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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. 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).


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, Universiteitsbibliothek; 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, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek; London, British Library; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France; St. Petersburg, Rossiskaia Nacional’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 Valgulio (see 1.1 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. Ike Vermeer has corrected my English.

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." 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.

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. Whether or not this is true, 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.

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 Nicolpolis 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.


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," 13–14).

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

7. Ibid., 115 (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 Stoa, 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 Stoa, Panaetius (ca. B.C. 185–109) and Posidonius (ca. B.C. 135–50). Epictetus was also strongly influenced by Plato, Socrates, and Diogenes. 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. 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 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. 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 Aletectatio 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 Ἄφικοµένου δὲ τινος πρός αὐτόν 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 Σῷ οὖν, φησιν, ἕλευθερος 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 προαιρεσιν δὲ πότερον αἰδήμονα καὶ πιστῆν ἐξέσων ἢ ἀναίσχυντον καὶ ἀπίστον, οὐδ’ ἑγὼς διαφερομέθα πλην μόνον ἐν τῇ σχολῇ μέχρι τῶν λογορίων (“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” [Oldfather’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

---

aphorism, e.g., chapter 8, Μὴ ἔχει τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι ὡς θέλεις, ἀλλὰ θέλε τὰ γινόμενα ὡς γίνεται, καὶ εὐροθέσεις ("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, λόγιοι, ὑπομνήματα, ἀπομνημονεύματα, ὁμιλίαι, διάλεκτοι, 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? 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, 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. 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; others believe that Arrian freely composed the Diatribes, using as a basis what he had heard from Epictetus. 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.

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." 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 Saintabinus"), 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.

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).

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 Epidauros, which reads Ἐπίκτητον τὸν εὐσεβέστατον ὁ φίλος ("His friend [honors] the most pious Epictetus"); Christian Blinkenberg believed that φίλος must be the emperor Hadrian, in which he is followed by B. Puech ap. Fuentes González, "Epictête," 116. In the Scriptores historiae augustae (Life

14. For Arrian, see CTC 3.1–20.
17. E.g., P. A. Stader, Arrian of Nicomedia (Chapel Hill, 1980), 26–28. On the entire question, see Fuentes González, "Épictète," 122–23 (with the references given there).
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-
it is stated that Hadrian was on very familiar terms with Epictetus.

The three epigrams from the *Anthologia palatina* (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 ἀνέχοντες ἄνεχον ("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 ὑποψήφια 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, 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, shows unmistakable traces of Epictetus’ influence. 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. XLI), Proclus (In *Platonis Alcibiadem commentaria*; see Schenkl, test. XLI), Hierocles (In *Carmen aureum*; see Schenkl, test. XXXVIII), and Olympiodorus (In *Platonis Gorgiam commentaria*; In *Platonis Alcibiadem commentaria*; see Schenkl, test. LII). The *Encheiridion* is the primary source for the Neoplatonists; the *Diatribes* are hardly ever mentioned or referred to. 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.

The relation of Epictetus to Christianity has been the subject of much debate. In one place (4,7,6) Epictetus mentions the Christians ("Galiacens") 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. LIX).

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. 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 755–73.
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-

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 Theodoretus (Schenkl, test. XXXVIa 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 AlTRACIO HADRANI 

which consists of seventy-three very short questions asked by the emperor Hadrian and answered by Epictetus (for instance: Hadrianus "Quid est morts?"—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 et 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 En
tcheridion 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 Spannue. 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

28. Ibid., 642–45.
29. L. W. Daly, AlTRACIO HADRANI 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 AlTRACIO HADRANI et Epicteti," Classica et mediaevalia 7 (1945) 146–49.
30. W. Suchier, Das mittellateinische Gesprächen 'Adrian und Epictitus,' nebst verwandten Texten (Joca monachorum) (Tübingen, 1955), 44–45.
31. For the Christian adaptations, see Spannue, "Épi
tèse," 835–42; the same, "Epiket," 664–70; and Boter, Enche
tiridion, 149–263.
Par. exists in three versions of varying length and was recently edited by Spanneut.\textsuperscript{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 Phiotius (ninth century) and Arethas (ca. 900). The former mentions eight books of δαστριβαί and twelve books of Ομηλία, 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 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, Rhazés, and Avicenna.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{35}

**The Fifteenth Century to the Present\textsuperscript{36}**

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 (Nicolò 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


\textsuperscript{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).


\textsuperscript{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 (Gembloux, 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 volumo, quod tamen olim culpa temporum interiit, Arrianus vir clarissimus conscriptis..." 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 Valgulio (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 reproduced in 1550 at Antwerp; the few notes by Verlenius in the 1543 edition were considerably expanded 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 Schegkius (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, 1.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

38. See Boter, *Encheiridion*, 58–82.
impressed by Epictetus and tried strenuously to christianize Epictetus in his *Manuductio ad Stoi-
cam philosophiam* (Antwerp, 1604). Lipsius' in-
fluence 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 Sán-
chez de las Brozas (Salamanca, 1600), Gonzalo
der Correas (Salamanca, 1630), and Francisco de
Quevedo (Madrid, 1635).44

During the same period there were other ex-
pressions 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 En-
cheiridion as the basic source.45 Matthias Mittner
(1575–1632), a German Carthusian, compiled an
*Encheiridion cartusianum comprehendens aphor-
ismos quinquaquinta ad conservandam animi pa-
cem plurimum facientes* for his confrères.46 A me-
ticulous adaptation of Epictetus’ *Encheiridion*,
this work is strictly applicable to life in a Carthu-
sian monastery. In this respect, it is comparable
to the Greek Christian adaptations of the *Enchei-
ridion* (see above).

In the first half of the seventeenth century, op-
position to the Christian interpretation of Epict-

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 Eu-
rope. Nonetheless, the Christian interpretation of
Stoicism received a new impulse in France from
the new edition of Epictetus published by Sebasta-
tien and Gabriel Cramoisy at Paris in 1653; Cardi-
nal Alphonse de Richelieu (1582–1633), Gilles Boi-
leau (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 pre-
valved 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 Joh-
ann 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 Stoa, especially Epictetus.53 An impor-
tant 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. Chris-
tian Gottlob Heyne produced a new text of the
*Encheiridion* (Dresden, 1756, 1776, 1783); Jean-
Baptiste Lefèvre de Villebrune did the same
(Paris, 1782, 1783, 1794–95). But all previous edi-
tions were superseded by the magnificent work of
Johann Schweighäuser, whose editions of the

42. The next vernacular translation of the *Diatribes* was
Jan Hendrik Glazemaker’s Dutch version published at Am-
sterdam 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 Print-
ed between 1482 and 1690* (Pittsburgh, 1970), 66, 82, 86–87;
at p. 96, Beardsley mentions an anonymous Spanish trans-
lation, published in 1672. See also D. Rubio, *Classical Scholar-
ship in Spain* (Washington, D.C., 1934), 81–82, 95, 103.
45. C. Spalatin, "Matteo Ricci’s Use of Epictetus’ Enchei-
46. The text was published for the first time in B. Peg,
*Bibliotheca ascetica*, 12 vols. (Regensburg, 1723–40), vol. 5. It
is also found in L.M. Guerin, *Mathiae Mitter cartusiani opuscula*, vol. 2 (Currière, 1898), 277–303.
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, Épictète et le stoïcisme
dans l’oeuvre de René Descartes," *Revue de théologie et de
50. *Analecta historiae philosophiae* (Halle, 1706).
51. *Bibliotheca graeca* (Hamburg, 1705).
52. *Disquisitio de Epicteto philosopho Stoico* (Groningen,
1708).
Encheiridion (1798) and of all Epictetean texts, including Simplicius' commentary (Epitetteae 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 Πάρειμα Ἐλληνικῆς 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 Bonhoeffer 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, Bonhoeffer 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 Bonhoeffer 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 Pohlzen (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. Malese (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 Epictète." 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." 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.
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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 Valgulio). 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 Valgulio, who spent almost his whole life in Brescia. Valgulio published (among other works) a translation of Arrian’s Anabasis and Indica in 1508 (for which see CTC 3.12–14; L. W. Daly, “Carolus 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 Valgulio states that he had also translated Epictetus’ Diatribes: “quos inscrivit sermones familiari Epicteti, quoque nos et ipsos veritum” (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 Valgulio borrows a manuscript containing Epictetus’ works.57 From these entries

57. On 24 June 1494, Valgulio borrowed Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 325 (Arrian, Disputations, Gesta Alexandri; Porphyry, De abstinentia animalium). This codex was returned on 7 October [1494] (Bertola, 56–57). On 18 July 1498, Valgulio borrowed “Epictetum cum Expositione Simplicii sine principio, tectum corio rubro” (= Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 326; the manuscript contains
it appears that Valgilio’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). Valgilio’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 Valgilio’s interest in Arrian may have been awakened by his interest in Epictetus. If this is true, Valgilio 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 Valgilio 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, Valgilio produced a word-for-word Latin version of the Greek text. The opening paragraphs of Diss. 2.22 (Περι ἀ τις ἐσπουδάκεν, φιλεὶ ταύτα εἰκότως, μή τι οὖν περὶ τὰ κακὰ ἐσπουδάκασιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι; οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ μή τι περὶ τὰ μηδὲν πρὸς αὐτούς; οὐδὲ περὶ ταύτα, ὑπολείπεται τοῖνυ περὶ μόνα τὰ ἄγαθα ἐσπουδάκεραν αὐτούς; εἰ δ’ ἐσπουδάκερα, καὶ φιλεὶν ταύτα) serve as a good example of his methods; these have been rendered as: “Quae quisque studet, ea meritó amat. Nuncquid 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 Valgilio corrected his efforts currente calamo. For example, at 2.16.37 we read ὃ γὰρ ἐξετετεύχεν ἐξελευθείεν, ὡταν θέλη, τοὺς συμποσίους καὶ μηδέκες πιέζειν, ἔτι οὐκοῦν ἀνάπται μένον; οὐχι δ’ ὡς παῦσιν παραμένει, μέχρις ἔν ψυχικῶς γίγνεται; The translation of this passage begins: “Cui licet exire de convivio cum velum, et amplius non ludere adhuc illae angitūr 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 capiit perpetam.” At 2.17.15 the word φιλοτεχνίαν was originally translated as “curiositatem”; it was cancelled and replaced by “accuratam descriptionem.”

