

EPICETUS

GERARD J. BOTER

(VU University Amsterdam)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	2
Bibliography.	10
Composite Editions.	14
I. <i>Dissertationes.</i>	16
Translations.	
1. Carolus Valgulius (2.11.12–4.13.24).	
2. Jacobus Schegkius.	
3. Hieronymus Wolfius.	
Commentaries.	
a. Jacobus Schegkius.	
b. Hieronymus Wolfius.	
II. <i>Encheiridion.</i>	27
Translations.	
1. Nicolaus Perottus.	
2. Angelus Politianus.	
3. Hieronymus Verlenius.	
4. Thomas Naogeorgus.	
5. Hieronymus Wolfius.	
6. Anonymus Parisinus (1–21).	
7. Christianus Francken.	
8. Ludovicus Odaxius (rejected).	
9. Jacobus Schegkius (rejected).	
Commentaries.	
a. Hieronymus Verlenius.	
b. Thomas Naogeorgus.	
c. Hieronymus Wolfius.	
d. Christianus Francken.	
III. Fragments.	52
Translations.	
1. Hieronymus Verlenius.	
2. Hieronymus Wolfius.	
Commentaries.	
a. Hieronymus Verlenius.	
b. Hieronymus Wolfius.	

FORTUNA*

The sources for the life of Epictetus are scanty. First we have the records in Epictetus' own works. Then there are the ancient testimonia in other authors assembled by Heinrich Schenkl.¹ These are based almost exclusively on three sources: the *Noctes Atticae* by the second-century A.D. Latin author Aulus Gellius (1.2.6–13; 2.18.10; 15.11.5 = Schenkl, test. VIII–X), the commentary on the *Encheiridion* by the sixth-century Greek philosopher Simplicius, and the entry in the tenth-century lexicon *Suda* (E 2424 [2.365.24–27 Adler] = Schenkl, test. XXI).

*This account owes much to existing discussions of Epictetus and his influence on later generations. Special mention should be made of the contributions by A. Jagu, M. Spanneut, and J.-E. d'Angers, "Épictète," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, vol. 4.1 (Paris, 1960), 822–54; M. Spanneut, "Epiktet," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 5 (Stuttgart, 1962), 599–681; P. P. Fuentes González, "Épictète," in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 3 (Paris, 2000), 106–51. A splendid general account of the influence of Stoicism is found in M. Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme* (Gembloix, 1973). For bibliographical work on Epictetus, the following works are indispensable: W. A. Oldfather, *Contributions toward a Bibliography of Epictetus* (Urbana, Ill., 1927); Oldfather, *Contributions toward a Bibliography of Epictetus. A Supplement*, ed. M. Harman (Urbana, Ill., 1952).

In the course of my work on this article, I have received help from many persons and institutions. It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to them. The librarians of the following libraries have helped me by sending reproductions of manuscripts and editions, and by supplying information: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek; Bern, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek; Boston, Boston Public Library; Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár; Casale Monferrato, Biblioteca del Seminario; Cologne, Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek; Dublin, Trinity College Library; Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek; Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale; Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek; Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek; London, British Library; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France; St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsional'naia Biblioteka; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; Toulouse, Bibliothèque Municipale; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek; and Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek. Dr. Paul Botley (Warburg Institute, London) has identified the author of the first extant Latin translation of the *Diatribes* as Carlo Valgilio (see I.1 below). Prof. Virginia Brown† has been my never-failing guide in every aspect of my work. My colleague Dr. Harm-Jan van Dam has commented on an earlier draft and given me valuable bibliographical information. Mrs. Ilke Vermeer has corrected my English.

1. H. Schenkl, *Epictetus, Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1916; repr. Stuttgart, 1965), test. III–XV.

At the beginning of the preface to his commentary on Epictetus' *Encheiridion*, Simplicius remarks that Arrian, to whom we owe all the extant works of Epictetus, "wrote about the life and death of Epictetus . . . and that we can learn from him what kind of man he was in life."² Some scholars claim this means that Arrian wrote a full-scale biography of Epictetus; others believe that Simplicius refers to some remarks concerning Epictetus' life and death in lost parts of the *Diatribes*.³

From the *Suda* we learn that Epictetus was born at Hierapolis in southern Phrygia, at an uncertain date, probably about A.D. 50. An inscription from Pisidia (Schenkl, test. XIX) states that he was born of a slave mother.⁴ Whether or not this is true,⁵ it is certain that he came to Rome as a slave in the household of Epaphroditus, a freedman and secretary of Nero. While in Rome, Epictetus was able to attend the lectures of Musonius Rufus, of whom he often speaks with profound admiration. Musonius' teaching made an indelible impression on Epictetus; it is now generally assumed that Musonius was the only important philosopher whose lectures Epictetus followed.⁶

At some time before A.D. 94 Epictetus must have been freed from slavery, because in that year he was banished from Rome by Domitian, along with other philosophers. He went to Nicopolis in Epirus, where he founded a school. The alleged meeting between Epictetus and the emperor Hadrian is usually supposed to have taken place in Nicopolis, although some scholars hold that the two met in Athens.⁷

2. I. Hadot, ed., *Simplicius, Commentaire sur le Manuel d'Épictète. Introduction & édition critique du texte grec* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 1996), 192.1–4; Hadot, ed. and trans., *Simplicius, Commentaire sur le Manuel d'Épictète, chapitres I à XXIX* (Paris, 2001), 1.4–8.

3. See Hadot, *Simplicius* (1996), 152–57; S. Follet, "Arrien de Nicomédie," in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1994), 602; Fuentes González, "Épictète," 111–12.

4. See now D. S. du Toit, *Theios Anthropos. Zur Verwendung von theios anthropos und sinnverwandten Ausdrücken in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Tübingen, 1997), 182–87, 408–9; cf. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 47 (Amsterdam, 1997), no. 1757.

5. The name Epictetus means "acquired," but this is no proof that he became a slave only later in life; the same name is also attested for free citizens (G. Germain, *Épictète et la spiritualité stoïcienne* [Paris, 1964], 183 n. 7; Fuentes González, "Épictète," 113–14).

6. See Fuentes González, *ibid.*, 115 (with the references given there).

7. *Ibid.*, 116 (with the references given there).

The date of Epictetus' death is even less certain than that of his birth. Generally, it is placed about 125–30; however, the *Suda* states that he lived until the time of Marcus Aurelius (161–80), and Georgius Syncellus (Schenkl, test. V) places his *floruit* during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–61).

Epictetus is one of the three major representatives of the so-called New Stoia, the others being Lucius Annaeus Seneca the Younger (B.C. 1–A.D. 65) and the emperor Marcus Aurelius (121–180). He belongs to the orthodox type of Stoicism, harking back to the founders of the school: Zeno (B.C. 335–263), Cleanthes (B.C. ?–238), and Chrysippus (B.C. ?–208/4), but totally neglecting the representatives of the Middle Stoia, Panaetius (ca. B.C. 185–109) and Posidonius (ca. B.C. 135–50).⁸ Epictetus was also strongly influenced by Plato, Socrates, and Diogenes.⁹ The principal concern in his extant works is ethical; this does not mean that logic is neglected, but the study of logic is always ancillary to ethics.¹⁰ For Epictetus, the primary goal of philosophy is to attain absolute freedom. Man should attach importance only to those things which are under his control, such as his opinions, desires, aversions, etc.; all things outside his control should be dismissed as unimportant. If man succeeds in attaching importance exclusively to the things under his control, he will be completely free, and therefore completely happy.

The extant works of Epictetus can be divided into three groups. The bulk is constituted by the four books of *Dissertationes* (normally designated *Diatribes* in English). Secondly, we have the *Encheiridion* or *Manual*, which can be regarded as a synopsis of Epictetus' philosophy and is based on the *Diatribes*. Thirdly, there are a number of fragments from lost parts of the *Diatribes*

8. See P. Hadot, *La citadelle intérieure. Introduction aux Pensées de Marc Aurèle* (Paris, 1992), 89–117 (“Le Stoïcisme d’Épictète”).

9. For the influence of Plato, see A. Jagu, *Épictète et Platon. Essai sur les relations du stoïcisme et du platonisme, à propos de la morale des Entretiens* (Paris, 1946); for Socrates, see A. A. Long, *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (Oxford, 2002), 67–96, with further references; J.-B. Gourinat, “Le Socrate d’Épictète,” *Philosophie antique. Problèmes, renaissances, usages* 1 (2001) 137–65. For Diogenes, see M. Billerbeck, ed. and trans., *Epiktet, Vom Kynismus* (Leiden, 1978).

10. See P. de Lacy, “The Logical Structure of the Ethics of Epictetus,” *Classical Philology* 38.2 (1943) 112–25; J. Barnes, *Logic and the Imperial Stoia* (Leiden, 1997), 24–145.

and scattered sayings attributed to Epictetus in various *gnomologia*. The fragments are collected in Schenkl, 455–75 (his numbering is standard); the large majority have been preserved in Stobaeus' *Anthologium*. Further Epictetean material is found in various *gnomologia*, edited by Schenkl, 476–96; the so-called *Florilegium of Democritus, Isocrates, and Epictetus* was edited by Wachsmuth.¹¹ In addition, there are three certainly spurious Latin works belonging to the question-and-answer genre in which Epictetus plays an important role (see section “Late Antiquity” below): the *Alteratio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi*, the *Disputatio Adriani Augusti et Epicteti*, and the *Conversation of Adrian and Epictetus*, which in turn inspired the *Enfant Sage* in the thirteenth century. All these works have hardly anything in common with the real Epictetus except his name.

The *Diatribes* give a lively picture of Epictetus' teaching. Usually Epictetus discusses with members of his audience. In some cases the interlocutor is introduced explicitly, as in 1.11, which opens with the words Ἀφικομένου δέ τινος πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἐν τέλει (“When an official came to see him”). In other cases the interlocutor is anonymous or may even be fictitious; see, for instance, 4.1.151 Σὺ οὖν, φησίν, ἐλεύθερος εἶ; (“So you, he said, are free?”). Often there are very abrupt transitions; the train of thought is sometimes hard to follow. Time and again, Epictetus stresses that it is deeds, not words, that count; see, e.g., 2.10.29 τὴν προαίρεσιν δὲ πότερον αἰδήμονα καὶ πιστὴν ἔχομεν ἢ ἀναίσχυντον καὶ ἄπιστον, οὐδὲ ἐγγὺς διαφερόμεθα πλὴν μόνον ἐν τῇ σχολῇ μέχρι τῶν λογαρίων (“yet the question whether we are going to have a moral purpose characterized by self-respect and good faith, or by shamelessness and bad faith, does not so much as begin to disturb us, except only insofar as we make it a topic of trivial discussion in the classroom” [Old-father's translation]). The language is simple and unembellished koine Greek.

The *Encheiridion* has a more expository character and so lacks the liveliness of the *Diatribes*, although there are some echoes of discussions (e.g., chapter 24). Some chapters consist of an

11. C. Wachsmuth, *Studien zu den griechischen Florilegiern* (Berlin, 1882; repr. Amsterdam, 1971). See also G. Martino, “Una nuova recensione dello gnomologio democriteo-epitteteo,” *Bollettino dei Classici*, 3d Ser., 2 (1981) 104–19.

aphorism, e.g., chapter 8, Μὴ ζήτει τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι ὡς θέλεις, ἀλλὰ θέλε τὰ γινόμενα ὡς γίνεται, καὶ εὐροήσεις (“Do not seek to have events happen as you wish, but wish them to happen as they do happen, and all will be well with you”).

Later authors use several terms in referring to the works of Epictetus: διατριβαί, λόγοι, ὑπομνήματα, ἀπομνημονεύματα, δόμιλαι, διαλέξεις, σχολαί. This diversity has caused much discussion: are all these terms just various designations of the *Diatribes*, or do they indicate different types of works?¹² Further, there are varying reports about the number of books. On the basis of the extant fragments and of the parts of the *Encheiridion* not matched by parts of the extant *Diatribes*, it is certain that we do not have the complete works; but the quantity of what was lost remains a matter of speculation.

Although some scholars assume that Epictetus is responsible for at least part of the composition of the written works,¹³ it is almost universally accepted that Epictetus did not publish anything himself: everything that remains of his teaching is owing to the work of his pupil Arrian.¹⁴ Opinions vary with regard to the character of Arrian’s report of Epictetus’ teaching. Some scholars hold that Arrian made stenographic reports of Epictetus’ lectures, so that the *Diatribes* represent Epictetus’ *ipsissima verba*;¹⁵ others believe that Arrian freely composed the *Diatribes*, using as a basis what he had heard from Epictetus.¹⁶ Still others take up a position between these two extremes: allowing for literary fiction and idealization, they explain the language of the *Diatribes* as an attempt to imitate Epictetus’ speech.¹⁷

12. A succinct and clear account is given by Fuentes González, “Épictète,” 119–21.

13. See for instance H. W. F. Stellwag, *Epictetus, Het eerste boek der Diatriben* (Amsterdam and Paris, 1933), 11–13; R. Dobbin, *Epictetus, Discourses Book I* (Oxford, 1998), xxix–xxiii. In the *Suda* entry (= Schenkl, test. XXI) it is stated that Epictetus wrote many books (ἔγραψε πολλά).

14. For Arrian, see CTC 3.1–20.

15. E.g., K. Hartmann, “Arrian und Epiktet,” *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 15 (1905) 248–75; A. B. Bosworth, “Arrian’s Literary Development,” *Classical Quarterly*, N.S., 22.1 (1972) 163–85.

16. E.g., T. Wirth, “Arrians Erinnerungen an Epiktet,” *Museum Helveticum* 24 (1967) 149–89, 197–216.

17. E.g., P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill, 1980), 26–28. On the entire question, see Fuentes González, “Épictète,” 122–23 (with the references given there).

With regard to the *Encheiridion*, Simplicius remarks in the preface to his commentary that Arrian composed this work “picking from Epictetus’ words the most useful and necessary elements in philosophy, most appropriate to move the soul.”¹⁸ Taking these words from a lost letter of Arrian to Massalenus, Simplicius adds that more or less the same thoughts and words are found in the *Diatribes*.

The Greek text of the *Diatribes* is preserved in some twenty manuscripts. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. T. 4.13, (“Codex Saibantinus”), copied ca. 1100, is the source of the other extant witnesses; evidence for the derivation comes from the lacuna found in all the other manuscripts at the exact place in the text where a stain has rendered the passage illegible on fol. 25 of the Oxford codex.¹⁹

The Greek text of the *Encheiridion* and of its three Christian adaptations (for which see section “Late Antiquity” below) is preserved in more than one hundred manuscripts. The most important witnesses to the authentic *Encheiridion* are the following: Paris, BNF, suppl. gr. 1164 (s. XIV); Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Ambrosianus gr. 481 (L 43 sup.; s. XV); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. gr. 23 (s. XIV; this ms. contains only selections); Athens, National Library of Greece, Atheniensis 373 (s. XV).²⁰

LATE ANTIQUITY

Epictetus’ influence is well attested from the second century onwards. The inscription found in Pisidia has already been mentioned (Schenkl, test. XIX). There is another inscription, from Epidaurus, which reads Ἐπίκτητον τὸν εὐσεβέστατον ὁ φίλος (“His friend [honors] the most pious Epictetus”): Christian Blinkenberg believed that ὁ φίλος must be the emperor Hadrian, in which he is followed by B. Puech *ap.* Fuentes González, “Épictète,” 116.²¹ In the *Scriptores historiae augustae* (*Life*

18. Hadot (1996 edition), 192.4–11 = Hadot (2001 edition), 1.7–17.

19. See J. L. G. Mowat, “A Lacuna in Arrian,” *Journal of Philology* 7 (1876) 60–63; Schenkl, LIV–LXI.

20. For a full account of the transmission of the *Encheiridion* and its adaptations, see G. J. Boter, *The Encheiridion of Epictetus and Its Three Christian Adaptations* (Leiden, 1999), 3–263.

21. Chr. Blinkenberg, “Les inscriptions d’Épidaure,” *Nor-*

of Hadrian 16.10), it is stated that Hadrian was on very familiar terms with Epictetus.

The three epigrams from the *Anthologia Latina* (Schenkl, test. XVIII, XL, XLI) are of uncertain date, but they may well be ancient. One of them (test. XVIII) was known to Macrobius (Schenkl, test. XXXVI).

Following Spanneut, “Epiktet,” we will first pay attention to the knowledge of Epictetus in the pagan world, then to Christian authors.

In the second century Epictetus is a well-known figure in the Roman world. The explicit mention made by his contemporary Favorinus Arelatensis is preserved in the works of his pupil Aulus Gellius and in Galen. In *Noctes atticae* 17.19.6 (= Schenkl, fr. X) Gellius reports an account of Epictetus given by Favorinus, which ends with the famous motto ἀνέχον et ἀπέχον (“bear and forbear”); and in *Noctes atticae* 19.1.14–21 he makes a Stoic philosopher expound some elements of Epictetus’ philosophy. Galen mentions Epictetus twice in connection with Favorinus (*De optima doctrina* 1.41 and *De libris propriis* 19.44 in the edition by C. G. Kühn).

Marcus Aurelius (121–80) praises Epictetus lavishly in his spiritual autobiography (the *Meditations*). In the first book, which consists of a series of acknowledgments, Marcus thanks Rusticus for having brought to his notice the commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) of Epictetus. He quotes Epictetus on several occasions; in other places it is obvious that Marcus has been influenced by Epictetus. After the second century Epictetus’ influence in the Roman West strongly diminishes with the virtual disappearance of Stoicism.

In the Greek East Epictetus was less influential than in Rome during the second century. Lucian (ca. 125–after 180) mentions Epictetus five times (Schenkl, test. IV, XIII–XVI), relating the famous anecdote (test. XV) about the man who bought Epictetus’ earthenware lamp for the sum of 3000 drachmas in the hope that, if he read at night by the light of his lamp, he would become as wise as Epictetus. Celsus, whom we know from Origen’s *Contra Celsum*, is the first to tell the well-known story of how Epictetus’ leg was broken by his master Epaphroditus (Schenkl, test. XVII). In the corpus of letters ascribed to Philostratus,

disk Tidsskrift for Filologi, 3d Ser., 3 (1895) 153–78 at 157 (the article is a review of P. Cavvadias, *Fouilles d’Épidaure*, vol. 1 [Athens, 1891]).

there are two short letters addressed to Epictetus (nos. 65 and 69; Schenkl, test. XXII and XXIII).

In the third century Plotinus (204/205–70), the founder of Neoplatonism,²² shows unmistakable traces of Epictetus’ influence.²³ Themistius (*Or. 5* = Schenkl, test. XXX) mentions Epictetus as a favorite of the Antonines.

In the fifth and sixth centuries Epictetus was well known to the Athenian and Alexandrian Neoplatonists. Quotations from and references to his works are found in the works of Damascius (*Vita Isidori*; Schenkl, test. XLII), Proclus (*In Platonis Alcibiadem commentaria*; see Schenkl, test. XLIII), Hierocles (*In Carmen aureum*; see Schenkl, test. XXXVIII), and Olympiodorus (*In Platonis Gorgiam commentaria*, *In Platonis Alcibiadem commentaria*; see Schenkl, test. LIII). The *Encheiridion* is the primary source for the Neoplatonists; the *Diatribes* are hardly ever mentioned or referred to.²⁴ Simplicius’ monumental commentary on the *Encheiridion* is, of course, the most important source for the knowledge of Epictetus in this period. The interest of this work lies in the fact that he comments on a Stoic text from a Neoplatonist and Aristotelian point of view.²⁵

The relation of Epictetus to Christianity has been the subject of much debate.²⁶ In one place (4.7.6) Epictetus mentions the Christians (“Gallaeans”) in a disparaging manner. Even so, it has often been argued that Epictetus was influenced by Christian belief; in the Middle Ages he was widely regarded as a Christian (see Schenkl, test. LXI).

Early Christian authors such as Justin Martyr (100–165) and Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–211/216) do not mention or quote Epictetus directly, but in some places they show traces of his influence.²⁷ In the early third century Origen is the first Christian author to mention Epictetus explicitly. With regard to the practical value of his

22. For Plotinus, see CTC 7.55–73.

23. See Spanneut, “Epiktet,” 622–23.

24. The predominance of the *Encheiridion* over the *Diatribes* also becomes clear from the fact that Stobaeus (second half of the fifth century) quotes twenty-one passages from the *Encheiridion*, against only four passages from the extant books of the *Diatribes*.

25. For a full discussion, see Hadot (1996 edition), 51–111.

26. For a very full and instructive account of the matter, see Spanneut, “Epiktet,” 627–70.

27. Ibid., 632–40.

philosophy, he prefers Epictetus to Plato (Schenkl, test. XXVI).

Basil the Great (ca. 330–79), in *Ep.* 151, appears to paraphrase *Encheiridion* 8, and his statements may have been influenced in many other places by Epictetus.²⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus (ca. 329–89) mentions a number of times the episode of how Epictetus' leg was broken (Schenkl, test. XXXI–XXXIV), but he does not appear to be acquainted with Epictetus' works themselves. The third Cappadocian, Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 335–ca. 394), shows no knowledge of Epictetus or his work.

John Chrysostom (347–407) mentions Epictetus by name once (Schenkl, test. XXXV). Chrysostom was influenced by the Cynic-Stoic dia-tribe, the themes of which recur in Musonius, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius; therefore it is often impossible to distinguish between the various sources he consulted. But in a few places Epictetus' direct influence is obvious, for instance in *Homiliae in Acta apostolorum* 14.4 (PG 60, col. 118), where Chrysostom paraphrases *Encheiridion* 33.9.

In the Latin West the knowledge of Epictetus among the Fathers is restricted; indeed, he appears to have fallen into complete oblivion after the fifth century. Arnobius (d. ca. 330) mentions him once by name (Schenkl, fr. Xa). Ambrose (*De bono mortis* 8.31) paraphrases *Encheiridion* 5a. Augustine quotes (*De civitate Dei* 9.4.2) the account given by Gellius (Schenkl, fr. IX) and mentions Epictetus a few more times, but he does not appear to have direct knowledge of Epictetus' works.

The renewed interest in Epictetus among the Neoplatonist philosophers of the fifth and sixth centuries (see above) is not matched by contemporary Christians. Epictetus is mentioned by Palladius and Theodoreetus (Schenkl, test. XXXVIIa and XXXVIIa). Synesius and Procopius (Schenkl, test. XLVI) refer to *Encheiridion* 17, in which life is compared to the stage. Further knowledge of Epictetus during this period is restricted to second-rate authors, such as Ps.-Nonnus and Cosmas (Schenkl, test. XXXIa).

Epictetus' name is also found in three Latin *specimina* of the so-called question-and-answer dialogue. The oldest one is the *Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi* (AHE),

which consists of seventy-three very short questions asked by the emperor Hadrian and answered by Epictetus (for instance: Hadrianus "Quid est mors?"—Epictetus "Perpetua securitas" [H. "What is death?"—E. "Perpetual security"]); L.W. Daly assigns the work to the second or third century.²⁹ AHE is the source of the *Disputatio Adriani Augusti et Epicteti* (DAE), which consists of only twenty-one questions and answers, almost all of them taken from AHE. The third item is the *Conversation of Adrian and Epictitus* (AE), which was composed ca. 650, according to Suchier.³⁰ It was very popular in later times, as its numerous translations and adaptations attest. The most famous of these is the *Enfant Sage*, written in Southern France in the thirteenth century.

In the monasteries of the Greek East the *Encheiridion* was a great success.³¹ The work was reshaped no fewer than three times in order to suit the needs of the monks. The first of these adaptations is mistakenly assigned to Nilus Ancyranus (d. ca. 430) (*Nil.*); the second is traditionally designated as *Paraphrasis Christiana* (*Par.*); the third one, preserved in Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 2231 (*Vat.*), was not discovered until 1972 by Michel Spanneut.³² In *Nil.* and *Vat.* the text is only slightly modified: names of Socrates and others are replaced by names of Christians (Paul, Solomon, etc.), gods are reduced to the singular, and passages incompatible with Christian faith are omitted. The author of *Par.*, however, went much further: for instance, *Encheiridion* 11 on endurance is turned into a brief commentary on Job 1:21 (*Par.* 14) and, in the final chapter of the *Encheiridion*, quotations from Plato are replaced by suitable passages from the gospels (*Par.* 70–71). A Greek commentary on the first ten chapters of

29. L. W. Daly, *Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 24 (Urbana, Ill., 1939), 75–78. On the other hand, the work is assigned to the fifth century by E. Löfstedt, "Zur Datierung der *Altercatio Hadriani et Epicteti*," *Classica et mediaevalia* 7 (1945) 146–49.

30. W. Suchier, *Das mittellateinische Gespräch 'Adrian und Epictitus', nebst verwandten Texten (Ioca monachorum)* (Tübingen, 1955), 44–45.

31. For the Christian adaptations, see Spanneut, "Épictète," 835–42; the same, "Epiktet," 664–70; and Boter, *Encheiridion*, 149–263.

32. M. Spanneut, "Épictète chez les moines," *Mélanges de science religieuse* 29 (1972) 49–57.

Par. exists in three versions of varying length and was recently edited by Spanneut.³³

The dates of composition of these adaptations are unknown, and it is generally assumed that they cannot be earlier than ca. 500. An obvious *terminus ante quem* is provided by the oldest extant manuscripts: s. X for *Nil.* (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. gr. 131 [471]), s. X for *Par.* (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 55.4), and s. XIV for *Vat.* (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 2231).

Finally, another witness to the presence of the *Encheiridion* in the monastic world is Ps.-Antonius' *Philokalia*. This work, which comprises 170 very short chapters, is a slightly christianized version of a Stoic treatise probably composed ca. A.D. 200 (the date of the adaptation itself is unknown). In seventeen places the author quotes passages from the *Encheiridion*.

THE MIDDLE AGES

Epictetus turns up frequently in numerous Byzantine florilegia, such as the collections of sayings attributed to Maximus Confessor (PG 91.721–1018; probably ninth century) and to Antonius Melissa (PG 136.765–1244; eleventh century). In a number of manuscripts containing a selection from the *Encheiridion* the text is accompanied by scholia in Greek of a purely philological character.

Apart from some scattered records in figures such as Elias Cretensis, Eustathius, Tzetzes, and Cecaumenus, Epictetus received particular attention from the great scholars Photius (ninth century) and Arethas (ca. 900). The former mentions eight books of διατριβῶν and twelve books of ὄμιλίαν, plus a number of works which he had been unable to lay his hands on (*Bibliotheca*, “codex” 58). Arethas is regarded as the author of the

33. M. Spanneut, ed. and trans., *Commentaire sur la Paraphrase chrétienne du Manuel d'Épictète* (Paris, 2007). The commentary is preserved in fifteen manuscripts, of which the most important are Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 55.4 and Paris, BNF, gr. 1053. See M. Spanneut, “La tradition manuscrite d'un commentaire chrétien d'Épictète,” *Philologus* 108 (1964) 128–37; Spanneut, “Technique, morale et philosophie chrétienne dans un document grec inédit du IXe (?) siècle,” *Orpheus*, N.S., 2 (1981) 58–79; and A. M. Santerini Citi, “Il commento anonimo alla Parafrasi cristiana del Manuale di Epitteto,” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 51 (1979) 50–71.

scholia on Lucian, in which Epictetus is mentioned a number of times. Schenkl also regards Arethas as the author of the Greek scholia on the *Diatribes* contained in ms. Bodl. Auct. T. 4.13 (Schenkl, test. LXXIX–LXXXII). Finally, there is a brief entry in two manuscripts of the *Diatribes* (Schenkl, test. LXI) praising the usefulness of Epictetus to Christians.

In the medieval Arabic world, Epictetus exerted some influence on Arabic authors such as al-Kindi, Ibn-Fatik, Miskawayh, Rhazès, and Avicenna.³⁴ As is the case with the later Greek writers mentioned above, the primary source for their knowledge seems to have been the *Encheiridion*.

However, Epictetus seems to have been almost completely unknown in the Latin West, although his name figures in the question-and-answer works mentioned above. An exception is John of Salisbury (twelfth century; Schenkl, test. LVIII), who reports the story told by Aulus Gellius (*Noct. att.* 19.1.14–21; see above), probably drawing on the version given by Augustine.³⁵

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT³⁶

During the fifteenth century the Italian humanists reintroduced the study of Greek literature after a silence of almost a thousand years. The feverish activity of making Greek texts accessible to readers of Latin resulted in two translations of the *Encheiridion*.

Nicolaus Perottus (Niccolò Perotti) was the first to translate this work. He produced a Latin version in 1450 (II.1 below), possibly at the behest of Pope Nicholas V; preserved in nineteen manuscripts, the work was finally published in 1954.

More than twenty-five years later Angelus Politianus (Angelo Poliziano, Politian) rendered the *Encheiridion* into Latin for the second time. His 1479 translation (II.2 below) was dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici. It appeared in print

34. For a general account of the influence of Stoicism on Arabic thinkers, see F. Jadaane, *L'influence du stoïcisme sur la pensée musulmane* (Beirut, 1968).

35. John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 7.3, 8.1, ed. C. C. I. Webb (Oxford, 1909).

36. A superb account of the general history of the influence of Stoicism in this period is found in part 3, chapters 7 and 8 of M. Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme* (Gembloix, 1973), 213–382.

for the first time in 1497, three years after Politian's death, and was often reprinted until the translation of Hieronymus Wolfius (Wolf) (II.5 below), published at Basel in 1561 and based on much better sources, made this earlier rendering of the *Encheiridion* obsolete. From the dedicatory preface, it appears that Politian regarded the *Diatribes* as lost: "Huius [= Epicteti] de vita ac moribus ingens volumen, quod tamen olim culpa temporum interiit, Arrianus vir clarissimus conscripsit. . ." Moreover, he seems not to have known of the earlier version by Perotti.

The first extant Latin translation of the *Diatribes*, only partly preserved in one manuscript (Vatican City, BAV, Patetta 967), was made ca. 1500 by the Brescian scholar Carlo Valgilio (I.1 below).

