The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Schenkl's *Epictetus Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, ad fidem codicis Bodleiani*, recensuit Henricus Schenkl. Accedunt Fragmenta, Enchiridion, Gnomologiorum Epicteteorum reliquiae, Indices. Teubner. 1894. 10 Mk.

J. B. Mayor

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 31 - 37

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201005, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201005

How to cite this article:

J. B. Mayor (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 31-37 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201005

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is no evidence to show that *τριάτῃ φθίνοντος* at Sparta was (as at Athens) the 27th in a hollow as much as in a full month, we may suppose Geraistios 424/3 and Artemisios 422/1 to be hollow, and the last date

to be the 26th. We thus get 722 days again, the Lacedaemonians making one year contain 383, the other 354 days.

T. NICKLIN.

SCHENKL'S *EPICETUS*.

Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, ad fidem codicis Bodleiani, recensuit HENRICUS SCHENKL. Accedunt Fragmenta, Enchiridion, Gnomologiorum Epictetorum reliquiae, Indices. Teubner. 1894. 10 Mk.

THE importance of this edition consists in the fact that it is the first which is professedly based upon the readings of the Bodleian Codex (*Cod. Gr. Misc.* 251).¹ That this codex is the parent of all the known MSS. of the *Dissertationes* was first proved by the late Mr. J. L. G. Mowat in 1876, when he printed in the *Journal of Philology* (vol. vii. p. 60 ff.) a paper entitled 'A Lacuna in Arrian.' He there states that in collating this codex, to which his attention had been directed by Mr. Bywater and Mr. Hatch, he found one of the pages to be rendered partly illegible by a large smear-like blot, occurring in Bk. i. ch. 18, and corresponding to a lacuna marked in Upton's and Schweighäuser's editions and in a Paris MS. used by the latter, but unnoticed in the older editions and in other MSS.

Similar reasoning had been employed by Valentine Rose in 1871 (*Hermes* v. p. 360 ff.) to prove that the Bodleian MS. of the *Vita Pythagorae*, which is bound up in the same volume with the *Epictetus*, was rightly stated in Coxe's Catalogue to be the source from which the other existing MSS. had been derived. Rose adds that he had been informed by Mr. Bywater, in a letter written Dec. 26, 1870, 'dass auch in der vorhergehenden wichtigen (ältesten und bisher unbenutzten) Texte von Arrian's Dissertationen eine Rasur ganz ähnlichen Charakters vorkommt.'² Mr. Schenkl informs us (p. xxiv.) that on reading Rose's proof of the importance of the Bodleian MS. of the

Vita Pythagorae, *statim mihi suspicio orta est haud aliter rem se habere in Arriano Epicteteo, et codice ipso inspecto me haud falso suspicatum esse facile intellexi. Etenim casu quodam satis iniquo factum est ut in libri Bodleiani folii 25 pagina antica macula adspersa...haud paucae litterae quae olim ibi legebantur, non solum obscurarentur, sed etiam oblitterarentur....Cum igitur in hoc loco omnes dissertationum Epictetearum libri manuscripti lacunas exhibeant, quid certius quam ad unum omnes aut ex ipso Bodleiano aut ex eius apographis descriptos esse?* He does not give the date of his visit to Oxford in this passage, but on a later page (lxvii.) we read: *codicem pretiosissimum Bodleianum a. MDCCCLXXXI admodum iuvenis non indiligenter contuli cum editione Didotiana; deinde saepius ad eum reversus quotienscumque in Anglia commoratus sum iterum iterumque singulos locos examinavi.*

One would suppose from this statement that, till the time of Mr. Schenkl's visit to Oxford in 1881, the existence of the tell-tale stain in the Bodleian Codex was a secret, not only to outsiders, but even to Oxford scholars and to the Librarian himself, and that it was left to Mr. Schenkl to discover it; yet, as we have seen, it had been publicly announced by Mr. Mowat five years earlier; and even if Mr. Schenkl was ignorant of this, he could hardly fail to have been informed of it by the Librarian when he asked leave to consult the MS.

But though Mr. Schenkl makes no reference to Mr. Mowat's article in pp. xxiv. and lxvii., where he assumes to himself the credit of proving the fact which Rose, or rather Bywater, had suggested, yet he distinctly refers to it in p. xxxii. n. in which he controverts Mowat's guesses as to the history of the Codex, and again in p. xc. in which he gives Mowat's conjectural filling up of the lacuna. Whether he made acquaintance with Mowat's article before or after his visit to Oxford in 1881 is of little consequence. Mowat is the person to whom belongs the credit of establishing the

¹ Not 257, as Schenkl prints at the beginning of his text.

² A quotation from Mr. Bywater's letter follows, in which two erasures are mentioned, which were made (as it would seem) after the later MSS. had been copied from the Bodleian, but no mention is made of the earlier stain in i. 18.

supremacy of the Bodleian Codex of Epictetus, and Mr. Schenkl has been guilty of an unpardonable breach of the comity of scholars in endeavouring to filch this credit from him.

