

CHARACTERS AND NAMES IN THE *VITA AESOPI*
AND IN THE *TALE OF AHIQAR*
PART II: THE ADOPTIVE SON

This article forms the conclusion of a more extensive study, the first part of which has appeared in the previous issue of *Hyperboreus*.¹ The former part was dedicated to two of the central characters of Ahiqar's story:² the Assyrian king and the executioner that saves the hero. They were renamed respectively Lykoros and Hermippos in the section of the *Vita Aesopi* that is based on *Ahiqar* (ch. 101–123, the so-called “Babylonian section”). The present, second part will focus on another important character of *Ahiqar* and of the Babylonian section: the hero's adoptive and treacherous

¹ See I. M. Konstantakos, “Characters and Names in the *Vita Aesopi* and in the *Tale of Ahiqar*. Part 1: Lykoros and Hermippos”, *Hyperboreus* 15 (2009): 1, 110–132. Throughout the article references to the *Vita Aesopi* follow the editions of F. Ferrari, *Romanzo di Esopo* (Milano 1997) for the G version, M. Papat homopoulos, *Ὁ Βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου. Ἡ παραλλαγή W* (Athens 1999) for the recension MORN, and G. A. Karla, *Vita Aesopi. Überlieferung, Sprache und Edition einer frühbyzantinischen Fassung des Äsopromans* (Wiesbaden 2001) for the recension BPT hSA of the Westermanniana.

² For the text and translation of the earliest version of *Ahiqar*, the Aramaic papyrus of Elephantine (late 5th c. BC) see A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1923) 212–226; B. Porten, A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* III. *Literature, Accounts, Lists* (Jerusalem 1993) 24–53; other translations in F. C. Conybeare, J. R. Harris, A. S. Lewis, *The Story of Ahikar. From the Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Old Turkish, Greek and Slavonic Versions* (Cambridge 2nd 1913) 168–173 (henceforward to be cited as CHL); P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* (Paris 1972) 432–451; J. M. Lindenberger, “Ahiqar. A New Translation and Introduction”, in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* II (London 1985) 494–507. For the later versions of *Ahiqar* see CHL 1–23 (Slavonic), 24–85 (Armenian), 86–98 (Old Turkish), 101–127 (Syriac), 130–161 (Arabic); R. Schneider, “L'histoire d'Ahiqar en éthiopien”, *Annales d'Éthiopie* 11 (1978) 147–152 (Ethiopic); M. Gaster, “Contributions to the History of Ahiqar and Nadan”, *JAS* 21 (1900) 302–309 (Romanian); M. A. Danon, “Fragments turcs de la Bible et des Deutérocannoniques”, *JA* (sér. 11) 17 (1921) 113–122 (Turkish). For more information on *Ahiqar* and its tradition see the first part of this study.

son. In all extant versions of *Ahiqar* the young man, whom the wise vizier adopts and destines for his successor, is Ahiqar's own nephew – in most cases, more specifically, the child of Ahiqar's sister.³ In the *Vita*, however, this relation of kinship could not be preserved, due to the different context of the narrative. The wise hero was now Aesop, who came to Lykoros' kingdom from abroad, as a stranger; he was originary of a different region, Phrygia (ch. 1), far away from Mesopotamia, and arrived at Babylon as a travelling sophist, after he had served for a long time as a slave in Samos and then roamed about the world, giving lectures to audiences (ch. 101). So Aesop could not possess family ties and natural relatives, such as siblings or nephews, in Lykoros' land. For this reason, the *Vita*-Author made his hero simply adopt a young local nobleman, whom Aesop chanced to meet in Babylon (ch. 103). The original story of Ahiqar was thus adapted to Aesop's different biography and adventures.

In the preserved text of Elephantine the name of the nephew adopted by Ahiqar is mentioned once with the form *ndn*;⁴ this is regularly transcribed by editors as Nadin, a widely attested Akkadian name, borne by several scribes and officials in the Neo-Assyrian state.⁵ Presumably in the original *Tale of Ahiqar* the young man's name was Nadin or Nadinu (these are the commonest forms found in Neo-Assyrian documents). In the Syriac and Arabic versions the name is vocalized as Nadan. From this latter variant are derived the forms of the name found in the other

³ The papyrus of Elephantine, though very lacunose at this point, preserves identifiable traces of the phrase “son of my/his sister” in three passages near the beginning of the narrative: see Porten, Yardeni (n. 2) 26–29 (vv. 6, 12, 25); Cowley (n. 2) 212, 220–221; Grelot (n. 2) 433, 448. Most of the later versions clearly describe the same relationship: see CHL 1 (Slavonic), 24–25, 36, 39–40, 51, 56, 73, 82 (Armenian), 99, 102 (Syriac), 131–132, 138–139, 145, 156 (Arabic); Schneider (n. 2) 147 (Ethiopic); Gaster (n. 2) 302 (Romanian). Only the Old Turkish text (CHL 87, 95–96, 98) designates the young man as son of Ahiqar's brother. Possibly the Turkish redactor misunderstood the term of kinship used in his Armenian model and mistranslated “sister's son” as “brother's son”.

