XX. Demetrius of Phalerum and the Aesopic Fables

B. E. PERRY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The first European collection of Aesopic fables ever to be made, so far as we know, was compiled by Demetrius of Phalerum, who lived from about 350 B.C. down to 280 or later. This book of fables has not come down to us. The only ancient author who mentions it explicitly is Diogenes Laertius in his biography of Demetrius, *Lives* 5.80, who gives its title, in his detailed catalogue of the writings of Demetrius, as *Αἰσωπείων α′*. There is nothing in the specific testimony about this book to indicate the approximate period of the author's life within which it was published; but the relationship which seems to have existed between certain writings of Demetrius on the one hand, and certain sculptures of Lysippus on the other, favors the assumption that the fable-book of Demetrius was written either before or during his regency at Athens, 317–307 B.C. The matter will be dealt with below, page 308.

A few facts concerning the contents and nature of the lost book of Aesopic fables composed by Demetrius can be deduced with a high degree of probability, I think, from what is known about the literary history of particular fables and collections of fables other than that of Demetrius; and, from the same kind of data, a number of further inferences may be drawn which have some claim to probability, although the evidence on which they rest is not so positive. In attempting to bring together in this article all that I think can be reasonably predicated of the *Aesop* of Demetrius, it is necessary to repeat the substance of what I have already written in other articles here and there, where the assigning of this or that fable to Demetrius, the nature of his collection, and its relation to Phaedrus and the texts of other writers, are topics treated incidentally in relation to other contexts.[1]

[1] The following abbreviations will be used for these and other publications to which repeated references are made below: **Adrados** = F. R. Adrados, in an article entitled "El Papiro Rylands 493 y la tradición fabulistica antigua" in *Emérita* 20 (1952) 337–88; **Aes.** = *Aesopica* vol. 1, ed. B. E. Perry (Urbana 1952). Fables are cited by

From the correspondence between Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea, and his friend Stephanus, as published by S. Kugeas from a manuscript at Moscow,[2] it appears very likely, although the inference is not entirely certain, that a copy of the fables of Demetrius, written on papyrus, was in the hands of Stephanus somewhere near the ancient site of Babylon in the early years of the tenth century; and that this book contained, among other fables, the one about the Sow and the Bitch, which is No. 223 in *Aesopica* and is transmitted as a fable in the oldest extant collection of Greek prose fables ascribed to Aesop, namely, the socalled Augustana or Class I recension.[3] This fable tells of a

the serial numbers given them in this edition; page references are to other parts of the book; **BZ** = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 46 (1953) 308–13: "An Aesopic Fable in Photius," by B. E. Perry; **Epimythium** = "The Origin of the Epimythium" by B. E. Perry in *TAPA* 71 (1940) 391–419; **Fable** = the article so entitled in *Studium generale* 12 (1959) 17–37, which deals with the nature, origin, and ancient history of Aesopic fable as a type, by B. E. Perry; **Wehrli** = *Die Schule des Aristoteles, Texte und Commentar*, Heft 4: Demetrios von Phaleron, von Fritz Wehrli (Basel 1949).

[2] S. Kugeas, *Ho Kaisareias Arethas kai to ergon autou* (Athens 1913) 114 f.

[3] The text-history (*Aes.* pages 305–8) shows clearly that the archetype of this recension, in the form in which we have it, consisting of some 231 fables, was copied in late antiquity, perhaps in the fifth or fourth century, but the date of its original composition must be referred to an earlier time, certainly not later than the second century and more probably the first. The relatively large size of the collection in itself suggests a date earlier than the fifth century, in view of the fact that its derivatives, recensions Ia and II, and all the other collections known to us, whether Greek or Latin, subsequent to the second century (Aphthonius, the Babrian paraphrase, Avianus and Romulus) contain a much smaller number of fables, in accordance with the widespread practice of the second century and later of syncopating or epitomizing larger works. It is unlikely that a collection of fables made in the fourth or fifth century would be either so extensive as the Augustana, or so simple in its style and so free of rhetorical affectation. Moreover, a few of its fables can be compared, in respect to the details of the narrative, with the same fables as told by Phaedrus and in *PRyl.* of the early first century; and on the basis of such a comparison Adrados (see note 1) infers that the contents of the Augustan collection as it existed already in the first century were very similar to what we have in the later archetype of our manuscripts. That may well be so; but such changes as were made in the text of this book in the course of its transmission from the first to the fifth century are as likely to have involved the fable-content, by way of additions or omissions and substitutions, as the language in which it is written. We have no evidence, however, by which to define such changes either in the content of the collection as a whole or in its language and style. In my opinion the language and style are such as point strongly to a dating in the first or early second century, and it is very difficult to refer them to any later period, in which they would be without parallel either in fable-books or in any other kind of writing. In respect to the general character of its style and vocabulary the Augustana text bears a strong resemblance to that of *PRyl.* There is not, I believe, a single word in it that is too "late," "Ionic" or "poetic" (as Adrados puts it) to have been used by the author of the papyrus text in the first century; or if there are a few such words—which I deny—they may be reckoned as due to scribal infiltration after

dispute about εὐτοκία, ease in bearing offspring. When the bitch had boasted that she gave birth quicker than any other quadruped, the sow replied, "But remember, when you say this, that the offspring you bear are blind." To which the moral is added, "Things are not judged by the speed with which they are accomplished, but by their perfection." Haste makes waste. In a letter to Stephanus, Arethas had complained of his friend's delay in sending him a transcript, which he had promised, of a book made "long, long ago" (πάλαι καὶ πρόπαλαι) of "Babylonian reed" (Βαβυλῶνος . . . σχοίνου) i.e. papyrus;[4] and in his reply to this letter, Stephanus deprecates his friend's impatience by explaining that the delay was due partly to the time required for making a more complete and satisfactory copy. Arethas ought to realize, he says, that haste in such matters leads to very poor results, just as the man of Phalerum had himself declared in terms of the old proverb about dogs in a hurry, or on the run, giving birth to blind puppies: τὰς δὲ κύνας τυφλὰ τίκτειν

the text had been composed. There is no evidence of its having been rewritten throughout or restylized after the first century. I say this with reference to the conclusion arrived at previously by Adrados, on the basis of very artificial, elusive, and unreliable linguistic measurements (cf. Koster in *Mnemosyne* 1 (1948) 341, and Pisani in *Paideia* 6 (1951) 395 f.) in his *Estudios sobre el lexico de las fábulas esópicas* (Salamanca 1948).

It is true in a general way that the learned or sophistic writers of later antiquity from the fourth century on are likely to employ a larger number of poetic words than do historians and sophists in the first and second centuries; but the style traditionally proper to fables in a collection, i.e. outside a larger context, was never that of historians, sophists, and the writers of serious, informative or epideictic prose, but rather something belonging in the broadly comic and mock-heroic tradition of ancient writing—hence the "poetic" and Ionic (instead of Attic) words; and even among prose writers in the serious, informative genres, by reference to whose vocabularies Adrados falsely judges that of the Augustana fables, there must have been, as early as the first and second centuries, a wide degree of difference among individual writers in the use or avoidance of poetic or vulgar words, according to the taste or purpose or education of each man who wrote. Contrast the vocabulary and style of Lucian, for example, with that of the historians whom he mentions as extravagant exploiters of poetic diction in the *Quomodo hist. conscrib.* 22: if Adrados were to apply his method of determining dates on the basis of word-analysis to those writers mentioned by Lucian, he would have to conclude that they lived two hundred years after Lucian himself; and the result would be equally false and absurd if he applied it to the *Life of Aesop*, which contains a larger number of definitely poetic, Ionic and vulgar words, than do the Augustana fables, together with which it has been transmitted in the manuscripts and which is demonstrably not later than the first century.

[4] The use of papyrus for writing in Babylonia is mentioned by Pliny, *NH* 13.73: "nuper et in Euphrate nascens circa Babylonem papyrum intellectum est eundem usum habere chartae"; cf. Strabo 16.740.

ἐπειγομένας ἀφῆκας; τὸν δὲ Φαληρέα τοιαῦτα τίκτειν καὶ τὰ κριτήρια φάμενον εἴασας; This is highly figurative language, the meaning of which, as seen from the context, is as follows: "Have you been willing to let the proverbial dogs bear blind puppies, because of their hurry (i.e. have you been content to have only a hasty copy of this book made with correspondingly bad results?); and have you been willing that the man of Phalerum should give birth to similar offspring (i.e., that this man's book should come out in a very bad copy, because of haste), and that too, although the man of Phalerum himself (the author of the book that I am copying for you) has told us how to judge such products (i.e. has stated the right verdict about them by likening them to blind puppies born on the run)?" Kugeas (page 115) suggests that the reference here was to the moral summary of the fable about the Sow and the Bitch as told by Demetrius in his *Αἰσώπεια*. Certainly the most likely place in which Demetrius would have had occasion to deal with this subject was in his book of Aesopic fables; and the most likely source from which this fable was taken into the old Augustana recension, along with others which we shall consider later, was also the collection of Demetrius.

That Demetrius had somewhere spoken about the moral of dogs giving birth in a hurry to blind puppies is attested furthermore in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* published by L. Sternbach in *Wiener Studien* 10 (1888) 228, No. 253: *Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἔφη ὡς οἱ ⟨θυμοὶ, καθάπερ οἱ⟩ κύνες τυφλὰ τίκτουσι τὰ κριτήρια.* In some other anthologies this proverbial simile is ascribed to Plutarch or is quoted as a common saying without being attributed to any particular author;[5] but there is good reason to believe that the ascription to Demetrius is old and genuine. The use of the philosophical term *κριτήριον*, which occurs nowhere else in the epimythia of Aesopic fables, and which refers in this context to the results characteristic of hasty action, shows clearly

[5] It is ascribed to Plutarch (= Fr. 40, Bernadakis) in the *Loci communes* of Maximus Confessor, Ch. 19 (Migne, *PG* 91, page 839), but with the reading *ἐγκλήματα* in place of *κριτήρια*. See the variants cited by Sternbach, *loc. cit.*

This proverb about dogs in a hurry giving birth to blind puppies, which is alluded to by Aristophanes in *Peace* 1079, may be the same as one which is partially preserved in a collection of Sumerian proverbs recently published by Edmund Gordon in the *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 12 (1958) 69: "The bitch is weakened from . . . the puppies' eyes will not open."

that the phraseology of Stephanus writing to Arethas on the one hand, and that of the unknown anthologist on the other, come from the same source. It is possible, of course, that Stephanus got his stuff from an anthology, but since he had a book of Demetrius actually in his hands it is more probable that that book was his source. The *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, compiled by a learned man in the fourteenth century or earlier, contains a number of elsewhere rarely attested, or unattested, sayings ascribed to Demetrius and to Aesop which recur in part under the same lemma in Stobaeus, Plutarch, or Diogenes Laertius; from which it may be inferred, with considerable probability, that a number of them probably came from his lost collection of *χρεῖαι*, wherein they were presumably ascribed to Aesop; two of them, including the one about the bitch, seem to come from his collection of Aesopic fables; and seven other sayings ascribed to Demetrius, six of which, incidentally, were overlooked by Wehrli in his collection of Demetrian apophthegms (page 27), come from unknown sources and probably, in most cases, from other writings of Demetrius.[6]

[6] The eight apophthegms printed by Wehrli on page 27 as Fragments 115–22 of Demetrius are all from Diogenes Laertius. The apophthegm concerning liars not being believed when they tell the truth, which is quoted below from Stobaeus, is classified by Wehrli (Fr. 198, page 42) as of dubious origin, because Stobaeus does not identify his "Demetrius" as *Phalereus*; but its authenticity as a fragment from the fable-book of Demetrius is confirmed by its ascription to "Aesop" in other anthologies, and by the fact that the substance of it stands in the old Augustana collection of Aesopic fables, the author of which must have derived some of his fables from Demetrius, whether directly or indirectly, as we shall see below.

To the sayings of Demetrius of Phalerum which are listed by Wehrli, and which were taken presumably from lost writings of Demetrius, the following items should be added (*GnV* = *Gnomologium Vaticanum* edited by Sternbach in *Wiener Studien* 10 (1888) 229 ff., cited by serial numbers):

GnV 253: *Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἔφη, ὡς οἱ ⟨θυμοὶ καθάπερ οἱ⟩ κύνες τυφλὰ τίκτουσι τὰ κριτήρια.* Other authority for this saying as Demetrian is cited above.

GnV 254: *Ὁ αὐτὸς εὐχομένους μὲν ἔφη δεῖν αἰτεῖσθαι τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, βουλευομένους δὲ ζητεῖν δυνατά.*

GnV 255 presents a variant form of the saying attested by Diogenes Laertius 5.82, = Wehrli, Fr. 117: *Ὁ αὐτὸς ἔφη δεῖν τοὺς καλῶς ἀγομένους τῶν νεανίσκων αἰδεῖσθαι ἐν μὲν ταῖς οἰκίαις τοὺς γονεῖς, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὁδοῖς τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐρημίαις ἑαυτούς.* See other variants and additions cited by Sternbach from other MSS.

GnV 256: *Ὁ αὐτὸς εἶπε τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον γενναίως ἐνεγκεῖν ἀτυχίαν μὴ δύνασθαι ἐπιδεξίως ἐνεγκεῖν εὐτυχίαν.*

GnV 257: *Ὁ αὐτὸς ἔφη μὴ δεῖν ζητεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰ ἐκ μεγάλης πόλεώς εἰσιν, ἀλλ' εἰ μεγάλης πόλεως ἄξιοι.* This is ascribed to Aristotle by Diogenes Laertius (5.1.19), to Zeno in Max. *Loci communes* 63 (Migne, *PG* 91, page 994), but to Demetrius again in Cod. Mon. 187, according to Sternbach.

An apophthegm excerpted from a fable told by a well-known author and ascribed to Aesop, or recognized as Aesopic, may be attributed by the excerptor, or by the copyist of a manuscript, either to Aesop or to the author who quotes or paraphrases "Aesop." Thus Theophylactus in letter 34 (Hercher, *Ep. Gr.* page 774) relates the well-known fable of the jackdaw parading in borrowed feathers, to which he adds a moral of his own; part of this moral is quoted in the gnomologium of Georgides under the lemma of "Theophylactus" in one manuscript, but under that of "Aesop" in another; see *Aes.* page 254, Sent. 26. And again in the same anthology the words of Gregory Theologus, which are extant in his *Poemata de se ipso conscripta* and which outline the substance of an Aesopic fable (the fox with the swollen belly, *Aes.* 24), are assigned to "Aesop" in two manuscripts, but to "Theologus" in another (*Aes.* pages 254 f.). These examples, in which the source of the quotation is extant, serve to illustrate the nature of the matter. In other cases, which will claim our attention below, the source in Demetrius is no longer extant, but the variant ascriptions are due obviously to the same phenomenon.

In the *Loci communes* ascribed to Maximus Confessor, ch. 35 (Migne, *PG* 91, page 900; cf. *Aes.* page 253, No. 24), the following is said of Aesop: *Αἴσωπος, ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ὄφελος τοῖς ψευδομένοις ἐκ τοῦ ψεύδους, ἔφη "τὸ κἂν ἀληθῆ λέγωσι μὴ πιστεύεσθαι."* This comes from the epimythium of a fable in the Augustana collection (*Aes.* 210) with which it agrees to a large extent even verbally: *ὁ λόγος δηλοῖ ὅτι τοῦτο κερδαίνουσιν οἱ ψευδόμενοι, τὸ μηδ' ὅταν ἀληθεύωσι πιστεύεσθαι.* The fable to which this is attached is the famous one about the shepherd boy who cried

GnV 258: *Ὁ αὐτὸς ἔλεγε τὸ μὲν τὰ κακὰ ἐνεγκεῖν ἀνδραπόδων εἶναι, τὸ δὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀνδρῶν.* In another anthology mentioned by Sternbach this saying is attributed to Demosthenes.

GnV 259: *Ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί τῶν ζώων κάλλιστόν ἐστιν εἶπεν· "ἄνθρωπος παιδείᾳ κεκοσμημένος."* This is elsewhere ascribed to various other authors, including Aristotle and Democritus.

GnV 260: *Ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τίς ἄριστος σύμβουλος ἔφη "ὁ καιρός."* This is elsewhere ascribed to various authors other than D.; but D. had written a book on *καιρός*.

Max. Conf., *Loci communes* 16 (Migne *PG*, 91, page 817): *Ὥσπερ τὸ μέλι τὰ ἡλκωμένα δάκνει, τοῖς δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἡδύ ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἐκ φιλοσοφίας λόγοι.* See below, page 314, where the source of this quotation is shown to have been the *Aesop* of Demetrius. Here in Maximus it comes under the lemma of Demetrius Phalereus and immediately follows the saying attributed to Demetrius by Plutarch in *Regum et imper. praec.* 189D, which is Fr. 63 in Wehrli.

"Wolf!" as a practical joke too often, and was not believed when he called for help in earnest. Since Stobaeus, *Flor.* 3.12.18, assigns the substance of the above-mentioned epimythium, along with some of its wording, to the utterance of "Demetrius," we may conclude with some confidence that the apophthegm was founded on the fable of the shepherd boy as told by Demetrius of Phalerum in his once well-known and widely used collection of Aesopic fables, and that it was from that source, whether directly or not, that *Aes.* 210 came into the Augustana collection, and also into Babrius, of whose version however we have only a paraphrase.[7] The text of Stobaeus runs thus: *Δημητρίου· Δημήτριος ἐρωτηθεὶς τί φαῦλον τοῖς ψευδομένοις παρακολουθεῖ εἶπε "τὸ μηδ' ἂν τἀληθῆ λέγωσι ἔτι πιστεύεσθαι."*[8]

[7] No. 169 in the edition of Babrius by Crusius.