Passing on from the personal question, we have in the volume before us :

(1) The Introduction, containing a chapter on the Life and Times of Epictetus and the History of the *Dissertationes* (pp. i.—xiv.), *Testimonia Veterum de Epicteto* (xv.—xxiii.), an account of the MSS. of the *Dissertationes* (xxiv.—l.), a comparison between the readings of the Bodleian and the quotations from Epictetus in Stobaeus and other ancient writings, also between the quotations found in Epictetus and the originals (l.—lxii.), editions of Epictetus (lxii.—lxx.), scholia copied from the Bodleian Codex by T. W. Allen (lxx.—lxxxiv.), *Adnotationis Supplementum* (lxxxiv.—cxxii.) containing emendations by Reiske, Coraes, Elter and others, as well as further notes and corrections by the editor.

(2) Text with critical notes (pp. 1—400).

(3) Appendix containing *Fragmenta Dissertationum* (pp. 403—423), *Enchiridion* (424—460), *Gnomologium Epictetum Stobaei* (461—478), *Sententiae Codicis Vaticani* (479—480), *Μοσχίωτος γνῶμαι ἐς ὑποθήκας* (481—490).

(4) *Indices Nominum et Locorum* (490—501), *Verborum* (501—720). A facsimile of the page of the codex containing the famous smear is given at the end.

The description of the Bodleian MS. and the faithfulness of the collation will be tested by Mr. Lindsay, who follows me. I shall confine my attention here to the actual Text in connexion with the Critical Notes and Supplement, and to the Index Verborum, merely remarking that the Introduction seems to be on the whole carefully written.

In p. lxviii. the editor thus states the principle he has followed in framing his text, *ne imprimis id egisse ne a codicis memoria sine iusta causa decederem*; but he confesses that he finds he has too frequently substituted for the true reading of the Bodleian *sive correctorum sive virorum doctorum commenta*: (he should certainly have added *sive mea ipsius*). In consequence we find the *Adnotationis Supplementum* full of retractations of the readings given in the text. In itself this proves perhaps nothing more than too great precipitancy, but the accepted readings, or the final emendations of the Supplement, are sometimes of such

a nature as to excite grave suspicion as to the scholarship of the editor.

I will begin with examples of improved readings due to the editor, which I have observed in looking through Book i.¹

C. 7, 3. ἡ τοῦτο λεγέωσαν ὅτι οὐ συγκαθήσει εἰς ἐρώτησιν...ὁ σπουδαῖος, ἢ ὅτι συγκαθίσει οὐκ ἐπιμελήσεται τοῦ μὴ εἰκῇ...ἀναστρέφεισθαι. μὴ τούτων <δὲ> μηδέτερον προσδεχομένους ἀναγκαῖον ὁμολογεῖν ὅτι κ.τ.λ. This is the ordinary text, δὲ being inserted with Sb. Ed. omits δέ with S, puts a comma after ἀναστρέφεισθαι, and changes μὴ to ἢ.

C. 11, 28. ταῦτόν ἐστιν ἐπὶ πάντων τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ ποιεῖν τι ἡμᾶς ἢ μὴ ποιεῖν...τοῦ ἐπαίρεσθαι ἢ συστέλλεσθαι ἢ φεύγειν τινὰ ἢ διώκειν. *Fortasse* τοῦ φεύγειν Ed.

C. 12, 30. τοιούτων αὐτῶν <όντων> οὐδεμία σοι δίδεται μηχανή; Sb inserts ὄντων, Ed. in *Suppl.* proposes to omit αὐτῶν.

C. 15, 8. μὴδ' ἂν, ἐγὼ σοι λέγω, προσδόκα. Ed. reads οὖν for ἂν found in all MSS. and edd.

C. 18, 9. εἰ σὲ δὲ παρὰ φύσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις κακοῖς διατίθεσθαι, ἐλέει αὐτὸν μάλλον ἢ μίσει. A corrector (Sc) wrote οὐ which was accepted by former editors; but Schenkl restores εἰ, on the ground that ἔλεος itself is an emotion called out by the sufferings of others and, as such, discouraged by the Stoic rule, cf. iii. 18, 7 τί σοι καὶ τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ κακῷ; iii. 22 δεῖ σοι μὴ ὀργὴν εἶναι, μὴ φθόνον, μὴ ἔλεον, and i. 28, 9 τί οὖν χαλεπαίνεις αὐτῇ...οὐχὶ δέ, εἴπερ ἄρα, ἐλεεῖς; where εἴπερ ἄρα shows that mercy is not commended unconditionally.

C. 26, 13. τὰ ρά εἰς δὲ τὸν ἀναγινῶσκοντα τοὺς ὑποθετικούς καὶ γελάσαντος τοῦ υποθεμένου αὐτῷ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν Σεαυτοῦ, ἔφη, καταγέλῳ. Ed reads τὰ ρά εἰς for * * ρά εἰς S, κρά εἰς Sc. Perhaps we should omit καί. Translate 'When he had confused the reader of the hypothetical arguments and his teacher had burst out laughing, he turned to him and said "you are laughing at yourself."'

Some good readings may also be gleaned from the miscellaneous collection of emendations in the Supplement, e.g.