⁴ See Cowley (n. 2) 212 (v. 18), 220; Porten, Yardeni (n. 2) 28–29 (v. 18); cf. Grelot (n. 2) 448; Lindenberger (n. 2) 495.

⁵ See K. L. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names* (Helsingfors 1914) 165; L. Waterman, *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire* (Ann Arbor 1930–1936) I, 232–233, 274–275, 348–349; II, 36–39, 108–109, 234–235, 274–275, 434–435; III, 147, 231; I. M. Konstantakos, *Ακίχαρος. Η Διήγηση του Αχικάρ στην αρχαία Ελλάδα* (Athens 2008) I, 175 with more references and bibliography.

later versions (Anadan in the Slavonic, Nathan in the Armenian etc.).⁶ These forms may have arisen either from adjustment of the name to the particular phonetics of each language or from textual corruption during the cross-lingual transmission of the text. In the *Vita Aesopi* the corresponding character's name varies from one version to another: in the G he is called Ἡλῖος, in the Westermanniana (both recensions) Αἶνος. In cod. Vind. theol. gr. 128 (14th c.), which preserves only Aesop's exhortations to his adoptive son (ch. 109–110), apparently excerpted from an old manuscript of the *Vita*, the name is given as Αἶνος.⁷ In *P.Oxy.* 3720 (3rd c. AD), which offers a fragment of the Babylonian section, the young man's name is mentioned once (col. I v. 9), but at that particular point the text is faded and illegible; practically only the final sigma can be discerned. According to M. W. Haslam, the name could be Αἶνος or Λἶνος, while Ἡλῖος seems less likely; but given the condition of the papyrus, nothing is certain.⁸ Consequently, unlike what happened in the case of Lykoros, the manuscript tradition of the *Vita* does not offer a definitive answer as to the original form of the son's name. Αἶνος would appear to be favoured, if this (or its corrupt variant Λἶνος, for which see below)

⁶ See CHL 1 ff. (Slavonic), 24 ff., 56 ff. (Armenian), 99 ff., 102 ff. (Syriac), 131 ff. (Arabic). Some inferior Armenian manuscripts retain the form Nadan, as do also the Old and later Turkish texts (CHL 24, 87 ff.; Danon [n. 2] 118 ff.). See in general Lindenberger (n. 2) 483. From Nadan are also ultimately derived, through successive corruptions, the variants of the ungrateful youth's name found in the manuscripts of the Greek text of Tob. 11, 18 and 14, 10 (Ναδάβ, Ναβόδ, Νασβᾶς, Ναβᾶς, Ναμάν, Ἀμάν, Ἀδάμ, Ἀδόδ); see R. Hanhart, *Tobit* (Göttingen 1983) 154, 181–182; Konstantakos (n. 5) I, 161 with further bibliography. Obviously, the distortion of the name began from an early age.

⁷ See B. E. Perry, *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* (Haverford 1936) 32, 174; idem, *Aesopica. A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition That Bears His Name* (Urbana 1952) 17, 21–22, 69–70. The antiquity of the source of this codex is indicated by certain mistakes evidently due to misreading of capital letters; note also the state of the exhortations themselves, which are here more complete and better transmitted than in the extremely lacunose and corrupt text of G, as well as free from the alien interpolations found in the Westermanniana manuscripts.

⁸ So M. W. Haslam in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 53 (1986) 152, 154–155, 163, with due caution. Unjustifiably, some scholars, misguided by Haslam's *exempli gratia* supplement in v. 9, consider it as certain that the name on the papyrus was Αἶνος or Λἶνος (see e. g. Ferrari [n. 1] 219; C. Jouanno, *Vie d'Ésope* [Paris 2006] 179).

was the reading of the quite old *P.Oxy.* 3720. But as practically nothing can be discerned on the papyrus, the reading Ἡλῖος cannot be excluded.⁹ Thus, in order to discover the authentic form of the name, we need to examine the suitability of each variant for the adoptive son's role in the plot of the *Vita*.

The name Αἴνος suits the young man in various respects. αἴνος is the oldest Greek term for the fables of "Aesopic" type, the literary genre of which Aesop was regarded by the ancients as the emblematic representative.¹⁰ So, it can serve as an appropriate name for Aesop's son: according to an age-old Greek habit, traceable already in Homer, the son's name refers to some quality or activity of his father – in Ainos' case, to Aesop's literary genre and output.¹¹ We may also discern here a tendency manifested elsewhere too in the Greek biographical traditions about poets or authors, especially of the archaic age: the story of a writer's life is enriched with invented personages, who are usually presented as direct blood relatives of his (parents or children) but are in fact personifications or allegorical incarnations of the literary genre cultivated by the writer in question.¹² For instance, Archilochos seems to have presented himself in a poem as the son of a slave-woman called Enipo (fr. 295 W = Ael. *Var. hist.* 10, 13, drawing from a report of Kritias, 88 B 44 DK). This figure

⁹ Generally on the variants of the name see Perry, *Studies* (n. 7) 32; A. La Penna, "Il romanzo di Esopo", *Athenaeum* 40 (1962) 267; B. Holbek, "Äsop", *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* 1 (1977) 887; P. Gómez, "Αἴνος: El Fill d'Isop", *Lexis* 5–6 (1990) 81–88; Ferrari (n. 1) 43, 219; Karla (n. 1) 54; N. Kanavou, "Personal Names in the *Vita Aesopi* (*Vita G* or *Perriana*)", *CQ* 56 (2006) 211–212, 215; Jouanno (n. 8) 176, 179.