[8] The substance of the saying quoted above was taken from the text of a fable ascribed to Aesop. In casting it into the form of a *χρεία*, the author of the *Loci communes*, or of the anthology from which it was derived, has invented an episode in the life of Aesop for which there was no traditional authority; and Stobaeus, or his source, has employed the same technique, for the purpose of framing this quotation, when he states that these words were given in reply by Demetrius on a particular occasion when somebody asked him what harm comes from telling lies. The fact probably is that Demetrius wrote them in the context of his book of "Aesopic" fables; and it is not to be inferred that either he or Aesop actually spoke them in conversation with another man, or that the anthologist was following a biographical tradition of any kind in so representing the matter. It is a common practice with ancient as with modern collectors or reporters of wise sayings, *bons mots* and jests, and with Phaedrus especially in the case of Aesopic fables, to invent outright on their own authority, in accord with the dramatic license freely exercised by all writers of dialogue and mime, the special circumstances under which the supposed author of a wise or witty saying, or of a fable, delivered it. In so doing there is no intention of recording biographical facts, or traditions about such facts, nor even, in most cases, of portraying character. The thing reported, whether an apophthegm or a fable, stands forth as something told for its own sake as wit or wisdom, and the presumable circumstances under which it was told are invented only for the purpose of introducing it or framing it—not as biographical data in the life of the presumptive author, whose very historical identity often varies with different reporters and sometimes, as in Diogenes Laertius, with the same reporter. The formula most commonly employed is very simple: So-and-so (an historical person), on being asked by so-and-so (either an historical person or an indefinite somebody, as fancy may suggest) how, why, or what, replied in these words, or with this fable. Sometimes the imagined circumstances are more complex or more special, but they are none the less *ad hoc* dramatic inventions, intended only to provide a setting for the quotation, the idea, or the fable so introduced. They are not told with biographical intention and do not imply anything about a previous biographical tradition. For that reason they are meaningless and worthless as evidence pointing to the existence of a popular biography of Aesop written in the classical period.

I say this because it is from evidence of just this kind, and nothing more, that the existence of such a biography, a *Volksbuch* written in Ionic prose and thumbed by a

We have seen that the fable-book of Demetrius was in all probability extant and known to Arethas and his friend Stephanus in the early tenth century, as the correspondence between the two men seems definitely to indicate. If so, it is natural to suppose that the same book was known also to Photius, the teacher of Arethas, since he was a great collector and reader of ancient books, was much interested in matters of prose style and rhetorical theory, and twice quotes from the writings of Demetrius of Phalerum on rhetoric.[9] As a matter of fact, one fable is told and ascribed to Aesop by Photius in his *Letters*, which, in view of its history as elsewhere evidenced, can hardly have come from any other source than directly from the *Aesop* of Demetrius. This fable, concerning Dionysus and the apportionment of various amounts of wine, is thus introduced, narrated, and commented upon by Photius in the letter above mentioned.[10]

> Aesop was a maker of fables, and in his view the fable contributed much that was useful for the conduct of life. He invented a number of stories by means of which he sought to reform the bad habits of men; and here, behold, is a notable fable which he made up to illustrate the nature and harmfulness of wine: in the beginning Dionysus invented three different clusters of grapes (*βότρυες*). The first he took for his own portion, the second he set aside as a present for Aphrodite, and the third cluster was left to Hybris as his portion. Whence it comes about that the violence (*hybris*) which shows up in the speech of men, and that also which manifests itself disgracefully in their actions, is commonly called *paroinia*. You wonder, perhaps, what these things mean? Dionysus himself did not become a reveler (*οὐκ ἐβάκχευε*) although he led the Bacchanals after him in his train. We may pass over the rest, since this letter is not the place for a long and detailed

reading public for amusement in the early fifth century B.C., has been deduced by Hausrath and Crusius and is often proclaimed as an established fact of literary history, whereas it is only a myth invented by scholars who can imagine, in the romantic tradition of Jacob Grimm, that literary conditions in ancient Ionia were as favorable to the composition and circulation of a jest-book dealing with the antics and utterances of an Eulenspiegel or a Marcolfus as they were in medieval or early modern Germany. See, on the contrary, my refutation in *Aes.* page 5 and *Fable* 31; and also, to the same effect, Adrados 344 f. and Chambry in *Supplément critique au Bull. de l'Assoc. Guill. Budé* 1 (1929) 183.

[9] Fragments 164 and 206 in Wehrli.

[10] Letter 16 on pages 10–12 of the edition by Papadopoulos–Kerameus in *Zapiski Istoriko-Philologischeskago Fakulteta Imperatorskago S.-Peterburgskago Universiteta* 41 (1896). This edition, made from two MSS. on Mt. Athos, contains letters of Photius not previously published.

story. (We may note, however, that) Dionysus, for his part, never lost his sobriety. This means that the first cluster from the vine is for him whose use of wine is controlled by need; but he who goes beyond his need and takes wine from the second cluster has lost his balance and, while still preserving his nature, allows himself to join in the orgies of Aphrodite and to become initiated therein; but those are the mysteries of impurity. Still, do not enter into lamentation too much just yet, nor shed too many tears over that calamity; for, behold, there is the third cluster which is bound to arouse your compassion and your grief, since it makes him who partakes of it a slave in effect of Hybris and drags him off into captivity away from the human family. It would be better, indeed, and a happy state of affairs, if there had been no Dionysus. Why should I turn my attention to the Bacchanals, to seem to take part in their madness, and to be torn by the troubles and anxieties that go with it? If that can be no more than a pious wish, since the custom of this age is rooted in those things of life which are most difficult to overcome, at least it is within our power not to make wine from the second cluster of grapes, and to avoid the evil which it entails. But he who is not wise enough to be on his guard against the injury caused by the second cluster ought with all his power to avoid that last one. He who gives himself over to the third cluster in very truth makes himself the plaything of Hybris and exiles himself from the commonwealth of humanity.

The first to call attention to this fable in Photius was V. Grumel in an article entitled "Une Fable d'Ésope dans Photius," published in the *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 11 (1951) 129–32. Previously the fable in question, as told by Photius and ascribed to Aesop, had escaped the notice of all students of folk-lore, partly no doubt because the letter in which Photius describes it was not published until 1896, and in a volume that is often difficult of access. As Father Grumel observed, this fable is not found in any of the Greek collections of fables ascribed to Aesop, whether early or late; nor, so far as I know, is it mentioned as a fable in any other Greek or Latin author. Photius is apparently the only author who calls it a fable or, with one exception, ascribes it to Aesop's telling. This would indicate that the book in which the patriarch found this fable under the name of Aesop was one which was extant in his time but has not come down to us. The collection

of Aesopic fables made by Demetrius of Phalerum evidently fits that description, since, as we have seen above, the independent testimony of Stephanus tends strongly to show that this book was known and read by himself and Arethas in the early tenth century. For Photius, moreover, who studied and respected the ancient rhetoricians and orators, including Demetrius, the official Aesop, so to speak, would naturally be the edition of Demetrius, rather than that of some obscure compiler unknown to us. So much for the general likelihood. Far more decisive, however, as evidence pointing to the Demetrian origin of the fable about Dionysus and the wine, is the fact which I explained in *BZ* (see note 1) namely, that the form in which this story appears in Photius is essentially the form that it had in the fourth century B.C. and earlier, and that no writer later than Demetrius, except Photius, so reports it.

In an altered form, without any mention of Dionysus, the Bacchanals, Aphrodite, or Aesop, the substance of this "fable" is often recorded with slight variations as the saying of some famous man or unnamed sage. In Diogenes Laertius, Stobaeus, Maximus Confessor, and the *Melissa* of Antonius, the saying is attributed to Anacharsis;[11] in Maximus again (*loc. cit.*, page 885) to Epictetus; in the gnomology of Georgides to Democritus;[12] and in Apuleius and Fulgentius to an unnamed wise man.[13] These writers present two distinct versions of the saying about the wine which may be labelled A and B, for convenience, and described as follows:

Version A is recorded in Diogenes Laertius, Maximus, and Georgides, and the two last mentioned read exactly the same: *ἡ ἄμπελος τρεῖς βότρυας φέρει· τὸν μὲν πρῶτον ἡδονῆς, τὸν δεύτερον μέθης, τὸν τρίτον ὕβρεως.* Diogenes Laertius puts the sentence in indirect discourse (*τὴν ἄμπελον τρεῖς φέρειν βότρυς*) and has *ἀκηδίας* in place of *ὕβρεως*, but is otherwise the same. This form of the story, which is closer akin to that in Photius than is version B, stems from a mythological prototype which appears in a fragment of the epic poet Panyassis of Halicarnassus, the uncle of Herodotus, as quoted by Athenaeus, 2.36D. Here the first portion is assigned

[11] Diogenes Laertius 1.8.105; Stobaeus, *Flor.* 3.18.25; Max. Conf. *Loci comm.* 30 (Migne, *PG* 91, page 885); Antonius, *Melissa* 1.41 (Migne, *PG* 136, page 920).

[12] In Boissonade's *Anecdota Graeca* 1.41 = Migne, *PG* 117, page 1097.

[13] Apuleius, *Florida* 20; Fulgentius, *Myth.* 2.12.

to the Graces, the Hours, and Dionysus himself; the second to Aphrodite and Dionysus; and the third and last to Hybris and Ate:

> *πρῶται μὲν Χάριτές τ' ἔλαχον καὶ εὐφρονες Ὧραι*
> *μοῖραν καὶ Διόνυσος ἐρίβρομος, οἷπερ ἔτευξαν.*
> *τοῖς δ' ἔπι Κυπρογένεια θεὰ λάχε καὶ Διόνυσος.*
> *ἔνθα τε κάλλιστος πότος ἀνδράσι γίνεται οἴνου·*
> *εἴ τις ⟨τόν⟩ γε πίοι καὶ ἀπότροπος οἴκαδ' ἀπέλθοι*
> *δαιτὸς ἀπὸ γλυκερῆς, οὐκ ἄν ποτε πήματι κύρσαι·*
> *ἀλλ' ὅτε τις μοίρης τριτάτης πρὸς μέτρον ἐλαύνοι*
> *πίνων ἀβλεμέως, τότε δ' Ὕβριος αἶσα καὶ Ἄτης*
> *γίνεται ἀργαλέα, κακὰ δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὀπάζει.*

Version B appears in Apuleius and Stobaeus and, along with version A, also in Maximus and Antonius. The following is the text of Stobaeus and of Maximus, with the substantial variants of Apuleius noted in parentheses:

> Ἀνάχαρσις ἔφη (sapientis viri . . . dictum) *κιρναμένου κρατῆρος ἐφεστίου τὸν μὲν πρῶτον ὑγιείας πίνεσθαι* (ad sitim pertinet), *τὸν δὲ δεύτερον ἡδονῆς* (ad hilaritatem), *τὸν δὲ τρίτον ὕβρεως* (ad voluptatem), *τὸν δὲ τελευταῖον μανίας* (quarta ad insaniam).

The prototype of this version is seen in a fragment of the comic poet Eubulus, written in the fourth century B.C. (Athenaeus 2.36B):

> *Εὔβουλος δὲ ποιεῖ τὸν Διόνυσον λέγοντα·*
>
> *τρεῖς γὰρ μόνους κρατῆρας ἐγκεραννύω*
> *τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσι· τὸν μὲν ὑγιείας ἕνα,*
> *ὃν πρῶτον ἐκπίνουσι· τὸν δὲ δεύτερον*
> *ἔρωτος ἡδονῆς τε· τὸν τρίτον δ' ὕπνου,*
> *ὃν ἐκπιόντες οἱ σοφοὶ κεκλημένοι*
> *οἴκαδε βαδίζουσ'. ὁ δὲ τέταρτος οὐκ ἔτι*
> *ἡμέτερός ἐστ', ἀλλ' ὕβρεος· ὁ δὲ πέμπτος βοῆς . . .*

This version by Eubulus obviously represents a stage of evolution in the story which is intermediate between that of Panyassis on the one hand and that of Stobaeus on the other. Dionysus, missing in Stobaeus, is still prominent here in Eubulus, as in Panyassis; but for the first time, as later in the first-century *Life of Aesop* and in Photius, it is Dionysus himself who assigns the various portions of wine. The portions are called *μοῖραι* in Panyassis and are three in number, as in Photius and version A, but in Eubulus

and Stobaeus (version B) four portions or more are mentioned and are called bowls, κρατῆρες. The term βότρυς, used figuratively to indicate an amount of wine, appears first in version A (Diogenes Laertius) and elsewhere only in Photius. It must have been in the source used by Photius; and that source must have been later than Panyassis and earlier than version A of the saying, in which all of the deities and mythological elements, which are common to Photius and Panyassis, have been eliminated or secularized. In respect to the absence of those mythological features the version of Eubulus has already evolved in the same direction as the later version A, although it still retains some traces of the original form which are missing in the later tradition: thus ἔρως is retained from Aphrodite as joint heir with ἡδονή to the second bowl, and mention is made, as in Panyassis, of the prudent man leaving and going home after moderate indulgence.

After Eubulus the first writer whom we know to have told this "fable," socalled only by Photius, is the author and inventor of the *Life of Aesop*, who lived in Egypt in the first century of the Christian era. In this biography (ch. 68) Aesop speaks as follows in trying to restrain his master Xanthus from headlong drunkenness:

> ὁ Διόνυσος εὑρὼν τὸν οἶνον, τρεῖς σκύφους κεράσας, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑπέδειξεν πῶς δεῖ τῷ πότῳ χρᾶσθαι· τὸν μὲν πρῶτον εἶναι τῆς ἡδονῆς, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον τῆς εὐφροσύνης, τὸν δὲ τρίτον τῆς ἀκηδίας.[14] δὶ ὅ, δέσποτα, κτλ.

Here, as in Photius, the fable is ascribed to Aesop's telling; and, since the mythological form of it as given by Photius and Panyassis was already giving way to secularized versions in the fourth century B.C., the book of Aesop's fables in which Photius found it could hardly have been any other than that of Demetrius of Phalerum. And it must have been from the same source, moreover, that this fable came to the author of the *Life of Aesop*, since no one before his time except Demetrius, so far as we know, had ascribed it to Aesop; and it was natural, if not inevitable, that the author of this biography, in the course of putting ten or more fables into the mouth of Aesop, should draw some of them from the only collection of Greek fables which we know to have been current under the name of Aesop before his time, and which,

[14] *Vita W*, an ancient reworking of the older *Vita G*, has ὕβρεως in place of ἀκηδίας, which may or may not have been the original reading.

in all probability, was easily accessible to him in Egypt, his own home and for many years that of Demetrius. The form in which the story of the wine is told in this first-century *Life of Aesop* is intermediate between the version of Demetrius, as reported by Photius, and the form in which it appears as a saying ascribed to this or that philosopher in later times from Diogenes Laertius onward: in the latter there is no mention of Dionysus as prescribing the various portions of wine, but in the *Life* this feature is retained from the older Demetrian version.

It is probable that a number of other fables which are told by Aesop in the *Life* have been taken from or modeled upon fables contained in the collection published by Demetrius. Foremost among these probable derivatives from the lost book of Demetrius is the fable about True and False Dreams in ch. 33, which is preserved only in the oldest version of the *Life* (G) and was first published in 1952 (*Aes.* page 47). Here follows a translation of that fable (*Aes.* No. 385):

> Aesop said, "Don't be surprised, mistress, that you have been deceived by your dream. Not all dreams are true. At the request of the Leader of the Muses Zeus gave him the power of prophecy, so that he (Apollo) excelled all others in the business of oracles. But the Leader of the Muses, because all men marvelled at him, got into the habit of despising all others, and was too much of a braggart in everything else. On that account his superior (ὁ μείζων), being angered with him and not wanting him to have so much power with men, fashioned certain dreams which told men in their sleep what was really going to happen. When the Leader of the Muses discovered that no one any longer needed his prophecy, he begged Zeus to relent and quit invalidating his oracle. Zeus became reconciled with him, and, in accordance therewith, fashioned certain other dreams for men which would show them false things in their sleep; in order that, having been deceived about the truth in their dreams, they might turn again to the oracles of the original prophet. For this reason, if a dream of the original type comes to one, it shows a true vision. Don't be surprised, therefore, that you saw one thing in your sleep and that something else came to pass, for it wasn't a dream of the original kind that you saw, but one of those lying dreams came to you deceiving you with falsehoods in your sleep."

This story is not found in any collection of Aesopic fables, ancient or modern, and I know of only one parallel to it elsewhere,

namely, a droll myth told by Euripides, somewhat in the spirit of the *Hymn to Hermes*, about the same two gods, but involving other gods also, in the *Iphigenia at Tauris* 1259 ff. According to this version Apollo, while still a child, after killing the earth-born Pytho, took the oracular shrine away from Themis, who had previously held it; and thereafter Earth, in order to avenge her daughter Themis, destroyed the need for Apollo's prophecy by sending dreams to men which truly foretold the future. Thereupon Apollo ran off in hot haste (ταχύπους . . . ὁρμαθείς) to Olympus and, stretching out his childish arms in supplication to Father Zeus, implored him to remove Earth's curse by restoring value to his oracles. Stop these dreams! Zeus laughed at his son, who was so fearful of losing a profitable business, and goodnaturedly took away from men the prophetic dreams, thereby restoring honor and value to the oracles of Apollo. Euripides seems to have left the popular story unfinished; for he does not say *how* the true dreams were nullified, nor why dreams which seem to be prophetic, but are false or deceptive, still visit men in their sleep, as Iphigenia herself had discovered (*IT* 569). The only prophetic dreams that Euripides mentions in this passage are *true* dreams, not deceptive as Paley tried to make out;[15] and it was just because they were true that they ruined Apollo's oracle business. It is not plausible, nor in accord with what must have been the original form of the story, to take no account of false dreams. For everyone, including Euripides, was well aware that such dreams do come to men and, logically, it must have been by sending these false dreams along with the true, rather than by taking away *all* dreams, as Euripides implies, that the oracles of Apollo were again needed, to distinguish between true and false, and so restored to honor.