C. 4, 31. Contrasting the honours paid to Triptolemus, the inventor of the plough, with those paid to philosophers who have brought to light moral truths, Epict. says τῷ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐρόντι...οὐ τὴν περὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ εὖ ζῆν, τίς ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ βωμὸν ἰδρύσατο; Here editors in

¹ S stands for the original reading of the Bodleian, Sb.c.d. for subsequent corrections, s for the later MSS., Schw. for Schweighäuser, Ed. for Schenkl, D for Dübner's text in the Didot series.

general have followed later MSS. in reading *περὶ τοῦ ζῆν*. Reiske's emendation *πρὸς τὸ ζῆν*, published for the first time in Schenkl's Supplement, applies better to the invention of Triptolemus and gives a more pointed antithesis to the words which follow.

C. 6, 20. *αἰσχρόν ἐστιν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀρχεσθαι καὶ καταλήγειν ὅπου καὶ τὰ ἄλογα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐνθεν μὲν <ἐκεῖνα καταλήγει> ἀρχεσθαι, καταλήγειν δ' ἐφ' ὃ κατέληξεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ φύσις*. Reiske's insertion seems necessary to distinguish between the starting point (*ἀρχεσθαι*) of man and brute.

C. 8, 13. *εἰ δὲ καλὸς ἦν Πλάτων... ἔδει καὶ μὲ καθήμενον ἐκπονεῖν ἵνα καλὸς γένομαι... ὥς τοῦτο ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν*; Insert with Reiske *ὃν* after *ἀναγκαῖον*.

C. 15, 2. *οὐκ ἐπαγγέλλεται φιλοσοφία τῶν ἐκτός τι περιποιήσων τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· εἰ δὲ μή, ἕξω τι τῆς ἰδίας ὕλης ἂν ἐξέταί*. Read with Reiske *ἀναδέξεται*.

C. 24, 6. λέγει *ὅτι ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔστι κακόν, οὐδὲ γὰρ αἰσχρόν*. λέγει *ὅτι εὐδοξία ψόφος ἐστὶ μαινομένων ἀνθρώπων. οἷα δὲ περὶ πόνου, οἷα δὲ περὶ ἡδονῆς, οἷα περὶ πενίας εἴρηκεν*. Here Elter has restored *ἀδοξία* (the reading of S) instead of Upton's conjecture *εὐδοξία*, and altered *ἡδονῆς* into *ὀδύνης*, as the context treats only of resisting trials. Cf. for the former c. 30, 2 *φυγὴν καὶ φυλακὴν καὶ δεσμὰ καὶ θάνατον καὶ ἀδοξίαν τί ἔλεγες*;

In general however I do not think that the present text can be regarded as an improvement on Dübner's: many of the alterations are unnecessary, some impossible, and on the other hand a reading which had neither sense nor construction has been occasionally left unaltered, without even the warning of an obelus to the unwary reader.

I proceed to give examples of each sort. Unless otherwise stated the text and small-type notes are those of the present edition.

C. 1, 3. *ἀλλ' ὅτε μὲν ἂν τι γράφῃς τῷ ἐταίρῳ, δεῖ τούτων ὧν γραπτέον, ἢ γραμματικῇ ἐρεῖ· πότερον δὲ γραπτέον τῷ ἐταίρῳ ἢ οὐ γραπτέον ἢ γραμματικῇ οὐκ ἐρεῖ*.

ὅταν Sb in marg. | ἂν S (i.e. ἀντιγράφῃς) | ἐτέρῳ S, corr. Sd (item v. 5) | ὧν C. Schenkl, τῶν S, sed fortasse gravius mendium latet | ὅταν μὲν ἀντιγράφειν δέη, τούτῳ τί ed. Trinc. | γραπτέον S (-ον s), γραπτέων Sd.

Here *ὅτε* has no construction and *δεῖ* τούτων ὧν *γραφτέον* does not give the required sense. In the Supplement Elter proposes *ὅ τι μὲν, ἂν τι γράφῃς τῷ ἐτ., δεῖ* (sc. γράφειν) τούτων τῶν *γραμ-*

μάτων, which is, I think, right if we change *ὅ τι* into *ὅτι* (the true reading of S, as we learn from Mr. Lindsay's remarks below) and omit the misleading explanation in brackets. The editor unfortunately adds *mihī iam dudum tale quid requiri videbatur* ἀλλ' ὅτε μὲν ἂν (*tamquam* ὅταν μὲν) *τι γράφῃς τῷ ἐτ. διὰ τίνων γραμμάτων γραπτέον*.

C. 1, 7. *τὴν χρῆσιν τὴν ὀρθὴν ταῖς φαντασίαις*. Here the note is: *fort. τῶν φαντασιῶν*, though Upton had cited *χρήσις τέκνοις* and *χρήσις γῆρα* from Stobaeus, and Schw. had referred to similar constructions in Polybius.

C. 1, 13. *τί οὖν; μή τι μικρά σοι φαίνεται ταῦτα; μὴ γένοιτο. ἀρκῇ οὖν αὐτοῖς; εὐχομαι ἢ δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς*.

ἀρκῇ s, ἀρκῆν S, ἀρκεί Sb, ἀρκού s | εὐχου ed. Trinc. | δὲ] γε unus s, δὲ C. Schenkl. Suppl. malim αὐτ' εὐχομαι ἢ τοὺς θεοὺς, αὐτ' cum Schw. εὐχαρίστω (f. εὐχ. οὖν vel εὐχαρίστω) τοῖς θεοῖς scribere.

