTORI S"

The preface speaks of the fact that Avienus, (so the name is consistently spelled) was known to Servius and St. Jerome, with a discussion of the different classes of fables, and a plea to the readers to judge fairly the merits of the following work. The rest of the preface or introduction, which is significant as throwing some light on the origin of the book, and the method of editing it, is quoted below in full.

"Et has quidem nunc primi edimus, cupimusque ut operam nostram in his fabulis restituendis lectores acquis bene-que consulant. Quos et hoc admonitos velim, has olim quidem a Gregorio Gyraldo esse lectas, is enim in suis libris quandam particulam praefationis adsept; ab eo autem aut alio quoris non esse editas: # hac de causa,

* For the above details, see Hervieux, ibid. III, 123 ff. For the remainder of the description I have used a photograph of the copy in the British Museum, (G 7712) belonging to Dr. Oldfather.

ut credimus, quod nacti non essent satis emendatum exemplar: nos feliciores qui nacti fuimus tria exemplaria quae simul Avienum nobis integrum et quam emendatum exhibuerunt."

The first point to be noted is, that in two places in this preface, and one in the title, the statement is emphatically repeated, which was made in the letter quoted above. This not only adds a link to the chain of evidence connecting the writer of the letter with the editor of Avianus, but makes clear his purpose in publishing an author whom he believed to be entirely unknown and inaccessible to the public. This purpose has its basis in the Renaissance idea of restoring to circulation the fragments of ancient literature buried during the Middle Ages, and that too, in correct and emended form. This point is further emphasized by his statement that he has used three originals in preparing the text, that these furnish it in emended form, and his surmise that it had not previously been published for the lack of just such material.

The critical care with which Cujas conducted his work is admirably illustrated by another letter, quoted from the same source as the first, in which, however, both date and address are given. It is written in Cujas' own hand to Pithou, to whom he had in the previous letter promised a copy of the fables, on January twentieth, 1571, evidently as an accompaniment of the gift. In it he mentions specifically a number of mistakes in the edition, most notable of which is that two verses at the end of VI should be the opening of VII. These corrections, however, were never made, for in all the subsequent reprints of the edition, the same mistakes occur.

On page 384 is the epistle to Theodosius, with the words: "AVIENUS THEODOSTO" at the top. The insertion of this letter, and the unusual spelling "Avienus", both indicate that the edition was derived from early manuscripts. The careful use of the diphthongs ae, oe, etc., would also tend to support this view: since all these are characteristic of the older manuscripts as distinguished from the later ones. There is one inconsistency: for example, "haec" is printed in three ways, with the vowels joined,

* v. Ibid. Vol. DCC, No. 3.
with a cedilla underneath the e, and with the four letters separate. Sometimes an abbreviation is used in one line, while the same word is written out in the next. These differences may be attributed to the printer.

On page 385, below an ornamental band design, is the title:

"AESOPI PVRYGIS FABULAE XLII/ AB AVIENO ELEG0/ carmine conscriptae."

The fables themselves have the titles printed in small capitals, the size of those in the second line of the title, (those in the first line being about twice as large). They have an arachic numeral on the right, just at the edge of the margin. A heavy line is drawn below each fable. Not only are the pages numbered, but also the first five or six leaves of each quire, thus: B, B2, B3, etc., at the bottom of the right hand page. In the outer corner of each page is also printed the first syllable appearing on the next page. The running title appearing at the top is: "AVIENI/ FABULAE."

Unlike the two German editions previously described, there is no effort here to crowd the material into as little space as possible, but rather to give symmetry and beauty to the book. There are no glosses, notes, or commentaries of any kind. Large, clear type is used, with several different sizes of capitals, although the preface and epistle are printed in much smaller italic script. At the end is the word "FINIS", written in capitals of the same size as those in the titles. On the next page begins the index. The whole book shows evidence of careful preparation in every particular. Copies are preserved at the British Museum, at Paris, Oxford, Basel, and Ferrara.
CHAPTER II

DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE ARCHETYPES.