It was in Italy, too, that the first Greek editions of Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion* (Venice, 1528) and the text of the *Diatribes* (Venice, 1535) were published. The Simplicius edition also contained the greater part of the *Encheiridion*, added as lemmata in the commentary. Epictetus' works inspired figures like Agostino Steuco (1496–1549), librarian of the Vatican Library, St. Ignatius Loyola (1491–1556), and St. Charles Borromeo (1538–84). The last named is even said to have read the *Encheiridion* daily. On the other hand, a certain silent opposition to Stoicism was mounted during the entire sixteenth century by men like Gasparo Contarini (1483–1542) and Giovanni Battista Crispi (ca. 1550–97); according to one hypothesis, this explains why Epictetus was ignored by seventeenth-century scholars in Italy.³⁷

In sixteenth-century France, Germany, and the Netherlands, the study of Stoicism in general and of Epictetus in particular was the special domain of Protestant scholars. The first edition of the complete *Encheiridion* in Greek was prepared by Gregorius Haloander (Gregor Hoffmann) and published in 1529 at Nuremberg; it served as the direct or indirect source of all subsequent editions up to Johann Schweighäuser's 1798 edition.³⁸ Hieronymus Verlenius published a Latin translation of the *Encheiridion* in 1543 at 's-Hertogenbosch, which was republished in 1550 at Antwerp; the few notes by Verlenius in the 1543 edition were considerably expanded

37. D'Angers, "Épictète," 850.

38. See Boter, *Encheiridion*, 58–82.

in the 1550 edition (II.3 and II.a below). Verlenius' 1550 edition also contains a commented Latin translation of the Epictetean fragments from Stobaeus (III.1 and III.a below). Jacobus Schegkiius (Jacob Schenck), who had already published a German translation of the *Encheiridion* at Basel in 1534³⁹ (the first translation into a vernacular language), published a Latin translation of the *Diatribes* in 1554 also at Basel (I.2 below), to which he added a very modest number of notes (I.a below); in the same year Thomas Naogeorgus (Kirchmaier or Kirchmeyer) published at Strasbourg a Latin translation of the *Encheiridion* with a full commentary (II.4 and II.b below). In 1563 Hieronymus Wolf published at Basel his great edition with Latin translations of Epictetus' complete works accompanied by commentaries (I.3, I.b, II.5, II.c, III.2, and III.b below); his rendering of the *Encheiridion* became extremely popular and was reprinted countless times until well into the eighteenth century. An anonymous translation of the first twenty-one chapters of the *Encheiridion* is found on some blank leaves in Bern, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Bong. I. 417 (1), an interleaved copy of the edition of the Greek text of the *Encheiridion* published at Paris in 1564 (II.6 below). In 1585, the German scholar Christian Francken published a Latin translation with commentary of the *Encheiridion* at Cluj (II.7 and II.d below); both the translation and the commentary are based largely on the commented edition by Thomas Naogeorgus. In France there appeared French translations of the *Encheiridion* by Antoine du Moulin (Lyons, 1544) and André de Rivaudeau (Poitiers, 1567).⁴⁰ Other sixteenth-century translations into vernacular languages include the Dutch translation by Marcus Antonius Gillis (Antwerp, 1564), the Italian translation by Giulio Ballino (Venice, 1564), and the English translation by James Sanford (London, 1567).⁴¹

At the end of the sixteenth century, Justus Lipsius, by then a fervent Catholic, was deeply

39. See F. J. Worstbrock, *Deutsche Antikerezeption 1450–1550*, part 1: *Verzeichnis der deutschen Übersetzungen antiker Autoren* (Boppard am Rhein, 1976), 68–69. Schenck's German translation is based on Politian's Latin translation, not on the Greek text.

40. See P. Chavy, *Traducteurs d'autrefois: Moyen Age et Renaissance*, vol. 1 (Paris and Geneva, 1983), 503–4.

41. The sixteenth-century vernacular translations of the *Encheiridion* are listed by R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge, 1954), 512–13.

impressed by Epictetus and tried strenuously to christianize Epictetus in his *Manuductio ad Stoicam philosophiam* (Antwerp, 1604). Lipsius' influence can be seen at work in France through French translations of the *Encheiridion* made by his pupils Guillaume du Vair (Paris, 1591), Jean Goulu (Paris, 1609) and le Père de Bouglers (Douai, 1632). Goulu's French translation of the *Diatribes*, published at Paris in 1609, was the first rendering of this text into a vernacular language; it was made at the behest of Queen Marguerite of France, to whom the work is also dedicated.⁴² In Germany, Lipsius' pupil Caspar von Barth claimed that Epictetus was actually a Christian.⁴³ In Spain, Spanish translations of the *Encheiridion* were made by Lipsius' pupils Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas (Salamanca, 1600), Gonzalo de Correas (Salamanca, 1630), and Francisco de Quevedo (Madrid, 1635).⁴⁴

During the same period there were other expressions of interest in Epictetus. For example, the Italian Jesuit Matteo Ricci (1552–1610), who worked as a missionary in China, composed his *Book of 25 Paragraphs* in Chinese, using the *Encheiridion* as the basic source.⁴⁵ Matthias Mittner (1575–1632), a German Carthusian, compiled an *Enchiridion cartusianum comprehendens aphorismos quinquaginta ad conservandam animi pacem plurimum facientes* for his confrères.⁴⁶ A meticulous adaptation of Epictetus' *Encheiridion*, this work is strictly applicable to life in a Carthusian monastery. In this respect, it is comparable to the Greek Christian adaptations of the *Encheiridion* (see above).

In the first half of the seventeenth century, opposition to the Christian interpretation of Epicte-

42. The next vernacular translation of the *Diatribes* was Jan Hendrik Glazemaker's Dutch version published at Amsterdam in 1657.

43. Caspar von Barth, *Adversariorum commentariorum libri LX* (Frankfurt, 1624), 53.10 (col. 2497 in the edition of Frankfurt, 1648).

44. T.S. Beardsley, *Hispano-Classical Translations Printed between 1482 and 1699* (Pittsburgh, 1970), 66, 82, 86–87; at p. 96, Beardsley mentions an anonymous Spanish translation, published in 1672. See also D. Rubio, *Classical Scholarship in Spain* (Washington, D.C., 1934), 81–82, 95, 103.

45. C. Spalatin, "Matteo Ricci's Use of Epictetus' *Encheiridion*," *Gregorianum* 56 (1975) 551–57.

46. The text was published for the first time in B. Pez, *Bibliotheca ascetica*, 12 vols. (Regensburg, 1723–40), vol. 5. It is also found in L.M. Guerrin, *Mathiae Mittner cartusiani opuscula*, vol. 2 (Currière, 1898), 277–323.

tus was voiced by such French scholars as St. Francis de Sales (1567–1622), Yves de Paris (1590–1678), Julien Hayneuve (1588–1663), Léon de Saint-Jean (1600–1671), and Jean-Pierre Camus,⁴⁷ and by Johannes Caselius (1533–1613), Méric Casaubon (1599–1671), Charles Daubus (1556–1630), Claude Saumaise (1588–1653), and others in northern Europe. Nonetheless, the Christian interpretation of Stoicism received a new impulse in France from the new edition of Epictetus published by Sébastien and Gabriel Cramoisy at Paris in 1653; Cardinal Alphonse de Richelieu (1582–1653), Gilles Boileau (1631–69), Jean-Marie de Bordeaux,⁴⁸ and others are among the major representatives of Lipsius' Roman-Catholic Stoicism in this period. The counter-movement which eventually prevailed emerged halfway through the century, with men such as Antoine Arnauld (1612–94), Nicolas Malebranche (1638–1715), Blaise Pascal (1623–62), and René Descartes (1596–1650)⁴⁹ in France, and Johann Franciscus Buddaeus,⁵⁰ Johann Albert Fabricius,⁵¹ and Michael Rossal⁵² in Germany and the Netherlands. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, Christian Stoicism had virtually ceased to exist.

The eighteenth century, however, showed a certain interest in the three representatives of the New Stoia, especially Epictetus.⁵³ An important edition with commentary was published at London by John Upton in 1739–41; his text of the *Encheiridion* was reprinted a number of times by Robert and Andrew Foulis. Elizabeth Carter published her influential English translation of the complete Epictetus at London in 1758. Christian Gottlob Heyne produced a new text of the *Encheiridion* (Dresden, 1756, 1776, 1783); Jean-Baptiste Lefebvre de Villebrune did the same (Paris, 1782, 1783, 1794–95). But all previous editions were superseded by the magnificent work of Johann Schweighäuser, whose editions of the

47. *Diversités*, 10 vols. (Paris, 1609–18).

48. *Épictète chrétien* (Paris, 1658).

49. For a brief account of Descartes' appreciation of Epictetus, see Long, *Epictetus*, 264–66; a full discussion is found in J.-E. d'Angers, "Sénèque, Epictète et le stoïcisme dans l'oeuvre de René Descartes," *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 4 (1954) 169–96.

50. *Analecta historiae philosophiae* (Halle, 1706).

51. *Bibliotheca graeca* (Hamburg, 1705).

52. *Disquisitio de Epicteto philosopho Stoico* (Groningen, 1708).

53. See Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme*, 318–42.

Encheiridion (1798) and of all Epictetean texts, including Simplicius' commentary (*Epictetae philosophiae monumenta*, 5 vols., Leipzig, 1799–1800), provided the standard for the next century; it still remains an inexhaustible source of pertinent observations. Outside the scholarly world, Epictetus is mentioned by men such as Anthony Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713), Frederick the Great (1712–86), and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78).

Epictetus continued to attract the attention of scholars in the nineteenth century. Adamantios Koraes published the complete Epictetus (with the exception of the fragments) in his Πάρεργα 'Ελληνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης (Paris, 1826–27). Friedrich Dübner was responsible for the Didot edition (Paris, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1871). Among non-classicists, Epictetus is mentioned in Europe by men such as Hegel, Nietzsche, and Leopardi; in North America, Walt Whitman was influenced by him. But the most important work was done in Germany at the turn of the century. In 1894 Heinrich Schenkl published the Teubner edition of the complete Epictetus; his text of the *Diatribes* is the first to be based on ms. Bodl. Auct. T.4.13 and it is still the standard edition. Adolf Bonhöffer published three monographs on Epictetus (*Epictet und die Stoa* [Stuttgart, 1890, repr. 1968]; *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epiktet* [Stuttgart, 1894, repr. 1968, English trans. New York, 1996]; *Epiktet und das Neue Testament* [Giessen, 1911]); these works occupy a prominent place in the literature on Epictetus up to the present day. In his last monograph, Bonhöffer dealt with the hotly debated issue of whether or not Epictetus might have been influenced by Christianity; he denied any direct relationship whatsoever between Epictetus and the New Testament. Although his book did not settle the matter once and for all, the current prevailing opinion is that Bonhöffer was right in rejecting any direct connection between Epictetus and Christianity.

Twentieth-century research on the Stoa received important impetus from the works of Hans von Arnim (*Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, 1903–5) and Max Pohlenz (*Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 2 vols., 1948–49 and later editions). Two commentaries on book 1 of the *Diatribes* were composed (Helena Wilhelmina Frederika Stellwag, 1933; Robert F. Dobbin, 1998); however, a full-scale commentary on

the complete works of this Greek philosopher is still eagerly awaited. Epictetus benefits from the renewed general interest in Hellenistic philosophy that is characteristic of the second half of the twentieth century. New translations of the *Encheiridion* continue to appear; some recent instances are an Italian translation by Enrico V. Maltese (1990), an English translation by Nicholas P. White (1983), and French translations by Jean-Baptiste Gourinat (1998) and Pierre Hadot (2000). A critical edition of the Greek text of the *Encheiridion* was published by Gerard J. Boter in 1999.

Epictetus also plays a role outside the scholarly world. During the First World War, the French philosopher Teilhard de Chardin developed a view of man's position in the universe which is so thoroughly permeated with Stoicism that he is even called a "nouvel Épicète."⁵⁴ In the field of psychotherapy Epictetus' teaching has been expressly advocated by Albert Ellis, for his so-called Rational-Emotive Therapy: the basis for this therapy is provided by the opening line of *Encheiridion* 5a: "People get upset not by what happens but by their opinions of what happens."⁵⁵ Epictetus figures prominently in Tom Wolfe's great novel *A Man in Full* (1998), in which a young man discovers Epictetus' work by chance while in prison: this encounter gives him the strength to endure his confinement; he escapes miraculously during an earthquake, which he believes to be the work of Zeus himself.⁵⁶

The twenty-first century has started promisingly for Epictetus with the publication of A. A. Long's impressive monograph *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (2002).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

W. A. Oldfather, *Contributions toward a Bibliography of Epictetus* (Urbana, 1927); Oldfather, *Contributions toward a Bibliography of Epictetus. A Supplement*, ed. M. Harman (Urbana, 1952);

54. Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme*, 373–79.

55. A. Ellis, "The Basic Clinical Theory of Rational-Emotive Therapy," in *Handbook of Rational-Emotive Therapy*, vol. 1, ed. A. Ellis and R. M. Grieger (New York, 1977), 3–34.

56. Wolfe's novel is discussed at some length by Long, *Epictetus*, 269–70.

M. Spanneut, “Épictète 1952–1962,” *Information littéraire* 14 (1962) 212–16; J. Hershbell, “The Stoicism of Epictetus: Twentieth-Century Perspectives,” ANRW 2.36.3 (1989), 2148–63.

II. MODERN EDITIONS, TRANSLATIONS, AND COMMENTARIES

A. Opera Editions

J. Schweighäuser, *Epicteteae philosophiae monumenta*, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1799–1800; repr. Hildesheim and New York, 1977); H. Schenkl, *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* (Leipzig, 1894; 2d ed. 1916).

Translation

W. A. Oldfather, *Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*, 2 vols., The Loeb Classical Library 131, 218 (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1925–28; repr. 1967, 2000).

B. Diatribes Editions

J. Souilhé and A. Jagu, *Épictète, Entretiens*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1943–63 and later editions).

For a description of the *codex unicus* Bodl. Auct. T. 4.13 and its apographs, see Schenkl, LIV–LXXIX and J. L. G. Mowat, “A Lacuna in Arrian,” *Journal of Philology* 7 (1876) 60–63.

Translations and commentaries

M. Billerbeck, *Epiktet: Vom Kynismus* (Leiden, 1978) (with the Greek text); commentary on 3.22; R. F. Dobbin, *Epictetus, Discourses, Book I* (Oxford, 1998); English translation with commentary on book 1 (without the Greek text); H. W. F. Stellwag, *Epictetus: Het Eerste Boek der Diatriben* (Amsterdam, 1933); Dutch translation with commentary on book 1 (without the Greek text).

C. Encheiridion Editions

J. Schweighäuser, *Epicteti Manuale et Cebetis Tabula graece et latine* (Leipzig, 1798); G. J. Boter, *The Encheiridion of Epictetus and Its Three Christian Adaptations* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 1999); Boter, *Epicteti Encheiridion* (Berlin and New York, 2007). All editions up to Boter’s depend on Schweighäuser’s edition.

For a description of the manuscripts and older editions, see Boter’s 1999 edition, 3–117.

Translations and commentaries

K. Seddon, *Epictetus’ Handbook and the Table of Cebes: Guides to Stoic Living* (London and New York, 2005): English translation with commentary (without the Greek text).

D. Fragments Edition

H. Schenkl (see above, A. *Opera*), 455–96.

E. Pseudepigraphical texts Editions

Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi (AHE) and *Disputatio Adriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi* (DAE): W. Suchier, *Die Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi, nebst einigen verwandten Texten*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 24 (Urbana, Ill., 1939), 104–7 and 112–13.

The Conversation of Adrianus and Epictitus (AHE): W. Suchier, *L’Enfant Sage: Das Gespräch des Kaisers Hadrian mit dem klugen Kinde Epitus* (Dresden, 1910), 265–72; Suchier, *Das mittellateinische Gespräch ‘Adrian und Epictitus’, nebst verwandten Texten (Joca monachorum)* (Tübingen, 1955), version AHE1a pp. 11–16; version AHE1b pp. 16–19; version AHE2 pp. 30–36.

III. GENERAL NOTICES

J.-E. d’Angers, A. Jagu, and M. Spanneut, “Épictète,” *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, vol. 4 (1960), 822–54 (1. *Doctrine* [A.J.]; 2. *Influence à l’époque patristique* and 3. *Épictète et le Moyen Age* [M.S.]; 4. *Période moderne* [J.-E. d’A.]); H. von Arnim, “Epiktetos,” PW 6.1 (1907), 126–32; P. P. Fuentes González, “Épictète,” *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 3 (2000), 106–51; M. Spanneut, “Epiktet,” *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 5 (1962), 599–681.

IV. EPICETUS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

K. Algra, ed., *Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1999); d’Angers-Jagu-Spanneut (1960) and Spanneut (1962) (III above); O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 2d ed., vol. 4 (Freiburg, 1924), 161–

78; Boter, *Encheiridion* (1999) (II.C above), 149–263; R. Cadiou, “Épictète et Galien,” *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 4th Ser. (1954), 94–101; P. G. Chappuis, *La destinée de l'homme. De l'influence du stoïcisme sur la pensée chrétienne primitive* (Paris, 1926); G. Cortassa, “Uno stoico di età giustiniana: Simplicio interprete di Epitteto,” in *Byzantina mediolanensis. V Congresso nazionale di studi bizantini* (Milano, 19–22 ottobre 1994), ed. F. Conza (Soveria Mannelli and Messina, 1996), 107–16; I. Hadot, ed., *Simplicius, Commentaire sur le Manuel d'Épictète* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 1996), 51–60; P. Hadot, *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1987), 135–53; Hadot, *La citadelle intérieure. Introduction aux Pensées de Marc Aurèle* (Paris, 1992), 89–117; P. de Lacy, “Galen and the Greek Poets,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966) 259–66; E. V. Maltese, “Per il ‘manuale’ di Marco Aurelio,” in *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*, 3 vols., ed. R. Pretagostini (Rome, 1993), 3.1111–18; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des Pères de l'Église de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1969); Spanneut, “Épictète chez les moines,” *Mélanges de science religieuse* 29 (1972) 49–57; Spanneut, *Permanence du stoïcisme* (Gembloux, 1973), 103–78; Spanneut, “Techne, morale et philosophie chrétienne dans un document grec inédit du IXe (?) siècle,” *Orpheus*, N. S., 2 (1981) 58–79.

V. EPICTETUS IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE RENAISSANCE

J.-E. d'Angers, “Le stoïcisme en France dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle. Les origines: 1575–1616,” *Études franciscaines*, N.S., 2 (1951) 287–97, 389–410 and 3 (1952) 5–19, 133–57; d'Angers, “Sénèque, Épictète et le stoïcisme dans l'œuvre d'un humaniste chrétien: le Carme Léon de Saint-Jean (1600–1671),” *Ephemerides carmelitae* 5 (1951–54) 476–90; d'Angers, “Sénèque, Épictète et le stoïcisme dans l'œuvre de René Descartes,” *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 4 (1954) 169–96; d'Angers, “L'Épictète chrétien de Jean-Marie de Bordeaux, Tertiaire régulier de Saint-François (1658),” *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 31 (1955) 174–97; d'Angers, “Étude sur les citations de Sénèque et d'Épictète dans l'*Institutione Civile Christiana* de B. Castori,

S.J. (1622),” *Mélanges de science religieuse* 17 (1960) 81–130; d'Angers, “Épictète et Sénèque d'après le *De Perenni Philosophia* d'Augustin Steuco (1496–1549),” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 35 (1961) 1–31; d'Angers, “Le renouveau du stoïcisme au XVI^e et au XVII^e siècle,” in *Association Guillaume Budé, Actes du VII^e Congrès (Aix-en-Provence, 1–6 avril 1963)* (Paris, 1964), 122–53; d'Angers, “Le renouveau du stoïcisme en France au XVI^e siècle et au début du XVII^e,” *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 4th Ser., (1964), 122–47; K. A. Blüher, *Seneca in Spanien. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Seneca-Rezeption in Spanien vom 13. bis 17. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1969) (Spanish translation: Madrid, 1983); G. J. Boter, “The Greek Sources of the Translations by Perotti and Politian of Epicurus' *Encheiridion*,” *Revue d'histoire des textes* 23 (1993) 159–88; Boter, *Encheiridion* (1999) (II.C above), 149–263; H. Busson, *La pensée religieuse française de Charron à Pascal* (Paris, 1933), 379–427; D. G. Castanien, “Three Spanish Translations of Epictetus,” *Studies in Philology* 61 (1964) 616–26; P. Hadot, “La survie du commentaire de Simplicius sur le Manuel d'Épictète du XV^e au XVII^e siècles: Perotti, Politien, Steuchus, John Smith, Cudworth,” in *Simplicius, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa survie: Actes du colloque international de Paris (28 sept.–1^{er} oct. 1985)*, ed. I. Hadot (Berlin and New York, 1987), 326–67; F. Jadaane, *L'influence du stoïcisme sur la pensée musulmane* (Beirut, 1968); A. Jagu, “L'influence du stoïcisme sur la pensée religieuse française au XVII^e siècle,” *Revue des Facultés Catholiques de l'Ouest* 4 (1957) 16–27; J. Lagrée, *Juste Lipse et la restauration du stoïcisme. Étude et traduction des traités stoïciens, De la constance, Manuel de philosophie stoïcienne, Physique des stoïciens (extraits)* (Paris, 1994); Lagrée, ed., *Le stoïcisme aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles. Actes du colloque CERPHI (4–5 juin 1993)* (Caen, 1994); P. Mesnard, “Du Vair et le néo-stoïcisme,” *Revue d'histoire de la philosophie* 2 (1928) 142–66; J. Moreau, “Sur Épictète et Pascal,” *Giornale di metafisica* 17 (1962) 653–66; G. Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge, 1982); R. P. Oliver, “Era plagiario il Poliziano nelle sue traduzioni di Epitteto e di Erodiano?” in *Il Poliziano e il suo tempo. Atti del IV Convegno internazionale di studi sul rinascimento* (Firenze 23–26 settembre 1954) (Florence, 1957), 253–71; Oliver, “Politian's Translation of the *Enchiridion*,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philolog-*

ical Association 89 (1958) 185–217; J.L. Saunders, *Justus Lipsius. The Philosophy of Renaissance Stoicism* (New York, 1955); C.B. Schmitt, ed., *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988); C. Spalatin, “Matteo Ricci’s Use of Epictetus’ Encheiridion,” *Gregorianum* 56 (1975) 551–57; M. Spanneut, “La tradition manuscrite d’un commentaire chrétien d’Épictète,” *Philologus* 108 (1964) 128–37; Spanneut, “Épictète chez les moines” (IV above), 49–57; Spanneut (1973) (IV above); R. M. Wenley, *Stoicism and Its Influence* (New York, 1927); L. Zanta, *La renaissance du stoïcisme au XVI^e siècle*, Bibliothèque littéraire de la Renaissance. Nouv. série 5 (Paris, 1914; repr. Geneva, 1975); Zanta, *La traduction française du Manuel d’Épictète d’André de Rivaudeau au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1914).

VI. STUDIES OF EPICTETUS’ LIFE, WORKS, AND THOUGHT

R. Asmus, *Quaestiones epictetae* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1888); J. Barnes, *Logic and the Imperial Stoa* (Leiden, 1997); M. Billerbeck, “Le cynisme idéalisé d’Épictète à Julien,” in *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements. Actes du colloque internationale du CNRS (Paris, 22–25 juillet 1991)*, ed. M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and R. Goulet (Paris, 1993), 319–38; S. Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy* (Oxford, 1998); A. Bonhöffer, *Epictet und die Stoa* (Stuttgart, 1890, repr. 1968); Bonhöffer, *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epictet* (Stuttgart, 1894, repr. 1968, English trans. New York, 1996); Bonhöffer, *Epictet und das Neue Testament* (Giesen, 1911); A.B. Bosworth, “Arrian’s Literary Development,” *Classical Quarterly*, N.S., 22.1 (1972) 163–85; G.W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); P.A. Brunt, “From Epictetus to Arrian,” *Athenaeum*, N.S., 55 (1977) 19–48; A. Carlini, “Osservazioni sull’epilogo del *Manuale di Epitteto*,” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* ser. 3, vol. 13 (1995) 214–25; C. Cassanmagnago, “Il problema della prohairesis in Epitteto,” *Rivista di filologia neoscolastica* 69 (1977) 232–46; T. Colardeau, *Étude sur Épictète* (Paris, 1903); R. Dobbin, “Προάρτεσις in Epictetus,” *Ancient Philosophy* 11 (1991) 111–35; K. Döring, “Sokrates bei Epiktet,” in *Studia Platonica. Festschrift für H. Gundert zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 30.4.1974*, ed. K. Döring and W. Kullmann (Amsterdam, 1974), 195–226; Döring, *Exemplum So-*

crosis (Wiesbaden, 1979), 43–79; Döring, “Epiktets Handbüchlein der Moral und seine Rezeption,” in *Von der Rezeption zur Motivation*, ed. P. Neukam (Munich, 1998), 62–83; J.-J. Duhot, *Épictète et la sagesse stoïcienne* (Paris, 1996); J.M. Floristán Imízcoz, “Arriano, aticismo y koiné, I: Fonética y morfología,” *Cuadernos de filología clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos*, N.S., 4 (1994) 161–84; Floristán Imízcoz, “Arriano, aticismo y koiné, II: Sintaxis,” ibid., N.S., 5 (1995) 91–141; G. Germain, *Épictète et la spiritualité stoïcienne* (Paris, 1964); C. Gill, “Stoic Writers of the Imperial Era,” in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, ed. C. Rowe and M. Schofield (Cambridge, 2000), 597–615; J.-B. Gourinat, “Le Socrate d’Épictète,” *Philosophie antique. Problèmes, renaissances, usages* 1 (2001) 137–65; J.C. Gretenkord, *Der Freiheitsbegriff Epiktets* (Bochum, 1981); I. Hadot and P. Hadot, *Apprendre à philosopher dans l’Antiquité. L’enseignement du “Manuel d’Épictète” et son commentaire néoplatonicien* (Paris, 2004); P. Hadot, *La citadelle intérieure* (IV above), 89–117; O. Halbauer, *De diatribis Epicteti* (Leipzig, 1911); K. Hartmann, “Arrian und Epiktet,” *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 15 (1905) 248–75; J.P. Hershbell, “Plato and Epictetus: Philosophy and Politics in Ancient Greece and Rome,” in *Griechenland und Rom: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Entwicklungstendenzen und -höhepunkten der antiken Geschichte, Kunst und Literatur*, ed. E.G. Schmidt et al. (Erlangen and Jena, 1996), 476–84; Hershbell, “Epictetus and Chrysippus,” *Illinois Classical Studies* 18 (1993) 139–46; Hershbell, “Epictetus: A Freedman on Slavery,” *Ancient Society* 26 (1995) 185–204; B.L. Hijmans, Jr., *ΑΣΚΗΣΙΣ. Notes on Epictetus’ Educational System* (Assen, 1959); A. Jagu, *Épictète et Platon: essai sur les relations du stoïcisme et du platonisme à propos de la morale des Entretiens* (Paris, 1946); Jagu, “La Morale d’Épictète et le christianisme,” *ANRW* 2.36.3 (1989), 2164–99; P. de Lacy, “The Logical Structure of the Ethics of Epictetus,” *Classical Philology* 38.2 (1943) 112–25; R. Laurenti, “Epicuro in Epitteto,” *Sophia* 28 (1960) 59–68; Laurenti, “Il filosofo ideale secondo Epitteto,” *Giornale di metafisica* 17 (1962) 501–13; Laurenti, “Epitteto e lo scetticismo,” in *Lo scetticismo antico. Atti del convegno organizzato dal Centro di studio del pensiero antico del C.N.R. (Roma 5–8 novembre 1980)*, ed. G. Giannantoni, vol. 1 (Naples, 1981), 377–92;

A. A. Long, "Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius," in *Ancient Writers*, ed. T. J. Luce, vol. 2 (New York, 1982), 985–1002; Long, *Epictetus. A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (Oxford, 2002); F. Millar, "Epictetus and the Imperial Court," *Journal of Roman Studies* 55 (1965) 141–48; M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoia. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 7th ed., vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1992), 327–41; R. Radice, *La concezione di Dio e del divino in Epitteto* (Milan, 1982); S. L. Radt, "Zu Epiktets Diatriben," *Mnemosyne*, 4th Ser., 43 (1990) 364–73; J. M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1969); R. Salles, "Epictetus on Moral Responsibility for Precipitate Action," in *Akrasia in Greek Philosophy. From Socrates to Plotinus*, ed. C. Bobonich and P. Destrée, *Philosophia Antiqua* 106 (Leiden and Boston, 2007), 249–65; T. Scaltsas and A. S. Mason, eds., *The Philosophy of Epictetus* (Oxford, 2007); G. Segalla, "Il problema della volontà in Epitteto," *Studia patavina* 10 (1963) 340–79; W. O. Stephens, *Stoic Strength. An Examination of the Ethics of Epictetus* (Philadelphia, 1990); K. Vanhaegendoren, "Individuelles religiöses Erleben auf dem Hintergrund stoischer Vorgaben? Aspekte von Epiktets Gottesbild," *Hermes* 132 (2004) 495–510; B. Wehner, *Die Funktion der Dialogstruktur in Epiktets Diatriben* (Stuttgart, 2000); T. Wirth, "Arrians Erinnerungen an Epiktet," *Museum Helveticum* 24 (1967) 149–89, 197–216; J. Xenakis, *Epictetus, Philosopher-therapist* (The Hague, 1969).

COMPOSITE EDITIONS

1543, Busciducis ('s-Hertogenbosch): apud Ioannem Schoeffer. With the translation by Hieronymus Verlenius of the *Encheiridion* and a few notes by him. Not mentioned by Oldfather. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek (presently lost); Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek.

(photo.) 1550, Andwerpiae (Antwerp): apud Ioannem Loëium. With the translation by Hieronymus Verlenius of the *Encheiridion* and a larger body of his notes than in the 1543 edition, followed by the Latin translation of fragments taken from Stobaeus, which are indicated as *tertia pars Enchiridii Epicteti* (the first part consists of Verlenius' chapters 1–13, the second of chapters 14–34; the fragments from Stobaeus are numbered as

chapters 35–42); Verlenius' translation of a number of fragments with some notes by him; a fragment from book 4 of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (for which see CTC 8.342–44), and Hippocrates' letter to Demagetus. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 666a. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek; Xanten, Stiftsbibliothek; Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek; Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek.

