

FROM LIMPING IAMBS TO EPIC HEXAMETERS: BABRIUS TRANSFIGURED

The Byzantine lexicon known as the Suda oftentimes cites fables in hexameter verse under the title of *Mythoi* or *Mythica*.¹ For the most part, they appear to be based directly on the collection of fables in choliambics by Babrius, the first Greek poet to have composed a fable book in verse some time in the first or second century of the Common Era.² The Suda also quotes three times from a version in elegiac couplets under the same title. Babrius had many later imitators and paraphrasts,³ but the author of the *Mythica* was likely a contemporary of his to judge from Babrius' apparent allusion to him in the prologue to his second book.⁴ The work was clearly popular enough to have survived to Byzantine times. It was probably transmitted in a codex containing the poems of Babrius and possibly other imitators, which would explain why the Suda (ε 3268 = fr. 10) once mistakenly ascribes a hexameter citation to Babrius himself.⁵ There are some possible indications that it was still known to Maximus Planudes in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.⁶

The last scholar to edit the fragments of the *Mythica* was Otto Crusius in an appendix to his Teubner edition of Babrius.⁷ Crusius, however, following Bergk, also included a great number of anonymous hexameter fragments from the Suda that are now attributed to Callimachus' *Hecale*,⁸ and he does not number fragments from the same fable separately. Both features complicate using his appendix as a reference text. Now a third-century papyrus of the *Mythica* from Oxyrhynchus has come to light (P.Oxy. LXXXVIII 5644), which adds several new fragments of this work, some of them overlapping with the quotations in the Suda. It seems useful therefore to present a new edition and study of all the fragments of the *Mythica* together and without the encumbrance of the fragments now securely assigned to the *Hecale*. At the risk of rendering the destitute *Hecale* even poorer, I will nevertheless make a case for reclaiming three fragments currently attributed to the *Hecale* for the hexameter fables.⁹ The new edition of the fragments is a good opportunity to analyse the language, style, and metre of this little-

This article was written within the framework of the project 'Hexameters Beyond the Canon: New Poetry on Papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt' funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (ref. AH/W003554/1; PI L. Prauscello). I thank W. Benjamin Henry and Lucia Prauscello for reading a draft.

¹ For the common use of the word μῦθος *vel sim.* to designate fables, see van Dijk (1997) 84–8.

² For an orientation on Babrius and his *Mythiambi*, see Holzberg (2019) 9–46, with further bibliography on pp. 220–22. His date remains uncertain, but it preceded the turn of the third century. Morgan (2007) 326–30 plausibly revives the identification of the king Alexander whose son is addressed in the second prologue with the client king of Cilicia Trachea appointed by Vespasian in the 70s. More sceptical about drawing any biographical inferences from the prologues is Spielhofer (2021).

³ For a list of these, see Vaio (2001) xxiii–xxv.

⁴ See below, Section II.

⁵ So Crusius (1892) 89 and (1896) 2660.

⁶ See below, Section III.

⁷ Crusius (1897) 215–22. Earlier collections include: Knoche (1835) 202–5; Knochius (1838) 4–14; Lachmann (1845) vii–viii; Bergk (1868) xx–xxii, 171–5; Eberhard (1875) 96–7; Rutherford (1883) xxi n. 1; cf. also Gitlbauer (1882) 147–9.

⁸ Namely his fr. 1.1 (*Hec.* fr. 58 Hollis = 310 Pfeiffer), 7.9–10 (*Hec.* fr. 44 H. = 376 Pf.), 9.12 (*Hec.* fr. 120 H. = 312 Pf.), 9.13 (*Hec.* fr. 74.1 H. = 346 Pf.), 9.18–19 (*Hec.* fr. 72 H. = 374 Pf.), 9.20 (*Hec.* fr. 126 H. = 320 Pf.), 10.26 (*Hec.* fr. 63 H. = 256 Pf.), 14.36–8 (*Hec.* fr. 119 H. = 309 Pf.), 14.39–40 (*Hec.* fr. 149 H. = 363 Pf.), 15.41 (*Hec.* fr. 94 H. = 344 Pf.), 16.42 (*Hec.* fr. 129 H. = 324 Pf.), 17.43–5 (*Hec.* fr. 145 H. = 358 Pf.), 18.46–7 (*adesp.* SH 1012 + Call. *Hec.* fr. 137 H. = 340 Pf.). For 'Hecker's Law' and the attribution of these fragments to the *Hecale*, see Hollis (1990) 41–4 and cf. Hecker (1842) 79–148.

⁹ *Hec.* fr. 94, 119, 149 Hollis = fr. 18, 19, 20 below.

known work and to assess its place in the landscape of Imperial hexameter poetry. The first section accordingly presents a new text of the fragments, with critical apparatus, translation, and a brief commentary. The second and third sections analyse the broad relationship between the *Mythica* and Babrius' *Mythiambi* and the prose *Aesopica* respectively. In the fourth section, I look more closely at how the hexameter poet translated his choliambic model to the epic mode by focusing on his adaptation of Babr. 95. The fifth section gives an overview of the work's lexicon, intertexts, and metrical style. Some reflections on the poet's broader project and the possible literary motivations behind his adaptation will be offered by way of a conclusion. A brief appendix presents the three fragments from the elegiac version of the *Mythiambi*.¹⁰

Babrius' text is cited from Luzzatto and La Penna (1986). Prose fables are cited from Hausrath and Hunger (1959, 1970) (= CFA), which usefully includes the text of all three main recensions of the fables. Where appropriate, the equivalent number in Perry (1952) (= *Aes.*), which provides a superior text of the first recension (known as the *collectio Augustana*), is given.¹¹ With a few minor exceptions, the text of the Suda, including the manuscript sigla and apparatus, is based on Adler (1928–38), but I also incorporate or report some emendations not cited in her edition.¹² The text of P.Oxy. 5644 and most of the commentary on the fragments preserved by this papyrus are taken from my *editio princeps*, to which I refer the reader for a fuller description of the papyrus and technical details. Supplements due to me are marked with 'B.' in the apparatus, those due to W. Benjamin Henry with 'H.'

¹⁰ Strictly speaking, it is not impossible that some of the citations of single hexameters in the Suda belonged to the elegiac version, but for practical purposes they will be considered as part of the more frequently cited hexameter work in this article.

¹¹ For a succinct overview of the different recensions of the Aesopic fables and their complicated editorial history, see Holzberg (1993) 5–7, 80–81, 104–5 = (2002) 3–7, 73–4, 94 and Jedrkiwicz (1989) 16–21. For a more detailed discussion of the three main recensions, see Perry (1936) 71–230.

¹² Most of these are recorded by Crusius. Emendations to the following lines are not reported by either Crusius or Adler: fr. 10.3 (ἐτρέφεθ'); 12.14 (ἐπί); 20 (βόκετο); fr. eleg. 1.1 (ἔριεν); 3 (πλάζεν ἄμ'). The emendation to fr. 19.1 (ποσσὶ δ' ἀνελθεῖν) is recorded by Adler (1938) 2 in the 'addenda et corrigenda' section.

I. The Fragments of the *Mythica*

Fable 3: The Goat and the Goatherd

Fr. 1

]ον .π .[.]ης
] ὑπὸ δεσμῶι
]ιν ἑτοῖμον
]νων
5] πέτρον
	[– ∞]υ γναμπτόν χειμ[άρου	
	[– ∞] μή ποτ' ἄνακτι κα[
	[– ∞] .μεγ αὐτῶρ ὁ τὸν .[
	[ἦ δ' εἶπ]εν κρατερῶς· “καὶ [
10	[– ∞] κέρασ δὲ καὶ οὐλ .[.”]

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 4 i (c).3–7, ii (b).1–5

1 ἐπὶ κηκ]όν ex.gr. H. ἀπη[ν]ής dub. H. 5 βάλε] H. 6 χειμ[άρου B. 1. χιμάρου 7 [εἶπε δὲ] H. 9 [ἦ δ' εἶπ]εν H. 9–10 [πῶς κρύψω; τό γε δῆλον] | [πᾶσι] H. 10 ex.gr. οὐ λό[γος ἡμέτερός σε καθαρεῖ] H.

Cf. Babr. 3:

	αἶγας ποτ' εἰς ἔπαυλιν αἰπόλος κλείων
	ἐπὶ κηκὸν ἦγεν· αἶ μὲν ἦλθον, αἶ δ' οὐπω.
	μηὲς δ' ἀπειθοῦς ἐν φάραγγι τρωγούρης
	κόμην γλυκεῖαν αἰγίλου τε καὶ εἰνίου
5	κατέαξε τὸ κέρασ μακρόθεν λίθῳ πλήξας.
	τὴν δ' ἰκέτευε· “μή, χίμαιρα συνδούλη,
	πρὸς τοῦ σε Πανός, δε νάπας ἐποπτεύει,
	τῷ δεσπότη, χίμαιρα, μή με μηνύρης·
	ἄκων γὰρ ηὐετόχησα τὸν λίθον ρίψας.”
10	ἦ δ' εἶπε “καὶ πῶς ἔργον ἐμφανὲς κρύψω;
	κέκραγε τὸ κέρασ κἂν ἐγὼ σιωπήσω.”

‘... cruel (?) ... under a halter ... ready ... (he) [threw] a stone ... (broke) the curved (horn) of the she-goat ... “do not ... to the master ... but he (the master will) ... him ...” [And she replied] sternly ... “it is the (broken) horn, not [my speech, which condemns you].”

1 If ἀπη[ν]ής can be read, it would refer to the cruel goatherd at the beginning of the fable. There may not be enough space in the gap, however, for the nu and most of the two etas on either side.

2 ὑπὸ δεσμῶι = *Od.* 22.200 (v.l.), *Opp. H.* 1.193, 415, 4.79, *Nonn. D.* 45.270. Of a goat halter (cf. *Il.* 6.507)?

5 πέτρον. Presumably the stone of Babr. 3.5 λίθῳ πλήξας.

6 γναμπτόν. The curved horn (κέρας) of the goat broken by the stone; cf. Q.S. 9.396 γναμπτοῖσιν ... κεράεσσι, 11.102 ἀπὸ γναμπτοῖο κεράατος, Nonn. *D.* 12.184 γναμπτήσ ... κεραίης.

7 μή ποτ' ἄνακτι κα[~ Babr. 3.8 τῷ δεσπότη, χίμαιρα, μή με μινύσης.

8 αὐτὰρ ὁ τὸν [. The apprehensive goatherd presumably states what the master (ὁ) will do to the one (τόν) who harmed his goat.

9 [ἦ δ' εἶπ]εν κρατερῶς. If the supplement is correct, L. Prauscello compares *Il.* 9.431 μάλα γὰρ κρατερῶς ἀπέειπεν (similarly implying reproach) and *Il.* 1.25, 326, etc. κρατερὸν δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε.

10 κέρασ δὲ καὶ οὐ λό[γος ἡμέτερός σε καθαιρεῖ] ~ Babr. 3.11.

Fable 36: The Oak and the Reeds

Fr. 2

ἠχήεις ἐτάνυσε βαλὼν προκάρηνον ἀήτης

Suda π 2460: προκάρηνος· ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν· ἐν Μύθοις· ἠχήεις—ἀήτης.

Cf. Babr. 36.1–2: δρῶν αὐτόριζον ἄνεμος ἐξ ὄρουσ ἄρασ | ἔδωκε ποταμῶ.

‘A roaring wind threw (an oak tree) headlong and laid it low.’

ἠχήεις. A *dis legomenon* in Homer: *Il.* 1.157 θάλασσά τε ἠχήεσσα, *Od.* 4.72 κατὰ δώματα ἠχίεντα. Only here with ἀήτης. The verse is framed by the epithet and its noun: on this pattern, see below, p. ♣ n. 63.

προκάρηνον. First in *AP* 7.632.3, which was included in the *Garland of Philip* and therefore dates from before the mid first century CE. It is assigned to a certain Diodorus in the manuscript, but it is uncertain how reliable this ascription is or which of the several epigrammatists of this name is meant (see Gow–Page (1968) II 264, 269). The adjective is otherwise rare before Nonnus, who uses it frequently; cf. also Mus. 341 and *AP* 9.533.2. ἐτάνυσε ... προκάρηνον recalls *Il.* 23.25 πρηνέα ... τανύσσασ, said of Achilles laying down the body of Hector beside Patroclus’ bier.

Fr. 3

ἔτασαν οὐδὲ κόμαι ψαφαρῆ μεμίαντο κονίη

Suda ψ 31: ψαφαρῆ· (...) καὶ αὐθις ἐν Μύθοις· ἔτασαν—κονίη.

κόμαι S, Valckenaer : κόμασ plerique codd. ψαφαρεῖ A μεμίαντο Valckenaer : ἐμίαντο Portus : μίαντο codd.

Cf. Babr. 36.4: πολλὺς δὲ κάλαμος ἐκατέρωθεν εἰστίκει.

‘(The reeds) stood firm, and their hair was not defiled by the sandy dust.’

οὐδὲ κόμαι ψαφαρῆ μεμίαντο κονίη. An expansion of Babrius’ simple εἰctήκει based on *Il.* 16.795–6 μιάνθησαν δὲ ἔθειραι | αἵματι καὶ κονίησι; cf. also *Il.* 23.732 μιάνθησαν δὲ κονίη. The former passage supports the choice of κόμαι over κόμας (accusative of the part).

ψαφαρῆ ... κονίη. The phrase is modelled on Euph. fr. 50.3 Powell = 70 Lightfoot ψαφαρῆ ... τέφρη (in the same position), while the noun-epithet combination is based on *AP* 7.315.1 (Zenodotus or Rhianus) ψαφαρῆ κόνι. The adjective first appears in Aesch. *Th.* 323 ψαφαρᾶ σποδῶ.

Fable 64: The Fir Tree and the Bramble

Fr. 4

αἰπεινὴν ἐλάτην ἔρις ὄρωρεν αἴκυλα φάσθαι

Suda αἰ 269: αἰπεινή· ὑψηλή. αἰπεινήν—φάσθαι. καὶ αἰπειναίς, ὑψηλαίς, μακραις. ἐν Μύθοις· αἰπειναίς—τελέειν (appendix fr. eleg. 1). Suda αἰ 339: αἴκυλα· παράνομα, ἄδικα. ἐν Μύθοις· αἰπεινήν—φάσθαι.

ὄρωρεν V M (Suda αἰ 269) F (Suda αἰ 339) : ὄρωρεν F (Suda αἰ 269) G T V M (Suda αἰ 339)

Cf. Babr. 64.1–2: ἦριζον ἐλάτη καὶ βάτος πρὸς ἀλλήλας. | ἐλάτης δ’ ἑαυτὴν πολλαχῶς ἐπαινούσης.

‘A quarrel drove a lofty fir tree to utter unseemly words.’

αἰπεινὴν ἐλάτην. Cf. *Il.* 5.560 ἐλάτην ... ὑψηλῆσι, A.R. 3.968 μακρῆσιν ... ἐλάτην, Nic. *Th.* 472 ἐλάτησι μακεδναίς. This is the first known application of the epithet αἰπεινός to a tree; cf. later Q.S. 7.409 πετέλει ... αἰπεινήσιν. αἰπεινός never appears at the beginning of the verse in Homer (first in Theoc. 15.101 αἰπεινάν τ’ Ἔρυκα, A.R. 4.573 αἰπεινήν τε Κερωσσόν). The prominently placed adjective has a particular relevance here, as the tree will proceed to boast of her height; cf. Babr. 64.3–4, 7.

αἴκυλα φάσθαι. A variation of αἴκυλα μυθήσασθαι in *Il.* 20.202, 433, also at line-end.

Fable 67: The Wild Ass and the Lion

Fr. 5

ἐς βίοντον κοινωνὸς ὄνω γένητ’ ὠμοβόρος λίκ

Suda λ 598: λίκ· ὁ λέων. μῦθος· ἐς—λίκ.

κοινωνὸς Reinesius : κοινὸς codd. γένοιτ’ F ὠμοβόρος ed. pr. : ἄμοβόρος codd.

Cf. Babr. 67.1: θήρης ὄναγρος καὶ λέων ἐκοινωνοῦν.

‘A flesh-eating lion became a partner with an ass for their sustenance.’

κοινωνός. Post-homeric, first in tragedy.

ὠμοβόρος λίς. A variation on Theoc. 13.62 ὠμοφάγος λίς in the same *sedes*. The poet substitutes the Homeric ὠμοφάγος with ὠμοβόρος, a less common epithet taken from A.R. 1.636, where it is said of the Thyades; cf. also Soph. fr. 10g, 13(b).³ Radt Θυέ?]ετης ὠμοβόρ[ος, Nic. *Th.* 739 ρηκὶ ... ὠμοβορηῖ. The adjective recurs in later poetry ([Opp.], Q.S., Man., Nonn.) and prose; note especially *Orac. Sib.* 11.215 ὠμοβόρος θήρ at verse-end, said of a lion.

Fr. 6

τοῦτο μὲν οὖν πρῶτον λάχος οἴχομαι

Suda λ 170: λάχος· μοῖρα. (...) καὶ αὐθις ἐν Μύθοις· τοῦτο—οἴχομαι.

λάχος μέρος codd., μέρος del. ed. pr.

Cf. Babr. 67.5: καὶ “τὴν μὲν αὐτὸς” φησί “λήψομαι πρῶτος” (πρώτην Eberhard).

‘(The lion said:) “I will therefore take this first share.”’

λάχος. The word is post-Homeric (first in Thgn. 592, then in Pindar and tragedy). The manuscripts’ unmetrical μέρος is an intrusive gloss. Ruhnken (1789) 173 suspected the same in Pl. *Leg.* 745d ἐπονομάσαι καὶ καθιερώσαι τὸ λαχὸν μέρος ἑκάτῳ τῷ θεῷ.

Fable 77: The Fox and the Crow (?)

Fr. 7

	τ[υρ- (?)	
	ἰεχ[ανόωσα	ἀλώπηξ]
	αι[
	το[
5	διο[
	ὀξ[
	ετη[θ-	
	οια .[
	ευ . .[
10	αλλ . .[
	ῶε [
	ὀξυ[
	το .[
	ὀργ[
15	οὐ .[
	ἐεθ[

1, 2, 7 suppl. H. 16 e.g. ἔcθ', ἐcθ[λ-, ἔcθ[ειν vel sim. B.

‘... cheese (?) ... the [fox] craving ... sharp(ly) ... chest ... thus ... shrilly ... bird ... not ...’