Occasionally Valgilio 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 ἐπιτηδεύωντας, Valgilio could not find a Latin equivalent for τὸ σχῆμα, and thus we read “Ad eos qui celeriter ad [spatium vacuum] philosophorum assilunt.” At 4.11.19 Epictetus states Ἀλλὰ ἑκάστης ὁλίγας ἐλύετο.—Ἀλλὰ ἐστιλβεῖν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα; Valgilio apparently did not know the verb στιλβεῖν (“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,” Valgilio 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 ὀρμη (“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 Valgilio contents himself with transliterating the Greek, sometimes adding a note. Thus at 3.2.6 μεταπίπτοντας, ἑρώτησαι περαίνοντας, ύποθετικοὺς, ψευδομένους we find metapipontas, interrogo conficientes, et hypotheticos et pseudomenos, to which a note is added “nomina sunt argumentorum” (written by Valgilio 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 Valgilio omits or misrepresents the Greek. Thus at 4.1.150 he leaves a blank space for the Greek ψφαγματος; in the margin the word ψφαγμα was added by a later hand. The title of

58. Bertola gives reproductions of handwritten entries by Valgilio in Vat. lat. 3964, fol. 25v and in Vat. lat. 3966, fols. 14r–v.
4.2. Περὶ συμφορᾶς, was not translated at all; a later hand has added περὶ συμφορᾶς ἡ συμφορᾶς in the margin.

Finally, there are several instances of marginalia in Italian (e.g., on fol. 1r 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 videtur. 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 aliquius quemadmodum in ponderibus librarn invenimus, in rectis et obliquis amissim, 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. 1r, 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. 1v 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 Bagliani, 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 Schegkius

The Diatribes were translated into Latin by Jacobus Schegkius (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 (1a 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 Schlussberg, 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 (1.1–3). The Greek begins: Τῶν ἄλλων δυνάμεων ὁδηγεῖ οὕτω διὰ τῆς ὑποκλίσεως, οὐ τούτων ὀφθαλμός δοκιμαστικὴ ἢ ἀποδοκιμαστικὴ; Schenck translates: “Si quae sunt facultates aliae animae (excepta ratiocinatrice) reperiertis sane nullam quae ipsam esse contemplari possit. Quo-circa nullius erit proprium approbare quidpiam, vel reprouare 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 θεωρητικὸν; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνώσει τὰ γράμματα, ἡ μουσικὴ; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνώσει 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 nimium intenta ut cognoscat literas? Quin etiam musica in id incumbat, ut exploratam habeat rationem sonorum.”

The simple opening phrase of section 3, αὕτη οὖν αὐτὴν θεωρεῖς τις αὐτῶν; is rendered by the verbose “Num vero sic comparata est quaeipiam ex his ut ipsa sui ipsius sit contemplatrix?”
I.2. JACOBUS SCHEGIUS

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 Arrian dissertatio-
nes Epictetae in Latinum sermonem transtulit: parum fovente Minerva vero hunc eum laborem suscepsisse, passim viris doctis observatum est [Brucker is referring to Isaac Casaubon, *Episto-
lae* (The Hague, 1638), no. 599 (p. 702): ‘Ego nunc Arriani Dissertationes publice expono, cuius au-
rei libri neque Schegius neque Wolfius umbram viderunt’]: cujus praecipua causa esse videtur, quod satis quidem feliciter Graecam linguam te-
neret, verum a Stoicæ philosophiae cognitione esset destitutus, sine qua talis labor inutiliter suscitur.”

_Dedicatory letter._ (ed. of Basel, 1554). Generoso et amplis(simo) viro, domino Ioanii Iacobou Fug-
gero, Kirchpergae et Weissenhorni domino, con-
siliario Caesareo et Regio, patrono colendiss(imo) Sebastiano Sigmar a Schlussberg, Sereniss(imi) Romanorum, etc. Regis Ferdinandi a Consilii et Secretis, s. d. [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) Non utar longa praef-
tione in commendando hoc nostro authore, aut matria operis. Constat enim omnibus, atque eti-
am mediocrer eruditis exploratissimum est, Epictetum philosophum veram ac purissimam Platonis philosophiam assecutum ea duntax-
at prodidisse, quae ad cultum morum vitamque recte ac sancte institutendum pertinere: quae certe philosophiae pars humanae vitae in primis utilis ac necessaria omnium iudicio existima-
tur. Haec autem omnia Arrianus noster ab ipso Epicteto, ut ipse narrat, et audivit ac fidissimae percepit, atque etiam postteratis memoriae hoc suo scripto mandavit. Rogavi itaque optimum et doctissimum virum Iacobum Schekium, ut hunc libellum latina civitate donaret: qui hoc ip-
sum sane erudite et bona fide absolvt, atque etiam loca difficillima suis haud contemnedis com-
mentaris (fol. a2v) illustravit. Quae omnia mihi studiosorum ac communis utilitatis causa in lu-
cem efferre visum fuit. Sicuti in praesentia Arria-
nus 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 multos sane de causis ac propertea maxime offerre et dedicare volui, quod sciam te non solum omnes meliores literas ac humanitatis artes valde amare et colere, in isdemque multum occii et temporis consumere, sed et ipsa studia omnesque doctos ac studiosos, quantum quidem in te est (est autem procul du-
bio perquam plurimum in tuis et tui simillim adiumentis positum) maxime fovere et complecti. Quo nomine multum profecto laudis et gloriae tibi et posteris non tam iampridem comparasti, quam etiam in posterum compare contendis. Atque id quidem recte. Hae enim sunt verae ani-
miri virtutes, haec ipsissima nobilissima signa, quae interire nunquam poterunt. Quod equidem hoc nostro seculo non adeo multo accidisse video, ut fortunae bonis ac nobilitati virtutum ac eruditio-
nis vera etiam ornamenta adiungentur, 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 Fugg-
gero, eiusdemque virtutibus praestat tacere quam paucu dicere. Sed de his satis. Cum has enim ob causas, tum etiam pro(fol. a3r)ter tua et familiae tuae in me bene merita, hoc quaelegunque mu-
nus tibi dedico potequo abs te sane diligentur ut meam operam aequi bonique facias. Quod ubi a te consecutus fuero, brevi, Deo volente, et ubern-
ora et maiora dabimus. Bene et foeliciter vale. Vi-
ennae Austriae, mense Februario, Anno DMLIII (sic).

_Dissertationes._ Arrianus Epictetus, Iacobou Schekio Medico Physico interprete. _Arrian's intro-
ductive letter to Lucius Gellius._ Arrianus Lucio Gellio salutem. [Inc.]: (p. 29) Epicteti sermones nec tam accurate conscripti, quam potuisset fortesse perscribi ab alio quopiam, nec eo consili-
lio ut in lucem ederentur. . . . [Expl.]: (p. 30) Qua sane vi ac efficacia si scripti sermones ca-
reant, ego fortesse in causa ero, aut forsan 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) reperietis sane nullan quae ipsam sese contemplari possit. Quocirca nullius erit proprium approbare quidpam, vel reprobare in rebus agen-
dis. . . . [Expl.]: (p. 36); (Diss. 4.13.24) Sed ista utinam hodie quispiam inveniat, aut demon(p.
362)stretur quispiam qui ita sit affectus, qui sic dicit: Mihi duntaxat, quae mea, curae sunt, quae prohiberi non possunt, quae natura sunt libera. Haec mihi substantia est boni: caetera fiant prout permittam, non enim ut fiant laboro.

