

Vinet corrected in this way the *habes* of the manuscripts). In fact, as Gratwick explains,¹¹ the word *aveo*, which (perhaps because of its homophony with *habeo*) had disappeared from literature at the beginning of the first century A.D., was recovered in late Latin literature, in learned and refined contexts (often in imitations of Cicero or Livy), though it remained rare. And, as we have seen, it is extremely rare in Ausonius. It therefore seems probable that its presence in this passage is not casual, and could not remain unnoticed by ancient readers, especially because its appearance coincides with the division of the letter into two halves, the second one being much more clearly Horatian in its theme (the annoyance of urban life—lines 19–28—vs. the pleasure of the *otia ruris*—lines 29–34), and especially for the strong presence of Horatian echoes.¹²

University of Bristol

ANNA DE PRETIS

a.de-pretis@bris.ac.uk

¹¹ A. Gratwick, 'Habeo and aveo: the Romance future', *CQ* 22 (1972), 391–8.

¹² It is worth noticing, though, the ring-composition of Ausonius's letter: l. 36 (*veni* [...] *citius*) is repeated with inversion in the invitation of l. 12 (*citius veni remo aut rota*); Paulus's poetry is mentioned both at the beginning and at the end of the poem (especially l. 3: *Camenarum* [...] *Castaliarum*, and ll. 35–6: *tuarum* [...] *Camenarum*), and both in the first and in the last line there is a reference to loyalty: l. 1 (*Si qua fides* [...]) and l. 42 (*non Poena, sed Graeca fide*).

A NOTE ON THE *VITA AESOPI*, RECENSION G, 69–70*

The recension G of the *Vita Aesopi* has received a fair amount of attention after the *editio princeps* by Perry. In recent years, Papathomopoulos and Ferrari have emended scores of corrupt passages in their fine editions. I will offer only one note, dealing with a section that has been left unclear.

Xanthos, drunk at a party, bets the whole of his fortune that he will 'drink up the sea', and gives his ring as a pledge. His servant Aesopus, present at the party, vainly tries to dissuade him from making the foolish bet. The next morning, Xanthos' mind is free from wine, and clear of the memory of what happened the night before. He notices that the ring is missing, and asks Aesopus (§ 70, lines 5–12 Ferrari):

‘Αἴσωπε, τί μου γέγονε ὁ δακτύλιος;’ Αἴσωπος· ‘οὐκ οἶδα.’ Ξάνθος· ‘οὐά.’ Αἴσωπος· ‘τοιγαροῦν ὅσα δύνασαι τοῦ βίου σου λαθὼν αἶρε καὶ ἀπόθου εἰς δευτέρας τύχας· οὐκ ἐτι γὰρ ὁ βίος σός ἐστι.’ ὁ δὲ Ξάνθος· ‘τί λέγεις;’ Αἴσωπος· ‘παρὰ τὸν ἐχθές πότον συνθήκας τέθηκας τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκπιεῖν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου σου τὸ δακτυλίδιον προβαλὼν.’

The dialogue is very surprising. Aesopus obviously knows very well what has happened, but denies all knowledge of it in his first answer, only to admit in his next two sentences that he in fact knows what Xanthos has pledged to do and why the ring is missing. If Aesopus wanted to pretend not to know anything about it, why did he change his attitude in the next sentence? Consider the following dialogue:

* Bibliography: E. Δημητριάδου-Τουφεξή, 'Index verborum Vitae Aesopi Perrianae', *EEThess* 20 (1981), 69–153; *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 53, edited with translations and notes by M. W. Haslam (London, 1986); *Romanzo di Esopo*, Introduzione e testo critico a cura di F. Ferrari, traduzione e note di G. Bonelli e G. Sandrolini (Milano, 1997); M. Papathomopoulos, *Aesopus revisitatus. Recherches sur le texte des vies ésopiques. Volume I. La critique textuelle* (Ioannina, 1989); M. Παπαθωμόπουλος, 'Ο Βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου. Ἡ παραλλαγή G. Κριτική ἔκδοση μεῖ εἰσαγωγή καὶ μετάφραση (Ioannina, 1990); B. E. Perry, *Aesopica I* (Urbana, IL, 1952).