[15] In his notes on *IT* 1234 and 1282 in *Euripides* (London 1880) 3. For the true interpretation of this passage and its motivation as a choral ode, see W. S. Messer, *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (New York 1918) 94. The ode of which we are speaking heralds the triumph of Apollo's oracle as reestablished by Zeus in the primitive time long ago, and it has no logical connection, such as Paley infers, with Iphigenia's dream in lines 42 ff., or with her conclusion (569) that dreams generally are false. Because she believes that her dream was false, Paley infers that it came from Earth and that the dreams said to have been sent by Earth in this myth were false dreams. What Euripides actually says is correctly translated by Paley in his note on 1259: "But when (Apollo) on his arrival had dispossessed Themis, child of Earth, of the sacred oracles, then did the Earth cause to be brought forth nightly visions of dreams which to numbers of mortal men foretold both things at the beginning and what afterwards was destined to happen, in the dark repose of sleep."

We see that the fable about dreams, as told by Aesop in the *Life*, is derived—like the fable about the wine, which was ascribed to Aesop by Demetrius and also by the author of this *Life*—from a *mythological* prototype that was current in the fifth century B.C. It is, by virtue of its mythological and aetiological character, a distinctly *early* type of "Aesopic fable"; early, because this type figures more prominently among the few stories alleged to have been told by Aesop in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. than among the numerous animal fables and other metaphorical (as opposed to aetiological) types which predominate in the extant collections. When we find in Phaedrus, Babrius, or the Augustana collection a fable turning about the actions of Olympian deities, Prometheus, mythological personifications such as Plutus or Momus, or figures of saga like Heracles, we have reason to suspect that the fable in question, especially if it is aetiological, and provided that it is witty, has come down from a fourth or fifth-century source and probably, though not necessarily, through the *Aesop* of Demetrius. As we have already observed, in the case of the story about the wine as told by Panyassis and by Demetrius (as reported in Photius), in contrast with later forms of the same story, there was a strong tendency to secularization and the elimination of deities and mythological elements in later antiquity, both in the retelling of old fables and in the selection or formulation of new ones for the Aesopic corpus. The older fables ascribed to Aesop are more often mythological or aetiological in kind, than in the later collections, or they have more of those qualities than later versions of the same fables. Thus Plato thinks it is typical of Aesop to invent an aetiological myth. In commenting on the strange proximity of pleasure to pain in the *Phaedo* (60B) Socrates is made to say: "And it seems to me that, if Aesop had noticed this, he would have composed a myth to the effect that the god, wishing to reconcile these warring elements and not being able to do so, joined their heads together into one, so that whenever either of the two comes to a man the other follows thereafter" (*Aes.* 445). Callimachus ascribes to Aesop a purely aetiological tale according to which Zeus took away the speech of animals and gave it to men, whence the human race became exceedingly loquacious (*Aes.* 431). Aristotle (*Meteor.* 2.3; cf. *Aes.* 8) tells us how Aesop outwitted some shipbuilders who had challenged him, by inventing an aetiological tale to the effect

that, in accordance with the process of creation hitherto revealed, the sea was in danger of being dried up almost any day, and if that happened, they would be out of business. In the *Birds* of Aristophanes, Peisthetaerus cites the authority of Aesop to prove that the crested lark is older than the earth itself; he had to bury his father in his head, hence the big crest, because there was not yet any earth (*Aes.* 447). This is not an Aesopic fable in the generic sense of the term as it was commonly understood in later antiquity and now, because it is not metaphorical; but Aesop's reputation was that of a wit who was very clever at repartee and one who would use *any* kind of story or jest which would serve to turn the tables on an adversary, or to win an argument.

What author other than Demetrius of Phalerum is so likely to have told the mythological and aetiological fable about Dreams, which we find in the first-century *Life of Aesop*, and to have referred it to Aesop? The myth, in its main outlines, was already known to Euripides, and it was just the kind of story, in view of its droll nature, that one would plausibly attribute to the jesting Aesop. Demetrius was the man most likely to make this attribution, because he was actively interested not only in Aesop, whose fables he published in one book, but also in the subject of dreams in general, concerning which he wrote a work in five books, according to Artemidorus 2.44 (Wehrli page 26). In the light of these facts, it seems unlikely that Demetrius could fail either to be familiar with the fable about Dreams, or to ascribe it to Aesop.

The highly poetic and mythological fable concerning Apollo, the Muses, and the Dryads, which is spun out by Himerius in one of his orations and ascribed to Aesop (*Aes.* 432), is very probably a paraphrase made on the basis of a fable that the rhetorician had read in the collection of Demetrius. This fable is nowhere else told or ascribed to Aesop, only in Himerius. It is a kind of fable that seems to have been favored by Demetrius in his *Aesop*, considering its mythological content, and a kind, moreover, that the authors of fable-collections in later times tended to leave out of their collections, as they did in the case of the fable about Dionysus and the wine, or in that about true and false dreams. A prominent part of the fable, as Himerius tells it, relates indirectly to the ancient strife between the personified mountains Helicon and Cithaeron, and the great contrast between these two is

proclaimed by Helicon in a speech, said to be quoted from Aesop, urging the Nymphs and Dryads not to be so insane as to desert the gentle home of the Muses and Apollo on Helicon and go over to the wild Cithaeron, whose ways are savage and inhuman. A papyrus fragment of Corinna relates to the strife between Helicon and Cithaeron,[16] but the best account of the myth is given in Ps.-Plutarch's *De fluviis* 2.3. According to this, Helicon and Cithaeron were once human beings and brothers, the former gentle and kind to his parents, the latter cruel and a patricide. When Cithaeron tried to throw Helicon over a cliff he himself was borne over with him, and the two brothers afterwards were transformed into the mountains that bear their names. Now this myth was one with which Demetrius of Phalerum was well acquainted in its poetic form, as might be expected of so learned an antiquarian and one who collected the popular lore of earlier times. In a fragment of his lost book, *On Odyssey* 1–4, which is quoted by the scholiast on *Odyssey* 3.267 and by Eustathius, Demetrius sketches the biography of the earliest poets, deduced with Peripatetic precision from what had been said about them incidentally in Homer and other early poets, or to some extent, perhaps, by logographers before his time rationalizing on the same basis. He states that Creon founded the Pythian games and that the first to win a victory there was "Demodocus the Laconian, pupil of Automedes the Mycenaean, who in turn was the first to write up in epic verse the battle of Amphitryon against the Teleboans and the strife between Cithaeron and Helicon, from whom the mountains in Boeotia are named." Here we have a specimen of the method followed by Demetrius in the making-up of literary history, which is important to bear in mind when we come to consider what he or his contemporaries contributed to the shaping of legends about Aesop. For the present, however, the point to which we are calling attention is only that Demetrius was familiar with the poetic myth about Cithaeron and Helicon, which is reflected in the fable ascribed to Aesop by Himerius, and that this was a kind of myth that he might have assigned to Aesop's telling. His version of it as an Aesopic fable would have been relatively very short in comparison with the rhetorically inflated and otiose retelling of it by Himerius. No

[16] E. Diehl, *Anth. lyr.* 1.4, pages 195–97.

improbability, therefore, is involved in supposing that the fable in question came from the *Aesop* of Demetrius.

That the collection of Demetrius was indeed the source of the fable discussed by Himerius is quite definitely implied, as it seems to me, by the manner in which it is introduced:

> *πάλιν ἐλθεῖν μοι συνέριθον παρακαλέσω τὸν Αἴσωπον, λόγον δὲ ὑμῖν οὐ Λιβυκόν τινα ἢ Αἰγύπτιον, ἀλλ' ἐκ μέσων τῶν πάνυ Φρυγῶν, ὅπου καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ὁ μῦθος ἐγένετο, ἐν αὐτοῖς εὑρὼν τοῖς Αἰσωπείοις ἀθύρμασιν, ἐθέλω καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς διηγήσασθαι.*

Himerius is here saying in effect that his source is the most authentic of all possible written sources for Aesopic fables. It was *the* book of Aesop *par excellence*, as he understood it. Now what would that prime authority for Aesopic fables be in the mind of a fourth-century rhetorician? Only the relatively ancient, and therefore classical book by the learned Demetrius of Phalerum, which was the work of an author apparently well known to all the rhetoricians and sophists, and the first collection of Aesopic fables known to have been made, could possibly be so rated. No other collection known to us contained the fable, and no collection made by an unknown fabulist or compiler after the Alexandrian age would be likely to include a highly poetic myth of this kind as an Aesopic fable, unless it had been taken from Demetrius.

Themistius, a contemporary of Himerius, relates or summarizes, in various passages of his orations, seven different fables, each of which he attributes explicitly to Aesop. It is probable, but not demonstrable, that some of these, if not all, were fables that he had read in the collection of Demetrius. In the following paragraphs those fables of Themistius which seem to have the best claim to Demetrian origin will be considered first.

Themistius, *Orat.* 32 (ed. Dindorf, page 434):

> *καὶ τοῦτο αὖ πάλιν Αἴσωπος λέγει· τὸν γὰρ πηλὸν αὐτῷ ὁ Προμηθεύς, ἀφ' οὗ τὸν ἄνθρωπον διεπλάσατο, οὐκ ἐφύρασεν ὕδατι, ἀλλὰ δακρύοις. οὐχὶ οὖν ἐκκόπτειν αὐτὰ πειρᾶσθαι χρεών· ἀμήχανον γάρ.*

This fable (*Aes.* 430) is not told or mentioned by any writer before Themistius. Stobaeus (3.1.122) includes it in an excerpt from the oration of Themistius; and Nikephoros Gregoras (*Hist. Byz.* 16.4) may have taken it from Stobaeus or Themistius, since he

adds nothing to the latter's version, except to call Aesop a Phrygian, and his creator is ὁ θεός instead of Prometheus. The ascription by Themistius of this old-looking myth to Aesop implies that the philosopher-rhetorician found it in a book that is no longer extant to-day, and one in which it was represented as a fable told by Aesop, or possibly as one of his sayings. That points definitely to the book of Demetrius. What looks like an allusion to this tragic version of man's creation by Prometheus from clay and tears may be seen in a passage of Suetonius (*Tib.* 57); where we are told that the teacher of Tiberius, the well-known rhetorician Theodorus of Gadara, noted the mixture of cruelty and mildness in his pupil's nature "et assimulasse aptissime visus est, subinde in obiurgando appellans πηλὸν αἵματι πεφυραμένον." Here αἵματι seems to be substituted for δακρύοις rather than for ὕδατι, although we cannot be sure of it; for it would have been wittier and more effective to parody a well-known witticism, such as that of Aesop about clay and tears, than to play upon the familiar but more abstract and colorless tradition that man was made of clay and water, which had never been formulated as a memorable saying.

The question of just how old this fable really was, is discussed by W. Nestle in an article entitled "Ein pessimistischer Zug im Prometheus-mythus."[17] Nestle seeks to locate in history the environment of thought and cultural outlook in which such a "pessimistic" conception of mankind could have come into the myth of Prometheus. He admits that this might have happened in either the sixth or the fifth century B.C., but he thinks it more probable that the myth took shape in the sixth century, when, under the Orphic influence from Thrace "eine trübselige Auffassung des Lebens weit verbreitet fand." This implies that the myth as shaped in the Aesopic fable is necessarily the serious expression of a pessimistic outlook on human life which prevailed in a certain age; but that is by no means a safe assumption on which to proceed. The idea that man was born to sorrow from the beginning, or that it were best never to be born at all, might find expression in any age, not necessarily as an index to the prevailing thought and feeling of the age—which might be Orphic or tragic, Socratic, Cynic or Christian—but as a momentary revelation of the tragedy of existence as seen by an individual,

[17] *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 34 (1937) 378–81.

Schopenhauer or Nietzsche or Robert Burns or Thomas Hardy in a predominantly optimistic age might have authored such a myth as well as Theognis. But, however this may be, there is one thing that our fable does presuppose, as it seems to me quite surely, and that is the preexistence and currency of the myth that Prometheus fashioned man out of clay mixed with water. If we could know when that famous myth originated, we should have a *terminus post quem* for the paradoxical version of it ascribed to Aesop. As Nestle himself points out, the earliest reference to the story that Prometheus created man is made by the comic poet Philemon in the fourth century B.C. (Fr. 89, Kock).[18] How much older this form of the Promethean myth is, or when it originated, we cannot know; but it may be significant in this connection that in the myth told by Protagoras in Plato's dialogue (320C) it is the gods who are said to have created man and the animals, while Prometheus and Epimetheus are ordered to bestow upon each of the species his own peculiar means of self-defense and livelihood. Here the role played by Prometheus seems to be midway in evolution between the representation of him in the early period as the giver of fire and various arts to mortals—*πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως*—and the representation of him in later times as the creator of man out of clay and water, and the god who endowed man and the animals with various physical and mental qualities inherent in their nature. The Aesopic variant of the myth is not likely to have originated before the fourth century B.C., when the myth that it presupposes is first attested, and it may well have been invented by Demetrius himself, either as a fable of Aesop's, or as a saying ascribed to him in his book of *χρεῖαι*. It is essentially a witticism, however somber its implications, rather than a myth seriously intended to explain the origin and nature of man; and there would be little point or plausibility in it unless the serious myth about the creation of man as an organism made out of earth and water were already familiar. That the life of man, generally speaking, is full of sorrow is a simple fact, the truth of which has been recognized by men in all ages, who are not on that account rated

[18] Pandora is said to have been made of clay—of course by some god or gods other than Prometheus—in a fragment of Aeschylus (Fr. 369), and men are *πλάσματα πηλοῦ* in Aristophanes, *Birds* 686. See the passages cited by Pfeiffer on Fr. 493 of Callimachus in his edition, 1.366. There is no sure mention of Prometheus as the creator before Philemon.

as "pessimists." Aesop's fable takes that simple fact for granted and wittily explains why it is so, on the analogy of an older myth which sought to explain the birth of man only as a living organism.

In *Or.* 16.208A Themistius describes the substance of a fable, which he attributes to Aesop, as follows: *ἄμιλλά τις Πειθοῦς καὶ Βίας· καὶ ἀνύει τι μᾶλλον ἡ Πειθὼ τῆς Βίας ἐν τῷ μύθῳ, καὶ γυμνοῖ πρόσθεν ὁ ἥλιος τῶν λάβρων πνευμάτων.* This of course is none other than the well-known fable, *Aes.* 46, which is elsewhere entitled, in all the extant collections that include it (the Augustana, Babrius, and Avianus), "Boreas and Helios." In the epimythia of these versions, excepting that of Avianus, the meaning of the fable is summarized with a statement to the effect that more is accomplished by persuasion than by force, and the phraseology thereby employed is very similar to that used by Themistius in outlining the fable: thus Babrius reads *ἀνύσεις τι πειθοῖ μᾶλλον ἢ βίᾳ ῥέζων*, and the Augustana *ὅτι πολλάκις τὸ πείθειν τοῦ βιάζεσθαι ἀνυστικώτερόν ἐστι.* Here the personifications *Πειθώ* and *Βία* are missing; but their prominence as contending forces in Themistius gives his version of the fable such a different aspect that Nestle (page 378) fails to recognize its identity, in spite of the words *γυμνοῖ . . . ὁ ἥλιος . . . λάβρων πνευμάτων*, and concludes that Themistius must have found it in a book of Aesop's fables that is no longer extant. Nestle's premises are mistaken; but his conclusion, guided by the impression that the form of the fable in Themistius is something unique, is probably right. Themistius must have read this fable in a version that is no longer extant; and, although Nestle does not say so, that version could scarcely have been any other than the one that stood in the book of Demetrius of Phalerum, the official "Aesop" of his time. It was like Demetrius, as we have seen above, to represent the contending parties as the personified abstractions Peitho and Bia, even though their agents were the sun and the wind respectively. He dramatizes as actors broad abstractions, or deities, which the later fabulists reduced to particular persons or things, in this case specifically sun and wind.

The earliest reference to this fable about Boreas and Helios is found in an epigram ascribed to Sophocles addressing Euripides, as quoted by Athenaeus 13.604F.[19] The epigram seems to come from the historical memoirs of Hieronymus of Rhodes,

[19] *καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἀκούσας ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐπίγραμμα, χρησάμενος τῷ περὶ*

a contemporary of Demetrius, whom Athenaeus cites as authority for the episode involving Sophocles and Euripides to which it refers. Whether Sophocles actually wrote this epigram, or whether it was first composed and attributed to him by Hieronymus or by one of his contemporaries, is an open question which cannot be decided. The fable about Boreas and Helios may or may not have been familiar in the fifth century; but the idea of Peitho and Bia as opposing forces, and the triumph of the former in the guise of λόγος, seems to have been something of a doctrine with Demetrius of Phalerum,[20] and it was implicit, if we may trust Agathias (*APl* 4.332), in a group of sculptured figures cast by Lysippus in the time of Demetrius, which represented Aesop in front of the Seven Wise Men of Greece:

Εὖγε ποιῶν, Λύσιππε γέρων, Σικυώνιε πλάστα,
δείκελον Αἰσώπου στήσαο τοῦ Σαμίου
ἕπτα σοφῶν ἔμπροσθεν· ἐπεὶ κεῖνοι μὲν ἀνάγκην
ἔμβαλον, οὐ πειθώ, φθέγμασι τοῖς σφετέροις,
ὃς δὲ σοφοῖς μύθοις καὶ πλάσμασι καίρια λέξας,
παίζων ἐν σπουδῇ πείθει ἐχεφρονέειν.
φευκτὸν δ' ἡ τραχεῖα παραίνεσις· ἡ Σαμίου δὲ
τὸ γλυκὺ τοῦ μύθου καλὸν ἔχει δέλεαρ.

It seems probable that the sculptures of Lysippus here mentioned were suggested to the artist's mind by the writings of Demetrius on the same two subjects: Aesop's fables, and the collected *Sayings of the Seven Wise Men.*[21] Surely this is the environment of thought and fashion, headlined in the last two decades of the fourth century B.C., in which the fable about Peitho and Bia,

Ἡλίου καὶ Βορέου λόγῳ, καί τι πρὸς μοιχείαν αὐτοῦ παραινιττόμενος·

Ἥλιος ἦν, οὐ παῖς, Εὐριπίδη, ὅς με χλιαίνων
γυμνὸν ἐποίησεν· σοὶ δὲ φιλοῦντι ἑταίραν
Βορρᾶς ὠμίλησε, κτλ.

