NOTES ON THE AESOP ROMANCE
NEW SERIES, I*

The text of the so-called Aesop Romance or Life of Aesop has attracted the attention of scholars for a very long time. A turning point in the history of the text was the discovery of a parchment codex of the 10th century (siglum: G) containing a unique version of the text, which was edited in the monumental work of B.E. Perry, Aesopica¹). Perry in his edition and other publications refers to this new version as Vita G, in order to distinguish it from other versions and especially the one edited by A. Westermann²), for which he uses the term Westermanniana in honor of its first editor. In order to avoid the cumbersome term Vita G and to honor its distinguished first editor, I have ventured to introduce the term Perriana to designate this version³) and have used the siglum G for the codex alone. The same practice is followed in this paper.

Perriana, ch. 4, p. 36, 20:

In this chapter we read the story of Aesop’s encounter with the priestess of Isis who had lost her way. In the lines immediately preceding the passage discussed below, the priestess approaches Aesop from behind. Thus, he is unaware of her presence and of her identity, when she first addresses him. Upon hearing her voice (lines 19–21):

* For introductory remarks on the text and bibliography see my two earlier papers published in Greek with summaries in English under the title Κριτικά, γλωσσικά και έμφραντικά εις τὴν περὶ Αιολόπου Μυθιστορίαν: Συμβολή Α’, in: Πλάτων 21, 1969, 251–69, and Κριτικά, γλωσσικά...: Συμβολή Β’, Ἀθηνᾶ 73/74, 1973, 231–44 (hereafter referred to as Συμβολή I and II respectively; the English summary of Συμβολή II accompanies only the offprints).

¹) B.E.Perry, Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition That Bears His Name; Collected and Critically Edited... with a Commentary and Historical Essay, vol. I: Greek and Latin Texts, Urbana, Ill., 1952, pp. 35–77 (hereafter referred to as Aesopica I).

²) Vita Aesopi ex Vratislaviensi ac partim Monacensi et Vindobonensi codicibus... edidit A. Westermann, Brunsvigae [et] Londini 1845.

³) See Συμβολή I, p. 252.
From the foregoing it is evident that the editor himself felt doubts concerning the reading ἄνθρωπινον of the ms., and it is not difficult to surmise the reasons for his dissatisfaction. The passage, as printed above, cannot be understood without doing violence to the rules of logic or of syntax. Presumably, Post felt that an object was needed here for the participle περικείμενον, because this is what his emendation provides (ἄνθρωπον).

If Post’s emendation—which Perry did not adopt—is accepted, the passage becomes very awkward. A literal translation of the passage would be, “when Aesop turned around and saw the garb of the goddess on a human being...”. Since Aesop had already heard the voice of the priestess when he turned around, what else but a human being might he have expected to see? The awkwardness of the passage, however, is removed, if we emend ἄνθρωπινον into ἄνθρωπον. In such a case, ἄνθρωπον would be the subject of the participle περικείμενον, while τὸ τῆς θεοῦ σχῆμα would serve as its object. This usage of περικείμενον – with Acc. rei and in the sense “to wear”, “to be clothed in” – is strongly attested and especially for its participle.

As far as the word-order of the passage is concerned, the position that the object of περικείμενον occupies may appear a bit strange, but it is explained by the emphasis required by the logic of the narrative. The garb of the goddess is the new element that enters Aesop’s consciousness and also the one that makes the strongest

4) L. Daly’s translation of this passage (Aesop without Morals: The Famous Fables and Life of Aesop Newly Translated and Edited, New York and London 1961, p. 33: “a woman wearing the raiment of a goddess”) makes good sense by itself, but it also appears to be a rather free rendition of the Greek (τῆς θεοῦ becomes “of a goddess”); he may have either adopted Post’s emendation and translated it freely, or presumed tacitly an emendation of the text.

impression on him; for that reason Aesop immediately ἰδεσεβης ὑπάρχων προσεκύνησεν. 6)

Perriana, ch. 7, p. 38, 2–3:

αἰ Μοῦσα... εἰς τὸ Ἑλικώνα ἄνεβησαν [ὀρος].

ἐλικόν cod. et Perry in apparatu ἐλικόν perp. leg. Paphathomopoulos

This passage has been discussed recently by Paphathomopoulos, who observes that "l’expression τὸ Ἑλικώνα ἄνεβησαν ὥρος n’est pas du grec. Il faut écrire τὸν Ἑλικώνα ὥρος". 7)

The remedy proposed, however, is hardly Greek either, and the deletion of the verb (ἄνεβησαν) reduces the passage to absurdity. The difficulties of the passage are easily removed, if we edit the text as follows:

αἰ Μοῦσα... εἰς τὸν Ἑλικώνα 8) ἄνεβησαν [ὀρος].