The reading of the text seems right enough if *γε* be substituted for *δέ*: 'Are you content with your lot?' 'At any rate I pray the gods to make me so.' Cf. c. 11, 38 *ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον τοίνυν ἡμέρας οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐπισκοπήσομεν... οὔτε τὸν ἀγρὸν οὔτε τὰ ἀνδράποδα... ἀλλὰ τὰ δόγματα*. *Εὐχομαι, ἔφη*, also iv. 1, 151.

C. 1, 20. *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔτι πρότερον προσελθόντι τῷ Ἐπαφροδίτῳ [τῷ κυρίῳ] τοῦ Νέρωνος καὶ ἀνακρίνοντι αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ συγκρουσθῆναι 'ἂν τι θέλω', φησίν, 'ἔρω σοὶ τῷ κυρίῳ'*.

*προσελθόντ' * S (προσελθόντα unus s) | τῷ scripsi, tis S, del. s. | κυρίῳ] ἀπελευθέρῳ ed. Trinc. | delevi verba τῷ κυρίῳ ul' ex v. 18 repetita. Suppl. tis temptare non debebam.*

But *tis* is not in the least wanted: the subject is Lateranus, as in the preceding sentence. Schw. considered it to be a marginal query, 'who is he alluding to?'; but it is simpler to explain it as a dittographia of the preceding syllable. There seems no occasion for the article, as *Ἐπαφροδίτῳ* is anarthrous in c. 26, 12 and elsewhere. Instead of *τῷ κυρίῳ*, which may have been a marginal note to remind the reader that Epaphr. had been the master of Epictetus, we should perhaps read *ΑΠο* which would be easily lost after *ΔΙΤῳ*, the confusion between the long and short vowel, and the loss or addition of the *u* subscr. being not unfrequent in this MS.

C. 1, 32. *ἀποθανεῖν με δεῖ. εἰ ἤδη, ἀποθνήσκω· καὶ ν μετ' ὀλίγον, νῦν ἀριστῶ τῆς ὥρας ἐλθούσης, εἴτα τότε τεθνήξομαι*.

καὶ μετ' C. Schenkl, καὶ μετ' S, εἰ μετ' ed. Trinc.

In a distinct alternative εἰ is evidently required.

C. 4, 24. μαθεῖν τί ἐστὶ θάνατος, τί φυγή, τί δεσποτήριον, τί † νοσκόμιον, ἵνα δύνῃται λέγειν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ ὃ φίλε Κρίτων κ.τ.λ.

locus varie emendari potest: τί νόσ<ος>, τί > κώνειον, vel τί νοσοκομείον (νοσοκόμιον) conieci; τί κώνειον vel τί τὸ κώνειον s.

The reference here seems to be to judicial penalties, with a special allusion to Socrates in the final words; which forbids the reading νόσος or νοσοκόμιον. Why not τίνος κώνειον; 'Whose is hemlock,' i.e. 'What sort of person it was for whom (the draught of) hemlock was reserved?'

C. 6, 9. After speaking of the argument from final causes in the case of sensible objects and our bodily appetites, Ep. continues οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἐμφαίνει τὸν τεχνίτην; ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν <οὕτω> ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τῆς διανοίας κατασκευή...οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἱκανὰ κινήσαι...πρὸς τὸ <μὴ> ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν τεχνίτην;

οὕτω Stob., om. S, οὕτω Meineke. Suppl. οὕτω quod apud Stobaeum legitur obelo notat E. sic interpretans ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν (sc. ἐμφαίνει) ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τ. δ. κατασκευή (sc. οὐκ ἐμφαίνει).

Surely there cannot be a doubt that οὕτω with interrogative is the true reading: 'Do not these things either prove a divine artist? If however these are not yet enough to prove it, go on to the processes of mind.' Below, μὴ is inserted from Stob. and Sc: I prefer to omit it with S and to read ἀπολείπειν with Stob. understanding it in the sense 'to admit,' (which is common in later philosophy, though not recognized in L. and S.) cf. Philodemus περὶ εὐσεβείας (p. 84 Gomp.) εἰ καὶ ἀπέλειπον τὸ δαιμόνιον, ὥσπερ οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἀπέλειπον, ἕνα θεὸν λέγουσιν εἶναι.... πλανῶντες δ' ὡς πολλοὺς ἀπολείποντες, Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. vii. 55 where ἀπολείπειν κατάληψιν is opposed to ἀναιρεῖν.

C. 6, 10. (We not merely receive imprints from the objects of sense) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκλαμβάνομεν τι καὶ ἀφαιροῦμεν καὶ προστίθεμεν καὶ συντίθεμεν τάδε τινα δι' αὐτῶν καὶ νῆ Δία μεταβαίνομεν ἀπ' ἄλλων ἐπ' ἄλλα τινὰ <οὐχ> οὕτω πως παρακείμενα.

τάδε <καὶ τάδε> Meineke, πάλιν Wachsmuth. | τινα οὐχ scripsi, τὰ S, om. Stob., de ἄλλ' ἅττα cogitaverat Wachsmuth, ἄλλα τούτοις πως Schw., ἀλλὰ οὐδαμῶς Upton. Suppl. συντίθεμεν <τὰ μὲν δι' ἄλλων> > τὰ δὲ [τινὰ] δι' αὐτῶν Reiske, συντ. τοιάδε τινα δι' αὐτῶν Coraes.