Henry has perceptively noted that these line beginnings probably correspond to Babr. 77: 1 τ[υρ- ~ Babr. 1. 1 τυρόν, 2 ἰcχ[ανόωca ... ἀλώπηξ] ~ Babr. 1. 2 ἀλώπηξ ἰ(c)χανώca, 6 ὀξ- ~ Babr. 1. 4 ὀξέη γλήνη, 7 cτη[θ- ~ Babr. 1. 5 cτέρνον αἰετοῦ φαίνεις, 11 ὥc in a speech-closing formula (?), 12 ὀξύ ~ Babr. 1. 9 ἐκεκράγει, 14 ὀρν[- ‘bird’, 15 οὐ [~ Babr. 1. 11 οὐκ ἦcθ’ ἄφωvoc (the beginning of the fox’s closing speech).

Fable 95: The Lion, the Fox, and the Deer

Fr. 8

] . [. .] . . [. .] . εἰ . . ν . . [] . γ[ἐπὶ ποίηc]
 cκαίρουcaν μαλακ[ῆc, καί μιν πρὸc μῦθον ἔειπεν.]
 “χαῖρε, φίλη, καί μο[ι
 5 δῶρον ἔοι παρὰ ceῖ[o
 γεινώcκειc ὅτι δη[ρὸν
 ἔcτι λέων ὃc θηρ[cῖν ὀρεcκώοιcιν ἀνάccει]
 κεῖνον νοῦcoc ἔμ[αρψε
 ἐγγύθεν ὑcτατεῖη [. [.
 10 θηρῶν ᾧ κε λίπη [.
 καί οἱ πορφυρέογ[τι διακριδὸν ἀμφὶc ἔκαcτα.]
 ἄρκτοc μὲν νωθῆ[. c
 οὐδέ οἱ οὐδ’ αἴθων ἰάδε πόρδαλιc οὔνεκα θυμοῦ.]
 ἐμπλείη, τὸ δὲ πολλὸν ἀγήνορα μέμφετο τίγριν.]
 15 κοιρανίηc δὲ cé φ[ηci
 οὔνεκεν εἴμερτ[.
 γούναci· θηητῆ [.
 ἐρπηcται τρομέο[.
 θηρῶν ἦ τάχα τιc [.

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 1 11 = Suda π 2097: πορφύρη· ταράcσεται. καὶ ἐν Μυθικοῖc· καί—ἔκαcτα. 13–14 = Suda α 433: ἄδεν· ἤρεcκεν. ἐν Μύθοic· οὐδέ—ἐμπλείη. 14 = Suda π 1920: πολλόν· ὡc ἐπὶ τὸ πλείcτον. ἐν Μύθοic· τὸ—τίγριν. versus in Suda α 433 et π 1920 citatos coniunxit Tyrwhitt.

2 ἐπὶ ποίηc] H. 3 μαλακ[ῆc B. καί μιν πρὸc μῦθον ἔειπεν] H. 4 μο[ι H. 5 ceῖ[o B. ex.gr. λόγouc χρηcτοῦc αἰούcηc] H. 6 δη[ρὸν B. 1. γινώcκειc 7 θηρ[cῖν B. ὀρεcκώοιcιν ἀνάccει] H. 8 ἔμ[αρψε B. 9 1. ὑcτατεῖη 11 πορφυρέογ[τι pap. : πορφύροντι Suda 12 νωθῆ[. c B. ex.gr. ἀνεφαίνετο, cῦc δ’ ἀνοήμων] H. 14 τὸ pap. Suda : ὁ Τουρ μέμφεται G 15 φ[ηci B. ex.gr. ἐτοιμοτάτην ἐπιβαίνειν] H. 16 ex.gr. εἴμερτ[ὸν δέμαc, οὐδέ τι γῆραc ἔπειcιν] H. 1. ἴμερτ[17

interpunct pap. ex.gr. [κεφαλή κέρασιν, τά τε πάντες] H. 18 τρομέο[νται, τρομέο[υσι, τρομέο[ντες B.
19 ex.gr. τίς [σε, φίλη, φήσει βασίλειαν] H.

Cf. Babr. 95.10–23:

- 10 ἀπῆλθε κερδῶ, τὴν δ' ὑπ' ἀγρίαις ὕλαις
σκιρτῶσαν εὔρε μαλθακῆς ὑπὲρ ποίης.
ἔσηνε δ' αὐτὴν πρῶτον, εἶτα καὶ χαίρειν
προσεῖπε, χρητῶν τ' ἄγγελος λόγων ἦκειν.
“ὁ λέων” ἔφασκεν, “οἶσθαι, ἔστι μοι γείτων,
15 ἔχει δὲ φαύλως, κάγγυς ἐστὶ τοῦ θνήσκειν.
τίς οὖν μετ' αὐτὸν θηρίων τυραννῆσει
διεσκοπεῖτο· σὺς μὲν ἐστὶν ἀγνώμων,
ἄρκτος δὲ νοθής, πάρδαλις δὲ θυμώδης,
τίγρις δ' ἀλαζῶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐρημαίη.
20 ἔλαφον τυραννεῖν ἀξιοτάτην κρίνει·
γαύρη μὲν εἶδος, πολλὰ δ' εἰς ἔτη ζῶει,
κέρασιν δὲ φοβερόν πᾶσιν ἐρπετοῖς φύει,
δένδροισι ὅμοιον, κοῦχ ὅποια τῶν ταύρων.

‘... (the fox found the deer) skipping over the soft [grass and addressed a word to her:] “Greetings, friend, and may I receive a reward from you ... [when you hear my good news]. You know that [for a long time] ... there is a lion who [rules over the mountain-dwelling] beasts. An illness has seized him ... his end is near ... (he has been considering) to whom he would leave (his kingship) over the animals, and as he pondered each point separately, the bear [appeared to him] sluggish ..., nor did the sleek leopard please him because he is filled with anger, and he criticised the tiger as arrogant for the most part. He says that you [are the most ready to succeed] to the throne, because [your body is] lovely [and old age does not attack] your knees. Wondrous [is your head for its horns, before which all] creeping beasts tremble. Soon indeed, [friend], everyone [will call you the queen] of the beasts ...”’

For further discussion of the hexameter poet’s adaptation of this part of the fable, see below, Section IV.

2–3 ἐπὶ ποίης] | καίρουσαν μαλακ[ῆς ~ Babr. 95.10–11 τὴν δ' ὑπ' ἀγρίαις ὕλαις | σκιρτῶσαν εὔρε μαλθακῆς (Boissonade, μαλακῆς A) ὑπὲρ ποίης. Restoring μαλακ[ῆς ἐπὶ ποίης would violate Naeke’s Law and would not leave sufficient space for a speech-opening formula.

4 χαίρε, φίλη ~ Babr. 95.12–13 εἶτα καὶ χαίρειν | προσεῖπε. The wording here is closer to the farewell near the end of the fox’s speech in Babrius (l. 28): ἀλλὰ χαίρε, φιλότατη.

5 For the sentiment, cf. Babr. 95.26–7 τότε ἂν (A: οὖν Haupt, αὖ Seidler) γένοιτο τῆς ἀλόπεκος μνήμη, | δέσποινα, τῆς σοὶ τοῦτο πρῶτον εἰπούσης. The hexameter version would seem to support the emendation to an optative of wish in Babrius.

παρὰ σεῖ[o = Il. 24.502, Od. 15.158 (in the same *sedes*). For Henry’s suggested λόγουσιν χρητῶν ἀιούσης], cf. Babr. 95.13 χρητῶν τ' ἄγγελος λόγων ἦκειν.

6 γεινώσκεις ὅτι ~ Babr. 95.14 οἶσθαι.

7 ἔστι λέων ὃς θηρ[σὶν ὀρεκκοῖσιν ἀνάσσει] ~ Babr. 95.14 “ὁ λέων” ἔφασκεν, “οἶσθαι, ἔστι μοι γείτων”, 25 (in reference to the deer) μέλλει τ' ἀνάσσειν θηρίων ὀρειφοίτων.

8–9 κείνον νοῦκος ἔμ[αρψε ...] | ἐγγύθεν ὑστατεΐη . [~ Babr. 95.15 ἔχει δὲ φαύλωσ, κάγγύς ἐστι τοῦ θνήσκειν; cf. also 1 λέων νοσήσας. For the first phrase, cf. IG VII 2539.7 (Boeotia; 3rd c.) ἀλλά ἐ νοῦκος ἔμαρψε κακὴ καὶ μοῖρα [β]αρεία, CIRB 126.5 (Panticapaeum; second half of 1st c. BC) εἰ δέ σε νοῦκος ἔμα[ρ]ψε. For similar subjects with this verb, cf. *Il.* 23.62 τὸν ὕπνος ἔμαρπτε, [Hes.] *Sc.* 245 γῆράς τε μέμαρπεν.

9 ἐγγύθεν ὑστατεΐη. The adjective is probably used as a substantive to refer to the lion's imminent death ('his end is near'), as in Q.S. 10.102, 14.315 ἐφ' ὑστατίη βιότοιο. Alternatively, L. Prauscello suggests understanding ὑστατίη sc. ἡμέρα, 'last day', in both cases.

10 θηρῶν ᾧ κε λίπη [. The object will be some expression for kingship; cf. Babr. 95.16–17 τίς οὖν μετ' αὐτὸν θηρίων τυραννίσει, | διεσκοπεῖτο.

11 διακριδὸν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα. The second half of the verse is based on A.R. 1.498 διέκριθεν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα. For διακριδὸν ἀμφὶς, cf. Opp. 1.498 καὶ θαλάμους ἀλόχους τε διακριδὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι (with a spatial sense).

12 ἄρκτος μὲν νοθή[ε ~ Babr. 95.18 ἄρκτος δὲ νοθήσ. The heavy spondaic rhythm is expressive. The adjective is a Homeric *hapax* in *Il.* 11.559, said of a donkey.

13–14 ~ Babr. 95.18–19 πάρδαλις δὲ θυμώδης, | τίγρις δ' ἀλαζῶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐρημαίη.

15 κοιρανίης δὲ ἐφ[ησι ~ Babr. 95.20 ἔλαφον τυραννεῖν ἀξιώτατην κρίνει. κοιρανίης is probably dependent on τυχεῖν, κυρεῖν, or ἐπιβαίνειν in some tense; cf. Q.S. 5.552 οὐ ἐό κοιρανίης ἐπιβήσεται. The abstract noun, based on πολυκοιρανίη in *Il.* 2.204, is first attested in *AP* 6.171.8, an anonymous epigram of the early Hellenistic period (see Gow–Page (1965) II 588–9), and becomes current in later Imperial poetry; cf. also D.P. 464 in the same *sedes*.

16–17 οὐνεκεν εἰμερτ[...] | γούνασι. Knees are not mentioned in Babrius, but these lines presumably paraphrase Babr. 95.21 γαύρη μὲν εἶδος, πολλὰ δ' εἰς ἔτη ζῶει. For Henry's supplement and the connection of weak knees to old age, cf. Sappho fr. 58c.6–7 Νερί γόνα δ' οὐ φέροισι | τὰ δὴ ποτα λαΐψηρ' ἔον ὄρχηθ' ἴσα νεβρίοισιν.

17–18 θηητή ... ἐρπηταὶ τρομέο[~ Babr. 95.22 κέρασ δὲ φοβερόν πᾶσιν ἐρπετοῖσ φύει. For the adjective, cf. Babr. 77.5 θεητὸσ ἀυχήν, likewise in disingenuous flattery. For ἐρπητήσ as a synonym of ἐρπετόν, cf. Nic. *Th.* 9, etc., Antiphil. *AP* 9.86 (of a mouse), Androm. 101.

19 θηρῶν ἧ τάχα τις [~ Babr. 95.25 μέλλεισ τ' ἀνάσσειν θηρίων ὀρειφοίτων. τις probably has the sense of 'everyone': see LSJ s.v. A.II.2.

Fr. 9

κέρδεσι φηλωθεῖσα θοῆ κεμάσ, ἐγγύθι δ' ἔστη
ἠπεδανοῖο λέοντος

Suda φ 266: φηλοῦν· ἀπατᾶν. (...) καὶ φηλωθεῖσα, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα. ἐν Μύθοισ· κέρδεσι—κεμάσ. Suda η 420: ἠπεδανός· ἀσθενής. ἐν Μύθῳ· ἐγγύθι—λέοντος. fragmenta coniunxit Lachmann.

κερδοῖ Lachmann obloquente Crusio

Cf. Babr. 95.36–8: τῆσ δ' ὁ νοῦσ ἔχαινώθη | λόγιοι ποιητοῖσιν, ἦλθε δ' εἰσ κούλην | σπήλυγα θηρός.

'The swift deer, deceived by (the fox's) wiles, ... and stood near the weakly lion.'

1 φηλωθεῖσα. This uncommon verb first appears in Aesch. *Ag.* 492 and is used in hexameters by A.R. 3.983 and Man. 6.183 (ἀπάτησιν ... φηλωθεῖσαι).

κεμάς. A Homeric *hapax* at *Il.* 10.361 redeployed in Hellenistic and Imperial poetry: see Adorjáni (2021) on Call. *Dian.* 112. For the epithet, cf. Q.S. 6.140 θοῆ ... κεμμάς, 223 κεμμάς ... θοῆ.

2 ἡπεδανοῖο λέοντος. The epithet is a Homeric *dis legomenon* at *Il.* 8.104 and *Od.* 8.311 (also *h.Ap.* 316) and recurs in Hellenistic and Imperial poetry (A.R., Euph., Opp., Man., Orph. *L.*).

Fable 108: The Country Mouse and the City Mouse

Fr. 10

θέντο μετ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἑταιρείην μύε δοιώ,
οὐ καθ' ὅμα ζώντες· ὁ μὲν κατὰ νειὸν ἐρήμην
ἐτρέφεθ', ὃς δὲ δόμοισιν ἐν ἀφνειῶν τρέφετ' ἀνδρῶν.

Suda ε 3268: ἑταιρεία· ἡ συνήθης ὁμόνοια, καὶ φιλία. Βάβριος· θέντο—ἀνδρῶν.

1 ἀλλήλοισιν Cobet 2 νειὸν κατ' ἐρήμην Bernhardy 3 ἐτρέφεθ' Knoche : ἐτρέφετ' codd. : ἐτρέφεθ' Bergk

Cf. Babr. 108.1–3: μῶν ὁ μὲν τις βίον ἔχων ἀρουραῖον, | ὁ δ' ἐν ταμείοις πλουσίοις φωλεύων, | ἔθεντο κοινὸν τὸν βίον πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

‘Two mice established a friendship with each other, although they did not live in the same way: one was reared in an empty field, the other in the houses of rich men.’

1 μετ' ἀλλήλοισιν. The phrase recurs in the same *sedes* in Opp. 1.482; cf. in other positions Thgn. 763, Opp. 4.40, 69, [Orph.] *L.* 722. For Cobet's emendation, cf. below, p. ♣ n. 76.

ἑταιρείην. First in poetry apparently in Sim. *Ep.* 49.2 Sider (= 82 *FGE*) and tragedy, and otherwise rare in hexameters (Opp. 2.321, Nonn. *D.* 11.119).

μύε δοιώ. Cf. at verse-end A.R. 1.735, 2.426 νίεε δοιώ, 4.1483 νίεε τε δοιώ.

2 οὐ καθ' ὅμα ~ [Hes.] *Sc.* 50 οὐ καθ' (Dobree : οὐκέθ' MSS) ὅμα φρονέοντε, Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.26 ἐτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὅμα | [δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν.

2–3 κατὰ νειὸν ἐρήμην | ἐτρέφεθ'. The enjambement echoes Hes. *Op.* 130–31 παρὰ μητέρι κεδνῇ | ἐτρέφετ'; cf. also Theoc. 24.104. κατὰ νειόν is an Apollonian phrase (3.411, 754, 778), always occurring in the same position and referring to the field of Ares in Colchis.

Note the subtle and consistent verbal variations in the description of the two mice: ὁ ~ ὅς, ἐτρέφεθ' ~ τρέφετ', κατὰ νειὸν ἐρήμην ~ δόμοισιν ἐν ἀφνειῶν ... ἀνδρῶν.

Fr. 11

] νομον .[
] μελαιν[
] υων
 5 “ ἐτ]αῖρον·
 ἀ]φαιρ .[
 ἔδμεναι] ἄδην
]α νέεσθαι
 ἔνθ’ ἵνα μοι βίος ἐστίν, Ἀμαλθείης κέρασ αἰγός.”
 10 ἀγρο]νόμος μῦς
] ἦλθε καλει[ήν]
]ι πήραις
] δ’ ἄρα χειρο .[
 ὀπ]ῶραι
]ρ ὀπωπαί
 15]αγ .ο .
] .ρα .[

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 3 8 = Suda α 1478: Ἀμαλθείας κέρασ· ἐπὶ τῶν ἀφθόνως ζώντων καὶ εὐθηνούντων (εὐθηνούντων Adler) καὶ εὐπραγούντων· ἐν Μύθοις· ἔνθ’—αἰγός.

1 ἀγρ]ονόμον μ[ῦν] H. cl. 9 3 ἐμφωλέ]υων H. 4 ex.gr. προσέειπεν ἐτ]αῖρον H. 5 ἀ]φαιρ .[B. 6 ἔδμεναι] B. 8 ἔλθ’ Kidd Ἀμαλθείης A G I : Ἀμαλθείας T S : Ἀμαλθείας F M 9 ἀγρο]νόμος B. 10 ἦλθε vel εἰς]ἦλθε B. καλει[ήν] H. 1. καλήν 11 ἐν]ι H. 12 χειρός, χειρόν, χειροί, χειροῖ[c] possis l. cιρ- 13 ὀπ]ῶραι H.

Cf. Babr. 108.16–18:

τρώγων δ’ ἀραιὰς καὶ διαβρόχους δίτου
 ῥίζας, μελαίνη συμπεφυρμένας βόλω,
 “μύρμηκος” εἶπε “ζῆς βίον ταλαιπώρου,
 10 ἐν πυθμέσιν γῆς κρίμνα λεπτὰ βιβρώσκων.
 ἐμοὶ δ’ ὑπάρχει πολλὰ καὶ περιεσεύει·
 τὸ κέρασ κατοικῶ πρὸς σὲ τῆς Ἀμαλθείης.
 εἴ μοι συνέλθοις, ὡς θέλεισ ἀσωτεύει,
 παρειαὶ ὀρύσσειν ἀφάλαξι τὴν χώρην.”
 ἀπήγε τὸν μῦν τὸν γεηπόνον πείσας
 15 εἰς οἶκον ἐλθεῖν ὑπὸ τε τοίχον ἀνθρώπου.
 ἔδειξε δ’ αὐτῷ, ποῦ μὲν ἀλφίτων πλήθη,
 ποῦ δ’ ὄσπριων ἦν σωρὸς ἢ πίθοι κύκων
 στάμνοι τε μέλιτος σάρακοί τε φοινίκων.

‘... black ... lurking (?) ... [he addressed] his friend “... light (fare) ... [to eat] your fill ... to go there where I have my livelihood, the horn of the Amalthean goat ...” the country-dwelling mouse ... he came to his hut ... [in (?)] bags ... grain-pit(s) ... fruits ... eyes ...’