The word ὥρος in the passage must have originated with a gloss which was later copied into the text, a common enough occurrence in the Perriana. Glosses of the same puerile character occur also in other passages of the text; see, e. g., ch. 6, p. 37, 12–13: μαλακοῦ πνεύματος ὅντος [ἀνέμον] Ζέφυρον; ch. 39, p. 49, 15–16: ἀπελθὼν φανὼν ἐγγησον ἦμῖν [ὀσπιον]; ch. 52, p. 52, 35: οἱ σχολαστικοὶ... χολέφι [ἀσθένια] [sic] ἔχον αὐθησαν. 8)

Perriana, ch. 10, p. 38,29 and 28; Westermanniana, chs. 10, p. 82,29 and 77b, p. 97,5:

In chapter 10 of the Perriana we read an amusing, vivid dialogue between Aesop’s master and Zenas, the overseer of the

---

6) There may have also been a general tendency to place the object of περικείμαι before the verb itself, especially among post-classical authors; in the numerous passages referred to or cited in the dictionaries (see preceding note) the object appears before the verb very frequently as, e.g., in Lucian, Icar. 14: ἀνεθόν τῷ πτέρυγα τῷ δεξιῶν περικείμενος.


8) The reading ἐλικόν cannot be considered a corrupt explanatory note on ὥρος, both because of the word-order of the passage and because the author of the Perriana refers to the mountain by its name elsewhere (ch. 36, p. 48,22). This also contrasts the Perriana with the other versions of the text (Westermanniana, Planudea, and Lolliniana), in which Helicon is never mentioned; see C. M. Birch, Traditions of the Life of Aesop, St. Louis, Mo., 1955, p. 93.

9) See also Perry’s remarks in Aesopicα I, p. 23.
slaves. Zenas comes to the master in great hurry to report that τερατώδες τι πράγμα συνέβη ἐν τῷ κτήματί σου (= line 23), namely, that the dumb Aesop had suddenly gained the faculty of speech. Zenas has difficulty getting to his point, because of his agitation and of his master’s interruptions. The dialogue reads, in part, as follows (lines 26–30):


Two changes in the text seem appropriate, which are in keeping with the vivid color of the dialogue and, indeed, enhance it.

(a) It is unnecessary to athetize the τί of the codex in front of τοῦτο νομίζεις (= line 29), because the passage should be edited as follows: τί; τοῦτο νομίζεις τερατώδες εἶναι; I translate: “What? Do you consider that to be monstrous?” τί here is used alone as a simple question with exclamatory color; syntactically it stands as an absolute in relation to the rest of the sentence. A similar use of τί occurs in Plato, Phaedo 84c (ed. J. Burnett): Σιγῆ οὖν ἐγένετο ταύτα εἰπόντος τοῦ Σωκράτους... Κέβης δὲ καὶ Σμύμιας σμικρὸν πρὸς ἄλληλῳ διελεγόμενην καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης ἰδὼν αὐτῶ ἤφετο, τί; ἔρη, όμιν τὰ λεχθέντα μῶν μή δοκεί ἐνδεώς λέγεσθαι; Moreover, the same usage occurs several times in the Westermanniana as, e. g., in ch. 74, p. 95,5: “τί; ἔγω τοῦτο οὐχ ἐνεθυμοῦμαι;”

(b) The use of τί which was discussed above points also to a more satisfactory way of editing the first question of the master, τί τέτοιεν. The editor obviously considers τί to be the object of the verb τέτοιεν. This implies that the master was expecting Aesop to give birth to something and he is now asking merely what that something turned out to be; in other words, it is τί

---

11) See LSJ, s.v. τίς, τι, B 8 η and 8 ε. This use of τί is very common in Modern Greek.
12) See Westermanniana, ch. 76, p. 95,24 and the passages noted below, in section (c) and in note 16.
13) So also Daly, who translates (Aesop without Morals, p. 35): “What has he given birth to?”
that conveys the main weight of his question. Thus, Zenas’ answer, ὠ τί τοιοῦτον, ἄλλα... ἐλάλησεν [sc. Αἴσωπος] seems a bit off the mark, because he does not answer the question “what has Aesop given birth to?”, but rather the question “has Aesop given birth to something?” For Zenas’ actual answer the question conveyed by the verb alone (τέτοξεν;) would have been not only sufficient, but actually more appropriate. 14) This is precisely the meaning of the master’s question, if we edit it, τί; τέτοξεν; In this case τί stands alone as an absolute question of exclamatory color, which prepares and intensifies the question asked through τέτοξεν.

Finally, if we look at the entire dialogue in ch. 10, it becomes evident that the author is striving after comic effect and portrays the master as making fun of Zenas’ excitement. The way in which our passage is edited in Aesopica directs the main thrust of the master’s irony against Aesop; on the contrary, if the change proposed here is accepted, Zenas -or both Zenas and Aesop- remains the butt of the master’s irony.

(c) The foregoing discussion of the use of τί allows us to dispense with detailed argumentation on proposing a different way of editing a passage of the Westermanniana, namely:

Ch. 10, p. 82,29–30 (Perry): ὥ δὲ “τί,” φησι, “μὴ δένδρον ὄρμον... ἦ τετράπον... ἐγέννησεν;”

Edit.: ὥ δὲ “τί,” φησι, “μὴ δένδρον...”

Perriana, ch. 26, p. 44,3–4:

Chapters 25 and 26 of the Perriana may be viewed as one unit with regard to their narrative content; they contain a description of the sale of Aesop by a slave-dealer to the philosopher Xanthus. The dominant scene in this section is a dialogue between Aesop on the one side, and Xanthus along with the

14) To put it into purely syntactical terms, Zenas’ answer is more appropriate to a Satzfrage than to a Wortfrage; see R. Kühner – B. Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II, 2, 3rd ed. Hannover and Leipzig 1904, pp. 515 ff.