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. I. Mentioned by P. A. A. Ducoing, Catalogue des livres que ren ferme 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 1.13. 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 Epicurus it appears as “Schegius,” “Schekius,” 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 “Schevck” 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 excurrerit claruerunt, con-


3. Hieronymus Wolfius
In 1563 Hieronymus Wolfius (Wolf) published his three-volume edition of the complete Epicetus 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 Epicetus. 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 Fuggeriana. Here he found the quiet to continue his work on Epicetus, 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 Naigeorgus (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 Epicetus. 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 Τον ἄλλων δυνάμεων οὐδέμιαν εὐρήσετε αὐτήν αὐτῆς θεωρήτηκην, οὐ τοῖνοι οὐδὲ δοκιμαστικὴν ἢ ἀποδοκιμαστικὴν; is rendered
I.3. Hieronymus Wölfius

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 ἣ by aut instead of vel.

§ 2 ἣ γραμματική μέχρι τίνος κέκτηται το θεωρητικόν; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνώσα το γράμματα. ἡ μυσική; μέχρι τοῦ διαγνώσα το μέλος is translated as "Grammaticae contemplatio quousque progradit? Ad distinctionem literarum. Musicæ quousque? Ad discernendam cantilenam." Here the phrasing is altered, but the structure of question and answer is maintained.

§ 3 αὐτῆς οὖν αὐτήν θεωρεῖ τις αὐτῶν, extended disproportionately in Schenck's translation, is rendered simply as "Num ergo ardua 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'élegance."

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 1). Ioanni Baptistae Hainzelio, Patricio et Consuli Augustano, vro doctrina, pietate, virtute ornatissimo, Dominio et patrono colendo, Hieronymus Wölfius s. p. d. [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) Concinnavi munusculum, ornatissime Consul, filiolis tuus potius, bonae spei pueris, usui futurum (uti spero) quam tibi, et praeclara doctrina cum profanarum tum sacrarum literarum praedito, et multo rerum usus variisque florenti etiamnum aetate casibus erudito, necessarium, non incommodum tamen vel doctissimis et exercitissionis hominibus, mea quidem opinione. Nam ea doctrinae morum et eius potissimum partis quae ad contemptum rerum humanarum et animi tranquillitatem pertinent ratio esse videtur, ut sive negliget nostra et prava consuetudine sive animorum immecillitae id fiat, nunquam satis inculcaria memoriaque repeti possit. Subinde salutarium praecipitionum obliviscimur paulatimque ad vulgi sermones et opiniones relabimus, ut non sine causa sive Virgilius sive quis alius (nam de autore ambiguitur) exclamet [App. Verg., De inst. viri boni 23–24]: Cur me natura magis quam/disciplina trahit? est prava consuetudo (fol. a2v) (si verum fateri libet) saepius nos quam natura quantumvis prava trahit. Equidem quid alii accidat nescio, neque dubito quin plurimi, inter quos te quoque cumprimis numero, et ingeniiorum acumine et animorum constantia roboreque me longissimo intervallo superent... [usefulness of reading Epictetus] (fol. a3r) Hae tanta res, tam utiles, tam necessariae cognitu, tam salutares, ut et a pluribus cognitarentur et animo meo scribendo quam legendo, ut fieri solet, altius insigieren tur, decimo abhinc anno, Lutecia Parisiorum huc perfectus, incerto rerum mearam statu, li(fol. a3v)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 nominus), tale nihil ne somnianti quidem, sed longinquam protectionem adornanti, hospitium victumque communem perhumaniter obtulisset, tranquil lum illud quidem ocium, sed non omnis curae tamen expers, in hoc negotium rectissime conferri posse existimavi. Sed dum absoluto Enchiridio in Arriani commentariis transferendis sedulo versor, ecce Fuggeranae Bibliothecae curatio aequae praeter expectationem offertur.

Qua et digerenda et describenda et augendae dum occupor, non satis oeci datur ad institutum meum persequestendum. Inciderunt deinde aliae occupationes (ut fortuna mea ab ineunte aetae crebras mutationes variasque vicissitudines habuit) et lucubrationes necessariae mihi magis quam iucundae et Augustinane denique scholeae Bibliothecaeque curatio. Quibus rebus factum est ut horum opusculorum editio in hunc usque annum prorogata, dum ego vel cesso vel aliiis negociis distineor, et novitatis gratiam magna ex parte amitteret, et doctissimorum virorum, Iacobii Scheggi, quem praecipios loco veneror, ac Thomae Naogeorgi, qui copioso commentaria Epictetum declaravit, conversionibus editis super(fol. a4r) vacanea videri posset. De quo ego sane mihi curiosius esse disputandum non existimo, nec speciosas excusationes quarendas, aut plurimorum exemplis tam nostrae aetatis quam veteris memoriae virorum, causam meam defendendam. Ea sine ulla ambigibus dicam, quae verissima et simplicissima sunt, utcunque ab aliis accipiantur. Ego enim quid aliis de me sentiant et loquantur praestare nec possum nec debo; ne quid malo stultove consilio faciam praestare et culpa vacare in hac quidem re fortasse possum, debo certe quadem. Conversionisigitur 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. q8v)

Sed et haec in annotationibus rectius tractatur, et una reliqua editionis causa iam exponenda est. Ea fuit, ut merita erga me tua, Consul opiter et prudentissime, multorumque annorum constantem et iucundam amicitiam (qua me rebus omnibus longe inferiores, sola humanitate tua adductus, ob qualemunque literarum commodationem es complexus) publico aliquo testimonio ad posteros etiam duraturo celebrarem. Alias enim opes non habeo quibus tibi et tuis gratiam referam; et ea te benignitatem 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 arbitreres, et cum domestica disciplina vitaeaque modestia et pietate publicam beneficientiam coniungendam. Quibus virtutibus id consequeris es ut non a civibus tantum tuis, sed ab exteri etiam quam (fol. a9r) pluriis isque clarissimis doctissimis viris et sincere diligaris et citra omnem adulationis suspicem certatim lauderis. Quare mihi plura scribenda esse non duco, ne tenebris meis somnis illustrare velle videar, sed illud unum petendum, ut hoc levendise minus crasso filo, ut Cicero quodam loco iocatur [Fam. 9.12.2], aequi bonique facias et veterem tua erga me benevolentiam conserves. Vale quam felicissime et diutissime, ut bonitas tua meretur et humanitas, omnibus titulis illustrius praecomnium, cum a D. Paulo ή φιλανθρωπία του θεοῦ [Tit 3:4] non minus quam ή δύναμις και μεγαλείπις [2 Pet 1:16] praedicitur. Augustae Vindelicorum, 7. Cal. Iulii, Natali tuo: qui ut felix et faustum tibi et tuis illuxerit, Deum precor. Anno MDLX.