The text of S is quite right. Treating of the way in which the intellect deals with the impressions of sense, Epictetus mentions selection, abstraction, composition [of imaginary individuals (τάδε τινα) such as the centaur or chimaera], analogical reasoning in cases where there is a natural correspondence. Cf. Sext. Emp. cited by Schw.

C. 6, 14. ἐκείνοις μὲν (sc. τοῖς ἀλόγοις mentioned before) ἀρκεῖ τὸ ἐσθίειν...καὶ τὰλλ' ὅσα ἐπιτελεῖ τὸ ν ἄλ ὁ γ ω ν ἕκαστον.

τῶν del. s | ἀλόγων scripsi, αὐτῶν S.

The corruption in S (τῶν αὐτῶν) is more easily explained from αὐτῶν than from τῶν ἀλόγων, not to mention that the latter comes in awkwardly after ἐκείνοις.

C. 7, 6. τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐν χρήσει νομίσματος μὴ διαπίπτειν ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο ἀκοῦσαι, διὰ τί τὰς μὲν δοκίμους δραχμὰς παραδέχῃ, τὰς δ' ἀδοκίμους ἀποδοκιμάζει; Οὐκ ἀρκεῖ.

ov ε
παραδέχῃ et ἀποδοκιμάζειs S, quibus correcturis probatis διότι s.

The reading of the later MSS. (διότι with the imperatives) makes very good sense: 'Is it enough for one who would guard against taking bad money for good, merely to be told that "thou must accept the genuine coin and reject the spurious"? It is not enough.' Schw. has pointed out that διότι constantly bears the sense of ὅτι in later Greek, and is often written διὰ τί in the MSS. He would make a similar correction in c. 10, 7 ἐγὼ λέγω ὅτι ἀπρακτόν ἐστι τὸ ζῶν; μὴ γένοιτο. ἀλλὰ διὰ τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν πρακτικοί; where however the editor keeps to the old reading without even mentioning Schw.'s certain emendation. In the present passage διὰ τί is equally unmeaning.

C. 7, 32. Epictetus, being blamed by Musonius for failing to detect an omission in a syllogism, replied οὐ γὰρ οἶμαί, φημί, τὸ Καπιτώλιον κατέκαυσα.

οὐ γὰρ οἶμαί scripsi, οὐχ οἶον μὲν S, οὐχ οἶονεῖ Eller | κατέκαυσα scripsi, κατεσκευάσα S, κατέσκαψα s | μὴ γὰρ, ἔφην, τὸ Κ. ἐνέπρησα unus s.

No scholar will deny that the reading ascribed to unus s is infinitely more vigorous and idiomatic than any of the alternative readings. That of S reads, as Schw. has remarked, like a marginal interpretation. Also the word ἐμπύπρημι 'to set fire to' is more suitable than κατακαίω 'to burn down,' and it is repeated in the next sentence. The

difficulty is, how should this, if it be the true reading, get into *unus s*, i.e. into a MS. derived from S? It is too bold and too good for a scribe's emendation. Turning to the notes in Schw.'s edition, we find that the authority is Upton's codex (of which I shall have more to say hereafter) and a Paris MS. *in ora*, which might be a correction from some independent source. The reading of S (κατεσκευάσα) may be, as Ed. conjectures, a corruption of κατέκανσα, which may itself have formed part of a marginal gloss in the original MS. from which S was derived.

C. 8, 16. The good of man consists in ποιὰ προαίρεσις [φαντασιῶν].

φαντασιῶν *delevi*, <καὶ χρήσις> φ. *vel* <χρηστική> φ. *Schw.*

The phrase *χρήσις φαντ.* occurs in c. 20, 15 οὐσία δ' ἀγαθοῦ χρήσις οἷα δέει φαντασιῶν, and in ii. 1, 4 ἡ οὐσία τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔστιν ἐν χρήσει φαντασιῶν, while ποιὰ προαίρεσις is identified with the οὐσία ἀγαθοῦ in i. 29, 1. The two might therefore be very well combined here, as they are in c. 30, 4 τὰ ἀγαθὰ τίνα ὑμῖν ἐδόκει; προαίρεσις οἷα δέει καὶ χρήσις φαντασιῶν, also in ii. 22, 29: iii. 22, 103, in which case the omission of καὶ χρήσις might easily come about by the eye passing from the termination of προαίρεσις to that of χρήσις. On the other hand, what explanation can be given of the interpolation of such a word as φαντασιῶν?

C. 9, 11. Ep. has been grieving over the necessity of putting spirit into his hearers; he would have preferred to have had occasion to restrain their impetuosity, μηχανώμενον...μή τις ἐπιπτώσιν τοιοῦτοι νέοι<οἱ> ἐπιγνόντες τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς συγγένειαν, καὶ ὅτι δεσμὰ τίνα ταῦτα προσηρτήμεθα τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν κτῆσιν...ὥς βάρη τίνα ἀπορρίψαι θέλωσι καὶ ἀπελθεῖν πρὸς τοὺς συγγενεῖς.