1554, Argentorati (Strasbourg): Wendelinus Rihelius. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translation by Thomas Naogeorgus of the *Encheiridion* and his commentary. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 283; Adams E-222; VD E-1618; Brunet 2.1013; BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1554, Basileae (Basel): ex officina Ioannis Oporini. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translation by Jacob Schenck of the *Diatribes* and some notes by him, and Politian's translation of the *Encheiridion*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 14; Brunet 2.1013; Maittaire 3.638; VD E-1608; NUC. BL; BNF; (MH).

1561, Basileae (Basel): per Ioannem Oporinum. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translations by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and ps. Cebes' *Tabula* and his notes on both texts. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 322; Adams E-223; VD E-1610; NUC. BL; BNF; (CU; MH; MWiW).

1563, Basileae (Basel): per Ioannem Oporinum. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translations by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and ps. Cebes' *Tabula* and his notes on both texts (vol. 1); Wolf's translations of Simplicius' *Commentary on the Encheiridion* and the Epictetean fragments from Stobaeus and his notes on the Epictetean fragments (vol. 2); Wolf's translation of the *Diatribes* and some notes by him (vol. 3). The three volumes also contain a considerable amount of other material (vol. 1) p. 4: three epigrams (Gr.-Lat.; Schenkl, test. XVIII, XL, XLI); pp. 86–121: ps. Cebes, *Tabula* (Gr.-Lat.; see CTC 6.9); pp. 122–30: notes to the *Tabula*; pp. 131–36: Plato, *Republic* 10, 617d–621d (Greek); pp. 137–42: idem (Latin translation by Joachim Camerarius); p. 143: Hesiod, *Works and Days* 287–297 (Gr.-Lat.; translation by Nicolaus Valla); pp. 144–46: [Pythagoras], *Carmen aureum* 6–7; Virgiliana, vel alterius cuiuspiam Paraphrasis; Litera Pythagorae; Venus et Bacchus; pp. 146–50: Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.1.21–33 (Gr.); pp. 151–55: idem (Latin translation by Guillaume Budé [up to 2.1.31 oὐδὲν

γὰρ πώποτε σεαυτῆς ἔργον καλὸν τεθέασαι] and by Bessarion [the rest]; see CTC 7.167, 169); p. 158: *Evangelium secundum Mattheum* 7.42 (Gr.-Lat.; Erasmus' translation). (Vol. 2) pp. 390–93: *Philosophorum Problemata*; pp. 394–96: *Plutarchi libellus quo deridet Stoicos, ut admirabiliora locutos quam poetas: Hieronymo Wolfio interprete*; pp. 396–414: *Plutarchi libellus, eodem interprete, qui Gryllus a grunnitu porcorum (qui Graecis γρυλλισμὸς est) inscribitur*; in addition, there are a number of epigrams by Wolf, Johannes Moibanus and Johannes Camerarius. Vol. 3 concludes with a number of κέντρωνες ἐπιλογικοί (patchwork from other authors), e.g., VIRGILIUS. Vixi, et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi, / et nunc parva mei sub terras ibit imago. / Libros complures scripsi, mea pignora vidi: / Invidiam sprevi: non vicit blanda voluptas, / Non labor, et duris urgens in rebus egestas. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 35–36; Adams E-224; VD E-1611; NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; MoSU; WU; CU).

(photo.) 1585, Claudiopolis (Cluj): apud Gasparem Helti. With Christian Francken's adaptation of the translations by Thomas Naogeorgus and Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and Naogeorgus' commentary. Oldfather, nos. 130 (listed erroneously under the editions of the Greek text), 247. See *Régi Magyarországi Nyomtatványok*, vol. 1: 1473–1600 (Budapest, 1971), 507–8, no. 565. Casale Monferrato, Biblioteca del Seminario (without preface and errata); Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (with preface and errata).

1594, Genevae (Geneva): apud haeredes Eu-stathii Vignon. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translation by Jacob Schenck of the *Diatribes* and some notes by him; Politian's translation of *Encheiridion* 1–48; and Hieronymus Wolf's translation of *Encheiridion* 49–53. Oldfather, no. 15; Adams E-228; NUC. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (ICU; NjP).

1595, Coloniae (Cologne): in officina Birckmannica, sumtibus Arnoldi Mylii. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translations by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and ps. Cebes' *Tabula* and his notes on both texts; Wolf's translations of Simplicius' *Commentary on the Encheiridion*, the Epictetean fragments from Stobaeus, and the *Diatribes* with some notes. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 38; Adams E-229; NUC. BL; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit; (MoU).

(*) 1595, Genevae (Geneva): apud haeredes Eu-

stathii Vignon. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1594, Geneva edition. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 16. BNF.

1595–96, Coloniae (Cologne): in officina Birckmannica, sumtibus Arnoldi Mylii. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1595, Cologne edition. In the 1595–96 edition vol. 1 is dated 1596, and vols. 2 and 3 are dated 1595 (as in the edition of Cologne, 1595). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 38a; Adams E-230; VD E-1612; NUC. BL; (CtY; MH; NcU; IU; CU).

1600, Genevae (Geneva): apud haeredes E. Vignon. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1594, Geneva edition. Oldfather, no. 17. BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1600, Lugduni (Lyons): sumptibus haered. E. Vignon. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1594, Geneva edition. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 18; Adams E-231; NUC. BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (CoU; NNH; CU; PPL [the NUC entry for PPL gives an erroneous date of 1690]).

1655, Cantabrigiae (Cambridge): ex celeberrimae Academiae Typographeo. Impensis G. Morden Bibliopolae. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1563 Basel edition. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 40. NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; IU; KMK; CLU-C).

1670, Londini (London): typis Jacobi Flesher, prostant apud Guilielmum Morden Bibliopolam Cantabrigiensem. (Gr.-Lat.). A reprint of the edition of the complete Epictetus, Cambridge, 1655, with the omission of all notes. Oldfather, no. 42; NUC. BL; BNF; (PPL; PMA; ViU).

1670, Lugduni Batav. et Amstelod. (Leiden and Amsterdam): ex officina Danielis, Abrahami et Adriani à Gaasbeek. Ed. A. Berkel. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translation by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and his notes. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*, and other works. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 232. Brunet 2.1013; NUC. BNF; (MH; CtY; NcD; ICN; MoSU; CLSU).

1683, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): apud Janssonio-Waesbergios. Ed. Nicolaus Blaardus (Gr.-Lat.). With the translations by Hieronymus Wolf and Politian of the *Encheiridion* and selections from Wolf's notes on the *Encheiridion* (part of a variorum commentary); Wolf's translation of the Epictetean fragments from Stobaeus. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 235, 658. (Oldfather, no. 658, states that F. O. Mencken, *Historia vitae et in*

literas meritorum Angeli Politiani [Leipzig, 1736], 558, is wrong in reporting that this edition contains Politian's translation, but he is wrong himself: under no. 235 Oldfather quotes the separate title page of the Epictetean texts, one of which is *Epicteti Enchiridion ab Angelo Politiano e Graeco versum*. The Greek text in this edition is accompanied by Wolf's translation [pp. 237–321], while Politian's prefatory letter to Lorenzo de' Medici and translation are added separately [pp. 371–95]. NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CtY).

1683, Delphis Batavorum (Delft): apud Viduam Gerardi de Jager. Ed. Abraham Berkel. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translations by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and ps. Cebes, *Tabula* and his notes on both texts (they are part of a variorum commentary). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 233. Brunet 2.1013; NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; OU; IU; KMK; CLU-C).

1711, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): apud Fredericum Haring. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translation by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and his notes. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 234. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1723, Delphis (Delft): apud Adrianum Beman. Ed. Johann Caspar Schröder. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translations by Hieronymus Wolf of the *Encheiridion* and ps. Cebes, *Tabula* and his notes on both texts (they are part of a variorum commentary). Oldfather, no. 291. NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; DLC; CU).

1741, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. (Gr.-Lat.) With the translation by Upton of the *Diatribes* (vol. 1 [London, 1739]); Upton's translation of the *Encheiridion* and his commentaries on the *Diatribes*, in which he inserts the complete notes ("cum integris annotationibus") of Jacob Schenck and Hieronymus Wolf on this work, and on the *Encheiridion* (vol. 2 [London, 1741]). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 30. NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; NCH; MiU; IU).

(*) 1750, Amstelodami et Lipsiae (Amsterdam and Leipzig): apud Arksteum et Merkum. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1683, Amsterdam edition. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 237 (Oldfather does not mention the presence of Politian's translation in this edition). BL; BNF. (photo.)

1750, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): apud Petrum de Coux. (Gr.-Lat.). Contents the same as in the 1683, Amsterdam edition. Oldfather, *Sup-*

plement, no. 237a (Oldfather does not mention the presence of Politian's translation in this edition). St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka.

I. DISSERTATIONES

TRANSLATIONS

1. Carolus Valgulius

The first extant Latin translation of the *Dissertationes* (or *Diatribes*) was made ca. 1500 by the Brescian scholar Carolus Valgulius (Carlo Valgilio). Partly preserved in a single manuscript (Vatican City, BAV, Patetta 967), it covers *Diss. 2.11.12–end*. The *terminus ante quem* is established by a note at the top of fol. 91r: "1512. mense februario. et fuit die Iovis pinguis. Flamis (*sic*) ereptus et armis. Brixia dum Gallis depopulata fuit." This is followed by the comment of Federico Patetta, a former owner of the codex: "Brescia fu infatti espugnata e messa a sacco dai Francesi il 19 febbraio del 1512, cioè appunto nel giovedì grasso."

The manuscript does not provide the name of the translator, which is hardly surprising, given the fact that it has all the appearance of being a working copy (see below). Dr. Paul Botley has suggested that the translator is to be identified as Carlo Valgilio, who spent almost his whole life in Brescia. Valgilio published (among other works) a translation of Arrian's *Anabasis* and *Indica* in 1508 (for which see CTC 3.12–14; L. W. Daly, "Charolus Valgulius' Latin Version of Arrian's 'Anabasis,'" *Library Chronicle* 17 [1951] 83–89). In the proem to his translation of Arrian's *Anabasis* and *Indica* Valgilio states that he had also translated Epictetus' *Diatribes*: "quos inscripsit sermones familiares Epicteti, quosque nos et ipsos vertimus" (quoted from CTC 3.13). Maria Bertola, *I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: Codici Vaticani latini 3964, 3966* (Vatican City, 1942), mentions three instances in the registers where Valgilio borrows a manuscript containing Epictetus' works.⁵⁷ From these entries

57. On 24 June 1494, Valgilio borrowed Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 325 (Arrian, *Disputationes, Gesta Alexandri; Porphyry, De abstinentia animalium*). This codex was returned on 7 October [1494] (Bertola, 56–57). On 18 July 1498, Valgilio borrowed "Epictetum cum Expositione Simplicii sine principio, tectum corio rubro" (= Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 326; the manuscript contains

it appears that Valgulio's translation of Epictetus is based on Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 325, which also was the source of his translations of Arrian's works (see CTC 3.13–14). Valgulio's autograph entries in the loan registers furnish conclusive proof that he is the translator of the *Diatribes* in ms. Patetta 967: the comparison of these entries with the Patetta codex shows that both were written by the same hand.⁵⁸ Botley's hypothesis is thus fully confirmed. He further suggests that Valgulio's interest in Arrian may have been awakened by his interest in Epictetus. If this is true, Valgulio must have made his translation of Epictetus well before 1508, when his translation of Arrian was published (see above). If we combine this with the observation that Valgulio borrowed the Epictetus manuscripts between 1494 and 1498, the date of the translation may fall between 1494 and ca. 1500.

Leaving aside any attempt at elegance, Valgulio produced a word-for-word Latin version of the Greek text. The opening paragraphs of *Diss.* 2.22 (Περὶ ἣ τις ἐσπούδακεν, φιλεῖ ταῦτα εἰκότως. μή τι οὖν περὶ τὰ κακὰ ἐσπουδάκασιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι; οὐδαμῶς. ἀλλὰ μή τι περὶ τὰ μηδὲν πρὸς αὐτούς; οὐδὲ περὶ ταῦτα. ὑπολείπεται τοίνυν περὶ μόνα τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐσπουδακέναι αὐτούς εἰ δ' ἐσπουδακέναι, καὶ φιλεῖν ταῦτα) serve as a good example of his methods; these have been rendered as: "Quae quisque studet, ea merito amat. Nunquid mala student homines? minime. num ea quae nihil ad se? neque illa. reliquum igitur est eos sola bona studere —: si studere certe et ipsa amare."

It is obvious that the translation is a work in progress. In many instances Valgulio corrected his efforts *currente calamo*. For example, at 2.16.37 we read ψ γὰρ ἔξεστιν ἔξελθεῖν, ὅταν θέλῃ, τοῦ συμποσίου καὶ μηκέτι παίζειν, ἔτι ούτος ἀνιᾶται μένων; οὐχὶ δ' ὡς παιδιὰ παραμένει, μέχρις ἂν ψυχαγωγῆται; The translation of this passage begins: "Cui licet exire de convivio cum velit, et

Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*, with the opening lines of each chapter of the *Encheiridion* added as lemmata. The beginning and the end of the text are missing.). It was returned on 26 September [1498] (Bertòla, 57). On 27 September 1498, Valgulio borrowed "Disputationes Ariani et quedam alia", which, again, is Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 325 (see above). Its return is not recorded (Bertòla, 57).

58. Bertòla gives reproductions of handwritten entries by Valgulio in Vat. lat. 3964, fol. 25v and in Vat. lat. 3966, fols. 14r–v.

amplius non ludere adhuc ille angitur manens tanquam in ludo ita manere dum animus delectatur"; at this point the translator changed his mind, cancelled the words "tanquam in ludo ita manere dum animus delectatur," and continued with "nonne tanquam in ludo quoadusque oblectamentum animo capit permanet." At 2.17.15 the word φιλοτεχνίαν was originally translated as "curiositatem"; it was cancelled and replaced by "accuratam descriptionem."

Occasionally Valgulio seems not to have known a specific Greek word or was unable to find the corresponding Latin word. For instance, in the title of 4.8 Πρὸς τοὺς ταχέως ἐπὶ τὸ σχῆμα τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐπιπηδῶντας, Valgulio could not find a Latin equivalent for τὸ σχῆμα, and thus we read "Ad eos qui celeriter ad [*spatium vacuum*] philosophorum assiliunt." At 4.11.19 Epictetus states Ἄλλὰ Σωκράτης ὀλιγάκις ἐλούετο.—Ἄλλὰ ἔστιλβεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα; Valgulio apparently did not know the verb στίλβειν ("look radiant"), and wrote "At Socrates perraro lavabatur. at ipsius est corpus est." The final three words are written in a very large space; the cancellation of the first "est" may suggest that, when writing "est," Valgulio intended to transliterate the Greek word as "estilben."

Often the Latin translation is unintelligible to someone who does not know the original Greek. For instance, the technical term ὄρμή ("impulse") is rendered as *accessus ad res expetitas* (2.17.15); the phrase οὐ διαφέρομαι ("it makes no difference to me") is translated as *nullam differentiam habeo* (4.13.24).

In the case of some technical terms Valgulio contents himself with transliterating the Greek, sometimes adding a note. Thus at 3.2.6 μεταπίπτοντας, ἡρωτήσθαι περαίνοντας, ὑποθετικός, ψευδομένοντς we find *metapiptontas, interrogando confidentes, et hypotheticos et pseudomenos*, to which a note is added "nomina sunt argumentorum" (written by Valgulio in different ink). At 3.23.2 the word δολιχοδρόμος ("long-distance runner") is rendered as *dolichodromos hoc est longi curriculi cursor*.

Several later hands added marginal notes. Some of these refer to the Greek text, especially when Valgulio omits or misrepresents the Greek. Thus at 4.1.150 he leaves a blank space for the Greek φρύγαμα; in the margin the word φρύγαμα was added by a later hand. The title of

4.2, Περὶ συμ^{<περι>}φορᾶς, was not translated at all; a later hand has added περὶ συμφορᾶς ἢ συμπεριφορᾶς in the margin.

Finally, there are several instances of marginalia in Italian (e.g., on fols. 11v and 12r); these notes have proved difficult to decipher.

Dissertationes (Vatican City, BAV, Patetta 967). [Inc.]: (fol. 1r; Diss. 2.11.12–13) tibi ita videatur. Quidnam hoc est? Si principium philosophiae est sensus pugnae hominum inter se, et perquisitio eius in quo est pugna damnatioque et fidei abrogatio ab ipso absolute videri, indagatio autem quaedam circa ipsum videri si recte videtur, inventioque formulae alicuius quemadmodum in ponderibus libram invenimus, in rectis et obliquis amussim, hoc est principium philosophiae. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 9ov; Diss. 4.13.24) Haec autem ubi nunc facile invenias? aut ostendito mihi quispam qui sic se habeat, ut dicat mihi sola mea curae sunt improhibita, natura libera. Hanc habeo substantiam ipsius boni, cetera sunt uti datum sit (*sic*), nullam differentiam habeo.

Manuscript:

(photo.) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Patetta 967, fols. 1r–9ov, s. XVI. According to the notes of Federico Patetta on fol. Ir, the codex belonged in the sixteenth century to Giacomo Soranzo of Venice and was numbered 1236; in the eighteenth century it was acquired by Matteo Luigi Canonici and numbered 238; bought by the Rev. Walter Sneyd in 1835, the manuscript passed in the early twentieth century into the hands of Federico Patetta, who bequeathed his collection to the Vatican Library on his death in 1945. On fol. Iv Patetta gives a brief codicological description of the manuscript, mentioning the composition of the fascicles and the visible watermarks. (L. Duval-Arnould, M. M. Lebreton, and A. Paravicini Baglioni, *Inventario dei manoscritti Patetta*, vol. 3: *Mss. 810–1200* (1971), 68; Kristeller, *Iter* 6.404a–b).

Biography and Bibliography:

See CTC 3.14 and 7.6–7.

2. Jacobus Schegkiius

The *Diatribes* were translated into Latin by Jacobus Schegkiius (Jacob Schenck) and included in his edition of the complete works of Epictetus (Basel, 1554). He also added a commentary consisting of a very modest body of notes (I.a below).

For the *Encheiridion* Schenck printed the translation by Politian (II.2 below); his motive for not preparing a new translation of the *Encheiridion* himself is probably to be found in the prestige attached to Politian's translation (Zanta, *La traduction*, 39). He gives no translation of the fragments.

For his translation of the *Diatribes* and edition of the text in Greek, Schenck relied on Vittore Trincavelli's *editio princeps* of the Greek work (Venice, 1535). Sebastian Sigmar von Schlüsselberg, counsellor and secretary of King Ferdinand I, dedicated Schenck's edition to his patron Johann Jacob Fugger (1516–75). As Sigmar states in the dedicatory letter, he encouraged Schenck to edit the *opera omnia* since no edition of Epictetus had as yet appeared in Germany.

Schenck's translation is very free. In numerous places he uses many more words than the original. This may be illustrated from the opening sections of the first *Diatribe* (1.1.1–3). The Greek begins: Τῶν ἄλλων δυνάμεων οὐδεμίαν εύρήσετε αὐτὴν αὐτῆς θεωρητικήν, οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ δοκιμαστικήν ἢ ἀποδοκιμαστικήν; Schenck translates: “Si quae sunt facultates aliae animaliae (excepta ratiocinatrice) reperietis sane nullam quae ipsam sese contemplari possit. Quocirca nullius erit proprium approbare quidpiam, vel reprobare in rebus agendis.” The most striking departure from the original is the splitting of one sentence into two. Moreover, the words “excepta ratiocinatrice,” borrowed from section 4 (= ἡ δύναμις ἡ λογική), are added for clarity's sake; the partitive genitive τῶν ἄλλων δυνάμεων is turned into a conditional clause; the words “in rebus agendis” are added without any counterpart in the Greek.

Section 2 continues in the same vein. The Greek has two pairs of question and answer: ἡ γραμματικὴ μέχρι τίνος κέκτηται τὸ θεωρητικόν; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνῶναι τὰ γράμματα. ἡ μουσική; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνῶναι τὸ μέλος. Schenck completely alters the structure of the passage, turning the second part into a positive statement: “Nonne grammatica aliquousque contemplatrix est, in id nimirum intenta ut cognoscat literas? Quin etiam musica in id incumbit, ut exploratam habeat rationem sonorum.”

The simple opening phrase of section 3, αὐτὴ οὖν αὐτὴν θεωρεῖ τις αὐτῶν; is rendered by the verbose “Num vero sic comparata est quaepiam ex his ut ipsa sui ipsius sit contemplatrix?”

Schenck's translation was subsequently criticized by various scholars, mainly because his knowledge of Stoic philosophy was insufficient. Thus J. Brucker, *Historia critica philosophiae*, 2d ed., vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1766–67), 295, writes (quoted by Zanta, *La traduction*, 37 n. 2): "Et tentavit quidem Stoica quoque, et Arriani dissertationes Epicteteas in Latinum sermonem transtulit: parum fovente Minerva vero hunc eum laborem suscepisse, passim viris doctis observatum est [Brucker is referring to Isaac Casaubon, *Epistola* (The Hague, 1638), no. 599 (p. 702): 'Ego nunc Arriani Dissertationes publice expono, cuius aurei libri neque Schegkius neque Wolfius umbram viderunt']: cuius praincipia causa esse videtur, quod satis quidem feliciter Graecam linguam teneret, verum a Stoicae philosophiae cognitione esset destitutus, sine qua talis labor inutiliter suscipitur."

Dedictory letter (ed. of Basel, 1554). Generoso et amplis(simo) viro, domino Ioanni Iacobo Fugero, Kirchpergae et Weissenhorni domino, consiliario Caesareo et Regio, patrono colendiss(imo) Sebastianus Sigmar a Schlussberg, Sereniss(im) Romanorum, etc. Regis Ferdinandi a Consiliis et Secretis, s. d. [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) Non utar longa prae-fatione in commendando hoc nostro authore, aut materia operis. Constat enim omnibus, atque etiam mediocriter eruditis exploratissimum est, Epictetum philosophum veram ac purissimam Platonis philosophiam assetatum ea duntaxat prodisse, quae ad cultum morum vitamque recte ac sancte instituendam pertinerent: quae certe philosophiae pars humanae vitae in primis utilis ac necessaria omnium iudicio existimatur. Haec autem omnia Arrianus noster ab ipso Epicteto, ut ipse narrat, et audivit ac fidelissime percepit, atque etiam posteritatis memoriae hoc suo scripto mandavit. Rogavi itaque optimum et doctissimum virum Iacobum Schekium, ut hunc libellum latina civitate donaret: qui hoc ipsum sane erudite et bona fide absolvit, atque etiam loca difficiliora suis haud contempnendis commentariis (fol. a2v) illustravit. Quae omnia mihi studiosorum ac communis utilitatis causa in lucem efferre visum fuit. Sicuti in praesentia Arrianus noster Graecus, hactenus (quod ego quidem sciam) in Germania nunquam editus, una cum versione latina et adiectis scholiis typis excusus prodit. Tibi vero, vir generose et omni virtutum genere praestantissime, Arrianum multis sane de

causis ac propterea maxime offerre et dedicare volui, quod sciam te non solum omnes meliores literas ac humanitatis artes valde amare et colere, in iisdemque multum ocii et temporis consumere, sed et ipsa studia omnesque doctos ac studiosos, quantum quidem in te est (est autem procul dubio perquam plurimum in tuis et tui similiū adiumentis positum) maxime fovere et complecti. Quo nomine multum profecto laudis et gloriae tibi et posteris non tam iampridem comparasti, quam etiam in posterum comparare contendis. Atque id quidem recte. Hae enim sunt verae animi virtutes, haec ipsissima nobilitatis signa, quae interire nunquam poterunt. Quod equidem hoc nostro seculo non adeo multis accidisse video, ut fortunae bonis ac nobilitati virtutum ac eruditio-nis vera etiam ornamenta adiungerent, ac pariter ipsa studia et honestarum artium studiosos iuvarent. Quibus te esse conspicuum et patrem demortuum Raimundum Fuggerum potius vincere quam imitari omnes vident et fatentur, atque adeo hoc familiae tuae quasi innatum videtur. De patruo enim tuo, viro amplissimo, Antonio Fugero, eiusdemque virtutibus praestat tacere quam pauca dicere. Sed de his satis. Cum has enim ob causas, tum etiam pro(fol. a3r)pter tua et familiiae tuae in me bene merita, hoc qualemque munus tibi dedico petoque abs te sane diligenter ut meam operam aequi bonique facias. Quod ubi a te consecutus fuero, brevi, Deo volente, et uberiora et maiora dabimus. Bene et foeliciter vale. Vienae Austriae, mense Februario, Anno DMLIII (sic).

Dissertationes. Arriani Epictetus, Iacobo Schekio Medico Physico interprete. *Arrian's introductory letter to Lucius Gellius*. Arrianus Lucio Gellio salutem. [Inc.]: (p. 29) Epicteti sermones nec tam accurate conscripsi, quam potuissent fortasse perscribi ab alio quopiam, nec eo consilio ut in lucem ederentur. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 30) Qua sane vi ac efficacia si scripti sermones ca-reant, ego fortasse in causa ero, aut forsitan rerum natura id fert ut aliter se habere ista nequeant. *Dissertationes*. [Inc.]: (Diss. 1.1.1) De his quae sunt in potestate nostra, aut non sunt. Caput I. Si quae sunt facultates aliae animae (excepta ratiocina-trice) reperiens sane nullam quae ipsam sese contemplari possit. Quocirca nullius erit proprium approbare quidpiam, vel reprobare in rebus agen-dis. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 361; Diss. 4.13.24) Sed ista utinam hodie quidpiam inveniat, aut demon(p.

362)stretur quispiam qui ita sit affectus, qui sic dicat: Mihi duntaxat, quae mea, curae sunt, quae prohiberi non possunt, quae natura sunt libera. Haec mihi substantia est boni: caetera fiant prout permissum fuerit, non enim ut fiant labore.

Editions:

- 1554 (Basel). See above, Composite editions.
- 1594. See above, Composite editions.
- 1595 (Geneva). See above, Composite editions.
- 1600 (Geneva). See above, Composite editions.
- 1600 (Lyons). See above, Composite editions.

Rejected editions:

(*) 1610, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned in the *Catalogue général* of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. The date is an error for 1600.

(*) 1660, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned by H. Relandus (in the edition of the *Encheiridion* by M. Meibom [Utrecht, 1711]), *Index editionum*) and later sources dependent on Relandus. The date is an error for 1600. Oldfather, no. 19.

(*) 1690, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned in the NUC (PPL). The date is an error for 1600.

(*) 1694, Genevae (Geneva). Mentioned by F.O. Mencken, *Historia vitae et in literas meritorum Angeli Politiani* (Leipzig, 1736), 162. The date is an error for 1594. Oldfather, no. 20.

(*) 1695, s. l. Mentioned by P.A.A. Ducoin, *Catalogue des livres que renferme la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Grenoble, classés méthodiquement* (Grenoble, 1831–39), no. 10693. The date is an error for 1595. Oldfather, no. 21.

Biography:

See CTC 1.113. Add the following information:

Schenck's name is often spelled as Schegk (so, for instance, Jöcher), but the preface to his German translation of the *Encheiridion* (Basel, 1534) is signed "Jacob Schenck." The Latin spelling of Schenck's name is variously reported: in his edition of Epictetus it appears as "Scheggius," "Scheckius," and "Schegkius"; A. Hirsch, *Biographisches Lexikon der hervorragenden Ärzte aller Zeiten und Völker*, 2d ed., vol. 5 (Vienna and Berlin, 1934), 59 gives "Scheckius." Zanta also gives the spelling "Scheyck" for his German name (Zanta, *La renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle*, 142).

Add to Bibliography:

M. Adam, *Vitae Germanorum medicorum, qui saeculo superiori, et quod excurrit claruerunt, con-*

gestae et ad annum usque 1620 deductae (Heidelberg, 1620), 290–301; J. Brucker, *Historia critica philosophiae*, 2d ed., vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1766–67) 294; Jöcher 4.235–36; Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 14; Zanta, *La traduction*, 36–39.

3. Hieronymus Wolfius

In 1563 Hieronymus Wolfius (Wolf) published his three-volume edition of the complete Epictetus that appeared at Basel and is dedicated to the Augsburg patrician and burgomaster Johann Baptist Hainzel. Vol. 3 contains Wolf's Latin translation of the *Diatribes*.

The circumstances in which Wolf prepared his translation and edition are sketched by Zanta, *La traduction*, 53–56. Wolf himself relates his activities in the dedicatory preface to vol. 1. He explains that, while living in Paris (until 1550), he had originally intended to publish a Latin translation of the complete Epictetus. However, his turbulent life did not permit him to complete the project within the time he had allotted. Finally, in 1557, he settled in Augsburg, where he found hospitality in the house of Hainzel's brother-in-law and became the director of the Bibliotheca Fuggerana. Here he found the quiet to continue his work on Epictetus, but various other tasks proved a distraction and so prevented him from finishing the project before the appearance in 1554 of the Latin translations of the *Diatribes* by Jacob Schenck (I.2 above) and the *Encheiridion* by Thomas Naogeorgus (II.4 below). Consequently his own versions, so Wolf says, may seem to have lost a large part of their novelty and could be regarded as superfluous.

In the preface to vol. 2, Wolf discusses at length the value of Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*: just as Iolaus helped Hercules, so Simplicius helps Epictetus. In the preface to vol. 3, Wolf apologizes for burdening the world with a book, but he argues that at any rate he cannot be accused of over-hasty publication.

Wolf's translation of the *Diatribes* follows the Greek very closely and, in this respect, presents a striking contrast to Schenck's version, since Wolf tries to preserve the structure and word order of the original and rarely has substantial additions or omissions. A good illustration of his method is the translation of *Diss. 1.1.1–3*:

§ 1 Τῶν ἄλλων δυνάμεων οὐδεμίαν εύρήσετε αὐτὴν αὐτῆς θεωρητικήν, οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ δοκιμαστικήν ἢ ἀποδοκιμαστικήν; is rendered

as “Aliarum facultatum nullam reperietis ipsam suimet contemplatricem: ac proinde ne approbatricem quidem, aut improbatricem.” This is a faithful reproduction of the original; the only possible objection concerns the translation of ἢ by *aut* instead of *vel*.