¹⁰ See Hes. *Op.* 202; Archil. fr. 174, 1 and 185, 1 W; and later Call. *Iamb.* 4, fr. 194, 6 Pfeiffer (cf. Δηγήσεις VII, 7 = I p. 177 Pf.); Theoc. 14, 43; Diod. Sic. 33, 7, 5; Konon 42 (= Phot. *Bibl.* 186, 139 b 8) etc.

¹¹ See e. g. Hom. *Il.* 6, 402–403: Hector's son was called Astyanax, for οἶος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτώρ. In *Od.* 19, 407–409 Odysseus is christened according to the same principle, though from a quality of his grandfather, rather than of his father. Cf. the names of the children of other Homeric heroes: Telemachos (of Odysseus), Eurysakes (of Ajax), Megapenthes (of Menelaos), Iphianassa, Chrysothemis and Laodike (of Agamemnon), Euneos (of Jason), Periphetes (of the herald Kopreus), and Mantios (of the seer Melampous). See H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen. Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation* (Göttingen 1982) 31–33; S. West in A. Heubeck, S. West, J. B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* I (Oxford 1988) 91–92.

¹² On this tendency cf. Gómez (n. 9) 85–88.

was doubtless fictional: ἐνιπή means “reproof, abuse, taunt”, and so Enipo is essentially a personification of the iambic blame-poetry composed by Archilochos.¹³ The later biographical tradition willingly adopted the poet’s allegorical invention, treating it as a real person (see the passages of Kritias and Aelian). Similarly, Kleoboulos of Lindos, who acquired fame as a creator of riddles, was given, already from the 5th c. BC, a daughter called Kleoboulina, who was also renowned for her riddles. This Kleoboulina most probably began as a fictional incarnation of her father’s literary activity, a kind of “personification” of the riddles which had made Kleoboulos famous; and subsequently she grew into an autonomous legendary figure, with the result that various stories were created about her (see the comedies *Kleoboulinaí* by Kratinos and *Kleoboulina* by Alexis, and her appearance in Plutarch’s *Banquet of the Seven Sages*).¹⁴ Whoever introduced the name Ainos (whether the *Vita*-Author himself or the redactor of a subsequent version of the *Vita*) was presumably aware of this biographical motif and inspired by it to name the adoptive son after Aesop’s literary genre.

The name Ainos also points to an aspect of the young man’s role in the plot. The term αἶνος is etymologically related to a group of words denoting counsel or exhortation (αἰνέω and its compounds παραινέω, παραινέσις etc.), and it carries itself relevant connotations: the αἶνος is a tale told for a specific purpose, often to advise or admonish or teach a lesson to the addressee.¹⁵ It is precisely such admonitions that Aesop offers to his adoptive son in the Babylonian section of the *Vita*: when the king reinstates Aesop, the hero takes the unfaithful young man with him, in order to teach him a lesson, and addresses to him a long series of moral precepts, which advise him how to behave in various occasions in his life (ch. 109–110). It thus seems appropriate that the young man is named Ainos,

¹³ Cf. M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin – New York 1974) 28, 122; G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore – London 1979) 247–248; M. G. Bonanno, “Nomi e soprannomi archilocher”, *MH* 37 (1980) 72, 84–85; Gómez (n. 9) 87; C. G. Brown, “Iambos”, in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden – New York – Köln 1997) 50.

¹⁴ See I. M. Konstantakos, “Amasis, Bias and the Seven Sages as Riddlers”, *WJA* N. F. 29 (2005) 14–16.

¹⁵ On this meaning of the word see especially Nagy (n. 13) 238–239 and Konstantakos (n. 5) II, 130 with further bibliography.

since it is he who receives the moral admonitions (αἶνοι) of Aesop.¹⁶ For these reasons, many scholars believe that Ainos must have been the authentic name of the adoptive son in the original *Vita*.¹⁷

The form Λῖνος in cod. Vind. theol. gr. 128 is clearly a corruption of Αἶνος – confusion of capital A and Λ being a common scribal mistake.¹⁸ This also explains the irregular accentuation of the name with a circumflex: Λῖνος, both as a proper name and as a substantive, normally has a short iota; this prosody was already established in Homer and Hesiod and standardly retained in subsequent writers.¹⁹ The circumflex on the Λῖνος of cod. Vind. 128 is obviously due to the provenance of that reading from the circumflexed Αἶνος. Therefore, the name Λῖνος can be excluded, and the source of cod. Vind. 128 may be regarded as one more testimony in favour of the form Αἶνος.