2] μελαιν[~ Babr. 108.7 μελαίνη ... βόλω?

3] υων. For Henry’s suggested ἐμφωλέ]υων, cf. φωλεύων in Babr. 108.2. μ]υῶν is impossible in view of the short upsilon. φωλεύω is prosaic in origin but is found in some

Hellenistic poets (Theoc. 24.85, Nic. *Th.* 394, *Al.* 523) and later in Triph. 394 and Nonn. *Par.* 20.86.

4 ἐτ]αῖρον. Cf. fr. 10.1 ἔταιρείην.

5 ἀ]φαυρ .[~ Babr. 108.9 κριμνὰ λεπτὰ βιβρώσκων; cf. DGE s.v. ἀφαυρός 3: ‘de alimentos *poco nutritivo, ligero* *citia* Hp. *Mul.* 1.67.’

6 ἔδμεναι] ἄδην = *Il.* 5.203; cf. Babr. 108.12 ὡς θέλεισ ἀωτεύει.

7]α νέεσθαι ~ Babr. 108.12 εἴ μοι συνέλθοις? Other possibilities such as θ]ανέεσθαι seem out of place in this context.

8 ἔνθ’ ἴνα μοι βίος ἐστίν, Ἀμαλθείης κέρασ αἰγός ~ Babr. 108.10 τὸ κέρασ κατοικῶ πρὸς ἐὲ τῆσ Ἀμαλθείησ. For βίος, cf. also 8 “μύρμηκος” εἶπε “ζῆσ βίον ταλαιπώρου”. The hexameter poet has reversed the order of the invitation and the description of the city mouse’s house as a horn of plenty in Babrius. On the horn of Amalthea, the goat that suckled the baby Zeus, as a symbol of abundance, see Wernicke (1894).

9 ἀγρο]νόμοσ μῦσ. Cf. Nonn. *D.* 1.194 ἀγρονόμοσ βοῦσ in the same *sedes*. The adjective occurs only once in Homer at *Od.* 6.106 νόμφαι ... | ἀγρονόμοι. In Babr. 108.14, the country mouse is referred to as τὸν μῦν τὸν γεηπόνον and in l. 27 as μῦσ ... ἀρουρίτησ. Henry notes that μῦσ at line-end recalls Virgil’s *exiguus mus* at *G.* 1.181, imitated by Horace *A.P.* 139 *ridiculus mus* (cf. Quintilian 8.3.20): perhaps there was a Hellenistic precedent. For some Hellenistic poets’ predilection for monosyllables at verse-end, see West (1982) 156.

10 ἦλθε καλ]ει[ήν] ~ Babr. 108.14–16 ἀπῆγε τὸν μῦν τὸν γεηπόνον πείσασ | εἰς οἶκον ἐλθεῖν.

11]ι πήρσισ. A bag containing foodstuffs. Lachmann emended πλήρη in Babr. 108.16 ποῦ μὲν ἀλφίτων πλήρη (A) to πήρη. The hexameter adaptation supports this emendation over πλήθη (Fix), favoured in most editions.

13 ὄπ]ῶρσισ ~ Babr. 108.17 πίθοι κύκων, 18 κόρακοί τε φοινίκων. A version of the fable in Byzantine dodecasyllables has φοίνικασ ἄμα, τυρόν, μέλι, ὀπόρασ (245a.10 Chambry, p. 397).

Fable 115: The Eagle and the Tortoise

Fr. 12

]α χε[λόνη]
] .οισι .[
]γοιμ[
] .πετ .[
5		αἰετὸσ ἦε]ρόφοι[τοσ
		ἄγ]χι παρα[στάσ·]
	ι	“τίσ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ἐέο μισθὸσ ἐπάξιουσ, ἦν σ,ε διδάξιω,
	ι	λύψου ὑπὲρ πόντοιο μεταχρονίην π,οτέεσθαι;
10		ὄ]ππόσασ χέρσφ
] ἄλμησ.”
] .σ ὀνόχεσσιν ἀείρασ
]ήγαγε λίμνησ
] . ἦκε φέρεσθαι

6 ἄγ]χι παρα[στάς]. Often at verse-end in Homer; in a speech-introducing formula at *Il.* 23.304, *Od.* 9.345, etc.

7–8 ~ Babr. 115.4–6. The adapter's διδάξω corresponds to the prose fable in CFA 259 I = *Aes.* 230 προελθοῦσα δὲ τοῦτον παρεκάλει ἐφ' ᾧ βούλεται μισθῶ διδάξαι αὐτήν (similarly in versions II and III); cf. also the eagle's reply in Babr. 115.8 τοιγὰρ διδάξω. For a discussion of the relationship between the *Mythica* and the prose Aesopica, see below, Section III.

7 μισθὸς ἐπάξιος. Cf. Babr. 107.16 ἐπάξιον δοῦς μισθόν. The adjective is post-Homeric (Pind., tragedy, A.R. 1.150) and common in Imperial hexameters.

8 ὑψοῦ ὑπὲρ πόντοιο μεταχρονίην πιστέεσθαι. This verse recalls several Apollonian phrases: 2.587 ὑψοῦ δὲ μεταχρονίη, 3.1151 μεταχρονίη πεπότητο, 4.952 ὕψι μεταχρονίην, 4.1269 ἐκ πόντοιο μεταχρονίην.

9–10 ὀ]πόσα χέρσῳ | [...] ἄλμης ~ Babr. 115.7 τὰ τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς πάντα δῶρά σοι δώσω.

11] .c ὀνύχεσσιν ἀείρας ~ Babr. 115.8 ὑπτίην δ' ἄρας. Cf. Hes. *Op.* 204 ὕψι μάλ' ἐν νεφέεσσι φέρων ὀνύχεσσι μεμαρπῶς (notably in a fable), Nonn. *D.* 11.137 ἀδρύπτοισιν ἐοῖς ὀνύχεσσιν ἀείρων. The preceding word is possibly an adjective agreeing with ὀνύχεσσιν (-ο]ις). For ὀνύχεσσιν, cf. ὄνυξιν in CFA 259 III.

12]ήγαγε λίμνης. Cf. Babr. 115.1 λιμνάειν. In Babrius, the word refers to a marsh, but the hexameter poet perhaps intends the sea, as often in Homer and tragedy; cf. 8 ὑπὲρ πόντοιο.

13] .ῆκε φέρεσθαι ~ Babr. 115.9 ἔνθεν εἰς ὄρος ῥίψας. The same phrase appears at *Il.* 21.120, A. R. 1.622, Q. S. 8.165, *Orph. Arg.* 695, 776. CFA 259 I, II, III have ἀφῆκεν. προ]ῆκε (*Od.* 19.468) cannot be read.

14 ἴθι στυφελῶν, ἐπὶ πλευρῶν. The citation in the Suda must originally have been made under a different lemma (στυφελός in some case) that has now dropped out of the text. πλευρόν is presumably used in the geographical sense, as often in Dionysius Periegetes: see Lightfoot (2014) 77–8. It is apparently said of the side of a mountain at D.P. 815 if M. L. West's ἐχούσης is accepted (*CQ* 42 (1992) 569). The more familiar πετρῶν in the Suda would have taken the place of the unusual πλευρῶν as a result of the frequent qualification of rocks with the adjective στυφελός *vel sim.*, e.g. *h.Merc.* 124 καταστυφέλω ἐνὶ πέτρῃ, A.R. 2.1248 στυφελοῖσι πάγοισιν, [Opp.] 4.278 στυφελὰς ... πέτρας, Q.S. 1.295, 3.236, 6.478, 11.368, 12.409, 14.475, 624 (all with a form of πέτρῃ), an instance of banalisation. CFA 259 also refers simply to a rock or rocks: I ἀφῆκεν ἐπὶ τινος πέτρας, II ἐπὶ πέτραν πεσῶν, III ἡ δὲ κατὰ πετρῶν πεσοῦσα (cf. below, n. 34).

15 ~ Babr. 115.9 ἤραξεν αὐτῆς οὐλον ὄστρακον νότων. The adjective ὄστρακόεις first appears in Antiphil. *AP* 9.86.4 (mid first century CE) and is otherwise rare.

ἀγκύλα γυῖα. The phrase is without parallel.

16] .ca χελώνη. Cf. [Opp.] 1.214 ἀσπιδόεσσα χελώνη at verse-end. The trace after the break is compatible with c, but -ca is more likely to be the ending of a participle, e.g. ἐκψύχο]υσα (Henry), as in Babr. 115.11 ἡ δ' εἶπεν ἐκψύχουσα. A verb introducing the following speech will have stood earlier in the line.

18 ~ Babr. 115.11 σὺν δίκη θνήσκω.

ἀεικέι δάμναμαι οἴτῳ. For the structure, cf. A.R. 4.1094 στονόεντι δὲ κάρφεται οἴτῳ. For ἀεικέι ... οἴτῳ, cf. Q.S. 4.41 ἀεικέος οἴτου.

19–20] ἔπλετο ταρσῶν | [...] γούνατα νομᾶν ~ Babr. 115.12–13 τί γὰρ νεφῶν μοι, καὶ τίς ἦν περῶν χρεΐη, | τῇ καὶ χαμᾶζε δυσκόλως προβαινούρη;. The use of ταρσοί to designate ‘wings’ is postclassical (LSJ s.v. II.3); it is found in Babr. 72.9, 124.18.

20 γούνατα νομᾶν. Cf. *Il.* 10.358, 22.144 λαιψηρὰ δὲ γούνατ’ ἐνώμα, 15.269, 22.24 λαιψηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ’ ἐνώμα. A tortoise of course does not have knees, but the poet may not have been sensitive to anatomical niceties in his adoption of epic terminology. ‘Perhaps the tortoise noted that she does not have (swift) knees to move’ (Henry).

Fable 122: The Ass and the Lion

Fr. 13

ἔκ μοι κῶλον ἔρυσσον, ὅ μοι κακὸν ἔμπεσεν ὀπλῆ

Suda c 686: κῶλος· εἶδος ἀκάνθης, ἢ σκάνδαλον. (...) καὶ αὐθις· ἔκ—ὀπλῆ. ὁ ὄνος φησὶ πρὸς τὸν λύκον.

ἔρυσσον Toup : ἔρυσσον plerique codd. : ἔτρυσσον supra scr. ἔκβαλον V

Cf. Babr. 122.7: ἐκ τοῦ ποδός μου τὴν ἄκανθαν εἰρύσσεια.

‘Please pull out the thorn, an evil that has beset my hoof.’

κῶλον. A Homeric *hapax* at *Il.* 13.564 referring to a pointed stake, but the sense of ‘thorn’ is late (Ar., Call.); cf. Hollis on Call. *Hec.* fr. 49.15.

ὅ μοι κακὸν ἔμπεσεν ὀπλῆ. The phrase is modelled on *Od.* 2.45 ἀλλ’ ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεΐος, ὅ μοι κακὸν ἔμπεσεν οἴκῳ.

Fable 129: The Donkey who Wanted to be a Pet

Fr. 14

(b)] [.] ν οἰκιδίην [
 [ἔτρεφ]ε καὶ ταλαεργὸν [ὄνον
] . αρ . κετο . λ . [
 [πλης]άμενος κρειθῆ[ς
 5 [–] . ἔσκαίρε[.] . [
 [– =] ἐσθλὸ . . [
] . νυμ . [
] . [. .] . [

(c)] . [
 [.] c . [
 [.] κειτ [
 [.] . τε καὶ α . [
 5 ῥ[ήχθης]αν δὲ κάλο[ι

. . [. . . .]ων οὐ κατ[
 ψ . . . [.] περισσαίν[.
 . [.] [. .] μ[έ]νοις [.
 α [.] [. . .] και [.
 10 λα [. .]ων πυ[
 δεξ[πο]τέφ νότ[φ
 π[λῆξ]εν λακτ[ίζων
 ὀ[τρηρο]ῖ θερά[ποντες
 π[ρήνι]ξαν τ[
 15 θ[. . . .] . . . [.
 [.
 [.

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 4 ii (b).6–13, (c).1–17

(b) 2 [ἔτρεφ]ε H. 2 [ὄνον B. 4 [πλησ]άμενος κρειθῆ[ς H. 1. κριθ- (c) 4 ἀβ[ροσύνη H. 5 ῥ[ήχθη]ς]αν H. κάλο[ι H. 6 ex.gr. οὐ κατ[ὰ μέτρον H. 7 ψαῦε dub. H. 11 δεξ[πο]τέφ νότ[φ H. 12 π[λῆξ]εν H. λακτ[ίζων B. 13 ὀ[τρηρο]ῖ θερά[ποντες H. 14 π[ρήνι]ξαν H. 15 ex.gr. θ[εῖνοντες H.

Cf. Babr. 129.1–3, 9–22.

‘... domestic (dog) ... he [reared] and a labour-enduring [donkey] ... when he had filled himself with barley ... (the dog) used to skip ... good ... the ropes broke ... in a disorderly fashion (?) ... (the donkey) was fawning ... on his master’s back ... kicking he [struck] ... his [nimble] servants ... subdued (the donkey) ... beating (him) (?) ...’

(b) 1 οἰκιδίην [. The adjective presumably qualifies the puppy envied by the donkey, object of [ἔτρεφ]ε at line 2 along with ταλαεργόν [ὄνον; cf. Babr. 129.1 ὄνον τις ἔτρεφε καὶ κυνίδιον ὠραῖον. For its use as the equivalent of οἰκεῖος to refer to ‘domestic’ dogs, cf. [Opp.] C. 1.438 οἰκιδίησι κύνεσσιν, 473 λίχνοις οἰκιδίοισι τραπεζήεσσι κύνεσσι. Babrius refers to τὸ κυνίδιον, but the feminine form here would imply ἡ κύων or ἡ κύλαξ (always feminine in Homer and Hesiod).

2 ταλαεργόν [ὄνον. ταλαεργός is often said of mules (ἡμίονοι) in epic poetry (LSJ s.v.). For its application to a donkey specifically, cf. Nonn. *Par.* 12.64 ὄνον ταλαεργόν.

4 [πλησ]άμενος κρειθῆ[ς ~ Babr. 129.9 ἔτρωγε κριθάς. In view of the latter passage, the subject is more likely the donkey filling himself or satiating his heart with barley (cf. e.g. *Od.* 17.603) than the master filling e.g. a trough with barley for the donkey (cf. e.g. *Od.* 14.112).

In V, the codex of Babrius transmitting this fable, lines 8–9 of modern editions appear after line 1. They were transposed to their present position by Lachmann. The mention of barley so early in the fable in the hexameter version suggests that the poet’s copy of Babrius followed the same order as V, casting doubt on Lachmann’s intervention.

5 ἔσκαψε[~ Babr. 129.3 τὸν δεσπότην τε ποικίλως περικαῖρον (sc. the puppy). In Babr. the verb is also later used of the donkey, 14 θέλων περικαίρειν.

(c) 4 For Henry’s ἀβ[ροσύνη (rare), cf. Babr. 129.11 ἀβρότητι σὺν πάσῃ.

5 ῥ[ήχθησ]αν δὲ κάλο[ι ~ Babr. 129.12 φάτνης ὀνειίης δεσμὰ καὶ κάλουε ῥήξασ.

6 οὐ κατ[. For Henry's οὐ κατ[ὰ μέτρον, cf. Babr. 129.13 ἄμετρα λακτίζων.

7 π]ερισσαιν[. ~ Babr. 129.14 καίνων. The verb is Homeric (*Od.* 10.215, 16.4, 10).

11 δεξ[πο]τέφ νότ[ω ~ Babr. 129.17–18 δειπνοῦντα δ' ἰθὺς ἦλθε δεσπότην κύσσων, | νότοις ἐπεμβάσ. δεσπότης had appeared only in Lyc. 1183. For the form δεσπότης *metri causa*, cf. Homeric Ἐκτόρε(ι)ος, etc.

12 λακτ[ίζων ~ Babr. 129.13 ἄμετρα λακτίζων.

13 ὀ[τρηρο]ῖ θερά[ποντες ~ Babr. 129.19 θεράποντες. The phrase is Homeric (*Il.* 1.321, *Od.* 1.109, etc.).

14 π[ρήνι]ξαν. The verb first appears in Lycophron and Euphorion but becomes common in Imperial poetry.

15 For Henry's proposed θ[εῖνοντες, cf. Babr. 129.22 ἔθεινον.

Fable 142: The Oak Trees' Complaint to Zeus

Fr. 15

ὣς φάσαν· οὐδὲ ἄναξ ἄνεως ἦν.

Suda α 2284: ἄνεως· ὁ ἄφωνος. ἐν Μυθικοῖσ· ὦσ—ἦν.

Cf. Babr. 142.5 (as reconstructed from the prose paraphrase in G Ba): πρὸς ταῦτα δ' ὁ Ζεὺς μειδιῶν ἔλεξ' οὕτως.

'Thus they spoke, but the lord (Zeus) did not remain silent.'

ἄνεως. The Homeric adverb ἄνεω ('in silence') was often spelled with a final iota and interpreted by ancient grammarians as a nominative plural of a supposed adjective ἄνεως, e.g. Σ *Od.* 2.240c ἄνεω· σὺν τῷ ι τὸ "ἄνεω". εὐθεῖα γὰρ ἐστὶ πληθυντικὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνεως. The adjective is attested only here in literature. For the possibility that ἄνεω was in fact originally a nom. pl. adjective, see Beekes (2010) I 102–3 s.v., citing Peters (1993) (*non vidi*).

Fr. 16

τί γὰρ σθένος ἔσκε σιδήρω,
ὕμειων εἰ μὴ οἱ ἐνὶ στείλειδὸν ἀρήρει;

Suda c 1079: στείλειός· τὸ τῆς ἀξίνης ξύλον. τί—ἀρήρει;

1 ἔσχε V

Cf. Babr. 142.7–8 (as reconstructed from the prose paraphrase in G Ba and Suda c 1030): εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὕμιν στείλειά πάντ' ἐγεννήθη, | οὐκ ἂν γεωργὸς πέλεκυν ἐν δόμοις εἶχεν.

‘(Zeus replied): “For what strength would be in the iron (of an axe) if a shaft (made out of) you was not attached to it?”’

2 στειλειόν. A Homeric *hapax* at *Od.* 5.236 στειλειόν ... εὖ ἐναρηρός; cf. ἐνὶ ... ἀρήρει here.