§ 2 ἡ γραμματικὴ μέχρι τίνος κέκτηται τὸ θεωρητικόν; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνῶνται τὰ γράμματα. ἡ μουσικὴ; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνῶνται τὸ μέλος is translated as “Grammaticae contemplatio quousque progreditur? Ad distinctionem literarum. Musicae quousque? Ad discernendam cantilenam.” Here the phrasing is altered, but the structure of question and answer is maintained.

§ 3 αὐτὴ οὖν αὐτὴν θεωρεῖ τις αὐτῶν, extended disproportionately in Schenck’s translation, is rendered simply as “Num ergo earum aliqua se ipsam contemplatur?” Zanta remarks (*La traduction*, 56) that Wolf’s translation is more successful than Schenck’s: “il saura pénétrer avec finesse la pensée d’Épictète, en saisir les nuances, et pourtant, il exprimera cette concision parfois un peu rude sous une forme qui ne manque point d’élégance.”

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 1). Ioanni Baptistae Hainzelio, Patricio et Consuli Augustano, viro doctrina, pietate, virtute ornatissimo, Domino et patrono colendo, Hieronymus Wolfius s. p. d. [Inc.]: (fol. α2r) Concinnavi munusculum, ornatissime Consul, filiolis tuis potius, bonaे spei pueris, usui futurum (uti spero) quam tibi, et praeclaræ doctrina cum profanarum tum sacrarum literarum praedito, et multo rerum usu variisque florente etiamnum aetate casibus eruditio, necessarium, non incommodum tamen vel doctissimis et exercitatissimis hominibus, mea quidem opinione. Nam ea doctrinae morum et eius potissimum partis quae ad contemptum rerum humanarum et animi tranquillitatem pertinet ratio esse videtur, ut sive negligentia nostra et prava consuetudine sive animorum imbecillitate id fiat, nunquam satis inculcari memoriaque repeti possit. Subinde salutarium praceptorum obliviscimus paulatimque ad vulgi sermones et opiniones relabimur, ut non sine causa sive Virgilius sive quis alias (nam de autore ambigitur) exclamet [App. Verg., *De inst. viri boni* 23–24]: Cur me natura magis quam/disciplina trahit? etsi prava consuetudo (fol. α2v) (si verum fateri libeat) saepius nos quam natura quantumvis prava trahit. Evidem quid aliis accidat

nescio, neque dubito quin plurimi, inter quos te quoque cumprimis numero, et ingeniorum acuminis et animorum constantia roboreque me longissimo intervallo superent. . . . [usefulness of reading Epictetus] (fol. α3r) Hae tantae res, tam utiles, tam necessariae cognitu, tam salutares, ut et a pluribus cogitarentur et animo meo scribendo quam legendo, ut fieri solet, altius infigerentur, decimo abhinc anno, Lutecia Parisiorum huc profectus, incerto rerum mearum statu, li(fol. α3v)bellis hisce convertendis atque in publicum edendis adieci animum. Nam cum vir egregius Ioannes Henricus Herbardus, sororius tuus (quem et honoris et grati animi ergo nomino), tale nihil ne somniant quidem, sed longinquam profectionem adornanti, hospitium victumque communem perhumaniter obtulisset, tranquillum illud quidem ocium, sed non omnis curae tamen expers, in hoc negocium rectissime conferri posse existimavi. Sed dum absoluto Enchiridio in Arriani commentariis transferendis sedulo vursor, ecce Fuggeranae Bibliothecae curatio aequa praeter expectationem offertur.

Qua et digerenda et describenda et augenda dum occupor, non satis ocii datur ad institutum meum perseverendum. Inciderunt deinde aliae occupationes (ut fortuna mea ab ineunte aetate crebras mutationes variasque vicissitudines habuit) et lucubrationes necessariae mihi magis quam iucundae et Augustanae denique scholæ Bibliothecaeque curatio. Quibus rebus factum est ut horum opusculorum editio in hunc usque annum prorogata, dum ego vel cesso vel aliis negotiis distineor, et novitatis gratiam magna ex parte amitteret, et doctissimorum virorum, Iacobi Scheggii, quem praceptoris loco veneror, ac Thome Naogeorgi, qui copioso commentario Epictetum declaravit, conversionibus editis super(fol. α4r)vacanea videri posset. De quo ego sane mihi curiosius esse disputandum non existimo, nec speciosas excusationes quaerendas, aut plurimorum exemplis tam nostrae aetatis quam veteris memoriae virorum, causam meam defendendam. Ea sine ullis ambagibus dicam, quae verissima et simplicissima sunt, utcunque ab aliis accipiuntur. Ego enim quid alii de me sentiant et loquantur praestare nec possum nec debeo; ne quid malo stultove consilio faciam praestare et culpa vacare in hac quidem re fortasse possum, debeo certe quidem. Conversionis igitur eae mihi causae fuerunt quas exposui. Editionis vero hae

sunt, quas iam dicam. . . / . . [long exposition on the usefulness of combining philosophy and theology, on human activities in general, and on the position of Stoic philosophy towards other philosophies, such as Aristotelianism] (fol. a8v) Sed et haec in annotationibus rectius tractantur, et una reliqua editionis causa iam expponenda est. Ea fuit, ut merita erga me tua, Consul optime et prudentissime, multorumque annorum constantem et iucundam amicitiam (qua me rebus omnibus longe inferiorem, sola humanitate tua adductus, ob qualemque literarum commendationem es complexus) publico aliquo testimonio ad posteros etiam duraturo celebrarem. Alias enim opes non habeo quibus tibi et tuis gratiam referam; et ea te benignitate ac facilitate esse scio ut sola voluntate mea sis contentus, cum is animus et a natura tibi tributus et vera institutione longoque usu confirmatus sit ut tibi gratis atque etiam cum periculo de Ecclesia, de patria, de omnibus doctis et bonis bene merendum esse arbitreris, et cum domestica disciplina vitaeque modestia et pietate publicam beneficentiam coniungendam. Quibus virtutibus id consecutus es ut non a civibus tantum tuis, sed ab exteris etiam quam (fol. a9r) plurimis iisque clarissimis doctissimisque viris et sincere diligaris et citra omnem adulationis suspicionem certatim lauderis. Quare mihi plura scribenda esse non duco, ne tenebris meis solem illustrare velle videar, sed illud unum petendum, ut hoc levidense munus crasso filo, ut Cicero quodam loco iocatur [*Fam.* 9.12.2], aequi bonique facias et veterem tuam erga me nevolentiam conserves. Vale quam felicissime et diutissime, ut bonitas tua meretur et humanitas, omnibus titulis illustrius praeconium, cum a D. Paulo ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ θεοῦ [Tit 3:4] non minus quam ἡ δύναμις καὶ μεγαλειότης [2 Pet 1:16] praedicetur. Augustae Vindelicorum, 7. Cal. Iulii, Natali tuo: qui ut felix et faustus tibi et tuis illuxerit, Deum precor. Anno MDLX.

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 2). Ioanni Baptistae Hainzelio, Patricio et Consuli Augustano, viro doctrina, pietate, virtute ornatissimo, Domino et patrono colendo, Hieronymus Wolfius s. p. d. [*Inc.*]: (p. 3) Superiori tomo Epicteti nostri, Stoicae philosophiae (cuius in exaggeranda virtute caeterisque rebus extenuandis consilium gravissimo et prudentissimo cuique maxime probatur) summa quaedam et nuda praecepta sunt exposita, quae non quidem invito

et repugnanti assensionem extorquere, sed tamen cordatum hominem ad considerandam naturae suae dignitatem et earum rerum quas vulgus hominum prope solas miratur vanitatem cogitandam invitare et excitare queant. . . [comparison of Epictetus and Simplicius with Hercules and Iolaus: just as Iolaus helped Hercules to kill the Hydra, so Simplicius helps Epictetus to extinguish mental errors] (p. 5) Vigilandum igitur est semper nec cessandum unquam: deponenda nunquam est panoplia D. Pauli [Eph 6:11] in rebus divinis. In humanis autem retinenda etiam panoplia haec Epicteti nostri atque Simplicii et Arriani; quem Arrianum tertio instituti operis tomo ὕστερον πρότερον Ὁμηρικῶς [Cic., *Att.* 1.16.] tibi obtulimus, ut saepe tractata et gestata minus urgeat humeros, nec magis oneret corpus, assuetudine ipsa facta levior quam delicata vestis. Haec ad te scribo liberius, ornatissime idemque humanissime consul, quod mihi non cum importuno aliquo et immodi ci animi homine, aut superstитioso et imperito res est (quo genere latinus Menander [Ter., *Adel.* 98–99] quicquam esse negat iniustius, quod nisi quod ipse faciat, rectum nihil esse putet), sed cum eo viro qui ab ineunte aetate a doctissimis et clariss(imis) in Germania viris, Simone Grynaeo et Philippo Melanchthon, eruditus et in studiis optimarum artium ad virilem usque aetatem in Galliis atque Italia magna cum laude singularis humanitatis et modestiae versatus sacras literas cum profanis et philosophiam cum theologia coniunxit, quique intelligit quicquid in philosophorum scriptis (nam de ipsa quidem philosophia, hoc est virtutis, veritatis et sapientiae studio, dictu nefas id fuerit) vanum, ineptum, falsum, impium reperiatur, id esse repudiandum et detestandum, ut ab autore dia(p. 6)bolo et ab eius instrumentis, hominibus partim improbis, partim vaecordibus, atque etiam ab humana infirmitate profectum atque ortum, quicquid contra verum, sincerum, simplex, iustum, pium, ad degendam vitam utile et necessarium, id ad autorem Deum esse referendum. Qui etsi veritatis suae lumen hebraeis vatis longe uberioris impertit, tamen aliarum quoque gentium philosophis, hoc est viris et virtutis et veritatis amantibus, non plane denegavit, ut si minus ad veram ipsius agnitionem pervenire possent, tamen huius caducae vitae rectius et tranquillus degendae rationem caeteris mortalibus, quorum aut tardiora essent ingenia aut studium remissius aut usus rerum minor, demonstrarent

et ad convenientiam conservationemque naturae deducerent, quae (Tullianis enim verbis libenter utimur) [Cic., *Off.* 1.28.97] “ut homines essent re, non nomine, personam illis imposuisset magna cum excellentia praestantiaque animantium reliquorum (*sic*).” Quod quantum sit beneficium, non est obscurum. . . / . . . [There follows a defense of the study of philosophy, as *ancilla theologiae*. Wolf enumerates the subjects touched upon by Simplicius, whom he praises lavishly. The study of Epictetus is both pleasant and useful: there is no excuse for not studying the works of philosophy. Wolf illustrates the difference between man and beast.] (p. 14) Quod etsi theologia longe prolixius praestat (iam enim ad alteram excusationem venio) si cuius animum penitus occuparit, tamen quam ii pauci sint, videmus: et sic audiri vulgo sacras conciones et mysteria religionis ita usurpari ut bonarum rerum mala consuetudo pessima esse videatur, non ipsarum rerum quae optimae sunt, sed eorum vitio qui iis abutuntur. Tales qui sunt, et his nequiores etiam, οἵ δοκοῦσιν, ut ait Isocrates [Or. 13.1], ἀμεινον βουλεύεσθαι οἱ ῥᾳθυμεῖν αἰρούμενοι τῶν περὶ φιλοσοφίαν διατριβόντων, apud hos nec philosophia nec theologia suo (p. 15) fungi munere potest. Illi autem qui legem Domini dies et noctes meditantur, nec quicquam aliud cogitant, qui alia re nulla delectantur, qui coelestem in terris vitam degunt, nullo praesertim aut perexiguo cum fructu, qui (ut dixi) perpauci sunt, hi perinepte meo iudicio facerent, si ab equis ad asinos, quod aiunt [cf., e.g., Zenobius 2.33 (1.41.9–12 Leutsch-Schneidewin); Erasmus, *Adagia* I.vii.29], descenderent. Sed qui inter stupidum vulgus et felices istas animas interiecti civilem vitam agunt, et quamvis theologiam venerentur, tamen nec aleam nec pocula neque canes neque equos nec alias fortassis deteriores his oblectationes aspernantur, hi si literis imbuti sint, non video quid causari possint, quominus et philosophiam attingant, nisi forte Christiano aleatori esse liceat, philosopho esse, hoc est, animum ab erroribus et perturbationibus, quoad quisque possit, repugnare non liceat: aut haec occupatio sit illa deterior atque illiberalior ac non potius et honestissima et homine dignissima et praeter ingenuam et sinceram delectationem vitae hominum in primis fructuosa. Qua de re cum alibi tum secundo libro de Officiis praecclare Cicero disputat, cuius verba temperare mihi nequeo quin epilogi vice propter

adolescentes ascribam [*Off.* 2.2.5–6]. Quid est (inquit) per deos optabilius sapientia? . . . / . . . (p. 16) Hactenus Cicero, quem hominibus studiosis vel ob elegantiam dictionis et orationis suavitatem non magis familiarem esse miror. Sed ne Philumenae meae nimium tribuere videar, desino, et ea quae scripsi aequo et perito lectori aestimanda relinquo. Tuae autem prudentiae et humanitati et me et alterum filiolum hunc meum, quem tertius nescio quo pacto antevertit, commendo. Vale. Nonis Martii, Anno MDLXI.

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 3). Ioanni Baptistae Hainzelio, Patricio et Consuli Augustano, viro doctrina, pietate, virtute ornatissimo, Domino et patrono colendo, Hieronymus Wolfius s. p. d. [Inc.]: (p. 3) Sitne labor hic meus post aliorum lucubrationes supervacaneus, an aliquid fructus studiosis hominibus allaturus, alii iudicabunt. Qui ut supervacaneus sit, in magno eorum librorum erit numero, qui hoc tempore ab hominibus et ocio et literis abutentibus temerario editionis honore (ut Fabii verbis utar [Quint., *Inst.* 1, *praefatio*, 7]) vulgantur, quamvis eadem argumenta iam olim et doctius et dexterius et maiori orationis elegantia summis a viris pertractata ad nostram aetatem pervenerunt. Est hoc vetus illud et iam olim reprehensum scribendi sed nondum profligatum cacoethes. A quo morbo si me vindicare potuisse, iucundius fortasse, tranquillus certe quidem et minore cum invidia vixisset. Ut igitur hoc crimen agnoscam (difficulter enim consueta relinquimus) sic nec inanis gloriae studio incitatus, qua contempnenda me in dies exercere soleo, nec aemulatione, a qua na(p. 4)tura abhorreo, impulsus, diu intermissum opus hoc, et vix tandem repetitum, edere constui. Nam alia fuit hic meus labor ac caeteri conditione. Qui cum velut ab incude rapti in publicum provolarint, hic vere de Horatii sententia [*Carm.* 4.11.1] nonum in annum pressus ac vix tandem impressus e musaei nostri latebris erupit. Sed quum iam libellum hunc edere statuisse, non alias ei patronus quaerendus fuit quam is qui Epicteti Enchiridion et praclarum illius interpretem Simplicium non aequo tantum sed libenti etiam animo in fidem et clientelam suam receperisset. Quum enim trium horum libellorum idem author Epictetus, idem scriptor Arrianus, idem interpres Wolfius, idemque scopus sit, ut homines ab immodico voluptatum et rei familiaris studio ad animi curationem diligentiores

traducantur, idem etiam patronus fuit retinendus, is praesertim qui praecepta haec vitae quotidianae actionibus exprimere potius quam hisce de rebus ociose disputare consueverit. Ac tali non tantum patrono, sed etiam lectore nobis est opus. Nam qui nec ullum vitae communis usum habent et vulgaribus tantum opinionibus imbuti consilium philosophorum non intelligunt, parvi ista facient, obiterque lecta vel ut obscura et incerta relinquunt vel ut inania et super(p. 5)vacanea repudiabunt. Qui autem vel tuo exemplo cum doctrina usum rerum coniunxerint vel diligenter naturae humanae vim et conditionem considerarint, ut quae hic traduntur non probent omnia (neque enim ullum librum extare arbitror qui et omnibus et ubique placeat), complura tamen ingeniose cogitata diserteque explicata mirabuntur, cumque veritatem doctrinae huius et quotidianum atque adeo inevitabilem usum perspexerint, salutares admonitiones vita et moribus exequi conabuntur. Alia picturae ratio est, alia doctrinae morum. Imaginem eleganter depictam spectasse homini picturae non dedito satis est; praecepta vero philosophorum obiter aspexisse non est satis, sed illud etiam requiritur, ut iis, quantum res viresque nostrae sinunt, obtemperemus. Sed quis est illius obedientiae fructus? Animi tranquillitas, aut certe aequitas, in utraque fortuna, aut (si hoc quoque nimium videtur) moderatio doloris in rebus adversis, laeticiae in secundis, multarumque inanum curarum et occupationum evitatio. Nam plerique multa nobis curiositate quadam perversoque studio negotia ipsi accersimus, quibus supersedere licet. Sed haec lector ex ipso Epicteto multo melius cognoscet. Qui sicubi argutior et obscurior videbatur, nos (p. 6) operam dedimus ut annotationibus nostris pleraque planiora et dilucidiora redderentur. Tu vero, consul ornatissime, ut nihil aliud, at studium et observantiam tui meam aequi bonique facies, meque ut hactenus ita in posterum etiam commendatum habebis. Vale. Augustae Vindelicorum, Idibus Augusti, natali meo, anno MDLX.

Introductory letter from Arrian to Lucius Gellius (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 1). [Inc.]: (p. 9) Arrianus Lucio Gellio s. Ego sermones Epicteti neque sic conscripsi ut talia conscribi solent, neque ipse publicavi ut qui vel conscripsisse me negem. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 10) Quod si vero sermones eius ipsi per se id non consequuntur, ego

fortassis in causa sum; fortassis etiam se res aliter habere non potest. Vale.

Dissertationes (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 3). [Inc.]: (p. 11; Diss. 1.1.1) De iis quae in nostra potestate sunt, quaeque non sunt. Aliarum facultatum nullam reperiens ipsam suimet contemplatricem: ac proinde ne approbatricem quidem, aut improbatricem. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 437; Diss. 4.13.24) Ea vero nunc ubi invenire proclive est? Ostende mihi hominem sic affectum ut dicat: Mihi solae meae res curae sunt, quae prohiberi nequeunt, quae natura sunt liberae. Hanc naturam boni habeo, caetera vero fiant ut res tempusque tulerint; mea non refert.

Editions:

1563. See above, Composite Editions.

1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Editions.

1595–96. See above, Composite Editions.

1655. See above, Composite Editions.

1670 (London). See above, Composite Editions.

Doubtful editions:

(*) 1565, Basileae (Basel). Mentioned by Graesse 2.483; this item follows immediately after the 1563 edition, so that the source of the entry is difficult to trace. Oldfather, no. 37.

(*) 1594, Coloniae (Cologne). Mentioned in Catalogue d'une bibliothèque de Littérature . . . , vol. 1 (Utrecht, 1776), nos. 1816–18 (cited by Oldfather). The date must be an error for 1595. Oldfather, nos. 37a, 39.

Rejected edition:

(*) 1655, Oxonii (Oxford). Mentioned by Th. Georgi, *Allgemeines europäisches Bücher-Lexikon*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1742; repr. Graz, 1966), 22. Oldfather, no. 41 remarks: "This although listed alongside the Cambridge 1655 edition is probably only a mistake for it." Oldfather wrongly states that, according to Georgi, this edition contains the *Encheiridion* and the *Diatribes*: Georgi mentions only the *Encheiridion*.

Biography:

See CTC 2.90.

Add to Bibliography:

G. Algazi, "Food for Thought. Hieronymus Wolf Grapples with the Scholarly Habitus," in *Egodocuments and History. Autobiographical Writing in its Social Context since the Middle*

Ages, ed. R. Dekker (Hilversum, 2002), 21–43; H.-G. Beck, *Der Vater der deutschen Byzantinistik: das Leben des Hieronymus Wolf, von ihm selbst erzählt* (Munich, 1984); H. Zäh, *Die Autobiographie des Hieronymus Wolf (Commentariolus de vita sua)* (Donauwörth, 1998 [microfiche]).

COMMENTARIES

a. Jacobus Schegkius

Jacob Schenck added a number of notes to his Latin translation of the *Dissertationes* (I.2 above). As Schenck states in the preface to the notes, Johannes Alexander Brassicanus (1500–1539) had planned to write a full-scale commentary on the *Dissertationes* but was prevented from doing so by his untimely death. Schenck feels that his own notes are only a slight recompense for this irreparable loss: on the one hand, he does not feel competent to write a full-scale commentary; on the other hand, he is prevented from doing so by lack of time. Schenck's notes take up only nine pages, six of which are devoted to chapters of the first book. They treat philosophical and historical subjects occurring in the *Dissertationes*. When dealing with philosophical topics, Schenck often refers to Aristotle; for historical topics he regularly quotes from Tacitus. Other ancient authors mentioned and quoted in the notes include Plato, Xenophon, Plutarch, Terence, Horace, and Suetonius.

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1554). Iacobus Schegkius lectori s. [Inc.]: (p. 362) Verborum atque orationis Arriani sensum, quoad potui, sum interpretatus hac versione: quam nihilominus rerum quarundam obscuritas et difficultas, quo minus aperta et perspicua sit, sic perplexam et impeditam facit ut nihil egisse interpretando videatur aliquis, si non rebus etiam explanandis operam aliquantulam impertiat. Quod ego in praesentia tametsi magis coner quam praestem, brevitate temporis impeditus, aequi bonique faciatis tamen id ipsum rogo. Hac enim opera non gratiam a vobis inire, sed debitum pensum utcunque absolvere statueram. Plenissime id quidem doctissimus D. Io. Alexander Brassicanus olim, varia et librorum suppellectile et summa eruditionis ingeniique copia fretus, praestare potuisset; ac praestitisset etiam, nisi e medio cursu fati necessitas ipsum abripuisse. Cuius ego propositum et voluntatem sequi me etsi fatear, exequi tamen aut assequi si me

sperem, plane ineptus sim, et hac ipsa confidentia nimis arrogans et protervus. Itaque sic habetote, candidi lectores, me maluisse vestra causa parum lucis quam omnino nihil ad intelligenda Arriani scriptorum quaedam loca afferre in medium, non tam ut studium quam voluntatem meam vobis probarem; quod vel hac qualicunque et mediocri quadam industria me consecuturum sum arbitratus, in qua magis conatus meus quam facultas iuvandi communia studia appareat. Sed ad rem ipsam accingor, omissis excusationum depreciationumque ambagibus. Si quae singulorum librorum (p. 363) in capitibus singulis difficiliora inesse quam ut a quolibet intelligentur visa fuerint, annotatiunculis planiora faciam. Nec explicabo, ut dicitur, ad amussim, sed attingam duntaxat loca e quibus nonnullarum disputationum explicatio sit requirenda, praesertim si prolixa sit et philosophica, quae paucis tractari nequit.

Commentary. Annotata in primi libri cap. I. [Inc.]: (p. 363) *Si quae sint facultates* (1.1.1). Quicquid in natura est, id opus exercere et ἐνεργεῖν, respectu alicuius quod extra se sit, dicitur. Atque id contagione corporum, naturalium praesertim, perspicuum est, itemque actionibus animae, quas ipsa non intra se sed in corpore animato praestare soleat. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 371) *Non Massurii aut Cassii legibus* (4.3.12). Celeberrimi isti fuerunt iurisconsulti, quorum de priore sic scribit Atheneus lib. 14 Dipnosoph. [623e] Μασούριος ὁ πάντα ἄριστος καὶ σοφός, καὶ γὰρ νόμων ἔξηγητής οὐδενὸς δεύτερος. De Cassio apud Cor. Tacitum lib. 12 historiae Augustae [Ann. 12.12] ita scriptum reperies: Ea tempestate Cassius caeteros praeeminebat peritia legum. Fuit sub Claudio et Nerone imperatoribus. Proinde si lex est constans et perpetua voluntas, omnes nimirum leges, quantumvis pro temporum locorum hominumque ratione sint mutabiles, nisi ex ratione dependeant immutabilis legis, pro legibus non sunt habendae. Propterea autem immutabilis est voluntas, quoniam dependet ex ratione perfecta, qua nihil est antiquius. Hanc apud deos esse, et in primis penes Iovem, Sophocles inquit in Antigona [456–57]:

οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κἀθέει, ἀλλ' ἀεί ποτε
ζῆ ταῦτα, κούδεις οἶδεν ἐξ ὅτου φάνη (sic).

Finis.

Editions:

- 1554 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.
 1594. See above, Composite Editions.
 (*) 1595 (Geneva). See above, Composite Editions.
 1600 (Geneva). See above, Composite Editions.
 1600 (Lyons). See above, Composite Editions.
 1741. See above, Composite Editions.

Doubtful editions:

(*) 1742, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 31. Mentioned by J. F. Beyer, *Über Epiktet und sein Handbuch der stoischen Moral, in biographischer und literarischer Rücksicht* (Marburg, 1795). Oldfather suggests that some copies of the 1741 edition may have borne the date 1742; since no copy has yet been located, the date of 1742 may be an error on the part of Beyer or his sources.

(*) 1745, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather, no. 33. The only mention of this edition is in A. A. Renouard, *Catalogue de la bibliothèque d'un amateur* (Paris, 1819); a copy has yet to be located.

(*) 1751, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather, no. 34. As Oldfather notes, there is probably some confusion with the Foulis edition of the same year.

Rejected edition:

(*) 1744, Londini (London): Impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather, no. 32. The printed catalogue of the British Library mentions two copies of Upton's edition printed in the year 1744 (location number 525.g.2, 3); in reality, these copies bear the year 1741 (communication of Mrs. Claudine Davie, 25 March 2003).

Biography and Bibliography:

See I.2 above.

b. Hieronymus Wolfius

The translation by Hieronymus Wolf (I.3 above) is accompanied by a number of notes printed after the Latin text of each chapter. Most of these notes are philological in character, often discussing variant readings, but some of them are concerned with the philosophical or historical content of the text. Wolf himself remarks that his purpose in writing the notes was to elucidate

difficult and obscure passages: "Qui [Epictetus] sicubi argutior et obscurior videbatur, nos operam dedimus ut annotationibus nostris pleraque planiora et dilucidiora redderentur" (vol. 3, pp. 5–6). Originally, Wolf had intended the notes to be much fuller but, as he states in a note to the reader, he did not have the opportunity to realize his plans.

Preface: see I.3 above.

Author's note to the Reader (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 3). Postiores annotationes. Interpres lectori s. [Inc.]: (p. 438) Nulli unquam lucubrationi meae tot et valetudinis et aliarum rerum impedimenta obiecta fuerunt. Evidem credo Alastorem aliquem bonis moribus infensum et humanae felicitati parum faventem his meis conatibus, quoad potuerit, obstisset. Tantum autem ille potuit ut simul et de vita et de absolutione Epicteti saepius desperarem. Illud vero non potuit efficerre, ut vel immori tam praeclaro labori recusarem. Cum igitur ex longis intervallis ad conversionem hanc redirem, non potuit animus ita in omnes totius operis partes intentus esse, et uno velut obtutu contueri omnia, ut fit cum unum quidam idque continenter agitur, ingenio fervente ac nullis aliis distracto curis. Nunc autem, cum Deo propitio portum teneamus, adversis ventis et fluctibus superatis et consopitis, operae premium visum est, amoeniore minusque periculoso anni tempore, eundem cursum relegere, et in idem mare denuo expaciari et contemplari omnia diligentius. Experiamur quam vere scripserit Euripides [*Hipp.* 436], αἱ δεύτεραι πως φροντίδες σοφώτεραι. Et quae priore conatu nos fefellerunt, studiosius indagemus et expendamus.

Printer's note to the reader (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 3). [Inc.]: (p. 439) Typographus lectori. Statuerat interpres accuratiores addere annotationes. Sed varietate fortunae et valetudinis multipliciter impeditus, eruditos lectores orat ut de suo, quod deesse videbitur, suppleant, συγγνώμην νέμοντες τοῖς παραλειψόμενοις [cf. Arist., *SE* 184b7]. ὡς δυνάμεθα γάρ, ἐπεὶ ὡς θέλομεν οὐ δυνάμεθα [cf. Menand., *Andria* fr. *45 Körte-Thierfelder; Menand., *Monostichoi* 273 Jaekel; Ter., *And.* 804].

Commentary (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 3): [Inc.]: (p. 14) In caput I. Τῶν ἄλλων δυνάμεων (1.1). *Aliarum facultatum*. δυνάμεις vires seu facultates appellat, non tantum naturales animi corporis potentias, sed etiam artes et scientias, ut exempla quibus utiliter declarant. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 437) προσέτι δὲ

(4.13). Μαλιμ πρόσεστι. ἃν γε ὁ τοιοῦτος. Fortasse πιστὸς, aut σιωπηλὸς, aut est ἐλλειπτικὸν, ut sub-intellegatur οἷος σιωπῶν, vel οἷον εἶναι μὲν ἔκεινος ὑπολαμβάνει. παρεκάλου] παρεκάλουν.

Editions:

- 1563. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1595–96. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1655. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1741. See above, Composite Editions.

Doubtful editions:

(*) 1742, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 31. Oldfather suggests that some copies of the 1741 edition may have borne the date 1742; but, as no copy has yet been located, this is probably an error owing to the notice in J. F. Beyer, *Über Epiktet und sein Handbuch der stoischen Moral, in biographischer und literarischer Rücksicht* (Marburg, 1795).

(*) 1745, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather, no. 33. The only mention of this edition is in A. A. Renouard, *Catalogue de la bibliothèque d'un amateur* (Paris, 1819); a copy has yet to be located.

(*) 1751, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather, no. 34. As Oldfather notes, there is probably some confusion with the Foulis edition of the same year.

Rejected edition:

(*) 1744, Londini (London): impensis Thomae Woodward. Ed. John Upton. Oldfather, no. 32. The printed catalogue of the British Library mentions two copies of Upton's edition printed in the year 1744 (location number 525.g.2,3); in reality, these copies bear the year 1741 (communication of Mrs. Claudine Davie, 25 March 2003).