<οἱ> *add. s. Suppl. νέοι* <ἡν> *E* *propter θέλωσιν* (an <οἱ ἡν>?); *sed vide an scribendum sit sine ulla mutatione μὴ ἐπιπτώσιν* (audi eis ἀπορίας *vel* ἀτυχίαν) τοιοῦτοι νέοι ἐπιγνόντες...συγγένειαν καὶ, ὅτι (quoniam)...βίη, ὥς βάρη...ἀπορρίψαι θέλωσι: *facilior sane esset verborum conformatio si suppleret liceret καὶ* <μαθόντες> ὅτι *vel tale quid. Nunc nodum puto solvit E* *diabius litteris insertis: μὴ* <ἡν> *τις ἐπιπτώσιν.*

The reading of the text makes excellent sense with the slightest possible departure from S: 'taking measures to restrain the impetuosity of youngsters so high-spirited as to desire to depart at

once and join the kindred deity.' The deplorable emendations of the Suppl. are due to a misunderstanding of the construction. The subjunctive (θέλωσι) follows the relative, as it does in iv. 11, 35 ἰδοὺ πρεσβύτης...ὅ τις υἱὸν παραδῶ μαθησόμενον *ecce senex cui filium in disciplinam tradat aliquis.*

C. 9, 16. When God gives the signal, καὶ ἀπολύσῃ ὑμᾶς ταύτης τῆς ὑπηρεσίας τοῦ ἀπελύσσεσθε πρὸς αὐτόν.

ἀπελύσεσθε *Eller*, ἀπολύσεσθε *S.*

The MS. is quite right: 'When He dismisses you, then and not till then, depart.'

C. 11, 2. πῶς τι οὖν χρῆ τῷ πράγματι; read with Upton and Schw. τί οὖν; πῶς χρῆ, a reading not even mentioned in the note.

C. 16, 19. οὐκ ἔδει τίνα εἶναι τὸν...ὑπὲρ πάντων ᾧ δοῦντα τὸν ὕμνον τὸν εἰς τὸν θεόν;

διαδόντα *S, corr. s.* an ἰδίᾳ ᾑδόντα?

The correction is wrongly assigned to *s*; it is due to Schw. who gives as the readings of the inferior codices διαδιδόντα or διαδόντα: Upton's codex has διδόντα. The Ed.'s suggestion is needless: ΑΙΔΟΝΤΑ easily passes into ΔΙΔΟΝΤΑ or ΔΙΑΔΟΝΤΑ.

I must be content to cite only a few out of the many passages I had marked in which the editor seems to me to have gone astray. I will merely note here some more general sources of error.

The scribe of the Bodleian codex is very careless in the insertion or omission of the article and of ἄν. The editor has corrected this in c. 4, 23 <τὸ> οἶμοι after Schw., 6, 3 <τὰ> ὁρατά after Schw., 6, 9, ἡ προθυμία <ἡ> πρὸς τὴν συνουσίαν where the second ἡ is inserted on the authority of Stobaeus and the first ἡ should probably be omitted on the same authority, 6, 42 [τὰ] ἐγκλήματα omitted with *s*, and elsewhere; but he has failed to make a necessary correction in 2, 6 μαθεῖν <τὴν> τοῦ εὐλόγον καὶ ἀλόγον πρόληψιν with *s*, 11, 18 <τοῦ> φεύγειν (αἰτίον) τοῦτο αὐτὸ ὅτι ἐδοξέν σοι with D, 14, 10 ἐπέχεσθαι ὑπὸ <τῆς> σκιάς ἣν ἡ γῆ ποιεῖ with Stob., 16, 12 ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικῶν...ἐν <τῇ> φωνῇ τι ἐγκατέμειξεν ἀπαλώτερον with D, 20, 11 ἐπὶ δὲ <τοῦ> τάλαιπῶρον ἡγεμονικοῦ...πάσαν φαντασίαν παραπροσδεχόμεθα with D, 22, 6 ἐντεῦθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ <τῆς> μάχης with *s*, 26, 5 τοῦτον <τὸν> ἀπολογισμὸν with D. In the same way I think we should correct 28, 18 (the houses of men and nests of storks were fired. It matters little: else show me) τί διαφέρει

οἰκία ἀνθρώπου καὶ νεοσσιὰ πελαργοῦ ὡς οἰκησις.
ὅμοιον οὖν ἐστὶ πελαργός καὶ ἄνθρωπος; τί
λέγεις; κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ὁμοιότατον. [πλὴν ὅτι
μὲν ἐκ δοκῶν καὶ κεραμίδων καὶ πλίνθων οἰκοδο-
μεῖται τὰ οἰκίδια, ἡ δ' ἐκ ῥάβδων καὶ πηλοῦ.]

*quae post ὁμοιάται in S leguntur, Upt. post
οἰκησις transponendo, alii aliis modis servare
statuerunt, ego ut glossema cecit.*

Upton is undoubtedly right. The sentence is necessary, and has not the least the look of a gloss. What is required is the insertion of the article between ὅτι and μὲν. I had thought of τὰ, but from Mr. Lindsay's remarks it appears that the original reading of S was ὁ δ' ἐκ ῥάβδων (referring to πελαργός) instead of ἡ δ' (referring to νεοσσιὰ), so that we should probably read οἰκοδομεῖ (the -ται being due to dittography of τὰ) and insert ὁ before μὲν, 'the man builds his habitation of beams &c., the stork of clay.' I think also that τί λέγεις has got displaced from before ὅμοιον.