[20] Among the apophthegms ascribed to Demetrius by Diogenes Laertius (Wehrli, Fr. 120) is the following: *ὅσον ἐν πολέμῳ δύνασθαι σίδηρον, τοσοῦτον ἐν πολίταις ἰσχύειν λόγον.* This may have some connection with a saying ascribed to Aesop by the rhetorician Nicolaus in his *Progymnasmata* (Spengel, *Rh. Gr.* 3.461) where he is illustrating varieties of the *χρεία*: *ὡς ἐκεῖνο· Αἴσωπος ὁ λογοποιός, ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἰσχυρότατον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, "ὁ λόγος" ἀπεκρίνατο.* Nicolaus may well have found this in the collection of *χρεῖαι* by Demetrius. That "speech is man's greatest weapon" is a saying ascribed to Demosthenes in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (*Wien. Stud.* 10[1888] 216, No. 219). In *Aes.* 311 (from Babrius) *λόγος* is likewise said to be the greatest of weapons.

[21] Copious excerpts from this book (Wehrli, Fr. 114) are preserved by Stobaeus, *Flor.* 3.1.172. See Wehrli's commentary on page 69.

mentioned by Themistius, is most likely to have been composed, or retold, and ascribed to Aesop. Cf. note 52 below.

The fable about the lion and the bulls, of which parallel versions are found in Babrius (No. 44 = *Aes.* 372), Aphthonius (16), Avianus (18), and Syntipas (13) is thus told in substance by Themistius (*Or.* 22.278C–79A), after a preface in which he remarks that Aesop always represents the fox as employing calumny (διαβολή) and by that means overcoming the strongest of the beasts:

> Two bulls, the leaders of the herd, always grazed together and were close friends. The lion was afraid to attack them or their herd, so long as they remained together, but since he was dying of hunger he sought aid of the fox. The fox by crafty deceit sowed discord between the two bulls so that they parted company, and thereafter the lion made easy prey of each bull separately.

As Benfey and Crusius have both observed, this is the most plausible version of the fable that we have, and so, presumably, close to the original form.[22] The source from which it was taken must have been quite different from any that we can point to in extant literature, and for that reason principally we may suppose that its source was the lost collection of Demetrius. In the versions of Babrius, Aphthonius and Avianus, all of which are on the same general pattern, no fox intervenes; and it is the lion himself who, contrary to Aesopian fashion elsewhere, sows discord by means of διαβολή between three or four bulls, four in Avianus. This is obviously a perverted form of the fable as told by Themistius, and therefore of later origin. In Syntipas there are only two bulls, as in Themistius; but there is no fox,

[22] Benfey, *Panchatantra* 1.93; Crusius, *De Babrii aetate* 208. This is one of several fables in the *Panchatantra* in which the basic pattern of the story, derived from a Greek fable, is freely altered and adapted to Indian ideas and combined with other narrative motifs. In this connection Benfey (1.95) remarks: "In general details we will decide to give the priority of the Occident to those Aesopic fables that are found in the *Panchatantra*; but some cases will also arise where we must, without hesitation, give India priority." The fable about the lion, the two bulls, and the fox (Themistius) is the basis on which the frame-story at the beginning of the *Panchatantra*, about the lion and bull as friends and the jackal who separates them, has been built. Other Aesopic fables, which have been taken over into the *Panchatantra* and so transformed as to become much less plausible in the matter of motivation, and more involved, are the fable about the ass in the lion's skin (*Aes.* 358 and 188, *Panch.* 3.1) and that about the stag that had no heart (*Aes.* 336 = Babrius 95), which becomes the story of the ass without heart or ears in the *Panchatantra* (4.1).

and the lion persuades one of the two bulls to deliver up his companion on the promise of being spared himself, with the result that both are destroyed. This version was translated from an extant Syriac collection in the late eleventh century by Andreopulus of Melitene; but the Syriac text has the same substance as Syntipas–Andreopulus and was itself translated from an earlier Greek original. Either that original, or the Syriac translation of it, seems to have been based upon the text of Themistius (with two bulls), which was well known in the Near East, but contaminated, as regards its action-motifs, with a fable of the Augustana collection (*Aes.* 191), in which a fox leads his hunting companion, an ass, into a trap and so delivers him to the lion, in return for the lion's promise, which he later breaks, that he will spare the fox.[23]

The fable ascribed to Aesop and told at length (9 lines) by Themistius in *Or.* 23, immediately preceding the saying of Aesop that man was made of clay and tears, relates to a man who bought an Indian slave and tried vainly to wash his skin white. The proverbial black man in this story is an Aethiopian in Aphthonius 6 (= *Aes.* 393), and in the paroemiographers; but an Indian, as with Themistius, in Lucian's epigram 19 (ed. Jacobitz, 3.463),

[23] The fable in Syntipas (No. 13, *Aes.* page 533) reads as follows in translation: "A lion, coming upon two bulls, tried to make a meal of them, but they lined up against him in partnership with their horns and did not allow him to come between them. When the lion saw that he was unable to overcome the two bulls together, he tricked one of them by saying, 'If you will betray your companion to me, I will let you go unharmed.' (The bull agreed) and by this device the lion destroyed both of them." Concerning the kindred Syriac and Arabic versions of these fables, which are mentioned above, see *Aes.* pages 520–23.

Among the fables of Syntipas, so-called, there are fifteen (*Aes.* 401–15) which have no counterparts in the Greek tradition from which the others are descended through the Syriac (mainly the Augustana recension and Babrius), except for the two that are in Themistius (*Aes.* 372 and 393 as described above); and one of those odd fables (Dog and Hunter, Synt. 21 = *Aes.* 403), for which there is no extant Greek source, is found in Phaedrus (1.23), who undoubtedly got some of his fables, probably many, from Demetrius. Thus two widely separated writers who used the collection of Demetrius, Themistius and Phaedrus, give us the only known previous version of a fable told in Syntipas. Why? Because, I strongly suspect, the book of Demetrius, of which at least one copy is known to have been preserved in the Near East (above, page 288), was one of the Greek sources, direct or indirect, which lie back of the Syriac fables translated into Greek under the name of Syntipas by Andreopulus of Melitene near the end of the eleventh century. It seems probable, therefore, that the fable about the hunter and the dog in Syntipas 21 (= *Aes.* 403) comes from Demetrius; and, if this is so, the same may be true also of some other fables among those which are preserved only in Syntipas (*Aes.* 401–15).

in Moses of Chorene's *Armenian History* (2.88), and in the Syriac text corresponding to Syntipas 41. In the Greek of Syntipas, however, we have the curious double reading *Αἰθίοπά τινα 'Ινδόν*, showing a conflation of the Themistian version with the Aphthonian, and this is repeated, probably from Syntipas, in an unpublished Arabic version.[24] If the fable in Themistius was indeed taken from a collection of fables ascribed to Aesop, as the context clearly implies, it could not have been from any collection that is now extant, and so it might well have come from that of Demetrius, which was extant in the fourth century of our era and was probably well known to the rhetoricians of that time. It is clear from the phraseology employed by Themistius and Aphthonius respectively, as well as from their substance in contrast with the two-line version of Syntipas, that the two rhetoricians have drawn their matter from a common source. Aphthonius probably substituted *Αἰθίοπα* for *'Ινδόν*.

Three other fables (*Aes.* 266, 358, 142) are ascribed to Aesop by Themistius, but they are well known from other sources and, as told by Themistius, they have no peculiar features to distinguish them from other versions. All three occur in Babrius, one in both Babrius and Phaedrus (266), and one in Babrius and the Augustana (142). The last mentioned fable, concerning one-way traffic into the lion's cave, is mentioned by Plato (*Alc.* 123A) as a fable of Aesop's; 266, the story of the two wallets borne by every man, the one in front containing the faults of other people, the one behind the bearer's own, is alluded to by Catullus (22.21) and often in later writers; and 358, about the ass in the lion's skin, may be equally old or older, although the earliest reference to it appears to be in Horace (*Serm.* 2.1.64). It is quite possible, and not unlikely, that Themistius found all three of these fables in Demetrius, whence he surely took other fables; but in these cases there is no positive indication that he did.

In the writings of Callimachus, Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and Lucian we find six different fables which are ascribed to Aesop but are nowhere else mentioned or told under his name. It is probable that some, if not all, of these fables were ascribed to Aesop by Demetrius and contained in his collection. I say that this is probable, because the book of Demetrius must have been the best known source and authority for Aesopic fables among the

[24] See *Aes.* pages 522 f., and the annotation on Synt. 41, page 542.

rhetoricians of the first and second centuries after Christ, as well as in the time of Callimachus, and no other collection of *Aesopica* in which these fables could have been found is known to us.[25] There can be no certainty, however, concerning the provenience of these fables in any one case, since fables ascribed to Aesop's telling were presumably reported or mentioned in passing here and there by historians, poets and philosophers who wrote in the fourth century and in the Alexandrian age, and whose writings have not survived to us, just as they are reported in later authors, and in the works of Aristotle before the time of Demetrius. It is possible, therefore, that some of the odd fables which we are about to mention came from collections that we do not know, or from authors whose writings have been lost; but Demetrius is always the most probable source, because he published a collection of Aesopic fables and was widely known and respected as being among the foremost of Alexandrian scholars and collectors of cultural antiquities.

Aes. 431, entitled *Ἀνθρώπων πολυλαλία*, is preserved, but only partially, with something like fifteen lines missing at the beginning and with many small lacunae in what follows, in *POxy.* 1011, vss. 160 ff., belonging to the *Iambi* of Callimachus (Fr. 192, Pfeiffer). The textual reconstruction of this fable as told by Callimachus is hopeless; but at the end Callimachus tells us that Aesop related this fable, and we have two paraphrases of its substance. One of these paraphrases is found among the so-called *Διηγήσεις* preserved on a papyrus from Tebtunis at the University of Milan, which consists of summaries of the narrative substance of the poems of Callimachus,[26] and the other is given in a passage of Philo of Alexandria (*De confusione linguarum* 6–8), to which attention was first called by L. Früchtel in *Gymnasium* 57 (1950) 123–24. These two paraphrases agree in substance with each other; although the story in Philo is told more explicitly than the one in the *Diêgêsis*, where it is condensed to the point of obscurity; and Philo, differing from Callimachus and the *Diêgêsis*,

[25] Unless the fables on *PRyl.* 493 are from a different text than that of Demetrius, which may or may not be the case.

[26] A. Volgiano, *Papiri della R. Università di Milano* 1 (1937) page 133. A. Hausrath, in an article on this fable published in *Gymnasium* 56 (1949), had made use of these *diêgêseis* in the first edition published by Norsa and Vitelli in 1934 under the same title. See the critical and informative review of this publication by P. Maas in *Gnomon* 10 (1934) 436–39.

makes the myth explain, on the analogy of the story of Babel in *Genesis*, why the animals became ἑτερόγλωττα and no longer able to understand each other's speech or that of men, contrary to the original state of things, in which all men and animals spoke the same language. The first three lines of this fable as told by Callimachus are preserved, as Pfeiffer has rightly seen, in a previously unassigned fragment (Schneider Fr. 87) quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 5.14):

> ἦν κεῖνος οὐνιαυτός, ᾧ τό τε πτηνόν
> καὶ τοὺν θαλάσσῃ καὶ τὸ τετράπουν οὕτως
> ἐφθέγγεθ' ὡς ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος.

The substance of what followed these lines in the original poem of Callimachus can be restored fairly well with the aid of the two paraphrases above mentioned. The story in outline was this: originally men and animals spoke the same language and lived together in harmony under the happy conditions that prevailed in the golden age under Cronus. Later, under Zeus, the animals, being sated with the abundance of mortal blessings that they enjoyed, grew dissatisfied with their lot and presumed to demand of the gods the divine privilege of immortality, or everlasting youth. The swan headed an embassy to Zeus asking for release from old age for all the animals, claiming that this was a privilege already enjoyed by the serpent, whose youth is ever renewed; and the fox complained that the rule of Zeus was unjust. As punishment for this insolence, Zeus took away the speech of animals and bestowed it upon men. "So it happens," says Callimachus, "that Eudemus has the voice of a dog, Philto that of an ass,... that of a parrot, the tragedians the kind of utterance that once belonged to fish, and all mankind has come to be, by virtue of that transfer, exceedingly fond of words and full of chatter. ταῦτα δ' Αἴσωπος | ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς εἶπεν, ὅντιν' οἱ Δελφοὶ | ᾄδοντα μῦθον οὐ καλῶς ἐδέξαντο."[27]

[27] Many obscurities in the papyrus text were removed and new readings established by E. Lobel, who examined the papyrus with the aid of ultraviolet light; *Hermes* 69 (1934) 167 ff. See Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* 1.172 (Fr. 192), for the latest critical text.

Aesop is here called Sardianus with reference to the legend that he spent some time at the court of Croesus, which is probably a literary invention of the fourth century, analogous to the earlier story about the meeting of Solon and Croesus. A parallel *chronological* calculation (*Aes.* page 217), which is probably Alexandrian, puts the death of Aesop in 564 B.C., before Croesus came to the throne. If μῦθον refers to ταῦτα,

Such was the aetiological fable that Callimachus attributes to Aesop. Where did he get it? It is nowhere else recorded as Aesop's, and it was the kind of fable that Demetrius, an older contemporary of the poet, was likely to have included in his collection. It was an old convention in the telling of animal fables to represent the action as taking place in the golden age of Cronus, *ὅτε φωνήεντα ἦν τὰ ζῷα*, or *ὁμόφωνα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*.

The fable about honey in the eyes, which is told and ascribed to Aesop by Dio Chrysostom in *Or.* 33.16 (= *Aes.* 461) is nowhere else recorded. Presumably, therefore, it was taken from an early collection of Aesopic fables which is no longer extant. Dio tells his audience that the same kind of thing has happened to them that happened to the eyes in Aesop's fable. When the eyes saw the mouth enjoying the sweetness of honey, they were indignant and blamed the man for not honoring themselves likewise with a portion of this good thing; but, when the man did put some honey in them, the eyes felt the sting (*ἐδάκνοντο*), shed tears, and were convinced that this substance was something bitter and unpleasant. "And so," adds Dio in pointing the fable, "do not you seek to taste of philosophical discourses (*τῶν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας λόγων*), as the eyes did of honey; for, if you do, methinks you will be stung by it and disgusted, and perhaps you will say that philosophy is no sweet thing but only abuse and injury." Our supposition, that this fable was based on one that stood in the collection of Demetrius, takes on probability from the fact that a very similar comparison, conveying precisely the same idea and phrased to a notable extent in the same words, is ascribed to Demetrius of Phalerum explicitly in the *Loci communes* of Maximus Confessor (Migne, *PG* 91.817): *ὥσπερ τὸ μέλι τὰ ἡλκωμένα δάκνει, τοῖς δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἡδύ ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἐκ φιλοσοφίας λόγοι.*[28] The substitution, prosaicly, of wounded

which is very doubtful, then Callimachus must be saying that this fable about man's loquacity was one that Aesop told to the Delphians; but since it is not elsewhere so recorded, nor among the eight fables that Aesop tells to the Delphians in the *Life*, it is more probable that the words *ὅντιν' . . . ἐδέξαν]το* refer to some other fable or fables told by Aesop on that occasion, very likely the fable about the eagle and the beetle which Aristophanes mentions in the *Wasps* 1446 ff.

[28] This saying is quoted verbatim by Stobaeus (3.13.41) from the florilegium of a certain Aristonymus, entitled *Tomaria*; cf. Christ–Schmid, *Gr. Lit.*[6] 2.1089. It is paraphrased also by Plutarch in *Quom. adulator ab amico internoscatur* 14 (59D): . . . *ὥσπερ τὸ μέλι τὰ ἡλκωμένα δάκνουσα καὶ καθαίρουσα, τἄλλα δ' ὠφέλιμος οὖσα* (sc. *ἡ ἀληθὴς παρρησία*) *καὶ γλυκεῖα, περὶ ἧς ἴδιος ἔσται λόγος*.

and healthy parts of the body, in place of personified eyes and mouth respectively, is quite in line with that evolution away from the mythical and poetical manner of speaking which we have seen to be common in the transmission of Aesopic fables from the early Alexandrian period onward. But in seeking to avoid the poetically personified Mouth and Eyes, which he probably found in the fable as told by Demetrius, the anthologist who reduced the fable to a χρεία has substituted physiological terms which are unrealistic and unfit to illustrate the idea which his simile is meant to convey; for it is only in the mouth that honey is sweet, not in healthy parts of the body generally, and it is just in the eyes, rather than in wounded parts of the body, that honey can be said to sting.

Likewise Alexandrian and relatively old, thereby suggesting its identity with the *Aesop* of Demetrius, is the source from which another of Dio's fables ascribed to Aesop is derived, namely the fable about the owl as variously told in *Orations* 12 and 72. The narrative substance of this fable, has two fundamentally distinct forms in the various texts in which it is preserved in whole or in part. What was probably the earliest form of this fable (I) is predicated of the owl and appears only in *PRyl.* and in Dio Chrysostom; but a secondary form, built on the analogy of the first, relates to the swallow, and this form (II), which appears already in Phaedrus, became dominant in the fable-books and quickly superseded the fable about the owl. The following diagram shows the two main branches of the tradition and their principal subdivisions:

I ABOUT THE OWL

Birds warned by owl against the mistletoe-bearing oaks

1. *PRyl.* (early first century)[29]
2. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 12.7 f. (= *Aes.* 437)
3. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 72.14 ff. (= *Aes.* 437a)

[29] This text is edited by C. H. Roberts in vol. 3 of *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1938) No. 493. It contains fragments of fourteen prose fables, of which only four are well enough preserved to be recognizable. The text of these is given on pages 187–89 of Hausrath–Hunger, *Corpus fab. Aes.* 1.2 (Leipzig [Teubner] 1959). They are: Boar, Horse and Hunter (*Aes.* 269), Shepherd and Sheep (*Aes.* 208), Heracles and Plutus (*Aes.* 111), The Owl and the Birds (*Aes.* 437, 437a). I have commented on the historical significance of this text, its conventions and style, and its presumable relation to Phaedrus and to Demetrius, in my article *Epimythium* (above, note 1) 400 ff.