Biography and Bibliography:

See I.3 above.

II. ENCHEIRIDION

TRANSLATIONS

1. Nicolaus Perottus

The *Encheiridion* was first translated into Latin by Nicolaus Perottus (Niccolò Perotti) in early 1450, when Perotti was living at Bologna in the

company of Cardinal Bessarion (Oliver, *Perotti*, 19–27). In 1451 it was presented to Pope Nicholas V (1447–55), who may have commissioned the translation (Oliver, *ibid.*, 24). As his Greek source, Perotti states in his letters that he consulted a manuscript belonging to Bessarion (Oliver, *ibid.*, 22; Boter, "Sources," 160–66, 180–82). This codex is now Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. gr. 261 (725), which contains Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*, with the Epictetean text as *lemmata*.

In the dedicatory preface, Perotti expresses his amazement that people are ready to pay so much attention to the well-being of their bodies, while at the same time neglecting the demands of the soul. What medicine is for the body, philosophy is for the soul. One may consult any philosopher one likes, but Perotti prefers Epictetus' *Encheiridion*. He explains that, as soon as he obtained this little book, he decided to prepare a translation and dedicate it to Nicholas V. He also translated the preface to Simplicius' commentary, and this serves as an introduction to the *Encheiridion*.

Perotti's translation of the *Encheiridion* is preserved in nineteen manuscripts with the text divided into seventy-one chapters. The *editio principis*, published in 1954, is the work of R. P. Oliver, who follows Schweighäuser's arrangement of the Greek text into fifty-three chapters (see, however, Boter, *ibid.*, 160–61 and n. 9). In all likelihood, the main reason for the absence of earlier editions is to be found in the prestige of Politian's translation of 1479 (II.2 below).

Oliver (*ibid.*, 30–34) draws a comparison between both translations by quoting and discussing *Ench. 1.1–3*. He points out that Perotti follows the Greek much more closely than does Politian; for instance, while Politian omits the phrase μέμνησο δτι at the beginning of section 3, Perotti renders it as *memento quod*. Nevertheless, Perotti allows himself some liberty. A good illustration of this is the phrase ἐν λόγῳ, which occurs twice in section 1; initially Perotti gives *ut breviter dicam*, then *ut brevi complectar*. Oliver also observes that the latinity of Perotti's translation is markedly inferior to Politian's translation. As examples, he cites the nonclassical *memento quod*, the indicative in indirect questions (*quaero quis est*), and other nonclassical usages. But, Oliver adds, we should not blame Perotti too

much for such errors since, in the fifteenth century, scholars had to learn to write Latin without the help of dictionaries, grammars, etc.; on the other hand, “change was rapid and progress can be measured almost from year to year” (*ibid.*, 34).

There is a second apparatus to Perotti’s translation in which Oliver discusses the relation between original and translation in minute detail. Among many other things, he notes errors (e.g., *Ench.* 14.1, where Perotti wrongly renders τὸν παῖδα [“slave-boy”] as *filius tuus*) and passages where Perotti, often basing himself on Simplicius’ commentary, inserts words for clarity’s sake (e.g., *Ench.* 16, where Perotti adds *ea vero est quae affilit*, corresponding to Simplicius’ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ θλίβον αὐτὸν; ch. 31.4 τὸ εὔσεβές = *pietas . . . religio*). Oliver also mentions many cases of free rendering of short phrases; see, e.g., *Ench.* 32.3 πήρωσις μέρους τινὸς τοῦ σώματος = *vulnera*; *ibid.* πρόσεχε = *animadvertisenda sententia est*.

Preface (ed. of Urbana, 1954). Nicolai Perotti in Epicteti philosophi Enchiridium praefatio incipit feliciter ad Nicolaum Quintum Pontificem Maximum. [*Inc.*]: Soleo mecum interdum mirari, Summe Pontifex, stultitiam atque instabilitatem humani generis, quod, cum constemus ex animo et corpore, animique salutem saluti corporis longe anteponendam esse existimemus, corporis tamen curandi tuendique causas omnis diligentissime perquirimus; animi vero curam nec desideramus nec probamus, sed potius contemnimus invisamque habemus. Qui noster error eo maior iudicandus est quod morbi perniciosiores pluresque sunt animi quam corporis; quod plus detrimenti afferunt animi aegritudines; quod corpora interdum, etiam si diligentissime carentur, sanari non possunt, animi autem omnes qui se sanari voluerunt sine ulla dubitatione sanantur. . . . / . . . [argument that philosophy is medicine for diseases of the soul.] Eligat sibi quisque quos libet; mihi profecto inter ceteros maxime utilis videtur Epictetus nobilissimus philosophus. Nam cum duo sint in quibus praecipue consistit ut bene honesteque vivamus—unum ut intentio finisque nostrarum operationum rectus sit, alterum ut operationes quae ad rectum finem ducunt inveniantur—Epictetus breviter utrumque demonstrat. Nam et finem eligendum docet, et media quibus ad eum finem pervenire possimus ostendit. At quanta est apud hunc virum, dii boni, in loquendo facilitas, in verbis elegantia,

in sententiis gravitas! Non possum dissimulare quod sentio: hoc mihi inter huius ac ceterorum philosophiam videtur interesse, quod aliorum quidem praecepta nos scire faciunt (utputa scire quid sit iustitia, quid fortitudo, quid temperantia), Epicteti vero praecepta fortes nos esse et iustos et temperantes. Tanta est apud hunc philosophum vis elegantiae et gravitatis. Huius cum mihi nuper in manus incidisset exiguis hic libellus, qui Enchiridium inscribitur, dignus mihi visus fuit quem Latinum facerem et tuo beatissimo nomini, Pontifex Maxime, dedicarem. Eum, cum pro tua solita clementia atque benignitate susperis, noli idcirco contemnere quod sit corpore exiguis. Est enim amplissimus viribus, instar lapillorum qui interdum, cum nullius sint corporis, pretiosissimi habentur. Qualiscumque tamen tuae Sanctitati videbitur, non despero—tanta est tua benignitas atque clementia—vel propterea tibi gratum acceptumque futurum quod ab homine tuae Sanctitati deditissimo, optimo animo summoque obsequendi studio oblatus fuit. Valeat tua Sanctitas felicissime.

Preface to Simplicius’ commentary. Simplicii philosophi in expositionem Enchiridii praeatio incipit felicissime. [*Inc.*]: De vita quidem Epicteti deque eius morte Arrianus scripsit, maximis voluminibus eius diatribas complexus, a quo licet intellegere qualis vita fuerit Epictetus. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Qui vero pecuniis et ceteris eiusmodi rebus intentus est, is neque hominis neque instrumenti eius sed eorum quae instrumenti sunt curam habet [Plato, *Alc.* 1 131bc]. Nicolai Perotti de Graeco translatio prooemii finit feliciter.

Encheiridion. Epicteti philosophi Enchiridium incipit feliciter [*Inc.*]: (*Ench.* 1.1) Eorum quae sunt, quaedam in nobis sunt, quaedam non sunt in nobis. In nobis quidem opinio, appetitio, declinatio, et, ut breviter dicam, quaecumque nostra opera sunt. Non in nobis vero corpus, possessio, gloria, et, ut brevi complectar, quaecumque non sunt opera nostra. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (*Ench.* 53.3–4) “Sed, O Criton, si haec diis placent, ita fiat.” “Me vero Anytus et Melitus interficere quidem possunt, nocere vero mihi minime possunt.”

Manuscripts:

(photo.) Cambridge, St. John’s College, 61, s. XV, fols. 127r–147v (M.R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St. John’s College, Cambridge* [Cambridge, 1913], 80–

- 82; Boter, "Sources," 188; d'Alessandro, 297 n. 34).
- (*) Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 48.36, s. XV (1454–70 [?]), fols. 1–29 (Bandini 2.458–59; Oliver, *Perotti*, 47–48).
- (*) ——, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, II.VII.125, s. XV (a. 1495), fols. 126–143 (Oliver, *Perotti*, 51; Kristeller, *Iter* 5.572a).
- (photo.) ——, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 365, s. XV, fols. 49r–69v (Boter, "Sources," 187; d'Alessandro, 296 n. 30; Kristeller, *Iter* 1.191a).
- (*) London, British Library, Harley 4923, s. XV, fols. 278v–285r (Oliver, *Perotti*, 46–47; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.182a).
- (photo.) Mantova, Biblioteca Comunale, A.III.28, s. XV, fols. 8v–15v (Boter, "Sources," 188; Kristeller, *Iter* 1.271b).
- (*) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L 27 sup., s. XV (a. 1473), fols. 10–32 (Oliver, *Perotti*, 40–41; Kristeller, *Iter* 1.300b).
- (*) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 3604, s. XV (a. 1452–60), fols. 118r–141v (*Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis*, vol. 1 [Munich, 1894], 119–20; Oliver, *Perotti*, 48–51).
- (*) Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, VIII.H.30, s. XV (a. 1454–65 [?]), fols. 70r–94r (J. Truhlář, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum latinorum qui in C. R. bibliotheca publica atque universitatis Pragensis asservantur*, vol. 1 [Prague, 1905], 610; Oliver, *Perotti*, 51–52).
- (photo.) Regensburg, Fürst Thurn und Taxis Hofbibliothek, 64, s. XV, fols. 27r–46v (Boter, "Sources," 187; d'Alessandro, 298 n. 34; Kristeller, *Iter* 3.690b).
- (photo.) Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1129, s. XV, pp. 2–47 (Boter, "Sources," 187; d'Alessandro, 296 n. 31; Kristeller, *Iter* 3.342b).
- (*) Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, 1371 (T 5. 9), s. XV, fols. 1–24 [44–77] (E. Narducci, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Angelica olim coenobii Sancti Augustini de Urbe*, vol. 1 [Rome, 1893], 576–77; Oliver, *Perotti*, 52).
- (*) San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Comunale Guarneriana, 204, s. XV (a. 1454–60), fols. 14r–39v (Oliver, *Perotti*, 43–46; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.569a).
- (photo.) Trento, Museo Nazionale, 3224 (olim Vindob. Palatinus 305), s. XV (a. 1454–65 [?]), fols. 21r–42r (Oliver, *Perotti*, 53–54; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.193b, 3.59b, 6.232b).

(*) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 49, s. XV (a. 1452–95), fols. 12–38 (Oliver, *Perotti*, 42–44; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.442a).

(photo.) ——, Ottob. lat. 1971, s. XV, fols. 132r–156r (Boter, "Sources," 187; d'Alessandro, 293 n. 25; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.434b).

(*) ——, Vat. lat. 3027, s. XV (a. 1454–61). (Oliver, *Perotti*, 54–55; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.316a).

(photo.) ——, Vat. lat. 6526, s. XVII, fols. 182r–202r (Oliver, *Perotti*, 40; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.381a).

(*) ——, Vat. lat. 6847, s. XV (post a. 1456), fols. 17v–57. (Oliver, *Perotti*, 55–56; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.341a, 2.584a, 6.344b).

Edition:

1954, Urbana. Ed. R. P. Oliver.

Biography:

See CTC 3.7.

Add to Bibliography:

P. d'Alessandro, "L'archetipo dell'*Enchiridium Epicteti* di Niccolò Perotti," *Rinascimento* 35 (1995) 287–317; Boter, "Sources," 160–66, 186–88; J.-L. Charlet, "Perotti (Niccolò)," in *Centuriae Latinae. Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat*, ed. C. Nativel (Geneva, 1997), 601–5; P.O. Kristeller, "Niccolò Perotti ed i suoi contributi alla storia dell'Umanesimo," *Res publica litterarum* 4 (1981) 7–25; R.P. Oliver, *Niccolò Perotti's Version of the Enchiridion of Epictetus, Edited with an Introduction and a List of Perotti's Writings* (Urbana, 1954); S. Prete, *L'umanista Niccolò Perotti* (Sassoferato, 1980).

2. Angelus Politianus

Angelus Politianus (Angelo Poliziano, Politian) translated the *Encheiridion* in 1479 at Fiesole. In a letter of that same year dated 22 May and addressed to his patron Lorenzo de' Medici (1449–92), Politian says that he is staying in the villa at Fiesole and promises to produce some booklets in order to show his gratitude to Lorenzo (for the full text of this letter, see G.B. Picotti, *Ricerche umanistiche* [Florence, 1955] 72–73). Oliver, "Politian," 197–98 argues that the translation was probably made in June.

In the accompanying prefatory letter addressed to Lorenzo, Politian states that he made the translation during a period of leisure grant-

ed to him by his patron. After recounting some anecdotes about Epictetus and briefly characterizing his philosophy, he explains that he has translated the work from two very defective manuscripts ("duo omnino mendosissima exemplaria"). These codices have been identified as (congeners of) Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 327 and Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek—Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Da 55; see Boter, "Sources," 169–74. Vat. gr. 327 contains Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*, with the text of the *Encheiridion* added as *lemmata* before the relevant parts of the commentary; the *lemmata* contain numerous *lacunae* and the text is very corrupt in many places (Boter, *Encheiridion* [1999], 52–55, 97–98). Dresden Da 55 contains only a selection from the *Encheiridion* (Boter, *ibid.*, 4–5, 28). A full collation of the two manuscripts is found in Boter, "Sources," 183–86.

Politian tried in many passages to reconstruct the corrupt or absent text in his Greek sources through recourse to Simplicius' commentary in Vat. gr. 327 (Boter, *ibid.*, 175). He also used Simplicius' commentary for the titles that he placed at the head of each of the sixty-eight chapters into which his text is divided (see Zanta, *La traduction*, 23–27; P. Hadot, "La survie," 336, 358–64; Boter, "Sources," 169–70 with n. 31).

As noted in II.1 above, Oliver, *Perotti*, 30–34 demonstrates that the latinity of Politian's version is much better than Perotti's. Politian translates the opening section of chapter 1 as "Eorum quae sunt partim in nobis est, partim non est"; however, the elegant use of the idiomatic "partim-partim" is partly spoiled by the incorrect singular "est." The frequently occurring phrase μέμνησο ὅτι, which Perotti translates with the nonclassical *memento quod*, is often omitted altogether by Politian.

Editions of Politian's translation exhibit many points of agreement with the translation by Perotti. Oliver, "Era plagiario," 256–63 shows in detail that this phenomenon can be explained by the fact that Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, who prepared the *editio princeps* of Politian's translation (Bologna, 1497), incorporated passages from Perotti's translation into his own manuscript (now Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 766) of Politian's translation. Nearly all subsequent editions depend on Beroaldo's edition with the exception of that prepared by E. V. Maltese (Milan,

1990) who bases his text on Johann Schweighäuser's edition but also takes account of the readings of Riccardiana 766, as reported by Oliver, "Politian," 212–17.

Despite obvious defects, Politian's translation acquired enormous prestige and popularity (see Oliver, *Perotti*, 27–32). It had no competition from the new translations by Verlenius in 1543 (II.3 below) and Naogeorgus 1554 (II.4 below), but was superseded by Hieronymus Wolf's translation of 1561 (II.5 below), which was to be the most widely read translation well into the eighteenth century.

Prefatory letter to Lorenzo de' Medici (ed. of Milan, 1990). (p. 58) Caenea Lapithan, eum qui cum Centauris pugnaverit, Laurenti Medices, adeo vulneribus inviolabilem telisque impervium fuisse scribit Pindarus [Plut., *Mor.* 1057d; cf. Pind., fr. 128f Maehler], ut, cum in eum Centauri ingentem quandam sylvarum molem facto unanimiter impetu congesisset, recto (ut idem inquit) pede terram sciderit. At vero Epictetus hic noster ea non a Vulcano, ut Achilles [Hom., *Il.* 18.478–617] atque Aeneas [Verg., *Aen.* 8.407–53], sed a natura ipsa ac ratione arma accepit, quae non modo se a telis et ferro, sed a metu quoque et dolore ceterisque animi perturbationibus tutum inviolabilemque praestiterint. Bellum quidem hic vir non cum Centauris, ut ille, sed cum fortuna cumque opinione acerrimum gessit. Quas ita ambas fudit atque fugavit, ut eas ex universa quoque hominum vita exterminaverit. Qui cum et servus esset et claudus et Homericus Iro [Hom., *Od.* 18] pauperior, haud tamen dubitavit diis sese amicum notissimo apud Graecos disticho asseverare [*Anth. Pal.* 7.676 = Schenkl, test. XVIII]. Legerat enim apud Platonom, in eo dialogo qui *Alcibiades primus aut de natura hominis* inscribitur [129b ff.], eum proprie veroque hominem esse, cuius omnis in rationali animo substantia existeret. Quapropter quicquid extra hunc hominem foret, id ad se minime pertinere arbitratus est; neque id verbis tantum aut libris, sed vita quoque ipsa prae se tulit. Ita enim sese ab externorum cura avocavit, ut Romae eius domus ne ianuam quidem ullam habuerit, quippe in qua praeter vilissimum cubile nihil omnino esset.

Huius de vita ac moribus ingens volumen, quod tamen olim culpa temporum interiit, Arrianus vir clarissimus conscripsit, eque eius libris quasi florrem quendam, qui hunc Platonicum, hoc est verum hominem, in libertatem vindicaret, excerpit

atque in volumen redegit [cf. Simpl., *In Epicteti Ench.*, praef. 1–11 Hadot]. Quem quia librum ad manum semper (p. 60) habere oporteat, *Enchiridion* (*Encheiridion* ed.), quo nomine militaris pugnunculus significatur, inscripsit [cf. Simpl., *In Epicteti Ench.*, praef. 18–20 Hadot]. Sermo autem in eo omnino efficax est atque enargiae plenus, et in quo mira sit ad permovendum vis: suos enim qui vis affectus in eo agnoscit adque eos emendandos ceu quodam aculeo excitatur [cf. Simpl., *In Epicteti Ench.*, praef. 21–24 Hadot]. Omnia vero ordinem inter se mirum habent omnibusque veluti lineis, quamvis in plura id opus capita sit distinctum, ad excitandum rationalem animum quasi ad ipsum centrum contendunt, ut is et suae dignitatis curam habeat et propriis actionibus secundum naturam utatur [cf. Simpl., *In Epicteti Ench.*, praef. 49–55 Hadot]. Stylus autem, qualem res postularet, concisus est, dilucidus quique omnem respuat ornatum, Pythagoreorumque praeceptis, quas illi diathecas vocant, quam simillimus [cf. Simpl., *In Epicteti Ench.*, praef. 48–49 Hadot].

Hoc ego opus cum Latinum facere aggrederer, ut indulti a te nobis huius tam suavis otii rationem aliquam redderem, in duo omnino mendo-sissima exemplaria incidi pluribusque locis magna ex parte mutilata. Quapropter cum et cetera quaecunque usquam exemplaria extarent non dissimilia his esse audirem, permisi mihi ut, sic ubi aliqua capita aut deessent aut dimidiata superforent, ea ego de Simplicii verbis, qui id opus interpretatus est, maxima (quantum in me esset) fide supplerem. Quod si non verba ad unguem (id nullo modo fieri poterat), at sensum certe ipsum purum sincerumque Latinum a nobis redditum arbitror. Quod ne quempiam forte perturbet, quemadmodum Aristarchus Homeri versus quos ipse non probaret, ita nos singula ipsa capita, quae nostris quidem verbis explicitur, obelo, hoc est veru, iugulavimus [these obeli are not found in Riccardiana 766].

Suffurare igitur, Laurenti, tuis occupationibus otium aliquod, si potes, quod libelli huius lectioni impertias. Id enim disciplinae genus in eo est, quod, si recte perpendas, non cuiquam magis aliorum quam ingentis fortunae viris conveniat. Sed quod in toto hoc libello pluribus explicatur, id omne Epictetus duobus his verbis, quae etiam frequentissime usurpabat, comprehendere est solitus: sustine et abstine [Gell., *Noct. att.* 17.19.6 = Epict. fr. X Schenkl].

Patriam hic vir Hierapolin Phrygiae urbem habuit. Romae Epaphrodito cuidam Neronis familiari servit atque ad Marci usque Antonini tempora pervenit [cf. *Suda E* 2424 (II, 365, 24–27 Adler)]. Domitiano autem imperante, eius dominatu offensus, Roma Hierapolin migravit [cf. Simpl., *In Epicteti Ench.* 32.191–93 Hadot], ratus verum esse quod est apud tragicum, patriam esse cuiusque ubi quis recte ageret [cf. Cic., *Tusc.* 5.37.108]. Tanta vero apud omnis homines eius vitae admiratio extitit, ut Lucianus Syrus Epicteti lucernam fictilem tribus drachmarum milibus ob eius auctoritatem venisse tradat [*Adv. indocitos* 13 = Schenkl, test. XV]. Nos ad te nunc non lucernam Epicteti, sed eius imaginem animi, quae multo plus lucis habeat, Laurenti, mittimus. Nam cum universam tuae pulcherrimae bibliothecae supellectilem, quam tute nobis utendam concessisti, nuperime scrutarer, hoc unum merito opusculum quasi ex horto flosculum, quod tibi offerrem, delibavi. Hic enim unus est liber, nisi me opinio fallit, qui et naturae isti tuae ad magna quidem semper atque ardua excitatae et his tam duris temporibus, quibus te undique fortuna exercendum accepit, maxime omnium conveniat. Vale.

Encheiridion. [Inc.]: Epicteti Stoici Enchiridion ab Angelo Politiano e Graeco versum. (p. 67; title of chapter 1) Quae in nobis sint quaeve non, qualiae quaeque sint. (*Ench.* 1.1) Eorum quae sunt partim in nobis est, partim non est. In nobis est opinio, conatus, appetitus, declinatio et, ut uno dicam verbo, quaecunque nostra sunt opera. Non sunt in nobis corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus et uno verbo quaecunque nostra opera non sunt. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 86; *Ench.* 53.3–4) Sed et tertium: o Criton, si ita diis placet, ita fiat. Me vero Anytus et Melitus interimere quidem possunt, laedere autem non possunt.

Manuscripts:

(photo.) Edinburgh, University Library, 234, s. XVI, fols. 1v–79r (Gr.-Lat.), with Ludovicus Odaxius' translation of ps. Cebes, *Tabula* (Boter, *Encheiridion* [1999], 39–40 and "Sources," 167 n. 24; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.22b–23a).

(photo.) Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 766, s. XV ex., fols. 308r–317v (Boter, "Sources," 167–68; Kristeller, *Iter* 1.199b–200a).

(*) Savignano sul Rubicone, Biblioteca dell'Accademia Rubiconia dei Filopatridi, 56, s.

XVI ex., pp. 1–62. (Oliver, "Politian," 207 n. 69; Boter, "Sources," 167 n. 24; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.571a).

(photo.) Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, J III 13, s. XVI, fols. 374v–382r (Boter, "Sources," 167 n. 24; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.181b–182a).

Editions:

(photo.) 1497, Bononiae (Bologna): Benedictus Hectoris Faelli. Ed. P. Beroaldus. With Censorinus, *De die natali* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 621. GW 6471; HC 4847; BMC 6.843; Goff C-376; Maittaire 1.634; Pellechet 3471; Sheehan C-198; Walsh 3234–35; NUC.BL; BNF; (CtY; MM; PPC; ICJ; CLSU).

1498, Venetiis (Venice): in aedibus Aldi Romani. Ed. A. Sarti. With the *opera* of Politian. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 623. HC 13218; BMC 5.559; Goff P-886; Sheehan P-429; Walsh 2666–70; NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; MiU; IU; TxDaM-P; OrU).

(*) 1499, Florentiae (Florence). With the *opera* of Politian. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 624. HC 13219; BMC 7.992–93; Goff P-887; Walsh 3439; Sheehan P-430; NUC.BL; BNF; (DLC; CtY; InU; ICN; CSt).

(*) 1508, s. l. [Strasbourg]: Matthias Schurerius. With Athanasius, *In Psalmos*, etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 625. Panzer 6.42, no. 131; VD E-1613. BL.

(*) 1512, Parrhisiis (Paris): in aedibus J. Badii Ascensii. With the *opera* of Politian. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 626. Panzer 7.562, no. 525; NUC.BL; (ICU; KU; CtY; CaBVaU).

(*) 1516 (March), Argentorati (Strasbourg): ex aedibus Schurerianis. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Oldfather, no. 627. Panzer 6.80, no. 448; VD E-1614. BL.

(*) 1516 (October), Argentorati (Strasbourg): apud M. Schurerium. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 628. Panzer 6.81, no. 459; VD E-1615. BNF.

(*) 1517, Argentorati (Strasbourg): apud Matthiam Schurerium. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Oldfather, no. 629. Panzer 6.85–86, no. 494; VD E-1617. BL.

(*) 1517, Lipsiae (Leipzig): in aedibus Valentini Schumann. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 630. Panzer 7.201, no. 634; VD E-1616. Mannheim, Universitätsbibliothek.

(*) 1518, Lipsiae (Leipzig): ex aedibus Valentini Schumann. With *Catonis praecepta moralia*

etc. Oldfather, no. 631. Panzer 7.205, no. 673; VD E-1619. Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek.

(photo.) 1518, Lipsiae (Leipzig): ex officina Lottheriana. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Not mentioned by Oldfather. VD E-1618. Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek.

(*) 1518, Argentorati (Strasbourg): apud Matthiam Schurerium. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 632. Panzer 11.364, no. 523. VD E-1620. Jena, Universitätsbibliothek.

1519, Parrhisiis (Paris): in aedibus Iodoci Badii Ascensii. With the *opera* (vol. 2) of Politian. Oldfather, no. 633. Panzer 8.54, no. 1077; NUC.BNF; (MH; CtY; MiU; ICU; CU).

(*) 1519, Argentorati (Strasbourg): Matth. Schurer. With *Catonis Disticha* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 634. Panzer 6.91, no. 545 (but Panzer does not mention *Ench.* explicitly); VD E-1621. BL.

(photo.) 1520, Argentinae (Strasbourg): apud Ioannem Knoblouchium. With *Catonis Disticha*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 635. VD E-1622. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

(*) 1520, Selestadii (Sélestat): apud Lazarum Schurerium. With *Catonis praecepta moralia* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 636. Panzer 8.291–92, no. 17 (but Panzer does not mention *Ench.*). BL.

(*) 1521, Lipsiae (Leipzig): ex officina Jacobi Thanner. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 637. VD E-1623; NUC.(IU).

1529, Norenbergae (Nuremberg): apud Joan. Petreium. Ed. Gregorius Haloander. (Gr.-Lat.). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 249, 640. Panzer 7.475, no. 261; Brunet 2.1013; VD E-1606. BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

(*) 1531, Basileae (Basel): apud And. Cratandrum. (Gr.-Lat.). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 250, 641. Panzer 6.283, no. 833; Adams E-219; VD E-1607. BL; BNF.

(*) 1533, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Seb. Gryphium. Not mentioned by Oldfather. Panzer 11.457, no. 700b; NUC.BLF; (MH; ViU; NcD; ICU; IaU; CtY).

1537, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Seb. Gryphium. With the *opera* (vol. 2) of Politian. Oldfather, no. 642. NUC.BNF; (MH; ViU; NcD; ICU; IaU).

(*) 1539, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Seb. Gryphium. With the *opera* (vol. 2) of Politian. Oldfather, no. 638. NUC.BNF; (NN; CtY; NcD; MnU).

(photo.) 1540, Parisiis (Paris): per Conrad. Neobarium. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 643. Maittaire 3.314; NUC. BNF; (CtY; MiU).

(*) 1545, Parisiis (Paris): apud J. Bogardum. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 644. NUC. BL; BNF; (NcD).

1545, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Seb. Gryphium. With the *opera* (vol. 2) of Politian. Not mentioned by Oldfather. NUC. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (MiU; CtY; MsG; AzTeS; CaBVaU).

(*) 1546, Venetiis (Venice): apud Hieronymum Scotum. With Angelus Caninius' Latin translation of Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 645, 813. BL.

(photo.) 1548, Venetiis (Venice): ad signum spei. In some parts, this edition deviates from Politian's translation; thus the opening sentence of chapter 1 runs as follows: "Rerum aliae in nobis sunt, aliae non sunt," whereas earlier editions have: "Eorum quae sunt partim in nobis est, partim non est." For *Ench.* 53.1–2 (where Politian's translation is based on a very corrupt Greek text) this edition gives a new metrical translation: "Semper haec in promptu habenda: O summe Pater, o Fatum ineluctabile, / Quo destinatum est ire me deducite, / Sequare libens, vel improbus cogar sequi. / Item, Necessitatis imperata qui facit, / Sapientia habetur, et sciens coelestium." Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 603a. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

(*) 1550, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Seb. Gryphium. With the *opera* (vol. 2) of Politian. Not mentioned by Oldfather. BNF.

1553, Basileae (Basel): apud Nicolaum Episcopium Iuniorem. With the *Opera* of Politian. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 645a. NUC. BL; BNF; (CtY; MH; MnU; KyU; CLSU).

1554 (Basel). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1581, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Alexandrum Massilium. With Boethius, *Consolatio Philosophiae*. Oldfather, no. 650. BL. 1594. See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1595 (Geneva). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1596, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Ioann. Musonium. With Boethius, *Consolatio Philosophiae*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 651a. Cambridge, University Library.

1600 (Geneva). See above, Composite Editions.

1600 (Lyons). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1617, Rothomagi (Rouen): apud Romanum de Beauvais. With Boethius, *Consolatio Philosophiae*. Not mentioned by Oldfather. BL.

1683 (Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1750 (Amsterdam and Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.

(photo.) 1750 (Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.

1800, Lipsiae (Leipzig). In vol. 5 of Schweighäuser's *Epictetae philosophiae monumenta*. Oldfather, nos. 26, 660. BL.

(*) 1926, Mediolani (Milan): C. F. Cigliati. Ed. G. Rensi. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 661a.

(*) 1971, Milano (Milan): Grande Universale Mursia. Ed. G. de Ruggiero.

1990, Milano (Milan): Garzanti. (Gr.-Lat.). Ed. E. V. Maltese.

Doubtful editions:

(*) 1566, Parisiis (Paris): ex officina Thomae Brumennii. (Gr.-Lat.). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 126, 648. The copies so far located contain only the Greek text.

(*) 1567, Parisiis (Paris): ex officina Thomae Brumennii. (Gr.-Lat.). Oldfather, nos. 127, 649. The copies so far located contain only the Greek text.