Again with regard to ἄν, this is corrected by Ed. in 15, 8 μὴδ' οὖν ἐγὼ σοι λέγω, προσ-
δόκα, where S has μὴ δ' ἄν, and in 11, 32 κἂν
μεταδόξῃ οὐκ ἂν ἀπελεύσῃ, where Suppl. has
ἄν *del.* *Cor.*, *puto in archetypo scriptum fuisse*
av *ap*

ἀπελευσῇ *vel* ἀνελ., but he has left it in 11, 27 οὐδὲν ἦν τὸ κινήσαν σε...πρὸς τὸ ἀφεῖναι τὸ παιδίον;...ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτόν τι ἄν, οἷον καὶ ἐν 'Ρώμῃ τινὰ ἦν τὸ κινεῖν, where I think we should either change ἄν into ἦν or at any rate insert ἦν after it, 'it must have been something of the kind of which we had an instance in Rome.'

Ἄν is omitted where we should have expected it, not only in 14, 13 τίνι γὰρ ἄλλω κρείττονι...φύλακι παρέδωκεν ἡμῶν ἕκαστον; where we learn from the note that ἄν was inserted by Upton and Schw., but also in 16, 20 εἰ γοῦν ἀηδὼν ἤμην, ἐποιοῦν τὰ τῆς ἀηδόνης where Coraes inserted ἄν, and in 29, 51 εἰ δὲ...ἐδεδώκει ἀπόφασιν...τί ἐγεγόνει τῷ συνημμένῳ; where there is no remark, but we should probably insert ἄν.

The editor speaks contemptuously of what is known as Upton's codex: *de codice illo, si dis placet, ab Uptono saepissime adhibito diligentius disserendum esse videtur, ne cui fraudi sit fucata eius auctoritas, ut fuit Schweighausero* &c. (p. xxvii.). But Upton is perfectly open in his description of what he calls his codex: it was a copy of the *ed. pr.* (A.D. 1535) lent to him by Harris, on the margin of which some readings had been added by an unknown scholar, who stated

that these readings were taken from another copy of the *ed. pr.* which *Cardinalis Salernitanus ad codicis Vaticani exemplar, quantum coniectura assequi possum, emendari curaverat. Hisce vero diebus, cum annus ageretur a Christo nato 1548, alium nactus codicem manuscriptum e bibliotheca Cardinalis Carpensis, quem Albertus ille pius...a Georgii Vallae haeredibus...emerat, cum eo itidem, quod videbatur emendatissimus, hunc etiam contuli, ac summa cura et diligentia quicquid inerat discriminis, nullo adhibito selectu, annotavi.* This second codex is still preserved in the Library at Modena, where it was identified by Mr. T. W. Allen, and is described by him in the *Class. Rev.* iii. p. 14; but the writer of the note seems to have had no certain knowledge as to the first codex, and it has not yet been identified with any one of the three Vatican MSS. (64, 325, 1374) mentioned in Schenkl's preface. No one has ventured to accuse Upton of fathering emendations of his own upon his 'codex,' as Ursinus has been accused of doing, but Schenkl suggests that emendations of Wolf and other editors may have found their way into it. If so, it must have been at a period subsequent to the date named by the former owner of the codex, since Wolf's *ed.* did not appear till 1560. Anyhow the readings which follow are not given by any editor before Upton. I have already said that the reading of this 'codex' in c. 7, 32 seems to be independent of S, and derived from a better MS. The following readings seem to me to favour the same conclusion:—

7, 18. (If the premisses remain unaltered such as they were when they were conceded, we must abide by our concessions) *πᾶσα ἀνάγκη ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς παραχωρήσεως ἐπιμένειν καὶ τὸ ἀκόλουθον αὐτοῖς προσδέχεσθαι...οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔτι οὐδὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς συμβαίνει τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον, ἐπειδὴ τῆς συγχωρήσεως τῶν λημμάτων ἀπέστημεν.* [Thus printed with lacuna by Ed.]

Post προσδέχεσθαι suppl. Upt. 'e cod.' hanc μὴ μενόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ὁποῖα παρεχωρήθη καὶ ἡμᾶς πᾶσα ἀνάγκη τῆς παραχωρήσεως ἀφίστασθαι καὶ τοῦ τὸ ἀνακόλουθον τοῖς αὐτοῖς (αὐτῶν Schw.) λόγοις προσδέχεσθαι; ego lacunam indicavi.

From Schw.'s note we learn that the real reading of the last clause in the 'codex' was τὸ ἀνακόλουθον αὐτοῖς λόγοις προσδέχεσθαι, which Schw. emended by inserting τοῦ before τὸ, and reading τοῖς αὐτῶν (understanding this in the sense of τοῖς ἡμῶν αὐτῶν). I should prefer to read αὐτοῖς simply, considering λόγοις to be a marginal ex-

planation. But does not the fact of such alterations being necessary prove that Upton's filling up of the lacuna is not the conjectural emendation of an ingenious scholar, but a tradition of the original reading, which was lost through homoioteleuton (προσδέχασθαι)?