Preface (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 2). Ioanni Baptistae Hainzelio, Patricio et Consili Augustano, viro doctrina, pietate, virtute ornatisimmo, Domino et patrono colendo, Hieronymus Wolfius s. p. d. [Inc.]: (p.3) Superiori tomo Epicetii nostri, Stoicae philosophiae (cuuius in exaggeranda virtute caeterisque rebus extenuandis consilium gravissimo et prudentissimo cuique maxime probatur) summa quaedam et nuda praecipita 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 cogitandum invitare et excitare queant. . . . [comparison of Epicetius and Simplicius with Hercules and Iolaus: just as Iolaus helped Hercules to kill the Hydra, so Simplicius helps Epicetius to extinguish mental errors] (p. 5) Vigilandum igitur est semper nec cessandum unquam: deponenda nuncupam est panoplia D. Pauli [Eph 6:11] in rebus divinis. In humanis autem retinenda etiam panoplia haec Epicetii nostri atque Simplicii et Arrianii; quem Arrianum tercio instituti operis tomo στόρεον πρότερον Ομηρικός [Cíc., Att. 1.16.1] tibi obtulimus, ut saepe tractata et gestata minus urget humeros, nec magis oneret corpus, assuetudine ipsa facta levior quam delicata vestis. Haec ad te scribo liberius, ornatissimae idemque humanissimae consul, quod mihi non cum importunum aliquo et immodici animi homine, aut superstitione et imperio res est (quo genere latinus Menander [Ter., Adel. 98–99] quicquam esse negat iniquiustus, quod nisi quod ipse faciat, rectum nihil esse putet), sed cum eo vire qui ab ineunte aetate a doctissimis et clarissimis 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 versatur sacras literas cum profanis et philosophiam cum theologica 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 degradam vitam utile et necessarium, id ad autorem Deum esse referendum. Qui etsi veritatis suae lumen hebraeiis vatibus longe uberos impertit, tamen aliarum quoque gentium philosophic, hoc est viris et virtutis et veritatis amantibus, non plane denegavit, ut si minus ad veram ipsius aignitionem pervenire posset, tamen huius caducae vitae rectius et tranquilli 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 excellenti praestantiaque animantium reliquorum (sic).” Quod quantum sit beneficium, non est obscursum. . . . [There follows a defense of the study of theology, as ancilla theologiae. Wolf enumerates the subjects touched upon by Simplicius, whom he praises lavishly. The study of Epicetus 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 theologiam longe prolixius praestat (iam enim ad alteram excusationem venio) si cuius animum penitus occuparet, tamen quam i piaci sint, videmus: et sic audiri vulgo sacras conciones et mysteria religiosa ita usurpari ut bonorum rerum mala consuevendo pessima esse videatur, non ipsarum rerum quae optimae sunt, sed eorum vitio qui ibi abuntur. Tales qui sunt, et his nequiores etiam, o Macedoniae, ut ait Isocrates [Or. 13.1], aequos quidem reddint, quosque semel absolvere sint, quibus diebus et diebus aliquando tamen ad principia sua tamen maiora in se perierunt. Qui tamen alius erit, in magno eorum libro rerum erit numero, qui hoc tempore ab honori bus et occio et literis abutentibus temerario editionis honore (ut Fabii verbi usur [Quint., Inst. 1, praefatio, 7]) vulgantur, quomvis eadem argumenta iam olim et doctius et dexterius et maiori orationis elegantia summis a viros preractata ad nostram aetatem pervenerat. Est hoc vetus illud et iam olim reprehensum scribendi sed non duum profligatum cacoethes. A quo morbo si me vindicare putuissem, iucundius fortasse, tranquilli certe quidem et minore cum invidia vivissem. Ut igitur hoc crimen agnoscam (difficult quanto consequa relinquimus) sic nec inas- nis gloriae studio incitatus, qua contemnenda me in dies exercere soleo, nec aemulatione, a qua na(p. 4) tura abhorreo, impulsus, diu intermissum opus hoc, et vix tandem repetitum, edere constitui. Nam alia fuit hic meus labor ac caeteri conditione. Qui cum velut ab incide rapti in publicum provarlant, hic vere de Horatii sententia [Carm. 4.11.1] nonum in annum pressus ac vix tandem impressus e musaei nostris latebris erupit. Sed quum iam libellum hunc edere statuissem, non alius ei patronus quaerendus fuit quam qui Epicetem Enrichirion et praecelaram iilius interpretam Simplicium non aequo tantum sed liberti etiam animo in fidem et clientelam suam recipissest. Quum enim trium horum libellorum idem author Epicetus, idem scriptor Arrianus, idem interpres Wolius, 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 praeccepta haec vitae quotidianaes 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 habitet et vulgaribus tantum opinionibus imbuti consilium philosophorum non intelligent, parvi ista facient, obiterque lecta vel ut obscura et incerta relinquent vel ut inania et super(p. 5)vacanea repudiabant. Qui autem vel tuo exemplo cum doctrina usum rerum coniunxerint vel diligentius naturae humanae vim et conditionem considerarint, ut quae hic traduntur non probent omnia (neque enim illum librum extare arbitror qui et omnibus et ubique placeat), complura tamen ingenioso cogitata diserteque explicata mirabantur, cumque veritatem doctrinae huius et quotidiam 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; praecipita 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, laetiorum in secundis, multarum inaniam curarum et occupationum evitatio. Nam plerique multa nobis curiositate quadam perverso studio negocia ipsi accersimus, quibus supersedere liceret. Sed haec lector ex ipso Epicteto multo melius cognoscet. Qui sicubi argutior et obscureior videbatur, nos (p. 6) operam dedimus ut annotationibus nostris pleraque planiora et dilucidiora reddenderunt. Tu vero, consul ornatissime, ut nihil aliud, at studium et observantium tui meam aequi bonique facies, meque ut haectus ita in posterum etiam commendatum habebris. 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 Epictetis neque sic conscripsi ut talia conscribisci 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 fortass in causa sum; fortass etiam se res aliter habere non potest. Vale.


Editions:
1565. 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.


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
I.A. JACOBUS SCHEGGIUS


COMMENTARIES

a. Jacobus Schegkius

Jacob Schenk added a number of notes to his Latin translation of the Dissertationes (I.2 above). As Schenk 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. Schenk 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. Schenk’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, Schenk 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). Jacobus Schegkius lectori s. [Inc.]: (p. 362) Verborum atque orationis Arriani sensum, quoad potuim, sum interpretatus hac versione: quam nihilominus rerum quarundam obscuritas et difficulatas, quo minus aperta et perspicua sit, sic perplexam et impediam facit ut nihil egisse interpretando videatur aliquis, si non rebus etiam explanandis operam aliquantulum impertiat. Quod ego in praesentia tametsi magis conger quam praestem, brevitate temporis impeditus, aequis bonique faciatis tamen id ipsum rogo. Hac enim opera non gravius a vobis inire, sed debitum pensum utcunque absolvere statute rem. Plenissime id quidem doctissimis D. Io. Alexandri Brassicanii olim, varia et librorum superelictae et summa eruditionis ingenii copia fretus, praestare potuisset; ac praestitisset etiam, nisi e medio cursu fatis necessitas ipsum abripuisset. Cuius ego propositum et voluntatem sequi me etsi fatear, exequi tamen aut assequi si me sperem, plane ineptus sim, et hac ipsa confidencia nimis arrogans et protervus. Itaque sic habetote, candidi lectores, me maluisse vestra causa parum lucis quam omnino nihil ad intelligenda Arriani scriptorum quaedar 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 iuvandis communia studia appareat. Sed ad rem ipsam accingor, omissis excusationum deprecationumque ambagibus. Si quae singulorum librorum (p. 363) in capitis singulis difficultiora interesse quam ut a quolibet intelligantur visa fuerint, annotatiunculis planiora faciam. Nec explicabo, ut dicitur, ad amussim, sed attingam duntaxat loca e quibus nonnullarum disputationum explicatio sit requienda, praesertim si prolixa sit et philosophica, quae paucis tractari nequit.


οὐ γὰρ τινὸν γε κάθες, ἄλλ’ ἀεὶ ποτε ἣτα 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] sibi argutior et obscurior videbatur, nos operam dedimus ut annotationibus nostris pleraque planiora et dulcidioria reddentur” (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). Posterores annotationes. Interpres lectori s. [Inc.]: (p. 438) Nulli unquam lucrabantiones meae tot et valetudinis et aliarmur rerum impedi menta objecta fuerunt. Equidem credo Alastorem aliquem bonis moribus infensum et humanae felicitati parum faventem his meis conatis, quoad potuerit, obstississe. Tamquam autem ille potuit ut simul et de vita et de absolutione Epicteti saepius desperarem. Illud vero non potuit efficere, ut vel immo tam praecario 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 contuerti omnia, ut fit cum unum quiddam idque continenter agitare, ingenio fervente ac nullis aliis distracto curis. Nunc autem, cum De propitio portum teneamus, adversis ventis et fluctibus superatis et consopitis, operae preci um visum est, amoeniore minusque periculo so anni tempore, eundem cursum relegere, et in idem mare denuo expersi et contemplari omnia diligentius. Experiamur quam vere scripsisset Euripides [Hipp. 436], ai δευτέρα με τε ρως φροντίδες σοφώτερα. Et quae priores conatus nos fefellerunt, studiosius indagamus et expendamus.


Commentary (ed. of Basel, 1563, vol. 3): [Inc.]: (p. 14) In caput I. Tōn ἀλλων δυνάμεων (I.1). Aliarum facultatum. δυνάμεις vires seu facultates appellat, non tantum naturales animi corporis potentia, sed etiam artes et scientias, ut exempla quibus utitur declarant. . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 437) προσέτι δὲ
(4.13). Malim próσεχτη ἃν γε ὁ τοιοῦτος. Fortasse πιστῶς, aut simillūs, aut est ἐλλειπτικῶς, ut sub-
intellegatur οἷος σωσών, vel οἷον εἶναι μὲ ἐκεῖνος
ὑπολαμβάνει παρεκάλου] παρεκάλουν.

Editions:
1563. See above, Composite Editions.
1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Edi-
tions.
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. Bey-
er, Über Epiketet und sein Handbuch der stoischen
Moral, in biographischer und literarischer Rück-
sicht (Marburg, 1795).

(*) 1745, Londini (London): impensis Thomae
The only mention of this edition is in A. A. Ren-
ouard, Catalogue de la bibliothèque d’un ama-
teur (Paris, 1819); a copy has yet to be located.

(*) 1751, Londini (London): impensis Thomae
As Oldfather notes, there is probably some con-
fusion with the Foulis edition of the same year.

Rejected edition:
(*) 1744, Londini (London): impensis Thom-
The printed catalogue of the British Library men-
tions 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

Biography and Bibliography:
See I.3 above.

II. *Encheiridion*

translations
1. Nicolaus Perottus

The *Encheiridion* was first translated into Lat-
in by Nicolaus Perottus (Niccolò Perotti) in ear-
ly 1450, when Perotti was living at Bologna in the
company of Cardinal Bessarion (Oliver, *Perot-
ti*, 19–27). In 1451 it was presented to Pope Nich-
oslas V (1447–55), who may have commissioned
the translation (Oliver, ibid., 24). As his Greek
source, Perotti states in his letters that he con-
verted a manuscript belonging to Bessarion (Ol-
This codex is new Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale
Marciana, Zan. gr. 261 (725), which contains Sim-
plicius’ 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’ *Enchei-
ridion*. He explains that, as soon as he obtained
this little book, he decided to prepare a transla-
tion and dedicate it to Nicholas V. He also trans-
lated the preface to Simplicius’ commentary, and
this serves as an introduction to the *Encheiridi-
on*.