CFA 190: The Toiling Donkey

Fr. 17

(a)] πονεῖτο π]ηλὸν ἀείρων κεραμῆ]ϊ ἄνακτι νυ]κτὶ καὶ ἡοῖ
5] .σειεν]σεν] ἀμεῖψαι ἦ]γαγεν Ἑρμῆς
10	γηθ]όσυνος κῆρ]ριαπο .[]]ινε . .[. . .]ε]]τα]αε .[
15]τε[] .νκ[]σαν[]ατω[]μι .[
20] .γε[] .κ .[]α .[] .ε[----- -----
(c)]αλε .[]ρηος

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 4 (a).1–23, (c).1–2

2 π]ηλὸν B. αειρω pap. 3 κεραμῆ]ϊ B.]ϊ pap. 4 ex.gr. [εὐχετο δὲ Κρονίδη πάσῃ σὺν H. νυ]κτὶ B. 5 ὥς κεν ... πολ]ήσειεν H. 6 ἐπένευ]σεν H. 8 ἦ]γαγεν B. 9 γηθ]όσυνος B. 11 λάτρ]ιν H. 18 v. comm.

‘... (the donkey) was toiling ... carrying clay ... for his master [the potter] ... (he prayed to Zeus) [every] night and day ... [so that] he might sell (?) [him again to another master] ... (Zeus) assented (?) ... to change ... Hermes led (the donkey) ... glad at heart ...’

This fable does not have a counterpart in the extant poems of Babrius. It appears to match CFA 190 on the donkey who toils for a gardener and prays to Zeus to change master. Zeus sends Hermes to sell him to a potter. The donkey suffers even more hardship under the potter and asks to change master again, whereupon he is sold to a tanner, leaving him wishing that he had stayed with his former masters.

1 πονεῖτο ~ CFA 190 I = *Aes.* 179 ἐπειδὴ καὶ πολλῶ πλείονα ἀχθοφορεῖν ἠναγκάζετο (sc. ὁ ὄνος), II ἐπειδὴ πολλῶ πλέον ἀχθοφορῶν, III πλέον ἢ πρότερον ἀχθοφορῶν.

2 π]ηλὸν ἀείρων ~ CFA 190 II ἦν <έν> τῶ πηλῶ καὶ τῇ πλινθείᾳ, III τὸν τε πηλὸν καὶ τὰς κεράμους κομίζων.

3 κεραμη]ῖ ἄνακτι. A reference to the potter, the donkey’s second master. For ἄναξ, cf. fr. 1.7 ἄνακτι.

4 νυ]κτὶ καὶ ἡοί. Probably a reference to the donkey’s second appeal to Zeus ~ CFA 190 I = *Aes.* 179 τὸν Δία ἐπικαλουμένου, II πάλιν τὸν Δία παρεκάλει, III πάλιν οὖν ἀμείψαι τὸν δεσπότην ἰκέτευε. In a version of the fable in Byzantine dodecasyllables (274d.2 Chambry, p. 448), he prays ‘every day’ (εὐχὴν ἐποιεῖτο Διὶ καθ’ ἐκάστην) to leave the gardener, his first master. For the phrase, cf. Theoc. 12.1 τρίτη εὖν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡοί | ἦλυθε; also Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 1.2.1.539 (*PG* XXXVII 563). It is likely that a preposition governed the dative, e.g. ἐν or εὖν, as in Theocritus; see Gow ad loc. on the use of the preposition and for the possibility that ἡός means ‘day’ rather than ‘dawn’.

7 ἀμείψαι recalls again CFA 190 III πάλιν οὖν ἀμείψαι τὸν δεσπότην ἰκέτευε.

8 ἦ]γαγεν Ἑρμῆς. A collocation recurring at verse-end at *AP* 7.91.1 (Diogenes Laertius), Nonn. *D.* 8.406, and Mus. 152. The line must refer to Hermes leading the donkey to his third master, the tanner. For the role of Hermes as Zeus’ intermediary, cf. CFA 190 I = *Aes.* 179 ὁ δὲ Ἑρμῆν πέμψας ἐκέλευε κεραμεῖ αὐτὸν πωλῆσαι (in reference to the first sale).

9 γηθ]όσυνος κῆρ: *Il.* 4.272, 326, 18.557. The subject is presumably the donkey, initially happy at the second change of master.

18]ατω[. Compatible with ἀεικέ]α τῶ [κεραμη]ῖ = fr. 18. Line 14 is less likely to match] ἀει[κέα, as the upright trace before the break seems too short for iota and the line would be much too long.

Fr. 18

λάτρην ἄγειν παλίνορσον ἀεικέα τῶ κεραμηῖ

Suda λ 149: λάτρον· ὁ μισθός. (...) λάτρις δὲ διὰ τοῦ ι. λάτρην—κεραμηῖ.

κεραμηῖ ἰῶτα V

‘(The donkey begged Zeus or Hermes) to lead him back to be an unfitting servant to the potter.’

Bergk (1868) 173 was the first to attribute this verse to the *Mythica*, and Crusius rightly related it to CFA 190. In view of *παλίνοργον*, the line should be connected to the donkey’s final wish to be led back to serve the potter rather than, as Crusius thought, to *ὁ δὲ* (Ζεὺς) Ἑρμῆν πέμψας ἐκελεύει κεραμεῖ αὐτὸν (τὸν ὄνον) πωλῆσαι in CFA 190 I = *Aes.* 179, i.e. the donkey’s first sale to the potter. Hecker (1842) 105, followed by Hollis and Pfeiffer, ascribed the line to Callimachus’ *Hecale* (fr. 94 H. = 344 Pf.), but not on any compelling grounds. Hollis is furthermore obliged to give *λάτρις* an unattested sense, ‘wage’ instead of ‘servant’, to fit the verse to the poem’s context (the *Suda*’s definition *μυθός* applies only to *λάτρον*).

λάτρις. The word is post-Homeric (Thgn., tragedy).

παλίνοργον. A Homeric *hapax* at *Il.* 3.33 recurring in Hellenistic and Imperial poetry; cf. esp. A.R. 1.416 ἄγε νῆα ... *παλίνοργον*.

ἀεικέα. For the application of the adjective to persons, see LSJ Suppl. s.v.

CFA 162, S 44: The Wolf and the Goat

Fr. 19

ποσσὶ δ’ ἀνελθεῖν
ἄγκος ἐς ὑψικάρηνον ἐδίξετο· πᾶσα δ’ ἀπορρώξ
πέτρῃ ἔην ὑπένερθε καὶ ἄμβρασις οὐ νύ τις ἦεν.

1–2 = *Suda* α 248: ἄγκος· ὑψηλὸς τοῦ ὄρου τόπος. ποσσὶ—ἐδίξετο. 2–3 = *Suda* α 3508: ἀπορρώγας· (...) καὶ ἀπορρώξ, ἀπόσπασμα ὄρου. (...) πᾶσα—ἦεν. 3 = *Suda* α 1517: ἄμβρασις· ἀνάβρασις. καὶ—ἦεν. versus coniunxit Bergk.

1 ποσσὶ δ’ ἀνελθεῖν Toup et Valckenaer : ποσσὶ δ’ ἀν̄ ἐλθεῖν codd. 3 ὑπένερθεν G T S M

CFA 162 = *Aes.* 157:¹³ λύκος θεακάμενος αἶγα ἐπὶ τινος κρημοῦ νεμομένην, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἠδύνατο αὐτῆς ἐφικέσθαι, κατωτέρω παρήνει αὐτὴν καταβῆναι, μὴ καὶ πέτρα λαθοῦσα, λέγων ὡς ἀμείνων ὁ παρ’ αὐτῷ λειμών, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ πόα σφόδρα εὐανθής. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς αὐτὸν “ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐμὲ ἐπὶ νομῆν καλεῖς, αὐτὸς δὲ τροφῆς ἀπορεῖς.” Cf. etiam S 44 (CFA II, p. 174).

‘(The wolf) sought to climb the high-peaked mountain glen with his feet, but the whole rock was sheer from underneath and there was no way up.’

The two fragments were joined by Bergk (1868) xx, 173, who related them to the prose fable of the wolf and the goat (CFA 162 = *Aes.* 157, S 44). The fable is not preserved in our incomplete text of Babrius. The lines were assigned to Callimachus’ *Hecale* by Hecker (1842) 121–2 (fr. 119 Hollis = 309 dub. Pf.), but it is difficult to see what situation they could relate to in that poem. Hecker, followed by Schneider (1873) 186, thought that the fragment was

¹³ I print Perry’s text from *Aes.* 157.

about Perigune, the daughter of Sinis, trying to escape from Theseus (cf. Plu. *Thes.* 8.4). Crusius (1905) 797 n. 2 defended the ascription to the *Mythica*. The suggestion by Webster (1964) 116, endorsed by Hollis, that the passage refers to the Marathonian bull trying to escape from Theseus is implausible, for it would be absurd to describe a bull trying to climb a mountain. Since it is known that 1) some hexameter quotations in the Suda without an attribution to a work or author certainly derive from the *Mythica*,¹⁴ and 2) the *Mythica* included fables not extant in the preserved poems of Babrius but with prose counterparts in the Aesopic corpus, there is no reason to doubt the ascription of this and the following fragments to that work in view of their close correspondence with CFA 162, S 44. See also below on fr. 20.

1–3 ~ CFA 162 = *Aes.* 157 ἐπί τινος κρημνοῦ ... ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἠδύνατο αὐτῆς ἐφικέσθαι, S 44 ἐπὶ πέτρας ὑψηλῆς νεμομένης ... μὴ δυνάμενος δὲ ὅλως ἐπαναβῆναι τῇ πέτρᾳ.

1–2 ἀνελεθεῖν ... ἐδίξετο. The use of δίζημαι with a complementary infinitive is post-Homeric (LSJ s.v., III; DGE s.v., 3).

2 ὑψικάρηνον. A Homeric *hapax* at *Il.* 12.132 (also *h.Ven.* 264), well attested in Imperial poetry. Only here with ἄγκος.

2–3 ἀπορρώξ | πέτρη. The enjambement is perhaps expressive. The collocation appears in the same position at *Od.* 10.514–15, but there the two words do not go together. Cf. Call. *Lav.Pall.* 41–2 ἀπορρώγεσσιν ... | ἐν πέτραις. The phrase is common in prose: see Bulloch (1985) on Call. loc. cit.

3 ἔην ... ἦεν. For the playful variation in form in the same line, cf. *Il.* 11.762 ὦς ἔον, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε, Call. *Iamb.* IV fr. 193.1 Pf. εἴθ' ἦν ... ἠνίκ' οὐκ ἦα. On the phenomenon, see Hopkinson (1982).

ἄμβαις. The syncopated form of the noun is rare, otherwise appearing only in Soph. *OC* 1070 and Phil. *AP* 16.106.2. The verb ἀμβάινειν (e.g. *Od.* 12.77) and the adjective ἀμβατός (e.g. *Il.* 6.434) are better attested in Homer.

Fr. 20

καὶ ἀγλαὰ πίσεια γαίης
βόσκειο

Suda π 1638: πίσεια· οἱ κάθυγροι τόποι. καὶ—βόσκειο.

2 βόσκειο Hecker

‘... and feed on the splendid meadows of the land.’

The wolf attempts to bring the goat down from his unreachable height by inviting him to feed on the grass in the meadows. The citation was attributed to the same fable by Bergk (1868) 173 (followed by Crusius), but to Callimachus' *Hecale* by Hecker (1842) 108 (fr. 149 Hollis = 363 Pf.). The second person, however, would not sit well in the *Hecale*. Hecker

¹⁴ Fr. 12.7–8; 13; 16. Cf. already Pfeiffer (1965) 228, correcting Hecker's statement that 'eaque (sc. *Mythica*) numquam sine nomine Suidas citat' (Hecker (1842) 94).

emended the verb to the third person, taking the subject to be the Marathonian bull, but as Hollis notes ad loc. ‘the style seems ... surprisingly “lush” for such a ferocious creature’. Pfeiffer’s suggestion, taken up by Hollis, that this is an apostrophe by the narrator, presumably in the imperfect, seems unlikely, since this device is typically used to elicit sympathy and would be jarring if it were used to address the monstrous bull. It is telling that Avianus, most (if not all) of whose fables are based on Babrius’ poems, has a version of the same fable (no. 26), substituting the wolf with a lion: cf. especially 26.5–6 *sed cytisi croceum per prata virentia florem | et glaucas salices et thyma grata pete*.

1 ἀγλαὰ πίεα ~ CFA 162 ἡ πόα παρ’ αὐτῷ φαιδροτάτη, *Aes.* 157 ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ πόα σφόδρα εὐανθή.¹⁵ πίεα is a Homeric *dis legomenon* (*Il.* 20.9, *Od.* 6.124), uncommon in poetry afterwards (*h. Ven.* 99, *h. Pan.* 2, A.R. 1.1266, 3.1218). Our poet varies the Homeric formula πίεα ποιήεντα with the epithet ἀγλαά, which Homer had already applied to an element of the landscape in *Il.* 2.506, *Od.* 6.291 ἀγλαὸν ἄλκοc.

πίεα γαίης. For such verse-endings with noun and dependent genitive, common in Dionysius Periegetes and Oppian, see Whitby (1994) 107, 109.

Fr. 21

πικρὴ μὲν τε λύκοισιν, ἀτὰρ χιμάρουσιν ἀκηδῆc

Suda α 860: ἀκηδῆc· ἄταφοc, ἀμελήc. (...) λέγεται καὶ ἀκηδῆc (ἀκηδῆc M) ἐν Μυθικοῖc· πικρὴ—ἀκηδῆc.

πικρὴ plerique codd. : πικροὶ I Lachmann λύκοισιν Küster : λύκοιc codd. ἀτὰρ G T M : αὐτὰρ plerique codd. ἀκηδῆc codd. : ἀκηδεῖc Lachmann

‘(The rock is) bitter to wolves but harmless to goats.’

This line was previously attributed to a version of Babr. 93, in which wolves offer to make a treaty with sheep on condition that the guard dogs are delivered to them for punishment. It would supposedly refer to the dogs, who are ‘bitter to wolves but harmless to goats’. Crusius compares Babr. 93.4 δι’ οὗc (sc. τοὺc κύναc οἱ λύκοι καὶ ἡ ποιῖμη) μάχονται καὶ κοτοῦσιν ἀλλήλοισι, but that line makes a different point. The hexameter verse refers to goats, not sheep, and this interpretation requires a violent emendation of the two adjectives to the masculine plural, whereas the feminine singular ending is strongly supported by the Suda’s introductory λέγεται καὶ ἀκηδῆc ἐν Μυθικοῖc. Bernhardt (1853) II 1786 also found the ascription to the fable of Babr. 93 doubtful.¹⁶ As Henry suggests, the line would suit the πέτρῃ of fr. 19.3. ‘The fragment could belong to the goat’s reply to the wolf at the end of the fable (with generalising plurals): she is not persuaded by his argument that she is endangering herself by remaining on the cliff.’

Note the elegantly chiasmic structure of the verse.

¹⁵ ἀγλαά would seem to support Hausrath’s φαιδροτάτη (cf. φαιδροτέρα Pb, σφοδροτάτη Mb CA).

¹⁶ ‘πικροὶ μὲν τε λύκοισιν, ἀτὰρ χιμάρουσιν ἀκηδεῖc coniectura Lachmanni Babr. p. VII. quae Babrii fab. 93. parum convenit.’

ἀκηδής. In early epic, the epithet means ‘uncared for’, especially in the sense of ‘unburied’, or ‘without care’. The active sense of ‘harmless’ is late and is only paralleled by Opp. 1.611 (δελφίνες) ἀκηδέες ἐννεμέθονται, 2.648 (κεστρήες) αἵματος ἄχραντοι καὶ ἀκηδέες. For the active and passive possibilities of compound adjectives in -ής, see Chantraine (1933) 428.

CFA 203: The Ass, the Fox, and the Lion (?)

Fr. 22

] κεν ἀλώπηξ</td
]ν ἐθέμεϑθα
]δὲ σοὶ αὐτῶι
] αἴ κε πίθηαι
5]τα τε προτενή τε
]ανεύμενοι εὐνής
]α[ι] ἄτος ἐδωδής
] ἀλεείνειν
]ονδ' ἐτέτυκτο
10	θυμ]ὸς ἀγήνωρ
	π]επ[ο]ιθῶς
	ἀ]μφοτέροισιν
] , ὁ μὲν αἰνῶς
	γ]αμφηλῆσι
15] κῆρα φυγοῦσα
	πειθῆ]μογα βουλής

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 2 i 26–41

1 συνέθη]κεν H. 3] δὲ, ἡ]δὲ, οὐ]δὲ possis 6]α νεύμενοι vel μετ]ανεύμενοι B. 10 θυμ]ὸς B. 11 (ex.gr. ἀλκί) π]επ[ο]ιθῶς B. 12 ἀ]μφοτέροισιν B. 13 ὄφ]ρ' vel ἔν]θ' H.] , ' pap. 14 γ]αμφηλῆσι B. 15 [ἡ δ(έ) ad versus initium H. 16 πειθῆ]μογα H.

‘A fox ...-ed ... “we established ... to you yourself ... if you listen ...” ... and fore-stretching ... as they were going ... of the lair ... (a lion) insatiable of food ... to avoid ... was made ... his valiant [heart] ... trusting in ... both of them ... the one ... terribly ... in/with his jaws ... (while the fox) escaping death ... persuaded by her counsels ...’

The fable told in these lines is not identifiable among the surviving fables of Babrius. It seems to suit CFA 203 = *Aes.* 191 on the ass, the fox, and the lion. The fox and the ass form an alliance (1–4) and go out to hunt together (6). When they encounter a ravenous lion (7–11), the fox betrays the ass to him, hoping that he will kill the ass but spare her (13–16). The end of the fable will have come at the top of the next column in the papyrus, now lost: in fact, the lion will kill the fox first, then the ass.

1]κεν ἀλώπηξ. If correct, Henry's συνέθη]κεν is probably used in the sense of 'frame, devise, contrive' (LSJ s.v. συντίθημι A.II.5).

2 ἐθέμεσθα. At verse-end in Opp. 5.564, with ὁμοφροσύνην as object, said of the former truce between men and dolphins. Presumably here of the pact between the fox and the ass; cf. CFA 203 I, III ὄνος καὶ ἀλώπηξ κοινωνίαν συνθέμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους. Cf. fr. 10.1 θέντο μετ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἐταιρείην and fr. 24 μετὰ δὲ σφίσι πιτώσαντο | συνθεσίην.

3]δὲ κοὶ αὐτῶι. Cf. in the same position *Il.* 3.51 δυςμενέειν μὲν χάρμα, κατηφείην δὲ κοὶ αὐτῶ, 23.342 χάρμα δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοισιν, ἐλεγχείη δὲ κοὶ αὐτῶ. Did the line have the same structure?

4 αἴ κε πίθηται = *Il.* 1.207, 21.293, 23.82, *Od.* 1.279.

5]τα τε προτενῆ τε. Probably two neuter plural adjectives. προτενής, 'fore-stretching', is relatively uncommon (first in A.R. 1.756, of a spear). It is said of the antelope's horns in [Opp.] 2.304 καὶ κεράων ὀρθαὶ μὲν ἀπὸ κρατὸς πεφύασι | ἀκρέμονες προτενεῖς, based on Opp. 2.122, where it describes the cuttlefish's feelers. The remaining poetic instance is Nonn. *D.* 25.411.