(*) 1642, Argentorati (Strasbourg). Mentioned by H. Relandus (in the edition of the *Encheiridion* by M. Meibom [Utrecht, 1711], *Index editionum*). Possibly confused with the edition published in 1642 at Cologne, which contains Wolf's translation (Oldfather [with *Supplement*], nos. 153, 605). Oldfather, no. 654.

Rejected editions:

(*) 1528, Venetiis (Venice). Relandus wrongly states that this edition (the *editio princeps* of Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*) also contains a Latin translation; he is followed by Mencken, 558. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 121.

(*) 1537, Parisiis (Paris). Adams E-221 mentions an edition "Egxeiridion, Idem latine, A. Politiano interprete (...), Parisiis, in off. Christiani Wecheli, 1537." This entry is a ghost (communication of Nicolas Smith of the Cambridge University Library, 1 March 2001).

(*) 1557, Parisiis (Paris): A. Wechelus. (Gr.-Lat.). Mentioned by C. E. Lutz, CTC 6.8b14, where there is some misunderstanding of the entry in the

Catalogue général of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France: in reality, the BNF copy of the 1557 Paris edition of ps. Cebes' *Tabula* is bound together with Jacob Schenck's 1554 edition of Epictetus.

(*) 1589, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Ioan. Tornae-sium. Schweighäuser, *Ench.*, xxxix wrongly classifies this edition under the *Editionis Basileensis secundae* [= Jacob Schenck, which contains Politian's translation] *sequaces*; he is followed by Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 132. However, under no. 322, Oldfather mentions this edition as reproducing Wolf's translation.

(*) 1590, Francoforti (Frankfurt): Wechel. (Gr.-Lat.). See CTC 6.14b under the heading "Doubtful Commentaries" with a reference to Fabricius-Harles 2.707, who record the following: "Epictet. Enchiridion et Cebetis Tabula gr. lat. Antwerp. (...)—et Lugd. Bat.—Antwerpiae 1585. 8—Cebes cum notis Bernhardii Copii et versione lat. Reineri ac Langii, Francof. apud Wechel. 1590. 8."

(*) 1610, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned in the *Catalogue général* of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. The date is an error for 1600.

(*) 1628, Venetiis (Venice). Relandus means the 1528 edition of Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion* (see above); he wrongly states that this edition also contains a Latin translation; he is followed by Mencken, 558. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 121, 147.

(*) 1651, Roterodami (Rotterdam). Mentioned by Relandus. Probably confused with the editions published in 1651 at Leiden, and in 1654 at Rotterdam, which contain Wolf's translation (Oldfather [with *Supplement*], nos. 156, 161). Oldfather, no. 655.

(*) 1666, Rintelii (Rinteln). Mentioned by Relandus and Mencken. In reality, the edition published in 1666 at Rinteln contains Wolf's translation (Oldfather [with *Supplement*], no. 169). Oldfather, no. 657.

(*) 1690, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned in NUC. The date is an error for 1600.

(*) 1694, Genevae (Geneva). Mentioned by Mencken, 558. The date 1694 is an error for 1594. Oldfather, no. 20.

(*) 1695, s. l. Mentioned by P.A.A. Ducoin, *Catalogue des livres que renferme la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Grenoble, classés méthodiquement* (Grenoble, 1831–39), no. 10693. The date is an error for 1595. Oldfather, no. 21.

Biography:

See CTC 1.133–34, 225–26; 4.272; 7.231.

Add to Bibliography:

Boyer, "Sources," 167–80; V. Branca, *Poliziano e l'umanesimo della parola* (Turin, 1983); D. Giunta, "Le postille ad Epitteto nel manoscritto Laurenziano Redi 15," in F. Bausi and V. Fera, eds., *Laurentia Laurus. Per Mario Martelli*, Biblioteca Umanistica 1 (Messina, 2004), 243–63; Hadot, "La survie," 329–37; P. Hallyn-Galand, "Politien (Ange)," in *Centuria Latine. Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat*, ed. C. Nativel (Geneva, 1997), 623–28; J. Kraye, "L'interprétation platonicienne de l'*Enchiridion* d'Epictète proposée par Politien: philologie et philosophie dans la Florence du XVe siècle, à la fin des années 70," in *Penser entre les lignes. Philologie et philosophie au Quattrocento*, ed. F. Mariani-Zini (Lille 3, 2001), 161–77; T. Leuker, *Angelo Poliziano. Dichter, Redner, Strateg* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997), 28–40; J. Mähly, *Angelus Politianus* (Leipzig, 1864), 95 f.; I. Maier, *Ange Politien. La formation d'un poète humaniste (1469–1480)* (Geneva, 1966), 374–80; E. V. Maltese, *Epitteto, Manuale* (Milan, 1990), 49–57; Maltese, "Nota sul ms. Taur. J.III.13 (per l'*Encheiridion* del Poliziano)," *Res publica litterarum* 14 (1991) 143–46; M. Martelli, "Angelo Poliziano e la politica culturale laurenziana," in *Il Poliziano latino. Atti del Seminario di Lecce—28 aprile 1994*, ed. P. Viti (Galatina, 1996), 9–36; F.O. Mencken, *Historia vitae et in literas meritorum Angeli Politiani* (Leipzig, 1736), 161–62, 556–59; Oliver, "Era plagiaro," passim; Oliver, "Politian," passim; É. Séris, *Les étoiles de Némésis: la rhétorique de la mémoire dans la poésie d'Ange Politien (1454–1494)*, Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance 359 (Geneva, 2002); A. Stewart, "The Singing Boy and the Scholar: the Various Deaths of Politian," in *Eros et Priapus*, ed. I. De Smet and P. Ford (Geneva, 1997), 43–63; Zanta, *La traduction*, 15–39; Zanta, *La renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle*, 14–15, 139, 141.

3. Hieronymus Verlenius

The Dutch scholar Hieronymus Verlenius (also Vaerlenius or Verlensis) translated the *Encheiridion* into Latin in 1543. His text is divided into thirty-four chapters. Each chapter of the *Encheiridion* has a heading that gives a summary of its contents; in this respect he follows Politian's example.

Verlenius states in the preface that with his new translation he incurs the risk of being accused of plagiarizing Politian's version on the one hand, while exposing himself to severe criticism for possible errors on the other. He explains that he was induced to make a new translation by the fact that in many places Politian's translation departs from the Greek text (which had become available since the publication of the 1528 edition [Venice] of Simplicius' commentary and the 1529 edition [Nuremberg] of the *Encheiridion*). He imputes this to Politian's Greek sources and not to Politian himself; see II.2 above for the two defective Greek manuscripts, which Politian used.

A second edition of Verlenius' translation was published in 1550 at Antwerp. The volume contains more material than the 1543 edition and is dedicated to Nicolaus Busius (for whom see H. de Vocht, *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517–1550*, vol. 4 [Louvain, 1955], 406–7; A. Gerlo and H. D. L. Vervliet, *Bibliographie de l'Humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas* [Brussels, 1972], 264, no. 3350). Verlenius begins his preface with δις καὶ τρὶς τὰ καλά ("good things twice and thrice") to justify a new edition of his Latin translation of the *Encheiridion*. The new edition, he explains, is richer than the first one because it includes a number of fragments taken from Stobaeus; these fragments, put together in eight chapters, constitute a sequel to the *Encheiridion*, or rather, they form the third part of it (the authentic *Encheiridion* consists of two parts, according to Verlenius). He then explains why he has also inserted his translations of a passage from book 4 of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* and Hippocrates' letter to Demagetus.

As a rule, Verlenius follows the original Greek of the *Encheiridion* very closely. He abstains from reworking the original and from making substantial additions. However, occasionally the same Greek phrase is rendered in different ways; for instance, the phrase ἐνὶ λόγῳ, which occurs twice in chapter 1.1, is translated as "ut uno dicam verbo" and as "in summa." At times the translation is so literal as to result in dubious Latin; one such example is in chapter 1.1 where the phrase ὅσα ἡμέτερα ἔργα is rendered as "quaecunque nostra sunt opera." Like Perottus and Naogeorgus, Verlenius introduces the nonclassical *memineris/memento quod* (e.g. in chapter 2). Occasionally there is a wrong use of the present subjunctive in

a conditional clause which is followed by a main clause with the future indicative (e.g. in chapter 1.3). Some other instances of indifferent Latin are: chapter 6 ἀλλοτρίῳ προτερήματι = "praestantiam alicuius rei alienae" ("res aliena" means "debt"); chapter 7 ἐν πλῷ = "inter navigandum".

Verlenius' translation appears to have remained almost completely unnoticed. Wolf, who mentions the versions by Politian and Naogeorgus (1554), passes over Verlenius' efforts in silence. Jöcher, 4.1537 states: "... gab auch Epicteti *encheiridion* cum scholiis . . .," which probably refers to the 1550 edition. Zanta, *La traduction*, 41 believes that Naogeorgus was the next translator of the *Encheiridion* after Politian. Verlenius' translation is not mentioned in the standard bibliographical reference works; Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 666a mentions the 1550 edition (which he inspected in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek), but in his description he admits that he has not been able to locate the earlier edition referred to by Verlenius, suggesting that it may be identical with his no. 123 (Antwerp, 1547), which he has likewise not been able to locate.

The only reference to the 1543 edition so far located in the bibliographical literature occurs in D. F. Scheurleer, *Encheiridion, Zedekundig handboekje van Epictetus* (The Hague, 1919), 253 (overlooked by Oldfather), who mentions the copy in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek. Biographical works concerning Verlenius mention the 1543 edition (but overlook his 1550 edition of the Greek text published at Louvain [Oldfather, no. 318], for which see III.1 below).

Preface (ed. of 's-Hertogenbosch, 1543). (fol. A1v) Candido lectori. Operae pretium ratus sum me esse facturum, candide lector, si hoc operae quanquam invidiosum in tui omniumque studiosorum gratiam subirem, et Epicteti Enchiridion olim ab Angelo Politiano versum, denuo e Graeco traducerem. Quam quidem provinciam cum quanto famae et nominis periculo subverim, quivis facile intelligit. Si enim fideliter et recte quid a nobis versum fuerit, non id nostrum, sed illius esse qui prior verterit, continuo malevoli dicturi sunt, et me in alienam (quod aiunt) messem falcem misisse [LXX, Deut 23:25]. Si quid peccatum fuerit, quod certe non negaverim, neque enim adeo Suffenus [cf. Cat., Carm. 22] sum, nulla putabor venia dignus, quod interpretationem tanti viri damnare videar. At qui Poli-

tiani Latinum Epictetum cum Graeco conferat, videbit luce clarius quam multa Graecis non respondeant, et eum aliquot locis sua quaedam assuisse, et plura addidisse quam patiatur fidi interpretis officium. Verum id non interpreti eruditissimo sed corruptissimo et mutilo exemplari in quod incidit, imputandum censeo. Verum quicquid sit, et quocunque tandem modo id accidisse putabitur, varia enim sunt et libera cuique iudicia, non putavi pias et Christianas aures tam salubribus fraudandas praecepsit, et admonitionibus, quae non ex media philosophia sed theologia intima deprompta dicas. Ego certe miraculo simile esse dixerim gentilem philosophum non illustratum luce evangelica tam consentanea nostrae religioni et praecepsis evangelicis potuisse scribere. Totus enim in hoc est Epictetus noster, ut ab externis occupationibus, quibus avocamus a contemplanda veritate, ad sese redeat quisque et posthabitatis alienis sua potius, id est, animae suae (fol. A2r) negotia curet et, ut Persius ait [Sat. 4.52], tecum habites, et noris, quam sit tibi curta supellex. In hoc enim uno cardo absolutissimae et verissimae philosophiae versatur. Quamdiu enim extra nos vagamur, et per externas toti effundimur actiones, quidvis potius facimus quam philosophamur. Unde et Socrates neglectis caeteris rebus, ut autor est in eius vita Laertius [Diog. Laert. 2.21], censebat id potissime curandum ὅτι τοὶ ἐμ (sic) μεγάροισι κακῶν τ' ἀγαθῶν τε τέτυκται, id est aedibus in nostris quae prava a recta gerantur, significare nimirum volens vir ille etiam Apollinis Delphici testimonio sapientissimus iudicatus [Pl., Ap. 21a], omnibus alienis posthabitatis in nostrum pectus et sinum adsidue descendendum, et dispiciendum quid ibi recte, quid minus recte geratur. Quae omnia mirum quanta dexteritate et compendio praecipiat Epictetus. Operam itaque hanc nostram boni consule. Vale.

Preface (ed. of Antwerp, 1550). (fol. A2r) Ornatus atque Eruditissimo viro et Domino Magistro Nicolao Busio Ecclesiae Bekensis Decano meritissimo et sacrae theologiae baccalaureo patrino suo et amico unice dilecto Hieronymus Verlenius s. d. Graecorum proverbium habet, ornatus vir, δίς καὶ τρίς τὰ καλά [see for instance Zenobius 3.33 (I, 66,5–6 Leutsch-Schneidewin)], hoc est ea quae pulchra et honesta sint non semel modo sed bis et ter dicenda, nam ut author est Plato, κόρος οὐδεὶς τῶν καλῶν [Lucianus, Dips. 9], id est, rerum honestarum nulla satietas. Ex-

istimavi itaque me operaे pretium facturum, si Epicteti Enchiridion olim nostra opera emaculatus e Graeco versum iam denuo emitterem, non prorsus idem, sed priore illo longe auctius; nam praeter uberiora scholia nostra in obscuriores aliquot locos quae a nonnullis desiderabantur, adiecimus huic Enchiridio tertiam partem (nam antea duabus constabat) in octo capita sectam, quae civilis vitae pracepta continet, ut quemadmodum prima Enchiridii pars eum format qui iam philosophari incipit, et secunda eum instituit qui iam in philosophia aliquousque progressus proficerere incepit, ita tertia haec pars virum in repub. versantem et civilem agentem vitam optimis erudit praecepsit. Quam selegimus ex graecis collectaneis Ioannis Stobaei vere aureis, nam ea mihi non collectanea sed thesaurus quidam pretiosissimarum rerum videntur. Omnia enim Graecorum monumenta vir ille evolvit et acri iudicio summoque delectu adhibito in locos communes sententias praeclaras philosophorum, poetarum et oratorum redegit. Nec cuiquam id temere aut inconsulto (fol. A2v) factum a nobis videri debet adiecisse quaedam quae vetus exemplar graecum non habebat, quasi Epictetus sua illa pracepta in eam Enchiridii formam digesserit quam hodie habemus. Nam constat Epictetum plurima scripsisse [cf. Suda E 2424 (2,365.27 Adler)] et ex eius scriptis Arrianum illius studiosissimum sententolas has collegisse in eam quam modo habemus Enchiridii formam. Quare tantum abest ut in hoc me peccasse putem, ut multum gratiae et benevolentiae apud studiosos me initurum sperem quod aureolas illas sententias apud Graecos sparsas in unum quasi corpus redegerim. Quoniam vero in Arriani mentionem incidimus, ne forte quispiam superstitionis ad hoc nomen ceu impium et infaustum resiliat (est enim hic author apud Graecos quam apud Latinos notior), libet ex Suida [A 3868 (1,350,8–12 Adler)] quaedam de hoc ipso subcere. Fuit igitur hic Arrianus patria Nicomedensis philosophus Epicteteus, hoc est Epicteti sectator, floruit autem Romae Adriano et M. Antonino imperatoribus, quibus ob summam eruditioinem [eruditorem ed.] eloquentiam et vitae integritatem adeo carus fuit ut magnis in repub. Romana honoribus functus usque ad consulatum evectus fuerit. Porro Xenophontis dictionem adeo feliciter aemulatus est ut minor sive iunior Xenophon appellatus sit; nam et librorum Xenophontis argumenta et titulos ad sua opera transtulit. Nam

ut Xenophon 7 libros τῆς ἀναβάσεως Cyri scripsit, ita hic 8 libros ἀναβάσεως Alexandri postoris reliquit, quibus expeditiones et res bellicas ab Alexandro Magno gestas complexus est. Ad haec ut Xenophon παιδέαν [παιδίαν ed.], hoc est disciplinam et instituta Cyri iunioris, cuius in bello comes fuit, scripsit, ita Arrianus tribus libris vitam Epicteti et absolutissimam eius philosophiam persecutus est, quos velut flores ex innumeris (fol. A3r) Epicteti libris, qui temporum iniuria intercederunt, descriptis, unde mihi persuadeo Enchiridion hoc fragmentum quoddam esse illorum trium librorum. Atque haec de Arriano eiusque scriptis praefati sumus pluribus fortasse quam par erat ut curioso lectori fieret satis. Atque haec quidem hactenus. Quum vero editionem hanc alteram adornarem commodum incidi in epistolam quandam Hippocratis Coi medicorum principis quam scripsit ad Demagetum de risu Democriti philosophi. Quod argumentum cum mire placaret, erat enim totum morale, nec abhorrens ab Epicteto nostro, epistolam hanc e Graeco verti. Nesciebam enim hanc inter Hippocratis opera extare. Repperi [Reperi ed.] itaque eam postea versam a M. Fabio Calvo Reginate qui totum Hippocratem vertit; quam cum perlegisset et cum graeco exemplari et nostra versione contulisset, non poenituit suscepti laboris. Mirum enim quantum Graeca a Latinis dissidebant, poteram enim plures quam viginti locos annotare si libusset perperam versos: insigniores tamen aliquot lapsus annotavimus, ut candidus lector intellegat non per omnia veteribus interpretibus fidendum et ex hac una epistola coniciat quantum vir ille exorbitarit a genuina lectione et germano sensu in toto Hippocrate vertendo. Et quoniam summa fere totius philosophiae est ut sese quis norit, adiecimus et dialogum sumptum ex 4 lib. Xenophontis de dictis et factis [facttis ed.] Socratis qui hoc ipsum elegansissime docet, nihil definiendo aut asserendo sed interrogando, quod Socrati et veteri Academiae peculiare fuit. Hunc itaque ingenioli nostri partum tibi dicare volui, ornatissime atque eruditissime vir, ut hoc literario munusculo in favorem et benevolentiam ita tuam me insinuarem, cuius candidissimos mores et humanitatem ante multos (fol. A3v) annos quum Lovanii agerem perspexi et miratus sum. Sit itaque hic libellus familiaritatis nostrae auspicium et amicitiae mutuae pignus et monumentum. Quem si velut paedagogum aliquem et gubernatorem vitae nostrae assciscamus

[assciscanus ed.], ut Homericus ille Phoenix Achilli custos et paedagogus additus est, non modo docebit nos ut ille suum Achillem [Hom., *Il.* 9.443] μύθων τε ὥρτηρ' ἔμεναι πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων, id est res gerere et apte dicendi munus obire, sed etiam contra omnia fortunae iacula invulnerabiles reddet et multo securius undique muniet quam Vulcania illa arma Achillem [Hom., *Il.* 18.478–617] aut eadem Virgilianum Aeneam [Verg., *Aen.* 8.407–53] protexerunt, quorum alter iniuria offensus ab ira, alter ab amore sauciatus et foedissime victus est, si fabulis credimus. Vale et nos ut facis amore perge. E museo nostro, 9 Calend. Iunias Anno quadragesimo nono supra Millesimum (*sic!*).

Encheiridion: (ed. of 's-Hertogenbosch, 1543 = ed. of Antwerp, 1550). [*Inc.*]: (title of chapter 1) Vera rerum divisio sapienti perquam necessaria cognitu. (*Ench.* 1.1) Rerum aliae in nobis positae sunt, aliae non sunt. In nobis sunt opinio, conatus, cupiditas, evitatio, et ut uno dicam verbo quaecunque nostra sunt opera. In nobis vero minime sunt ipsum corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus, et in summa quaecunque non sunt nostra opera. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (*Ench.* 53.3–4) At o Crito, si ita diis placet, ita fiat. Me vero Anytus et Melitus occidere quidem possunt, laedere autem non possunt.

Editions:

1543. See above, Composite Editions.
(photo.) 1550. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 8.344.

Add to *Bibliography*:

A. Gerlo and H. D. L. Vervliet, *Bibliographie de l'Humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas* (Brussels, 1972), 469, no. 5452.

4. Thomas Naogeorgus

In 1554 Thomas Naogeorgus (Kirchmaier, Kirchmeyer) published at Strasbourg an edition of the *Encheiridion*, with a Latin translation and a very full commentary. The text is divided into sixty-three chapters.

The work is dedicated to the burgomasters and senators of Augsburg. In the dedicatory letter Naogeorgus states that kings and rulers should be thoroughly acquainted with theology and philosophy. He illustrates his thesis with numerous examples from the Old Testament and Greek and

Roman history. The preface is devoted to a lengthy defense of philosophy, with whose help one could attain happiness in terrestrial life. Nevertheless, Christian faith is superior to philosophy in all respects.

Naogeorgus' work did not enjoy great success. In fact, his translation was never reprinted, although it provided the basis for the translation of the *Encheiridion*, with commentary, by Christian Francken (Cluj, 1585; II.7 and II.d below). Zanta, *La traduction*, 45 suggests that the lack of popularity may be due to the fact that Jacob Schenck's edition of the complete Epictetus, with a reprint of Politian's translation of the *Encheiridion*, was published in the same year as Naogeorgus' work. On the other hand, Hieronymus Wolf (1561, 1563) does mention Naogeorgus' edition of the Greek text and his translation in his commented edition (vol. 1, p. 5, note on *Ench.* 1; II.c below).

Naogeorgus' translation is discussed by Zanta, *La traduction*, 39–44. She points out that his status as a Protestant clergyman put a strong stamp on his translation, since he stresses the religious element in the *Encheiridion*. In general, Naogeorgus' translation is very literal; he often tries to preserve the Greek word order, as at *Ench.* 1.3: μέμνησο οὖν ὅτι ἐὰν τὰ φύσει δοῦλα ἐλεύθερα οἰηθῆς καὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἴδια, ἐμποδισθήσῃ, πενθήσεις, ταραχθήσῃ, μέμψῃ καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους = “memento igitur, quod si ea quae natura sunt serva libera putaveris et aliena propria, impedieris, lugebis, conturbaberis, incubabis et deos atque homines.” This sometimes results in bad Latin, for instance the nonclassical *memento quod* in the passage just quoted. Naogeorgus does not try to improve on the original Greek, e.g. by choosing different renderings of identical phrases; thus in chapter 1 the phrase ἐν λόγῳ is rendered as “ut uno verbo dicam” in both occurrences. In several places the Latin translation does not correspond to the Greek text printed by Naogeorgus; for instance, at 1.4 Naogeorgus' Greek text reads μέμνησο ὅτι οὐ δεῖ οὐδὲ μετρίως κεκινημένον ἄπτεσθαι αὐτῶν, while the Latin translation has “memento quod te eam haud mediocriter commotum capessere oporteat”; thus Naogeorgus does not translate οὐδὲ (and rightly so).

Illustrations of how Naogeorgus expurgated both the Greek text and his Latin translation are provided by Boter, *Encheiridion* (1999),

68 and n. 9. For instance, in *Ench.* 41 Naogeorgus prints περιπατεῖν (“walk around”) instead of the authentic ἀποπατεῖν (“relieve oneself”); in the same chapter he omits the word ὄχενειν (“have sexual intercourse”) in the Greek text, while giving “vehi” (“travel,” corresponding to the Greek ὄχεισθαι) in his translation.

Zanta, *La traduction*, 40 draws a comparison between Politian and Naogeorgus. She admits that Naogeorgus used a much better text, but believes Politian's translation to be superior in itself: “... mais nous y [sc. in Naogeorgus' translation] trouverons peut-être moins de vivacité, moins d'exactitude; le traducteur suit le grec de moins près, il a aussi le précepte moins incisif, l'impératif moins catégorique.” On pp. 41–44 Zanta prints the final chapters of the *Encheiridion* in both Politian's and Naogeorgus' translations in order to show that Naogeorgus' Greek text was much better than the one consulted by Politian.

Epistula dedicatoria (ed. of Strasbourg, 1554). (fol. A2r) Magnificis ac clarissimis Viris et Dominis, Consulibus ac Senatoribus Augustanis, Thomas Naogeorgus salutem optat per Christum. [Inc.]: Si omnium gentium historias evolvimus, magnifici Domini, fere invenimus eos reges ac magistratus optime rerum publicarum gubernacula tenuisse, qui vel divina lege fuerunt erudit, ut apud Hebraeos, vel philosophiae incubuerunt, et contra pessime rexisse sibique atque aliis perniciem invexisse, qui vel divina neglecta postpositaque lege, vel contempta philosophia gesserunt principatum. Unde mirari non satis possum, quanam ratione quidam (quidem ed.) inducti, rerum publicarum rectoribus philosophiam (loquor autem de illa praecipue parte quae ad mores pertinet atque virtutes cohortatur viamque aperit) divinarumque scripturarum studium clamitant non convenire. . . / . . . [Naogeorgus illustrates his thesis with instances from the Old Testament (David, Saul, Solomon) and from the Graeco-Roman world (Cyrus, Philip of Macedonia, Alexander the Great, Romulus, Numa, Caesar, Augustus, Nero). For theoretical support he refers to the Old Testament (Eccl 9:16), Plato (“Let the philosophers be kings,” *Resp.* 473cd) and Cicero (“cedant arma togae,” *Off.* 1.22.77).] (fol. A5v) Vos igitur, clarissimi viri, pra multis aliis laudandi estis, quod longe ab illis dissentiatis, qui sacrorum voluminum lectionem

ad solos theologos pertinere dicunt philosophiamque ad pauperes et vulgares ablegant, eosque demum ingenuos idoneosque rectores ac principes esse censem, qui nihil penitus rerum divinarum atque philosophiae curant aut attingunt. Nam et ipsi quatenus per negotia licet studiose sacros evolvitis codices et commentaria pietatemque erga Deum atque religionem sectamini tamque divina quam humana estis philosophia instituti, unde non immerito (immerita *ed.*) et ipsi feliciter agitis commissamque vobis rem publicam in magna pace ac tranquillitate summa cum laude gubernatis licetque sperare hoc perpetuum fore. Quippe filios etiam vestros aliorumque civium multos ad religionis cognitionem a pueris adque bonas artes philosophiamque promovetis curatisque institui, ut quibus reipublicae gubernacula quasi per manus estis tradituri eundem quoque numinis favorem prosperitatemque consequantur. Hinc etiam me non inconvenienter facturum ratus sum, si meum hunc in Epicteti Enchiridion commentarium vobis nuncuparem, non quidem ut vos ad pietatem philosophiamque sectandam hortarer et incitarem, quum sponte huc propensi sitis et properetis, sed magis ut vestris liberis aliquo modo manum porrigerem atque ut alii aliarum civitatum rectores vestro moti exemplo similiter studiosi sint edacentque pios et illos (illi *ed.*), quibus rerum habendas post se tradant. . . . / . . . [Naogeorgus dwells on the depravity of man.] (fol. A7v) [Expl.]: Accipite igitur, clarissimi Domini, parvulum hoc munuscum sereno vultu, inque pietatis philosophiaeque studio strenue pergit, unde Deus et Dominus noster Iesus Christus remunerabit vos, vestramque rempublicam perpetuo favore ac felicitate prosequetur. Dat. Stutgardiae decimo Martii. MDLIII.

Praefatio. (fol. A8r) [Inc.]: Omnis humana tam praesens quam futura beatitudo in quiete veraque animi corporisque voluptate tranquillitateque consistit, et ad hanc homines quidem a principio creati sumus. Porro primorum inobedientia peccatumque parentum effectit, ut in labores variasque necnon continuas corporis aerumnas animique perturbationes coniceremur. Unde praesens haec vita iam motibus plena est insanis calamitatibusque ac immensis procellis, et ad futuram stupemus mortemque nobis potius operamur sempiternam, impediti coecitate animique densis tenebris affectionibusque pra-

vis, ne rectis ad vitam illam eamus gressibus. Futura quidem eius vitae beatitudo plenam perfectamque continet tranquillitatem, solidam et perpetuam voluptatem, haec vero praesens eo usque pertingere non potest. Obstac enim peccatum, quod adhuc rationi mortalique carni inhaerens in miserias aerumnasque praecipitat, nec sinit animas esse tranquillas semperque gaudere, quod unum felicem beatamque redderet hanc vitam, foretque beatitudinis specimen quoddam futurae. Fit enim id quod praeclarissimus poeta scripsit [Verg., *Aen.* 6.733–34]: Hinc metuunt cupiuntque, dolent gaudentque nec auras / Respiciunt, clausae tenebris et carcere caeco. . . . / . . . [Naogeorgus speaks at length about the causes of human unhappiness. He discusses the solutions offered by pagan philosophers, such as Democritus, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Epicurus and Cicero, concluding that these solutions are inferior to the blessings resulting from faith in Christ. But among pagan philosophers the Stoics, and especially Epictetus, come closest to the goal.] (fol. B8r) [Expl.]: Quum ergo huc Epicteti praecepta valde accommoda sint, ea nos fide in Iesum Christum, virtutumque studio bonaque conscientia praeposita, explicare conabimur. Sermo eius brevis quidem est, at mire efficax; id quod unusquisque sentiet, qui non oscitanter et supine pelleixerit.

Encheiridion. (p. 1) [Inc.]: (*Ench.* 1.1) Rerum existentium quaedam sunt in nostra potestate, quaedam non sunt. In nostra potestate est opinio, conatus, appetitus, declinatio, et, ut uno verbo dicam, quaecunque nostra sunt opera. In nostra vero potestate non sunt corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus, et, ut uno verbo dicam, quaecunque nostra opera non sunt. . . . / . . . (p. 473) [Expl.]: (*Ench.* 53.3–4) Verum o Crito, si sic diis placet, sic fiat. Me vero Anytus et Melitus occidere quidem possunt, laedere vero non possunt.

After the Greek and Latin text of the *Encheiridion* and the commentary there is a Latin poem, written in Sapphic stanzas (pp. 475–79):

Eucharisticon ac votivum eiusdem carmen ad Christum, postquam a diurna febri esset liberatus.

[Inc.]:
Conditor mundi et reparator idem
Christe, cunctarum data cui potestas
In polis rerum mediaque terra et

Faucibus Horci [Horti ed.].

.../...