15) A. Westermann’s edition (above note 1), p. 10,10–12 has in this passage several differences from Perry’s text and on the point concerning us here it reads: ὥ δὲ φησι “τί; μὴ δένδρον ὄρμον...”

16) The same use of τί occurs again in Westermanniana, ch. 77 b, p. 97,5, and the passage is edited better by Perry (“καὶ τί, μομολίκον; οὐτοὶ οὐκ
σχολαστικοί who accompanied him on the other. The primary aim of Xanthus is to assess the background and the capabilities of his prospective slave. The description of this episode is very vivid and calls to mind folk-narratives.\(^{17}\)

Xanthus knows nothing about Aesop when they first meet, and this is presumably why he asks him a series of questions through which he hopes to learn Aesop’s identity and perceive his talents. Aesop’s answers, however, instead of providing the information that Xanthus seeks, serve to reveal the shallowness and irrelevancy of the philosopher’s questions.

It is important for our purpose to note that neither the slave-dealer informs Xanthus of Aesop’s name, nor does the philosopher or the σχολαστικοί inquire about it. Nevertheless, in ch. 26, p. 44,3–4 of the Perriana the σχολαστικοί comment favorably on a caustic answer that Aesop gave to Xanthus with the remark, “καλός, μά τήν Ἰδον ὤ Αἰσχυλος ἀπεστομάτισεν τόν καθηγητήν.”

This is the third time\(^{18}\) that the σχολαστικοί comment on Aesop’s answers in this section of the Perriana, but the first and only instance that they use Aesop’s name.\(^{19}\) A careful reading of the narrative that precedes the passage cited above in both the Perriana and the Westermanniana makes clear that neither the σχολαστικοί nor Xanthus had learned Aesop’s name; hence, it was not possible for them to use it here\(^{20}\), nor could the author

---

\(^{17}\) Diogenes Laertius VI, 29–30, reports a similar tradition concerning the philosopher Diogenes. The theme of our narrative is discussed in detail and with due reference to other ancient stories and motifs by G. Donzelli, Una versione Menippea della Ἀλκιβιάδης, RFIC, n. s., 38, 1961, 225–76. See also H. Zeitz, Der Aesoproman und seine Geschichte. Eine Untersuchung im Anschluß an die neugefundenen Papyri, Aegyptus 16, 1936, 230–31 (where the reference should be to Diog. Laert. VI, 29, instead of II, 29). A similar theme and similar motifs appear also in Modern Greek folklore; see, e. g., Ευγενίου Σπαθάρη, Ὄ Καραγκώζης στὸ Διαστήμα, Act I, scene 2, phonograph record by His Master’s Voice, GCLP 19, EMI-Regal XREG 2023.

\(^{18}\) The other two instances occur in ch. 25, p. 43,14–15 and 22–24.

\(^{19}\) In the corresponding section of the Westermanniana the σχολαστικοί comment twice on Aesop’s answers: in ch. 25, p. 85,23–25 and in ch. 26, p. 85,29–30. In both instances they do not refer to Aesop by name.

\(^{20}\) At the end of the episode Xanthus buys Aesop without having learned his name. Nevertheless, in the subsequent episodes Xanthus does use Aesop’s name; see, e. g., Perriana, ch. 28, p. 44,32 and Westermanniana, ch. 29, p. 86,16. There is no explanation in the text as to how Xanthus
have made a lapse and allowed them to use it in an episode which is built on an inquiry concerning Aesop’s identity and talents. Thus, we suggest that the passage be edited,

"καλῶς, μὰ τίνι Ἡραν, [ὁ Ἀἰσωπὸς] ἀπεστομάτισεν 21) τὸν καθηγητήν."

The athetized proper name 22) must have originated as an explanatory note, which later crept into the text in the usual fashion.

Perriana, ch. 26, p. 44,6:

Here we have an exchange between Aesop and his master, in which the slave tells Xanthos that if he should decide to run
came to learn his slave’s name. Should the name of Aesop be deleted from those passages as well? I do not think so. The unexplained use of Aesop’s name in these and other episodes is amply justified by the folk character of the narrative. “Omniscience” is a well-known feature of the narrative technique in folk-stories (see, e.g., Vl. Propp, Morphologie du conte, French transl. from the 2nd ed. of the Russian original by M. Derrida, T. Todorov, and C. Kahn, Paris 1970, pp. 86–89). Outside the framework of each episode the author is not interested with consistency in how a character happened to learn something. In the episode discussed above, the author did not choose to explore how Xanthus learned Aesop’s name. Nevertheless, once the episode ends, the author feels free to allow Xanthus to use Aesop’s name. The very transition from one episode to another is reason enough for allowing something in a later episode that he did not allow in the former one. Our demand for logical consistency with regard to the episode in chapters 25–26 is limited to the narrative within those two chapters; it arises from the very subject of the narrative – an enquiry concerning Aesop by characters who do not know his identity – and is strengthened by the need for logical coherence within a single episode. These factors are not operative, however, once the author moves to another episode, and hence there is no need to athetize Aesop’s name in the subsequent episodes.