6]ανεύμενοι εὐνής. Cf. Nonn. *D.* 14.89 τὸν μὲν ὀρετιάδος Κώκης μετανέμενος εὐνήν (the verb recurs in 29.7, 36.161), *Mus.* 205 οὐ τρομέω βαρὺ χεῖμα τεῖην μετανέμενος εὐνήν. On the verb, see Hollis on Call. *Hec.* fr. 69.6. The line presumably corresponds to ἐξῆλθον ἐπὶ ἄγραν in CFA 203 I: the ass and the fox are 'going after' some prey. εὐνής could be either their prey's lair or their own.

7 ἄτος ἐδωδής. Presumably the lion. The phrase is based on ἄτος πολέμοιο in Homer, often said of Ares (*Il.* 5.388, etc.).

10 θυμ]δὸς ἀγῆνωρ. A frequent phrase at verse-end in Homer (*Il.* 2.276, 4.467, etc., *Od.* 2.103, 4.548, etc.); also in Hes. *Th.* 641 and *h.Merc.* 132, but not in later hexametric poetry.

11 π]επ[ο]ιθός. E.g. ἀλκὶ πεποιθός, as in *Il.* 5.299, 13.471, 17.61, 728, 18.158, *Od.* 6.130, often said of a lion.

12 ἀ]μφοτέροισιν. Presumably the fox and the ass.

13–16 The fox hopes (13 ὄφ]ρ'?) that the ass (ὁ μὲν) will fare badly (αἰνῶς) in the jaws (γ]αμφηλῆσι) of the lion, while she (ἡ δέ to be supplied at the start of 15) will escape death (κῆρα φυγοῦσα) through her wits (βουλήσιν).

13 αἰνῶς. Often at verse-end in Homer.

14 γ]αμφηλῆσι. The jaws of the lion, as in *Il.* 13.200, 16.489 (also dat. pl. but in a different position within the verse).

15 κῆρα φυγοῦσα. Cf. at verse-end *Il.* 17.714 κῆρα φύγομεν, *Od.* 12.157 κῆρα φύγομεν.

16 πειθή]μογα βουλήσιν. Cf. Christodorus (5th/6th cent.), *AP* 2.242 ἔης πειθήμονα βουλήσιν, Nonn. *P.* 10.144 χέων πειθήμονα βουλήν. The adjective otherwise first appears in Triph. 456 and is common in Nonnus. The expression is probably said of the ass whom the fox tricked. Contrast the fem. dat. pl. in -ησι with that in -αισι in fr. 11.11.

Babr. fr. 9: The Jujube Tree and the Snake (?)

Fr. 23

]
] .ην
]
]ν
 5]εc
]αι
] .αιηc
]c
 10 ρέε]θρου
]ic ἄκανθαγ
 πεπε]δημένoc . .[
] δ' ἔειπεν
] ναύτης
] . . . ε .[

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 5

7 ex.gr. γαίης B. 9 ρέε]θρου H. 11 πεπε]δημένoc B. 13]ν αὐτῆς possis

‘... of the stream (?) ... the thorny plant ... bound ... spoke ... the sailor ...’

The fable related in lines 9–13 (and possibly earlier lines) appears to correspond to Babr. fr. 9 (Luzzatto–La Penna p. 151), known only from a prose paraphrase. The fable concerns a παλίουρος-tree (Christ’s thorn jujube) that is swept away by an overflowing river, with a snake entwined in its branches. An onlooker comments: κακὴ μὲν ἢ ναῦς, ἀξίη δὲ τοῦ ναύτου, ‘bad is the ship (i.e. the thorny tree), but worthy of its sailor (i.e. the snake)’. 9 ρέε]θρου would correspond to ποταμοῦ/ποταμός of the paraphrase, 10 ἄκανθαγ to παλίουρον, 11 πεπε]δημένoc (sc. ὁ δράκων) to συμπλακέντα, 12 δ' ἔειπεν to εἶπε δέ, 13 ναύτης to ναύτου. Cf. the related fable in CFA 98 ~ *Aes.* 96: ἔχις ἐπὶ δέσμη ἀκανθῶν εἷς τινα ποταμὸν ἐφέρετο. ἀλώπηξ δὲ θεασαμένη αὐτὴν εἶπεν· “ἄξιος τῆς νηὸς ὁ ναύκληρος”.

Another possibility is perhaps Babr. 64 (the fir tree and the bramble); cf. 5–6 στέγη τε μελάθρων (στέγης τε μέλαθρον Bergk) εἰμὶ καὶ τρόπις πλοίων· | δένδρω τοσοῦτω πῶς ἄκανθα συγκρίνη;. This is followed by the bramble’s reply at 8ff. βάτος πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν. The opening line of the hexameter version of this fable is quoted by Suda α 269 and 339: αἰπεινὴν ἐλάτην ἔρις ὄρορεν αἴσυλα φάσθαι (fr. 4 ~ Babr. 64.1); cf. 6]αι. Babr. 134.12–13 (the tail leading the snake) may also be relevant: κοῖλον δὲ πέτρης εἰς βάραθρον ἠνέχθη | καὶ τὴν ἄκανθαγ ταῖς πέτραισι συντρίβει, followed by the tail’s address to the head, 14ff. καίνουσα δ' ἰκέτευεν ἢ πρὶν αὐθάδη.

FRAGMENTA EX INCERTIS FABULIS

Fr. 24

μετὰ δὲ σφίσι πιετώσαντο

αλλ[
εσ.[

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 2 ii 28–31

Fr. 28

5]ετοχρ[
]ετο .υμ[
]ζων .[
]νουδ .[
]αφεπ[
] .ε . . [.] . [.]
]στι [.
] .εκρυ[
10]εχερ[
] .ρι . [.
] .λα[
] . . . [.

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 6

Fr. 29

]κεξ[
] ἀνακτ[
]ωλι[
5]ποιο[
]χειν[
]αχε[
]ρικα[
]οσμ[
]ευς[
10]φικ[
]μα[
]οδ . [.

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 7

‘... lord ...’

Fr. 30

] .[
] .ϕω
] .
5] .ω
]
]
]ϵ
] .οι . .ον
]
10]
] .
]α
]ἔοικεν
]ην
15]
]φην
]ϵ

P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 8

13 ἔοικεν vel ἐπ]έοικεν B.

‘... is fitting ...’

FRAGMENTA DUBIA

Fable 43: The Overproud Stag (?)

Fr. dub. 1

αἰπύκερωε ἔλαφος

Suda αι 275: αἰπύκερωε ἔλαφος· ὕψηλὰ κέρατα ἔχων.

Cf. Babr. 43.1: ἔλαφος κεράκτηε ὑπὸ τὸ καῦμα διψήσας (A) vel ἔλαφος c. 8 litt. εὐκέρωε (Π²).

‘A steep-horned stag’

This fragment was attributed to the *Mythica* by Bruhn (1890) 283, followed by Crusius, but the ascription must naturally remain very doubtful. This is the only instance of the adjective αἰπύκερωε in literature. The lack of original compound formations in the surviving fragments of the *Mythica* would speak against an ascription to this poem.

Fable 75: The Unskilled Doctor (?)

Fr. dub. 2

τοῖς δ' ἐπέσειε φόβον, ὡς αὐτίκα τεθνήζοντος

Suda ε 2080: ἐπέσειεν· ἐπανετείετο. τοῖς—τεθνήζοντος.

1 τῷ Bergk τεθνήζοντος A F Zon. : τεθνήζαντος G VM : τεθνήζαντο I

‘(The doctor?) used to shake fear at them, (saying) that (the patient?) will die straightaway.’

This fragment was tentatively attributed to the *Mythica* by Bergk (1868) xxii (followed by Crusius), who plausibly related it to Babr. 75.5 ἀποθνήσκεις, 7 τὴν αὐρίον γὰρ μακρὸν οὐχ ὑπερβήκη. It used to be attributed to Callimachus, but it is not included by Pfeiffer in his edition.

1 ἐπέσειε φόβον. In poetry, the object of ἐπισειώ is usually the thing that causes fear, not fear itself. The usage here, however, is well attested in Late Antique prose, e.g. Lib. *Or.* 56.11. It may go as far back as Call. *Aet.* fr. 74 Pf. τί δέ σοι ἐπέθηκα φόβον if Meineke was right to emend ἐπέθηκα to ἐπέσειε. ἐπέσειε breaches Meyer’s First Law; cf. below, Section V(3).

τεθνήζοντος. The future perfect form is not otherwise found in hexameter poetry.

Fable 119: The Golden Hermes (?)

Fr. dub. 3

Ἑρμείη ξυλίνῳ τις ἐπηύχετο, καὶ ξύλον ἦεν.
εἶτά μιν αἰείρας χαμάδις βάλε· τοῦ δ' ἄπο χρυσός
ἔρρευεν καταγένοτος. ὕβρις πόρε πολλάκι κέρδος.

AP 16.187

Cf. Babr. 119.1–5:

ξυλινόν τις Ἑρμῆν εἶχεν· ἦν δὲ τεχνίτης.
επένδων δὲ τούτῳ καὶ καθ' ἡμέρην θύων
ἔπρασσε φαύλως. τῷ θεῷ δ' ἐθυμώθη,
χαμαὶ δ' ἀπεκρότησε τοῦ κέλουε ἄρα.
5 χρυσὸς δὲ κεφαλῆς ἔρρηξεν καταγείσης·

‘A certain man prayed for help to a wooden Hermes, but Hermes remained wooden. Then, taking him up, the man threw him on the ground, and, the statue breaking, out from it poured gold. Outrage often produces profit.’ (tr. W. R. Paton, Loeb)

Eberhard (1875) 97 suspected this short fable in hexameters to belong to the *Mythica*. It is clearly based on Babr. 119. However, as Eberhard himself observed, the poet of the *Mythica* ‘Babrium ... tam accurate sequitur, paene ut singulos uersus eius exprimat’, whereas this poet has compressed Babrius’ ten-line fable into three epigrammatic lines. The ascription to the *Mythica* therefore seems unlikely.

II. The *Mythica* and Babrius’ *Mythiambi*

The *Mythica* is known from two sources: quotations in the Suda and a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus dating from the third century CE.²⁰ The following table gives an overview of the fables with hexametric versions:

Babrius	Suda	P.Oxy. 5644	Prose Aesopica
3	–	fr. 1	–
36	fr. 2–3	–	CFA 71 (<i>Aes.</i> 70)
43 (?)	fr. dub. 1	–	CFA 76 I (<i>Aes.</i> 74), II
64	fr. 4	–	–
67	fr. 5–6, (fr. 24?)	–	–
75 (?)	fr. dub. 2	–	–
77	–	fr. 7	CFA 126 I (<i>Aes.</i> 124), II, III
95	fr. 8–9	fr. 8	–
108	fr. 10–11	fr. 11	–
115	fr. 12	fr. 12	CFA 259 I (<i>Aes.</i> 230), II, III α β γ
122	fr. 13	–	CFA 198 I (<i>Aes.</i> 187), III γ δ
129	–	fr. 14	CFA 93 I (<i>Aes.</i> 91) ²¹
142	fr. 15–16	–	–
fr. 9	–	fr. 23	–
–	fr. 18	fr. 17	CFA 190 I (<i>Aes.</i> 179), II, III
–	fr. 19–21	–	CFA 162 (<i>Aes.</i> 157), S 44
–	–	fr. 22	CFA 203 (<i>Aes.</i> 191)

The Suda cites from at least 10, possibly as many as 12, fables, two of which are known only from the prose Aesopica (CFA 162, 190). The papyrus offers fragments of at least 9 fables. Four of these were already known from the Suda (emboldened in the table), but the papyrus adds versions of fables 3, 77, 129, and Babr. fr. 9, as well as a version of CFA 203.²² All of the identifiable Babrian fables, apart from 129 (transmitted by V), 142 (transmitted by G), and Babr. fr. 9 (known only from a prose paraphrase), are present in the tenth-century Athous codex of Babrius (BL Add. MS 22087), the most important manuscript of his fables. This

²⁰ P.Oxy. LXXXVIII 5644 consists of ten fragments written on the back of a roll that was assembled from various discarded documents.

²¹ See also the version printed in Perry (1961) 7–9.

²² The fables in fr. 25–30 from P.Oxy. 5644 cannot be identified or placed in view of the small amount of text preserved. They may either represent additional fables or overlap with the already known ones.

alphabetically arranged collection is known to be incomplete, however, because it breaks off in the middle of the letter o (fable 123). It is thus likely that the versions of CFA 162, 190, and 203 paraphrase fables by Babrius that are now lost and that probably began with the letters o–ω. Of the 15 to 17 fables with hexametric versions, 9 have prose counterparts in the Aesopic corpus (see below, Section III),²³ while 8 are known only from Babrius and his imitators or later paraphrases.

It is not possible to determine whether the sequence of fables in the *Mythica* corresponded to Babrius' original ordering, since the latter is largely unknown as a result of the alphabetisation of the fables in later recensions.²⁴ Two of the three fables that are separated by coronides and paragraphi in the second column of P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 2 are not identifiable, though the second likely corresponds to Babr. 77 (*Myth.* fr. 7). The first letters of the first two fables at least (*Myth.* fr. 26.1 κϰ[, fr. 7.1 τ[) are not identical or consecutive; the third probably began with the letter π (*Myth.* fr. 27.1). In P.Oxy. 5644 fr. 4, a version of Babr. 3 on the goat and the goatherd (*Myth.* fr. 1) is followed immediately by one of Babr. 129 on the donkey who would be a pet (*Myth.* fr. 14). The evidence of the papyrus thus adds further, if admittedly indirect, support to the hypothesis that Babrius did not order his fables by letter of the alphabet. It has become current in recent scholarship to argue or assume that the alphabetical arrangement of the fables goes back to Babrius himself.²⁵ These attempts fail to convince, however, and do not sufficiently take into account the evidence of the papyri of the *Mythiambi*, especially Π¹ = P.Oxy. X 1249, which dates from as early as the second century.²⁶ A recently published papyrus of Babrius datable to the late second or early third century similarly does not follow the order of the Athous codex.²⁷ P.Amh. II 26 = Π³ (3rd/4th century) seems to follow a roughly alphabetic ordering principle, as all three fables preserved begin with alpha, but they appear in a different order from that found in the Athous codex (17, 16, 11). While this shows at least that collections based on an alphabetic order existed in antiquity, it is worth noting that this papyrus is not a regular bookroll, but an exercise in Latin translation probably used in an educational context.²⁸

A terminus ante quem for the composition of the *Mythica* is fixed by P.Oxy. 5644, which is securely datable to the third century. The hexameters are written on the back of a roll formed of various discarded documents, one of which is a copy of a report of proceedings before Septimius Severus during his visit to Egypt in 200 CE.²⁹ The writing of the literary text, in a small informal hand inclined to the right and with cursive features, does not suggest a date later

²³ I exclude prose paraphrases of Babrius from this count.

²⁴ On the sequence of fables in different manuscripts of Babrius, see Vaio (2001) xxxiii–xxxiv and Perry (1965) lvii–lix. Further details in Luzzatto–La Penna (1986) xxiii–xxix.

²⁵ See e.g. Holzberg (1993) 59–60, 72, 94–5 = (2002) 53–5, 65, 85; Mann (2018) 271 n. 35; Spielhofer (2023) 37–50. Hawkins (2014) 134 treats the first fable of the Athous as the first of the collection.

²⁶ The original editors assigned P.Oxy. 1249 to the second century. The hand is probably that of Scribe A#3 in Johnson (2004) 18–20, which was responsible for a number of papyri of Aeschylus, all of which were also assigned to the second century by Edgar Lobel, their original editor. Luzzatto–La Penna (1986) xxix n. 1 redates the papyrus to the early third century but do not cite any parallels or evidence in support. In favour of the second-century dating, cf. also Turner–Parsons (1987) no. 24 and Cavallo (2005) 183.

²⁷ P.Oxy. LXXXVIII 5643, preserving the beginning of fable 91 preceded by an uncertain fable which is not no. 90 of the Athous codex.

²⁸ On this text, see Adams (2003) 725–41; Kramer (2007) 137–44; Scappaticcio (2017) 103–66. For other examples of the use of fables in the learning of Latin, see Dickey (2012) 24–5 and Scappaticcio (2022).

²⁹ P.Oxy. LXXXVIII 5662.

than the third century. Now, in the prologue to his second book, presumably written some years after the first, Babrius disparages imitators of his poetry:

ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δὲ πρώτου τῆς θύρης ἀνοιχθείσης
εἰσῆλθον ἄλλοι, καὶ σοφωτέρης μούσης
γρίφοις ὁμοίαις ἐκφέρουσι ποιήσεις,
μαθόντες οὐδὲν πλεῖον ἢ με γινώσκειν.

‘When the door was first opened by me,
others entered in who publish poems
resembling the riddles of a more learned
muse, skilled in nothing more than imitating
my example.’ (prol. 2.9–12, tr. adapted from
Perry (1965))

This passage very probably refers to the poet of the *Mythica*, which would imply that the work dates from Babrius’ own lifetime in the first or second century. This was already the view of earlier scholars of Babrius who knew only the fragments in the Suda.³⁰ The sarcastic σοφωτέρη μούση would suit well a reference to the more prestigious hexameter verse of the adapter, while γρίφοις ὁμοίαις ... ποιήσεις probably alludes to the high poetic style and sometimes recondite vocabulary of the epic poem, on which see below, Section V. In his recent commentary on Babr. 1–17, Lukas Spielhofer suggests that the mention of imitators in Babrius’ second prologue should be understood ‘als literarischen Gestus’,³¹ but this seems too reductive: while it may be a literary convention to refer to one’s envious rivals or imitators, this does not preclude reference to actual imitators. Whether the plural ἄλλοι in Babrius’ prologue is generalising or implies that there was more than one contemporary imitator must remain an open question. The date of the elegiac version of the fables is unknown (see Appendix below), but it appears to be based on the hexameter version rather than directly on Babrius in view of the close correspondence between fr. eleg. 1 αἰπειναῖς ἐλάταις ἔριεν βάτος and fr. hex. 4 αἰπεινὴν ἐλάτην ἔρις.³² The identification of the author of the *Mythica* with the ‘other’ poets in Babrius’ second prologue would imply that the fables represented in the hexameter fragments were all included in Babrius’ first book.³³ This is, incidentally, further proof against an alphabetical ordering in Babrius’ original, since these fables are currently divided between two books in the alphabetised recension of the Athous codex.