Only one scholar, M. W. Haslam, has conversely argued that Αἶνος may be a corruption of an original Λῖνος, because this latter name, given its connections with Apollo, would suit the anti-Apollonian theme of the *Vita*.²⁰ However, Apollo's relationship with Linos in the mythological tradition is not at all similar to that of Aesop with his adoptive son in the Babylonian section. In one group of stories Linos is presented as a victim and, overtly or implicitly, an antagonist of Apollo: according to Pausanias (9, 29, 6–7), Linos was the most celebrated musician of all times and boasted that he could compete with Apollo, for which reason Apollo killed him. Another version (Diog. Laert. 1, 4) relates that Linos was a great poet, whom Apollo shot with his bow: the emphasis on Linos' poetic skill implies again that the cause of his death was Apollo's envy. According to a third tale, Linos was the first to abandon the strings of

¹⁶ Cf. Nagy (n. 13) 238–239; Kanavou (n. 9) 215.

¹⁷ See La Penna (n. 9) 267; Nagy (n. 13) 239; Gómez (n. 9) 83–88; Ferrari (n. 1) 43; M. J. Luzzatto, “Sentenze di Menandro e ‘Vita Aesopi’”, in M. S. Funghi (ed.), *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico I* (Firenze 2003) 36; Kanavou (n. 9) 215; Jouanno (n. 8) 176, 179.

¹⁸ Cf. Perry, *Aesopica* (n. 7) 17; Gómez (n. 9) 83–84, 88; Jouanno (n. 8) 179; Kanavou (n. 9) 211, 215.

¹⁹ See Hom. *Il.* 18, 570; Hes. *fr.* 305 M–W; further Theoc. 24, 105; epigram in Diog. Laert. 1, 4; Nonn. *Dion.* 41, 376; Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 56; Ov. *Am.* 3, 9, 23 etc. Cf. F. Greve, “Linos”, in W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* II, 2 (Leipzig 1894–1897) 2053; Kanavou (n. 9) 211–212, 215.

²⁰ Haslam (n. 8) 152.

linen, which were used until then for lyres, and to introduce strings made of animal intestines, and for this innovation Apollo killed him (Philochoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 207; Sch. Hom. *Il.* 18, 570 c–d); in this case too Linos practically attempts to surpass Apollo by improving the god’s emblematic instrument. In all these stories Linos looks very much like Aesop in the *Vita*: he stands up against Apollo, attempts to compete with him in music and is slain as a result, just as Aesop puts himself in the god’s place as leader of the Muses (see ch. G 100 and G 123 of the *Vita*) and pays with his life for it. Consequently, the name Linos is not suitable for Aesop’s adoptive son, who is an enemy of Aesop and tries to destroy him, i. e. acts in accordance with the wishes of Apollo, contrary to the mythical Linos.

In another group of myths Linos appears as a son of Apollo, but there too he presents striking similarities to Aesop. Apollo impregnates Psamathe, the daughter of Krotopos the king of Argos, and she gives birth to Linos. Fearing her father, the girl exposes her infant, and some hounds from Krotopos’ flocks find it and tear it to pieces (or, in another version, a shepherd picks the child up and his hounds accidentally kill it). Apollo is infuriated and sends a plague to the Argives, until they are forced to expiate Linos’ death.²¹ Here Linos is an innocent victim, unjustly slain, like Aesop who is unjustly condemned in Babylon and in Delphi. Linos’ death is not directly caused by Apollo, but the god is to a certain extent culpable for it (since he left Psamathe pregnant and then abandoned her and her baby); similarly, Apollo does not himself directly kill Aesop but is responsible for his death. Finally, the community which caused Linos’ death is punished with a plague and obliged to make amends, just like the Delphians with regard to Aesop’s murder (see *Vita* ch. 142). So, in this story too the figure of Linos does not tally with the role of the adoptive

²¹ This story is narrated, with some variations in details, by Paus. 1, 43, 7–8, Konon 19 (= Phot. *Bibl.* 186, 133 b 26 ff.), and Stat. *Theb.* 1, 571–668; it was included in Kallimachos’ *Aitia* (fr. 26–31 Pf.); see also Ov. *Am.* 3, 9, 23–24; Mart. 9, 86, 4; and for Linos as Apollo’s son cf. Theoc. 24, 105–106; Nonn. *Dion.* 41, 376; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1, 3, 2; *Certamen* 4 West; Asklepiades of Tragilos, *FGrHist* 12 F 6b (= Sch. [Eur.] *Rhes.* 895); Charax, *FGrHist* 103 F 62 (= Suda o 251); Suda λ 568; Phot. *Lex.* λ 326; Hyg. *Fab.* 161; Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 56–57; Phaedr. 3 Prol. 57. Generally on the myths about Linos see Greve (n. 19) 2053–2057, 2062; H. Abert, W. Kroll, “Linus (1)”, *RE* 13, 1 (1926) 715–717; J. Boardman, “Linus”, *LIMC* 6, 1 (1992) 290.

son in the *Vita*. By contrast to Lykoros, Linos cannot stand as a representative or an *alter ego* of Apollo, and so his name is not suitable for an enemy and persecutor of Aesop.