21) The verb ἀπεστομάτισεν (cod.: -ησεν) was introduced into the text hesitantly by Perry (see Aesopica I, p. 27); it has been emended to ἐπεστόμωσεν vel ἀπεστόμωσεν by X. X. Χαρίτωνίδης, Πλάτων 4, 1952, 105–106. Chari
tonides, however, does not discuss the possibility of the very likely emendation into ἀπεστόμασεν (see G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, s. v. ἀποστομίζω (and esp. the passages cited therein from Palladius, Hist. monach. 27,19: τοῦς ψυχοσφόντας ἀπεστόμιζεν and from Ev. Thom. Α 19,2: εὐθεμίας, ποὺς νοοδον ἀποστομίζει τοὺς διασκάλους τοῦ λαοῦ) or into ἐπεστομάτισεν (see Lampe and LSJ*, s. v. ἐπιστομάτιζω).

22) If we athetize the name of Aesop, the only indication left in the passage that the σχολαστικόν are speaking of him comes from the verb-
away,

\[ \text{οὐ λήψομαι σε σύμβουλον}^{23} \]
\[ \text{λήψομαι legit. Perry λήψομαι legit. Paphathomopoulos λήψομαι G} \]

From the brief \textit{apparatus criticus} given above, it is clear that both Perry and Paphathomopoulos\textsuperscript{24} have made a slight error each in reporting the reading of the manuscript and that Perry's error made natural the introduction of the form \textit{λήψομαι} into his text. Paphathomopoulos, however, seems unaware of the fact that \textit{λήψομαι} is a genuine and strongly attested Hellenistic Future of \textit{λαμβάνω}, which is cited in a great many dictionaries\textsuperscript{25} and grammars\textsuperscript{26}, and thus has left Perry's text unchanged. Be that as it may, since the codex reads \textit{λήψομαι}, this form should be printed in the text\textsuperscript{27}).

\textit{Perriana}, ch. 67, p. 56,37 and ch. 103, p. 67,13:

(1) \textit{kata tous pálai chrónonv basileów vóys ègéneto} (ch. 67, p. 56,37).

\[ \text{vóys Perry vóys Paphathomopoulos} \]

ending. This fact, however, causes no difficulty, because the \textit{σχολαστικό} refer to Aesop through the same means in the two passages of the \textit{Westermanniana} mentioned above (note 19) and in the first of the two passages of the \textit{Perriana} noted earlier (above note 18).

\textsuperscript{23} It should be noted that the codex (fol. 31v) does have the form \textit{σύμβουλον} also at the beginning of ch. 26 (p. 43,25), correctly reported by Perry and erroneously read by Paphathomopoulos (op. cit., p. 293) as \textit{συμβουλίαν}.


Notes on the Aesop Romance

(2) viōn ἐποιήσατο (ch. 103, p. 67,13)

viōn Perry  viōn Papathomopoulos

The introduction into the text of the forms of viōς instead of viōς seems odd in view of the general linguistic style of the Aesop Romance. Be that as it may, Papathomopoulos has proposed these changes, because he considers Perry’s reading of the codex faulty and reads himself viς and viv respectively.28) A check of the readings in the manuscript (fol. 47r, line 15 and fol. 58r, line 18)29) makes clear that Perry read the text correctly and Papathomopoulos incorrectly. The word is abbreviated in both instances, and a standard abbreviation symbol is placed over it30). Papathomopoulos has mistaken the abbreviation symbol for the circumflex sign, perhaps because it resembles the circumflex sign used in Modern Greek (but not the Byzantine one used in the codex)31). A comparison of the sign over viς on fol. 47r with the sign, e. g., over ἄνοι (= ἄνθρωποι) in line 20 of the same folio and the sign used there for a circumflex (e. g., lines 13 and 11: ἐαυτόν and εἰπεῖν) leaves no doubt. The same remarks could be made about the viv32) on fol. 58r, where the

λήψομαι also appears in the Perriana (see, e. g., ch. 35, p. 48,9); since alternate forms of words, however, are abundant in the text, it does not seem advisable to try to impose uniformity throughout it.

29) I have studied the ms. both in microfilm and in photographs.
30) The use of this sign to indicate an abbreviation was very common; see, e. g., H. Follieri, Codices Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae selecti (Exempla scripturarum edita consilio et opera procuratorum Bibliothecae et Tabularii Vaticani, fasc. IV), Vatican 1969, table 15 (10th cent.), col. 1, lines 10 and 12 etc.; table 21 (981 A.D.), col. 2, lines 5 and 6 etc.; table 23 (11th cent.), line 3; table 27 (1004 A.D.), col. 1, line 6. The use of the same abbreviation sign is strongly attested in subsequent centuries, too; see, e. g., A. Turyn, Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculis XIII et XIV scripti... (Codices e Vaticanis selecti quam simillime expressi... consilio... curatorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae, XXVIII), Vatican 1964, table 1 (1203 A.D.), line 3 etc.; table 107 (1330–1331), line 20 etc.
31) It may be recalled here that the word viōς is frequently abbreviated in the mss., despite its brevity; see R. Devreese, Introduction à l’étude des manuscrits grecs, Paris 1954, p. 41; see also the tables in L. Traube, Nominas Sacra, München 1907, pp. 56–87. See also the following note.
32) Papathomopoulos did not notice that the form viōn is abbreviated the same way (viv) on fol. 60r, line 14; the sign is used once more in the same line over θω (for θω) and in the preceding line over θν (for θν); more examples on the opposite page of the codex (= fol. 59v; e. g., line 8 σα for σωτήρα and line 20 πα for πατέρα).