By comparison of the text of this edition with the collations previously employed, it becomes evident that it has a resemblance to all the older manuscripts, from the IX, X, and XI centuries. In fact, these differ from one another much less than the later ones; the following, however, are the only ones showing sufficient likeness to justify the idea of an immediate relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Manuscript/Location</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dijon 497</td>
<td>XIII S.</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Paris 5570</td>
<td>IX/X S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>&quot; 8093</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>&quot; 13026</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Karlsruhe LXIII</td>
<td>X S</td>
<td>1-29 inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Leyden, Voss.L.Q.86</td>
<td>IX S.</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vienna, CCCVI(3261)</td>
<td>XVI S.</td>
<td>Epistle only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are none of the spurious epimythia in any of the above mentioned manuscripts, such as appear in the editions of Cologne and Ulm, in which point the 1570 edition agrees with them. This is conclusive proof that none of the newer manuscripts were used, for Cujas would have either printed or mentioned them.

We know from the preface that three manuscripts were used. It is much more difficult to give any definite and conclusive proof, where more than one original has been employed. Then too, there is always the possibility that one or more of them have since disappeared. Besides this, the editor has undoubtedly endeavored to correct and systematize the spelling, and to improve on his originals where he considered them faulty. Since peculiar spellings and mistakes are the easiest clues for identifying such a relation, the emendation adds another element of doubt. Also, there is no way of telling just how the three were used, and whether any one was preferred to the others. It is, however, possible to prove with a fair degree of certainty that some of the manuscripts mentioned above were not among the three used.

For example, Paris 13026 was probably not used, as it comes from the monastery of St. Germain de Prés, and seems never to have left Paris. The same holds for Karlsruhe LXIII, which was written at Reichenau, and probably was never outside Germany.
Any of the others, so far as we can tell, might have been used, except Vienna CCCVI, although its archetype, since lost, was almost certainly in the hands of Cujas, as will be shown below.
CHAPTER III.

ELIMINATION OF THOSE EVIDENTLY NOT USED.

The Karlsruhe manuscript is not complete, lacking the last thirteen fables. It is, moreover, so badly preserved that the words along the edges and in many other places are entirely illegible. It very closely resembles 32, and probably came from the same source, but has more mistakes and unusual spellings. It usually agrees with the edition in the same places as 32, but does not resemble it so closely on the whole. * On internal evidence alone, it seems least likely to have been one of the three used by Cujas.

No. 27, Paris 5570, is hard to read, has numerous glosses, in the same, and in a second hand, many holes, blots, etc. The epistle does not agree with that of the 1570 edition in any of the unusual readings. The title is in capitals, apparently by the same hand, on a line left for it. Both in this, and in the one at the bottom of the same page, the spelling "Avianus" is used. It does not seem probable that this spelling occurred in any manuscript Cujas saw, because as we have observed, he was of a careful and scholarly turn of mind, yet he shows no hesitation in writing the name "Avienus", both in the book, and in his letters to Pithou, in which he discusses various critical points. There is a distinct likeness between the text and that of the edition, but it is not consistent enough to prove any relation, as at least a third of the unusual readings are different.

No. 29, Paris 8093, is very much like 27, agreeing in almost all the important variations. It has the epistle, but does not coincide with more than half the readings of the 1570 edition. Space is left between the fables for titles, which are, however, sometimes omitted, as for instance in the case of fable number 1. The second and third have their titles in large capitals, but the rest are written in the same size as the text, and by the same hand, with Roman numerals on the left. In some places the manuscript is so badly faded that it cannot possibly be deciphered. There is no note at the end, but some indistinguishable writing, apparently prose, follows. While it would appear more likely that

* For this I have used Holder's collation in Philologus, Vol. 65 for 1906, pp. 91-96.
this manuscript had been used, than the very similar 27, neither is sufficiently similar to warrant such an assumption. (See tables of readings given below.)

No. 26, Dijon 497, is written in a fine and beautiful hand, ornamented with elegant capitals, is complete, and easy to read. After the epistle, and before the fables, is the title, "Avianus". This and the titles to the separate fables are written in the same hand as the text, but in a different color of ink. The epistle has one reading, "doceat" for "deceat", agreeing with the edition, and shown by no other manuscript. With this exception, it does not agree so closely with the text as 27 and 29, although it has many of the more ordinary variations, where 29, 27, 32, 42, and 59 are also in agreement. Three facts, then, seem to point against its having been one of the originals; the word "Avianus", the titles, and the lack of a sufficiently close agreement in the text. It is easier to believe that "doceat" is a correction of the editor of the edition, or derived from some source now lost, than that this manuscript should have been used by Cujas.