On the other hand, the name Ἥλιος fully suits the anti-Apollonian tendency of the *Vita*. Apollo was regarded as a sun-god and occasionally identified with the sun, already from the 5th c. BC and more commonly in later times.²² A character named Helios could obviously function in the narrative as a representative of Apollo, and so this name was appropriate for an enemy of Aesop. Just as Apollo hates and destroys Aesop, inducing the Delphians to insidiously frame him, so Helios too dislikes the hero and attempts to have him killed, treacherously ensnaring him himself; to achieve his purpose, Apollo acts through the inhabitants of Delphi, the “Lykoreis”, while Helios acts through King Lykoros. For this reason, the name Helios seems to be much more in accordance with the logic of the narrative and with the name-giving tactics of the *Vita*-Author. As shown in the first part of this study,²³ the *Vita*-Author systematically takes account of the anti-Apollonian theme in naming the characters of the Babylonian section: he gives to the (temporarily) hostile Babylonian king a name related to Apollo and Delphi, while consciously avoiding the use of a derivative of Apollo

²² In ancient literature Apollo is identified with Helios, the sun, from the 5th c. BC onwards (clearly in Euripides and certain Presocratics, possibly already in Aeschylus); literary testimonies extend to the imperial age (including Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and many Roman poets); see K. Wernicke, “Apollon”, *RE* 2 (1896) 19–21; L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* IV (Oxford 1907) 137–138; O. Jensen, “Helios”, *RE* 8 (1913) 75–76; N. Yalouris, “Helios”, *LIMC* 5, 1 (1990) 1007. Initially, the identification may have been the result of philosophical speculation and allegorization, and thus championed only by a small group of learned men or by the adherents of particular philosophical movements (such as Orphics and Pythagoreans); see P. Boyancé, “L’Apollon solaire”, in *Mélanges d’archéologie, d’épigraphie et d’histoire offerts à Jérôme Carcopino* (Paris 1966) 149–170. However, from Hellenistic times onwards, the merge of Apollo and Helios becomes evident in art and monuments (votive reliefs etc.), which come from the great traditional centres of Apollo’s cult in Greece (Delphi, Delos), as well as from the Hellenized East (Asia Minor, Syria). Therefore, Apollo’s association with the sun must have eventually passed into the cult (*pace* Farnell, 136–143, 316–317) and gained wider acceptance: see W. Lambrinudakis *et al.*, “Apollon”, *LIMC* 2, 1 (1984) 244–246, 248; Yalouris, *op. cit.*, 1031–1032.

²³ See above, n. 1.

for Aesop's saviour. By analogy, we would expect the same principle to apply to the adoptive son's case. It would indeed be strange if the *Vita*-Author, while giving an Apollonian name to the Babylonian king, who is an enemy of Aesop only temporarily, due to involuntary error, and finally gets reconciled with the hero, would yet employ an irrelevant name, without any Apollonian connotations, for the adoptive son, Aesop's chief enemy, who organizes the entire intrigue against the hero and bears the prime responsibility for his misfortunes.

Moreover, it is significant that other elements introduced by the *Vita*-Author into the Babylonian section also point to the sun (and through it to Apollo). These elements occur in the riddle-contest, in which Aesop (like Ahikar in the oriental model) represents his own Mesopotamian king and solves the problems posed by the Egyptian monarch. In ch. 119–120 of the *Vita* the Egyptian king Nektanebo invites the prophets from Heliopolis to help him in the riddle-contest against Aesop; they confront the hero and propound to him a riddle about the year, purportedly at the instigation of their god, but Aesop finds the solution without difficulty. These prophets of Heliopolis do not appear in any known version of the *Tale of Ahikar*: in all redactions preserving the relevant episode, the Pharaoh alone poses to Ahikar the riddle of the year, entirely by himself, without the intervention or mediation of any priests or counselors; and Ahikar accordingly gives the reply directly to the Pharaoh.²⁴ The prophets of Heliopolis are clearly an addition of the *Vita*-Author. This addition lends appropriate local colour to the Egyptian episode, weaving into the narrative the name of a particular Egyptian locality and enriching the plot with characters typical of Egyptian life and customs. But it also introduces an allusion to Helios, the sun, and thus implicitly recalls the conflict between Aesop and the Apollonian element: Aesop's contest with the priests of the city of Helios foreshadows his harsher later conflict with the inhabitants of another city of Apollo/Helios, Delphi. In another episode of the riddle-contest of the *Vita* (ch. 112–115), King Nektanebo and his attendants make a sequence of appearances before Aesop, each time dressed in different clothes and colours, and the hero is required each time to find an appropriate simile for their appearance. Aesop successively compares them to (a) the moon and the stars, (b)