3 Rhein. Mus. f. Philol. N. F. CXXIII, 1
abbreviation sign is not even over the i as Papathomopoulos reports (viv) but rather over the u (ðiv).

Perriana, ch. 127, p. 74,14 and PRoss.-Georg. I,18r,24:

In this chapter we are informed that the leaders of the Delphians, wishing to kill Aesop and μὴ ἔχοντες εὐλογον αὐτίαν ἐμφανίσαντι τι πανοῦργον, ἵνα μὴ οἱ παραδημοῦντες δυνῆσονται αὐτῷ βοηθῆσαι (= lines 13—14).

The editor has let stand in the text the ms. reading παραδημοῦντες, obviously a participle of παραδημώ. This verb, however, is not attested by any other source, nor is the noun παράδημος, from which it might have been derived.33) Papathomopoulos has proposed that παρεπιδήμω is the verb needed in the passage, because “on ne connaît pas de verbe παραδημώ [sic], mais seulement παρεπιδήμω”.34) Neither παρεπιδήμω nor παρεπιδήμω, however, are verbs attested by any source. Moreover, neither verb is likely to have been formed in ancient Greek and have the meaning required in our passage, as evidenced by the form and sense of all other similar verbs35). Indeed, if one had to choose between a form of the unattested and incorrectly formed παρεπιδήμω ὡς and a form of the correctly formed παραδημέω, which is after all attested by our ms., one would have no hesitation in choosing the latter. Such a choice, however, is unnecessary, because we do have from several sources the verb παρεπιδήμετ ὡς, beside the also well attested noun παρεπιδήμος;

33) Perry seems to have considered παραδημοῦντες a genuine form, but strangely he did not include it in his: Some Addenda to Liddell and Scott, AJPh 60, 1939, 29—40. The same omission is found in the book of his disciple W.H. Hostetter, A Linguistic Study of the Vulgar Greek Life of Aesop, Urbana, Ill., 1955, p. 117, where παραδημέω is not included among the “Words not Listed in Liddell and Scott”. Thus, one would be inclined to think that παραδημοῦντες in Perry’s text is merely a typographical error (for παρεπιδημοῦντες), were it not for the fact that he uses the same participle in his edition of the Golenisciév papyrus (see below).

34) Papathomopoulos, op. cit., p. 301. There is no ground, however, for assuming that Perry had in mind παραδημέ ὡς as Papathomopoulos presumes — rather than the correctly formed παραδημέ ὡς. To imagine such a verb as παραδημόω and with a meaning that would fit in the passage requires a level of ignorance that is not fair to attribute to a scholar such as Perry.

35) Thus we have ἀπαθημος-ἀπαθημεω, ἐκάθημος-ἐκάθημεω, ἐνάθημος-ἐνάθημεω, ἐπαθημος-ἐπαθημεω, ὀμαθημος-ὁμαθημεω, παρεπιδημεω, συναπαθημος-συναπαθημεω, συνἐκάθημος-συνἐκάθημεω.
its participial form παρεπιδημούντες is the one needed for emending the passage quoted above\textsuperscript{36}).

Another emendation of the passage is suggested indirectly by the supplement οἱ παραθήκηντες first proposed by H. Weil\textsuperscript{37) and adopted by G. Zereteli\textsuperscript{38) and H. Zeitz\textsuperscript{39) for the corresponding passage of the Goleniščev papyrus (= P Ross.-Georg. I, 185, 24).\textsuperscript{40) Even on palaeographical grounds alone οἱ παραθήκηντες may be rejected as an emendation for the Perriana passage when compared to οἱ παρεπιδημούντες.

Perry in his edition of the papyrus\textsuperscript{41}) prints line 24 as follows:

\[ [μενοι δὲ μητην οἱ παραθήκηντες ξενοὶ βοηθησωσιν αὐ[τοι πανε–] \]

If Perry’s approximate calculation of the length of the papyrus lines is accepted\textsuperscript{42}), then οἱ παρεπιδημούντες is a preferable supplement to οἱ παραθήκηντες for the papyrus text itself; it is also preferable to Perry’s οἱ παραθήκηντες and it allows perhaps the

\textsuperscript{36) The participle παρεπιδημούντες might also be possible here (see Preisigke – Kiessling, s. v. παρεπιδημεύω). This is, however, a poorly attested verb and, incidentally, poorly interpreted by the dictionaries. It occurs only once in a papyrus and its presumed meaning in LS\textsuperscript{9} (“to take up residence in a place”) does not fit in the passage to which the dictionary refers. The passage is cited in Preisigke – Kiessling (who give the verb the unconvinced meaning wobin abwandern) and also in the Μέγα λεξικόν ὅλης τῆς ἔλληνας γλώσσας issued in Athens by the publishing house of Ανηκτράκος. This last dictionary interprets the verb in a better way, but still not clearly. A careful reading of the papyrus passage shows that the verb means “to take up temporary residence in a place”. In our passage of the Perriana, however, the meaning needed is slightly different, i. e., “to sojourn in a place as a stranger”, and thus παρεπιδημούντες remains preferable to παρεπιδημούντες.