II ABOUT THE SWALLOW

1. Birds warned by swallow against the mistletoe-bearing oaks
   - Augustana text (= *Aes.* 39)
   - Babrian paraphrase (Crusius, No. 164; Chambry, No. 350, page 552)

2. Birds warned by swallow against the flax
   - a
     - Phaedrus in paraphrase[30]
     - *PMich.* 457 (early third century)[31]
   - b Recension Ia of the Augustana fables, as represented by Cod. Pf in Chambry, page 551. A corrupted version derived from 2a and freely altered

[30] Metrically restored from the prose paraphrase in Romulus 1.20 by C. Zander, *Phaedrus solutus, vel Phaedri fabulae novae* XXX (Lund 1921) No. 28.

[31] The Greek text on the verso of *PMich.* 457 was identified and supplemented by C. H. Roberts in 1952; and a copy of his restoration was kindly passed on to me by Professor Herbert Youtie of Michigan, who had collaborated with Mr. Roberts on the reading and interpretation of the text. Five years later Mr. Roberts published the results of his study together with the text, which is very defective and full of gaps, in *JRS* 47(1957) 124–25 under the title "A Fable Recovered." I have used this published version of the text as the basis of my comparison of the fable on the papyrus with other ancient versions. It is apparent that in this papyrus, as in *PAmh.* of Babrius, which Roberts cites in this connection, a Latin text of the fable preceded the Greek text of the same fable. Of the former only parts of three Latin lines are preserved immediately preceding the beginning of the Greek text; and since these lines convey a general sentiment, as Roberts says, they must be the epimythium of the fable, to the effect that failure to follow good advice brings damage.

The sense of the Greek fable on the papyrus in outline is this: When the *flax* was first sown, the swallow called the birds together and [advised them] to destroy it (ἀφα[νὲς ποιῆσαι?]); but [they failed to heed] this excellent advice (ἀρίσ]την συμβουλ[ήν]), and accordingly the swallow betook herself to (μετήν]εγκεν ἑαυτὴν ισ]) [men's houses] and under the same [roof] built her [nest]. When [the other birds] were being caught... With this narrative, though full of gaps, compare the fable of Phaedrus as paraphrased in Romulus 1.20 (Zander, No. 28):

> Qui non audit bonum consilium in se inveniet malum, ut haec opprobat fabula.
>
> Spargi et arari lini semen aves omnes cum viderent, pro nihilo hoc habuerunt. Hirundo autem hoc intellexit et convocatis avibus retulit omnibus esse malum [rettulit Hinc nasciturum cunctis magnum avibus malum—Zander]. Omnes dissimulantes riserunt. Deinde, ut fructicavit, iterum hirundo ait illis: "Malum est hoc, venite, *eruamus illud.* Nam cum creverit retia facient ex inde humanis artibus quibus capi possimus. Omnes verba hirundinis deriserunt

All three forms of I consist of an aetiological myth intended to explain why the other birds look upon the owl with admiration as a wise bird endowed with prophetic insight, and why they fly about him as if seeking his advice, which, however, he is no longer willing to give them. The form that best represents the original fable, as regards the action in outline, is clearly that of *PRyl.*, although this text as we have it is full of gaps and fails to mention any positive advice given by the owl. Here the owl merely warns the birds that the mistletoe-bearing oak will be a calamity for them, if and when it matures; and the birds, after learning by experience that the owl, whose warning they had ignored, was right, sought his advice in vain. Dio's two versions of this fable are both freely altered in the telling, and the changes are undoubtedly due to the sophist himself following his own fancy and combining with the original fable (I) motifs that were already current in the fable about the swallow (II). Thus, in *Or.* 12 (*Aes.* 437) Dio adds to the single original proof of the owl's prophetic wisdom, namely his warning about the oak, two other

eiusque respuentes consilium contempserunt. Ut hoc vidit hirundo, *ad homines se transtulit*, ut tuta esset *sub tectis eorum*. At quae respuerunt monita nolentes audire consilium semper *in retibus cadunt* (cf. ἐπιάζοντο).

The Greek fable on the papyrus agrees very closely in substance, order of detail, and even phraseology, with the Phaedrian paraphrase, in marked contrast with the Augustana version on the one hand, where the swallow warns against the mistletoe and the oak, and with the late Ia recension of the fourth or fifth century (cf. *Aes.* pages 306, 308) on the other, where the swallow advises the birds to seek refuge with men, and the other birds, in trying to eat up the flax become fat and are caught. It therefore seems probable to me that what we have in the papyrus text is a Greek translation freely made either from the metrical Latin text of Phaedrus himself or, more probably, from a Latin paraphrase of that fable. The italicized phrases in the Latin text quoted above are those which seem to have a close equivalent in the Greek. What was the promythium in Phaedrus, as in Romulus, has become the epimythium (normal after Phaedrus) in the Latin text of the papyrus; but it is the same moral framed in similar terms. The following points of resemblance between the papyrus version and that of recension Ia tend to show that the latter, though freely and arbitrarily altered and expanded, was based on the text of the former instead of on the Augustana or Babrius: (1) birds are warned about the *flax*, not about the mistletoe; (2) there is no mention in Ia or the papyrus, as in the Augustana, of the swallow being welcomed by men on account of her *intelligence*, nor is she called φρονιμωτάτη as in the Babrian paraphrase; (3) as in the papyrus so in Ia, mention is made of the swallow going to live on the houses of men before the end of the fable, but in the Augustana this is not so stated until the end, where the result of the aetiological fable is mentioned; (4) the words ἀφανὲς ποιῶμεν in Ia, as Roberts noted, look like αφα[νὲς ποιῆσαι?] in line 6 of the papyrus and are not found in the Augustana or the Babrian paraphrase; and (5) ἀρίστην γνώμην ἔχουσα in Ia, which has no equivalent in the Augustana or Babrius, is close to ἀρίσ]την συμβουλ[ήν in line 8 of the papyrus.

illustrations of the owl's foresight, one of which, drawn from II 2 as told by Phaedrus and in the Michigan papyrus, is a warning about the flax, and the other, based on a fable told by Aeschylus and by Babrius (*Aes.* 276), is a prophecy that hunters will overtake the birds with arrows winged with their own feathers. In *Or.* 72 (*Aes.* 437a) Dio again introduces an extraneous motif, namely that which relates to the nesting of the protagonist bird in the buildings of men, instead of in trees, which motif, as Adrados observes (page 367), belongs properly with the story of the swallow (II) and is a secondary development.

The fable about the swallow was invented for the purpose of explaining why that bird, unlike the others, makes its nest in the dwellings of men and lives as it were under their protection. The reason assigned for this, the *aition*, was taken from the owl-story: the swallow sought the protection of men and went to live with them because the birds had failed to follow his advice, to destroy the mistletoe-bearing oaks before they matured, and he knew that living wild in the trees after man's invention of bird-lime from the mistletoe would no longer be safe. Such was the earliest form of the fable about the swallow, as it appears in the Augustana and in the Babrian paraphrase (II 1). In the former of these two texts the swallow is said to be welcomed by men because of his shrewd intelligence (*ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει*), and in the latter he is called *φρονιμωτάτη*. Since this attribute did not belong to the swallow in ancient tradition, but properly to the owl, owing to the latter's association with Athena and his reputation for prophecy, it is clear, as Adrados has also pointed out (page 366), that the fable of the swallow was modeled on that of the owl.

It lies in the nature of things that many of the Aesopic fables published by Demetrius must have passed either directly or indirectly, and with more or less modification *en route*, into the extant collections of fables which were made in Roman times, namely the Augustana, Phaedrus, Babrius, Aphthonius, Avianus, and recension Ia of the Augustana, which contains 13 fables that are not in any of the others.[32] But since the sources from which

[32] These are Nos. 232–44 in *Aesopica*. Among them are three (Nos. 232, 239, and 240) which look older than the others by virtue of their ironical or mythological character, and on that account they are likely to have come from Demetrius. The first is a fable about the foxes assembled on the bank of the Maeander river, from which they wanted to drink but were afraid to do so, because the water was high and the

the authors of these collections drew their materials are obviously multiple in each case, it is always possible and sometimes quite probable that a given fable, even though it is old-looking or can be traced back to the fourth or fifth century B.C., is nevertheless derived from a written source other than the book of Demetrius. For this reason there is little to be gained by speculating on the Demetrian origin of particular fables that stand in one or more of these collections, unless we have other testimony or circumstantial evidence of some kind bearing on their history; hence in spite of temptations I refrain from doing so. On the other hand, a positive presumption in favor of Demetrian origin is created, as it seems to me, when a fable that is nowhere else attested is ascribed to Aesop by a learned writer such as Plutarch, Dio, or Lucian; and the more so when the fable in question is poetical and mythological in character, featuring deities or personified abstractions among its protagonists. In the telling of fables these learned writers seem never to be influenced by the phraseology of the extant collections, and the sources that they used are more likely to have been the works of scholars already famous in Alexandrian times, in this case Demetrius on Aesop, than the obscure compilers or second-rate poets of their own age who produced the fable-books that we know.

The following fables, ascribed to Aesop by Lucian and Plutarch respectively, may be *suspected* of having stood in the collection of Demetrius, merely because they are nowhere else cited as Aesop's: *Aes.* 429, 434, 446, 449.

current fast. While they hesitated, one fox, presuming to show the others how it should be done, entered the water and was carried off by the rushing stream. Said the other foxes, "Don't leave us behind, come back and show us how we may drink in safety." "I have to answer a summons at Miletus," said the fox in the river, "I'll show you when I get back." The second fable to which I refer is No. 239, in which a man who intends to perjure himself meets a lame person going out from the city's gates and asks him who he is. "I'm Horkos (Oath)," said the lame man. "I'm after the perjurers." "How often do you visit the cities?" asked the perjurer. "About once every forty years," was the answer, "sometimes after thirty years." On hearing this the man hesitated no longer, and on the next day gave his oath that he had not received a deposit which he had received. But immediately thereafter he fell in with Horkos again, who caused him to be condemned to death, and when the perjurer complained to Horkos that he had deceived him, Horkos replied, "Be assured, that when anyone irritates me excessively I go after him on that very day." The third fable (*Aes.* 240) relates that Prometheus at the command of Zeus fashioned both men and animals; but when Zeus saw that the animals were far more numerous, he commanded Prometheus to change some of the animals into men. That's why some men have the outward appearance of human beings but the souls of wild beasts.

The first of these is told by Lucian in the *Hermotimus*, ch. 84: "Aesop related . . . that a certain man was sitting on the seashore counting the waves that broke upon the beach. He had made a miscount and was bothered and fretting about it, when at length a fox (or Profit?) appeared and said to him, 'Why be worried, sir, about the waves that have passed by? You ought to disregard those and begin counting from here.'" The proverbial folly of counting the waves is mentioned by Theocritus (16.60) and is probably much older; but the point of the fable is not the folly of counting, but of mourning over losses of the past. I strongly suspect that *τὴν κερδώ* in this passage is a personification of profit or gain, like Peitho in Themistius; although the word is not quoted in that sense in our dictionaries nor so understood by Lucian's editors. Babrius uses *κερδώ* fifteen times meaning "fox"; but never, as it happens, with the definite article.

Aes. 434, from Plutarch's *Praec. ger. reip.* 806E, alludes to "Aesop's wren (*βασιλίσκος*) which rode on the eagle's shoulders, flew off suddenly (at the end of the course) and won the race." This is a type of folktale well known all over the world, but there is nothing quite like it elsewhere in ancient Greek or Latin literature. See Thompson's *Motif Index*[2] under K 11.2. In addition to the many parallels there cited, we may add fable No. 39 in Berechyah Ha Nakdan's *Mishle Shualim* (s. XII) where the starling rides on the eagle's back; the medieval Latin fable (*Aes.* 693) relating to a contest between eagle and rat in the matter of sharpsightedness, and a story of how the crab won his race with the fox by clinging to the latter's tail in No. 29 of the Armenian fables ascribed to Vardan.[33]

According to Plutarch (*Aratus* 30 = *Aes.* 446), "Aesop said that when the cuckoo asked the small birds why they fled from him, they replied that it was because he would some day be a hawk." This is not elsewhere, so far as I know, recorded as a fable.[34] Likewise Aesop's fable about the dog who in the winter time thought of building a house for himself, but decided when

[33] N. Marr, *Sborniki Pritch Vardana* (St. Petersburg 1899) 2.36 f.

[34] Cf. Aristotle's statement in *HA* 6.7 (Bohn translation by R. Cresswell, page 146): "The cuckoo is said by some persons to be a changed hawk, because the hawk which it resembles disappears when the cuckoo comes, and indeed very few hawks of any sort can be seen during the period in which the cuckoo is singing except for a few days."

summer came that it was unnecessary and too much work (*Aes.* 449), is mentioned only by Plutarch in *Sept. sap. conv.* 157B.

As Crusius once pointed out, Plutarch and Phaedrus seem to depend on the same unknown source for a number of stories that the two writers have in common which are not elsewhere recorded before their time.[35] These are: *Aes.* 426 (from Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 614E), 479, 495, 499. Only the first of these, the well-known fable about the fox and the crane dining together (fox and stork in Phaedrus 1.26), is called Aesopic or assigned to Aesop by Plutarch. In this case the common source of the two writers is very likely to have been the collection of Aesopic fables published by Demetrius; but in the other three cases the common source was probably something other than a collection of Aesopic fables.[36]

In Phaedrus the fable of the fox and stork is introduced by a promythium and ends with a sententious utterance by the stork, which points the moral of the fable:

> peregrinam sic locutam volucrem accepimus:
> "Sua quisque exempla debet aequo animo pati."

This is precisely the technique conventionally employed in *PRyl.*, wherever the beginning or the end of a fable is preserved; and the stereotyped phrase by which the moral, spoken by one of

[35] O. Crusius, "Ein Lehrgedicht des Plutarch," *RhM* 39 (1884) 581–606. *Ibid.*, page 605: "Vermutlich hat beiden Autoren (i.e. Plutarch and Phaedrus) dieselbe Sammlung von Fabeln und Anekdoten vorgelegen; einen bestimmten Namen, wie den des Demetrios von Phaleron, dafür in Anspruch zu nehmen wäre voreilig, so lange auf diesen ganz vernachlässigten Gebiete nicht gründlich aufgeräumt ist."

[36] The substance of *Aes.* 479 (= Phaedrus 1.18) is told by Plutarch (*Coniug. praec.* 143E), without ascription to any author, concerning a woman in childbirth pain who objects to lying on the bed for relief, at her husband's suggestion, because that's where all her trouble began. The action that Phaedrus ascribes to Aesop in 3.3 (= *Aes.* 495), how he advised a man, on whose estate a prodigy half-human and half-sheep had been born, to give wives to his shepherds, is assigned to Thales in conversation with Periander in Plutarch's *Sept. sap. conv.* 149C–E (where the prodigy is half horse); although Aesop himself is represented as present at this banquet and as relating three fables of his own, two of which (*Aes.* 12 in the Augustana, and 315 in Babrius) are elsewhere ascribed to him. In Phaedrus 3.8 (= *Aes.* 499) a father encourages his homely daughter and his handsome son both to look into the mirror daily, that the one may not be tempted to spoil his beauty by evil doing, and that the other may be led to overcome the handicap of her physical appearance by beauty of character. In Plutarch (*Coniug. praec.* 141D), as in Diogenes Laertius (2.5.33), this exhortation is attributed to Socrates, but according to Stobaeus (3.1.172) it was one of the sayings of Bias as recorded by Demetrius of Phalerum in his *Apophthegms of the Seven Wise Men.*

the characters, is introduced in the papyrus—*τὴν γνώμην φαίνεται εἰρηκέναι λέγων*—is often closely paralleled by phrases in Phaedrus which have the same function. Note the following examples, some of which resemble the phraseology of the papyrus even more closely than the line quoted above: Phaedrus 1.10, *dixisse fertur simius sententiam*; 1.12, *tum moriens edidisse vocem hanc dicitur*; 1.27, *fertur locutus*; 3.13, *tunc illa talem rettulit sententiam*; App. 31 (29), *at vespa dignam moribus* (read *memoria*) *vocem edidit*; Romulus 4.6 (Phaedrus paraphrased), *sic dixisse lanioni dicitur*. The moral so delivered by the last speaker in the fable is not always framed in general terms in Phaedrus, as it was presumably in the papyrus; but it always conveys a general principle clearly enough by implication even when the terms used are personal. Again, as in the papyrus, so in 25 of the 31 fables of his first book, wherein Phaedrus seems to follow his "Aesop" more closely than he does later on, the fable is introduced by a promythium and has no epimythium, properly so called, at the end. In view of these conventional similarities, which I have described and explained more fully elsewhere,[37] it follows that one of the principal Greek sources used by Phaedrus was a collection of fables that had the same stereotyped formulas for the beginning and end of a fable that we find in *PRyl.* In all probability it was the same text; and that text must have been closer in substance at least to the classic book of Demetrius than any other that we know. Indeed it is quite possible that the text of the papyrus is that of Demetrius himself. I think that it is; but however this may be, whether the fable of the fox and the stork came to Phaedrus directly or indirectly from Demetrius, it is more likely that Plutarch took the same fable from Demetrius, with whose books he elsewhere shows some familiarity, than from a collection made by an unknown compiler.

The fable about the goat and the vine (*Aes.* 374, from the Babrian paraphrase) is told in an epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 9.99) in the early third century B.C.; and the same fable, with a different and better motivated ending, has come down from antiquity in the Syriac, Armenian and Arabic versions of the *Book of Achiqar*, the archetype of which in all probability was a Greek translation of the Assyrian original made by Democritus, or at his instigation, in the fifth century. Since the Greek fable

[37] *Epimythium* (above, note 1) 400–2.

seems to be a derivative of the one in *Achiqar*, and since Theophrastus, the teacher of Demetrius, is said to have written a book entitled *Achiqar*, as well as a book about Democritus (Diog. Laert. 5.2.49–50), it is very plausibly conjectured by W. R. Halliday that this fable about the goat and the vine was contained in the collection published by Demetrius, and that it was from that source that it passed, on the one hand into the Aesopic tradition represented by Babrius, and, on the other, into the epigram written by Leonidas, who was a younger contemporary of Demetrius.[38] In the Greek fable the vine says in effect to the goat browsing on its foliage, "Eat as much as you like; so long as my root remains, I'll supply the wine used at your sacrifice." This alludes to the Greek ritual practice of sacrificing a goat to Dionysus, with the aetiological implication that goats are so sacrificed because they damage the vines. This looks very much like a specialized Greek version of the older, more generalized and more realistic oriental fable, in which a plant (sumac tree or madder) retorts to the animal that is feeding on it (goat or gazelle), "When you are dead my root will be used to tan or dye your hide."