²⁴ See CHL 20 (Slavonic), 49, 81 (Armenian), 121 (Syriac). The Arabic, Ethiopic and Romanian versions omit this episode.

the sun of springtime and the fruits of the earth, and (c) the sun and its rays.²⁵ The comparisons with the moon and stars and with the sun and its rays are also found in the corresponding episode of *Ahiqar*, but regarding comparison (b) all the known texts of *Ahiqar* differ from the *Vita*: instead of the “springtime sun and the fruits”, the various versions of *Ahiqar* mention the spring month Nisan (or April) and its flowers, or the spring vegetation in general (the forest and the grass, or the grass and its blossoms).²⁶ Here too the divergence of the *Vita* from *Ahiqar* is presumably due to the intervention of the *Vita*-Author: he purposefully introduced the element of the sun (ἡλίῳ τῷ τῆς ἔαρινῆς ὥρας) into the comparison with the springtime and its vegetation, so as to add to his text one more reference to the solar and Apollonian element. Significantly, in both the aforementioned cases the solar element is directly connected with King Nektanebo (the Heliopolitan priests function as Nektanebo’s helpers, the springtime sun as a comparison for Nektanebo’s appearance); and Nektanebo is also an opponent of Aesop in the plot, trying to trap and overcome the hero with his tricky riddles.

As it transpires, the *Vita*-Author alludes to the anti-Apollonian theme several times within the Babylonian section: he keeps marking the enemies of Aesop with distinctly solar-Apollonian elements, presumably in order to foreshadow the culmination of the hero’s conflict with Apollo in the following, Delphic section of his narrative. In essence, all those who try to harm Aesop in the final two sections of the *Vita* (the Babylonian king, Nektanebo, the inhabitants of Delphi) are in one or the other way

²⁵ The full sequence of simile-riddles can be best seen in the MORN recension of the Westermanniana, which preserves the description of all three appearances of Nektanebo, as well as all three answers of Aesop (see Papathomopoulos [n. 1] 125–127). In the G the comparison with the springtime sun and the fruits has gone missing in a lacuna comprising most of ch. 114 (see Ferrari [n. 1] 228–231). In the BPTSA recension the episode is abridged (see Karla [n. 1] 223–224): the comparison with the moon and the stars is omitted; the appearance originally corresponding to it has been joined with the comparison to the springtime sun, while the description originally connected with the springtime sun has also been suppressed.

²⁶ See CHL 19 (Slavonic: the shimmer of the forest and the colour of the grass), 48 (first Armenian: the green grass and the blossoms), 118 (Syriac: the month Nisan and its flowers), 150 (Arabic: the month of April and its flowers); Schneider (n. 2) 151 (Ethiopic: the month Nisan and the spring flowers). The second Armenian and the Romanian version omit the simile-riddles.

associated with Apollo. The unfaithful son who schemes against Aesop should not be an exception to this rule: the logic of the narrative calls for an association of that personage too with Apollo, and the only such connection traceable in the extant versions of the *Vita* is the name Helios. This strongly indicates that Helios was the name originally given to the young man by the *Vita*-Author.²⁷

On the contrary, the name Ainos, though suitable for the young man in some respects, does not harmonize so well with his *basic* role in the plot. The adoptive son's essential function in the narrative is that he machinates against Aesop and tries to exterminate him, and yet the name Ainos does not allude at all to this function. By contrast, in the entire narrative of the *Vita* the $\alpha\hat{\iota}\nu\omicron\iota$ /fables are often beneficial to Aesop: they ensure his great fame and success (both in the *Vita* ch. 100 and in the overall Greek tradition) and also save him on certain occasions, by altering the initially hostile intentions of powerful groups or persons, like the Samians (ch. 97–98) and Kroisos (ch. 99–100).²⁸ Therefore, it is not plausible, in narrative terms, that their name should be borne by a malicious enemy aspiring to Aesop's extermination. Even the allegorical dimension of the

²⁷ The referees of *Hyperboreus* remark that Helios was unusual as a personal name. Indeed, it seems to have been uncommon in actual life: the published volumes of *LGPN* (I–V.A) collectively record 72 attestations of the name, coming from a broad range of Greek-speaking areas (Aegean islands, Thessaly, Macedonia, Asia Minor, Scythia and South Russia, South Italy). Significantly, almost all cases date from the imperial period and a very large number of them belong to the 1st or 2nd c. AD, i. e. to the very time that the *Vita* was composed; cf. Kanavou (n. 9) 211–212. Anyhow, the relative rarity of the name in ordinary life does not constitute an argument against its use in the original *Vita*. First of all, the rival name, Ainos, was far more uncommon in actual circumstances: *LGPN* records only 6 instances of it, of which merely two are dated in the imperial age. Secondly and more importantly, the use of these names in everyday life is not relevant in our case: we are not dealing here with realistic names taken from actuality in order to ensure verisimilitude, but with symbolic names, artfully chosen (or invented) by the *Vita*-Author in order to match the peculiar character and role of the corresponding personages. Their occurrence or non-occurrence or commonness or rarity in actual life is of as little importance as e. g. that of the names Philokleon and Bdelykleon in Aristophanes' *Wasps*.