III. The *Mythica* and the Aesopica

Three fables treated in the *Mythica* appear only in the prose Aesopica, namely CFA 162 (*Aes.* 157) + S 44, CFA 190 (*Aes.* 179), and CFA 203 (*Aes.* 191). I argued above that choliambic

³⁰ E.g. Lachmann (1845) viii; Crusius (1879) 194–5 n. 3; Rutherford (1883) xxi; Perry (1965) lxi, 141 n. a; Wagner (1977) 1125; Hunter (2014) 236 n. 23.

³¹ Spielhofer (2023) 58–59. Similarly Spielhofer (2021) 377–9.

³² So Crusius (1897) 220: ‘Elegiographus eum imitatur qui v. 5 [i.e. *Myth.* fr. 4] scripsit.’

³³ Unless there was a ‘second edition’ of both books, to which Babrius added a new prologue, but this seems less likely; cf. Vaio (2001) li–lii.

versions of these fables probably formed part of Babrius' original collection but are now missing from the truncated alphabetic recension of the Athous codex. There are nevertheless verbal points of contact with other prose fables that raise the question whether the poet of the *Mythica* consulted a collection of Aesopic fables in addition to Babrius. This is most evident in his adaptation of Babr. 115 on the eagle and the tortoise (fr. 12). Babrius has the eagle ask πόσον, χέλυμα, μισθὸν αἰετῷ δώσεις, | ὅστις σ' ἐλαφρῆν καὶ μετάρσιον θήσω;, 'Tortoise, how much pay will you give me, an eagle, if I enable you to rise lightly on high in the air?' (5–6, tr. adapted from Perry). The hexameter version runs: τίς γὰρ ἐμοὶ ἐέο μισθὸς ἐπάξιος, ἦν σε διδάξω | ὑποῦ ὑπὲρ πόντοιο μεταχρονίην ποτέεσθαι; (7–8). The use of the verb διδάσκειν recalls the prose version in CFA 259 I = *Aes.* 230 προελθοῦσα δὲ τοῦτον παρεκάλει ἐφ' ᾧ βούλεται μισθῷ διδάξαι αὐτήν (similarly in versions II and III); but it may be argued that the verb was simply incorporated from the eagle's reply in Babr. 115.8 τοιγὰρ διδάξω, without having recourse to the prose version. Two other correspondences, however, are more difficult to explain away. In the *Mythica*, the eagle seizes the tortoise with its claws (11 ὀνύχεσσιν αἰείρα) where Babr. 115.8 has simply ὑπτίην δ' ἄρα, but a mention of claws is also found in CFA 259 III λαβὼν οὖν ταύτην τοῖς ὄνυξι. And when the eagle releases the tortoise from a great height, both the hexameter poet and the prose versions use forms of ἵημι (fr. 12.13 ἦκε φέρεσθαι, CFA 259 I, II, III ἀφήκεν) and mention the rocks on which the tortoise fell,³⁴ whereas Babr. 115.9 has only ἔνθεν εἰς ὄρος ῥίψα. Another close verbal correspondence between the *Mythica* and a prose fable occurs in fr. 17(a).2 πηλὸν αἰείρων ~ CFA 190 III τὸν τε πηλὸν καὶ τὰς κεράμους κομίζων.³⁵ It is curious that two of these correspondences—ὀνύχεσσιν ~ τοῖς ὄνυξι and πηλὸν αἰείρων ~ τὸν τε πηλὸν ... κομίζων—appear in the third recension of the Aesopica, the so-called *collectio Accursiana*. Because this recension is late and was probably edited by Maximus Planudes in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, it is not impossible that the *Mythica* was known to Planudes and that he borrowed these details from the hexameter poem.³⁶ In fact, the dating of the archetype of the *collectio Augustana* (I), the primary recension of Aesopic fables from which most of the surviving prose versions ultimately derive, is itself highly controversial, and it is likely that even it postdated the *Mythica*.³⁷ As Luzzatto has observed, it appears that Babrius' own *Mythiambi* were known to the redactor of the *Augustana* to judge from the quotation of Babr. 143.6 in CFA 62.³⁸ The *Mythica* poet's use of prose sources in addition to Babrius must therefore remain an open question.

³⁴ Fr. 12.14 στυφελῶν ἐπὶ πλευρῶν (P.Oxy. 5644: πετρῶν Suda) ~ CFA 259 I ἐπὶ τινος πέτρας, II ἐπὶ πέτραν, III κατὰ πετρῶν. The Suda's πετρῶν would allow an even clearer alignment with the prose fable, but the papyrus' πλευρῶν is the *lectio difficilior* (see above, n. ad loc.). It is not inconceivable that the already corrupt reading πετρῶν in the *Mythica* was known to the later redactor of the prose fable, especially in view of the other correspondences with the hexameter poem.

³⁵ Admittedly, in this case we do not know the wording of Babrius' lost original, which may or may not have been similar.

³⁶ On the ascription of this recension to Planudes, see Karla (2003).

³⁷ For a review of the different opinions on the date of the *Augustana*, see Jedrkiwicz (1989) 22–4 and Rodríguez Adrados (1999) 60–67, but Rodríguez Adrados' own dating of the collection as we have it to the fourth or fifth century has been rejected by Luzzatto (1983), who argues for a date in the early Byzantine period on stylistic grounds (see esp. pp. 173–7).

³⁸ Luzzatto (1983) 145 with n. 49. On the relation between the *collectio Augustana* and Babrius, see further La Penna in Luzzatto–La Penna (1986) xi–xvii.

IV. Epicising Babrius: The Example of Fable 95

How did the poet of the *Mythica* go about transforming Babrius' choliambic fables to epic form? His treatment of fable 95 on the lion, the fox, and the deer can serve as a case study. At 102 lines, this is by far the longest fable in Babrius and arguably the most 'epic'. Morton Nøjgaard characterised it as a 'fable épique' and analysed its episodic structure and style.³⁹ Niklas Holzberg remarked that 'Der Text erinnert, obwohl er nicht in Hexametern geschrieben ist, außer mit seinem großen Umfang auch durch narrative Struktur und Stil eher an ein Epyllion (Kurzepos) als an eine Exempelerzählung in aisopischer Tradition'.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, even if the scope and episodic structure of this fable are reminiscent of an epyllion, Babrius' language and style remain remote from those of epic.⁴¹ The very extent of the hexameter adaptation is proof of that.

The preserved portion of this fable in fr. 8 is from near the beginning of the fable, corresponding to lines 10–23 of Babr. 95. The Suda quotes parts of 5 lines from the hexametric version, three of which appear in context in the papyrus. To summarise the situation at the start: the lion lies gravely ill and is no longer able to go on the hunt, and so he asks his friend the fox to lure a deer into his cave with her persuasive words. The fox visits the deer and informs her that the dying lion has chosen her as his successor as queen of the animals, flattering her with various means and inviting her to visit the lion.

When the fox goes to the deer, she finds her skipping about the soft grass, κικρτῶσαν εὔρε μαλθακῆς ὑπὲρ ποίης (Babr. 95.11). The epic poet uses a similar phrase (2–3 ἐπὶ ποίης] | κκαίρουσαν μαλακ[ῆς) but substitutes different forms for variety, replacing κικρτάω with κκαίρω (both are poetic) and μαλθακῆς, which of course would not scan in dactylic, with μαλακ[ῆς. The possible enjambement and separation of the noun from its epithet may be expressive.

Babrius reports the beginning of the fox's address in indirect speech: εἶτα καὶ χαίρειν | προσεῖπε (12–13). In the *Mythica*, however, this has been incorporated into the fox's direct speech, as befits the style of hexameter epic. The poet takes the opening χαίρε φίλη from the fox's farewell near the *end* of her speech in Babrius: ἀλλὰ χαίρε, φιλότατη (28). Then Babrius' χρηστῶν τ' ἄγγελος λόγων ἦκειν (13), 'and (the fox said) that she had come to bring good news', still in indirect speech, is turned to a prayer in the optative and is elaborated into a wish to receive a gift from the deer in return for the good news the fox brings: καί μοι ... | δῶρον ἔοι παρὰ εἰ[λο λόγουσ χρηστοῦσ ἀϊούσῆς] (4–5). This is similar in sentiment to the fox's later wish in Babr. 95.26–7: τότ' ἂν (A: οὔν Haupt, αὖ Seidler) γένοιτο τῆς ἀλώπεκος μνήμη, | δέσποινα, τῆς σοι τοῦτο πρῶτον εἰπούσῆς (26–7), 'when that day comes, mistress, I pray you will remember the fox, who was the first to tell you this news'. (Incidentally, the papyrus' ἔοι supports γένοιτο as an optative of wish in Babrius, as some scholars have conjectured.) The epic adapter is clearly not averse to rearranging the order of the material in Babrius, transposing elements from the end of the fox's speech to its beginning.

³⁹ Nøjgaard (1967) 322–26.

⁴⁰ Holzberg (2019) 37. Similarly Holzberg (1993) 64 = (2002) 58.

⁴¹ Perhaps a more immediate model for a fable of this scale was Callimachus' fable of the laurel and the olive tree in *Iambus* IV, which extends over a hundred lines.

The fox goes on to recall the lion's illness and imminent death: οἶθ'αυτὸν (14) becomes γινώσκεις (6), and ἔχει δὲ φαύλως (15) is turned to κείνον νοῦκος ἔμ[αρψε] (8), a high expression with the exclusively poetic verb μάρπτω, which has close parallels in some verse inscriptions (see n. ad loc.). At the same time, κἀγγύς ἐστι τοῦ θνήσκειν (15) is transformed to ἐγγύθεν ὑστατεῖν (9), a rare use of the adjective ὑστάτιος as a substantive paralleled in Quintus of Smyrna (14.315 ἐφ' ὑστατῆ βιότοιο). Babrius' τίς οὖν μετ' αὐτὸν θηρίων τυραννῆσει, | διεσκοπεῖτο (16–17), 'so he has been thinking much of late concerning who should rule the beasts when he is gone', is expanded significantly and now occupies two full hexameter verses (10–11). The simple διεσκοπεῖτο is stretched out to καὶ οἱ πορφυρέοντι διακριδὸν ἀμφὶ ἕκαστα, 'as he pondered each thing separately', using the almost exclusively epic verb πορφυρέω and with the second half of the verse modelled on A.R. 1.498 διέκριθεν ἀμφὶ ἕκαστα (in a different context).

The fox proceeds to flatter the deer by mentioning her superiority over other animals. The beginning of the comparison is nearly identical to Babrius': 12 ἄρκτος μὲν νοθή[ε ~ Babr. 95.18 ἄρκτος δὲ νοθήε. Note the spondaic rhythm, expressive of the bear's sluggishness. The adjective νοθήε is a Homeric *hapax* at *Il.* 11.559, where it is said of a donkey, so that it was fitting for the adapter to retain it. No other animal is named between the bear and the leopard in Babrius, but a mention of the boar precedes (17 *cūc* μὲν ἐστιν ἀγνώμων). μὲν in the *Mythica* probably implies that the boar was mentioned in the second hemistich, e.g. ἄρκτος μὲν νοθή[ε ἀνεφαίνετο, *cūc* δ' ἀνοήμων], as Henry suggests. Alternatively, the negative characterisation of the bear could have been expanded. There follow two complete verses, parts of which were quoted separately by the *Suda* until they were joined by Thomas Tyrwhitt in the 18th century. The simple πάρδαλις δὲ θυμώδης in Babrius (18), 'the leopard is fierce', is expanded to an overflowing hexameter. πάρδαλις is now accompanied by the epic epithet αἴθων, and the adjective θυμώδης is inflated to a subordinate clause with emphatic enjambement (13–14 οὐνεκα θυμοῦ | ἐμπλείη). For the tiger, the prosaic and comic ἀλαζών (19), 'braggart', is substituted by the dignified epic epithet ἀγήνορα (14), 'arrogant'. In Babrius, the negative qualities of the other animals are stated simply and matter-of-factly, but the hexameter poet emphasises the lion's own judgement and subjectivity with the verbs οὐδ' ... ἄδε (an epic form) and μέμφετο. There is thus also a change in focalisation in the adaptation to the epic mode.

The lion, continues the fox, therefore came to the conclusion that the deer is his most suitable successor as sovereign of the animals: ἔλαφον τυραννεῖν ἀξιοτάτην κρίνει (20). The epic poet uses a rare abstract noun in his paraphrase, κοιρανίης, which only becomes common in later hexameter poetry. The genitive is probably dependent on τυχεῖν, κυρεῖν, or ἐπιβαίνειν in some tense. The fox now proceeds to accentuate the deer's positive qualities. γαύρη μὲν εἶδος, πολλὰ δ' εἰς ἔτη ζώει (21), 'she has a proud appearance, and she lives many years', is turned to a subordinate clause introduced by οὐνεκεν (16) in the hexameter version. The potentially ambiguous γαύρη is substituted with the more flattering εἰμερτ[ὶ]δὸν δέμας (*vel sim.*), while the deer's longevity is expressed with reference to her knees (οὐδέ τι γῆρας ἔπεισιν | γούνασι in Henry's reconstruction), thus introducing the new detail of the deer's swiftness. The fox then mentions the deer's fearful horns, using the poetic and less common ἐρηπητής in place of Babrius' ἐρηπετόν. The *Mythica* poet apparently omits the comparison of the horns to trees and the fox's rhetorical question in Babrius (24 τί σοι λέγω τὰ πολλά;), which would perhaps have been unsuitable to the epic register.

As this close analysis of a relatively small fragment reveals, the hexameter poet routinely substitutes Babrius' lexicon with more elevated epic or poetic words, often with accompanying epithets absent from his model. Only occasionally does he lift words or phrases directly from Babrius, and then only if they have good precedents in epic poetry. Often phrases and ideas in Babrius are expanded, and occasionally new details or different focalisations are introduced. Finally, the poet feels entitled to modify the order of presentation in his model, incorporating elements from the end of the fox's speech in its beginning. Parallels to some of these procedures can be observed in other fragments of the *Mythica*.⁴²

V. Language, Intertexts, Metre

(1) Lexicon

The vocabulary of the *Mythica* is fairly conservative and largely Homeric, with no new coinages or compound forms.⁴³ This contrasts markedly with Imperial poets like Dionysius Periegetes, Dionysius Bassaricus, and the Oppiani, who are fond of creating new compounds.⁴⁴ As observed above regarding the adaptation of Babr. 95, the poet's lexicon is naturally replete with epic or other 'high' poetic words and forms not found in Babrius:

ἀγῆνωρ, ἀγλαός, ἀγκύλος (Babr. 17.3 has ἀγκυλογλώχις), ἄγχι, ἀεικής, ἀήτης, αἰ, αἶθων, αἰπεινός, αἶκυλος, ἀκηδής, ἀλεείνω, ἄλμη, ἄμβασις, ἀμφίς, ἄναξ, ἄνεως, ἀπάνευθε, ἀπηνής, ἀραρίσκω, ἄτος, αὐτάρ, ἀφνειός, βίτος, γαμφηλαί, γηθόκυνο, δαμνάω, διακριδόν, δοιῶ, ἐγγύθι, ἔοι, ἔσκε, ἐρύω, ἠερόφοιτος, ἠπεδανός, ἠχήεις, θοός, κε, κεάζω, κεμάς, κῆρ, κονίη, κρατερῶς, λάτρις, λίς, μάρπτω, μεταχρόνιος, νέομαι/(μετα)νεῦμαι, νυ, νομάω, οἶτος, ὁμός, ὀπωπή, ὄρνυμι, ὄτρακόεις, ὄτρηρός, οὔνεκα, παλίνωρος, πέλομαι, πίσεια, πορφυρέω, πρηνίζω, προτενής, σεῖο, σκαίρω, σκῶλος, συνθεσίη, ταλαεργός, τανύω, τρομέω, ὑμείων, ὑπένερθε, ὑστάτιος, ὑψικάρηνος, ὑψοῦ, ὠμοβόρος.

He also redeploys a number of Homeric *hapax* and *dis legomena*, though most of them are also found in later poetry:

Homeric *hapax legomena*: ἀγρονόμος (common in Imperial poetry), κεμάς (common in Hellenistic poetry), νωθής (common after Homer), παλίνωρος (recurring in Hellenistic and Imperial poetry), σκῶλος (but in the later sense of 'thorn'), στειλειόν (rare), ὑψικάρηνος (well attested in Imperial poetry).

⁴² For other substitutions of prosaic with high poetic words and the addition of 'epic' epithets to simple nouns in Babrius, cf. e.g. fr. 2 ἠχήεις ... ἀήτης ~ ἄνεμος, fr. 4 αἰπεινήν ἐλάτην ~ ἐλάτη, fr. 5 ὠμοβόρος λίς ~ λέων. For another change in the order of presentation of the material in Babrius, see above, fr. 11.8 n. Compare the paraphrastic technique of Nonnus in his epic adaptation of the Gospel of St John, as analysed e.g. by Agosti (2003) 149–62.

⁴³ Except perhaps for αἰπύκερος in fr. dub. 1, which is of uncertain attribution. See also below on ἠερόφοιτος (fr. 12.5).

⁴⁴ See e.g. James (1970) 257–66 (with figures for other Imperial poets); Lightfoot (2014) 49–51; Benaissa (2018) 54; Lightfoot (2020) 105–12.

Homeric *dis legomena*: ἠπεδανός (recurring in Hellenistic and Imperial poetry), ἠχήει (common), πίσεια (uncommon), συνθεεῖν (common in A.R.).

A fair amount of the lexicon is drawn from post-Homeric, mostly Hellenistic, poetic sources:

ἄμβασις (Soph., Philip.), ἐπάξιος (Pind., tragedy, A.R., also in prose), ἐρπηκτής (Nic., Antiphil.), ἐταιρείη (Sim., tragedy), κοιρανίη (epigr.), λάτρις (Thgn., tragedy), λάχος (Thgn., Pind., tragedy), ὀστρακόμεν (Antiphil.), πρηνίζω (Lyc., Euph.), προκάρηνος (Diodorus epigr.), προτενής (first in A.R.), στυφελός (tragedy, A.R.), ταρρός in the sense of ‘wing’ (epigr.), φηλόω (tragedy, A.R.), ψαφαρός (Aesch., Euph., Nic.), ὀμοβόρος (A.R.).

The *Mythica* possibly provides the earliest instances of the adjectives ἠερόφοιτος (if correctly restored in fr. 12.5), οἰκίδιος (fr. 14(b).1), and πειθήμων (if correctly restored in fr. 22.16), otherwise first found in Oppian, Ps.-Oppian, and Triphiodorus respectively. In fr. 21, ἀκηδής is given a different sense (‘harmless’) from its usual meaning (‘uncared for’), a usage paralleled only by Oppian. Morphologically, the most notable form is the adjective ἄνεως (fr. 15), ‘silent’, from which ancient grammarians falsely derived the adverb ἄνεω in Homer and which is attested only here in literature. The rarer words surveyed here perhaps explain Babrius’ condemnation of his imitator’s verses as γρίφοις ὁμοίαις ... ποιήσεις, ‘poems resembling riddles’, in his second prologue (see above, Section II).