Perotti’s translation of the *Encheiridion* is pre-
served in nineteen manuscripts with the text di-
vided into seventy-one chapters. The *editio prin-
ceps*, 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 transla-
tion of 1479 (II.2 below).

Oliver (ibid., 30–34) draws a comparison be-
tween both translations by quoting and discuss-
ing *Ench. 1.1–3*. He points out that Perotti follows
the Greek much more closely than does Polit-
ian; for instance, while Politian omits the phrase
μέμνησό δι’ αυτόν at the beginning of section 3, Perot-
ti renders it as *memento quod*. Nevertheless, Pe-
rotti allows himself some liberty. A good illus-
tration of this is the phrase *ἐπὶ λόγῳ*, which occurs
twice in section 1; initially Perotti gives *ut brevi-
ter dicam*, then *ut brevi complacter*. Oliver also
observes that the latinity of Perotti’s translation
is markedly inferior to Politian’s translation.
As examples, he cites the nonclassical *me-
mento 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 πάταξα [“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 afflictit, corresponding to Simplicius’ τούτω ἔστη τὸ θλίψον αὐτόν; ch. 31.4 τὸ ἐπεσέκε = pietas... religio). Oliver also mentions many cases of free rendering of short phrases; see, e.g., Ench. 32.3 πήρας τῆς μέρους τοῦ τού ζωής τού = vulnera; ibid. πρόσεχε = animadverterenda 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 salutis corporis longe anteponedam esse existimemus, corporis tamen curandi tuendique causas omnis diligentissime perquirimus; animi vero curam nec desideramus nec probamus, sed potius contemnimus insignamque 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 curretur, sanari non possunt, animi autem omnes qui se sanari voluerint sine ulla dubitatione sanantur.../... [argument that philosophy is medicine for diseases of the soul.] Eligat sibi quisque quos libet; mihi profecto inter ceretor 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 inveniuntur—Epictetus breviter utrumque demonstrat. Nam et finem eliendum docet, et media quibus ad eum finem pervenire possimus ostendit. At quanta est apud hunc virum, dixi boni, in loquendo facilitas, in verbis elegantia, in sententias gravitas! Non possum dissimulare quod sentio: hoc mihi inter huius ac ceterorum philosophiam videtur interesse, quod aliorum quidem praeepta nos scire faciunt (utputa scire quid sit iustitia, quid fortitudo, quid temperantia), Epicteti vero praeepta fortes nos esse et iustos et temperantes. Tanta est apud hunc philosopham 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 nominì, Pontifex Maxime, dedicarem. Eum, cum pro tua solita clementia atque benignitate susceperis, noli idcirco contemnere quod sit corpore exiguis. Est enim amplissimus viribus, instar lapillorum qui interdum, cum nullius sint corporis, pretiosissimis habentur. Qualiscumque tamen tuae Sanctitati videbitur, non desero—tanta est tua benignitas atque clementia—vel propertea tibi gratum acceptumque futurum quod ab hominie tuae Sanctitati deditissimo, optimo animo summoque obsequiendo studio oblatus fuit. Valeat tuae Sanctitatis felicissime.

Preface to Simplicii’ commentary. Simplicii philosophi in expositionem Enchiridii praefatio incipit felicissime. [Inc.]: De vita quidem Epicteti deque eius morte Arrianus scripsit, maximis voluminibus eius diatribis complexus, a quo licet intellegere qualis vita fuerit Epictetum. .../... [Expl.]: Qui vero pescius 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, quaequemque nostra opera sunt. Non in nobis vero corpus, possession, gloria, et, ut brevi complectar, quaequemque non sunt opera nostra. .../... [Expl.]: (Ench. 53.3-4) “Sed, O Crito, si haec diis placet, ita fiat.” “Me vero Anytus et Melitus interficere quidem possunt, nocere vero mihi minime possunt.”

Manuscripts:

(phot.) 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–
Boter, “Sources,” 188; d’Alessandro, 296 n. 34).
(*) Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurentiana, 4836, s. XV (1454–70 [?]), fols. 1–29 (Bandini 2.458–59; Oliver, Perotti, 47–48).
(*) ———, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, II.IV.125, s. XV (1495), fols. 126–143 (Oliver, Perotti, 51; Kristeller, Iter 5.572a).
(1) ———, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 365, s. XV, fols. 49r–69v (Boter, “Sources,” 187; d’Alessandro, 296 n. 30; Kristeller, Iter 1.191a).
(*) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, I. 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).
(1) Regensburg, Fürst Thurn und Taxis Hofbibliothek, 64, s. XV, fols. 27r–46v (Boter, “Sources,” 187; d’Alessandro, 296 n. 34; Kristeller, Iter 3.690b).
(1) Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1129, s. XV, pp. 2–47 (Boter, “Sources,” 187; d’Alessandro, 296 n. 31; Kristeller, Iter 3.342b).
(*) San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Comunale Guarnieriana, 204, s. XV (a. 1454–60), fols. 14r–39v (Oliver, Perotti, 43–46; Kristeller, Iter 2.569a).
(1) 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).
(1) ———, Ottob. lat. 1971, s. XV, fols. 132r–156r (Boter, “Sources,” 187; d’Alessandro, 296 n. 25; Kristeller, Iter 2.434b).
(*) ———, Vat. lat. 3027, s. XV (a. 1454–61) (Oliver, Perotti, 54–55; Kristeller, Iter 2.316a).
(1) ———, 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).


*Biography:* See CTC 3.7.


2. Angelus Politianus

Angelus Politianus (Angelo Poliziano, Politian) translated the Enchiridion 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 Buder, "Sources," 163–94. Vat. gr. 327 contains Simplicius' commentary on the *Encheiridion*, with the text of the *Encheiridion* added as lemma before the relevant parts of the commentary; the lemmata contain numerous lacunae and the text is very corrupt in many places (Buder, *Encheiridion* [1999], 52–55, 97–98). Dresden Da 55 contains only a selection from the *Encheiridion* (Buder, ibid., 4–5, 28). A full collation of the two manuscripts is found in Buder, "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 (Buder, 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; Buder, "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 μεταρρητεῖ, 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 Verienius in 1543 (II.3 below) and Naogeorgus in 1544 (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.


Huius de vita ac moribus ingens volumen, quod tamen olim culpa temporum interiit, Arrianus vir clarissimus conscripsit, eque eius libris quasi flo- rem quendam, qui hunc Platonicum, hoc est verum hominem, in libertatem vindicaret, excerpti
atque in volumen redegit [cf. Simpl., in Epicteti Ench., praef. 1–11 Hadot]. Quem quia librum ad manum semper (p. 60) habere oporteat, Encheridion (Encheridion ed.), quo nomine militaris pu-
giânculus 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 permoveendum vis: suos enim qui-
vis affectus in eo agnoscite adoque eos emendandos ceu quodam aculeo excitatur [cf. Simpl., in Epicteti Ench., praef. 21–24 Hadot]. Omnia vero or-
dinem inter se mirum habent omnibusque veluti lineis, quamvis in plura id opus capita sit distinct-
tum, ad excitandum rationalem animum quasi ad ipsum centrum contendunt, ut is et suae dignita-
tis curam habeat et propriis actionibus secundum naturam utatur [cf. Simpl., in Epicteti Ench., praef. 49–55 Hadot]. Stylus autem, qualern res postula-
ret, concisus est, dilucidos quiue omnem respuat ornatum, Pythagoreorumque praecipitis, quasi illi diathecas vocant, quam simillimus [cf. Simpl., in Epicteti Ench., praef. 48–49 Hadot].

Hoc ego opus cum Latinum facere aggerader, ut inducti a te nobis huius tam suavis eti ratione
maldique redere, in duo omnino mendo-
sissima exemplaria incidi pluribusque locis mag-
nae parte mutilata. Quapropter cum et cetera
queacunque usquam exemplaria extarent non
dissimilia his esse audirem, permisi mihi ut, sic-
ubl aliqua capita aut desseent aut dimidiate su-
perante, ea ego de Simplicii verbis, qui id opus
interpretatus est, maxima (quantum in me esset)
vide supplerem. Quod si non verba ad ungum
(id nullo modo fieri poterat), at sensum certe
ipsum purum sincerumque Latinum a nobis red-
ditum arbitror. Quod ne quempiam forte pertur-
bet, quemadmodum Aristarchus Homerius versus
quos ipse non probaret, ita nos singula ipsa capi-
ta, quae nostrum quidem verbis explicitur, ob-
loc, hoc est veru, iugulavimus [these obel i are not found in Riccardiana 766].