²⁸ Even in the last, Delphic section, where this motif is reversed, the fables do not cause any damage to Aesop: they may lose their beneficial power, since Aesop is no longer able to persuade with his fables the Delphians and escape death; but they do not in themselves harm the hero nor do they contribute in any way to his destruction.

name Ainos seems artificial and rather clumsily adapted to the context of the Babylonian section. The name points to Aesop's literary activity: therefore, in order for the name to be credible, Aesop himself should appear choosing and giving it to his adoptive son, consciously christening him after a quality of his own, according to the age-old Greek practice. Yet, in the Westermanniana it is only stated that Aesop adopted a young nobleman called Ainos (ch. 103): in this way, the fact that the young man's name quite accidentally matches Aesop's activity looks like an artificial coincidence, not really justified by any narrative expediency.²⁹ So, the name Ainos seems secondary: it is more likely to have been introduced by a later redactor, who facetiously considered it as an appropriate speaking name for Aesop's son, but did not pay attention to the discrepancy between this name and the son's role in the plot nor did he care for the artificial coincidence thus created.

For these reasons, I find it more likely that the son's name in the original *Vita* was Helios.³⁰ The name Ainos must have been introduced in a later ad-

²⁹ This charge cannot apply to the name Helios, because the latter serves a basic narrative theme of the *Vita*, from which the names of other characters are also inspired, and so the coincidence is legitimate from a narrative point of view. In terms of plot, the name Helios can be regarded as a bad omen which Aesop imprudently overlooks: given his tense relations with Apollo, the hero should have been mindful enough not to adopt a man with the ominous name Helios. But Aesop disregards this and pays for his imprudence, as the young man fulfills the ill portents of hostility imminent in his name.

³⁰ Cf. Holbek (n. 9) 887; F. R. Adrados, "The 'Life of Aesop' and the Origins of Novel in Antiquity", *QUCC* n. s. 1 (1979) 97. La Penna (n. 9) 267 suggests that the name Helios derives from some oriental version of *Ahiqar*, in which the adoptive son bore a corresponding "solar" name (a common occurrence in Mesopotamia, given the diffusion of the cult of the solar god Shamash; cf. Gómez [n. 9] 88; G. Ragone, "La schiavitù di Esopo a Samo. Storia e romanzo", in M. Moggi, G. Cordiano [eds.], *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell' 'oikos' e della 'familia'* [Pisa 1997] 137). But this seems far-fetched: in all known versions of *Ahiqar* the son's name is Nadin (or a kindred form); it is arbitrary to postulate a putative version in which the young man's name would have been completely different, all the more so since the name Helios can be more plausibly explained on the basis of the plot of the *Vita*. Kanavou (n. 9) 215 argues that the various Greek forms of the son's name represent different attempts to Hellenize the oriental name found in *Ahiqar*. However, Αἴνος, Λῆνος and Ἡλιος do not bear the slightest phonetic similarity to Nadin and its other kindred forms, nor are they in any way semantically akin to them: so it seems impossible that the former could ever function as Hellenized forms of the latter.

aptation, probably as part of the suppression of the anti-Apollonian theme, which was discussed in the first part of this study (see above, n. 1).³¹ The name Lykoros did not betray so plainly its Apollonian connotations and was thus saved from the censorship (although it too was distorted with the passage of time). But the name Helios manifestly connected the vicious traitor of Aesop with solar Apollo, and therefore it had to be eliminated, along with the other indications of the god's hostility. From that censored adaptation are ultimately descended the Westermanniana, in which the name Ainos is standardly used, and the source of cod. Vind. 128, in which the name was corrupted into Linos. If in *P.Oxy.* 3720 the name was Ainos or Linos, we must suppose that the suppression of the anti-Apollonian tendency and the replacement of the original Helios had taken place already from a very early age, before the 3rd c. AD, when the papyrus is dated, i. e. not long after the composition of the original *Vita*. There is nothing improbable in this. The most opportune period for the censorship of the anti-Apollonian elements was precisely the time near the creation of the original *Vita*, when the ancient faith in the Olympian gods was still vigorous enough and the hero's anti-Apollonian attitude could still severely embarrass some of the faithful. By contrast, in the following, early Byzantine centuries, with the predominance of Christianity and the abandonment of the pagan cults, very few would truly care about the Delphic god any longer.