[Expl.]:

Vulneras, caedis, perimisque laeto,
Et tenebroso tumulas sepulchro
Rursus at sanas meritoque caesos
Ducis ab Horco.

Laus Deo et Domino Iesu Christo 1554. 10 Martii.

Edition:

1554 (Strasbourg). See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

Thomas Naogeorgus (his German name is Kirchmaier or Kirchmeyer; the forms Neumeyer and Neubauer attempt to translate the misunderstood Greek form of his name, Neogeorgus, back into German) was born 21 December 1508 in Straubing (Bavaria).

After the early death of his parents Naogeorgus entered the Dominican order in Regensburg, which he left in 1526, at which time he went from Regensburg to Nuremberg. In 1535 he was active as a Lutheran clergyman in Mühltroff; in 1542 he became a vicar in Kahlam through the intercession of Melanchthon. Naogeorgus' numerous quarrels on religious matters caused him serious trouble. In 1551 Johann Jakob Fugger granted him a scholarship for studying law in Basel; here he made the acquaintance of the printer Johannes Oporinus and others. In the same year he became vicar to the hospital in Stuttgart; here, too, he had many quarrels, which led to his departure for Esslingen in 1561, and from there for Wiesloch in 1563, the year of his death.

Works:

Naogeorgus' original works are all concerned with religion. A number of dramas brought him fame throughout Europe during his lifetime, and some of them were translated into German, e.g., *Tragoedia nova Pammachius* (Wittenberg, 1538), *Mercator seu Iudicium* (s. l., 1539), *Judas Iscariotes* (s. l., 1552). His other works include five books of *Satyrae* (Basel, 1555) and a number of lengthy didactic poems, for instance, *Agricultura sacra* (Basel, 1550) and *Regnum papisticum* (Basel, 1553).

Naogeorgus translated many Greek works into Latin, among them speeches of Dio Chrysostom (Basel, 1555), the tragedies of Sophocles (Basel, 1558) and letters of Synesius (Basel, 1558).

Bibliography:

ADB 23.245–50 (E. Schmidt); Boter, *Encheiridion* (1999), 67–68; A. Hübner, "Studien zu Naogeorg," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, N.S., 42 (1913) 297–338; Jöcher 3.813–14 and Suppl. 5.367–71; NDB 18.729–30 (H.-G. Roloff); Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme*, 217–18; L. Theobald, *Das Leben und Wirken des Thomas Naogeorgus* (Leipzig, 1908); Zanta, *La traduction*, 39–53.

A modern edition of Naogeorgus' works is being produced by H.-G. Roloff, 1975–; so far, four volumes have appeared.

5. Hieronymus Wolfius

In 1561 Hieronymus Wolfius (Wolf) published an edition of the Greek and Latin text of the *Encheiridion* and the *Tabula* by ps. Cebes. This work is practically identical with the first volume of his three-volume edition of the complete Epictetus (Basel, 1563; see I.3 above). The text of the *Encheiridion* is divided into seventy-nine chapters in both editions.

Vol. 2 of the 1563 edition contains Wolf's Latin translation of Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*. In contrast to the *editio princeps* of the Greek text of Simplicius' commentary (Venice, 1528), which in some cases offers abbreviated *lemmata* (see Boter, *Encheiridion* [1999], 104), Wolf gives the full text of Epictetus in a translation of his own that differs in some details from the translation printed in vol. 1. Vol. 2 ends with Wolf's Latin translation of the Epictetean fragments and the *Altercatio Hadriani et Epicteti*.

Wolf states in the first note to his translation of the *Encheiridion* that he has consulted five Greek editions. The first of these is the edition of Simplicius' commentary (De Sabio; Venice, 1528; Oldfather, no. 121), which contains the text of the *Encheiridion* as *lemmata* in the commentary. The four others contain the *Encheiridion* itself: Basel, 1531 (Andreas Cratander; Oldfather, no. 250; this edition is a reprint of Gregorius Haloander's *editio princeps* [Nuremberg, 1529], which was not used by Wolf); Venice, 1535 (Vittore Trincavelli; Oldfather, no. 29); Basel, 1554 (Jacob Schenck; Oldfather, no. 14); Strassburg, 1554 (Thomas Naogeorgus; Oldfather, no. 283). In addition, he used the translations by Politian (II.2 above) and Naogeorgus (II.4 above).

Zanta, *La traduction*, 56–60 gives a detailed account of Wolf's translation of the *Encheiridion*.

She points out that Wolf often varies the translation of identical formulas in Epictetus. For instance, the phrases τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν and τὰ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν occur a number of times in the first chapter. The first phrase is rendered as “res quaedam in potestate nostra sunt” in 1.1, as “ea . . . quae nobis parent” in 1.2, and as “in rebus nostrae potestati subiectis” in 1.5; for the second phrase Wolf has “nostri arbitrii non sunt” in 1.1, “in quae autem ipsi ius nullum habemus” in 1.2, and “in alienis” in 1.5. By the same token, the phrase ἐνι λόγῳ is first rendered as “ut uno complectar verbo,” then as “ad summam.” Zanta argues that Wolf sought variation not only in order to make his Latin more elegant, but also because he detected different nuances in Epictetus’ use of the same phrases. In general, however, Wolf follows the Greek faithfully.

In some places Wolf’s Greek text does not correspond to his Latin translation. For example, in chapter 1.4 Wolf prints τηλικούτου οὖν ἐφιέμενος μέμνησο ὅτι οὐ δεῖ οὐδὲ μετρίως κεκινημένον ἀπτεσθαι αὐτῶν; but his translation reads: “Cum igitur tantas res appetas, sic eas suscipiendas esse memento, ut sis non mediocriter incitatus.” The explanation of this divergence is given in the commentary: Wolf points out that Simplicius has a better text, reading τηλικούτων instead of τηλικούτου, and omitting οὐδὲ. Wolf adds that Politian too follows the text given by Simplicius; he continues: “ergo οὐδὲ redundant, quod quattuor reliqui codices habent; a quibus deceptus verteram: Ut prorsus omni vaces animi perturbatione.”

The next sentence of *Ench.* 1.4 shows another instance of Wolf’s acumen. In his Greek text he has ἔαν δὲ καὶ ταῦτ’ ἐθέλης καὶ ἄρχειν καὶ πλουτεῖν, which he translates as “Quod si et illas desideraris et magistratus etiam atque opes appetieris, et tuos florere volueris.” The final four words have no counterpart in the Greek. In the commentary, Wolf records that Politian has “domesticos dirigere” (which translates καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ἐπανορθοῦν, found in Vat. gr. 327, one of the two manuscripts used by Politian [see II.2 above]); he assumes that Politian’s Greek source had τοὺς οἰκείους εὐθύνειν; he goes on: “quod perperam scriptum fuisse reor, pro εὐθῆνεῖν, necessarios tuos florere. Volumus autem in primis nobis bene esse, mox etiam nostris et aliis. Discrimen τοῦ εὐθύνω καὶ εὐθῆνέω vel pueris notum est.”

Wolf’s translation enjoyed enormous popularity at the expense of Politian’s version, which had held sway almost without competition up to Wolf’s own time.

For prefaces and other material, see I.3 above.

Encheiridion. [Inc.]: (*Ench.* 1.1) Res quaedam in potestate nostra sunt, quaedam non sunt. In nostra potestate est, opinio, appetitio, desiderium, aversatio et, ut uno complectar verbo, quaelibet nostrae actiones. Nostri arbitrii non sunt corpus, pecunia, gloria, imperia, ad summam ea quae ipsi non agimus omnia. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (*Ench.* 53.3–4) Sed et tertium illud, o Crito, si diis ita visum fuerit, ita fiat. Me autem Anytus et Melitus occidere sane possunt, laedere vero non possunt.

Manuscripts:

(photo.) Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek—Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, B 298 (olim B 217) (s. XVII), pp. 71–79; this manuscript contains a Latin rendering based on Wolf’s translation (F. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Katalog der Handschriften der königl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden*, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1882], 162).

(*) Valladolid, Biblioteca Universitaria, Santa Cruz 238, misc. (s. XVII), fols. 1v–14r (M. de las Nieves Alonso-Cortés, *Catálogo de manuscritos de la Biblioteca de Santa Cruz* [Valladolid, 1976], 187; CTC 6.9a and 7.299; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.658b).

(photo.) In the copy of the translation by Christian Francken (Cluj, 1585; II.7 below) preserved in the Biblioteca del Seminario in Casale Monferrato (shelf mark: A-P8 Q2), the printed text is followed by a manuscript copy of Wolf’s translation of the *Encheiridion*, preceded by the *Vita*. The folios on which the translation is found were added later (information supplied by Dott. Alessandro Giganti).

Editions:

1561. See above, Composite Editions.

(photo.) 1562, Brixiae (Brescia): apud Albertum a Robore Placentinum. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. A pirated edition; in the preface to Count Rainuccio Garbara the editor states: “Hunc autem libellum, ac caetera, quae ei adiunxi opuscula, tibi dedicare constitui.” Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 124, 604. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale.

1563. See above, Composite Editions.

1578, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Christophori Plantini, Architypographi Regii. (Gr-

Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 128. Adams E-225. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1585, Antverpiae (Antwerp): apud Christophorum Plantinum. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 129. This edition was printed in Leiden; see L. Voet, *The Plantin Press* (1555–1589), vol. 2 (Amsterdam, [1981]), no. 1124B. Adams E-226. Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit.

1585, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Christophori Plantini. (Gr.-Lat.). With the translation by Hieronymus Wolf of ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Not mentioned by Oldfather. This edition was printed in Antwerp; see Voet, *The Plantin Press*, no. 1123. Adams E-227; NUC. BL; BNF; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit; (MH; ICN).

(*) 1585, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Christophori Plantini. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 131. No copy has yet been located; see Voet, *The Plantin Press*, no. 1124A.

1589, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Ioan. Tornaeium. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 132. BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1594. See above, Composite Editions.

1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1595 (Geneva). See above, Composite Editions.

1595–96. See above, Composite Editions.

1600 (Geneva). See above, Composite Editions.

1600 (Lyons). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1607, s. l. ([Leiden]): ex officina Plantiniana Raphelengii. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 136. Oxford, Bodleian Library.

(photo.) 1609, Coloniae (Cologne): sumptibus Bernardi Gualtheri. Part of a collection of sentences from Cicero and others, composed by Petrus Lagnerius; also with ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 604a. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

1613, Coloniae Allobrogum (Geneva): apud Ioan. Tornaeium. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 138. BNF; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit.

1616, s. l. (most bibliographers assign this edition to Leiden, but the BL catalogue mentions Antwerp; see Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 141): ex

officina Plantiniana Raphelengii. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 141, 142. BL; Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek.

(*) 1622, Parisiis (Paris): sumptibus Sebastiani Chappelet. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 143a. St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka (communication of Dr. Alexei Romanov).

(photo.) 1623, Parisiis (Paris): sumptibus Sebastiani Cramoisy. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 144a. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

1627, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): officina Jo. Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 146. NUC. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek; (CtY; IaU; IU).

1633, Parisiis (Paris): apud J. Libert. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 150. BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1634, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Joannis Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 152. NUC. BL; BNF; (IU).

1639, Luduni [sic] Batavorum (Leiden): typis Iohannis [sic] Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). In this edition the text of Wolf's translation is used for the *lemmata* in Simplicius' commentary. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 811a. Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit.

1640, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Iohannis Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). In this edition the text of Wolf's translation is used for the *lemmata* in Simplicius' commentary. With Ludovicus Odaxius' translation of ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 812. Brunet 2.1013; NUC. BL; (MH; CtY; NcD; IU; NbU).

(photo.) 1642, Coloniae (Cologne): apud Wilhelmum Friessem. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 153, 605. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

1646, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex offic. Ioan. Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 155. NUC. BL; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit; (MH).

(*) 1647, Avenione (Avignon): ex typographia I. Piot. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 155a. Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale.

(photo.) 1647, Rothomagi (Rouen): apud Io-

annem le Boulenger. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 155b. Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek.

(photo.) 1648, Lucernae (Lucerne): typis Lucernae, Davidis Hautt. Instead of Wolf's chapters 76–79 this edition has only "Dic, Fatum separa alacriter: si noluero, improbus sum, et separa tamen. Occidere me possunt, laedere non possunt" (= two adapted phrases from Wolf's chapters 77 and 79; these words constitute the end of chapter 75 in this edition). Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 606a. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek.

(photo.) 1649, Avenione (Avignon): ex typographia I. Piot, S. Officii Typographi. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Not mentioned by Oldfather. Toulouse, Bibliothèque Municipale.

1651, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex offic. Ioan. Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 156. BNF; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit.

(photo.) 1652, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Ioan. Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 157. NUC. (MB).

(*) 1653, Genuae (Genoa): typis Benedicti Guaschi. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 608. BAV.

(photo.) 1653, Parisiis (Paris): apud Sebastianum et Gabrielem Cramoisy. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula* (but not Wolf's translation). Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 158. NUC. BL; BNF; (IU).

1654, Roterodami (Rotterdam): ex offic. Arnoldi Leers. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 161. NUC. BL; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (MH; CtY).

1655. See above, Composite Editions.

(photo.) 1655, Helmestadi (Helmstadt): typis Henningi Mulleri Acad. Typ. (Gr.-Lat.). Oldfather, no. 162. Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek.

(*) 1657, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex offic. Ioan. Maire. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 164. BL.

1659, Londini (London): typis Tho. Roycroft, impensis Joh. Shirley. Ed. M. Casaubon. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 241. Brunet 2.1013; NUC. BL; BNF; (NjP; IU; CtY; PPL; MoSU).

(photo.) 1660, Coloniae (Cologne): apud Wilhelmum Friessem. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 165, 607. BL.

(photo.) 1660, Cellae (Zell): sumptibus Thomae Henrici Hauensteinii Bibliopol. Hannoverani. Cellis typis Andreeae Holweinii. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 166. Some catalogues designate Hannover as the place of publication because of *Bibliopol. Hannoverani* in the title; see, e.g., the catalogue of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

(photo.) 1666, Rintelii (Rinteln): sumptibus Thomae Henrici Hauensteinii, Bibliopole Hanoverani et Hildesiensis. Rintelii, typis Godofr. Caspari Waechter. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 169. Some catalogues designate Hannover as the place of publication because of *Bibliopol. Hannoverani* in the title; see, e.g., the catalogues of the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Halle, and the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel. Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek.

(*) 1669, Parisiis (Paris): apud Viduam Claudi Thiboust. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 158a, 171. BNF.

1670, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): ex officina Henrici et Theodori Boom. (Gr.-Lat.). With Hieronymus Wolf's translation of ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 172. NUC (the publisher is not mentioned, hence the next item might be intended; however, since the Harvard library possesses the Boom but not the Ravesteinius edition, the NUC probably indicates the former). BL; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (MH; ViU; MiAC; IU; MoSU).

(photo.) 1670, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): apud Joannem Ravesteinum. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 173. BL; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

(*) 1670, Londini (London): typis Jacobi Fleisher. Prostant apud Guilielmum Morden Bibliopolam Cantabrigensem. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 322a. NUC. (PU; PPL; IU; ICN).

(*) 1670, Lugd. Bat. et Amstelod. (Leiden and Amsterdam): apud Gaasbekios. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 174. Brunet 2.1013. New York Public Library.

1670 (Leiden and Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1670, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula* and Theophrastus, *Characteres*. Oldfather (with *Supple-*

ment), no. 175. NUC. BL; (CtY; PPL; IU; CLU-C).

1680, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 114, 177. NUC. BL; (CtY; MH; NcU; IU; CLU-C).

1683 (Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.

1683 (Delft). See above, Composite Editions.

(photo.) 1686, Guelferbyti (Wolfenbüttel): sumptibus Theophili Henrici Grentzii. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 179. Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.

(photo.) 1692, Guelferbyti (Wolfenbüttel): sumptu Haered. Hauenstein- et Grentzianorum, Bibliopolae Hannoverani et Hildesiensis, typis Caspari Johannis Bismarci. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 179a. Halle, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek.

1701, Hannov. (Hannover), Guelferbyt. (Wolfenbüttel), Rudolstadii (Rudolstadt): Hannov. et Guelferbyt. Sumtibus Gothofredi Freytagii. Rudolstadii, typis Heinrici Urbani. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 180–81. NUC. BL; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (MH).

(*) 1702, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano, Impensis G. West. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 115, 182. NUC. BL; (CtY).

(*) 1707, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula* etc. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 117. Brunet 2.1013; NUC. BL; (CtY).

1707, Hannov. (Hannover), Guelferbyt. (Wolfenbüttel), Rudolstadii (Rudolstadt): Hannov. et Guelferbyt. sumptibus Ludolphi Henrici Haunsteinii. Rudolstadii, typis Heinrici Urbani. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 184–86. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek.

1711. See above, Composite Editions.

1722, Guelferbyt. et Rudolstadii (Wolfenbüttel and Rudolstadt): Guelferbyt. sumptibus Io. Christophori Meisneri. Rudolstadii, typis Io. Henrici Loewii. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 188. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek.

1723. See above, Composite Editions.

1740, Guelferbyti (Wolfenbüttel): sumpt. Io.

Christophori Meisneri. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 190. NUC. BNF; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (MH; ICU; CU-I).

1750, Amstelaedami (Amsterdam): apud J. Wetstenium. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 195. NUC. BL; (MA; NcU; NN; MnCS; CU).

(*) 1750 (Amsterdam and Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.

(photo.) 1750 (Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.

(photo.) s. a. (ca. 1750), Viennae Austriae (Vienna): Prostat apud Maximilianum Grundt. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, nos. 197a, 228a. Vienna, Universitätsbibliothek.

1756, Guelferbyti (Wolfenbüttel): sumpt. Io. Christophori Meisneri. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 202. NUC. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (PU).

(*) 1799, Brunsvigae (Braunschweig): Schröder. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 218. No copy has yet been located.

Doubtful editions:

(*) 1565, Basileae (Basel). Mentioned by Graesse 2.483; this item follows immediately after the 1563 edition, so that the source of the error is hard to explain. Oldfather, no. 37.

(*) 1627, Amstelodami (Amsterdam). Mentioned by H. Relandus (in the edition of the *Encheiridion* by M. Meibom [Utrecht, 1711], *Index editionum*), followed by J.A. Fabricius and G.C. Harles, *Bibliotheca graeca*, 3d ed., vol. 5 (Hamburg, 1796); J.F. Beyer, *Über Epiket und sein Handbuch der stoischen Moral, in biographischer und literarischer Hinsicht* (Marburg, 1795); S.F.W. Hoffmann, *Bibliographisches Lexicon der gesammten Literatur der Griechen*, 3d ed., vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1839). (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. There may be some confusion with the 1627, Leiden edition, although the latter is also mentioned by Relandus. Oldfather, no. 145.

(*) 1631, Rostochii (Rostock). Mentioned by Relandus (and, in his wake, Fabricius-Harles, Beyer, and Hoffmann). (Gr.-Lat.). No copy known; not mentioned by sources independent of Relandus. Oldfather, no. 148.

(*) 1634, Hamburgi (Hamburg). Mentioned by Relandus (and, in his wake, Beyer and Hoff-

mann). (Gr.-Lat.). D.F.Scheurleer, *Enchiridion, Zedekundig handboekje van Epictetus* (The Hague, 1919), 256 states that he has found a notice of an edition published in Hamburg, 1634 in the *Catalogus librorum impressorum qui in bibliotheca collegii sacrosanctae et individuae Trinitatis, Reginae Elizabethae, juxta Dublin., adservantur* (see vol. 3 [Dublin, 1876], 97). However, this catalogue mentions the 1634, Leiden edition but states nothing about a Hamburg edition of the same year. Oldfather, no. 151.

(*) 1654, Amst<elodami> (Amsterdam): Leers. With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Mentioned by Th. Georgi, *Allgemeines europäisches Bücherlexicon*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1742), 22, and Beyer. As Oldfather observes, there is probably some confusion with the edition published in Rotterdam in the same year. Oldfather, no. 160.

(*) 1707, Hannov. (Hannover): Freytag. (Gr.-Lat.). Mentioned by Georgi 2.22. Oldfather, no. 184.

(*) 1721, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): Waesb. Mentioned by Georgi 2.22 (not by Graesse, as Oldfather states), who is followed by Beyer and Hoffmann. If Georgi is wrong, it is difficult to explain the source of the error, or rather errors. Georgi mentions this edition immediately after the 1711, Utrecht edition by Marcus Meibom/Hadrianus Relandus, thus creating the impression that he intends the 1721, Amsterdam edition to be taken as a reprint of the 1711, Utrecht edition; of such a reprint, however, nothing else is known. Oldfather, no. 187.

Rejected editions:

(*) 1546, Coloniae (Cologne). Mentioned in the catalogue of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Rome. The date 1546 is an obvious error for 1596. Oldfather, no. 321a.

(*) 1588, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned in the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de Genève*, but the copy referred to has no title page; therefore the work is identical with the Tornaeus edition 1589 (= Oldfather [with *Supplement*], no. 132). (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 131b.

(*) 1594, Coloniae (Cologne). Mentioned in *Catalogue d'une bibliothèque de Littérature*, vol. 1 (Utrecht, 1776), nos. 1816–18 (cited by Oldfather). The date must be an error for 1595. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, nos. 37a, 39.

(*) 1599, Lugduni (Lyons). Mentioned by Relandus (followed by Beyer, Fabricius-Harles, and Hoffmann); the date must be an error for 1589. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, no. 134.

(*) 1606, Lugd<uni Batavorum> (Leiden). Mentioned by Fabricius-Harles. (Gr.-Lat.). As Oldfather, no. 135, points out, the date is an error for either 1607 (Oldfather [with *Supplement*], no. 136) or 1616 (Oldfather, no. 142). Oldfather, no. 135.

(*) 1612, Genevae (Geneva). Mentioned by Oldfather, no. 137, who does not indicate the source for this reference. The date is an error for 1613 (Oldfather [with *Supplement*], no. 138).

(*) 1623, Lugduni <Batavorum> (Leiden): mentioned by A. Ferwerda, *Catalogus universalis 1.7* (Leeuwarden, no date [ca. 1775]), 112, who is followed by Beyer, Hoffmann, and Scheurleer. The date is probably an error for 1634. Oldfather, no. 144.

(*) 1632, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): mentioned by Scheurleer, who probably misinterpreted a note in A. Ebert, *Allgemeines bibliographisches Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1821–30). See Oldfather, no. 149.

(*) 1643, Coloniae (Cologne): Wilhelm Friessem. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 154, 606. The printed catalogue of the Bibliotheca Academiae Theresianae, Vienna (1804) gives the erroneous date 1643 for 1642 (see Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 606).

(*) 1651, Amstelodami (Amsterdam). Mentioned by Brunet 2.1013 under the heading of Casaubon's edition of London, 1659. Brunet may have intended to indicate the edition published in the same year at Leiden (Oldfather, no. 156).

(*) 1653, Parisis (Paris): Fabricius-Harles, 77 assign this edition to Joan. Dan. Snecanus; as Oldfather, no. 159, points out, this must be due to confusion with the 1653, Paris edition by Seb. Cramoisy.

(*) 1655, Oxonii (Oxford). Mentioned by Georgi 2.22. Oldfather, no. 41, remarks: "This although listed alongside the Cambridge 1655 edition is probably only a mistake for it."

(*) 1655, Roterod<ami> (Rotterdam): (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Mentioned by Georgi 2.22. Again, there may be some confusion with the 1654, Rotterdam edition. Oldfather, no. 163.

(*) 1662, Hanoverae (Hannover): (Gr.-Lat.). Mentioned by Relandus. There is probably some

confusion with the edition of Hannover, 1660 or Zell, 1660.

(*) 1663, Delphis (Delft): (Gr.-Lat.). Mentioned by Ferwerda 1.7, 113 (followed by Beyer, Scheurleer, and Hoffmann). This entry is probably due to some confusion with the edition of Delft, 1683 (Oldfather, no. 233). Oldfather, no. 168.

(*) 1666, Cellae (Zell): (Gr.-Lat.). Mentioned by Relandus. Probably confused with the edition of Cellae, 1660 (Oldfather, no. 166). Oldfather, no. 170.

(*) 1670, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): Leers (if Georgi's note has been interpreted correctly). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Mentioned by Georgi 2.22, who probably intended to indicate either the Boom or the Ravestein edition of the same place and year (Oldfather, nos. 172 and 173 respectively).

(*) 1679, Londini (London). Mentioned by C.G. Heyne, *Epicteti Enchiridion graece et latine*, 3d ed. (Leipzig, 1783), xxxiii. As Oldfather, no. 812, *sub finem* remarks, this record is due to some confusion with the edition of London, 1670. Oldfather, no. 176.

(*) 1679, Lugduni (Leiden). Mentioned by Ferwerda, 113 ("ex recensione Berkelii"); probably confused with Berkel's edition of Leiden/Amsterdam, 1670. Not mentioned by Oldfather.

(*) 1685, Antverpiae (Antwerp). Mentioned by Schweighäuser, lxxx, who refers to Lefebvre de Villebrune's first edition of the *Encheiridion* (Paris, 1782). Oldfather, no. 129, remarks that this record is owing to confusion with the edition of Antwerp, 1585. Probably Schweighäuser is responsible for the confusion, because Villebrune (at least in the third edition, which was available for consultation) states only: "6. Plantini editio, in Bibl. reg." Oldfather, no. 178.

(*) 1686, Amstelodami (Amsterdam). Mentioned by Relandus. As Oldfather, no. 235 points out, the date is an error for 1683. Oldfather, no. 236.

(*) 1706, Hannov. et Guelferb. (Hannover and Wolfenbüttel): apud Freytag. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Mentioned by Hoffmann. Oldfather plausibly suggests that the year 1706 is a misprint for 1701: in Hoffmann the item occurs between the editions of 1686 and 1702, and the edition of Hannover, 1701 goes unmentioned. Oldfather, no. 183.

(*) 1723, Guelferb. (Wolfenbüttel). Mentioned by Hoffmann. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*.

The date must be an error for 1722. Oldfather, no. 189.

(*) 1750, Amstelodami et Lipsiae (Amsterdam and Leipzig): J. Wetstein. Mentioned by Scheurleer; probably confused with the editions of Amsterdam and Leipzig, 1750, apud Arksteum et Markum (Oldfather, no. 237) and Amsterdam, 1750, apud J. Wetstenium. Oldfather, no. 196.

(*) 1750, Brunsvigae (Braunschweig). (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Mentioned by W. Engelmann and E. Preuss, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum*, 8th ed., vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1880), 223, who probably intended to mention the edition of Wolfenbüttel, 1740, as Oldfather, no. 218, remarks. Oldfather, no. 197.

(*) 1756, Brunsvigae (Braunschweig). (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Mentioned by Engelmann-Preuss and Hoffmann; probably confused with the edition of Wolfenbüttel, 1756, as Oldfather, no. 218, remarks. Oldfather, no. 201.

Biography and Bibliography:

See I.3 above.

6. Anonymus Parisinus

A translation of the first twenty-one chapters of the *Encheiridion* (plus the *Vita* from the Suda and three epigrams [Schenkl, test. XL, XLI and XXXVI]) is found on some blank leaves in Bern, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Bong. I. 417 (i), an interleaved copy of the edition of the Greek text of the *Encheiridion* published at Paris in 1564. According to Dr. Margaret Eschler (communication of 12 April 1996): "Es ist ein durchschossenes Exemplar, anfangs mit zeitgenössiger handschriftlicher Ueersetzung, von wem ist unbekannt." The main body of the translation is written in a hand that is very difficult to decipher.

The translation itself is very literal. In chapter 1.1, the phrase ἐνὶ λόγῳ is rendered as "uno verbo" in both places; ὅσα ἡμέτερα ἔργα is simply translated as "quaecumque nostra opera." The Latin follows the Greek word for word; see, for instance, *Ench.* 1.3 ἐὰν δὲ τὸ σὸν μόνον οἰηθῆς σὸν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἀλλότριον (ῶσπερ ἐστίν) ἀλλότριον = "Sin autem quod tuum est solum putaveris tuum esse, alienum vero (sicut est) alienum." Like his predecessors Niccolò Perotti (II.1 above) and Thomas Naogeorgus (II.4 above), the translator employs the nonclassical *memento quod* for the Greek μέμνησο ὅτι.

It should be noted that the translator is often rather careless. Thus at *Ench.* 1.2 he writes “At ea quidem in nobis sita sunt natura libera”; a more correct text would appear to be “At ea quidem <quae> in nobis sita sunt natura <sunt> libera”; in 1.3 “Mento” is given for “Memento.”

Several later hands have been at work. In some places notes have been inserted by a very clear French hand, one such instance being the addition of “τὸ πρόβατον *brebis*” at chapter 7. The first hand had omitted the translation of the second half of chapter 6 and of chapter 7; these parts were supplied by two different scribes.

Encheiridion. [Inc.]: (*Ench.* 1.1) Eorum quae sunt quaedam sunt in nobis, quaedam non in nobis. In nobis quidem opinio, impetus, appetitus (*sic*), declinatio, et uno verbo quaecumque nostra opera. Non in nobis sunt corpus, possessio, honores, principatus atque uno verbo quaecumque nostra non sunt opera. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (*Ench.* 21) Mors et exilium et omnia quae periculosa apparent (*sic*) ante oculos sint tibi quotidie, maxime vero omnium mors; et nihil unquam humile cogitabis neque valde appetes (*sic*) quidquam.

Edition:

(photo.) 1564, Parisiis (Paris): apud Andream Wechelum. Ἐγχειρίδιον Ἐπικτήτου. *Epicteti Hierapolitae philosophi Enchiridion*. Oldfather, no. 125. Bern, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Bong. I. 417 (1).

7. Christianus Francken

In 1585 Christian Francken published at Cluj a translation of the *Encheiridion*, accompanied by an extensive commentary. The name of the translator is not mentioned on the title page. Some copies (e.g., the copy preserved in Casale Monferrato, Biblioteca del Seminario) have no introduction or preface whatsoever; others (e.g., the copy in the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest) have a preface written by Christian Francken. The latter group of copies also contains at the end two pages of *errata* not found in the first group of copies.