No. 32, Paris 12026, might possibly have been one of the originals, if it ever strayed from its home in Paris. It has the epistle, differing in some details, to be sure, but very similar. There are numerous evidences that it was written by a rather ignorant person, as there are many words wrongly divided or joined, "cumutro quolitterarum", and "ub" for "ubi". The text conforms to that of the edition rather closely. There are many abbreviations, but most are easily intelligible. The title, "Festus Lavienus Fabulae", corrected to "Festi Lavici Fabulae", is written in a much later hand. There are no titles. *

As will be seen by reference to Table II below, 32 has most of the test readings. The fact that the manuscript is not consistent in spelling, and has many mistakes due to ignorance, accounts for the majority of the differences. It seems likely that either this manuscript, or more probably one most closely related to it, was used by Cujas in preparing his edition.

Manuscript No. 6 is a fragment containing only the epistle, copied by the Renaissance scholar Sannazarius from some manuscript.

* A list of the distinctive readings of the epistle, and the agreement of the manuscripts under discussion, is given in a table at the end. The agreement of the text is indicated in Table II, q.v.
which is not now extant. We know almost certainly that Sannazarius actually copied this from an old manuscript at Lyons, along with other fragments he collected during his stay in France between the years 1501 and 1504. He copied nothing but the epistle, but the archetype, which was probably complete, doubtless remained at Lyons, and from every available evidence, must have been used by Cuias. The fragment has before the epistle, the heading, "AVIENUS THEODOSIUS PIERIUS", which is exactly that of the edition, and otherwise it is a close parallel. For this reason it seems highly possible that Cuias used its original. It is impossible that he used the fragment itself, because he speaks of the three originals as though each were entire—"quae simul Avienum integre—exhibuerunt."—, and in any case Sannazarius must have taken his own copy with him when he returned to Italy.

Cuias mentions, too, it will be remembered, a fragment of the preface published by Gregorius Gyraldus in some book. This book must certainly have been the "Historia Poetarum" mentioned in a note at the bottom of page 46, since this is the only work of a similar nature written by Gyraldus. Since this was published in 1545, it may have contained a part of the identical preface copied by Sannazarius; that it was familiar to Cuias we know from his own statement.

The Leyden manuscript gives more definite evidence of having been one of the prototypes of this edition than any other now extant. It is one of the oldest, dating certainly from the ninth century. It is written in a fine, but easily legible hand, in two columns. The text is much compressed, leaving a wide margin on the left side and bottom of the page, as though for a commentary. The lines drawn on the parchment, with pricks at the ends where the compass was placed, are clearly visible. There is abundant evidence that the writer was somewhat ignorant, from numerous mistakes of grammar, spelling, and word division. There are some corrections by the first hand, and others in a different hand of about the same period, much resembling the other, but written in darker ink. This admirably fits Cuias' description, as it is entire, and gives the text in a fairly correct state.

At the end of the fables a line is drawn, with some prose following. There is no mention of the author's name. There are no titles, nor is any space left for them: The separate fables are distinguished by a large capital letter at the beginning of each. However, at the first line of VIII there is no such division, the

* Sandys, History of Classical Scholarship, Ed.2, np. 90 and 35.
first line beginning with a small capital like the others. As VI and VII are written so closely together, there is no possible way of distinguishing them except by careful reading, or by comparison with another manuscript. The moral of VII, moreover, comes at the first instead of at the last, as in the majority, so that the mistake of connecting these lines with the fable preceding is all the more natural. This point is significant, because it is precisely this sort of error, occurring in the edition of 1570, which Cujas corrected in his letter to Pithou, in regard to exactly the same two fables. It is therefore practically certain that Cujas made his copy which he sent to the printer, directly from this very manuscript, and himself made a mistake in dividing in dividing up the verses correctly between fables VI and VII.

The absence of titles, or spaces for them, both in 59 and 32, is significant from another point of view. There is little doubt that Cujas originated his own titles, as they differ entirely from those of any other manuscript. In the first place, they are all in the nominative case instead of the ablative; second, they are consistently brief and terse. As they bear resemblance to no known manuscript, it is the more likely that they were taken from originals having no titles.