In an article entitled "Quelques fables de Demétrios de Phalère," in *L'Antiquité classique* 19 (1950) 5–11, L. Herrmann discusses eight fables which he believes to have been invented or told by Demetrius in his book of Aesop. Nearly all of these appear in Lucian, as well as in the collections. The criteria for Demetrian authorship, upon which Herrmann's arguments depend, are usually either the localization of the story in Ptolmaic Egypt where Demetrius lived many years, whether this is explicitly so represented in the fable or not, and the fancied resemblance of the idea underlying the fable, or discoverable in it, to the personal fortunes and feelings of Demetrius as these are known to us from the explicit testimony of ancient writers, or deduced by Herrmann therefrom. I see no cogency, and seldom any plausibility, in this line of reasoning, which is, in my view, highly arbitrary, far-fetched and fantastic. In some cases, indeed, the main reasons given by Herrmann for assigning a fable to Demetrius are those that would dissuade me most. In two of the eight cases I agree with Herrmann's conclusion that the fable in question

[38] W. R. Halliday, *Indo-European Folktales and Greek Legend* (Cambridge 1933) 143–52.

probably came from Demetrius; but my reasons for thinking so are different from his. One of the two fables to which I refer is Lucian's story of the man on the seashore counting waves (*Aes.* 429), which was discussed above (page 320); the other is the fable telling how Momus found fault with the several creations of Zeus, Prometheus, and Athena (*Aes.* 100), which is fully related in the Augustana and in Babrius (No. 59), is familiarly cited and told in part by Lucian in *Hermotimus* 20, *Nigrinus* 32, and *Ver. hist.* 2.3, and is attributed to Aesop by Aristotle in *De part an.* 3.2 and by Plutarch in *Quaest. conv.* 645B-C. Since this fable was known as Aesop's in the mid-fourth century B.C., if not before, since its mythological nature is such as typifies those fables which have the best claim to Demetrian authorship, and since it is attributed to Aesop by Plutarch, I think it probable that it was among the fables that Demetrius bequeathed to the later collections, Babrius and the Augustana.[39]

Probability in varying degrees, never certainty, is the most that can be achieved in any attempt to specify what particular fables, among the many that we know, were included in the book of Demetrius. As evidence pointing to Demetrian origin we have considered the literary history and environment of certain fables, their nature, and, here and there, some hitherto unrecognized testimony about them or their substance. In the light of this kind of data, and of the historical inferences which it allows or invites, we conclude that the following fables, discussed above, are those which have the best claim to have been included in the collection made by Demetrius:

The Sow and the Bitch.	*Aes.* 223	(above, pp. 288–91)
Dionysus and the Wine.		(,, 294–99)
Shepherd who cried "Wolf" in Jest.	*Aes.* 210	(,, 292–93)
Honey in the Eyes.	*Aes.* 461	(,, 314–15)

[39] Since Aristotle mentions only the criticism of the bull made by "Aesop's Momus," we cannot say what the terms of the fable as a whole were in the form in which he knew it. The creators of man, bull, and house who are criticized by Momus are respectively Prometheus, Zeus (bull) and Athena in the Augustana (= *Aes.* 100); Zeus, Poseidon, and Athena in Babrius; and Hephaestus, Poseidon, and Athena in Lucian's *Hermotimus*. The idea that there should be a window or a door in a man's breast, so that one might look in and see what his thoughts were, as in this fable, is the subject of an old skolion (Bergk, *PLG* 3.645, No. 7).

Apollo, Muses and Dryads.	*Aes.* 432	(„	302–4)
True and False Dreams.	*Aes.* 385	(„	299–300)
Goat and Vine.	*Aes.* 374	(„	322–23)
Man's Loquacity.	*Aes.* 431	(„	312–14)
Man made of Clay and Tears.	*Aes.* 430	(„	304–7)
Boreas and Helios.	*Aes.* 46	(„	307–9)
Hunter and Dog.	*Aes.* 403 (Synt. 21)	(„	note 23)
Lion and Two Bulls.	*Aes.* 372	(„	309–10)
Owl and Birds.	*Aes.* 437	(„	315–18)
Fox and Crane.	*Aes.* 426	(„	321–22)
Man Counting Waves.	*Aes.* 429	(„	p. 320)
Momus.	*Aes.* 100	(„	p. 324)

In his article on Babrius in *RE* 2 (1896) 2661–62, Crusius listed a score of well-known fables which seem to come from an early book of Aesop in prose, because they are common to Babrius and Phaedrus, both of whom profess to have derived much of their substance from such a book, and because some of them also are attested in one way or another by writers before Phaedrus. With two exceptions (*Aes.* 142 and 266), this list does not include any of the fables which have been discussed above. I give it here, nevertheless, because the "Aesop" which was the common source of Phaedrus and Babrius is very likely to have been the well-known collection made by Demetrius, and to have contained most of the fables in question. In Phaedrus thirteen of these fables, those marked with a star below, are introduced by a promythium and have no epimythium, which is the convention followed in *PRyl* (below, p. 340), and a convention which must, I think, have been established in the first handbook of Aesopic fables to be published in the Alexandrian age, namely the *Αἰσώπεια* of Demetrius. The book of Demetrius, as I remarked above, may very well be, for aught we know or Adrados can make out to the contrary, the same collection and the same text as that represented in the papyrus; and, in any case, the collection of Demetrius must have been a principal source for Phaedrus.

It was probably the book which he calls "Aesop," which he professes to follow at the beginning and to depart from later on, and which contained, as he says, relatively few fables as compared with his own.[40] Wherever Phaedrus seems to be following his primary Greek source, the probability is that the fable he tells comes from Demetrius. Here follow the fables listed by Crusius.[41]

Wolf and Lamb at the Stream: Phaedrus 1.1, Babrius 89, *Aes.* 155 (from the ancient Augustana collection = Aug. below). Not previously attested.

Dog with meat in his mouth chases his Shadow in the water: Ph. 1.4*, Babrius 79, *Aes.* 133 (Aug.). The rhetorician Theon's version of this fable (*Progym.* 3, *Aes.* page 240) agrees in noteworthy detail with Babrius against Phaedrus: the dog was running

[40] In the prologue to Book 1, Phaedrus says that "Aesop" is his source (*auctor*) and that he has polished and put into senarian verse the matter that Aesop invented. This seems to imply that the fables which he versifies were written in prose and represented a definite amount. His statement in the prologue to Book 3 (38–39) is more explicit:

ego illius pro semita feci viam
et cogitavi plura quam reliquerat.

What Aesop "left" must refer to a book of Aesopic fables, and this, he tells us, contained relatively few fables as compared with his own book. He has made a highway out of what was a little foot-path, having invented, or adapted from other sources, more fables than he found in "Aesop." Again in the prologue to Book 4 he speaks of the paucity of fables in "Aesop" and the abundance of his own additions:

... quoniam caperis fabulis,
quas Aesopias, non Aesopi, nomino,
quia paucas ille ostendit, ego pluris sero,
usus vetusto genere sed rebus novis.

Finally, in the prologue to Book 5, he declares that he has long ago (most fully in Book 1) made acknowledgement to Aesop for whatever he owes him, and that henceforth, whenever he ascribes anything to Aesop, we are to understand that he uses this name only as a kind of trade-mark by which to recommend his fables, just as certain artisans nowadays write "Praxiteles" on their own statues or "Zeuxis" on a painting, in order to get a better price for it. Thus Phaedrus throughout his work professes an ever increasing independence of "Aesop," the principal source book with which he began; and this progression, from relatively close adherence to a Greek original typified by *PRyl.* in Book 1 to greater independence and freer adaptation in the subsequent books, is manifested likewise in the forms and substance of his fables, as compared with typical Greek fables, and in the evolving character of the promythia and epimythia, and their proportion to each other, throughout the five books. On this, see the detailed comparisons and tabulations made in my *Epimythium* (above, note 1) 413–18.

[41] I omit from this list, which comprises 22 fables, No. 102 in Babrius (*Aes.* 334), which is mistakenly equated with Phaedrus 4.14 (= *Aes.* 514), a totally different fable.

alongside the river instead of crossing it. No writer before Phaedrus cites this fable.

Lion's Share: Ph. 1.5* and Babrius 67 = *Aes.* 339. Here the Babrian version, in which the lion has only one hunting companion, a wild ass, is certainly older and much closer to the original form of the fable than the stupid alteration of it given us by Phaedrus. As Phaedrus tells it, the lion goes hunting with three would-be-carniverous partners, a cow, a she-goat, and a sheep (!); and the shares marked out by the lion are four in number instead of three, in order to show us that the Roman author can think of *three* logical pretexts by which the lion can claim a share, instead of two. How original! But it's like Phaedrus, and like other Roman writers too, when they seek to improve upon the Greek originals with which they work. The fable is not attested before Phaedrus.

Frogs alarmed by the Sun's Wedding: Ph. 1.6* and Babrius 24 = *Aes.* 314. Not previously attested.

Dr. Crane removes a Bone from Sir Wolf's Throat: Ph. 1.8*, Babrius 94 (heron and wolf), *Aes.* 156 (Aug., heron and wolf). Not attested before Phaedrus.

The Stag at the Spring, admiring his Horns: Ph. 1.12*, Babrius 43, *Aes.* 74 (Aug.). Not attested before Phaedrus.

The Fox and the Crow with a piece of Cheese (or Meat) in his Mouth: Ph. 1.13,* Babrius 77, *Aes.* 124 (Aug.), Apuleius in the prologue to *De deo Socratis.* According to Crusius, the action of this fable is painted on a Corinthian jar in the Berlin Museum; but there is no reference to it in Plutarch's *De Herod. malig.* 871D, which he cites as testimony for it, nor in any writer before Phaedrus.

Weasel's Services not appreciated by the Householder: Ph. 1.22 and Babrius 27 = *Aes.* 293. Not mentioned before Phaedrus.

Frog puffs herself up trying to look as big as a Cow: Ph. 1.24,* and Babrius 28 = *Aes.* 376. Told by Horace in *Serm.* 2.3.314–20.

Middle-aged Man with Two Mistresses, one Young the other Old. Ph. 2.2,* Babrius 22, *Aes.* 31 (Aug.). In Diodorus Siculus 33.7 this fable, *αἶνός τις*, without reference to Aesop, is said to have been told by the Lusitanian Viriathus in the second century B.C.

The hungry Wolf and the well-fed Dog whose neck was frayed by a Collar: Ph. 3.7,* and Babrius 100 = *Aes.* 346. Not attested before Phaedrus.

Weasel suspended on a Peg to catch the Mice: Ph. 4.2,* Babrius 17, *Aes.* 79 (Aug.). Not previously attested.

Sour Grapes: Ph. 4.3,* Babrius 19, *Aes.* 15 (Aug.). This fable, although not mentioned in extant writing before Phaedrus, is clearly pictured on a red-figured Athenian vase of the fifth century B.C. in private possession, which is reproduced on the frontispiece of L. W. Daly's excellent *Aesop Without Morals* (New York and London 1961).

Battle of the Mice and Cats, in which the generals of the mice wear horns on their heads and are thereby caught: Ph. 4.6, Babrius 31, *Aes.* 165 (Aug.). In the *Wasps* of Aristophanes (1185), which Crusius cites, mention is made of a fable about cats and mice, but there is nothing to indicate what story was meant.

Two Wallets worn by Men, one in Front the other Behind, containing respectively the faults of others and the bearer's own: Ph. 4.10, Babrius 66, *Aes.* 266 (indirectly from Babrius). Previously attested by Catullus (22.21) and by Horace (*Serm.* 2.3.299). In Babrius it is Prometheus who fastens the wallets on man at his creation, and that is probably the older form of the fable; in Phaedrus Jupiter replaces Prometheus. The fact that this fable is told by Themistius, who took other fables from Demetrius (above, 304 ff.), adds to the probability that it came from that source.

The Old Race Horse: Ph. App. 21* (in Bassi's edition following the manuscript N, App. 19 in Postgate), Babrius 29, *Aes.* 318 and 549, from Babrius and Phaedrus respectively.

Goatherd breaks a Goat's Horn accidentally by throwing a stone, then begs the goat not to tell on him: Ph. App. 24 (22),* and Babrius 3 = *Aes.* 280. Not attested before Phaedrus.

Fleeing Fox double-crossed by Woodman: Ph. App. 28 (26)* in which a cowherd replaces the woodman, Babrius 50, *Aes.* 22 (Aug.). A very similar story is told of Hermes and a rustic by Ovid, *Met.* 2.690–706.

No Tracks seen leading Out from the Lion's Cave: Ph P (i.e. Phaedrus in prose paraphrase) in *Cod. Ademari* (Ad.) No. 59, Babrius 103, *Aes.* 142 (Aug.). This is cited as Aesop's fable by Plato in *Alc.* 1.123A, and is told by Themistius along with other fables that seem to have come to him from Demetrius; see above, page 311.

Mouse frees Lion from Trap: Ph P (Ad. 18), Babrius 107, *Aes.* 150 (Aug.).

No use in Praying to the Gods on behalf of a Sick Crow: Ph P (Rom. 1.18), and Babrius 77 = *Aes.* 324.

Two fables preserved in the old *Life of Aesop* were traced to Demetrius in the early part of this essay on the basis of positive evidence, namely the fable about Dionysus and the Wine (not in *Aes.*) and that about True and False Dreams (*Aes.* 385). If these fables came from the collection of Demetrius, which is the only collection of Greek fables that we know to have been older than the *Life*, or to have any fables in common with it, excepting one fable of Babrius in paraphrase (Crusius 191), then it is reasonable to infer that some of the other fables told by Aesop in this *Life* were derived from the same early source. Only three of these fables call for comment here, in order to point out their relative antiquity and their connection with other texts.

Mouse and Frog in the River: *Aes.* 384 (= *Vita* ch. 133), Ph P (Ad. 4 etc.), Babrian paraphrase (Crusius 191, Chambry 246), and many later versions. All but the end of this fable, in which a kite carries off both the drowned mouse and the frog to which he is tied, forms an episode in the *Batrachomyomachia* (9–100). It is hard to say whether the fable antedated the epic parody or has been made from it; but in either case the substance of it must have been known in the early Alexandrian age, and someone of that time, possibly Demetrius, may have written it according to his own fancy and ascribed it to Aesop.

Widow and Ploughman: *Aes.* 388 (= *Vita* 129). This story is not told elsewhere in the same form, but it is fundamentally the same story as that of the widow and the soldier in Phaedrus (App. 15) and in Petronius (*Sat.* 111). The differences between the two indicate that the Greek fable told in the *Life of Aesop* is the older form, and the basis upon which the Roman form was expanded and retold in a new spirit, one of cynicism in place of simple irony, and one which reflects the social conditions of the later megalopolitan Roman world. In Aesop a ploughman, seeing a good-looking widow mourning at her husband's grave (not a large underground vault), leaves his team of oxen standing in the field and, going up to the woman, pretends to weep himself. She asks him why he weeps and he replies that he has lost a good wife and weeping lightens his grief. She says that her own case is similar; she has recently lost a good husband and weeping brings her some solace. "Since we both suffer from the same

misfortune," says the ploughman, "why don't we get together? I'll love you as I did her, and you shall love me as you did your husband." In this way he persuaded the woman. But while he was taking his pleasure of her, someone drove off his oxen; and when he returned and failed to find them he began to weep and shout in earnest. "What are you wailing about?" asked the widow. And he said, "Woman, now *I've* got something to mourn for." Here the Greek fable ends, and the substance of its action up to this point is closely paralleled in the Roman version; the soldier, like the ploughman, makes love to a widow mourning at her husband's grave, and, while he is busy with her, someone carries off a corpse for which he is responsible and this gets *him* into real trouble. The episode that follows, telling how the widow comes to the rescue of her lover by allowing her husband's body to be hung on the cross, brings in a sarcastic idea that is totally foreign to the spirit and sense of the Greek prototype. For, in view of the emphasis put upon the widow's reputation for chastity at the beginning of the story, of which nothing is said in the Greek, the Roman version implies that the woman is much weaker than she *ought* to be and professed to be, and that her action in preferring a live lover to a dead husband, which is made repulsive by the *added* episode of hanging her husband's body on a gibbet, is something hypocritical and highly reprehensible. Here one laughs in scornful mockery, or is shocked, to learn that she who seemed to be a saint is really a heartless sinner. But in the Greek story the widow is neither saint nor sinner; she is only human and natural, and no condemnation of her behavior is implied. It is assumed that a woman does no wrong in taking on a new lover when the old one is dead; and the whole point of the story, and its fun, lies in the irony of the ploughman's discovery that he too has something to mourn about. This is obviously an early Greek form of the fable about the widow. For that reason, and because it is not elsewhere so told, it seems probable to me that the author of the *Life* got it from Demetrius; and that Phaedrus, finding it in the same book, which was his official "Aesop," chose to substitute for it in his own collection the later version of the same story with which he was familiar and which he liked better. This may have come to him and to Petronius from the *Milêsiaka* of Aristides or Sisenna's translation of it, or from an oral source.