\textsuperscript{37) See H. Weil, La légende d’ Esope, in his: Etudes de littérature et de rythmique grecques, Paris 1902, p. 124; Weil – who published his study first in RPh., n. s., 9, 1885, 19–24 – edited only the first 27 lines of the papyrus. His reading and supplement to line 24 was actually οἱ παραθήκηντες, but all the other editors read also the τ in the word.


\textsuperscript{41) Perry, Studies, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{42) Ibid., p. 59: “approximately fifty or fifty-two letters to a line”.

\textsuperscript{43)}
replacement of \( \mu \rho \pi \omega \zeta \) (a supplement proposed by Zereteli and adopted also by Zeitz) with the supplement of Weil \( \mu \eta \), which is now supported by the evidence of the corresponding passage of the \textit{Perriana}.

\textit{Perriana}, ch. \textit{131}, p. 75.19–20:

A dim-witted \( \pi \alpha \rho \delta \epsilon \nu \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) describes to her mother how she ceased being a \( \pi \alpha \rho \delta \epsilon \nu \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \). She says (in Perry’s text): \( \alpha \nu \iota \rho \omicron \iota \tau \zeta \omicron \zeta \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \nu \eta \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \nu \tau \rho \varepsilon \chi \omicron \omicron \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \mu \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron } \( 43 \)


The same emendation has been proposed by Papathomopoulos, op. cit., p. 301. Papathomopoulos knows and cites La Penna’s article on p. 289, note 4 and again on p. 295 (in connection with another emendation), but strangely he passes over in silence La Penna’s contribution in this instance. The basic argument of Papathomopoulos is also the same as La Penna’s: “Il faut écrire \( \xi \omega \ \varepsilon \sigma \omega \), expression asyndétique...”. The same silence is found in Papathomopoulos’ article, p. 292, concerning La Penna’s interesting restoration of the text of \textit{Perriana}, ch. 19, p. 41,16ff., although La Penna devotes to it a section of his paper (op. cit., p. 268), and which Papathomopoulos repeats as his own.

Concerning our passage, Papathomopoulos seems to think that the conjunction \( \kappa \alpha \iota \) was introduced into the text by Perry (“\( \xi \omega \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \text{Perry} \)”), although the absence of angular brackets in Perry’s edition makes it evident that this is not so. Concerning the \( \kappa \alpha \iota \) see further comments immediately below.

\( 44 \)

order proposed here\(^{45}\) and led Perry to adopt \(\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \xi \omega\) in the text of that version\(^{46}\).

It is more difficult to decide whether the \(\kappa \alpha \iota\) should be retained and Perry himself had doubts about it with regard to the *Westermanniana* passage\(^{47}\). Both readings are possible, but since we have evidence supporting \(\kappa \alpha \iota\) both from the Goleniščev papyrus and from *Westermanniana* mss., it seems preferable, in terms of the present state of our knowledge of the transmission of the text, to retain the conjunction as well\(^{48}\).

*Perriana*, ch. 133, p. 75, 28–29; *Westermanniana*, ch. 133, p. 106, 9–10; *Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*, I, 2, no. 302, 1:

*Perriana*: ὅτε ἦν τὰ ζῷα ὀμόφωνα, μόνος Φιλιόσας βατράχῳ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ δεῖπνον...

*Westermanniana*: ὅτε ἦν ὀμόφωνα τὰ ζῷα, μόνος βατράχῳ Φιλιώθεις ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν εἰς δείπνον...

The reading Φιλιώθεις in the text of the *Perriana* has been recently athetized by Papathomopoulos, who considers it “bizarre” and states that instead of it he would expect Φιλιόσας.\(^{49}\)

It is not possible to guess how Papathomopoulos came to expect Φιλιόσας – which does not appear in the mss. of the Aesop Romance – when the mss. of both versions offer a variety of other

---

45) The evidence of the *Westermanniana* mss. is much clearer than it appears in Papathomopoulos’ paper. Papathomopoulos purports to cite the readings of the *Westermanniana* mss., but in reality he cites the readings only of 3 mss. (SRM) and does not mention the evidence of codd. P and W which run against his view. The picture presented by the *Westermanniana* mss. is as follows (see Perry, Aesopica I, p. 204, ad loc.): \(\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \xi \omega\) Ρ, \(\varepsilon \xi \omega \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \xi \omega\) Μ, \(\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \xi \omega \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \xi \omega\) (\(\varepsilon \xi \omega \ \theta \varepsilon \nu\) \(\varepsilon \xi \omega \ \theta \varepsilon \nu\)) PW.

46) See ibid., p. 106.2. L. Daly, op. cit., p. 88, translates this whole sentence rather freely and for our phrase he essentially adopts the reading of the *Westermanniana*.

47) Perry, Aesopica I, p. 204: “\(\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \varepsilon \xi \omega \ \text{R, fort. recte} \)”.