The text of 59 parallels that of the edition very closely, the most marked differences occurring in the epistle, quoted in an interlinear comparison at the end of this chapter. The corrections have in some cases been adopted; less frequently, they have been overlooked or discarded, and the original reading taken. A comparison follows, (Table III) in which the agreement of 32 is also noted. Where all the other manuscripts discussed above have the same text, the words "et al." have been added. In a few cases, certain later manuscripts have the same reading, but no mention of them is made. For the sake of brevity, the first fifteen fables are compared, but the others agree just as consistently.
CHAPTER IV.
TABLES FOR TEXT COMPARISON.

TABLE I.
COMPARISON OF THE EPISTLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reading of Edition</th>
<th>MSS. Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>doceat</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>graeca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>latinitate</td>
<td>26, 27, 29, 32, 42, 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Delphici Apollinis</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>in se</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iocorum</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ergo</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>edidi</td>
<td>&quot;(in gloss) &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>sollicitudines</td>
<td>32, 42, 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>agnoscas</td>
<td>ornes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vero</td>
<td>fere ornes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *
TABLE II.
Interlinear Comparison of the Epistle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1570.</th>
<th>AVIENUS THEODOSIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Avienus Theodosio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dubitanti mihi, Theodosi, optime, quonam literarum titulo

Dubitanti mihi Theodosi optime quo nam literarum titulo
(dubitanti)
Dictanti (mihi) theodosi op(ti)me quo(na)modo titulorum titulo

nostri nominis memoriam mandaremus, fabularum textus occurrit,
nostri nominis memoriam mandaremus, fabularum textus occurrit
(nostri) nominis memoriam mandaremus, fabularum textus occur(re)-

quod in his urbane concepta falsitas docet, et non incum-

quod in iis urbane concepta falsitas docet et ne incubet
runt quod in his urbane concepta falsitas docet et non incum-
necessitas veritatis. Nam quis tecum de oratione, quis de
necessitas veritatis. Nam quis tecum de oratione, quis de
bat necessitas veritatis nam quis tecum de oratione quis de

poemate loqueretur: cum in utroque literarum genere et Atticos
poemate loqueretur cum in utroque literarum genere et atticos
poemate loqueretur cum in utroque litterarum genere et atticos

graeca eruditione superes, et latinitate Romanos? Huius ego ma-
greca eruditione superes et latina romanos? Huius ergo ma-
greca eruditione superes et latinitate romanos (?) Huius ergo ma-

teriae ducem nobis Aesopum noveris, qui responso Delphici Apol-
teriae ducem nobis Aesopum noveris, qui responso Delphici Apol-
teriae (esse) ducem aescopum noveris qui responso delfici apol-

linis monitus ridicula orsus est ut legenda firmaret. Verum has
linis monitus ridicula orsus est ut legenda firmaret. Verum has
linis monitus ridicula orsus est ut legenda _ _ verum has
pro exemplo fabulas et Socrates divinis operibus indidit, et
pro exemplo fabulas et Socrates divinis operibus indidit et
pro exemplum fabulas et socrates divinis operibus indidit et
poemati suo Flaccus aptavit, quod in se sub iocorum communium
poemati suo Flaccus aptavit. Quod inde sub iocorum communium
poemati suo Flaccus aptavit quod in se sub iocorum communium
specie vitae argumenta contincant, quas graecis iambis Babrias
specie vitae argumenta contincant. Quas graecis iambis Babrias
specie vitae argumenta contincant, quas grecis iambis Babrius
repetens in duo volumina coartavit. Phaedrus etiam partem ali-
repetens in duo volumina coartavit. Phaedrus etiam partem ali-
repetens in duo volumina coartavit phaedus etiam partem ali-
quam quinque in libellos resoluit. De his ergo ad quadraginta
quam quinque in libellos resoluit. De his ergo ad quadraginta
quam quinque in libellos resoluit. De his ergo ad V LII
et duas in unum redactas, fabulas edidi, quas rudi latinitate
et duas in unum redactas fabulas dedi quas rudi latinitate

in unum redactas fabulas dedi(di) quas rudi latinitate

compositas elegis sum explicare conatus. Habes ergo opus quo
compositas elegis sum explicare conatus. Habes ergo opus quo
compositas elegis sum explicare conatus. Habes ergo opus quo

animum oblectes, ingeniun exercesas, sollicitudines leves, totumq:
animum oblectes ingenium exerceas sollicitudines leves totumque
animum oblect(e)s ingenium exerceas sollicitudines leves totum:

vivendi ordinem cautus agnoscas. Loqui vero arbores, seras cum
vivendi ordinem cautus agnoscas. Loqui vero arbores seras cum
vivendi ordinem cautus agnoscas. Loqui vero arbores seras cum

hominibus gemere, verbis certare volucres, animalia ridere fecimus,
hominibus gemere verbis certare volucres animalia ridere fecimus
hominibus gemere verbis certare volucres animalia ridere fecimus
ut pro singulorum necessitatibus vel ab ipsis animis sententia
ut pro singulorum necessitatibus vel ab ipsis animis sententia
ut pro singulorum necessitatibus vel ab ipsis animis sententia

proferatur. Aesop.
proferatur.
proferatur,*

* All words or letters enclosed in parentheses are glosses or corrections.
TABLE III.

In this table all the unusual readings are given, even where no manuscript agrees. The epistle is not included. For it see Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reading.</th>
<th>MSS. Agreeing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I,3</td>
<td>audiit</td>
<td>59 in correction. 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nimiae</td>
<td>59 et al. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>famis</td>
<td>&quot; 32,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>sylvarum</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>refers</td>
<td>59 (an e has been erased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>quae praedas rogas</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,4</td>
<td>queis</td>
<td>(obvious mistake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bacca</td>
<td>59 et al. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pretium</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>quietis</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>poenas</td>
<td>59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,6</td>
<td>neu velis ire</td>
<td>59 et al. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>proso</td>
<td>59 (corr. to pronoe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>temtes</td>
<td>--(probably taken by mistake from the end of the preceding line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV,1</td>
<td>Phoebus</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV,6</td>
<td>decutienda</td>
<td>59 et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>quo</td>
<td>59 et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Phoebus</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>se positis</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Titan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>praemissis</td>
<td>(abbreviated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V,4</th>
<th>coeperat</th>
<th>(59, coeperit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>defuncti</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>deprehendit</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>tegmine</td>
<td>(All MSS. have &quot;murmure&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI,5</th>
<th>quo</th>
<th>59 et al.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Paeonio</td>
<td>59 et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>caeruleus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII,8</th>
<th>nolam</th>
<th>59 et al.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII,11</th>
<th>adridens</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>perpetuam</td>
<td>32, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX,1</th>
<th>arctum</th>
<th>&quot; (corr. to &quot;um&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>quodcumque</td>
<td>&quot; et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>relisus</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>saeva</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X,1</th>
<th>capitis</th>
<th>(probably a mistake, since the following word begins with s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X, 4</td>
<td>fraenlis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>coepit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prospiciente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>millibus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tantus quod risus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ammota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII, 5</td>
<td>telluris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instruit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>lacrymis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI, 5</td>
<td>solido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>aerea testam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 4</td>
<td>Ciniphii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summissa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>discrepet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV, 11</td>
<td>hanc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>generis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 1</td>
<td>Treiciam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>arcanum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>deformis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 59
- 26, 27, 29.
- 32, 42
- 27, 32
- "
- (59, "aereat estam")
- 26, 32
- "
- "
- "
- "
- "
- (59 has "deformi", next word beginning with an s)
CHAPTER V.

VALUE OF THE 1570 EDITION.

From a careful study of the evidence in the above tables, it seems fairly certain that 59 was one of Cujas' originals, and very probable that another was the archetype of 6. The third may possibly have been 32, or a manuscript identical with it. To make a positive statement is, however, as explained above, out of the question, owing not only to the difficulty of knowing how the three manuscripts were employed, and how many emendations were made by the editor, but also to the great similarity of all the older manuscripts.

It remains, then, to consider the critical value of the 1570 edition. It was, as we know, prepared by a careful and scholarly editor, from the oldest, and therefore the least corrupt, manuscripts. According to his own repeated statement, it was uninfluenced by any other edition. It is fairly free from mistakes, and indeed, compares very favorably with Froehner's edition, to which it bears a strong resemblance. Its purpose, too, seems to have been humanistic and scientific; while the Stainhöwel edition was intended as a collection of amusing stories, and that of 1494 as a school text, Cujas' work is "pour remettre en lumière un auteur fort ancien et gentil". It is, from every point of view except that of age, the most interesting and the most important of all the early editions.

FINIS.