‘Αἴσωπε, τί μοι γέγονε ὁ δακτύλιος;’ Αἴσωπος· ‘οὐκ οἶδα<ς>’ Ἐάνθος· ‘οὐ{ā}.’ Αἴσωπος· ‘τοιγαροῦν ὅσα δύνασαι τοῦ βίου σου λαθὼν αἶρε καὶ ἀπόθου εἰς δευτέρας τύχας.’

In this text Aesopus does not pretend not to know what has happened, and the conversation flows without incongruities.

The omission of sigma occurred because after Xanthos’ question a scribe expected an answer, not a further question. The form οἶδα<ς> is regular in the *Vita* G: cf. §§ 2, 11, 16, 24, 25, 31, 60, and σύνοιδας in § 107.

The interjection οὐᾶ is very frequent in the *Vita*, and it is no wonder that it crept in at this point. It was an easy mistake in front of a word beginning with alpha: in the sequence ξανθοσοιαισωπος the negative οὐ could have been easily misunderstood for the very common οὐᾶ, which also fitted the context better, at least superficially, when the question οὐκ οἶδα<ς>’ disappeared from the text. The monosyllabic answer οὐ is frequent in the *Vita* (cf. e.g. 71, line 12 Ferrari; 73, line 5 Ferrari).

This text has the further advantage of making sense of τοιγαροῦν: ‘if you are in such a state that you can’t even remember what you did yesterday night, it is better if you pack everything and leave before they catch you’. The particle cluster τοιγαροῦν is used in exhortations, often with an inferential tone: cf. *Vita* G § 11, line 5 Ferrari; 17 line 4 Ferrari; *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament*, a translation [. . .] of W. Bauer’s *Griechisch–Deutsches Wörterbuch* [. . .] by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago and London, 1979), s.v. (Ach. Tat. 7.11.3; *J. C. Ap.* 2.201; *Ep. Hebr.* 12.1).

The mistake is old: the *recensio* W of the *Vita* derives from an original which had the same narrative sequence as the manuscript G, with οὐκ οἶδα. The editor of W tried to blunt the incongruity and wrote (§ 70, Perry 94, lines 14–17):

‘Αἴσωπε, τί μοι γέγονε ὁ δακτύλιος;’ Αἴσωπος ἔφη· ‘οὐκ οἶδα, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο γινώσκω, ὅτι ξένος ἐγένου τοῦ βίου σου.’ ὁ δὲ Ἐάνθος· ‘τί λέγεις;’ Αἴσωπος ἔφη· ‘παρὰ τῷ χθὲς πῶτῳ συνθήκας ἔθου τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκπιεῖν ὑπὲρ ὅλου τοῦ βίου σου, καὶ τὸν δακτύλιον προεβάλου.’

W changes and rephrases the wording of the ‘original’, trying to amend it.

Both the W and G versions derive from a common source. Perry 17–20 gives a list of passages where G and W show mistakes which derive from faults in the archetype (G and W often tried to mend the original in different ways). The most obvious example is in chapter 88/88a, where both G and W present a second speech by Aesopus, a doublet with partial repetition of the same content, and introduced to the same purpose. All the editors agree in deleting the passage as ‘unauthentic’.

The recently published P.Oxy. 3720 (the most extensive papyrus fragment of the *Life*) confirms that G and W derive from a common text. Haslam 152 notes that ‘the versions of G and W appear abridged in relation to [P.Oxy.] 3720’.

G is generally considered to be closer to the wording of the ‘original’ (Perry 10–15; Haslam 153; Ferrari 20), and this is now corroborated by the similarities to P.Oxy. 3720 (cf. Haslam 152, and notes to the lines 1–2, 2–4, 9–10, 12–14, 53–56, 66–68, 73–75, 106; but W is closer to the papyrus in other passages: Haslam 152).

In the passage § 70, G reproduced more or less faithfully the original and the division of the dialogue, while W rephrased it: the correction can be advanced only for the G version.