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

Patriam hic vir Hierapolini Phrygiae urbem
habuit. Romae Epaphrodiito cuidam Neronis fa-
miliaris servitv atque ad Marci usque Antonini
tempora pervenit [cf. Suda E 2424 (II, 365, 24–27
Adler)]. Domitian autem imperat (p. 62) et, eius
dominatus offensu, Roma Hierapolin migravit
[cf. Simpl., in Epicteti Ench. 32.191–93 Hadot], ra-
tus 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 vi-
tae admiratio extitit, ut Lucianus Syrus Epicteti
lucernam fictilem tribus drachmarum milibus
ob eius auctoritatem venisse tradat [Adv. indoc-
tos 13 = Schenkl, test. XV]. Nos ad te nunc non lu-
cernam Epicteti, sed eius imaginem aniini, quae
multo plus lucis habeat, Laurenti, mittimus. Nam
cum universam tuae pulcherrimae bibliothecae
supellectilem, quam tute nobis utendam con-
cessisti, nupDecember scrutare, hoc unum merito
opusculum quasi ex nocto flosculum, quod tibi
offerem, delibavi. Hic enim unus est liber, nisi
me opinio fallit, qui et naturae isti tuae ad magna
quidem semper atque ardua excitatae et his tan
duris temporibus, quibus te undique fortuna ex-
ercendum accept, maxime omnium conveniat.
Vale.

Encheridion. [Inc.]: Epicteti Stoici Encheridi-
on ab Angelo Politico e Graeco versum. (p. 67;
title of chapter 1) Quae in nobis sint quaeeve non,
qualiave quaeeve sint. (Ench. 1.1) Eorum quae
sunt partim in nobis est, partim non est. In no-
bis est opinio, conatus, appetitus, declinatio et, ut
uno dicam verbo, quaeacunque nostra sunt opera.
Non sunt in nobis corpus, possessio, gloria, prin-
cipatus et uno verbo quaeacunque nostra opera
non sunt. . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 86; Ench. 53.3–4) Sed
tertium: o Critos, si ita dies placet, ita fiat. Me
vero Anytus et Meltus intermire quidem poss-
sunt, laedere autem non possunt.

Manuscripts:
(photo.) Edinburgh, University Library, 234,
s. XVI, fols. 1v–77r (Gr.-Lat.), with Ludovicus
Odaxius' translation of ps. Cebes, Tabula (Boter,
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.
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(photos.) 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 Par- ter, o Fatum ineluctable,/ Quo destinatum est ire me deducite,/ Sequar libens, vel improbus cogar sequi./ Item, Necessitatis imperata qui facit,/ Sapientis habetur, et sciens coelestium.” Oldfather, Supplement, no. 603a. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.
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(*) 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.
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3. Hieronymus Verlenius

The Dutch scholar Hieronymus Verlenius (also Vaerlenius or Verlens) 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 τρίς τα καλὰ (“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 ἐν 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 δοxa ἡμέτερα ἐργα is rendered as "quaecunque nostra sunt opera." Like Perottus and Naogeorgeus, 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 ἄλλοτριῳ προτερήματι = "praestantiam alicuius rei alienae" (=res aliena" means "debt"); chapter 7 ἐν πλω = "inter navigandum."

Verlenius' translation appears to have remained almost completely unnoticed. Wolf, who mentions the versions by Politian and Naogeorgeus (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 tradition, 41 believes that Naogeorgeus was the next translator of the Encheiridion after Politian. Verlenius' translation is not mentioned in the standard bibliographical reference works; Oldfather, Supple ment, 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. Aiv) 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 abAngelo 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 nos trum, sed illius esse qui prior vereretur, continuo malevoli dicturi sunt, et me in alienam (quod aint) messem falcem misisse [LXX, Deut 23:25]. Si quid peccatum fuerit, quod certe non negaverim, neque enim adeo Suffenus [cf. Cat., Carin. 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 respondent, et eum aliquot locis sua quaedam assuisse, et plura addidisse quam patiatur fidei interpretis officium. Verum id non interpreti erudissimae sed corruptissimo et mutile exemplari in quod incidit, imputandum censeo. Verum quicquid sit, et quoquice tandem modo id accidisse putabitur, varia enim sunt et libera cuique iudicia, non putavi pias et Christianas aures tam salubribus fraudandis praecipitis, et admirationibus, quae non ex media philosophia sed theologia intima deprompta dicas. Ego certe miraculo simile esse dixerim gentilem philosophum non illust ratum luce evangelica tam consentanea nostrae religioni et praecipitis evangelicos potuisse scribere. Totus enim in hoc est Epictetus noster, ut ab externis occupationibus, quibus avocavmur a contemplanda veritate, ad se se redeat quidque et posthastibus alius suae potius, id est, animae suae (fol. A2r) negocia curet et, ut Persius ait [Sat. 4,52], tecum habites, et nolis, quam sit tibi curta supellex. In hoc enim uno cardo absolutissimae et verissimae philosophiae versatur. Quamdui enim extra nos vagamur, et per externas toti effundimus actiones, quidvis potissim facimus quae philosophamur. Unde et Socrates neglegit caeteris rebus, ut author est in eius vita Laertius [Diog. Laert. 2,21], censebat id potissime curandum ὅτι το ἐμ (sic) μεγάροις κακῶν τ’ ἀγαθῶν τε τέπνυται, id est aedibus in nostris quae prava ac recta gerantur, significare nimimum videbatur ille etiam Apollinis Delphici testimonio sapientissimus iudicatus [Pl., Ap. 214], omnibus aliis posthabitis in nostris pectus et sinum indisue descendendum, et dispiciendum quid ibi recte, quid minus recte geratur. Quae omnia mirum quanti dexteritate et compendio praecipit Epictetus. Operam itaque hanc nostram boni consule, vale.


Encheiridion: (ed. of "s-Hertogenbosch, 1543 = ed. of Antwerp, 1550). [Inc.]: (title of chapter 1) Vera rerum divisio sapienti per quam necessaria cognit. (Ench. 1.1) Rerum alien in nobis posii- tae sunt, aliena 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. 533–4) At o Crito, si ita dis placet, ita fiat. Me vero Anytus et Melitus occidere quidem possunt, laedere autem non possunt.

Editions:
1543. See above, Composite Editions.
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 (Brusels, 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.6 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. I, 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: μέμνεσιν οὖν ὑμῖν ἄν ταῖς φύσει δύσι ἐλευθεραίον ὄφθος καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τριάδια ἐνθοδόθης, πενθήσεις, παραφθησίς, μέμησις καὶ θεως καὶ ἀνθρώπων = “memento igitur, quod si ea quae natura sunt serva libera putaveris et aliena propria, impederis, lugebis, conturbaberis, incusabis 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 I the phrase ἐνι λόγω 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 I.4 Naogeorgus’ Greek text reads μέμνεσιν ὑμῖν οὖν δει οἶδαι μετρίως κακιμενένον ἀπεσεβαὶ αὐτῶν, while the Latin translation has “memento quod te eam haud mediocrerum commotum capessere oportet”; thus Naogeorgus does not translate οἴδα (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 ἀποκατεῖν (“relieve oneself”); in the same chapter he omits the word ὀνείρεσιν (“have sexual intercourse”) in the Greek text, while giving “vehi” (“travel,” corresponding to the Greek ἄπειρον) 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 Domini, 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 eruditi, ut apud Hebraeos, vel philosophiae incubuerunt, et contra pessimse rexisses sibique atque aliis perniciem invexesse, qui vel divina neglecta postpositaque lege, vel contempta philosophia gesserunt principatum. Unde mirari non satis possum, quamnam ratione quidam (qui dem ed.) induci, rerum publicarum rectoribus philosophiam (loquor autem de illa praecipue parte quae ad mores pertinet atque virtutes cohoritur viamque aperit) divinarumque scripturarum studium clamantem 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 ("cedeant arma togae," Off. 1.22.77).] (fol. A5v) Vos igitur, clarissimi viri, prae multis aliis laudandi estis, quod longe ab illis dissentiatis, qui sacrorum voluminum lectionem
ad solos theologos pertinere dicunt philosophiamque ad pauperes et vulgares ablegant, eoque demum ingenuos idoneosque rectores ac principes esse censent, qui nihil penitus rerum divinarum atque philosophiae curant aut attingunt. Nam et ipsi quatenus per negotia licet studiisque sacros evolutis codices et commentaria pietatemque erga Deum atque religionem sectantini tamque divina quam humana estis philosophia instituti, unde non immerito (immerita ed.) et ipsi feliciter agitis commissamque vobis rem publicam in magna pace et tranquillitate summum cum laude gubernatis licetque sperare hoc perpetuum fore. Quippe filios etiam vestros aliorumque civium multis ad religionis cognitionem a pueros adque bonas artes philosophiamque promovetis curatissque institutii, ut quibus reipublicae gubernacula quasi per manus quibus estis tradituri eundem quoque numinis favorem prosperitatatemque consequantur. Hinc etiam me non inconveniens fuerantur rursus sum, si meum hunc in Epicteti Enchiridion commentarium vobis nuncuparem, non quidem ut vos ad pietatem philosophiamque sectandam hortaret et incitaret, quum sponte huc propensi sitis et properitis, sed magis ut vestris liberas aliquo modo manum portigerem atque ut alii aliarum civitatum rectores vestro moti exemplo similiter studiosi sint educentque pios et illos (illi ed.), quibus rerum habenas post se tradant. . . . [Naogeorgus dwells on the depravity of man.] (fol. A7v) [Expl.]: Accipite igitur, clarissimi Domini, parvulum hoc munusculum sereno vultu, inque pietatis philosophiaeque studio strenue pergite, unde Deus et Dominus noster Jesus Christus remunerabit vos, vestrarum rempublicam perpetuo favore ac felicitate proscequetur. Dat. Stuttgardiae decimo Martii. MDLIII.