25, 4. τὰ σὰ τήρει ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων μὴ ἐφίεσο. τὸ πιστὸν σόν... τίς οὖν ἀφελέσθαι δύναται σου ταῦτα.

lacunam notavit Upt. e. cod. sed quod supplevit τὸ αἰδῆμον σόν viz sufficit: possis de εἰγνώμων, δῖον, κόσμον al. cogitare.

I do not see why it should be necessary to mention more than two specially human characteristics. In c. 28, 21 τὸ αἰδῆμον, τὸ πιστόν, τὸ συνετόν are the three selected. In c. 4, 20, ii. 2, 4, 9, 11, iii. 17, 3, iv. 1, 161, *Enchir.* 24, 3, 4, we have simply these two.

10, 10. τίς ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ κόσμου διοίκησις καὶ ποίαν τινα χώραν ἐν αὐτῇ ἔχει τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον;

αὐτοὶ S, αὐτῇ Upt. e. cod., αὐτῇ s.

19, 11. γέγονε γὰρ οὕτως τὸ ζῶον· αὐτοῦ ἔνεκα πάντα ποιεῖ. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος αὐτοῦ ἔνεκα πάντα ποιεῖ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτὸς ὁ Ζεὺς.

λοιπὸν Upt. e. cod., λυπηρὸν S.

It should have been mentioned that Upton on the authority of his codex also inserted ὥστε after ζῶον and changed the first ποιεῖ into ποιεῖν, in both which changes he is followed by Schw. It certainly reads better to have the law laid down first in the infinitive, and then that the examples should follow in the indicative.

28, 19. οὐδενὶ οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος πελαργόῳ; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τοῦτοις οὐ διαφέρει. τίνι οὖν διαφέρει; ζῆτει καὶ εὐρήσεις ὅτι ἄλλῳ διαφέρει.

Here there is no note, but Upton writes *noster codex* ὅτι ὅλῳ διαφέρει, which is certainly far more vigorous: ἄλλῳ adds nothing to what has been said before, and does not prepare the way for the list of qualities which follow.

It may perhaps be worth while to mention that the readings in the 'Codex' are sometimes introduced by an ἵσως or an ἄλλως, which might seem to indicate that they were taken from a MS. which had been annotated by a Greek scribe.

It only remains for me now to speak of the Index, which is a work of immense, but not altogether intelligent industry. It has the advantage over Schweighäuser's in containing, so far as I have been able to test it, every word which occurs in Epictetus and almost every instance of the use of each word, but the words are given without explanation and without context, except occasionally to show the construction; and important or peculiar uses are often smothered among the unimportant. Thus, under the heading ἐν, no notice is taken of the use of ἐν for εἰς in i. 11, 32 ἐν 'Ρώμῃ ἀνέρχῃ and ii. 20, 33 ἀπελθεῖν ἐν βαλανείῳ, indeed the references themselves are altogether wanting, though special attention had been called to it in Schw.'s lex. So the unusual form ἀνίστακα does not appear under ἀνίστημι, though in Schw.'s lex. we read '*In praet. perf. notione activa, rariori usu βωμοὺς πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἀνεστάσιν* i. 4, 30.' The peculiar use of ἔρχομαι in i. 1, 4 ἡ λογικὴ δύναμις πόσον ἀξία οὕσα ἐλήλυθε and in i. 7, 12 ἐλήλυθεν ἡμῖν περὶ τῶν συναγόντων λόγων πραγματεία is in no way distinguished from the common use. Under ὅς c. conj. (p. 635, col. 1) i. 9, 11 οὐ... θέλῃσι is omitted. Under ὅταν no instance of the omission of the verb is noted, though stress was laid on this in pp. xci. and xxxix. If the reader is puzzled with the construction i. 2, 17 σὲ ἔδει φροντίζειν πῶς ἂν ὁμοίος ᾖ τοῖς ἄλλοις and looks for πῶς ἂν in the Index, he will find πῶς c. conj. and then πῶς ἂν c. opt., but no πῶς ἂν c. conj.; only at the end of the article, half a page below, comes '*de πῶς ἂν vide ἂν*.' No reference is made to the position of the indefinite τις at the beginning of a sentence, as in iii. 1, 14 τινά ποτ' ἀκούω Πολέμωνα, 5, 6 τί ποτε μὲν γὰρ ποιούντά σε δεῖ καταληφθῆναι. The use of ὥφελον, as a particle, with the indicative is unnoticed in such passages as ii. 18, 15 ὥφελόν τις ἐκοιμήθη, ii. 22, 12 ὥφελον ἐγὼ ἐπύρεσσον, ii. 21, 1 ὥφελον τύχην εἶχον, which are not even referred to at all. Under αὐτός we find the startling statement that in i. 25, 24 εὐθὺς γὰρ αὐτὸς κατ' ἐμαντοῦ δηλῶ, τίνι ἄλωτός εἰμι, the reading of S (ἐμαντός) is *fortasse recte*.

J. B. MAYOR.

BODLEIAN MS. OF EPICTETUS.

IN appending to Mr. Mayor's review an account of Prof. Schenkl's collation of the Bodleian MS. of the *Dissertations* I have had to depart from my original intention. I had meant to give a full list of the instances in which Prof. Schenkl's account of the readings