(2) Intertexts

As expected of most skilled epic poets of this era, the author of the *Mythica* engages in Homeric *variatio*, echoing phrases in Homer but with the modification or substitution of one of their elements. Examples include:

- αἴκυλα φάσθαι (fr. 4) ~ αἴκυλα μυθήσασθαι (*Il.* 20.202, 433, also at line-end).
- ταλαεργόν [όνον (fr. 14(b).2) ~ ἡμίονον ταλαεργόν (*Il.* 23.654, etc.).
- ἀγλαὰ πίσεια (fr. 20.1) ~ πίσεια ποιήεντα (*Il.* 20.9, *Od.* 6.124).
- ἄτοσ ἐδωδής (fr. 22.7) ~ ἄτοσ πολέμοιο (*Il.* 5.388, etc., also at line-end).

Directly borrowed Homeric formulas or phrases are relatively few: ἄγχι παρα[στάς] (fr. 12.6), ἦκε φέρεσθαι (fr. 12.13, also A.R. 1.622), ὀ[τρηρο]ῖ θερά[ποντες (fr. 14(c).13), ὡς φάσαν (fr. 15), γηθ]όσυνος κῆρ (fr. 17(a).9), αἶ κε πίθηαι (fr. 22.4), θυμ]ὸς ἀγῆνωρ (fr. 22.10).

There are also some echoes of Hellenistic poetry:

- οὐ καθ’ ὁμά (fr. 10.2) ~ Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.26 ἐτέρων ἴχθια μὴ καθ’ ὁμά | [δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν (cf. also [Hes.] *Sc.* 50 with Dobree’s emendation).

- ὑψοῦ (ὑπὲρ πόντοιο) μεταχρονίην (ποτέεσθαι) (fr. 12.8) ~ A.R. 2.587 ὑψοῦ δὲ μεταχρονίη (cf. also 3.1151 μεταχρονίη πεπότητο, 4.952 ὕψι μεταχρονίην, 4.1269 ἐκ πόντοιο μεταχρονίην).
- ψαφαρῆ ... κονίη (fr. 3) ~ Euph. fr. 50.3 Powell = 70 Lightfoot ψαφαρῆ ... τέφρη (in the same position), *AP* 7.315.1 (Zenodotus or Rhianus) ψαφαρῆ κόνι.
- διακριδὸν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα (fr. 8.11) ~ A.R. 1.498 διέκριθεν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα (in the same position).
- κατὰ νειόν (fr. 10.2) ~ A.R. 3.411, 754, 778 (in the same position).
- ὠμοβόρος λίς (fr. 5) ~ Theoc. 13.62 ὠμοβόρος λίς, with ὠμοβόρος < A.R. 1.636.
- νυ]κτὶ καὶ ἡοῖ (fr. 17(a).4) ~ Theoc. 12.1 τρίτη cὺν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡοῖ | ἦλθεε (in the same position).

These variations and intertexts demonstrate that though not adventurous in style and vocabulary, the *Mythica* is a work of some literary sophistication rather than a mere Homeric patchwork. It is perhaps telling that some fragments of the *Mythica* were once attributed to Callimachus' *Hecale*.

(3) Metre

Metrically, too, the poem is fully competent and quite refined.

Prosody. Hiatus is rare and always involves an originally digammated word: fr. 8.11 καί (Ϝ)οί, 13 οὐδέ (Ϝ)οί; 15 οὐδὲ (Ϝ)ἄναξ; 16.2 μή (Ϝ)οί; 17(a).3]ι (Ϝ)ἄνακτι. All of these instances have precedents in Homer and Apollonius.

Correption is well attested, mostly after καί (fr. 1.10; 12.15; 17(a).4; 19.3; 20.1) but also in fr. 12.8 ὑψοῦ ὑπέρ, 18 δάμναμαι οἴτω; 16.2 οἱ ἐνί; 19.3 πέτρῃ ἔην; 22.3 κοὶ αὐτῶ, 6 - μνοι εὐνῆς, 7]α[ι] ἄτος. The correptions of ου and η are both in the first trochee.⁴⁵

There is no example of the elision of a noun or adjective. Words elided include mostly small words like δέ (fr. 9.1; 11.12; 19.1, 2; fr. dub. 2), ἔνθα (fr. 11.8), ποτε (fr. 1.7), and prepositions (fr. 10.1 μετ', 2 καθ'), but also verbs (fr. 5 γένετ' at the bucolic caesura; 10.3 ἐτρέφεθ' ... τρέφετ').⁴⁶ None occur before a main caesura.

Crusius (1879) 194–5 n. 3 observed that the hexameters quoted by the Suda usually end in long syllables, with only two exceptions, a feature associated with Nonnus and his school. This is, however, not borne out by the additional verse-ends preserved by the papyrus, which provide plenty of examples to the contrary.

There is one instance of Attic correption (fr. 12.14 ἐπὶ πλευρῶν pap., preferable to the Suda's πετρῶν), none of synecphonesis or crasis.

⁴⁵ Cf. Hollis (1990) 22–3 and Campbell (1973) 83–90.

⁴⁶ Uncertain type of words elided in fr. 22.9 (probably δέ), 13 (ὄφ]ρ' or ἔν]θ' Henry).

Caesuras. There are 46 lines where a main caesura can be more or less certainly identified. Of these, 30 (65%) are feminine and 16 (35%) are masculine.⁴⁷ If these numbers are representative—which is of course not at all guaranteed in view of the very small size of the sample—the rate of feminine caesuras would be comparable to that in Nicander (63%), Moschus’ *Europa* (60%), and Dionysius Periegetes (65%), but lower than that of most other Hellenistic and especially Imperial poets.⁴⁸ There are three or four cases of a naturally short vowel preceding a masculine caesura: fr. 1.6; 6; 15; fr. dub. 2 (the last example with a lengthening in *arsis*).⁴⁹ A spondaic word appears before the masculine caesura in six places: fr. 1.6; 6; 8.12, 13; 14(b).4, (c).11.⁵⁰ Where the fourth biceps is uncontracted, there are 19 instances of a ‘bucolic’ caesura against 5 without one.⁵¹ Contrary to Callimachean practice, a masculine caesura is not accompanied by bucolic caesura in fr. 3.

Metrical schemes and dactyllicity. As expected in hexameters of this period, the dactylic rhythm predominates and there are few lines with more than one spondee, although one line has as many as three:

DDDDD ×7 (fr. 3; 12.7, 15, 18; 18; 19.2, 3)
 SDDDD ×6 (fr. 2; 4; 8.11, 14; 13; 21)
 DSDDD ×5 (fr. 5; 8.13; 9.1; 10.2; 12.8)
 DDDSD ×2 (fr. 10.3; 11.8)
 DSDSD ×1 (fr. 10.1)
 SSDSD ×1 (fr. 16.2)
 DDSDS ×1 (fr. dub. 2)

These patterns are attested throughout the history of Greek hexameter, except the last two, which are absent from the poems of Nonnus (at least his *Paraphrase*) and his followers.⁵² Instances of contracted biceps in the incomplete lines:

1st biceps: fr. 8.3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 18, 19; 14(b).5, (c).5, 6, 12, 13, 14
 2nd biceps: fr. 1.6; 6; 8.4, 7, 12, 16, 17; 14(b).4, (c).7, 11
 4th biceps: fr. 15; 22.16
 5th biceps: fr. 22.14; 24.1

The verse beginnings in fr. 8.3–19 show a number of contractions of the first and second bicipitia: in 17 lines, there are 9 first-foot spondees (53%) and 6 second-foot spondees (35%), with one line (12) containing both. The proportion of first-foot spondees is much higher than

⁴⁷ Feminine: fr. 1.7; 2; 5; 8.[5], [6], [7], [8], 11, 14, [15]; 9.1, 2; 10.1, 2, 3; 11.8; 12.7, 8, 15, 18; 13; 14(b).2, (c).[13]; 16.1, 2; 18; 19.2, 3; 20; 21. Masculine: fr. 1.6, 9; 3; 4; 6; 8.[3], 9, 10, 12, 13; 14(b).4, (c).5, [11]; 15; 24.1; fr. dub. 2. Brackets indicate restored words.

⁴⁸ For comparative figures, see West (1982) 153, 177; Magnelli (2002) 70; Agosti (2004) 66–7.

⁴⁹ The phenomenon is avoided by Oppian, Triphiodorus, and Nonnus: West (1982) 177.

⁵⁰ Avoided by Nonnus: Wifstrand (1933) 37–53.

⁵¹ Bucolic caesura: fr. 4; 5; 6; 8.11, 13, 14; 9.1; 10.2; 12.7, 15, 18; 13; 16.1; 18; 19.2, 3; 20; 24.1; fr. dub. 2. None in uncontracted fourth biceps: fr. 2; 3; 12.8, 11; 21.

⁵² See Ludwich (1885) 321–2, who does not provide figures for the *Dionysiaca*; Lightfoot (2014) 65–6; Lightfoot (2020) 233–4.

the average figures calculated for Imperial and most Archaic and Hellenistic poets with the exception of Alexander Aetolus (51%) and the bucolic poems of Theocritus (47%), while the proportion of second-foot spondees is lower than that of most hexameter poets before Nonnus with the exception of Quintus (31%) and Dionysius Bassaricus (33%).⁵³ It is difficult to judge, however, whether such a small number of lines is representative of the *Mythica* as a whole. *Spondeiazontes* are found in fr. 22.14 γ]αμφηλῆσι, fr. 24.1 πιττώσαντο, and fr. dub. 2 τεθνήξοντο.

Rules on word end. There are no breaches in the extant fragments of most of the restrictions on metrical word shapes and word end observed by the more refined Hellenistic and Imperial poets, including Gieseke's Law (against words of the shape × – = ending in the second foot), Naeke's Law (against word end following contracted fourth biceps),⁵⁴ Tiedke–Meyer's Law (avoidance of words shaped – – or ~ – ending on the fifth princeps), or Hermann's Bridge (against divided fourth biceps). The 'rules' breached are:

- Meyer's First Law (against words starting in the first foot and ending after the second trochee): fr. 9.2 ἠπεδανοῖο; fr. dub. 2 ἐπέσειε.⁵⁵
- Meyer's Second Law (against iambic-shaped words before the masculine caesura): fr. 3 κόμαι; 8.10 λίπη; 14(c).5 κάλο[ι; 15 ἄναξ; fr. dub. 2 φόβον. Most instances are combined with a caesura after the first biceps, which Callimachus tolerates,⁵⁶ except in fr. 14(c).5 and fr. dub. 2. This supposed 'law', however, 'is far from being an absolute rule'⁵⁷ and is 'no more than a general preference' among some poets.⁵⁸
- Hilberg's Law (against word end following contracted second biceps) is only breached by monosyllables, as in Callimachus: fr. 8.7 ὄς; 16.2 εἶ.⁵⁹

Monosyllables occur at verse-end in fr. 5 λίς, 11.9 μῶς, 17(a).9 κῆρ, 22.5 τε. Where we can tell, they are accompanied by a bucolic caesura in conformity with the usual pattern.⁶⁰ There are no tetracola. In noun-epithet groups (excluding predicative adjectives), the epithet precedes the noun in the vast majority of cases,⁶¹ whereas the reverse order appears in fr. 8.2–3 (if correctly restored); 10.1, 2; 12.7 (unless predicative); 18; 19.2; 22.10 (a Homeric phrase).⁶² The poet is capable of some artful word patterning. Note for instance the elegant chiasmus in fr. 21, with the contrasting adjectives framing the verse: πικρὴ μὲν τε λύκοισιν, ἀτὰρ χιμάρουσιν ἀκηδής. In fr. 2, a verse is framed by an epithet and its noun, a relatively uncommon pattern in

⁵³ Figures for Imperial poets in West (1982) 178 (the highest for the first foot is 40% in D.P.) and Lightfoot (2020) 237. For earlier poets, see Magnelli (2002) 61 (the lowest figure for the second foot is 39% in the Homeric hymns). For Dionysius, see Benaissa (2018) 64–5.

⁵⁴ Except perhaps at fr. 15, unless followed by an appositive.

⁵⁵ I exclude fr. 1.10 κέραι δέ, for which cf. Hollis on Call. *Hec.* fr. 1, and fr. 12.15 ὀτρακόεντά τε, which is mitigated by the postpositive τε.

⁵⁶ Wifstrand (1933) 64–6.

⁵⁷ West (1982) 155.

⁵⁸ Hollis (1990) 20. Cf. also Magnelli (2002) 74 n. 61.

⁵⁹ Cf. Magnelli (2002) 75–6; Lightfoot (2014) 70.

⁶⁰ Cf. West (1982) 156.

⁶¹ Fr. 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 8.13, 14; 9.1, 2; 10.3; 11.8, 9; 12.15 (*bis*), 18; 14(b).2, (c).11, 13; 20.1; fr. dub. 1.

⁶² For this tendency in post-Homeric epic, which reaches its apogee in Nonnus, see Wifstrand (1933) 98–133.

Greek hexameters: ἡχίειε ἐτάνυκε βαλὼν προκάρηνον ἀήτης.⁶³ Enjambement is also not infrequently employed: fr. 3 (implied); 8.3, 5, 14, 17; 9.2; 10.3; 19.3; 20; 24.

VI. Why?

The *Mythica*'s project to 'translate' a book of poems from one metre and style to another was unique and unparalleled in its time.⁶⁴ It was sufficiently bold and successful to provoke Babrius' dismissive response in the prologue to his second book. This attempt at a stylistic and generic recasting should probably be distinguished from ancient concepts of plagiarism or 'literary theft', since presumably the poet of the *Mythica* did not attempt to pass off the fabulistic contents themselves as his own invention.⁶⁵ In prol. 2.12 μαθόντες οὐδὲν πλεῖον ἢ με γινώσκειν, Babrius accuses his imitator(s) of derivativeness, but not of outright theft or deception. Babrius, after all, acknowledges that some of his own material comes from the Aesopic tradition (prol. 1.14–16, prol. 2.4–6), so that he could hardly level such an accusation against his imitators.

A more useful ancient category for conceptualising the *Mythica*'s project is paraphrase. By the Imperial period, paraphrase, whether from verse to prose or from prose to prose, was an established rhetorical exercise practised by budding and advanced orators alike. It was theorised by several rhetoricians, among them Aelius Theon of Alexandria.⁶⁶ Although Theon was concerned with prose paraphrases of poetic works, the techniques he identifies for this exercise—permutation, addition, subtraction, and substitution—are equally applicable to the *Mythica*, as the analysis of the adaptation of Babr. 95 has shown (above, Section IV). The same can be said of Quintilian's emphasis on embellishment, variation, and amplification in paraphrase.⁶⁷ Later, epic paraphrases of prose, especially Biblical and hagiographical, works became a well-established genre of Late Antique poetry.⁶⁸ What is unprecedented in our poet's undertaking is the paraphrase from one poetic genre to another. What, then, was the literary motivation behind translating Babrius' choliambic fables to the epic mode?

Animal fables are rare in hexameters but have some indirect antecedents. The earliest fable in Greek literature, that of the hawk and the nightingale, is told in Hesiod's *Works and*

⁶³ For this pattern, cf. Wifstrand (1933) 133–9 and Conrad (1965) 226, 257 n. 50 (counting 10 examples in the first two books of the *Argonautica*).

⁶⁴ A later example is the group of μεταφράσεις of the poems of Theocritus, Apollonius, Callimachus, Aratus, and Nicander into iambs by Marianus under the reign of Anastasius (491–518 CE): Suda μ 194; *PLRE* II s.n. Marianus 3; Roberts (1985) 59–60. Cf. also the playful transformation of a hexameter line to a trochaic tetrameter κατὰ μετάθεσιν τῆς λέξεως in *AP* 13.30 = Sim. fr. 92 W.² and Timocreon's response in *AP* 13.31 = fr. 10 W.², for which see Sider (2020) 354–5.

⁶⁵ On notions of plagiarism in classical literature, see Stemplinger (1912), who treats paraphrase on pp. 212–15; Ziegler (1956); Roscalla (2006); McGill (2012), who notes that 'it is not ideas and content in themselves that the plagiarist steals but a predecessor's particular expression of ideas and content' (p. 3). It would be interesting to know whether the poet of the *Mythica* included an original preface acknowledging his model and justifying his undertaking.

⁶⁶ Patillon–Bolognesi (1997) civ–cvii, 4–5 (62.10–25), 107–10; Miguélez Cavero (2008) 309–16; Roberts (1985) 5–60.

⁶⁷ Quint. 1.9.2–3, 10.5.4–11 with Roberts (1985) 13–19, 29.

⁶⁸ Roberts (1985) esp. 4, 58, 74–104.

Days (202–12).⁶⁹ The poet of the *Mythica* could therefore lay claim to an authoritative literary ancestor. Horace also retold extensively the fable of the city mouse and the country mouse in hexameters in *Satires* 2.6, a fable that the author of our poem also adapted from Babrius (fr. 10–11).⁷⁰ Previous books of verse fables, however, resorted only to metres considered of lower register, in line with the perceived levity of the content: iambic senarii in the case of Phaedrus, limping iambs in the case of Babrius, with a precedent in Callimachus’ *Iambi*.⁷¹ The fable, with its speaking animals and relatively short and simple narratives, was always seen as a popular and witty form of instruction or entertainment, and it was associated with children and the schoolroom.⁷² Its morals sometimes championed people of humble social status. Quintilian tellingly states that fables are enjoyed by the uneducated masses: *fabellae ... ducere animos solent praecipue rusticorum et imperitorum* (5.11.19). As Tom Hawkins observes, ‘it is probably this popular enjoyment that, in turn, made the fable inappropriate to high-register literature’.⁷³ The legendary Aesop himself, the ugly barbarian ex-slave, could hardly be imagined in epic garb.

There are at least two ways to read the epicisation of the fable in the *Mythica*. One is to see it as a tongue-in-cheek exercise, in other words a playful parody or spoof of Babrius, in which the ludicrous effect results from the presentation of such humble subject matter in such grandiose language and metre. This would be in line with mock-epics involving animals like the *Batrachomyomachia*, itself loosely based on a fable (CFA 302), in which ‘the language of heroic epic is used to depict the deeds of small animals’.⁷⁴ This was, for instance, the reaction of the nineteenth-century Dutch philologist C. G. Cobet to *Myth.* fr. 10, which he described as a ‘ludicro fragmento’: ‘perlepada est linguae Epicae gravitas et pompa in tanta argumenti tenuitate. Quam me delectant μύε δούώ.’⁷⁵ But while it may be amusing or delectable to savour the tension between the epic register and the humble subject matter, there are no clear signs of a deliberate effort to create a comic, parodic, or grossly incongruous effect in the surviving fragments. For such an effect, one would have expected to find more exaggerations or the occasional recourse to bathetic language breaking through the elevated register. Instead, the

⁶⁹ On the paucity of allusions to fables in epic generally, see van Dijk (1997) 124–37. On Hesiod’s fable, see van Dijk (1997) 127–34 and Hunter (2014) 241–3. For an echo of the Hesiodic passage in the *Mythica*, cf. fr. 12.11 ὀνύχεσσι ἀείραα ~ Hes. *Op.* 204 ὀνύχεσσι μεμαρπῶα.