Praefatio. (fol. A8r) [Inc.]: Omnis humana tam praeens 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 effecit, ut in labores variasque necnon continuas corporis aerumnas animique perturbationes coniciemur. Unde praeens haec vita iam motibus plena est insanis calamitatibusque ac immensus procellis, et ad futuram stupemus mortemque nobis potius operamur sempiternam, impediti coeitate animique densis tenebris effectionibusque pra-vis, ne rectis ad vitam illam eamus gressibus. Futura quidem eius vitae beatitudo plenam perfectamque continet tranquillitatem, solidam et perpetuam voluptatem, haec vero praeens eo usque pertingere non potest. Obstat enim pecatum, quod adhuc rationes mortalique carni inhaerens in miseras aerumnas praecipitat, nec sinit animas esse tranquillas semperque gaudere, quod unum felicem beatumque redderet hanc vitam, foretque beatitudinis specimen quoddam futurae. Fit enim id quod praeclarissimus poeta scripsit [Verg., Aen. 6.733–34]: Hinc metuunt cu- piuntque, dolent gaudentque nec auras/Respiciunt, clausae tenebris et carceres caecos. . . . [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 Epicetus, come closest to the goal.] (fol. B8r) [Expl.]: Quum ergo huc Epicteti praecepta valde accommoda sint, ea nos فيه in lesum Christum, virtutumque studio bonaque conscientia praeposita, explicare conabimur. Sermo eius brevis quidem est, at mire efficax; id quod unusquisque sentiet, qui non oscitantes et supine pellerexerit. 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 Melsius 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):

Eucharisticum ac votivum eiusdem carmen ad Christum, postquam a diuita femi 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, Neoeorgus, 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 Judicium (s. l., 1539), Judas Iscariotes (s. l., 1552). His other works include five books of Satyræae (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:


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 Aljectatio Hadrien 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 Halander’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 τά ἄρρητα and τά ὕμνῳ and τά ὕμνῳ and τά ὕμνῳ and τά ὕμνῳ and τά ὕμνῳ 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 potestatis 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 εἰς λόγῳ is first rendered as “ut uno compacter 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 τηλικοῦτον οὐν ἔφεμενος μέμησε ὦτι οὐ δεῖ οὔδε κεκινημένον ἀπτεθαί αὐτῶν; but his translation reads: “Cum igitur tanta res appatet, sic eas suscipiantes 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 τηλικοῦτον, and omitting οὖν. Wolf adds that Politian too follows the text given by Simplicius: he continues: “ergo οὐδὲ redundat, 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 ἔν τε καὶ ταύτῃ ἔδειξα καὶ ἂρειν καὶ πλουτεῖν, which he translates as “Quod si et illas desideraris et magistratus etiam atque opes appetieris, et tuos floresre 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 οἰκείτας ἐπανορθίων, 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 fuisset reor, pro eōthēnein, necessarios tuos floresre. Volumus autem in primis nobis bene esse, mox etiam nostris et alius. Discrimen τοῦ εὐθύνω καὶ εὐθηνέω vel puers 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 prefices and other material, see 1.3 above.

_Encheiridion._ [Inc.:] (Ench. 1.3) Res quaedam in potestate nostra sunt, quaedam non sunt. In nostra potestate est, opinio, appetito, desiderium, averteri et, ut uno compacter verbo, quaelibet nostrae actiones. Nostri arbitrii non sunt corpus, pecunia, gloria, imperia, ad summam ea quae ipsis 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 poissent, laedere vero non poissent.

_Manuscripts:_


(*) Valladolid, Biblioteca Universitaria, Santa Cruz 238, misc. (s. XVII), fols. iv-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).

(phot.) 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.


1563. See above, Composite Editions.

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


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.


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. Cebs, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), nos. 141, 142. BL; Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek.


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


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


1640, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Ioannis 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. Cebs, *Tabula*. Oldfather (with *Supplement*), no. 812. Brunet 2.1013; NUC. BL; (MH; CTy; NCd; IU; NBu).


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

(phot.) 1648, Lucernae (Lucerne): typis Lucernae, Davidsis Hautt. Instead of Wolf’s chapters 76–79 this edition has only "Dic, Fatum sequar alacriter: si nolo, improbus sum, et sequar 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.


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

(phot.) 1653, Parisii (Paris): apud Sebastiannum et Gabrielem Cramoisy. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, Tabula (but not Wolf’s translation). Oldfather (with Supplement), no. 158. NUC. BL; BNF; (IU).


1655. See above, Composite Editions.


(*) 1669, Parisii (Paris): apud Viduam Claudii 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 Ravesteinian edition, the NUC probably indicates the former). BL; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (MH; ViU; MiAC; IU; MoSU).


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 Edi-
tions.

1683 (Delft). See above, Composite Editions.

(phot.) 1686, Guelferbyti (Wolfenbüttel):
sumptibus Theophili Henrici Grentzii. (Gr.-Lat.).
With ps. Cebes, Tabula. Oldfather, no. 179. Gött-
ingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universi-
tätsbibliothek.

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

1701, Hannov. (Hannover), Guelferbyt. (Wol-
fenbüttel), Rudolstadii (Rudolstadt): Hannov. et
Guelferbyt. Sumtibus Gothofredi Freytagi. Ru-
dolstadii, 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 Sheldonia-
no, Impensis G. West. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes,
Tabula etc. Oldfather (with Supplement), nos. 115,
182. NUC. BL; (CTY).

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

1707, Hannov. (Hannover), Guelferbyt. (Wol-
fenbüttel), Rudolstadii (Rudolstadt): Hannov. et
Guelferbyt. sumptibus Ludolfi Henrici Haun-
steinii. Rudolstadii, typis Henrici Urbani. (Gr.-
Lat.). With ps. Cebes, Tabula. Oldfather (with
Supplement), nos. 184-86. The Hague, Konink-
lijke Bibliotheek.

1711. See above, Composite Editions.

1722, Guelferbyt. et Rudolstadii (Wolfenbüt-
tel and Rudolstadt): Guelferbyt. sumptibus Io.
Christophori Meisneri. Rudolstadii, typis Io.
Henrici Loewii. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, Ta-
bula. Oldfather (with Supplement), no. 188. The
Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; Leipzig, Univer-
sitätsbibliothek.

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;
(MHi; ICU; CU-I).

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

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

(phot.) 1750 (Amsterdam). See above, Com-
posome Editions.

(phot.) s. a. (ca. 1750), Viennae Austriæ (Vi-
enna): Prostat apud Maximilianum Grundt.
(Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, Tabula. Oldfather,
Supplement, nos. 197a, 228a. Vienna, Universi-
tätsbibliothek.

1756, Guelferbyti (Wolfenbüttel): sumpt. Io.
Christophori Meisneri. (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes,
NUC. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek; (PU).

(*) 1799, Brunsvigiae (Braunschweig): Schrö-
der. (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, Amsterdam (Amsterdam). Men-
tioned by H. Relandus (in the edition of the En-
cheiridion by M. Meibom [Utrecht, 1711], In-
dex 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 biogra-
phischer und literarischer Hinsicht (Marburg,
1795); S.F.W. Hoffmann, Bibliographisches Lexi-
con 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 handboeke 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, Regiae Elizabethae, juxta Dublincum, adseruantur* (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.


(*) 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 Tornæusius edition 1589 (= Oldfather [with Supplement], no. 132). (Gr.-Lat.). With ps. Cebes, *Tabula*. Oldfather, *Supplement*, no. 131b.


(*) 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, Lugduni 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.


(*) 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 2.103 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).


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


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


(*) 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 Arktsteum et Markum (Oldfather, no. 237) and Amsterdam, 1750, apud J. Wetstenium. Oldfather, no. 196.


(*) 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 1,3 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 XXXVII]) 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 Scheller (communication of 12 April 1996): “Es ist ein durchschnittes Exemplar, anfangs mit zeitgenössischer handschriftlicher Ubersetzung, 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 11, the phrase ἐνι λόγῳ is rendered as “uno verbo” in both places; δέ ημέτερα ἐργα 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 οὐδὴς σὸν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἀλλότριον (ὢσπερ ἐστίν) ἀλλότριον = “Sin autem quod tuum est solum putaveris tuum esse, alienum vero (sic 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 μέμνησθο ὃτι.
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 "Ment" 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, apetitus (sic), declinatio, et uno verbo quae cumque nostra opera. Non in nobis sunt corpus, possessio, honores, principatus atque uno verbo quae cumque nostra non sunt opera. . . . . . . [Expl.]: (Ench. 21) Mors et exilium et omnia quae periculo aparent (sic) ante oculos sint tibi quotidie, maxime vero omnium mors; et nihil unquam humile cognosce neque valde apetis (sic) quidquam.


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 vicissitudes 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.6 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 dicas, quae cumque nostra opera. . . . . . .