The Two Roads, one of Freedom, the other of Slavery: *Aes.* 383. This fable, not elsewhere recorded as Aesopic, is thus told by Aesop to the Samians in the oldest version of the *Life* (ch. 94, in Daly's translation:[42] "Once, at the command of Zeus, Prometheus described to men two ways, one the way of freedom, the other that of slavery. The way of freedom he pictured as rough at the beginning, narrow, steep, and waterless, full of brambles, and beset with perils everywhere, but finally a level plain amid parks, groves of fruit trees, and water courses where the struggle reaches its end in rest. The way of slavery he pictured as a level plain at the beginning, flowery and pleasant to look upon with much to delight but at its end narrow, hard, and like a cliff." This fable seems to be an adaptation of the well-known allegorical tale told in a book by Prodicus in the fifth century B.C. concerning the choice made by Heracles at the crossroads, which is told at great length in paraphrase by Xenophon in the *Memorabilia* (2.1 ff.), where, as earlier in Hesiod (*Op.* 287–91), the two roads represent Virtue and Evil respectively.[43] It would be just like Demetrius to make this myth into one featuring Prometheus and Zeus at the creation of man; for that, as we have seen, is a mythological kind of fable which is conspicuous among those fables which have the best claim to Demetrian origin. No gods are mentioned in connection with this theme either by Hesiod or by Prodicus in Xenophon, except that in the latter version the personified figures Virtue and Evil each recommends to Heracles his own road. It is noteworthy that in the later version of the *Life*, *Vita W*, which still antedates the fifth century, Tyche has taken the place of Zeus and Prometheus in the older *Vita G.*

Other fables ascribed to Aesop's telling in the *Life*, but unattested elsewhere before the first century, and only rarely if at all thereafter, are *Aes.* 379, 380, 381, 386 and 387, dealing respectively with the following subjects: Daughter violated by her own

[42] L. W. Daly, *Aesop Without Morals* 76.

[43] Hesiod's familiar lines are always worth quoting:

> *τὴν μέν τοι κακόκητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι*
> *ῥηϊδίως· ὀλίγη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει.*
> *τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν*
> *ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν*
> *καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,*
> *ῥηϊδίη δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ ἐοῦσα.*

Father (cf. *Aes.* pages 19–20), The Man who Lost his Brains in a Bowel Movement (aetiological), The Old Man carried to the edge of a Cliff by his Donkeys, The Foolish Girl, who, in trying to acquire brains, lost all she had (much like the story of Alibech and Rustico in Boccaccio, *Dec.* 3.10). The Poor Man hunting Locusts. Each of these fables seems to come from a relatively early source in which it was ascribed to Aesop, and that source may well have been, in some cases if not in all, the book of Demetrius. No other source from which they might have come is known to us.

The Aesopic fables published by Demetrius were contained in one book roll, *Αἰσωπείων α′*, according to the catalogue of the author's books as given by Diogenes Laertius, 5.80. It is not clear from this title, which must have been either the author's own title or one that had been put on his book before the time of Diogenes, whether the contents consisted entirely of fables or of fables preceded by an introduction of some kind relating to Aesop. Such an introduction could easily be included in a book entitled *Αἰσώπεια*, or even under the descriptive words *λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγαί*, which Diogenes uses generically to indicate or to characterize one of the various kinds of books that Demetrius wrote.[44] Is it likely that such a learned student of ancient history, literature and cultural antiquities, who elsewhere shows interest in the biography of literary and historical figures, would issue a bare collection of Aesopic fables without saying anything by way of preface concerning Aesop and his career? I think not. And if we assume that Demetrius did say something in his book about the career of Aesop, that fact would well account for the fixation of certain beliefs about him which are unattested previous to the fourth century but are widely propagated thereafter as standard, namely the belief that he was a Phrygian by birth and that he lived for some time at the court of Croesus at Sardis. The second of these

[44] Note the context in which the words λ. *Αἰσ. σ.* are used: *πλήθει δὲ βιβλίων καὶ ἀριθμῷ στίχων σχεδὸν ἅπαντας παρελήλακε τοὺς κατ' αὐτὸν Περιπατητικούς, εὐπαίδευτος καὶ πολύπειρος παρ' ὁντινοῦν. ὧν ἐστι τὰ μὲν ἱστορικὰ τὰ δὲ πολιτικὰ τὰ δὲ περὶ ποιητῶν τὰ δὲ ῥητορικά, δημηγοριῶν τε καὶ πρεσβειῶν ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγαί, καὶ ἄλλα πλείω. ἔστι δὲ* . . . There are no titles here, and *συναγωγαί* does not refer exclusively to λ. *Αἰσ.* We are told that Demetrius made "collections of public speeches, of speeches made on embassies, and, notably also, of Aesopic fables." And he might have added "of apophthegms" (*χρειῶν*) and "of the sayings of the Seven Wise Men."

two propositions is historically improbable and looks very much like a dramatic literary invention of the fourth century; and the first is contradicted by the fifth-century tradition stemming from the local chronicler Eugeon of Samos, as reported by Aristotle and Suidas, according to which Aesop was a Thracian from the town of Mesembria.[45] There was a persistent tendency among the authors of Greek literary works, including historiography along with dialogue and drama, to bring together on the same stage, picturesquely and agonistically for the artistic purpose of dramatizing their thought and action, two or more characters famed for their wisdom or representative of different cultures or viewpoints; like Solon and Croesus in Herodotus, the Seven Wise Men from all over Greece assembled at the court of Croesus according to Ephorus (Fr. 101), or entertained, along with Aesop, by Periander at Corinth in Plutarch's *Banquet*, Aesop talking with Solon at Athens in a comedy of Alexis, and again with Solon at Sardis in Plutarch and Diodorus.[46] Such representations are freely invented about men who lived in approximately the same age, with little or no regard for historical reality or for previous biographical tradition, which in this case was contradictory (above, note 27); and probably at no time was there so much manipulation in literature of the outstanding cultural figures of early Greece as in the fourth and early third centuries B.C. That was just the time when the story of Aesop's career as an honored adviser and diplomatic courier conspicuous in the service of King Croesus was most likely to have been invented. Had any such story been known to Herodotus, who wrote much

[45] See *Aes.* page 216, Test. 5 and 6, for the statements made about Aesop by Eugeon in his *Ὧροι Σαμίων* as transmitted through Aristotle's *Constitution of the Samians* to Heraclides Ponticus (Müller, *FHG* 2.215) and the scholiast on Aristophanes, *Birds* 451 (= Aristot. Fr. 573, Rose); also Jacoby, *FGrH* III 2, pp. 520 f. and III 2, 457 f.; and his article on Euagon (= Eugeon) in *RE* 6 (1907) 819 ff. Suidas adds that Aesop's native city was Mesembria in Thrace, according to Eugeon. The account of Aesop given by Herodotus (2.134–35) is incidental to the mention of the Thracian *hetaera* Rhodopis, who, he tells us, was a fellow-slave with Aesop under Iadmon in Samos. This seems to imply, if somewhat faintly, that Aesop also came from Thrace as Eugeon explicitly stated. What Herodotus says about Aesop is in agreement with Eugeon's account, except insofar as one account supplements the other. As Jacoby observes, it is unlikely that Herodotus took his information from Eugeon's book; for he himself had lived for some time in Samos before 454 and elsewhere shows an intimate knowledge of local Samian affairs and traditions.

[46] The references are: Kock, *CAF* 2.299 f. for Alexis; Plutarch's *Life of Solon* 28, and Diodorus 9.28 (in excerpts). See *Aes.* pages 223 f.

about Croesus and the legend of his encounter with Solon (which is chronologically all but impossible), then surely he would have told us also about Aesop and Croesus. His silence means that no report about Aesop's association with Croesus was known to him. For these reasons it seems very probable that the legend about Aesop's career at Sardis was invented in the fourth century and propagated by Demetrius as the authority on Aesop for later generations, together with the doctrine that Aesop was a Phrygian by birth, which is nowhere attested before the time of Demetrius, and which entirely supplanted the earlier tradition, stated by Eugeon of Samos and implied by Herodotus (cf. note 45) that he was a Thracian.

Why did Aesop in the fourth century come to be represented as a Phrygian? The reason, I think, is that he was conceived on the analogy of the Phrygian Marsyas, to whom he is likened in the *Life*, as the spokesman of a homely rural culture characteristic of Phrygia coming into rivalry and conflict with the Apolline, and on that account like Marsyas, and like Midas in consequence of his preference for Pan's music, having become the victim of Apollo's anger.[47] The analogy between Aesop and Marsyas, in respect to what each stood for culturally and what they suffered in consequence of rivaling Apollo, was much closer than that between Aesop and any Thracian known to mythology. For that reason, and because he was a slave, which the word "Phrygian" almost implies, it was natural to imagine that Aesop like the famous Marsyas was a Phrygian. The early *biographical* tradition, that he was a Thracian, was forgotten or ignored in the preoccupation of Demetrius or his contemporaries with the problem of framing Aesop in the (fanciful) history of ideas and cultural values.

Babrius, in the prologue to his second book, states in effect that the (Aesopic) fable came to the Greeks from the Assyrians and Babylonians of early times (*οἳ πρίν ποτ' ἦσαν ἐπὶ Νίνου τε καὶ Βήλου*); and this is historically true, as we can now see in the light of recent publications of cuneiform texts, and from the book

[47] It is stated explicitly in the *Life* that Aesop had offended Apollo by representing Mnemosyne instead of the god as the leader of the Muses in a shrine that he had built at Samos, and that "Apollo became angry with him (on that account) as he had once been with Marsyas"; that Aesop had come to Delphi for the purpose of displaying his wisdom (ch. 124); and that Apollo connived with the Delphians in their plot to put him to death on a false charge (ch. 127).

of the Assyrian *Achiqar.*[47a] Here the question that concerns us is, Where did Babrius get this information about the history of fable, which is mentioned by no other ancient writer? Did he find it in the *Aesopica* of Demetrius, from which he must have drawn fables, or did he get it directly from the Syrians of his own day, among whom he lived, or from some source unknown to us? It might appear, from a hasty reckoning, that Demetrius is more likely to have proclaimed it for the first time than is Babrius; because the teacher of Demetrius, Theophrastus, had written a book about Achiqar (above, page 323), from which Demetrius must have learned that fables of the Aesopic type were cultivated by the Assyrians. But, granted that Demetrius knew the tradition about the Semitic origin of fable, would he, or did he proclaim it in his *Aesopica*? I doubt it very much, for two reasons: first, I think it unlikely that Demetrius, an ardent Hellenist, would have ascribed the invention of fable to Asiatics, instead of either claiming it for Greece or saying nothing about its origin; and, secondly, a more cogent reason, if Demetrius in his *Aesop* had said what Babrius says about the Asiatic origin of fable, then, surely, it would have been repeated somewhere by the rhetoricians and antiquarians of later times who speak of fable as a type, which is not the case. In their *progymnasmata* the rhetoricians point out that fable is older than Aesop, but they mean older in Greek literature, for they refer only to Hesiod and Archilochus or to Homer. For these reasons it seems unlikely that Demetrius in his *Aesop* said anything about the Asiatic background of Greek fable.

It is obvious from the contexts in which Phaedrus speaks of "Aesop" as his Greek source in comparison with his own book (see note 40), that he meant by that term all the Greek fables that had come down under the name of Aesop, and this would include, necessarily, the collection made by Demetrius, whether that book was the whole of "Aesop" in his understanding, or only a part of it. In either case the collection of Demetrius would have contained fewer fables than the number which Phaedrus claims to have put forth already in the prologue to his third book:

[47a] On the continuity of this long literary tradition and the documents that reveal it, see *Fable* (above, note 1) 25–28 and, supplementary thereunto, my recent review of Edmund Gordon's *Sumerian Proverbs* in *AJA* 66 (1962) 206 f.

ego illius pro semita feci viam,
et cogitavi plura quam reliquerat.

Since the number of fables originally contained in the first three books of Phaedrus could hardly have exceeded one hundred by the highest estimate,[48] it follows from what the poet says that all "Aesop," which includes Demetrius if it does not refer exclusively to his collection, amounted to considerably less than one hundred fables, and not more than fifty if Phaedrus means exactly what he says in the words *cogitavi plura quam reliquerat.* In any case the collection made by Demetrius was relatively small, and that is what one would expect from the fact that it was contained in only one book-roll.

Two different kinds of fables, broadly speaking, are included among those which can be assigned with the most probability to Demetrius. One, which may be called *mythos* for convenience in view of the older connotation of that term, is a distinctly poetic and mythological type of story in which deities and personified natural forces play leading parts and what happens is often, but not always, supernatural or miraculous. Of this kind are the fables about Dionysus and the Wine (above, page 294), about Apollo, the Muses, and the Dryads, *Aes.* 432; about True and False Dreams, *Aes.* 385; about Man's Loquacity, *Aes.* 431; about the making of Man by Prometheus out of Clay and Tears, *Aes.* 430, and similar fables relating to the creation of men and animals; and about Momus, *Aes.* 100. The other kind of fable to which I refer is the more common prosaic type which the ancients from Herodotus on called λόγος Αἰσώπειος. This term, which came to be used in a broad sense for Aesopic fables in general, including *mythoi* as well as *logoi*,[49] seems originally to

[48] The total number of fables versified by Phaedrus in the original five books of his work, counting the Appendix of Perotti and 40 fables that have survived only in paraphrase, was approximately 162, and that would mean, if the books severally were nearly the same in length, that each book contained about 30–35 fables.

[49] Aesopic fables are termed *logoi* in Herodotus (*Aes.* 11a), Aristophanes (see below) Xenophon (*Aes.* 356a), Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2.20, cf. *Aes.* 269a), *PRyl.*, the epimythia throughout of the Augustana collection and of its derivatives (cf. *Epimythium* 412), and often elsewhere. Cf. Theon, *Prog.* 3: πλεονάζουσι δὲ μάλιστα οἱ καταλογάδην συγγεγραφότες τὸ λόγους καὶ μὴ μύθους καλεῖν, ὅθεν λέγουσι καὶ τὸν Αἴσωπον λογοποιόν. Πλάτων δὲ . . . πῇ μὲν μῦθον, πῇ δὲ λόγον ὀνομάζει. On the other hand μῦθος is the word regularly used for Aesopic fable in the *progymnasmata* of the rhetoricians, although the classic definition (Theon 3, Aphthonius 1) is λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν (cf. *Fable* 22), and λόγος, in the sense of a rational explanation of the fable, is a predicate of the epimythium with the same rhetoricians.

have implied a predominantly rational, realistic, and down-to-earth quality which marked it apart from the poetic myth about the gods, in everything, that is, except in the primary assumption that animals and inanimate things may speak and think like human beings; and many Aesopic *logoi*, relating to the actions of men, do not involve even that much unreality. Among the fables that we have traced to Demetrius (above, page 324) the following are *logoi* in the stricter sense of the term as here defined: The Shepherd who cried "Wolf" in Jest, *Aes.* 210; Goat and Vine, *Aes.* 374; Sow and Bitch, *Aes.* 223; Hunter and Dog, *Aes.* 403; Lion and Two Bulls, *Aes.* 372; Fox and Crane, *Aes.* 426; Man Counting Waves, *Aes.* 429. Thus the Aesopic fables written down in prose by Demetrius included side by side with each other both *mythoi* in the poetic tradition and *logoi* in the realistic tradition of Ionic prose; and these two types of fable, which stand together also in the later collections, were ascribed to Aesop's telling in the fourth and fifth centuries B.C., before the time of Demetrius. Aristophanes refers to Aesopic fables as λόγοι whenever he designates them generically,[50] but he ascribes to Aesop the aetiological myth about the Lark burying his Father (*Aves* 471 ff., *Aes.* 447), and the *logoi* concerning the Eagle and the Fox (*Aves* 651, *Aes.* 1) and the Eagle and the Beetle (*Pax* 129 f., *Aes.* 3). In Plato's *Phaedo* (60B) Socrates is made to say that "if Aesop had noticed this (paradoxical proximity of pleasure to pain), he would have composed a *mythos* to this effect, that the divinity, wishing to reconcile these warring elements and finding it impossible to do so, joined their heads together into one, with the result that wherever the one is present the other follows after it." In referring to such a fable as this Plato intentionally uses the term μῦθος as distinguished from λόγος, as we see from another passage in the *Phaedo* (60D, 61B) where Socrates replies to an inquiry made by Cebes about the rumor that he had put Aesop's fables (τοὺς τοῦ Αἰσώπου λόγους) into poetry: "after I had composed the poem in honor of the god . . . it occurred to me that a poet must, if he's going to be a poet, compose myths and not prose stories (μύθους ἀλλ' οὐ λόγους), and since I myself was not a myth-maker, on that account I took such myths of Aesop as I happened to have at hand and understood (οὓς προχείρους εἶχον μύθους καὶ ἠπιστάμην τοὺς Αἰσώπου) and put them into

[50] *Aves* 651, ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις. *Pax* 129, ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις. Cf. *Vesp.* 1258.

poetry." Likewise in the ancient *Life of Aesop* (*Vita G*, ch. 7) the Muses are said to have given to Aesop λόγων εὕρεμα καὶ μύθων Ἑλληνικῶν πλοκὴν καὶ ποιήσεις, and in a later recension (see *Aes.* page 308, note 30) Aesop is called λογομυθοποιός. The proportion of μῦθοι to λόγοι in the short collection of Aesopic fables published by Demetrius seems to have been considerably larger than it is in the later collections, where some of the earlier Aesopic *mythoi* are left out or their mythological elements eliminated.

Otto Keller, in his learned and thorough *Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der griechischen Fabel*,[51] called attention to many fables in the Aesopic corpus, chiefly from the Augustana and Babrius, in which reference is made to specifically Athenian customs, places, persons etc., or in which the action is located in Athens; and from Phaedrus a number of other such fables may be added to his list.[52] In the light of these data Keller remarks: "Vielleicht ist diese Menge nach Attika weisender Züge in den erhaltenen Aesopischen Fabeln, die mit dem Schweigen der Tradition von eigentümlich attischen Apologen seltsam contrastiert, zum grössten Teil auf Rechnung jener ersten grossen Fabelsammlung zu setzen, welche Demetrios von Phaleron eben zu Athen veranstaltet hat, so dass ihm natürlich allemal die attischen Versionen einer Fabel zunächst lagen." It is certainly a reasonable conclusion that some and perhaps a majority of the fables in question owe their Athenian orientation to Demetrius; but the tendency to locate dramatic events in Athens, or to write about well-known Athenians or Athenian institutions, was also strong in later Greek literature, and for that reason it would not be safe to infer, on the basis of its Athenian orientation alone, that any particular fable was first so shaped by Demetrius.