³¹ The enmity between Aesop and Apollo is inherent already in the old legend about Aesop's death at Delphi, which was current from the 5th c. BC (see Ar. *Vesp.* 1446–1448; Hdt. 2, 134, 3–4; Perry, *Aesopica* [n. 7] 220–223). Aesop's quarrel with the inhabitants and the priests of Delphi might easily be taken to imply more broadly an inimical attitude towards their patron, the Delphic god himself. Indeed, Aesop, as a low-class figure and proponent of a popular, down-to-earth sagacity, appeared to be the ideal adversary of Apollo, the aristocratic god of high-brow and transcendent wisdom. In Greek mythology there was a small but distinct group of tales about conflicts of Apollo with lower figures that challenged the god's wisdom and artistic skill and fell victims to his wrath and cruel vengeance: see e.g. the stories about Linos (examined above) and Marsyas (see conveniently T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* [Baltimore-London 1993] 95 for ancient testimonies). The clash between Apollo and Aesop may have developed within the same tradition. It thus seems likely that the *Vita*-Author took over the anti-Apollonian stance from the earlier legends about Aesop and exploited it further, turning it into a basic constituent of his own narrative. For more detailed discussion of this theme see the first part of this article, section 2 (with extensive bibliography in nn. 33–37).

But there is also an alternative possibility. Perhaps in the original *Vita* both names, Helios and Ainos, were employed for the young man: the latter would initially bear the name Helios, and Aesop, when adopting him, would give him the new name Ainos, in order to mark him as his own son, christening him anew after his own peculiar activity. With such a scenario, both the connection with the anti-Apollonian theme would be ensured and at the same time the artificial coincidence of the designation Ainos would be avoided: the name Ainos would appear as a choice of Aesop himself, as an attempt of Aesop to appropriate the young man and to impart to his adoptive son a share of his own wisdom, which was mainly expressed through αἶνοι; in essence, it would be the onomastic equivalent of Aesop's effort to educate his son with his moral precepts (see ch. 103 and 109–110). Subsequently, after the suppression of the anti-Apollonian theme, the name Helios was eliminated from the censored version, and Ainos remained there as the only name of the young man, who thus appeared bearing this name from the beginning. In the G, on the other hand, the name Ainos was for some reason omitted, due either to abridgement or to oversight. Indeed, the G has omitted the very first mention of the young man's name in the narrative. In the Westermanni-ana the name is given for the first time in ch. 103, at the first appearance of the young man, when Aesop adopts him:³² this is entirely plausible and should be authentic. In the G, however, the name is not given at that point: the young nobleman adopted by Aesop remains awkwardly anonymous; but a little later (ch. 104), when Aesop gets condemned to death, it is reported that “Helios” took over Aesop's office, without any explanation as to who is this Helios;³³ and from that point onwards the name Helios is regularly used for Aesop's adoptive son (ch. 108–110). Obviously, the first reference to the young man's name, extant in the Westermanni-ana and presumably also in the original *Vita*, must have dropped out from G 103. Possibly, therefore, the original *Vita* stated at ch. 103 that the young man's name was Helios and that Aesop, in adopting him, renamed him

³² See e. g. the MORN recension (Papathomopoulos [n. 1] 115): Ὁ δὲ Αἴσωπος ἄτεκνος ὦν ἰδιοποίησατο παῖδα εὐγενῆ ὀνόματι Αἶνον. Similarly in the BPTHSA (see Karla [n. 1] 217).

³³ G 103: Ὁ δὲ Αἴσωπος ἐπιγνούς τινα εὐγενῆ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, ἄτεκνος ὑπάρχων τοῦτον υἷον ἐποίησατο. 104: Ὁ δὲ Ἥλιος παρέλαβεν τὴν διοίκησιν τοῦ Αἰσώπου. See Ferrari (n. 1) 216–218.

Ainos: it was this very statement that was omitted from the G, and so only the name Helios was left in the rest of the narrative.

Ioannis M. Konstantakos
University of Athens,
Faculty of Philology

Гл. 101–123 романа об Эзопе (*Vita Aesopi*) основаны на ближневосточной “Сказке об Ахикаре”. Автор *Vita* заимствовал из “Сказки” приключения главного героя, но внес ряд изменений в обстановку и имена персонажей. Неблагодарный юноша, носящий имя “Надин” в “Ахикаре”, по-разному именуется в редакциях *Vita*: Аинос (*Westermanniana*), Гелиос (G), Лин (древний эксцерпт *Vita*, cod. Vind. theol. gr. 128); указания папирусов в данном случае ненадежны. Имя “Аинос” соответствует некоторым аспектам роли юноши в сюжете *Vita*: оно указывает на литературный жанр произведений Эзопа и вместе с тем на его роль как адресата его нравственных наставлений (αἴτιοι); однако это имя irrelevantно для основной функции его носителя, его предательской вражды по отношению к Эзопу. Напротив, имя “Гелиос” указывает на солнечного бога Аполлона, врага Эзопа в *Vita*, и, таким образом, превосходно соответствует роли этого персонажа. Это делает вероятным, что имя “Гелиос” он носил первоначально, затем оно было заменено на “Аинос” в той редакции, в которой мотив вражды Аполлона был исключен по идеологическим соображениям. Наконец, форма Λίνοσ представляется собой результат рукописного искажения имени Αἴνοσ.