48) The asyndetic expression cited by La Penna and in E. Schwyzer, Gr. Grammatik, II, p. 701, to whom La Penna refers, shows only that the omission of \(\kappa \alpha \iota\) is permissible – not necessary (see, e. g., Preisigke – Kiessling, s. v. \(\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \varepsilon \xi \omega\)). The Modern Greek parallel μέσα \(\varepsilon \xi \omega\), which Papathomopoulos adduces in support of the emendation \(\varepsilon \xi \omega \ \varepsilon \sigma \omega\), actually supports the word-order proposed here (\(\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \xi \omega\)) rather than the one he favors. Furthermore, in Modern Greek both the asyndetic and the co-ordinate expressions occur (μέσα \(\varepsilon \xi \omega\) or μέσα κι’ \(\varepsilon \xi \omega\)).
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possible verb forms\textsuperscript{50}). Nevertheless, the form \textit{φιλιάσας} in the \textit{Perriana} should not be touched, because it makes good sense in the passage, it belongs to a verb known from several other sources (\textit{φιλιάζω})\textsuperscript{61}, and it appears even in several manuscripts of the \textit{Westermanniana}\textsuperscript{52}). On the contrary, the reading of the \textit{Westermanniana} text (\textit{φιλιωθείς}) seems dubious. Since both the \textit{Perriana} and a basic family of the \textit{Westermanniana} mss. (SBP) coincide in reading \textit{φιλιάσας}, which is also the \textit{lectio difficilior} of the \textit{Westermanniana} mss., it seems that \textit{φιλιάσας} should be printed in the text of both versions.\textsuperscript{60}

Some Addenda to \textit{LSJ} and Other Dictionaries

The \textit{Aesop Romance} has been a rich quarry which has yielded many new Greek words, forms, meanings, and uses.\textsuperscript{64}) The first scholar to explore systematically that aspect of the text was Perry, and many of the words that he noted have already found their way in the recent (1968) Supplement to \textit{LSJ}. The quarry is not yet exhausted, and below we are listing new words, forms, and meanings culled from the \textit{Aesop Romance}\textsuperscript{55), which are not found in \textit{LSJ} or \textit{LSJ Suppl.} Of course, words, meanings etc. not found in the Greek dictionaries in general\textsuperscript{56}) are also recorded.

\textsuperscript{50}) In addition to \textit{φιλιάσας} the \textit{Westermanniana} mss. provide the variants \textit{φιλωθείς} and \textit{φιλήσας}; see Perry, \textit{Aesopica}, I, p. 205, ad loc.

\textsuperscript{51}) See, e. g., \textit{LSJ}, s. v. \textit{φιλία}; \textit{LSK}, s. v. \textit{φιλιάζω}; G. W. H. Lampe, \textit{A Patristic Gr. Lexicon}, s. v. \textit{φιλιάζω} and E. A. Sophocles, \textit{Lexicon}, s. v. \textit{φιλιάζω}. See also \textit{Aesop's fable no. 6 successors} \textit{φιλιάσανων}. There is also a mime by \textit{Herodas} entitled \textit{Φιλιώθονται}...

\textsuperscript{52}) See Perry, ibid., p. 205, where \textit{φιλιάσας} is listed as the reading of SBP. Perhaps also the isolated reading of cod. \textit{W}: \textit{φιλήσας}, which was adopted by A. Westermann in his edition (p. 154,14), may have resulted from trivialization of \textit{φιλιάσας}.

\textsuperscript{53}) The reading \textit{φιλωθείς} is retained in the text of the fable also in the edition A. Hausrat - H. Hunger, \textit{Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum}, I, 2, Leipzig (Teubner) 1959, no. 302 (p. 111), which follows essentially the text of the \textit{Westermanniana}. Hence, if it is changed to \textit{φιλιάσας} in the \textit{Westermanniana}, it should be changed in the fable as well.

\textsuperscript{54}) See B. E. Perry, Some Addenda to \textit{Liddell} and \textit{Scott} (above note 33); the words listed by Perry are noted again – almost with no additions of new words – by W. H. Hostetter, \textit{A Linguistic Study}, pp. 108-114 and 114-121; see also \textit{X. X. Xeriptoxidh}, \textit{Kritikai}, in: \textit{Plátow}, 4, 1952, 110 (he lists mostly words already listed by Perry); \textit{I.-Θ. Παπαδήμητρον}, \textit{Συμβολή I}, pp. 255–256 and 265–67; \textit{Συμβολή II}, pp. 241–44.

\textsuperscript{55}) With the exception of no. 8 below.

\textsuperscript{56}) The dictionaries and other publications checked are the following: \textit{LSJ}, \textit{LSJ Suppl.}; \textit{LSK}; \textit{Stephanus' Thesaurus}; the dictionaries of G. W.
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1. ἀναγκαῖα, τά = latrina, toilet; Westermanniana, ch. 67, p. 93, 35-36: ὅταν καθεξής ὁμοῦ εἰς τὰ ἀναγκαῖα and ibid., 37-38: σοφὸς τίς... πολὸν χρόνον ἐκαθέζετο εἰς τὰ ἀναγκαῖα. This meaning is attributed only to the singular in LSJ9, which mentions only one source. For comments on this meaning and further documentation see Ε.Δηναίου (= a pen-name of Χ. Χ. Χαρίτονίδης), Ἀπόφαση, Θεσσαλονίκη 1935, pp. 196–97; cf. ibid., p. 189; Φαίδ. Κουκουλέ, Βυζαντινών Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός, vol. 4, Αθήνες 1951, p. 310.