Francken states in the preface that men's vices tend to give them the character of beasts such as lions, dogs, foxes, and wolves; this can be prevented by the study of philosophy, which cures human vices. He stresses that his translation relies heavily on Hieronymus Wolf's version of 1561

(II.5 above), while the commentary is based on Thomas Naogeorgus' commentary of 1554 (II.b below). But in reality Francken's translation also exhibits considerable borrowing from Naogeorgus' rendering (II.4 above); for one thing, both translations are divided into sixty-three chapters, with the same contents, whereas Wolf divides the text into seventy-nine chapters.

The way in which Francken deals with his two predecessors differs from chapter to chapter. For instance, Francken's chapter 1 (= Naogeorgus' chapter 1 = Wolf's chapters 1–3 = *Ench.* 1.1–3) is a mix of the translations by Naogeorgus and Wolf, with some small modifications made by Francken himself. The three translations of the first section of this chapter will illustrate the hybrid character of Francken's efforts:

Francken: Rerum existentium quaedam in nostra sunt potestate, quaedam non sunt: in nostra potestate est opinio, appetitio, desiderium, aversatio et, uno ut verbo dicam, quaelibet nostrae actiones; in nostra vero potestate non sunt corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus et, ut uno verbo dicam, ea quae ipsi non agimus.

Naogeorgus: Rerum existentium quaedam sunt in nostra potestate, quaedam non sunt. In nostra quidem potestate est opinio, conatus, appetitus, declinatio, et (ut uno verbo dicam) quaecunque nostra sunt opera. In nostra vero potestate non sunt corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus et (ut uno verbo dicam) quaecunque nostra opera non sunt.

Wolf: Res quaedam in potestate nostra sunt, quaedam non sunt. In nostra potestate est opinio, appetitio, desiderium, aversatio et, ut uno complectar verbo, quaelibet nostrae actiones. Nostri arbitrii non sunt corpus, pecunia, gloria, imperia, ad summam ea quae ipsi non agimus omnia.

On the other hand, Francken's chapter 4 (= Naogeorgus' chapter 4 = Wolf's chapter 8 = *Ench.* 3) coincides exactly with Wolf's translation, with no borrowing from Naogeorgus.

Preface (ed. of Cluj, 1585): (fol. A2r) Candido lectori Christianus Francken Gardelebiensis s. d. [Inc.]: Si omnes eas quibus ad huius felicitatem vitae perveniri posse putatur vias persequaris, nullam tandem aliam invenies quam Stoicorum ἀπάθειαν. Cum enim totius (potius *ed.*) humanae felicitatis partem sibi corpus vindicet (vendicit *ed.*), partem vero, eamque maximam, animus (anima *ed.*), corpore quidem necessario dolemus

et felices in hoc mundo esse non valemus, animo autem tranquilli semper beatique esse possumus. Nam quae ἀλληλοπάθεια τοῦ τε σώματος τῆς τε ψυχῆς cernitur, ea ita temperari ratione potest, (fol. A2v) ut male affecto et ad vicia propendente corpore non eodem quoque modo animus afficiatur, sed suis in omnem aeternitatem bonis fruens beatus existat. Quo autem id modo fieri possit, luculentissime docet in isto libello Epictetus, ostendens omnem animi aegritudinem ex solo errore nasci falsave de rebus concepta opinione, eundem vero sanari felicemque fieri recta rerum cognitione informatum. Quoniam vero recte rerum expetendarum cognitioni raro assentitur insita nobis bellua (appetitum dico cum bestiis nobis communem), non est haec in consilium adhibenda, sed ad opus tantum a recta ratione decreatum. Huius enim instinctu (fol. A3r) bestiae fit ut plurimi verae ductum rationis non sequantur, sed ad belluarum naturam inclinantes, alii quidem similes sint leonibus, feroce, crudeles, superbi, alii lupis, rapaces, infidi, furaces, alii vulpeculis, subdoli, insidiatores, fallaces, alii porcis, turpes, sordidi, voraces, alii canibus, mordaces, maledici, iracundi, alii asinis, agrestes, stolidi, segnes, alii denique avibus, libidinosi, leves, inconstantes. Iam omnes istas atque huiusmodi alias bestias homini innatas haec philosophia vel prorsus de medio tollit vel directa saltem ratione vincitas tenet, ne sua extra saepa evagentur. Quod autem ad libelli huius graece scripti et latinam (fol. A3v) versionem et explicationem attinet, neutra est tota mea, sed maxima ex parte versio est Hieronymi Wolfii, graece et latine doctissimi viri, commentatio vero Thomae Nageorgii (*sic*), qui cum divinitus quaedam ad omnem animi dolorem tollendum valde apposita scripsisset, in omnium manibus ea versari debere iudicabam, et tamen commentationis huius vix unum in tota Germania exemplum videram.

Quaerenti autem mihi huius rei causa illa statim occurrebat, quod optimus hic Christianus philosophus dum in optimum ethnicum philosophum Epictetum commentaretur, pessimam sorte uxorem habuerit, cuius intemperie concitus (fol. A4r) acerrime in magistratum invehementur, qui viris non permitteret uxores suas verberibus in officio continere. Haec igitur et nonnulla alia mihi resecanda videbantur; quaedam autem, quae resecari non erat necesse, brevitatis tamen causa omisi; non pauca denique capita ipse sum

interpretatus, et multis illius commentationibus meas attexui, non ut aliorum inventis nonnulla addens gloriam aliquam venarer, sed quod ipse expertus mirabiliter hanc philosophiam animi motus atque fluctus sedare aliorum quoque animos hac sanari doctrina cupiam. Itaque hic libellus sit compendium non solum totius philosophiae moralis, verum etiam (fol. A4v) commentatorum Thomae Nageorgii (*sic*) in Epictetum.

Encheiridion. [Inc.]: (*Ench.* 1.1) Rerum existentium quaedam in nostra sunt potestate, quaedam non sunt: in nostra potestate est opinio, appetitio, desiderium, aversatio, et, uno ut verbo dicam, quaelibet nostrae actiones: in nostra vero potestate non sunt corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus, et, ut uno verbo dicam, ea quae ipsi non agimus. . . / . . [Expl.]: (*Ench.* 53.3–4) Sic enim Socrates dicebat: Sed o Crito, si sic diis placet, sic fiat. Me vero Anytus et Melitus occidere sane possunt, laedere autem non possunt.

Edition:

(photo.) 1585. See above, Composite Editions.

Doubtful edition:

(*) 1592, Claudiopoli (Cluj): typ. Heltai. No copy has yet been located. See Régi Magyarországi Nyomtatványok, vol. 1: 1473–1600, 593, no. 689.

Rejected edition:

1595, Claudiopoli (Cluj). Both Hoffmann and Beyer give the wrong date 1595 for the 1585 edition. Oldfather, no. 133.

Biography:

Christian Francken (or Francke) was born at Gardeleben in 1549 to Lutheran parents.

He converted to Catholicism in 1569 and became a Jesuit in Rome. In 1576 he was professor of philosophy in Vienna. Some years later he settled in Leipzig, where he returned to the Protestant church. After various wanderings through Germany and Switzerland, Francken returned to the Jesuits in Vienna but did not get on well with his confrères and resumed his wandering lifestyle. In Transylvania he embraced the Socinian doctrine, manifesting himself as an ardent anti-trinitarian. He became rector of the school at Chmielnik in Poland (from which school he was banned in 1584), and lector in Cluj. In 1585 he was banned by King Bathory. Francken went to Prague in 1590, where he converted to Catholicism once more; in 1595 he was in Regensburg.

The date of Francken's death is unknown, but it is to be placed after 1602.

Works:

Francken wrote mainly theological treatises, among others *Colloquium Jesuiticum* (Basel, 1581), *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum cur christiani, cum in multis religionis doctrinis mobiles sint et varii, in trinitatis tamen retinendo dogmate sint constantissimi* (s. l., 1584; Heidelberg, 1592), and *Dolum Diogenianum strepitu suo collaborans dynastis christianis bellum in Turcos parantibus* (Hamburg, 1595).

Bibliography:

A. and A. de Backer and C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus*, vol. 3 (Brussels and Paris, 1892), 930–31; *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, vol. 18 (Paris, 1977), 663; B. Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge im XVI. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1907), 546–48; Hoefer 18.466–67; Jöcher 2.714–15; B. Keserü, *Epiktétosz magyarul—a XVII. század elején* (Szeged, 1963), 9–13; L. Szczucki, "Christian Francken," in *Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce* 8 (1963) 39–76; Szczucki, *Két XVL századi eretnek gondolkodó* (*Jacobus Palaeologus és Christian Francken*) (Budapest, 1980).

8. Ludovicus Odaxius

With regard to the 1497 Bologna edition of Censorinus, *De die natali* etc. by Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, in which Politian's translation of the *Encheiridion* was published for the first time (see II.2 above), Hadrianus Relandus lists (in the edition of the *Encheiridion* by Marcus Meibom [Utrecht, 1711], *Index editionum*): *Epicteti Encheiridion, et Tabula Cebetis, Latine versa a Ludovico Odaxio, cum Censorino de die natali, aliisque Plutarchi, Luciani, ac Basili tractatulis, edita a Philippo Beroaldo. Bononiae. in folio.* As Oldfather, no. 615 notes, this is either an error or a careless statement on the part of Relandus. In support of the first hypothesis, Oldfather suggests that Relandus may have been deceived by the fact that some copies of the 1497 edition "did not have statements on the title page as to who the authors of the separate translations were." The second explanation may be more likely, i.e., that the word *versa* should be taken as feminine singular, referring only to *Cebetis Ta-*

bula, and not as neuter plural referring to both Epictetus and Cebes. At any rate, Relandus' statement deceived Heyne, who states (1776 edition, p. xxxi): "Prodiit Enchiridion primum graece (nam latine iam prostabat conversum ab Lud. Odaxio et ab Angelo Politiano) cum Simplicii commentario Venetiis 1528."

9. Jacobus Schegkijus

Hadrianus Relandus mentions an edition published at Lyons in the year 1660, *Ench. ex versione J. Schegkii* (Oldfather, no. 19). This statement contains two errors: Schenck did not make a translation of the *Encheiridion* himself (his edition contains Politian's translation, for which see II.2 above); and the date 1660 must be an error for 1600.

COMMENTARIES

a. Hieronymus Verlenius

The translation by Hieronymus Verlenius, published in 1543 in 's-Hertogenbosch (II.3 above), is followed by three pages of notes. Verlenius himself describes them as "scholia brevia in locos aliquot Epicteti obscuriores." The notes largely consist of parallel passages from other philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Seneca.

In the second edition of his translation (Antwerp, 1550) Verlenius added many more notes; here the notes follow after each chapter of the *Encheiridion*. The notes of the 1543 edition are also included in the 1550 edition.

Commentary (ed. of 's-Hertogenbosch, 1543 = ed. of Antwerp, 1550). *Scholia in Epicteti Encheiridion. [Inc.]: Conatus (1.1). Graece ὄρμη, quae vox plura graecis significat. Est enim aliquando impetus animi seu conatus ad quidlibet perficiendum, est et alacritas, est et cupiditas: verum quia cupiditatem subiicit, ne idem bis dicere videatur, hoc loco ὄρμη vel studium vel impetum aut animi conatum denotat. . . / . . [Expl.]: Me vero Anytus et Melitus (53.4). Id ex Apologia Socratis sumptum est, ibi enim Socrates apud iudices sic inquit. . . Accusatores fuerunt Anytus, qui opificum partes tuebatur, et Lycon, qui oratorum, et Melitus, qui poëtarum partes defendebat. Condemnatus itaque ductus est in carcerem, et ibi cicutam bibit, quae publica et infamis Atheniensium poena fuit: author in vita Socratis Diogenes Laërtius. Finis scholii.*

Editions:

1543. See above, Composite Editions.
1550. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography and Bibliography:

See II.3 above.

b. Thomas Naogeorgus

The translation of the *Encheiridion* by Thomas Naogeorgus, published at Strasbourg in 1554 (II.4 above), is accompanied by a bulky commentary almost exclusively concerned with ethics and religion. Naogeorgus tries very hard to demonstrate that Epictetus' philosophy is in accordance with Christian doctrine, but time and again he stresses the superiority of Christian belief over pagan philosophy.

Naogeorgus' attitude is best illustrated by the opening sentences of his commentary on *Ench.* 31, which deals with the gods: "Ex hoc capite si deorum tollas multitudinem, nihil magis pium ac christianum invenies apud ullos Ethnicos. Nos igitur explicabimus ut de unico veroque Deo" ("If you remove the multitude of gods from this chapter, you will not find anything more pious and Christian in any pagan writer. Therefore we will explain it as if it deals with the one and only true God"). Zanta, *La traduction*, 45–53 discusses the Christian interpretation of Stoicism defended by Naogeorgus.

Commentary (ed. of Strasbourg, 1554). [Inc.]: (ad *Ench.* 1.1) A rerum apta, atque iis quae sequuntur necessaria divisione orditur. Vedit novitque hominum animos esse inexplorables, et nihil non sibi arrogare et polliceri. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (ad *Ench.* 53.4) Ita si fuerimus animati, tranquillitatem animi adipiscemur ac tuebimur, quo nihil in hac vita melius beatiusque obtingere potest.

Editions:

- 1554 (Strasbourg). See above, Composite Editions.

1585. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography and Bibliography:

See II.4 above.

c. Hieronymus Wolfius

Wolf added extensive notes to his translation of the *Encheiridion* (II.5 above). These notes deal with matters of every kind: philological, philosophical, and historical. Wolf pays special atten-

tion to the Stoic vocabulary used by Epictetus and refers in many places to Simplicius' commentary.

Commentary (ed. of Basel, 1561 = ed. of Basel, 1563 [vol. 1]). [Inc.]: (Basel, 1563, vol. 1, p. 5) *Annotatio in I. Cap. Praeter Angeli Politiani et Thomae Naogeorgi doctissimorum virorum conversiones, in Opusculi huius interpretatione quinque codicibus graecis sum usus: duobus Basileae [Cratander 1531 and Schenck 1554], totidemque Venetiis [De Sabio 1528 and Trincavelli 1535], sed nec eodem tempore nec in eadem officina editis; et uno Argentinensi [Naogeorgus 1554]. Quorum neque distinctio capitum est eadem, et lectio nonnullis in locis variat.* (Basel, 1563, vol. 1, p. 6) *Quae (si quid momenti habere visa fuerint) annotare visum est, ut quid in convertendo sim secutus, non ignoretur. Declarabimus etiam paulo accuratius ea vocabula quae ut in hoc opusculo subinde recurrent, ita totius doctrinae stoicae fundamenta continent. Sumus autem ea distinctione capitum usi, quae lectoris et meditationi et memoriae commodatura videbatur. ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἔστιν ὑπόληψις.* In nostra potestate est opinio (1.1). Negat hoc Homerus quum Cicerone interprete scribit: Tales sunt hominum mentes, quali pater ipse/Iuppiter auctiferas lustrarit lampade terras [Aug., *De civ. Dei* 5.8]. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (Basel, 1563, vol. 1, p. 85) In caput 79. *Sed et tertium illud, o Crito, si diis ita visum fuerit, ita fiat. Me autem Anytus et Melitus occidere sane possunt, laedere vero non possunt* (53.3–4). Mirum est, symbolum Epicteti ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου [Aul. Gell., *Noct. att.* 17.19.6], Sustine et abstine, esse praetermissum. Et Euripideum illud, οἰστέον κ' ἐλπιστέον [non invenitur], Tolerandum et sperandum. Mihi vero precatio illa Euripidea valde probatur [*Hel.* 1441–42]:

ὦ Ζεῦ πατήρ τε καὶ σοφὸς κλήζῃ θεὸς
βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ μετάστησον κακῶν.

Quam eleganter convertit vir doctiss. Vincentius Obsopoeus:

Iuppiter alme parens, sapiens, iustissimus
idem,
resipce nos miseros, atque medere malis.

Editions:

1561. See above, Composite Editions.
1563. See above, Composite Editions.
1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Editions.
1595–96. See above, Composite Editions.

1655. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1670 (London). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1670 (Leiden and Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1683 (Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1683 (Delft). See above, Composite Editions.
1711. See above, Composite Editions.
1723. See above, Composite Editions.
- (*) 1739, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. Ed. Joseph Simpson. This edition contains selections from Wolf's notes (part of a variorum commentary), revised by Simpson. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 297. NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; ViW; NcD).
- 1740, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. Ed. Joseph Simpson. This edition contains selections from Wolf's notes (part of a variorum commentary), revised by Simpson. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 298. Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek.
- (*) 1744, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. Ed. Joseph Simpson. This edition contains selections from Wolf's notes (part of a variorum commentary), revised by Simpson. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 299. NUC. (MH; ICN).
- (*) 1750 (Amsterdam and Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1750 (Amsterdam). See above, Composite Editions.
- (*) 1758, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. Ed. Joseph Simpson. This edition contains selections from Wolf's notes (part of a variorum commentary), revised by Simpson. Oldfather, no. 300. NUC. BL; (PPL; NNC; MnU).
- (*) 1804, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. Ed. Joseph Simpson. This edition contains selections from Wolf's notes (part of a variorum commentary), revised by Simpson. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 301. BL.

Rejected edition:

- (*) 1686, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): mentioned by Hadrianus Relandus in the edition of the *Encheiridion* by Marcus Meibom (Utrecht, 1711), *Index editionum*. As Oldfather, no. 235 points out, the date is an error for 1683. Oldfather, no. 236.

Biography and Bibliography:

See II.5 above.

d. Christianus Francken

The translation of the *Encheiridion* published at Cluj in 1585 (II.7 above) is accompanied by a voluminous commentary. As Francken states in the preface, this commentary is a slightly adapted version of the commentary by Thomas Naogeorgus (for which see II.b above): Francken leaves out some remarks, for instance, Naogeorgus' outburst against a magistrate who forbade husbands to beat their wives with a whip in order to make them fulfil their duty. In other places he has abbreviated Naogeorgus' notes; here and there, he has also added something of his own invention.

Commentary (ed. of Cluj, 1585). [Inc.]: (ad *Ench.* 1.1) Ut veritas rerum atque falsitas ab ipsis dependet rebus recte aut non recte intellectis et vi verborum, ut in se sunt aut non sunt, expressis, ita animi nostri tranquillitas et εὐδαιμονία in recto de rebus, quatenus in nostra sint potestate aut non sint, iudicio consistit. Nam nullam fere aliam ob causam perturbamur et animi tranquillitatem amittimus, nisi quod vagus noster animus non diligenter discernat inter ea, quae in nostra sunt potestate quaeque non sunt, nec harum rerum diversarum conditiones et proprietates diversas perpendat: nempe quod in nostra potestate quae posita sunt (cuiusmodi sunt actiones nostrae internae, quarum radix in sola est anima nostra) suapte natura sint libera, et prohiberi ac impediri a nemine possint. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (ad *Ench.* 53) Christus nos quoque ita Patrem orare docuit, Fiat voluntas tua ita in terra, quemadmodum in celo [Matt 6:10]. Hoc enim est abnegantis sese divinaeque permittentis et se et sua gubernationi, ut et hoc quod precari Epictetus iubet. Accedit huc, quod ratio quoque idem faciendum admonet. Neque enim divinae possumus resistere voluntati, et quod precibus non possumus obtinere, viribus nunquam ab eo extorquebimus. Insipientis est igitur resistere et impii non sponte concedere illius ordinationi, nempe necessitatibus. Notum est illud Publili (Publili ed.) [Publilius Syrus, *Sent.* 176 (= F 11)]: "Feras non culpes, quod mutari non potest." Et Horatii [Carm. 1.24.19–20]: "Levius fit patientia, quicquid corriger est nefas." Iustum et fructuosum est parere superioribus, eorumque ferre gubernationem, quanto magis autem Dei? Trahit necessitas volentes ac nolentes [cf. Sen., Ep. 107.11]. Hoc autem interest: Bonus et pius sponte sequitur, optimae spei plenus. Malus et impius reluctatur plorans, cogitunque suo sequi incom-

modo. Quare Epictetus eum dicit sapientem esse divinaque doctum, qui bene novit concedere necessitati.

Edition:

(photo.) 1585. See above, Composite Editions.

Doubtful edition:

(*) 1592, Claudiopoli (Cluj): typ. Heltai. No copy has yet been located. See *Régi Magyarországi Nyomtatványok*, vol. 1: 1473–1600, 593, no. 689.

Rejected edition:

(*) 1595, Claudiopoli (Cluj): Both Hoffmann and Beyer give the wrong date 1595 for the 1585 edition. Oldfather, no. 133.

Biography and Bibliography:

See II.7 above.

III. FRAGMENTS

TRANSLATIONS

1. Hieronymus Verlenius

In 1550, the same year in which the second edition of his Latin translation of the *Encheiridion* appeared at Antwerp (see II.3 above), Verlenius published at Louvain a Greek text of the *Encheiridion* (Oldfather, no. 318). The text is divided into sixty-two chapters as in Gregorius Haloander's *editio princeps* (Nuremberg, 1529), which formed the basis for Verlenius' edition. In this edition he added fragments taken from Stobaeus.

The fragments collected by Verlenius are put together in eight chapters, numbered 63–70, which immediately follow the *Encheiridion*. Chapters 63–69 contain the *Gnomologium Epicteteum*, leaving out a few items (pp. 478ff. in Schenkl's edition, with the commonly accepted standard numbering); chapter 70 corresponds to fragments 32, 23, and 24 of the *Dissertationum Epictetearum Fragmenta* (pp. 470–71 Schenkl; after fr. 24 [= Stobaeus 453.30] Verlenius adds Stobaeus 453.31).

Another set of fragments was put together in one chapter (chapter 71) by Gerardus of Loppersum; see the printer's note on p. (54): "Caeterum cum adhuc quaedam apud eundem Stobaeum restare cognovissem ex Gerardo Loppersum Phrisio, qui hunc libellum in officina mea correxit, iussi, ut et ea in fine adiiceret, ne iis quoque fraudaretur, qui libellum empturus est." Gerardus found these texts in Gesner's 1549 edition of

Stobaeus; he then added the items from the *Gnomologium Epicteteum* that had been omitted by Verlenius (nos. 4, 46–57) plus a number of fragments from Stobaeus assembled in Schenkl, 454–75 (nos. 17–20, 5, 25, 14, 15, 33, 34). This 1550 Louvain edition of the fragments was used by Jacob Schenck (Basel, 1554) for his edition of the Greek text, and by Hieronymus Wolf (Basel, 1563) for his Latin translation of the fragments (III.2 below). See for the whole matter Schenkl, C–CII. The 1550 Antwerp edition of Verlenius' translation of the *Encheiridion* is followed by a translation of the eight chapters of fragments compiled by Verlenius himself. Verlenius' translation of the *Encheiridion* has thirty-four chapters; the fragments are numbered chapters 35–42 and, like the chapters of the *Encheiridion*, each chapter of the fragments has a title. At the end of chapter 37 of the translation, fr. C 23 [p. 483 Schenkl] is missing, although it is present in Verlenius' edition of the Greek text [at the end of chapter 65]. Together they constitute the third part of the *Encheiridion*, in Verlenius' view, dealing with the *praecepta vitae civilis*. The fragments collected by Gerardus of Loppersum (chapter 71 in the Greek edition) were not translated by Verlenius. At the end of the last chapter, Verlenius added a translation of Plato, *Ap.* 42a, which is not found in the Greek text ("Atque iam nunc tempus est abeundi utrisque, mihi quidem morituro, vobis autem [audem ed.] victuris; utri autem nostrum ad meliora veniunt ignotum est omnibus praeterquam Deo soli").

Fragments (ed. of Antwerp, 1550). Tertia pars Enchiridii Epicteti continens praecepta vitae civilis, ex collectaneis graecis Ioannis Stobaei desuma. [Inc.]: (*Gnom. Epict.* 1 [p. 478 Schenkl]) Vita fortunae implicita et eidem obnoxia: fluminis hibernis aucto pluviis similis est, turbulenta namque est et limosa, quam nec facile nec tuto quis ingrediatur, ad haec tyrannica, obstrepera, minimeque diurna. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (Stobaeus 453.31) Vita brevior sed cum virtute coniuncta longe praferenda est longiori vitae sed improbae.

Edition:

(photo.) 1550. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography and Bibliography:

See II.3 above.

2. Hieronymus Wolfius

Wolf, in vol. 2 of his edition, pp. 367–81, gives a translation of the fragments from Stobaeus. He used the Greek text by Jacob Schenck (1554), which is based on the 1550 Louvain edition by Verlenius and Gerardus of Loppersum (see III.1 above). Wolf's translation comprises a larger portion of text since, unlike Verlenius, he translates chapter 71 of the Greek text.

Schenkl, CII notes that Wolf not only used Schenck's Greek text of the fragments but also consulted an edition of Stobaeus; this is evident from the addition of the translation of Stobaeus 4.38.31, which was not included by Verlenius and Schenck.

Fragments (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 2): Epicteti sententiae aliquot e Ioannis Stobaei collectaneis. [Inc.]: (p. 367) De Fortuna. Vita quae a Fortuna pendet, torrenti flumini similis est: quippe turbulenta, coenosa, impervia, tyrannica, tumultuosa, non diurna. (*Gnom. Epict.* 1 [p. 478 Schenkl]) . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 381) Voluptates commendat rarer usus. Rarissimae quaeque voluptates maxime delectant. Sed si quis excesserit modum, suavissima quaeque fiunt molestissima (Frr. XXXIII–XXXIV Schenkl [p. 474 Schenkl]).

Editions:

- 1563. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1595–96. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1655. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1683. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography and Bibliography:

See I.3 above.

COMMENTARIES

a. Hieronymus Verlenius

Verlenius added a number of notes to his translation of the Epictetean fragments taken from Stobaeus (III.1 above). In the notes, which follow after each chapter, he adduces parallel passages from Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, and others.

Commentary (ed. of Antwerp, 1550). [Inc.]: (ad *Gnom. Epict.* 1 [p. 478 Schenkl]) *Si vis bonus esse. Unde bene Seneca ad Lucilium. Et hoc ipsum inquit argumentum in melius translati animi est, quod vitia sua quae adhuc ignorabat videt.*

Quibusdam aegris gratulamur cum se ipsos aegros esse senserint [Sen., *Ep.* 6.1] . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (ad Pl., *Ap.* 42a) *Atque nunc tempus.* Locus est desumptus ex Platonis dialogo cui titulus est: Socratis apologia.

Edition:

- 1550. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography and Bibliography:

See II.3 above.

b. Hieronymus Wolfius

Wolf's three pages of notes to his translation of the fragments are entitled “Annotatio locorum aliquot, Oporiniana editionis anni 1554 [= Schenck's edition], quae emendationem postulare videntur.” These notes are concerned with the constitution of the text. The final note contains an interesting account of the tasks of an editor as viewed by Wolf and is quoted below in full.

Commentary (ed. of Basel, 1563). [Inc.]: (vol. 2, p. 382) (ad *Gnom. Epict.* 2 [p. 478 Schenkl]) πηγῇ καὶ γὰρ. Fortassis, πηγῇ ὑδωρ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀτάραχον, καὶ πότιμον καὶ νόστιμον καὶ κοινωνικὸν καὶ ἀβλαβὲς καὶ ἀνώλεθρον παρεχούσῃ. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (vol. 2, p. 384) ἐπέστησεν ὁ λέγων. Malim ἀρ. β absolute, ἐπέστη ὁ λέγων. Et mox vel ἔφη, vel εἶπεν redundant. Καὶ ὅς, οὐκοῦν, ἔφη, ἐν ἀρικίᾳ ἀριστήσουμεν.

Alia leviuscula, ut παρήγαγεν, ἥμερος, ἄμεινον, ἀδίκως, οὕτως, ἀνήρ, οὐκ et similia perperam excusa, sic corrigenda esse vel puer intelligat. In caeteris candidus lector cogitet elaborandum interpreti esse, ut et analogiae et syntaxeos ratio et ipse sensus autori constet. Quis enim ea vertat quae nec ipse nec alii intelligent? Grammatica errata homini docto animadvertere et emendare non est difficile. Ubi sententia [senentia ed.] ipsa claudicat, sagaciore ingenio est opus, cuius conjecturae prorsus contemnendae non sunt, donec emendatior codex offeratur; emendatior inquam, non vetustior. Constat enim antiquos etiam librarios (ἀνθρώπους γε ναι μὰ Δία, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνδράποδα γεγονότας) aequae atque nostri temporis chalcographos errare solitos; id quod is perspiciet, qui plura exempla vetera eiusdem autoris contulerit. Ipse quidem hoc in Zonara (non vetustissimo illo quidem autore, sed tamen paucos haberi codices existimo ante 400 annos scriptos) sum expertus, ubi interdum quinque codices eodem loco dissenserunt. Quid

hic in convertendo faciet obesae naris et superstiosus (vol. 2, p. 385) antiquarius? Nam diversas quidem lectiones annotare ut permolestum esse fateor, ita facillimum est. Ego mihi ubique et analogiam et stylum autoris et contextum sententiarum sequenda esse duco.

Augurium ratio est et coniectura futuri:
hac divinato noticiamque feres.
[Ov., *Trist.* 1.9.51–52].

Neque vero fideles antiquariorum et saepe utilles labores improbo, neque temeritatem mutandae lectionis laudo: neque nisi manifestos errores quicquam in autoribus muto, neque coniecturas meas pro oraculis haberi volo. Sed quid in convertendo spectarim, citra cuiusquam praeiudicium, anno: et eatenus probari lectoribus cupio, quatenus a συνέσει γραμματικῇ τε καὶ πολιτικῇ non abhorruerunt.

Note to the reader (ed. of Basel, 1563; this note serves to introduce the *Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi*, which begins on the next page). Hieronymus Wolfius lectori s. [Inc.:] (p. 385) Utinam epistolas Epicteti, quae cum Simplicii Commentariis in Florentina Bibliotheca extare dicuntur, habere potuissemus: ut ne quicquam tam praestantis philosophi desideraretur. Sed eas, uti spero, aliud tempus e situ et tenebris in lucem proferet. Nunc vero hanc altercationem, quamvis ψευδεπίγραφον, ut opinor, corollarii vice adiicere visum est, ob exiguum tantillae chartae iacturam, quam vel una sententia pensare potest. Vale.

Edition:

1563. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography and Bibliography:

See I.3 above.