⁷⁰ For a close reading of Horace’s fable, see West (1974), who emphasises its mock-heroic tone. See also Cortéz Tovar (1991).

⁷¹ We may also recall the anecdote of Socrates whiling away his time in jail by versifying Aesop, as told in Plato’s *Phaedo* (60c–61b). The putative metre is not specified. See van Dijk (1997) 40, 260–62.

⁷² See Morgan (1998) 146, 221–3; Cribiore (2001) 202–3; Holzberg (1993) 33–5 = (2002) 29–31; Perry (1952) 237–41 (T 97, 101–5). On the perception and status of fables in the Imperial period, see also Morgan (2007) 58–9.

⁷³ Hawkins (2014) 117. Cf. also Roberts (1985) 59: ‘the fable never enjoyed complete acceptance as a literary form in its own right, although it was recognised that fables might profitably be incorporated into larger works of literature.’

⁷⁴ On this poem, see recently Hosty (2020), esp. pp. 14–21 on how to interpret its tone and literary intent (quote from p. 19). Adopting Genette’s terminology, Hosty labels the poem ‘playful’ rather than ‘satiric’. Like the *Mythica*, it maintains a consistent epic tone throughout, with the ‘fundamental joke’ (p. 20) emerging from situational and contextual elements rather than the language per se.

⁷⁵ Cobet (1873) 23.

Mythica is written with some degree of refinement and elegance, as the careful choice of words and verbal variation in the same three lines of fr. 10 admired by Cobet demonstrate.⁷⁶

The other way to read these verses is through an agonistic lens, viz. as an attempt to outdo Babrius in a provocative move of one-upmanship. This was perhaps accompanied by an implicit—or possibly explicit if the poet included a preface—criticism of the unsuitability of Babrius’ limping iambs to his subject matter: the fable, being a vehicle of moral instruction, requires suitably weighty language and metre, for which Hesiod paved the way. In the *Mythica*, the fable accordingly attains its loftiest literary form: told for its own sake, not as an *exemplum* to illustrate a point, and in the most prestigious of metres, the dactylic hexameter, and yet still in a graceful and polished style. The centrality and popularity of hexameter poetry in Greek education of the Imperial period would only have widened the appeal of a hexametric book of fables.⁷⁷ The rhetorical exercise of paraphrase often involved not only *imitatio* but also *aemulatio*, in other words an element of rivalry and an attempt to surpass and better one’s model.⁷⁸ Because hexameter paraphrases were usually of prose works, a wounding corollary of the *Mythica* is that Babrius’ *Mythiambi* are placed on a par with prose. Perhaps there is something defensive behind Babrius’ insistence in his second prologue that he has ‘bridled’, ‘unsharpened’, and ‘softened’ the traditional choliamb.⁷⁹

Ironically, the author of the *Mythica* was advancing a project—the rehabilitation and literarisation of the fable—that Babrius had himself initiated. In both of his prologues, Babrius claims to have softened the harsh sting of choliamb with a new, more refined style of poetry.⁸⁰ Here for the first time, as Hawkins puts it, ‘we find ... the valorization of the fable as a polished and respectable literary genre’.⁸¹ In creating a fable-epyllion extending over 102 lines in his 95th poem, Babrius ‘brought together the antipodes of the Greek generic spectrum. Babrius’ claims to have controlled and mitigated the associations of the choliambic meter, then, can be understood as part of his larger project of gentrifying the fable by elevating the style of the narratives and the status of the narrator.’⁸² By resorting to elegant hexameters and a refined epic expression, the adapter has gone one better, fully removing the already softened iambic sting of Babrius’ poems and completing a process inherent in Babrius’ own poetic aims.⁸³

⁷⁶ See above, nn. ad loc., and note the echoes of Hesiod, Callimachus, and Apollonius. In the same vein, Cobet proposes to emend ἀλλήλοισιν to ἀλλήλοιον ‘quo esset oratio lepidior’.

⁷⁷ Compare the popularity of hexametric ἠθοποιαί and ἐγκώμια (standard exercises in early rhetorical education) in the papyri from Egypt, for which see Miguélez Caveró (2008) 320–27, 343–9.

⁷⁸ Cf. Quint. 10.5.5 *neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem*; Plin. *ep.* 7.9.3–4 with Roberts (1985) 19–20. The motif of stylistic improvement is also present in Late Antique Biblical epics: Roberts (1985) 29, 68–70, 107–8, 219–20.

⁷⁹ Babr. prol. 2.6–8 ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ νέη μουση | δίδωμι καθαρῶ χυρδέφ χαλινώσασ | τὸν μυθιάμβον ὥσπερ ἵππον ὀπλίτην, 13–16 ἐγὼ δὲ λευκῆ μυθιάζομαι ῥήσει, | καὶ τῶν ἰάμβων τοὺς ὀδόντας οὐ θήγω, | ἀλλ’ εὖ πυρώσασ, εὖ δὲ κέντρα πρηύνας, | ἐκ δευτέρου σοὶ τήνδε βίβλον αἰείδω. Compare this accumulation of metaphors with the simpler statement in prol. 1.18–19: μελιταγέε σοὶ νοῦ τὸ κηρίον θήσω, | πικρῶν ἰάμβων κκληρὰ κῶλα θηλύνας. On these passages, see the commentary of Spielhofer (2023) 102–5, 113–15, 117–20.

⁸⁰ See previous n.

⁸¹ Hawkins (2014) 114.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ A few centuries later Avianus was to do the same with his elegiac adaptation of Babrius. On Avianus’ transformation of Babrius, see Holzberg (1993) 69–79 = (2002) 62–71 (with further bibliography), and cf. esp. (1993) 78 = (2002) 69: what may have attracted Avianus to adapt Babrius ‘was the chance to prove his virtuosity and formal artistry as a poet under the challenging circumstances which, in Avianus’s eyes, this kind of text [i.e. fables] presented ... This last consideration [i.e. the narrative material’s suitability for adaptation in verse] will

Fable 64: The Fir Tree and the Bramble

Fr. eleg. 1

αἰπειναῖς ἐλάταις ἔριγεν βάτος· ἡ μὲν ἔειπε
καὶ ναῦς καὶ νηοὺς τεμνομένη τελέειν.

Suda αἰ 269: αἰπεινή· ὑψηλή. αἰπεινήν—φάσθαι (fr. hex. 4). καὶ αἰπειναῖς, ὑψηλαῖς, μακράις. ἐν Μύθοις· αἰπειναῖς—τελέειν.⁸⁵

1 αἰπεινῆ ἐλάτη Lachmann ἔριγεν Portus (ed. 1619): ἔριγε codd. 1–2 αἶ ... ἔειπον ... τεμνόμεναι dub. Crusius

Cf. Babr. 64.1–2: ἤριζον ἐλάτη καὶ βάτος πρὸς ἀλλήλας. | ἐλάτης δ' ἑαυτὴν πολλαχῶς ἐπαινούσης; 64.5: στέγη τε μελάθρων εἰμὶ καὶ τρόπις πλοίων.

‘A bramble contended with tall fir trees. The one said that when cut down she produced both ships and temples.’

Fable 66: Prometheus' Two Wallets

Fr. eleg. 2

τοῦνεκα τὴν ἰδίην οὔτις ὄπωπε δύην

Suda δ 1566: δύη· ἡ κακοπάθεια, ἡ δυστυχία. (...) ἐν Μύθοις· τοῦνεκα—δύην.

ιδείην A

Cf. Babr. 66.7–8: διό μοι δοκοῦσι συμφορὰς μὲν ἀλλήλων | βλέπειν ἀκριβῶς, ἀγνοεῖν δὲ τὰς οἴκοι.

‘For this reason no one sees their own misery.’

The Wily Ostrich⁸⁶

have been an added encouragement to create, by using a meter hitherto not associated with the genre, a type of fable that was—in terms of form at least—quite new.’

⁸⁴ Crusius' fr. 21 has been included among the hexameter fragments (fr. 24 above). Crusius' fr. 22 in fact comes from Greg. Naz. *PG* 37.1353.7: see Perry (1952) 254–5 on *Aes.* sent. 31.

⁸⁵ βάτις in Adler's edition is a typo, as a sample check of MS A = Par. gr. 2625 reveals.

⁸⁶ Babrius' original fable is not extant. Cf. Ignatius Diaconus, *Tetrasticha* 1 22, in Crusius (1897) 272: πᾶσιν πέφυκε θηρεῖ καὶ πτηνοῖς μάχη. | ἦλω Λίβυσα στρουθός, ἡ τοῦδ' ἐπλάνα | εἶναι μὲν ὄρνις, ἐκ μέρους δὲ θηρίον, | πτηνοῖς κάραν δεικνύσα, τοῖς θηρεῖν πόδας.

Fr. eleg. 3

ἀλλὰ Λίβυσα
ετρουθὸς ἀλικομένη πλάζε καὶ ἀμφοτέρου

Suda λ 497: Λίβυσα ὄρνις· ἡ ετρουθοκάμηλος. ἐν Μυθικοῖς· ἀλλὰ—ἀμφοτέρου.

2 πλάζε καὶ codd. : πλάζεν ἅμ' dub. Bergk

‘But the Libyan ostrich, when caught, baffled both of them.’

Works Cited

- Adams, J. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- Adler, A. 1928–38. *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. Leipzig.
- Adorjáni, Z. 2021. *Der Artemis-Hymnos des Kallimachos: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Berlin–Boston.
- Agosti, G. 2003. *Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni, canto quinto*. Florence.
- Agosti, G. 2004. Alcuni problemi relativi alla cesura principale nell'esametro greco tardoantico, in F. Spaltenstein and O. Bianchi (eds.), *Autour de la césure: Actes du colloque Damon des 3 et 4 novembre 2000*: 61–80. Bern–New York.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- Benaissa, A. 2018. *Dionysius: The Epic Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Bentley, R. 1697. *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and others, and the Fables of Aesop*. London.
- Bergk, Th. 1868. *Anthologia lyrica continens Theognidem, Babrium, Anacreontea cum ceterorum poetarum reliquiis selectis* (ed. alt.). Leipzig.
- Bernhardy, G. 1853. *Suidae Lexicon, Graece et Latine*, 2 vols. Halle.
- Bruhn, E. 1890. *Suidea*, *RhM* 45: 273–83.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1985. *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.
- Campbell, M. 1973. Notes on Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* II, *RPh* 47: 68–90.
- Campbell, M. 1994. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica III 1–471*. Leiden.
- Cavallo, G. 2005. *Il calamo e il papiro*. Florence.
- Chantraine, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Cobet, C. G. 1873. *Miscellanea philologica et critica*, *Mnemosyne* 1: 1–58.
- Conrad, C. W. 1965. Traditional patterns of word-order in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil, *HSCP* 69: 195–258.

- Cortéz Tovar, R. 1991. *Satura, sermo y fabella en Serm. II 6 de Horacio*, in A. Ramos Guerreira (ed.), *Mnemosynum C. Codoñer a discipulis oblatum*: 63–80. Salamanca.
- Criboire, R. 2001. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton.
- Crusius, O. 1879. *De Babrii aetate*. Leipzig.
- Crusius, O. 1892. Review of J. Werner, *Quaestiones Babrianae* (Berlin 1891), *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 43: 89–91.
- Crusius, O. 1896. Babrios, *RE* II.2: 2655–67.
- Crusius, O. 1897. *Babrii Fabulae Aesopeae*. Leipzig.
- Crusius, O. 1905. Studien zur griechischen Epen- und Hymnendichtung I: Sagenverschiebungen, *SBAW* 1905: 749–802.
- Dickey, E. 2012. *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheaana*, vol. I. Cambridge.
- Eberhard, A. 1875. *Babrii Fabulae ex recensione A.* Berlin.
- Gitlbauer, M. 1882. *Babrii fabulae*. Vienna.
- Gow, A. S. F. and D. L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Gow, A. S. F. and D. L. Page. 1968. *The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Harder, A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- Hausrath, A., rev. H. Hunger. 1959 (fasc. 2), 1970 (fasc. 1). *Corpus fabularum Aesopiarum*. Leipzig.
- Hawkins, T. 2014. *Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Hecker, A. 1842. *Specimen literarium inaugurale, exhibens commentationum Callimachearum capita duo*. Groningen.
- Hollis, A. S. 1990. *Callimachus: Hecale*. Oxford.
- Holzberg, N. 1993. *Die Antike Fabel: eine Einführung*. Darmstadt.
- Holzberg, N. 2002. *The Ancient Fable*. Bloomington, IN.

- Holzberg, N. 2019. *Babrios: Fabeln*. Berlin.
- Hopkinson, N. 1982. Juxtaposed prosodic variants in Greek and Latin poetry, *Glotta* 60: 162–77.
- Hosty, M. 2020. *Batrachomyomachia (Battle of the Frogs and Mice): Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Hunter, R. 2014. *Hesiodic Voices*. Cambridge.
- James, A. W. 1970. *Studies in the Language of Oppian of Cilicia*. Amsterdam.
- Jedrkiwicz, S. 1989. *Sapere e paradosso nell'antichità: Esopo e la favola*. Rome.
- Johnson, W. A. 2004. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto.
- Karla, G. A. 2003. Die Redactio Accursiana der *vita Aesopi*: Ein Werk des Maximus Planudes, *ByzZ* 96: 661–9.
- Knoche, I. H. 1835. *Babrii fabulae et fabularum fragmenta*. Halle.
- Knochius, J. H. 1838. Fabularum Aesopiarum hexametris et elegis conscriptarum reliquias, in *Einladungsschrift an alle Vorgesetzte, Gönner und Freunde des Gymnasiums zu Torgau zu dem Schröderischen Gestiftsactus einiger Schüler der ersten Classe*: 3–14. Torgau.
- Kramer, J. 2007. *Vulgärlateinische Alltagsdokumente auf Papyri, Ostraka, Täfelchen und Inschriften*. Berlin–New York.
- Lachmann, C. 1845. *Babrii Fabulae Aesopeae*. Berlin.
- Lightfoot, J. L. 2014. *Dionysius Periegetes: Description of the Known World*. Oxford.
- Lightfoot, J. L. 2020. *Pseudo-Manetho, Apotelesmatica: Books Two, Three, and Six*. Oxford.
- Ludwich, A. 1885. *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos*, Bd. II. Leipzig.
- Luzzatto, M. J. 1983. La datazione della *Collectio Augustana* di Esopo ed il verso politico delle origini, *JÖByz* 33: 137–77.
- Luzzatto, M. J. and A. La Penna. 1986. *Babrii Mythiambi Aesopei*. Leipzig.
- Magnelli, E. 2002. *Studi su Euforione*. Rome.

- Mann, K. 2018. The puzzle in Babrius's prologue, *GRBS* 58: 253–78.
- McGill, S. 2012. *Plagiarism in Latin Literature*. Cambridge.
- Miguélez Cavero, L. 2008. *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD*. Berlin–New York.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.
- Morgan, T. 2007. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Nøjgaard, M. 1967. *La fable antique II: Les grands fabulistes*. Copenhagen.
- Patillon M. and G. Bolognesi. 1997. *Aelius Theon: Progymnasmata*. Paris.
- Perry, B. E. 1936. *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop*. Pennsylvania.
- Perry, B. E. 1952. *Aesopica*. Urbana, IL.
- Perry, B. E. 1961. Two fables recovered, *ByzZ* 54: 4–14.
- Perry, B. E. 1965. *Babrius and Phaedrus: Fables*. Cambridge, MA.
- Peters, M. 1993. Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie, in L. Isebaert (ed.), *Miscellanea Linguistica Graeco-Latina*: 85–113. Namur.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1965. *Callimachus. Volumen I: Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- Roberts, M. 1985. *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*. Liverpool.
- Rodríguez Adrados, F. 1999. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable*, vol. I. Leiden.
- Roscalla, F. 2006. Storie di plagi e di plagiari, in F. Roscalla (ed.), *L'autore e l'opera: attribuzioni, appropriazioni, apocrifi nella Greca antica*: 69–102. Pisa.
- Ruhnken, D. 1789 (ed. alt.). *Timaei Sophistae lexicon vocum Platoniarum*. Leiden.
- Rutherford, W. G. 1883. *Babrius*. London.
- Scappaticcio, M. C. 2017. *Fabellae: Frammenti di favole latine e bilingui latino-greche di tradizione diretta (III–IV d.C.)*. Berlin.

Scappaticcio, M. C. 2022. Fables from the East: Latin Texts on Papyrus and the Role of Fables in Second-Language Acquisition, in R. Ast, T. Licht, and J. Lougovaya (eds.), *Uniformity and Regionalism in Latin Writing Culture of the First Millennium C.E.*: 23–31.

Schneider, O. 1873. *Callimachea*, vol. 2. Leipzig.

Sider, D. 2020. *Simonides: Epigrams and Elegies*. Oxford.

Spielhofer, L. 2021. (Re/De-)constructing identity in Babrius's *Mythiambi*, *Hermes* 149: 364–81.

Spielhofer, L. 2023. *Babrius: ein Interpretationskommentar zu den Prologen und Fabeln 1 bis 17*. Stuttgart.

Stemplinger, E. 1912. *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*. Leipzig.

Turner, E. G., rev. P. J. Parsons. 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd ed.). London.

Vaio, J. 2001. *The Mythiambi of Babrius: Notes on the Constitution of the Text*. Hildesheim.

van Dijk, G.-J. 1997. *Ainoi, Logoi, Mythoi: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature*. Leiden.

Wagner F. 1977. Babrios, in *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, Bd. 1: 1123–8. Berlin–Boston.

Webster, T. B. L. 1964. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London.

Wernicke, K. 1894. Amaltheia 1, *RE* I.2: 1721–3.

West, D. 1974. Of mice and men: Horace, *Satires* 2.6.77–117, in T. Woodman and D. West (eds.), *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*: 67–80. Cambridge.

West, M. L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.

Whitby, M. 1994. From Moschus to Nonnus: the evolution of the Nonnian style, in N. Hopkinson (ed.), *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*: 99–155. Cambridge.

Wifstrand, A. 1933. *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos: metrisch-stilistische Untersuchungen zur späteren griechischen Epik und zu verwandten Gedichtgattungen*. Lund.

Ziegler, K. 1956. Plagiat, *RE* XX.2: 1956–1997.

Amin Benaissa

Christ Church, Oxford
amin.benaissa@classics.ox.ac.uk