2. δωρεά, ἦ = endowment, talent; Perriana, ch. 6, p. 37,27–28: ἐπειεύν δε καὶ τάς... Μούσας ἐκάστην τι τῆς ἴδιας δωρεᾶς χαρίσασθαι. This meaning of the word is not found in any of the works listed above (notes 54 and 56).

3. ἀναγκασίας, ἦ = admiration (or perhaps, astonishment); Perriana, ch. 23, p. 42,28–29: καθηγητά... τι τῆς σῆς ἀναγκασίας τος ἄξιον; This meaning not in LSJ9, but see G.W.H. Lampe, s. v. ἀναγκασίας.

4. θρόλυμα, τό = ὁ θρόος, sound (chatter) of birds; Perriana, ch. 6, p. 37,15–16: καὶ πουκίλων δονέον καὶ πολυνόμων ἢχει τὸ θρόλυμα. This meaning of the word is not found in any of the works listed above (notes 54 and 56); W.H. Hostetter, A Linguistic Study, p. 109, gives “common talk” as the meaning of the word57), but it is clear that this cannot be accepted for our passage.

5. ἰεράσιος, ὁ, ἦ = ἱερὸς; Perriana, ch. 117, p. 71,22: ἱερασίου βασιλέως and ibid., p. 72,1: ἱερασίον Βουβάστεως.58)

6. καθαίρετος, ὁ (adj.) = ἔξαφετος (see LSK, s. v. ἔξαφετος, and Λημητράκος, s. v. ἔξαφετος 3 and 4); Perriana, ch. 16, p. 40,

H. Lampe, W. Bauer (transl. W.F. Arndt – F.W. Gingrich), Du Cange, E. A. Sophocles, Preisigke – Kiessling; H. Van Herwerden, Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum; the Ἦτωρονιον λέξεων τῆς νέας ἐλληνικῆς, which is being published by the Academy of Athens; the Μέγα λέξεων issued by Λημητράκος (see above note 36); Ἡ. Κοαιμανόθη, Συναγωγή λέξεων ἀθηναϊστῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐλληνικοῖς λέξικοις; the Εὐφημίων to the first 45 vols. of the Journal Ἀδηνα; the Gesamt-Register to the 20 first vols. of Glotta; the papers of R. Renehan, Greek Lexicographical Notes, in: Glotta 46, 1968, 60–73; ibid. 47, 1969, 220–34; ibid. 48, 1970, 93–107; ibid. 49, 1971, 65–85; ibid. 50, 1972, 38–60 and 156–81; the papers of Th. Drew-Bear, Some Greek Words, in: Glotta 50, 1972, 61–96 and 182–228; the special studies cited in the preceding footnote.

57) This is the meaning given to the word in LSJ9, which cites only one reference.

58) Hostetter, op. cit., p. 117 notes the word, but she misinterprets it.
22–23: ἐπεισιγχεται οὖν ὁ Ἅισωπος καὶ θεωρεῖ παιδὰς καλλίστους, πάντας καθαρέτους, ὡς Διονύσου καὶ Ἀπαλλάνας.59)

7. κοινὸς, ὁ (subst.) = written debt-agreement; synonym in the Perriana, ch. 122, p. 73,1: δανείον γραφῇ; Perriana, ch. 122, p. 73, 5–6: ὁ δὲ Ἅισωπος ἐξβάλων τὸ χειρόγραφον ἔφη “ἀνάγνωστε τὸν κοινὸν τοῦτον.” This meaning of the word is not found in any of the works listed above (notes 54 and 56).

8. παρευθημένος: see above note 36.

9. προσποιέομαι = to take notice; Perriana, ch. 64, p. 56,3: ὁ ἄγροικος οὖν προσεπιστάτω. This meaning of προσποιέομαι is not recorded in LSJ9 and the other works listed in notes 54 and 56, with the notable exception of the Lexicon of Bauer (transl. Arndt and Gingrich), where it is listed s. v. προσποιέω 2, and accompanied by two references to a religious text. In Stephanus' Thesaurus, s. v. προσποιέω, among the numerous passages cited therein two or three are included in which the verb seems to have the meaning suggested here. It is noteworthy that in all the instances mentioned above the verb is used in a negative form.

10. φλογή, ἡ = sun-heat, burning (of sun-rays); Perriana, ch. 28, p. 45,11–13: “τρία βουλόμενος ἐκφυγεῖν φαῦλα... ζεστότητα γῆς, οὗρον δημιοῦσα, καὶ φλογὴν ἥλιον.” The word is not found in any of the works listed above (notes 54 and 56).

11. φυσικά, τά = excreta; Perriana, ch. 67, p. 56,33–34: ἐνός ἑτο τοῦ κυλίδιον (= κυλίδιον) τοῦ Ξάνθου τῶν φυσικῶν καλούντων αὐτὸν εἰς ἀποχώρησιν. The meaning is further clarified by the narrative that follows ibid.
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