What was the *raison d'être* of the *Aesopica* (Αἰσώπεια) of Demetrius, the main purpose for which it was written, and what did Demetrius himself contribute in his own person as author to the

[51] *Jahrbücher für class. Philol.*, Supplementband 4 (1962) 369 f.

[52] In addition to Phaedrus 1.2 (Frogs ask for a King), which Keller cites, the following fables also represent the action as taking place in Athens: 2.9, Athenians set up a statue of Aesop (was this the statue of Aesop with the Seven Wise Men made by Lysippus, and was it made, perhaps, at the request of Demetrius as regent? See page 308 above); 3.9, Socrates and his Friends; 3.14, Aesop playing with the Boys in the Streets of Athens; 4.5, the Enigmatic Will solved by Aesop at Athens; App. 27, Socrates and a Servant.

conventions of fable-writing and fable-books as we know them? In attempting to answer these questions, which seem to be of primary importance, a number of literary-historical facts must be considered, the testimony of which, although indirect, is the only basis on which a reasonable conclusion can be reached.

The literary activity of Demetrius, as described in summary by Diogenes Laertius (5.80) includes two kinds of books that are especially noteworthy for their bearing on the presumable nature of his *Aesop*: collections of literary sayings of famous men; and works on rhetoric and literary history, subjects in which our author was keenly interested both as a student and as a practising stylist. It is unlikely that he would refrain from the exercise of his creative literary talent in the writing down of fables in prose, the substance of which allowed him more freedom of composition that the *bons mots* of famous men in his χρεῖαι or the sayings of the Seven Wise Men. The purpose of all his collections was obviously twofold: on the one hand to preserve for posterity felicitous utterances attributed to famous men of the past, and, on the other, to make these materials available in convenient form for the use of writers and speakers of his own time and later, who would use them as illustrations or for documentation. Many compilations of this kind were made in the Alexandrian age,[53] and some of them, like the *Narrationes amatoriae* of Parthenius, the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninus Liberalis, and a collection (by Demetrius?) of fables in Greek prose, were used as literary raw materials by the poets Cornelius Gallus, Ovid, and Phaedrus respectively.

Before Demetrius no collection of Aesopic fables written in

[53] Cf. *Epimythium* (above, note 1) 406, and Christ–Schmid, *Gr. Lit.*[6] (1920) 2.229 f., *ibid.* 110 f. The purpose of such collections of material, from the point of view of the ambitious speaker, writer or rhetorician, is clearly stated in the following preface to the Ia recension of the Augustana fables (see *Aes.* pages 211 f.), here quoted in part with some omissions:

. . . ἠξιώθη (sc. Aesop) βιβλιοθήκης· ὅθεν τοῖς πολιτευομένοις καὶ τοῖς λέγειν προαιρουμένοις εἰς τὰς περὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας φιλοτιμίας εὐπορία λόγων αὔξεται. εἰσὶν οἳ μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν τὰ κεφάλαια συναγαγόντες εἰς τὸ μέσον αὐτοῖς τεθείκασιν, ἡγούμενοι δεῖν ταῖς τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιστήμαις τὰς τῶν ποιητῶν γνωμολογίας μάρτυρας παρέξειν . . . ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν εἰς τὸν βίον καλῶς εἰρημένων συνενηνόχασι πολὺ πλῆθος ἀποφθεγμάτων, νομίζοντες ἡμᾶς . . . μεγάλα πλεονεκτήσειν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις. ἐπικεχειρήκασι δέ τινες τὰς ἐκ τῶν λόγων ἐναντιώσεις καὶ γνώμας . . . καθ' ἕκαστον εἶδος παραδοῦναι τοῖς πολιτευομένοις, ὅπως ἐξ ἐκείνου πολλὰς ἔχωσιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγώνων χρείας καὶ κατισχύειν διὰ τούτων δύνωνται τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας. τοῦτον οὖν τὸν τρόπον Αἴσωπος εὗρεν, ὁρῶν χρήσιμον οὖσαν δούλοις καὶ ἐλευθέροις ἐν ταῖς δημηγορίαις τὴν τῶν μύθων δήλωσιν τοῖς πρόσθεν εἰρημένοις.

either prose or verse is known to have been published. The cultural outlook and the corresponding literary fashions of the fifth century and earlier were foreign to that type of writing, that is, to collections made up of literary raw materials, or materials such as proverbs, fables, or apophthegms, which could only be *flosculi* in the body of a larger and differently oriented literary or scientific composition. Fable as such had never been a literary form in its own right; it had been used from Hesiod on only as a rhetorical device in a context, like a proverb or a quotation, or as a means of satirizing a personal enemy in an epigram by Archilochus or some other iambic poet. In *theory*, therefore, the first collection of Aesopic fables, made by Demetrius at the beginning of the Alexandrian age, would be a repertoire of materials compiled for the benefit of writers and speakers who would make use of fables in the manner in which they had always hitherto been used, namely as illustrations in the context of a different literary form—usually an oration, a history, or a philosophical essay of some kind. This is strongly confirmed by the fact that the earliest collection of Greek fables of which fragments have been preserved, namely the collection copied on the first-century *PRyl.*, which may be, for all we know, the text of Demetrius himself, is obviously so organized; for in this text each fable is preceded by a promythium, which serves to index the idea illustrated by the fable, and there are no epimythia, properly so called. This form of presentation, which is retained by Phaedrus in many places where he seems to be following his Greek source, especially in Book 1,[54] is typified by the following example from *PRyl.*, introducing the fable about Heracles and Plutus (*Aes.* 111):

> *Πρὸς τὸν πλούσιον ἴσα καὶ πονη(ρὸν)*
> *ὅδε λόγος ἐφαρμόζει.*

The same promythian formula introduces all the fables in the papyrus, three in number, in which the opening lines happen to be preserved. The word *Πρὸς* or *Κατὰ* projects into the margin at the left, to mark a heading, and the brief statement of the moral, followed by the words *ὅδε λόγος ἐφαρμόζει*, is meant to classify the fable for the convenience of one who is looking for an illustration of this or that idea, and who is not expected to read the

[54] See *Epimythium* 413.

complete text of each fable in order to find out whether or not it is something that he can use. The author of the collection is saying to his reader in effect, "If you wish to illustrate such and such an idea in your speech or composition, here is an appropriate fable." There is no reason to doubt that this system of indexing the ideas contained in fables by means of promythia goes back to Demetrius; its presence in the collection represented by *PRyl.* and even in Phaedrus, whose book has a different purpose and orientation, shows clearly what the Alexandrian tradition was in books of this kind, and Demetrius stands at the head of that tradition.

The literary-historical data which we have described above, even without the new documentary evidence afforded by *PRyl.* and its promythia, was enough to convince the best students of Aesopic fable in the mid-nineteenth century that the collection made by Demetrius, himself a practising rhetorician, was intended to be a repertoire for the use of rhetorically, that is literarily, ambitious writers and speakers of prose.[55] This conclusion concerning the fundamental nature of Demetrius' collection must be retained, whatever else may be predicated of the book's literary character. Hausrath, however, denied it on the verbal pretext, involving an unreal dichotomy, that, if Demetrius was interested in Aesop as an exponent of popular wisdom, as his book on the sayings of the Seven Wise Men would indicate, then his collection of fables would not have been a handbook made to serve a "rhetorical" purpose[56]—which does not follow; and Adrados (347) denies it on the basis of a similar and equally false argument: that, because Babrius and Phaedrus versified a series of fables meant to be read one after the other for their own sake as literature, therefore a literary interest must have attached to fable-collections from the beginning, including that of Demetrius, and, if so, Demetrius could not have intended his collection to serve as a

[55] So W. Herzberg in the essay on Greek fable appended to his translation of Babrius, *Babrios Fabeln* (Halle 1846) 123 f.: "Zunächst kann es nun wohl keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass die Sammlung des Demetrios Phalereus . . . lediglich zu rhetorischen Zwecken unternommen wird, und sie tritt somit in eine Reihe mit den zahllosen Figurensammlungen später Rhetoriker [cf. note 53 above], die dem Schüler und angehenden Redner zum deklamatorischen Schminktöpfchen dienten. Ob sie ausserdem auch auf die Unterhaltung eines grössern Leserkreises berechnet waren, mag unentschieden bleiben." O. Keller, *op. cit.* (above, note 51) 384, is of the same opinion.

[56] *RE* 6 (1907) 1732; cf. *Epimythium* 407, note 53.

repertoire for the use of writers and speakers! What Babrius and Phaedrus did with the fables which they found in the Greek collections, with what intention they gave their poetical versions of those fables to the public, and how the public regarded them, proves nothing at all about the nature and purpose of the earlier Greek fable-books from which they took their substance. Those books, *in theory*, were repertoires of literary building materials meant to be used in other contexts, as the promythium shows, not books intended to be read continuously throughout for their own sake as literary entertainment, although anyone could, and some might prefer, to read them from that point of view. Phaedrus was the first to bring a disconnected series of Aesopic fables onto that artistic plane of literature, as an independent form of writing; but necessarily in verse, in order to sanction it as poetic composition. Only as such could it become an independent form of literature in its own right. Babrius did likewise; but as soon as his fables were reduced to prose, in the so-called Bodleian paraphrase, they became a repertoire once more, in which each fable is introduced by a promythium to show how it may be used in another context. Told in verse a fable had the literary rating and recognition of poetry, by virtue of the form alone in which it was written and regardless of its subject-matter (so with Archilochus); but, told in prose without a context, a fable was nothing but subject-matter in theory and had no recognized place of its own in the field of literary forms, fashions and endeavors. Instead, it was governed by the originally objective and informative theory of ancient prose, as an idea to be communicated, not as a work of literary art by itself. A fable in prose, however much it might be stylized by the compiler of a collection—and it was indeed stylized—was always looked upon as raw material suited primarily for incorporation into the body of a recognized literary form, such as oratory, history or philosophical essay, where the style of its telling would be adapted to that of the larger context, the fable thereby losing, as it always does, the style given to it in the collections.

To admit, as the historical evidence compels us to do, that the collection of Aesopic fables published by Demetrius was intended to serve as a practical handbook for the use of writers and speakers, is not to deny that his fables, read one by one, had a positive literary quality and were carefully stylized. It is only the theory

of the book as a whole, the informative purpose which sanctioned the publication of a series of unconnected fables in prose, that can be described as rhetorical, scholastic, or scientific, not the style in which the fables were written. In practice, it was inevitable that Demetrius, or almost anyone else, in the course of putting a meaningful and potentially dramatic story into writing, would take pains to tell it effectively and artistically. The subject matter itself invited such treatment. It called for a style specifically adapted to its nature, like other types of subject matter in ancient literature;[57] because the fables in the collection stood alone by themselves without any context to determine their style, whereas previously such fables had received their style from the various contexts of prose and poetry into which they had been taken as illustrations, or else had been orally circulated. The man who first published fables divorced from such a context was bound to give them the definitive style which they retained traditionally in the later collections; and that man, according to the best of our knowledge, was Demetrius of Phalerum, the founder of the style proper to fables told one by one in a collection.

That which determined what the style of Aesopic fables would be, when they stood alone uncontrolled by a context, was mainly of course the nature of the subject-matter; the objective simplicity of the tale and of the ideas contained in it required a correspondingly simple and unaffected style of presentation; and its outright fictitiousness, as well as its comical and satirical qualities in many cases, brought fable under the banner of comic literature, as opposed to serious or ideal literature, and caused it to be influenced by the mock-heroic conventions of comedy in the large.

Concerning the style in which fables should be written, the rhetorician Nicolaus in his *Progymnasmata* (ed. Felton, page 11) comments as follows: "The language (φράσις) should be very simple, straightforward, unaffected, and free of all subtelty and periodic expression, so that the meaning is perfectly clear and the words do not appear to be loftier in stature than the actors, especially when these are animals." This describes the style in which the fables of the Augustana collection and those of *PRyl.*

[57] Concerning the necessary adaptation of style to subject-matter in ancient literature, a consideration which is too often overlooked by scholars in attempting to decide upon the authorship of a text or to date it, as with Adrados in writing about the Augustana fables, see F. Leo in *GGA* 1898, 173 ff., and E. Norden in *Antike Kunstprosa* 1.322 ff.

are written, and it must have been true likewise of the style adopted by Demetrius, since his collection of fables, being the first, would have set the fashion followed by the authors of later collections. Obvious though it may seem as a stylistic requirement, this manner of writing fables is not very common, but is distinctive of fables standing alone in a collection, in contrast to that of fables told elsewhere in a context. There, in accordance with the advice given to prospective writers by the rhetoricians in their *progymnasmata*, fables are sometimes expanded with the addition of many unnecessary descriptive or dramatic details; more often, as in Horace and Plutarch, they are so contracted that only the barest outline of the action is given in order to get at the point as quickly as possible; and in some of the sophists and professional rhetoricians, such as Aphthonius, Himerius, or Libanius, the style in which a fable is told is anything but simple, straightforward or unaffected, and bears no resemblance to the λόγος ἀφελής recommended by Nicolaus and employed by the authors of fable-collections from Demetrius on. In the collections, moreover, the length of the fable is determined by the amount of matter that needs to be told in order to make the story in outline perfectly clear; the telling is never prolix or otiose or unduly spun out, and never, as in Aphthonius, so artificially condensed and sophisticated as to cause a simple-minded reader to think twice about what a sentence means. It is only outside the collections, in fables told by sophistic writers, that the influence of technical or professional rhetoric on the style in which fables are written is discernible, not in the style founded by Demetrius and continued in the Augustana collection.

The Aesopic fable was fundamentally a comic species of narrative in which the heroic, poetic, or serious kind of narrative was likely to be parodied now and then for comic effect, or slightly caricatured, or subconsciously imitated. But the serious or ideal λόγος which preceded the comic (i.e. the fable) was Ionic by tradition and permeated, as in Herodotus, by the vocabulary and mannerisms of the earlier epic poetry. Accordingly, any imitation or mockery of serious story-telling was bound to reflect the vocabulary of that Ionic tradition; and it is for this reason that relatively more poetic and Ionic words, so judged from the standpoint of pure Attic prose, are to be found in our fables than in other kinds of Hellenistic literature, which are more learned

and more subservient to the Attic tradition. There had been very little story-telling in Attic prose or poetry before Demetrius, but much in Ionia, both in prose and in poetry. The effect of this tradition upon the vocabulary of the first-century *Life of Aesop*, as also on that of Lucian's *Asinus* in the second century,[58] is more pronounced and conspicuous than in the fables of the Augustana collection; from which it follows that the occasional use of poetic and Ionic words is to be expected in comic stories as a matter of literary propriety, and the more prominent the mock-heroic element in a story is, the more pronounced will be the poetic and Ionic coloring of its vocabulary. But the fables in our collections do not have as much narrative in the mock-heroic spirit as the longer stories above mentioned, and for that reason they do not contain so many words that can be labeled "poetic" or "Ionic" or are obviously such. None of the words so classified by Adrados in his study of the Augustana vocabulary[59] is obsolete in Hellenistic Greek, or strange looking, and most of them are familiar in either the spoken or in the written *koinê* dialect of the time, which extends beyond the confines of Attic prose and includes many words of Ionic origin or precedent. It was the simple and unpretentious nature of the subject-matter and the Ionic tradition of story-telling, much more than the mock-heroic spirit of comedy, that determined this vocabulary. It imitates instinctively, more than it parodies, the old Ionic λόγος, and it reads more naturally and appears less affected, for all its "poetic" and "Ionic" words, than it would if it were written in pure Attic prose. All this is a matter of the adaptation of style to subject-matter and provides no criteria for the dating of the texts.

Distinctive of fable-style as seen in the Augustana collection and its derivatives, in contrast with that of fables told elsewhere, is the epigrammatic ending of the fable and certain conventional phrases and mannerisms by which it is accompanied, usually in the form of what one might call a punch line in the mouth of one of the actors. Thus the final and decisive speech very often

[58] See V. Neukamm, *De Luciano Asini auctore* (Diss., Leipzig 1914) 88 ff.

[59] *Estudios sobre el léxico de las fabulas esópicas* 180 ff. The most obviously poetic of the words here cited, βριαρός on page 189, comes from a fable that does not belong to the Augustana collection originally but is a paraphrase of a fable written in choliambic verse: λύκος δὲ αὐτῷ βριαρὸς συναντήσας (Chambry, *Aes. Fab.* page 458).

begins with ἀλλ' ἔγωγε; with ὦ οὗτος (αὕτη) or ἀλλ' ὦ οὗτος; with ἀλλ' ἔγωγε δειλαία, ἥτις . . . (*Aes.* 25) or equivalent phrases on the same pattern in other combinations of gender and number; with ἄθλιος ἔγωγε, ὃς . . . ; with ἀλλ' ἔγωγε δίκαια (ἄξια) πάσχω (πέπονθα) + ὃς, or a participle, or τί γὰρ . . . ; with ὦ κάκιστα ζῶα (*Aes.* 11, 54, 72, 208); like ὦ κάκ(ιστα) πρ(ό)βατα in *PRyl.*, which corresponds to ὦ κάκιστα ζῶα in *Aes.* 208; with ἀτὰρ οὖν καὶ followed by ὑμεῖς or ὑμᾶς, ἡμᾶς + δεῖ. The last mentioned phrase (with ἡμᾶς . . . βλάπτει) is used by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2.20 = *Aes.* 427) in quoting the fable told by Aesop to the Samians about the demagogue. It occurs once in *PRyl.* near the end of a fable, and nine times in the Augustana fables, here all but once (*Aes.* 53) in epimythia. For further details on this subject see my *Epimythium* (above, note 1) 397 f. and 404, and Adrados in his *Estudios* (above, note 3) 63 f., 235–37.

It is difficult to define a style of writing; but what has been said above is enough to show, I think, that the style in which fables are written in the Augustana collection is something distinct and recognizable, and that its essential features were determined, in all probability, by the author of the first collection of prose fables to be made, Demetrius of Phalerum.