Naogeorgus: Rerum existentium quaedam sunt in nostra potestate, quaedam non sunt in nostra potestate est opinio, conatus, appetitio, declinatio, et uno ut verbo dicas, quae cumque nostra sunt opera. In nostra vero potestate non sunt corpus, possessio, gloria, principatus et uno ut verbo dicas, ea quae ipsi non agimus.

Wolf: Res quaedam in potestate nostra sunt, quaedam non sunt. In nostra potestate est opinio, appetitio, desiderium, aversatio et uno ut complector verbo, quae cuncte nostrae actiones. Nostri arbitrii non sunt corpus, pecunia, gloria, imperia, ad summmam ea quae ipsis 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.

et felices in hoc mundo esse non valentem, animo autem tranquilli semper beatique esse possumus. Nam quae ἀλληλομάθεια τού 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 animas 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 aequivitndinem ex solo errore nasci falsae 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 bestis nobis communem), non est haec in consilium adhibenda, sed ad opus tantum a recta ratione decertum. Huius enim instinctu (fol. A3r) bestiae fit ut plurimi verae ductum rationis non sequantur, sed ad bellumarum naturam inclinantes, ali quidem similes sint leonibus, feroxibus, crudelibus, superbi, aliis lupis, rapaces, infidi, furaces, aliis vulpeculis, subdoli, insidiatores, fallaces, aliis pircis, turpes, sordidi, voraces, aliis canibus, mordaces, maledici, iracundi, aliis asinis, agrestes, stolidi, segnes, aliis denique avibus, libidinosi, leves, inconstantes. Iam omnes istas atque huliusmodi alias bestias homini innatas haec philosophia vel prorsus de medio tollit vel directa saltem ratione vincatas tenet, ne suae extra saepa evagatur. Quod autem ad libellum huic graece scripti et latinam (fol. A3v) versionem et explicationem attinet, neutra est tota mea, sed maxima ex parte versio est Hieronymi Wolphi, graece et latein docc tissimi viri, commentatio vero Thomae Nageor gigii (sic), qui cum divinitus quaedam ad omnem animi dolorem tollendum valde apposita scriptisset, 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 occurretat, quod optimus hic Christianus philosophus dum in optimum ethnicum philosophum Epictetum commentaretur, pessimam sorte uxorem habuerit, cuius intemperie concitatustus (fol. A4r) acerrime in magistratum invehe tur, qui viris non permitted 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 paucu denique capita ipse sum interpretatus, et multis illius commendationibus meas attexui, non ut allorum inventis nonnulla addens gloriam aliquam venarer, sed quod ipse expertus mirabiliter hanc philosophiam animi motus atque fluctus sedare allorum quoque animos hac sanari doctrina cupiam. Itaque hic libellus sit compendium non solum totius philosophiae moralis, verum etiam (fol. A4v) commentariorum Thomaee Nageor gigii (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, laedem autem non possunt.

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


Rejected edition: 1595, Claudiiopoli (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 Jesuicicum (Basel, 1581), Praeceptuarum enumeratam causarum cur christiani, cum in multis religionis doctrinis mobiles sint et variis, in trinitatis tamen retinendos dogmata sint constantissimi (s.l., 1584; Heidelberg, 1592), and Dolium Diogenianum strenuus suorum collaborans dynastis christianis bellum in Turcos parantibus (Hamburg, 1595).

Bibliography:

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: Epicetii Enchiridion, et Tabula Cebitis, Latine versa a Ludovico Odaxio, cum Censorino de die natali, alisique 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 Epicetius and Cebes. At any rate, Relandus’ statement deceived Heyne, who states (1776 edition, p. xxxi): “Prodii Enchiridion primum graece (nam latine iam prostat ab conversum ab Lud. Odaxio et ab Angelo Politiano) cum Simplicii commentario Venetiis 1528.”

9. Jacobus Schegkius
Hadrianus Relandus mentions an edition published at Lyons in the year 1660, Ench. ex versione J. Schegkii (Oldfather, no. 9). 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 brevissula in locos aliquot Epicetii 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.

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. Vidit notitique hominum animos esse inexplebles, et nihil non sibi arrogare et polliceri. . . . . [Expl.]: (ad Ench. 53.4) Ita si fuerimus animati, tranquilitatem animi adipiscemur ac tuebimus, 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 attention to the Stoic vocabulary used by Epictetus and refers in many places to Simplicius’ commentary.


ὁ Ζεῦ πατήρ τε καὶ σοφὸς κλῆθος βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ μετάστησον κακῶν.

Quam eleganter convertit vir doctiss. Vincentius Obsopoeus:

Iuppiter alme pares, sapiens, iustissimus
idem,
respite 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).


(*) 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).


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.1b 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 fulfill their duty. In other places he has abbreviated Naogeorgus’ notes; here and there, he has also added something of his own invention.

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

**Edition:**
(photo.) 1585. See above, Composite Editions.

**Doubtful edition:**

**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 Halaonder'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 *Gnomologia Epictetum*, 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 Epicteteaum Fragmenta* (pp. 470–71 Schenkl); after fr. 24 (= Stobaeus 4.53.30) Verlenius adds Stobaeus 4.53.31.

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 re-stare cognovissim ex Gerardo Loppersum Phri-sio, qui hunc libellum in officina mea correc-it, iussi, ut et ea in fine adiceret, ne iis quoque fraudaretur, qui libellum empturum est.” Gerardus found these texts in Gesner's 1549 edition of Stobaeus; he then added the items from the *Gnomologia Epictetum* 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 praecepetta 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 moritura, 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 Epictetii continens praecepta vitae civiles, ex collectaneis graecis Ioannis Stobaei de-sumpta. [Inc.]: (Gnom. Epict. 1 [p. 478 Schenkl]) Vita fortunae implicita et eidem obnoxia: flumini hibernis aucto pluviis similis est, turbulenta namque est et limosa, quam nec facile nec tuto quis ingrediatur, ad haec tyrannica, obstrepera, minimeque diuturna. . . . . [Expl.]: (Stobaeus 4.53.31) Vita brevior sed cum virtute conjuncta longe praeferenda est longiori vitae sed impro-bae.

**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): Epicetet._


_Editions:_

1563. See above, Composite Editions.
1595 (Cologne). See above, Composite Editions.
1599–96. See above, Composite Editions.
1655. See above, Composite Editions.
1683. See above, Composite Editions.

_Biography and Bibliography:_

See II.3 above.

**Commentaries**

_a. Hieronymus Verlenius_

Verlenius added a number of notes to his translation of the Epicetean 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.


_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, Opominiae 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 the editor as viewed by Wolf and is quoted below in full.


Alia leviusscula, ut parēγαγεν, ἡμερος, ἀμεινον, ἅδικως, οὖτως, ἀνήρ, οὐκ et similia perperam excussa, sic corrigenda esse vel puer intellegat. In caeteris candidis lector cogitent elaborandum interpreti esse, ut et analogiae et syntaxes ratio et ipse sensus autori constet. Quis enim ea vertat quae nec ipse nec ali intelligent? Grammatica errata homini docto animadvertere et emendare non est difficile. Ubi sententia [senentia ed.]. ipsa claudiat, sagaciari ingenio est opus, cuius coniecturae prorsus contemnendae non sunt, donec emendator codex offertur; emendator inquam, non vestitior. Constat enim antiquos etiam librarios (ἀνθρώπους γε καὶ μᾶ Δία, μάλλον δὲ ἀνδρία παραγόντας) aequo atque nostri temporis chalcographos errare solitos; id quod is perspiciet, qui plura exempla vetera ei usdem autori contulerit. Ipsa quidem hoc in Zonara (non vestitissimmo illo quidem autore, sed tamen paucos haberi codices existimo ante 400 annos scriptos) sum expertus, ubi interdum quinque codices eodem loco disserunt. Quid
hic in convertendo faciet abesse naris et superstitionis (vol. 2, p. 385) antiquarius? Nam diversas quidem lectiones annotare ut per molestem esse fateor, ita faciillimum est. Ego mihi ubique et analogiam et stylum autore per contextum sententiarum sequenda esse duco.

Augurium ratio est et coniectura futuri: 

hac divinat ociamque feres.  

[Ov., Trist. 1.9.51–52].

Neque vero fideles antiquariorum et saepe utilenses labores improbo, neque tementatem mutandae lectionis laudo: neque nisi manifestos errores quicquam in auctoribus muto, neque coniecturas meas pro oraculis haberri volo. Sed quid in convertendo spectarim, citra cuissuam praedictionum, annoto: et eatenus probari lectoribus cupio, quatenus a suneose garammatike te kai politike non abhorrerunt.

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 Wolflis lectori s. [Inc.:] (p. 385) Utinam epistolae Epicteti, quae cum Simplicii Commentariis in Florentina Bibliotheca extare dicuntur, habere potuisse: 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 ψευδεπιγραφον, ut opinor, corollarium vice adicere visum est, ob exiguum tantillae chartae iacturam, quam vel una sententia pensare potest. Vale.


Biography and Bibliography: See 1.3 above.